

[This program design was submitted to the Steering Committee and approved in March 2008.]

Supervisor Expertise in Safety Intervention Decision Making

**Description of the Program Design
Recommendations
March 2008**

This description of the program design is approved by the Project Steering Committee.

Program Objectives

This program is being designed to achieve these objectives:

- * Participants recognize and can explain essential safety concepts, criteria, and standards and how each is applied at specific points in the safety intervention process.
- * Participants perform acceptable supervisory judgments related to assessing and responding to present danger and impending danger.
- * Participants independently analyze and perform critical thinking related to safety information, case practice, and decision making.
- * Participants successfully demonstrate proficiency in information analysis, safety assessment, safety planning, and safety management.

Multi-State Accommodation

As a program designed for four states, it is necessary that the program rises above the uniqueness and differences that exist among the participating states. The intent is to provide essential knowledge and skill which have relevance and usefulness in not only the participating states, but any state. To the extent that there are concerns among the states related to terminology or conceptual application, the Steering Committee will determine if there is a need for accommodation. In general, it is expected that this program will not teach content specific to states such as safety threat terminology or safety instruments. The intent is to prepare participants to master the essential safety concepts to such a degree that they are able to translate their abilities to any safety intervention model.

Essential Concepts

The premise of this program is that there are essential safety concepts that a supervisor understand and master the use of in order to effectively complete safety intervention decisions. Using this premise to form this program does not in any way suggest that additional knowledge and skill related to the complexity of supervising staff in safety intervention are not necessary to be fully effective in supervision.

The essential safety concepts are:

- * Definition of Safety
- * Present Danger
- * Impending Danger
- * Caregiver Protective Capacities
- * Safety Threats
- * Safety Threshold
- * Protective Plan
- * Safety Plan
- * Conditions for Return
- * Information Standards
- * Safety Management and Provisional Protection
- * Safety Intervention Analysis
- * Safety Intervention Process
- * Child Vulnerability
- * Safety in Placement

Synthesis of Safety Threats

Given the multi-state involvement in this project, the program requires a synthesis of safety threats to assure that each state's rendering of safety threats is accommodated. The program emphasizes understanding and applying the concept of safety threats in ways that are not confined or restricted by specific terms or language but by the family condition or dynamic to which terms or language refers.

The "universal safety threats" are:

1. Caregiver violence
 - * domestic violence
 - * caused serious physical harm
2. Caregiver is out of control
 - * emotional disturbance
 - * deviant sexual behavior
 - * substance misuse and abuse
3. Extremely unrealistic caregiver perceptions of child
 - * extremely unrealistic expectations
 - * child has unmet exceptional needs
 - * child is seen as being responsible for caregiver's problems
 - * caregiver describes child in predominantly negative terms
 - * caregiver acts toward the child in predominantly negative ways
4. Access to Child (*Present Danger*)
 - * caregiver refuses access to the child
 - * whereabouts of child unknown
5. Family may flee (*Present Danger*)
6. Failure to supervise
 - * no adult in the home
7. Failure to provide essential, necessary, basic care
 - * lack of resources to do so
8. Child is fearful
9. Hazardous physical living conditions
10. Unexplained injury (*Present Danger*)

11. Intention to hurt
 - * no remorse
 - * no guilt
 - * plausible threat
 - * previous serious physical harm
12. Parent's/caregiver's whereabouts are unknown (*Present Danger*)
13. Provocative child which caregivers cannot or will not manage, care for, meet needs
 - * child shows serious emotional effects of maltreatment and a lack of behavioral control
 - * child shows serious physical effects of maltreatment
14. One or both parents overtly reject intervention (*Present Danger*)
15. Maltreating parent exhibits no remorse or guilt
16. Parents have failed to benefit from previous related professional help

Program Focus

The program focuses on two areas of practice and decision making and will design the curriculum with respect to those.

- * Part 1: Recognizing and Responding to Present Danger
- * Part 2: Recognizing and Responding to Impending Danger

Program Standard

This will be a proficiency program designed to achieve an acceptable level of mastery. Curriculum design will assure a rigorous program employing adult learning principles. Curriculum design will include the identification of "correct answers" and will include methods for validating what constitutes proficiency.

Program Outline

DAY 1

1. Program Component

Program Orientation and Introduction to Present Danger

- 1.1. Location – on site
- 1.2. 6 hours
- 1.3. Classroom

2. Purpose

- 2.1. Orient participants to entire program
- 2.2. Introduce present danger
- 2.3. Make 1st assignment

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Participants understand and describe the entire program, reasons for the program, their responsibilities, expectations for involvement, and anticipated level of effort.
- 3.2. Each participant demonstrates his or her current level of understanding of safety-intervention decision making through completion of a pre-test.
- 3.3. Each participant describes how he or she will meet expectations of this program and achieve expectations set by the agency as represented through an individual program work plan.
- 3.4. Participants explain the first assignment concerned with present danger.

4. Content

- 4.1. Program description and delineation and rationale for program
- 4.2. Team formation
- 4.3. Agency expectations and requirements
- 4.4. Program outcome(s)
- 4.5. Schedules, level of effort, time frame
- 4.6. Present danger and protective plan
- 4.7. Conceptual resources
- 4.8. Assignment

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Presentation
- 5.2. Power point

- 5.3. Testing
- 5.4. Team building exercises
- 5.5. Structured work planning/exercise
- 5.6. Infomercial – informational video
- 5.7. Summarization exercise
- 5.8. Headline exercise
- 5.9. Pro - con analysis
- 5.10. Cost - benefit analysis
- 5.11. Quotation creation
- 5.12. Personal investment exercise

DAY 2 – Day 30

1. Program Component

Identifying and Responding to Present Danger

- 1.1. Location – off site
- 1.2. 12 – 15 hours
- 1.3. Off-site structured consultation

2. Purpose

- 2.1. To create a mastery level experience concerned with present danger and protective action

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Participants define present danger.
- 3.2. Participants identify, describe, and justify examples of occurrence of present danger.
- 3.3. Participants recognize present danger in case situations.
- 3.4. Participants explain the differences between present danger and other family conditions.
- 3.5. Participants explain the necessary response to present danger, including the rationale.
- 3.6. Participants recognize, explain, and provide rationale for the conceptual and philosophical basis for the protective plan, including provisional protection, purpose, least intrusiveness, and reasonable efforts.
- 3.7. Participants explain and recognize an acceptable protective plan.
- 3.8. Participants explain and demonstrate the application of protective action criteria within *present danger* protective plans.

4. Content

- 4.1. Definitions of concepts
- 4.2. Information standards
- 4.3. Present danger protective plan
- 4.4. Safety in placement
- 4.5. Sources of information
- 4.6. Methods for eliciting information
- 4.7. Child vulnerability
- 4.8. Reasonable efforts
- 4.9. Critical thinking concepts, content, and application
- 4.10. Range of family conditions: normal to abnormal – safe to unsafe
- 4.11. Criteria for present danger protective plans
- 4.12. Management of present danger protective plans

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Evaluate intake information and justify response time
- 5.2. Listen to phone intakes followed by analysis and conclusions
- 5.3. Analyze written intakes
- 5.4. Extract information from workers by phone, including kinds of inquiry
- 5.5. Video analysis
- 5.6. Analyze decisions which prompted emergency placements
- 5.7. Review and analyze policy with respect to supporting conceptual acuity
- 5.8. Variation to Cooley's Looking Glass Self exercise involving self-assessment
- 5.9. Evaluate initial contact situation in order to assess present danger and consider protective action options
- 5.10. Evaluate the quality of protective actions
- 5.11. Apply protective action criteria against case situations and present danger protective plans

Day 31

1. Program Component

Identifying and Responding to Present Danger Continues

- 1.1. Location – on site
- 1.2. 6 hours

[While the purpose, objectives, and content for this on-site experience are essentially the same as off site, at this juncture participants receive their assignment for impending danger.]

2. Purpose

- 2.1. Same purposes as above
- 2.2. To create a mastery level experience concerned with present danger and protective action
- 2.3. To introduce the assignment for impending danger

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Same purposes as above
- 3.2. Participants explain the assignment for impending danger.

4. Content

- 4.1. Same as above
- 4.2. Impending danger
- 4.3. Instructions; assignment resources
- 4.4. Impending danger resource material

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Produce testimony and testify before the team about rationale for present danger protective plan
- 5.2. Develop lists of present danger factors
- 5.3. Panel presentations by participants on concept and topic
- 5.4. Evaluate sufficiency of protective plans
- 5.5. Debate sufficiency of protective plans with other team members
- 5.6. Justify work and judgments completed during off site
- 5.7. Listen/observe a case scenario involving present danger conditions and analyze reasonable efforts, least intrusive, provisional protection
- 5.8. Evaluate worker justification of present danger and protective plan

DAY 32 – Day 60

1. Program Component

Identifying and Responding to Impending Danger

- 1.1. Location – off site
- 1.2. 15 – 20 hours
- 1.3. Off-site structured consultation

2. Purpose

- 2.1. To recognize and address impending danger

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Participants define and explain safe and unsafe, impending danger, caregiver protective capacities, demonstrating a full understanding of safety and concept for safety intervention.
- 3.2. Participants recognize impending danger in case situations.
- 3.3. Participants explain differences between impending danger and other family conditions.
- 3.4. Participants explain and apply “universal threats” and the safety threshold.
- 3.5. Participants demonstrate the ability to evaluate caregiver protective capacities.
- 3.6. Participants evaluate and judge the level of effort needed in information collection in relation to the information standards.
- 3.7. Participants fully understand and demonstrate the application of the information standard.
- 3.8. Participants demonstrate the ability to determine sufficiency of information collection, including case situations where information is unavailable for some reason.
- 3.9. Participants accurately identify and describe impending danger threats and qualify each with the safety threshold.
- 3.10. Participants explain and apply the safety intervention analysis.
- 3.11. Participants demonstrate an understanding of the criteria for safety intervention analysis, including caregiver protective capacities.
- 3.12. Participants explain the necessity of decision-making criteria and demonstrate how decisions are justified using criteria.
- 3.13. Participants access and analyze information.
- 3.14. Participants demonstrate how to operationalize reasonable efforts.
- 3.15. Participants judge and justify acceptable safety-intervention analysis.
- 3.16. Participants explain the concept of safety in placement and demonstrate effective judgment about assessing safety in placement.
- 3.17. Participants evaluate enhanced and diminished caregiver protective capacities.
- 3.18. Participants explain the concepts, philosophy, and purpose for safety planning, including the concepts of least intrusive and provisional protection.
- 3.19. Participants identify and explain safety services including rationale for their use and purpose. Participants can demonstrate, explain, apply criteria for safety plan.
- 3.20. Participants evaluate the sufficiency of safety plans.
- 3.21. Participants analyze and describe acceptable safety plan management.
- 3.22. Participants explain and justify the conclusion of the safety assessment, safety-intervention analysis and safety plan.

4. Content

- 4.1. Definition of impending danger
- 4.2. Information standard
- 4.3. Protocol or method of information collection—level of effort
- 4.4. Safety threshold criteria including vulnerability
- 4.5. Universal safety threats
- 4.6. Critical thinking and decision-making concepts
- 4.7. Range and continuum of family conditions
- 4.8. Criteria for safety intervention analysis and content about each criterion
- 4.9. Caregiver protective capacities
- 4.10. Safety services
- 4.11. Philosophical underpinnings of provisional safety intervention
- 4.12. Criteria for safety in placements—indicators of safe environment
- 4.13. Reasonable efforts
- 4.14. Level of effort
- 4.15. Purpose of a safety plan
- 4.16. Scope of safety plan options
- 4.17. Safety plan management
- 4.18. Accountability in safety planning and safety management
- 4.19. Evaluation of safety plans
- 4.20. Management and implementation of safety plans
- 4.21. Structure and strategy for how safety plans work
- 4.22. Conditions for return

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Family environment in a state of danger exercise
- 5.2. Review information (completed initial assessment) and identify missing information; identify questions to ask to fill in gaps; consider necessary level of effort; submit to consultant for interactive review
- 5.3. Create a safety plan using a logic model
- 5.4. Exercise to identify and justify impending danger threats
- 5.5. Evaluate video vignettes of worker information collection
- 5.6. Analyze video demonstration of supervisor and worker in case consultation concerned with impending danger
- 5.7. Apply safety threshold to cases and justify
- 5.8. Evaluate safety assessment conclusions against initial assessment information
- 5.9. Evaluate application of safety intervention analysis completed by a worker
- 5.10. Verbally articulate and justify safety assessment results and safety plan decisions
- 5.11. Justify safety decisions within a court context
- 5.12. Participant presentation describing and justifying the use of the information standard

- 5.13. Create safety plans; exchange with team members; evaluate them; provide feedback
- 5.14. Mock case staffing
- 5.15. Write conditions for return
- 5.16. Conduct policy analysis in relation to providing effective guidance in safety decision making
- 5.17. Video or audio of worker describing a case situation resulting in participant evaluating the description, including judging quality of content, level of effort, gaps, concerns
- 5.18. Creative in-home safety planning—exercise
- 5.19. Evaluate high profile cases or fatalities where safety in placement is an issue, including kinship cases
- 5.20. Critical thinking exercise related to judging when behaviors, emotions, attitudes, intent, perceptions and situations progress from problematic to threatening safety
- 5.21. A several-step learning method that moves from knowing a concept to showing examples to demonstrating application to justifying application (may include video as a resource)

Day 61

1. Program Component

Identifying and Responding to Impending Danger Continues

- 1.1. Location – on site
- 1.2. 6 hours
2. Purpose
 - 2.1. Same as above
3. Objectives
 - 3.1. Same as above
4. Content
 - 4.1. Same as above
5. Prospective Methods
 - 5.1. Selected from above

DAY 62 – Day 90

1. Program Component

***Identifying and Responding to Impending Danger
Continues***

- 1.1. Location – off site
- 1.2. 15 – 20 hours

2. Purpose

- 2.1. Same as above

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Same as above

4. Content

- 4.1. Same as above

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Selected from above

DAY 91

1. Program Component

***Identifying and Responding to Impending Danger
Continues***

- 1.1. Location – on site
- 1.2. 6 hours

2. Purpose

- 2.1. Same as above
- 2.2. To prepare participants for the final on-site program component

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Same as above
- 3.2. Participants explain the purpose of the final on-site program component.

- 3.3. Participants understand and describe their assignment to prepare for the final on-site program component.
- 3.4. Participant describes how he or she will prepare for the final on-site program component.

4. Content

- 4.1. Same as above
- 4.2. Instructions for the final on-site program component
- 4.3. Resource material for the final on-site program component
- 4.4. Instructions for off-site preparation and study
- 4.5. Instructions for specific assignments that may be required for the final on-site program component

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Selected from above
- 5.2. Presentation
- 5.3. Discussion
- 5.4. Group processing

DAY 92 - 109

1. Program Component

Demonstrating Proficiency in Safety Decision Making

- 1.1. Location – off site
- 1.2. 10 – 12 hours

2. Purpose

- 2.1. To complete preparation for demonstrating safety decision-making proficiency

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Participants review concepts, content, and decision-making practices.
- 3.2. Participants complete proficiency assignments for presentation.
- 3.3. Participants prepare for post-test.

4. Content

- 4.1. Content from entire program

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Study methods
- 5.2. Writing assignment
- 5.3. Presentation assignment
- 5.4. Case analysis
- 5.5. Study guide

DAY 110

1. Program Component

Demonstrating Proficiency in Safety Decision Making Continues

- 1.1. Location – on site
- 1.2. 6 hours

2. Purpose

- 2.1. To demonstrate proficiency in safety decision making which involves supervisors

3. Objectives

- 3.1. Participants successfully articulate understanding of concepts, content, and decision-making practices.
- 3.2. Participants demonstrate proficiency through verbal and written means.
- 3.3. Participants successfully pass a post-program test.

4. Content

- 4.1. Content from entire program

5. Prospective Methods

- 5.1. Individual presentation
- 5.2. Defense of written assignment
- 5.3. Post-test
- 5.4. Case analysis results

Program Consultation Approach

The program will be enhanced by classroom facilitation and off-site consultation. Two consultants will facilitate each training team of 8 participants. Each consultant will be assigned/matched with 4 participants for off-site consultation.

During curriculum design, a job description will be produced for the consultant position. It will include delineation of roles and responsibilities, desirable characteristics, areas of expertise, and specification of job duties.

Classroom facilitation will move away from the traditional trainer-led model so that the individual participant is the center of attention and learning. Consultants will facilitate exercises and learning opportunities through consultation and direction rather than presentations and stand-up instruction.

Off-site consultation will be highly dynamic and proactive. Curriculum designers will produce a structured approach to off-site consultation that will include objectives, time lines and scheduling, the timely use of consultation methods, and varied communication and access strategies. Contact between a consultant and each of his or her assigned participants will be weekly for a minimum of 30 minutes. Consultants will assist with problem solving and assigned work, will provide oversight to the off-site learning process, will troubleshoot barriers to participation, will guide or direct learning within assignments with individuals and with the all four assigned participants as a group. The following consultation activities, methods, and strategies may be included within this scheme:

- Oversight of participant's work plan approach
- Facilitating and troubleshooting adjustments
- Lesson plans
- Acquire necessary learning resources
- Evaluate/manage learning process as it is occurring—identifying trends
- Review work/feedback
- Planned team consultation
- Collaborate on exercise
- E-mail access
- Real time chats
- Go to meeting
- Periodical posting/newsletter
- Web site options

Project Steering Committee

Connie Klick, Chair
Bureau of Policies and Programs
Wisconsin

Cindy Phillips
Department of Social Services
Louisiana

Sue Ash
Department of Human Resources
Alabama

Pamela Bennett
Department of Social Services
South Dakota

Project Manager

Wayne Holder
ACTION for Child Protection

Approved