

Good afternoon, everyone and thank you all so much for joining us. I want to just kind of quickly just kind of go over week.

This is we have this is our last training in this series.

And so with that being said, I just want to go ahead and turn it over today is going to be impending danger safety planning and we have our wonderful tearing read who's going to present today so Tara and I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to you and then we'll do our Q&A.

A at the end of the training.

All right, great.

Well, thank you.

Welcome everybody get afternoon.

And as Carolyn said this is the last in our series of safety planning in particular we've gone from present danger all the way through information collection to identifying impending danger and now we're finishing up with safety planning and particular to impending danger.

If you've missed any of the prior webinars they are available to you to go back and reference today's.

Presentation is going to be a combination of how we've sort of progressed through to case scenarios.

So you have not read those prior to today.

You may want to go back and read them and you would always retake this webinar at any point in time.

So as Carolyn said this is going to be impending danger safety planning. So some of our objectives for today is we're going to go through and we're actually going to complete the safety

planning analysis based upon the case information that was provided to you.

We're going to identify conditions for return if they do apply. We're also going to talk about potentially some appropriate Safety Services or actions based upon those two case examples.

We're also going to talk about the safety management requirements for this ski, I as well as the case manager and talk a little bit about when we need to modify an impending danger safety plan based on family conditions and conditions for return.

So, this is just a brief review of our webinar series you may recall we talked about present danger during our first webinar, and we identified present danger through case scenarios.

We went through and we talked about present danger safety planning and in particular we talked about the Safety Management actions based upon case information.

If you participate in that webinar you may recall that we went through each one of the Safety Management categories and described what those are and how they can be applied to safety planning.

We also spoke.

About the role of the PI in the case manager in terms of their Safety Management.

We had three information collection where we reviewed the six domains of information collection, and we talked about what we have defined a sufficient information collection and how that drives decision-making we spent time talking about impending danger.

We reviewed the safety threshold criteria for impending danger and we also spoke about the relationship between information collection and my safety threshold criteria.

And brought in the concept of caregiver protective capacities in terms of the overall safety determination and ultimately case planning last week or two weeks ago.

We talked about safety planning analysis and conditions for return. We went through each one of the safety planning analysis criteria and Define them and we also spoke about how the relationship between safety planning analysis and conditions for return are linked in today's webinar.

We're going to be expanding upon our safety planning analysis and conditions for return and applying those two.

case scenarios so impending danger safety planning.

So this is where we're looking at utilizing that case information to determine what safety actions need to occur.

So I want you to take a moment and refresh your memory.

If you have been participating in the webinar Series in terms of the land and family.

So this is the child safety summary or the dangerous statement in regards to the land and family and if you've read the total of family functioning assessment, then they should be familiar to you in terms of the information here.

I'm going to ask that we can Meet a poll for you to identify.

What were the impending danger threats that we identified for the land and family in particular.

So let's talk about the danger threats that were identified

there. They are in terms of the land and family.

So you may recall that when we talked through the land and family and identifying impending danger a couple weeks ago that we identified two impending danger threats for miles in particular one was that that the parent or caregiver is violent impulsive are acting Dangerously in the ways it seriously harm the child or what?

Likely seriously harm the child.

We qualified it using the impending danger threshold criteria in terms of the daily drug use the severity with what has happened to Miles the observable nature of things in terms of collateral sources the self admitting of the mom as well as the homelessness and the incarceration.

We identified that this was a family condition that was out of control resulting in danger due the fact that the Sarah was a single mother there.

No other caregivers in the home the daily drug use was and it's an unrestrained and that we identified specifically that Sarah lacked caregiver protective capacities related to not taking action lacking impulse control not planning for protection and not recognizing threats and are vulnerable child in this situation is Miles who's three years old and he relies solely on his mom for that care and protection the second danger threat that we identified was in terms of the parent and caregiver not needing the child's basic and essential needs for food clothing and or supervision and the child is or has already been seriously harmed or

more likely be seriously harmed we identified the imminence here and that it was two years.

Basically, I'm Sarah abdicating her responsibility to others to provide the care for Miles seen left him with known drug users and violent of individuals and observable again was around those collateral sources the self admittance in our own observation throughout our assessment.

It's out of control in the standpoint that Sarah is the only caretaker of miles and that she is frequently relied on others that are not appropriate.

Provide care we identified specifically that she was not recognized in the child's needs not planning for protection not taking action not aligned with the child and that she was not stable as some of those caregiver protective capacities that were related to the impending danger or threat.

And again, we see miles as a three-year-old child relies on his mom for to provide that care.

And also we've seen that he's been affected developmentally by not receiving the care that he should be receiving by Sarah. So with that information in mind And thinking about these are dangerous threats that we've identified.

We have to be thinking about the safety actions that are going to control specifically for that danger that's occurring and we have to come to a decision based upon our gathering of sufficient information in regards to whether or not there is viability for an in-home safety plan or an at-home safety plan based upon our assessment of the family.

So let's go through and talk about the safety planning analysis criteria for the landing case in particular.

And so if we look at this, Information and there is a pole here in terms of the safety planning analysis, but I see that it's already populated on this slide.

So we're just going to go ahead and talk through this one and skip that second pole.

So the Landon family in particular if you remember the safety planning analysis criteria number one is that they're willing for an in-home safety plan to be developed and implemented and have demonstrated that they'll cooperate with identified safety service actions and safety resources and providers.

So if you look at the keys information that's been provided to them in regards to the land and family is that we have Sarah who is minimally expressing any desired apparent miles.

We also see that she cannot really identify what taking care of miles would look like and that we have a history of her not utilizing resources in the past and actively causing confrontation with informal safety service providers.

So if we look at this from the A two-pronged approach is willing but then also demonstrated.

So we have a concern here with her willingness and honest or her demonstration based upon our past experiences with Sarah and the informal safety service providers.

So for safety planning analysis number one, we would identify this as a no for Sarah and particular.

So let's look at safety planning analysis criteria number

two. So in terms of this one, if you may recall from our last webinar is we're looking at whether or not the home environment is calm and consistent enough for an in-home safety plan to be implemented and for safety actions and safety resources and service providers to be in the home safely. So part of this determination first and foremost is that Sarah has a home.

So what we know right now is that she's currently incarcerated so she does not currently have a physical location.

Station which is one of our other safety planning analysis criteria in order for us to assess that it would be calm and consistent.

We also have the prior history of her home not being stable and the prior places that she was utilizing in terms of shelter or a resident.

We're not reliable there was frequent times that she was residing with dangerous people.

So our safety planning analysis criteria for the landing case would be for number 2 would also be a no safety planning analysis criteria number three speaks specifically to the resources and services available on a sufficient level and to the degree necessary in order to gauge the way in which impending danger is manifested in the home safety planning analysis criteria number three because it is dependent upon safety resources and services is going to be contingent upon where you are at in terms of jurisdiction and resources available to you both from an informal and a formal.

And point so this is one of those safety planning analysis criteria that when we're applying it to these case examples is really going to be dependent upon what you have available to you in terms of your jurisdiction.

So there is information in the case record for Landon that would support that they're potentially is safety service Safety Services available.

We have some informal supports mainly the paternal relatives and them and maternal relatives.

We may have a pre school or daycare.

Setting for miles at go to and you may have resources such as in-home service providers that could provide that supervision and monitoring in regards to Sarah's parenting as well as her drug use and also any violence that's occurring in the home. Again.

This is going to require that you as the worker are looking at your services that are available and reconciling whether or not those services will be at a sufficient level to meet what you need for them to do in the in home setting.

Some information in the land and family that would support potentially know is that we have these informal supports the paternal relatives in the maternal relatives that have not had a great history with Sarah and in terms of being able to engage with her and provide the resources necessary to ensure miles to safety.

So they may not want to participate in the development of an in-home safety plan.



You may also have safety service providers that are not available for the needed level of over.

Oversight supervision and monitoring the home based upon what we know about Sarah's drug use and also her inability to meet miles is needs.

So again safety planning analysis criteria number three is really going to require that you reconcile the case information the Dynamics around the impending danger with the resources that you have both formally and then also with the family has in terms of informal resources.

In terms of safety planning analysis criteria number for this has to do with the need for a professional evaluation in order for us to even contemplate the viability of doing an in-home safety plan.

So the case information that would support that this would be a yes is that there is no indication in regards to the family functioning assessment that Sarah is suffering from any sort of cognitive or mental health concerns that prevents her from engaging in the discussion and the development of the Safety plan.

We have Sarah who's acknowledged her substance use and also the parenting concerns.

This is not to say that you may not need evaluations in terms of case planning, but for safety planning specifically, we don't have any information that would indicate that we need a higher level of an evaluation in order to understand what would be needed it to develop an in-home safety plan and

safety planning analysis criteria number five as I mentioned two and five oftentimes are Are frequently Associated right?

So number two had to do with common consistent.

Well, if you don't have a home then it's really hard to be able to assess the common consistent nature of it.

So frequently, if you have a no on number five, you're also going to have a no on number 2 because of the fact that you've already said that there's not a physical location.

So if we look at the case information and in particular to Sarah, she does not have a physical location in which to implement it in home safety plan.

She's currently incarcerated.

We have also concerns about her physical locations in the past that have had dangerous people that are present and the unreliable nature of her physical locations.

She was frequently Couchsurfing.

So when we think about its physical location in which to implement a in home safety plan, we need to have a level of predictability that that physical location is going to be there for us to continue to do our in-home safety plan.

So in terms I'm Sarah we've identified we've gone through the safety planning analysis criteria.

You can see how the case information supports our determinations around the safety planning analysis criteria, which leads us to the decision in terms of safety planning for miles is that we're looking at a out of home safety plan and in particular we're looking at a home safety plan because of

the parent not willing and hasn't demonstrated cooperation  
the home not being common consistent because we don't have  
a physical location you I also have had again dependent upon  
your jurisdiction your agency your location.

You may also have Safety Services that are not at a sufficient  
level as also a no, but for here, we're going to say that  
that one was a yes because of the informal safety service  
providers and also with formal safety service providers.

So if we think about those three that we've identified as  
a no right willingness home common consistent.

We have to think about the conditions for return that are  
very specific to those safety planning analysis criteria.

So you may recall from the last webinar that we did the whole  
purpose of the safety planning analysis and the relationship  
between conditions for return is how do we identify what  
it would take for the family to turn those NOS into yeses?

What would we need to see specifically from a behavioral  
standpoint or even observable standpoint in terms of us being  
Able to flip those noes to a yes.

So if you think about that opposite scheme, that's really  
what we're trying to describe is the information that we  
utilize to say and know what would it look like in a positive  
framework and from the parent standpoint of what they would  
need to do.

So the conditions for return that we've identified for Sarah  
in particular is first and foremost, she must secure physical  
location that is accessible to the agency and safety service

providers in order to control for safety.

T so you can see that speaks directly to the physical location we need for her to obtain one that is accessible to us.

So she can't get out of jail and go stay with a friend and the friend says like no you can't come into my home.

That means it's not accessible to us as the safety service providers. Once she obtains at home, then it's incumbent upon us to assess the nature of that home in terms of it being calm and consistent.

So you'll see here the second sentence to that first condition for return is that the physical location will be assessed to ensure that there is a reasonable structure and routine and that there's knowledge of the persons in the home and that the home condition does not interfere with safety services.

So that's that is what we would need to see in terms of of meeting then that the home is common consistent predictable.

We know who's there and that nobody in that home or the conditions in the home are going to prevent us from engaging in in home safety plan development and also execution of that plan.

This second statement in our condition is for return is going to speak to Sarah's willingness and her demonstrated cooperation.

So what specifically we would want to see from Sarah that would be demonstrative.

Of her being willing and also cooperating with the safety plan. So the first thing we want to see is we want her to maintain contact with the agency and demonstrate her engagement with formal informal service providers and that this engagement

will support her willingness and cooperation for in-home safety plan to be effective.

So we wanted to communicate with us.

We want her to come to the table and have conversations with us. We want her to engage in conversations with the service providers including our informal ones.

And our formal ones in order to develop that safety plan that in home safety plan.

So as you can see we've addressed in to sort of brief statements of our conditions for return of how if Sarah did these two things we would be able to look at developing an in-home safety plan for Sarah and miles and that absent her doing these things that miles would remain on and out of home safety plan for as long as needed until conditions for return could

That or if we were deciding to do an alternate form of permanence, then we to establish that and then the safety plan would end. All right.

So let's move on to the Mantra revamping.

So the Mantra family was our second family that we've been working with for the last several webinars.

So I want you to take a minute and go ahead and refresh your memory in terms of the Child Safety summary and the danger statement and I want you to be thinking about what the identified impending danger threats are why could taralyn launches the pole in regards to the Tree danger threats.

So in this one the pool has been fixed.

So you can select more than one danger Threat.

All right.

So we've got our results of our poll.

So overwhelmingly we've got folks that I've identified parenting caregivers violence and parenting caregivers not meeting basic needs and you are absolutely correct.

Those are the two danger threats that we identified based upon the case information.

So in terms of the monetary family, we identified that the parent or caregiver is violent impulsive and acting Dangerously and we qualified this through the imminence of this pattern of behavior has been occurring for at least the past 12 years.

And then also the addition of the moms daily drinking to the point of not being able to provide for care.

We looked at the first danger threat around violent impulse for enacting dangerously pertaining to all three children and the second danger threat around not meeting basic and essential needs for food clothing and or supervision really speaks to the two younger children and not so much the older child and so we didn't qualify that for The oldest child we only qualified it for the two younger children in regards to the level of supervision that they need compared to the older youth that's in the home.

So that was one of the things that we went through a couple weeks ago when we were talking about identifying impending danger is that you can have situations where you have danger threats that apply to only certain children in the household and you may also have cases where you have some kids that

are determined to be unsafe and some kids that are determined to be safe that still residing the same household and that has to do with when we are reconciling information.

And we're applying that impending danger threshold criteria is that vulnerability speaks to the vulnerability of the child and relation to the family condition that is represented in the danger threat.

So some of our danger threats that we talked through before is say around child who has serious emotional symptoms and our behaviors.

You may have one child that has those behaviors and one child that does not so you may have one child that is safe and one child that is unsafe.

So again, we identified these two impending danger threats for the monetary family.

So we're going to walk through again.

Just like we did for the land and family.

We're going to walk through the safety planning analysis criteria for the monetary family.

So in terms of the safety planning analysis criteria number one, if we look at the Mantra case information that's provided to us is that the case information would indicate that the information does not port that.

This would be a yes, it would be a no and we see that through the parents lack of understanding of the need for safety plan and also their current lack of participation and actions during the present danger safety plan.

So we have a degree of resistance in terms of recognizing the need for safety plan and also participating in that safety plan. The second safety planning analysis criteria speaks to the home environment being common consistent and there's two considerations that we need to look at in regards to being common consistent is the persons in the home.

Currently.

We know that we have violence and then we also have unrestrained unmanaged alcohol consumption.

So if we think about the viability of an in-home safety plan in the home being common consistent we have to think about the safety.

Service provider safety.

So can we say that this service providers can go into the home safely are their periods of time where they can go into the home safely maybe day versus night.

And we also have to think about how to manage that violence within the home.

We know that it's unmanaged unrestrained and that there's really no level of predictability and this is per the families report of when that violence occurs.

So this affects then our ability for planning.

And also to determine that there's really any point in time within the household that the household is common and consistent enough for in order for those safety service providers to be in the home.

So we would identify that at this point in time based upon



the current Dynamics in the household is at this safety planning analysis. Criteria would also be a no the third safety planning analysis criteria like we talked about with the land and family is going to be dependent upon again those formal and informal safety service providers that you have available.

Able to you so there is some case information that would support that this potentially could be a yes, and it may be around that you do have safety service providers that can manage for that violence in particular around specific days and times you may have safety service providers whether they be formal or informal that can intervene and and respond and you may have the opportunity or a viability in regards to utilizing separation of the family during.

The evenings and our days during specific times that would allow for you to still do an in-home safety plan.

But use separation as a Safety Management action case information that would indicate that this potentially would be a no is that the family really does have a limited informal safety service providers?

They do have some relatives, but it's very limited in regards to the extent of those informal safety service providers.

You also may have in terms of Your formal safety service providers the potential could concern for safety service providers may be so high but you don't have any formal safety service providers that would be willing to send staff into the home because of the unrestrained unmanaged violence that's occurring in the home.

You also have a high need of oversight and supervision and regards to the mom verbalizing the children and sort of coaching the children.

So this will require a high level of Safety Services that may not be accessible to you in terms of either formal or informal safety service providers.

The other aspect is that we're looking at the oversight and supervision for two children that occurs nightly and goes over into the morning.

So you're looking at safety service providers that would have to be in the home for extended periods of time including potentially overnight and unless really we're looking at it. Formal safety service provider.

We don't have a lot of formal safety service providers in jurisdictions that are able to come into the home for an overnight period of time so that would indicate that this potentially is a no based upon the resources that you have available to you.

The fourth safety planning analysis criteria as we mentioned has to do with professional valuations.

And so in this case the case information, it does not indicate that either parent has a mental developmental or cognitive impairment that would prohibit them from engaging in the development of the safety plan.

So we are very clearly able to support our impending danger threats. We've defined them.

We understand them we know when they're manifesting.

We know what impact having on child safety, there's not any information that we would need from a professional in order to help us understand whether or not there is viability for an in-home safety plan or not based upon the parents abilities to engage comprehend or understand the need for the safety plan. So this would be a yes.

And lastly as I mentioned in when we're talk about Landon is that frequently safety planning analysis criteria number two and number five do go hand in hand, especially if you don't have a home then it's hard to say it's consistent.

This is a case where they don't go hand in hand.

We do have a home.

There is a physical location in which to do need in I'm safety plan the concerns about the home have to do with them being common consistent and safe enough for in-home safety service providers to be in the home.

So here we have that.

Have their own residents the residents has been stable and that there's really no concerns for a loss of their residents at this point in time.

So we do have a location in which to do an in home safety plan, but we have other barriers in terms of the safety planning analysis criteria that would allow for us to support an in-home safety plan at this point in time.

So some things that we want to consider in terms of the mantras family in particular is we're dealing with a family that has intimate partner violence domestic violence that's been

occurring for a significant number of years, and we talked around the safety planning analysis criteria in particular around willingness and cooperation.

Sometimes the willingness and cooperation aspect of the safety planning analysis is I'd say missed there's a missed opportunities on our part as P eyes and case managers because the safety planning analysis criteria.

Number one really requires that as workers that were engaging with the family and having discussions about what a safety plan is what the implications of a safety plan are and The spending the time to assist the family and understanding the need for the Safety Action now at the end of the day they can still choose to say thanks, but no thanks.

I don't want to participate and we still must take the necessary action needed in order to ensure child safety, but frequently when we see cases or woman reviewing cases is we don't see these conversations that are occurring between parents and workers in terms of the exploration around in home.

Safety planning and also their willingness and demonstrated cooperation. So one of the things that you may want to consider here that does have an implication in terms of your safety planning analysis and ultimately that decision or an in home or out of home for the Mantra family.

Is that engagement with the family and thinking about whether or not they're willing to consider or offer other?

Ins or actions within the safety plan?

We also have to think about in terms of that coaching.

We know that we saw that initially in the case.

Is that something that is continuing in pervasive and if so then how is that demonstrative of her not cooperating and her not being willing.

So we realistically would not be able to control for what is occurring in the monetary family and an in-home setting with both parents.

It's being in the home together.

So that is also another sort of consideration and looking at the safety planning analysis is if the Dynamics and the household changed, right so separation as we defined in a safety management category could also be an adult leaving the home versus the kids leaving the home.

So if that conversation was had and if a decision was made about a separation as part of being a Safety Management, could we be looking at an in-home safety plan with Mom and At home safety plants dad.

And so these are these are considerations of that critical thinking that we have to go through in order to think about the least intrusive least restrictive setting for kids prior to moving to the most intrusive which is and out of home safety plan.

So let's talk through this in terms of our decision-making if we are solid in our decision making around the safety planning analysis, and there are no changes in our safety planning analysis after Doing some good Exploration with the family around their willingness and demonstrated cooperation.

And we're left with the parents still not being willing haven't demonstrated cooperation the home not being common consistent and safety services at a sufficient level.

Then we have to be thinking about what those conditions for return are specifically to the parents in order to flip that out-of-home those noes to yeses so that we could look at from an atom's safety plan to an in-home safety plan.

So some of our conditions for return first.

The most is that we have Mom that will demonstrate her cooperation with the safety plan through not coaching or attempting to coach the children during face-to-face or virtual family time so that we need Mom to behave differently in terms of how she is not interfering with the safety plan.

I we also have that the mother and father will engage in a discussion regarding the development of a safety plan that demonstrates their understanding of the danger and need for safety plan.

Now as we said when we talked about safety eating analysis two weeks ago is that parents don't have to embrace this the concept around safety planning.

They don't have to admit their wrongdoing.

They do have to be able to demonstrate a most basic understanding about the need for a safety plan and also participate in the development of an in-home safety plan because we can't just arbitrarily put something into place in somebody's home without their consent and without their participation.

Parent ultimately, it's their home, and they can tell us

thanks, but no.

Thanks.

We would also want to see that the mother and father Express genuine interest in doing what is necessary to have the children returned home.

So again, this is that the parents are engaged in this process of in home safety plan development engaging doesn't necessarily mean again that they have two hundred percent believe that it is the absolute right necessary thing or that they have to admit any of their wrongdoing at this point in time.

The last part of the conditions for return that really speaks to this common consistent nature is around the father acknowledging the need for self management and it's and is demonstrating evidence of increased behavior management, and there's a judgment that in home Safety Services can provide sufficient monitoring of the family member interactions and manage the father's verbal and physical violence towards his children and wife.

This is speaking to the common consistent and also the Safety Services So what you'll see here is that there has to be some sort of behavior change in terms of the decrease in the level of violence that's going on in the home or at least a better understanding about the predictability of that violence in order for us to get Safety Services that are going to be safely in the home and also that the home would be demonstrative of being calm and consistent.

So this would be some conditions for return if we were looking

at a home safety plan for both mom and dad for the Montreal.

Emily If we were able to engage with the mother and the father in terms of building an in-home safety plan say that a mom and a dad a home safety plan for the dad.

Then we would be looking at utilizing separation in terms of whether or not say Mom and the children can go to paternal grandmother's home or whether or not Mom the kids can stay in their own home and this would be part of that conversation.

Potential safety plan for the mother because as you know with our intimate partner violence and domestic violence were creating two separate safety plans, and then we would have an ad of Home safety plan for the father and our conditions for return specifically around the father would be around sufficient and suitable safety services and resources at the level necessary to manage his violent Behavior thing.

So one of the things that I just want to really sort of re-emphasize for folks is that we do Our safety planning analysis based upon our case information and based upon are engaged with the family.

That's not to say that at any point in time that that safety planning analysis couldn't change and in particular when we think about the engagement of families and the development of impending danger safety plans.

It requires / 170 - 7 which has to do with safety planning.

It requires that we were pulling together the family and the formal and informal safety service providers to the table to have a conversation about the need.



For a impending danger safety plan and also for them to help help us craft what that safety plan would entail so you may have you may go into a situation with the monetary family where you're at that meeting and your safety planning analysis has indicated that you're looking at it at home safety plan for both mom and dad but based upon the Dynamics and everything that occurs during that meeting you may walk out of there with your safety planning.

This looking differently based upon what people bring to the table you may have safety service providers that are able and willing to do what you need for them to do.

You may have Mom and Dad who have demonstrated their cooperation in their understanding during that meeting which would then change your safety planning analysis criteria number one.

So it's a fluid process in terms of how we're building that safety plan.

And so as we go through the safety planning analysis we Approach our safety planning with the mindset of the were looking at of home, but we have to be open to the discussion and engagement with families about how we could build a sufficient in home safety plan based upon what comes out of that collaborative meeting with families and service providers.

So let's talk safety planning and turns in the case application for the land and family in the Mantra is family.

So land and family.

We know that we were looking at at home safety plan.

So we think about the add a home safety plan and we sort

of breakdown really what we would need in terms of the Safety Management actions is one we have the current placement where miles is at as he's currently with his aunt.

So in particular, we identified the danger threats around not meeting basic needs and the parenting caregivers violent impulsive acting dangerously.

So what specifically are the needs of miles that we would want to articulate in the safety plan.

Why do we have developmental do we have behavioral needs of him?

We also have to be thinking about what the ant needs in order to sustain that a home safety plan.

So you may recall in 170 - 7 appendix B speaks to caregivers at Kenan will protect that are your caregivers on your safety plans. And so we have to be thinking about how to avoid disruption of that safety plan by our assessment of those.

Caregivers and what particularly they may need in order to support their participation on that a home safety plan.

So does she need rest that does she need day care?

What resources does she need in regards to addressing miles is developmental needs.

We also if you recall from the land in case I have a father who we don't have any safety concerns with him right now.

We don't have the need to do a safety plan with the father.

And so what would it look like in terms of the contact between miles and his dad and also whether or not that add a home care provider the ant is able to facilitate that contact

in that visitation with Miles and his dad and then lastly is a contact with the mom in that we currently have a no contact order in place, but we have to be thinking about if that no-contact order was to be lifted what then would need to happen in terms of a safety plan is Safety actions to facilitate that contact between miles and his mother and whether or not our safety service provider the ant is capable willing and wanting to facilitate that contact or not.

So lots of considerations that go into thinking about building a sufficient impending danger safety plan.

So if we think about Landon, And we break it down isak.

These are some examples for you in terms of how we would break down a safety action for the land and case.

So first and foremost is our safety actions miles will have is basic and essential needs met by his maternal Aunt these need to include working with service providers to address miles and developmental delays including his potty training who's responsible.

The maternal Aunt what is going to be the frequency daily.

We know that that my own says Needs that are daily.

What is the Safety Management Service that we are deploying here is separation.

Right?

So we have separated miles from his mom at this point in time. And the person who is responsible for meeting.

His basic needs is the aunt and she's going to do that daily as well as addressing his developmental needs and collaboration

with with his therapists.

I'm a second Safety Action for miles would be around that he's going to attend ABC preschool Monday through Friday from 8 a.m.

To 4:30 and this is going to provide him the social interaction and develop mental stimulation.

Who's going to be responsible as the maternal Aunt our frequency is Monday through Friday and our Safety Management Services that were utilizing here separation.

So separation in this regard is separation between the aunt and Miles as well as miles and his mom in order to provide for safety.

It's also working towards crisis management.

And when we talked about crisis management several webinars ago is that part of Crisis management can also be addressing avoiding disruption of a safety plan.

So if Myles needs to go to daycare or preschool, it's addressing his social interaction, but it's also potentially decreasing the stress level within the out-of-home placement to in order to sustain that at home placement.

And we also looking at Social Connection in particular two miles. Let me back up right there.

You may notice that I did not address the contact between miles and his mom at this point in time.

Right?

So we have two safety actions one meeting his basic needs the second being that separation and social Connection in

awesome meeting is basic needs because there is a no contact order currently in place between miles and his mom my controlling for the violence right now is that separation is that he is an And that there's no contact you wouldn't necessarily need to write a Safety Action around that because you already have controls are in place and part of your assessment of the maternal aunt is that she is aware of and is not facilitating contact between miles in his mom.

If she was then we would be concerned about our viability of that safety service provider.

where I'm So let's move to Montreal.

So the Mantra family we had a discussion around potentially if there was the by ability for an in-home safety plan based upon engagement with the parents.

So if we were considering an in-home safety plan for the Mantra family, we would need to first and foremost consider the location.

Are we talking about the paternal grandmother's home?

Are we talking about the monetary Zone home?

We have to be looking at the time of day that the kids are going to school.

What would after after school care look like particularly to the 11 year old.

Would there be a need for daycare or preschool for the three-year-old?

What would we do about mom's drinking in the evenings in particular if we're talking about keeping the kids with Mom?

We don't have to be thinking about what occurs on the weekends

and also than the what would the contact with the father look like for all three of the children are just the younger child based upon the key Stein Amex and Would be willing to provide that oversight and management for the father when he's having contact with his children if we're looking at doing an at-home safety plan for both parents is we're looking at what would the contact look like between the mother and the children the father and the children and also who's going to then meet the basic needs including supervision for the 3 and the 11 year old?

So similar to how we broke down for the land and family in terms of safety actions is if we were looking at it in home safety plan for the mom and the children, right?

So our separation here is between dad and the children is we want to outline in particular what and who is going to meet the basic needs of the children.

So in this regard is we have school and we have kids that are attending the school Monday.

Through Friday, and we also specify who's going to be transporting those the the children to school and also allowing for the mom to accompany the paternal grandmother during that time to transport back and forth who's responsible paternal grandmother.

When does this occur Monday through Friday?

And this is again a Safety Management Service around separation and then also social connection.

If we're looking at a safety action in particular again to the mom and the children on in home bases, we know that our

danger threats around violent impulsive enacting dangerously  
has to do with the father, but then it also has to do with  
the mother's drinking as well.

So this specific Safety Action is that we're saying that  
the mom and her children are going to be residing with the  
paternal grandmother for their safety and that the paternal  
grandmother is responsible for the person's enter her home.

That she the paternal grandmother as part of the development  
of the safety plan has restricted the access to the father  
to our home due to his violence towards the mother and the  
children and that she's included or she's installed a security  
system and that the police will be notified if the father  
attempts to gain access to the paternal grandmother's home  
who's responsible paternal grandmother, it's her home.

She is determining who is coming in and out of the home.

We've assessed her to have that capacity to be able to do

so So she's aligned with the children.

She's aligned with child safety.

She recognizes threats and she's able to take action.

This would be daily.

And this has to do with separation as well as behavior management  
in terms of our safety Management Services.

Lastly we want to be able to provide for what that supervision  
and monitoring is going to look like in particular to the  
moms daily use of alcohol.

So again, we have paternal grandmother who's going to monitor  
the interactions of the mother and the children due to the

mother's inability to refrain from intoxication and that she the paternal grandmother would be the one that would provide for the children's care and supervision should the mother use alcohol so Often times we see safety actions where we say like Mom won't use alcohol.

Well if Mom is an alcoholic, it is really unreasonable for us to think that she's just going to be able to stop cold turkey and not drink it all what we're trying to control for. Is that should Mom decide to drink while at paternal grandmother's home that paternal grandmother is stepping in and providing for the children's basic needs because the mother is unable to do so so that Are controlling factors specifically to that danger threat that we've identified with the mother which has to do with her impulsive nature and her inability to meet the basic needs of kids when she's underneath the influence of alcohol.

So we have paternal grandmother.

What's the Frequency?

It's going to be dealing and we're looking at behavior management and supervision and monitoring as a Safety Management Service.

Lastly is we want to be able to speak to what the contact would be like between the father and the children during the times that were looking at this guy combined in home at home safety plan.

So oftentimes we I say we go to extreme but we say like, you know, the parents can't have contact.

What we need to be thinking about is is If the parents are



going to have contact how do we control for the safety of the kids during that period of time and and not sort of fool ourselves to think that the parents aren't going to still be in communication in some way shape or form.

So we're not saying you can't have contact and we're not saying you then.

Necessarily that you should have contact is that we're being realistic in our safety planning to say they can maintain contact. If they do that, it's going to be done absent the children. So the children be left in the paternal grandmother during these times will provide for their basic needs and supervision. We've identified the mom doesn't work outside the home.

So if she chooses to leave the home during the weekends or evenings of paternal Grandmother Had the children are in care now.

I know somebody's probably on this webinar saying we're restricting her access.

I want to go back to the premise that I discussed earlier, which is when we're developing safety plans.

And especially on in home safety plans is that we're doing it in in collaboration with the family.

So this Safety Action and how its described here would not be done without engagement agreement in collaboration with the family to say that this is what is going to occur based upon our discussion and how we've crafted the Safety Action if at any point in time, the mom or dad says, no, you know

what I'm I want to be able to leave the house with my kids and Point in time and we are saying that we can ensure their safety during that period of time then we may need to up our level of intrusiveness and we may need to formally restrict individuals access.

Therefore we would need to seek that legal intervention.

But again, this goes back to that whole hearted premise of developing safety plans and collaboration with families and that the actions that go on plans especially around in homes a non-judicial cases is because we've engaged the family in their understanding their ability their demonstration and cooperation with the safety plan and that they're agreeing to this and that this actually maybe their Safety Action that they have crafted as part of our collaboration.

Okay.

So who would be responsible paternal grandmother would be daily. And again, we're looking at that separation and behavior management as the Safety Management Services.

In particular to the safety actions for the father when we're looking at it in home safety plan with the mom and the kids is identifying that at this point in time.

There's only one child that's going to be having visitation or family time with the father and that's Trenton.

And so we're outlining that that will occur a minimum of three times per week will be coordinated by the paternal grandmother and the uncle and the father and that either the paternal.

And the uncle who ever is facilitating this will remove Trenton from the environment should the father start to exhibit aggressive behaviors and or not respond to verbal redirection.

So ternal grandmother and uncle are responsible.

It's going to happen least three times a week as agreed upon between the family and that our Safety Management Services around behavior management supervision and monitoring in separation. So you see here that we put in if he starts to exhibit those aggressive behavior.

Hers, or he's not able to respond to the redirection of the paternal grandmother uncle is that they're going to remove Trends in from that environment in order to keep him safe.

If you're looking at it at home safety plan across the board for both mom and dad then the primary thing that we're trying to control for in regards to the parents is around their contact when they're with the children.

And so we are saying that the kids are going to be out of home. We need to identify who they're going to be residing with and we've said that's the paternal grandmother that she's going to be providing for the basic needs ensuring that the children had.

What food the paternal grandmother and sure that the children attend school and daycare Monday through Friday, we have the paternal grandmother and the frequency are outlined here in terms of school and also Daily needs and then our Safety Management Services around supervision monitoring separation and social connection.

We'd also have to address on the at home safety plan what the visitation would look like or family time between the mom and dad and the kids and so here we have separated. Out that the visitation between Mom and the kids will be monitored by the paternal grandmother and she's going to monitor the interactions and the children and the mother due to the mother's inability to refrain from intoxication and that the paternal grandmother will provide for the children's care and supervision should the mother used alcohol during her visitation and the children with the children or arrived to the visit news suspected to them and drinking in that day. So again, it's our Colonel grandmother three times a week at the location agreed upon by the portable grandmother and the mother and our safety management is around supervision Mata monitoring and behavior management.

April looking at the visitation for the father.

This would be the same action that we identified for the in-home safety plan in terms of his contact and what we would be expecting those safety service providers to be doing which is to provide that supervision and monitoring separate if if necessary and also do some behavior management So I want to pause there for any questions catarrhal in that have come up. Yeah, we do have a couple of questions one question has been answered.

So I'll start with is it okay to use the word will I was told that we have to use agrees to instead of will You know, I think it's semantics honestly right is like so if I think

about if we're describing our safety actions as being behaviorally based, right so exactly what I need for Grandma to do is Grandma will transport the kids, right?

So agreeing is more of like she agrees she will so I guess

I look at it as more of the It is when I sign that safety plan my action is what I will be doing.

So I guess that's how I would look at it.

You know, the the agrees is more of a confirmation of your actions. So, okay.

Okay.

We have another question here that's dates regarding the land and family and the safety plan actions.

I'm having a hard time understanding why the no-contact order is Not needed on the safety plan is this no contact not considered an action to control for the for the danger making the aunt responsible to ensure the action is obeyed so that there were two questions there.

Yeah, so the note so the no-contact order, you know came out of a criminal aspect of things, right?

So what we know is that there's frequently there's criminal actions that occur on cases that we may or may not agree with that.

That Criminal action or that criminal no-contact order really isn't doing anything.

I don't want to put this we would not need a no contact order.

In order to ensure child safety.

If Mom was allowed contact we would be able to prescribe

sat action to ensure miles of safety why he why he was having contact with his mom?

And in fact, that's what we would do if that no-contact order was lifted.

So the no-contact order wasn't an action that the department took and I think I mentioned this before but these are actually two real cases in Florida that we've obviously redacted changed names and things of that nature is that we're actually saying that we don't need that no-contact order in order to ensure miles is safety and that he could have contact with his mom that we can ensure his safety during that period of time.

It's not something that it's not a Safety Action we've taken and so therefore we wouldn't put it on our safety plan.

When you have one more another just came in.

So it reads in hvt see situations and one parent goes to civil court and obtains a straight a restraining order.

Does it nullify the safety plan of the SP?

So safety plan?

That is a great question.

So I want to freeze this I always try to tread a little I don't say lightly, but in terms of intimate partner violence and domestic violence or household violence a piece of paper doesn't necessarily equate to safe, right so I can go and I can get a restraining order, but if I don't believe in that Any order or the need for that restraining order and I don't have the caregiver protective capacities to take action outside of being forced to take that action.

Then that piece of paper is really Dependable, it's just a piece of paper.

So if I don't believe in it and you come to my door that piece of paper isn't going to stop you from crossing the threshold if I open the door to you that piece of paper is not going to stop me from opening the door to you.

If I do not have the caregiver protective capacities.

I'm not aligned with child safety.

Maybe I am I am at a point where I am unable to do that independently because of my own victimization and being Survivor and so when we think about this safety planning in terms of recognizing where families are at this is not to say that say that you know moms or dads whoever is the Survivor may not have the disease may have the desire but does not have the ability to stand behind that piece of paper.

So who is going to stand behind us who is Going to keep that door closed who is going to provide for that child safety because the piece of paper doesn't automatically make somebody protective. So this is where that information is.

So critical to drive decision-making because if we have a pattern of behavior if we have a pattern of family dynamics that are going on that we've identified that that Parents caregivers have these diminished caregiver protective capacities and that they are unable to take action that has resulted then in danger to children.

We are responsible then for developing a safety plan with the family that is going to ensure their safety.

Excuse me, and in terms of intimate partner violence and domestic violence, we're responsible for developing two separate safety plans one that is confidential.

It's so on that confidential safety plan.

And we may have the who is going to keep that door shut and the vehicle to us being able to do that maybe that we've sought an additional level of oversight in regards to a temporary restraining order but we still have to have the who because we've already said that that parent or caregiver is unable to do what is needed.

So who is going to be in that position with maybe the Extra teeth with the temporary restraining order to support that action. You know, I'm sure several of you on the webinar today. I've seen cases where it's very cyclical in terms of somebody may go get a restraining order.

We close out our case.

We've hung our hats on that restraining order and that the parent or caregiver went and got that restraining order as being the Safety Action and they come back and they come back and they come back.

So I know from Reading several lots of case examples and speaking to lots of you cross.

The state is we have to be thinking about the relationship of restraining orders in regards to our safety plan if we've identified impending danger.

It means that we have parents or caregivers.

Burrs that lack caregiver protective capacities to do what



is needed in order to ensure child safety and that's not usually something that changes.

I just taking one legal step forward and so we have to be thinking about who then can be that person that's behind the door that can take the action that's needed.

So Okay, and I guess did just adding to the restraining order pieces as if the restraining order is filed and granted that would change things.

Correct a new safety plan would be needed and safety manager responsibilities would change potentially.

Yes.

I mean depending on depending on this situation.

Yes, and it also could it could change your safety planning analysis, right?

So you may be able to say because of this restraining order.

Somebody is barred from being on the physical premises which may then change your common consistent of your household again, though.

That piece of paper doesn't stop behaviors, right it what it does is it enforces consequences for behaviors?

So we still have to have somebody there that stops those behaviors from occurring prior to harm and somebody that will take action based upon our concerns around child safety.

Okay, and sailing we have about two more questions.

Do you want to go ahead and go to bed with the training or yeah, let me yeah, let me let me talk about Safety Management and then I think we're gonna have some time at the end.

So let me talk about Safety Management because some of these things I'm seeing around modification around safety fence.

Okay.

So we talked we talked around Safety Management when we were talking about the present danger safety planning.

And so we oftentimes get ask the big question is what is Management in the plan?

Who's responsible for the plan?

What's the In monitoring and assessing and management.

So active monitoring the safety plan to ensure that the plan is working to protect children from danger, right?

That's what we mean by this management of the plan and that the person that's responsible is the primary child welfare professional responsible for the case.

So this is a case that's in that limbo between we've identified impending danger.

We've developed a safety plan, but we haven't transferred it to case management yet.

It falls on the pie once it goes to case management it Would fall in the case manager.

If it's open to case management it falls on the case manager.

It is the primary child welfare worker who is responsible for the case.

It is their responsibility for management of safety plan the monitoring and assessing are the skills used by the primary child welfare professional to accomplish the management of the plan.

So when we talk about monitoring and assessing is this is the workers engagement observation and assessment of the parents and caregivers.

Children and also the safety service providers whether they be formal or informal.

So it requires that communication with the providers communication also with the service providers because sometimes as families are working in case management and they're enhancing their caregiver protective capacities that may affect the intrusiveness of your safety actions where your safety actions may be able to be decreased in terms of the level of oversight or maybe the action in particular.

And so you're constantly assessing with your safety service providers about the plan and whether the plan is excuse me, whether the plan is actually working.

The management means in terms of management is that you are fine tuning and tweaking your safety plan.

Let me just jump back that you're fine tuning and tweaking your safety plan based upon your monitoring and assessing of the effectiveness of the So the plan is working I don't need to do anything if the plan is not working because when I've gone out and engaged with my safety service providers and they're saying like yeah, we're done we can't do this anymore then I've got to manage that plan through a modification.

I'm so let's talk about modification.

first and foremost there is not a finite time frame of when a planning to be modified actually was in on a I was observing

a unit meeting first in case managers recently and the belief was that the safety plan pending danger safety plan had to be modified within I think was like five days of case transfer and I'm like Why know if it's sufficient?

I don't need to change it.

What I do need to do as a case manager when I'm receiving a case that has an impending danger safety plan is I need to assess the sufficiency of the safety plan through that monitoring and assessing to make sure that it's working and if it's not working then I need to modify it because it's not working.

Not just because I knew worker has been assigned to the case.

So keeping in mind the the plan.

Lives with the family the plan doesn't change because a new worker is assigned the plan would change because there is a need for a higher level of intrusiveness a lower level of intrusiveness, or maybe there's changes in the providers that are doing the safety actions.

I'm so if we think about this modification the safety plan, we are looking at a couple of different areas critical junctures in Terms of modifying safety plans if there is a need for either increasing or decreasing the Safety Management actions based upon the family condition.

Then I need to modify the safety actions with new actions.

So what I mean by this is Say for example on the land in case mom gets out of jail and the no-contact order is lifted.

I then have a need to increase my Safety Management actions

because there's going to be contact between miles and his mom. So what would those new safety actions be I would need to modify the safety plan with my new actions.

And again, this is done in collaboration with the family.

So I'm not just going to arbitrarily go into Faceman pop up a new safety plan write some new safety actions and send it out to people to sign.

I need to have conversations with the mom and the aunt and develop what that Safety Action would look like in terms of the contact between miles and his mom.

Then I'm going to document it and distribute it out to my parties within the case.

Another area in terms of when there would need to be a change for your safety plan or modification is once conditions for return are achieved.

So if I have an at-home safety plan, and I have these conditions for return that been met because I'm constantly monitoring assessing the family is I need to then develop an in-home safety plan and safety actions that are going to control for danger within the household.

If my impending danger threats have been resolved.

This would be another need for a modification of a safety plan and there are two ways to think about this one is that the alternate permanency has been achieved and or the legal relationship of parents and children are terminated.

So what I mean by this is say you've guardianship you're doing a Guardianship and the guardianship has been Approved

and is completed.

I no longer have a need for safety plan.

I'm terminating it.

I no longer have impending danger in terms of my household and intervention.

If I have gone through the legal process of terminating the parents rights or they have relinquished their rights their

Force every severing that legal relationship between parents and children is I no longer have a house of intervention original House of intervention.

And so therefore I do not need a safety plan any longer because I'm not controlling for safety threats because I no longer have parents or caregivers that Legal relationship to this child that that I would be considering reunification on.

The other aspect is an impending danger threats have been resolved. Meaning that the children are safe without the need for a safety plan.

I should be ending my safety plan and closing my intervention with the family.

That means that I have successfully worked with the family for them to be able to manage for safety permanency and well-being in their own home and there's no longer a need for intervention.

There's no longer a need for any sort of external controlling factors or Safety actions in order to control for safety because I have no life.

I no longer have impending danger and I no longer have unsafe children. I'm all of these.

Let me just jump back really quick.

All of these aspects conditions for return increase or decrease

Safety Management actions or impending danger threats resolved.

If this occurs, which it normally does occurs in case management,

it requires that the case manager complete their progress

update and they're going to capture how they've come to the

decision about the need for an increased Safety Management

actions or conditions for return being achieved or impending

danger threats being resolved.

So That constant assessment by the case manager should then

inform the need for the modification of the safety plan that

then is reflected in their progress update that is completed

by the case manager.

So let's get to some questions.

I just saw when they came across what about the rule being

modified every three months there is not a rule for it to

be modified.

Every three months.

You do have to go on the record every three months and capture

Pryor's update.

Eight and there is a the end of your progress update one

of the decisions that you come to is whether or not there's

a need to modify or change the safety plan based upon the

sufficiency of the safety plan or conditions for return being

met if there's not a need to change a safety plan then no

changes are needed and that's going to be reflected in your

progress update.

So keeping in mind.

Like I said, there's there's not a finite time frame to say like this.

Impending danger safety plan can only be in place for 30 to 60 days families are Dynamic its fluid you.

May you may modify safety plan.

Four or five times in 30 days.

You may not modify a safety plan for three or four months because again, this is dependent upon the fluidity of the family and what is going on.

Progress updates are to complete be completed every 90 days or whenever there's a critical juncture.

So minimum 90 days.

If something happens between that 90 days such as new babies born or say mom gets out of jail, and she gets her own residence.

Then that would be indicative of a critical juncture because it may have impacted your safety planning analysis.

And so if your safety planning analysis changes because conditions for return of been met say for example on the land in case my good I'm jail.

She gets a house you've assessed that those those conditions within the home to become inconsistent and she is demonstrating her cooperation with the safety plan that may have may happen a month after you get the case or it may happen six months after you get the keys whenever it happens that would be indicative of a critical juncture of her meeting those conditions for return.



We do have a it was a question from earlier and was would you have to enter the no-contact order to explain the visitation you would want to capture it in your justifying around your out of home safety planning.

You'd also want to capture it in terms of if you're doing a progress update or ongoing family functioning assessment.

So, okay, and then there was another I want to say I had to do with you know.

We talked about restraining orders and the safety plan.

No contact the question reads.

What would that go along with someone who was arrested we have been told we cannot go by location alone.

But if the person is in jail, his behaviors are controlled as he is incarcerated once released we would need to reassess and possibly safety plan and in which is a question.

So, you know.

You still need to be able to be thinking about how you're managing for those behaviors.

So if somebody's incarcerated the majority of the time you're looking at probably in at a home safe safety plan.

So Meeting those basic needs providing for the supervision and monitoring of those children.

If there's phone contact that's allowed.

I mean, I know that there's also jail.

That has video chatting now which sort of mind-blowing to me, but they do so just because you're in jail doesn't mean that that they are not having contact and so you'd want to

be able to describe what that contact would look like just because somebody can't physically assault you doesn't mean that they can't verbally assault to you on the phone in terms of either coaching or yelling or Screaming or blaming or whatever. It might be you so you still want to siddur what that contact would look like or if it is occurring and then yes, once somebody is and say available you're going to have to look at potentially modifying your safety plan to accommodate for what that family time contact would look like and how you're controlling for those violent impulsive or dangerous conditions. Okay, and we have here we've been putting what action needs to occur by the safety providers lat / manager if the parent or caregiver doesn't follow the action do we not spell that out on the plan anymore?

For example, if the mother is observed to be intoxicated or acting aggressive then the grandmother will take the child away from the environment to a safe location and contact law enforcement and DCF.

Yeah, so this comes up quite a bit.

This is an interesting Dynamic.

So, you know in some of the same reactions I mentioned like, you know, if mom drinks then grandma's going to take over responsibility, you'll notice that I didn't put in there and then contact DCF part of developing a Safety Action is in the assessment of your safety service providers is that you've assessed that they are capable reliable dependable individuals to do.

It is necessary to ensure child safety.

So we've given them the parameters in which to do those actions.

Right?

So if Dad starts to act aggressively, you know, then grandma's going to try and redirect them.

If she can't redirect them either she's going to boot them or she's in take the kid and provide for safety.

I don't need for her to call law enforcement unless she feels like she needs to write and matter of fact sometimes law enforcement can Escalate the situation if she feels like it's rising to the level where she needs law enforcement in order to enact the Safety Action.

Then the question that I would have is if this person's volatility and violence is so out of control that is going to result in potentially the need to call law enforcement as part of my Safety Action is maybe I need to look at my Safety Action differently and maybe am not utilizing grandma or having.

In the home, maybe I'm doing it in a supervised agency setting right calling DCF or calling the case manager.

There's nothing that the case manager and DCF is going to do in that moment in time.

It's after the fact right?

It's the grandma is already taken the action or whoever has already taken action.

What they're just doing is telling you hey, I took my Safety Action part of the management in in or monitoring and assessing on the In that case manager the pie is that you're having

frequent contact with your safety service providers and the questions that you should be asking them is hey tell me about how this is going and grandma would say, you know, what? Yeah the other day during the visit I had to ask him to leave because he would not he would not deescalate.

Okay Grandma.

How are you feeling about that?

Were you comfortable doing that?

It grandma says no, I'm not comfortable doing that any more than my Safety Action may need to change if Grandma did what she needed to do.

Good job Graham.

And thanks for letting me know.

I don't need an emergency phone call unless it's gotten to the point where grandma is unable to manage that situation and part of my assessment of grandma is that if she's unable to manage that situation she has the capacity to reach out for immediate action because nothing that the that we're going to do as a case manager RPI is going to be immediately alleviate the fact that Dad is in her home acting a fool.

Does that make sense?

Yes, Reverend Harrison who accident?

Yeah, well to ever asked.

Yeah.

Okay, right.

Yeah, and so then we have must a safety decision always be made within 14 days.

Through Time Out For A Present Danger.

Yeah, no information should drive your decision making and sometimes information comes at us very easily and sometimes information takes a little bit more time and work and effort at 14 days.

If there's a present present dangers been identified in a present danger safety plan has been put into place at 14 days what it requires is that there's a consultation between the worker and the supervisor and regards to the knee.

Continue in the present danger safety plan because a decision around impending danger has not been met and what action specifically need to occur in order to come to a safety decision sooner rather than later.

So no, there's nothing finite about day 14 other than there needs to be a consultation.

If you're going to continue that present danger safety plan and have not come to a safety determination.

Okay, and it looks like this one is more of a comment.

It says not sure if this is relevant to the conversation at hand thinking of case management supervisors while it does not in any way require any modification to the safety plan. We have found that the impending danger safety plan no longer displays on pulled reports when it has exceeded six months all content within the plan May remain the same if applicable, but the previous plan must be terminated and then a new plan must be entered.

Supervisor concert consultation then recorded any case note

to justify the continuity of the actions in in the plane.

Yeah, so that's that is how do I want to put this so basically because it doesn't show up on the report.

We're having case managers go in and duplicate safety plans.

The question that I would have to folks is if we have a safety plan that's been in place for six months without any changes in particular say an at-home safety plan.

Our I guess even in and home safety plan is the question that I would have is what are we doing?

What's the family doing?

How is it that we've had six months without any changes in regards to their intrusiveness escalating or decreasing.

So if I have the most intrusive safety plan, which is an at-home safety plan and it's six months and there's been no changes in the The family contact meaning decreasing the level of intrusiveness maybe for moving from supervised family time to unsupervised family time.

Then I would part of my Staffing as a case manager supervisor would be do we need to be looking at alternate form of permanence?

Do we need to be making changes in our case plan?

Because maybe what we're doing is not working is it that we have family that our parents or caregivers that we haven't had contact with?

As I said, you know safety plans are not they're not finite but it requires that we're assessing them on a continual basis and if nothing is changed in six months then the conversation maybe around what what do we need to do either to exit stage

left or exit stage right with the family because things are either not getting better or they've gotten their they're stable and maybe we no longer need to be involved with them.

I wouldn't necessarily just do work in order to show up on a report.

If it doesn't need to be modified or changed I get that it doesn't show up on a report, but you're creating extra work for case managers to just go in and do a physical and flip around and to me it would warrant a cam a consultation about what direction we're going with this family would be the focus. So I know we're over.

A little bit of time.

So let me we can essentially save those questions for next week Tehran.

Yes.

Okay, and let folks know that so next week.

We will be doing a QA on the 9th.

If you missed any of these prior webinars, you can access them via the Center's website and we're working on getting them on actions website as well for my case managers that are on the line or anybody really if you Managers to a 200 we are going to be continuing our webinar series.

I believe USF and and action is going to partner again after the new year and we're going to do a webinar series that is focused on case management in regards to the ongoing family functioning assessment and progress update.

So we should have be having some dates coming for you for

that as well as some outlines.

It'll be very similar format.

Of taking cases Concepts and applying them throughout.

So be looking for that be checking the Center's website in

terms of when those will be released, but they'll be Watt

live just like these ones have been and we're going to probably

keep it around the same time with weekend as well.

So with that being said as always I want to thank you guys

for your time your attention.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions that you

have. also, don't forget to utilize your resources that are

available to you whether it be re of the center's or via

actions website, so Terry lost something.

That was great.

Awesome.

Thank you all for joining us today.

We'll see you all next week.

Thank you.