

## Jefferson/Baxter Answer Key

Hotline Tools	
Assessment Section	Notes/Support for Scoring
Header Information	CWS/CMS referral name: Tammy Jefferson
Step I: Preliminary Screening	No criteria apply; proceed to Step II
Step II: Appropriateness of a Child Abuse/Neglect Report for Response	
<p>A. Screening Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical Abuse, Non-accidental or suspicious injury marked</li> <li>Physical Abuse, Other injury marked</li> <li>No other items marked</li> </ul>	<p>Facial and eye bruising, and small gash on cheek, observed by father and medical staff. Father stated that mother's explanation of injury was "he fell"; medical professionals report that child's injuries were unlikely to have occurred in a fall or at the same time.</p> <p>Injuries do not meet definition of "severe," which means an injury that "if left untreated, would cause permanent physical disfigurement, permanent physical disability, or death."</p> <p>Some participants may be tempted to mark "General Neglect: inadequate medical/mental health care" or "Caregiver absence/abandonment." Arguments for not marking include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the injuries are reported as suspicious, it is unclear if medical care for the injuries was required.</li> <li>Information in the report indicates the mother left the child in the care of another legal parent.</li> </ol>
<p>B. Screening Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-person response</li> </ul>	One or more criteria marked.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overrides</li> </ul>	No overrides apply.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercially Sexually Exploited and/or Sex Trafficked Information</li> </ul>	No criteria apply.
Step III: Response Priority	
Mark if applicable	No criteria apply.
<p>1. Decision Trees</p> <p>Physical Abuse: Allegation of physical injury to non-mobile child or any child under age 2 (or capability equivalent) marked</p>	<p>Item marked based on child's age and physician's statement that injuries were likely the result of abuse.</p> <p>The "Medical care currently required" item is not marked because the medical care being provided is not "immediately necessary and if not provided will seriously and possibly permanently affect the child's health and well-being." However, due to the pending X-ray results and the unexplained injuries, this item could be marked with justification.</p>
<p>2. Overrides</p>	No overrides apply.
Final response priority	24 hours
<p>Step IV: Path of Response Decision</p> <p>B. Path Decision for In-Person Response</p>	<p>Automatic Path 3: No</p> <p>Yes to the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior investigations, one or two</li> <li>Prior child protective services</li> <li>Primary caregiver has a history of abuse/neglect as a child</li> <li>Prior injury to a child due to abuse or neglect</li> </ul>
Path Decision	According to local differential response policy

**Training Note:** Segments 2 and 3 of this case example replicate common processes of assessing the safety of children when they are part of two different households. In this case example, the mother’s household is assessed because allegation households are always assessed. The father’s household is assessed after the mother’s home was determined to be unsafe and she was not available for safety planning. Be sure to help participants identify households and identify that each legal parent is the primary caregiver in their own household. In addition, Segment 4 will contain information that the safety assessment for the father’s household needs to be updated. The case example will provide these details, but participants are not expected to complete a third safety assessment.

<b>Safety Assessment on Tammy Jefferson’s Household</b>	
<b>Assessment Section</b>	<b>Notes/Support for Scoring</b>
Household being assessed	Tammy Jefferson (mother primary/Juan secondary caregiver)
Header information	Indian Ancestry: Parent not available Assessment Type: Initial Name of Child Assessed: Joshua Baxter Household Name: Tammy Jefferson; Yes, there were allegations
Factors Influencing Child Vulnerability	Age 0–5 years  Some participants might be tempted to mark “Not readily accessible to community oversight,” but Joshua and his mother are regularly seen in the apartment complex and his father visits him.
Section 1: Safety Threats	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serious physical harm, serious injury or abuse to the child, other than accidental: Physician reports that injuries are likely a result of abuse, occurring at different times; there are injuries occurring on his face (placing child at risk for brain trauma). While no specific proof exists that Tammy was the person who injured Joshua, her past history of physical injury to Joshua’s sibling and at least two different accounts by mother about how Joshua was injured support this item. Some participants may argue that it is not known who caused the injuries—redirect them toward what is “reasonably” known, including her past history.</li> <li>7. Caregiver’s explanation for the injury to the child is questionable or inconsistent with the type of injury, and the nature of injury suggests that child’s safety may be of immediate concern: Based on physician’s report that injuries could not have been caused by mother’s reported explanations and past substantiated physical abuse of sibling.</li> <li>9. Current circumstances, combined with information that a caregiver has previously maltreated a child: Based on unexplained injury and prior substantiated investigation with protective removal of sibling.</li> </ol> <p>Items not marked or other comments:</p> <p>Documentation should note that a safety assessment was completed on the mother’s household without direct interview with mother; assessment was based on interviews with father,</p>

Safety Assessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Assessment Section	Notes/Support for Scoring
	apartment manager, and mother's friend, as well as medical professionals. Item 3 should not be marked, because mother left child in care of legal father. No evidence of failure to seek medical care, because injuries did not require treatment.
Section 1A: Caregiver Complicating Behaviors	While information about the mother included some indicators of possible domestic violence and prior substance use with natural father, marking of items in the Complicating Behaviors section not justified without further assessment, which is not possible due to lack of contact with mother at this point.
Section 2: Household Strengths and Protective Actions	Lack of contact with mother makes assessment of household strengths and protective actions impossible at this point.
Section 3: In-Home Protective Interventions	Unable to create a safety plan with mother, so safety decision for her household is "Unsafe."
Safety Decision	Unsafe

Safety Assessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Assessment Section	Notes/Support for Scoring
Household being assessed	Tom Baxter
Header Information	Indian Ancestry: Cherokee Assessment Type: Initial Name of Child Assessed: Joshua Baxter Household Name: Tom Baxter; there were no allegations
Factors Influencing Child Vulnerability	Age 0-5 years
Section 1: Safety Threats	3. Caregiver does not meet the child's immediate needs for food, diapers, and shelter on at least two other occasions; leaves the child with another caregiver and does not return
Section 1A: Caregiver Complicating Behaviors	Substance abuse
Section 2: Household Strengths and Protective Actions	Caregiver problem solving: Caregiver identifies and acknowledges the problem/safety threat and took action to respond (this is both a household strength and a protective action). Caregiver took action to get medical help and help to protect the child.  Caregiver support network: Caregiver has at least one supportive relationship with someone (Sheila Baxter) who is willing to be a part of his support network, is aware of the safety threat, and is willing to provide protection (this is both a household strength and a protective action).  Caregiver support network: Caregiver is willing to work with the agency to mitigate safety threats.
Section 3: In-Home Protective Interventions	2. Use of family as safety resource. 7. Non-offending parent moves to an alternative safe environment with the child.
Safety Decision	Safe with Plan

**Over the course of the weekend, the safety decision for the father's household became "Unsafe," because he left the child, while using substances, without making arrangements for his care. Trainer should advise group that an updated safety assessment should be completed on the father's household in response to the aunt's call to the after-hours CWS worker.**

**Training Note:** There are two risk assessments for this case because we always do a risk assessment on the household with allegations AND a risk assessment for a non-custodial parent wanting reunification services as a baseline.

**WebSDM Note:** One risk assessment may be completed in a referral for the household with allegations. In order to complete the second risk assessment in webSDM, open a case in CWS/CMS and complete a second risk assessment.

Risk Assessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
<b>Prior Investigations</b>	
1. Prior neglect investigations	a. None
2. Prior abuse investigations	c. Two; sibling no longer in the home
3. Previous or current open CPS case	b. Yes, but not open now; half-sibling case
4. Prior physical injury resulting from child abuse/neglect or prior substantiated physical abuse of a child	b. Bruising on sibling and prior substantiation: both items marked
<b>Current Investigation</b>	
5. Current report maltreatment type	b. Physical and/or emotional abuse
6. Number of children involved	a. One
7. Primary caregiver assessment of the incident	a. Definition not met based on available case information
<b>Family Characteristics</b>	
8. Age of youngest child in the home	b. Under 2
9. Characteristics of children in the household	a. None applicable
10. Housing	a. Household has physically safe housing
11. Incidents of domestic violence in the household in the past year	a. None. While there were calls for service to the home for verbal altercations, there is no specific evidence of domestic violence except for some damage in the home and reports of verbal conflict. (This is an area of considerable debate, with some participants stating that "red flags" indicate the presence of domestic violence.)
12. Primary caregiver disciplinary practices	a. Employs appropriate discipline. There is no specific information that injuries were caused by disciplinary practices.
13. Caregiver history of abuse or neglect as a child	b. One or both caregivers have a history of abuse or neglect as a child.
14. Caregiver mental health	a. No past or current mental health problem
15. Caregiver alcohol or drug use	a. None that interferes with family functioning. While both use substances, there no information that use interfered with family functioning.
16. Caregiver criminal arrest history	b. Either caregiver has one or more criminal arrests. Both mother and Juan.

Risk Assessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Neglect: 5 Abuse: 5</b>
Scored Risk Level	Neglect Risk Level: Moderate; Abuse Risk Level: High
Policy Overrides	2. Child under 2 and physician stated injuries were non-accidental
Discretionary Override	No.
Final Risk Level	Very High
Planned Action	Promote
Supplemental Items 1. Difficulty accepting child's gender/sexual orientation 2. Alleged perpetrator is unmarried partner of primary caregiver 3. Another adult provides unsupervised care to child under 3 3a. Is other adult employed? 4. Caregiver is isolated in the community 5. Caregiver has provided safe and stable housing	1. a, no 2. a, no 3. b, yes 3a. b, yes 4. a, no 5. b, yes

Risk Assessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
<b>Prior Investigations</b>	
1. Prior neglect investigations	a. None
2. Prior abuse investigations	a. None (Tom not father to Joshua's sibling)
3. Previous or current open CPS case	a. None (Tom not father to Joshua's sibling)
4. Prior physical injury resulting from child abuse/neglect or prior substantiated physical abuse of a child	a. None (Tom not father to Joshua's sibling)
<b>Current Investigation</b>	
5. Current report maltreatment type	a. Allegation of general neglect added.
6. Number of children involved	a. One
7. Primary caregiver assessment of the incident	a. Caregiver does not blame the child
<b>Family Characteristics</b>	
8. Age of youngest child in the home	b. Under 2
9. Characteristics of children in the household	a. None applicable
10. Housing	b. Family homeless
11. Incidents of domestic violence in the household in the past year	a. None
12. Primary caregiver disciplinary practices	a. Employs appropriate discipline
13. Caregiver history of abuse or neglect as a child	b. Primary caregiver has history of abuse as a child
14. Caregiver mental health	b. Past or current mental health problem: depression
15. Caregiver alcohol or drug use	b. Alcohol and drugs, past and prior

Risk Assessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
16. Caregiver criminal arrest history	b: Petty theft, motor vehicle theft, breaking and entering, DUIs
<b>Total Score</b>	Neglect: 7 Abuse: 3
Scored Risk Level	Neglect Risk Level: High; Abuse Risk Level: Moderate
Policy Overrides	None
Discretionary Override	No
Final Risk Level	High
Planned Action	Promote
Supplemental Items 1. Difficulty accepting child's gender/sexual orientation 2. Alleged perpetrator is unmarried partner of primary caregiver 3. Another adult provides unsupervised care to child under 3 3a. Is other adult employed? 4. Caregiver is isolated in the community 5. Caregiver has provided safe and stable housing	1. a, no 2. a, no 3. c, N/A 3a. c, N/A 4. a, no 5. a, no

**Trainer's Note:** FSNA tools should be completed on each household, as both parents are seeking reunification services and reside in separate households.

Family Strengths and Needs Assessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
Household	Primary caregiver is Tammy, secondary caregiver is Juan
<b>Section 1: Caregiver Strengths and Needs Assessment</b>	
A. Household Context	Tammy is Caucasian, Juan is Mexican, no tribal affiliation, both heterosexual. Tammy assesses that her cultural identity is a strength in creating safety.
B. Caregiver Domains	
SN1. Resource Management/Basic Needs	b/b: Both caregivers employed, housing and resource needs met.
SN2: Physical Health	a/b: Tammy is using proactive strategies for health, including exercise, which can also be a strategy to mitigate trauma
SN3: Parenting Practices	d/b: Tammy expresses frustration with Joshua's tantrum behaviors; while no direct admission, concerns about disciplinary practices and frustration levels that cause a safety threat.
SN4: Social Support System	b/b
SN5: Household and Family Relationships	c/c: Calls for service; apartment manager is aware of verbal altercations in home with child present.
SN6: Domestic Violence	b/b: See above, no direct evidence of domestic violence, though some worries about this are present. Documentation should identify this area as a "watch" area during ongoing services.

Family Strengths and Needs Assessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
SN7: Substance Use	b/b: Substance use, past and current, does not interfere with family functioning or child safety.
SN8: Mental Health	b/b
SN9: Prior Adverse Experiences/Trauma	d/b: Impacts of trauma triggers on patience and care of Joshua make this domain a direct contributor to child safety threats.
SN10: Cognitive/Developmental Abilities	b/b
SN11: Other Identified Caregiver Strength or Need	N/A
C. Priority Needs and Strengths	Needs: 1. Trauma – case plan 2. Parenting – case plan 3. Household Relationships – “watch” area  Strengths: 1. Physical health – strategies can be generalized to support case plan objectives 2. Resource management – area of stability
<b>Section 2: Child Strengths and Needs Assessment</b>	
Cultural context	Child is Native American, Black, and White; possible Cherokee tribal affiliation; sexuality and gender expression not discussed
CSN1: Emotional/Behavioral Health	b
CSN2: Trauma	c: Aggressive and flinching behaviors
CSN3: Child Development	b
CSN4: Education	b
CSN5: Social Relationships	b
CSN6: Family Relationships	d: Child's family relationships within this household put him in danger of suffering serious physical or emotional harm.
CSN7: Physical Health/Disability	b
CSN8: Alcohol/Drugs	b
CSN9: Delinquency	b
CSN10: Relationship with SCP	a
CSN11: Independent Living	N/A
CSN12: Other Identified Child Strength or Need	N/A
C. Priority Needs and Strengths	Needs: Trauma Family relationships  Strengths: Relationship with SCP

Family Strengths and Needs Assessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
Household	Primary caregiver is Tom, no secondary caregiver
<b>Section 1: Caregiver Strengths and Needs Assessment</b>	
A. Household Context	Native American (Cherokee) and Black, heterosexual. Connected to spiritual traditions of Native American culture. Feels culture can be a resource
B. Caregiver Domains	
SN1: Resource Management/Basic Needs	c.: Homeless, unemployed due to injury and substance abuse issues
SN2: Physical Health	c: Broken ribs injury contributes to resource management issues
SN3: Parenting Practices	c: Inexperienced with care of young children, need basic toddler care skill development
SN4: Social Support System	a: Actively using relative for temporary care, engaged in social support for recovery
SN5: Household and Family Relationships	b
SN6: Domestic Violence	b
SN7: Substance Use	d: Father's resolution of his substance abuse issue is key to his ability to provide safe care
SN8: Mental Health	c: Depression—may contribute to substance abuse relapse
SN9: Prior Adverse Experiences/Trauma	c: Father's trauma resulted in relapse
SN10: Cognitive/Developmental Abilities	b
SN11: Other Identified Caregiver Strength or Need	N/A
C. Priority Needs and Strengths	Needs: 1. Substance Abuse – case plan 2. Parenting Practices – case plan 3. Resource Management/Basic Needs – case plan 4. Mental Health – “watch” area 5. Physical Health  Strengths: 1. Social Support System
<b>Section 2: Child Strengths and Needs Assessment</b>	
Cultural context	Same as in Tammy's household
CSN1: Emotional/Behavioral Health	b
CSN2: Trauma	c
CSN3: Child Development	b
CSN4: Education	b
CSN5: Social Relationships	b
CSN6: Family Relationships	a
CSN7: Physical Health/Disability	b
CSN8: Alcohol/Drugs	b

Family Strengths and Needs Assessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Section/Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
CSN9: Delinquency	b
CSN10: Relationship with SCP	a
CSN11: Independent Living	N/A
CSN12: Other Identified Child Strength or Need	N/A
C. Priority Needs and Strengths	Needs: Trauma  Strengths: Relationship with SCP Family relationships

**Trainer's note:** Remind participants that reunification reassessments are also household-based, and therefore two assessments should be completed, one on Tammy's household and one on Joshua's household.

Reunification Reassessment on Tammy Jefferson's Household	
Section/Assessment Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
Header information	This is the removal household, assessment #1
<b>A. Reunification Risk Reassessment</b>	
R1: Risk level on most recent referral	d, very high
R2: New substantiation	a, no
R3: Caregiver's progress with case plan objectives	d, does not demonstrate new skills and behaviors consistent with case plan objectives
Total Score	9
Reunification Risk Level	Very High
Overrides	Policy :none, discretionary: none
Final Reunification Risk Level	Very High
<b>B. Visitation Plan Evaluation</b>	Unacceptable visitation, based on scoring of "Rare or Never" for compliance with visitation plan and "Limited/Destructive" evaluation; no overrides
<b>C. Reunification Safety Assessment</b>	Not completed
<b>D. Placement/Permanency Plan Guidelines</b>	Child Under Age 3 decision tree:  Reunification risk level low or moderate: no Is this the six-month hearing or before: yes Is the answer to R3 a or b OR is visitation acceptable: no  Decision tree points to "Terminate FR"
Overrides	None apply
<b>E. Recommendation Summary</b>	Terminate FR, implement permanent alternative
<b>F. Sibling Group</b>	N/A

Reunification Reassessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Section/Assessment Item	Notes
Header information	Tom is primary caregiver, this is not the removal household; assessment #1
<b>A. Reunification Risk Reassessment</b>	
R1: Risk level on most recent referral	c, high
R2: New substantiation	a, no
R3: Caregiver's progress with case plan objectives	a
Total Score	2
Reunification Risk Level	Moderate
Overrides	Policy none, discretionary none
Final Reunification Risk Level	Moderate
<b>B. Visitation Plan Evaluation</b>	
Acceptable, based upon compliance with visitation plan (attended 94% of visits) and strong/adequate quality of visit	
<b>C. Reunification Safety Assessment</b>	
1. a, no. Father has maintained his sobriety and is now employed and has obtained housing. 2. a, no Safety Decision: Safe	
<b>D. Placement/Permanency Plan Guidelines</b>	
Child Under Age 3 decision tree:  Reunification risk level low or moderate: yes Is visitation acceptable: yes Is the home either safe, or safe with plan: yes  Decision tree points to "Return Home"	
Overrides	None apply
<b>E. Recommendation Summary</b>	
Return Home	
<b>F. Sibling Group</b>	
N/A	

Risk Reassessment on Tom Baxter's Household	
Assessment Item	Notes/Support for Scoring
Header information	Household: Tom Baxter, no secondary caregiver
R1. Number of prior neglect or abuse investigations	a. None
R2. Previous open CWS case	a. No
R3. Caregiver has a history of abuse or neglect as a child	b. Yes
R4. Characteristics of children in the household	a. Not applicable
R5. New investigation since the initial risk assessment	a. No
R6. Alcohol or drug use since the last assessment	c. Yes, problem is being addressed
R7: Adult relationships in the home	a. None applicable
R8: Caregiver mental health since the last assessment	b. No current mental health problem

<b>Risk Reassessment on Tom Baxter's Household</b>	
<b>Assessment Item</b>	<b>Notes/Support for Scoring</b>
R9: Caregiver's physical care of child	a. Consistent with child needs
R10: Caregiver's progress with case plan objectives	a. Demonstrates new skills and behaviors consistent with all family case plan objectives and is actively engaged to maintain objectives
<b>Total Score</b>	1
<b>Scored Risk Level</b>	Low
<b>Overrides</b>	None
<b>Final Risk Level</b>	Low
<b>Recommended Decision</b>	Close. Remind workers that a safety assessment must be completed prior to case closure.