

# Safety Intervention Analysis: Overview

## Overview of Safety Analysis:

The purpose of this analysis is to analyze Safety Threats, family functioning, and family and community resources in order to produce a sufficient Safety Plan. This analysis depends on having collected sufficient information. This analysis occurs as a result of a mental and interpersonal process between a family, a worker, a supervisor, family supports, and resources. The intention is to arrive at a decision regarding the most appropriate and least restrictive means for controlling and managing identified Safety Threats and therefore assuring child safety.

## Connecting Safety Analysis Questions to Safety Decisions:

If there are no Safety Threats, the safety analysis would not need to be completed. Counties may elect to have their staff write “no Safety Threats” or N/A, however this is not a requirement. Child(ren) would be determined to be **Safe**.

If there are Safety Threats, caseworkers need to use the analysis process to guide their determination as to whether or not a child is safe, safe with a comprehensive Safety Plan, or unsafe.

- After completing analysis questions 1 and 2, if the determination is that existing Protective Capacities are already in place to offset all Safety Threats then the safety decision is that the child(ren) are **Safe**. There is no need to proceed to analysis questions 3 and 4.

If the Protective Capacities do not offset all Safety Threats proceed to safety analysis question 3.

- After completing analysis question 3, if the determination is that a County Children and Youth Agency (CCYA) managed comprehensive Safety Plan is not an option, the safety decision is that the child(ren) is/are **Unsafe**. CCYA must either execute a Voluntary Placement Agreement or petition the court to have the child placed in a substitute/congregate care setting. There is no need to proceed to analysis question 4.

If the determination is that a CCYA managed comprehensive Safety Plan is an option either within the home of origin or in an alternate informal living arrangement, proceed to analysis question 4.

- After completing analysis question 4, if the determination is that a CCYA managed comprehensive Safety Plan cannot be implemented in the home of origin or in an alternate informal living arrangement, the safety decision is that the child(ren) is/are **Unsafe**. CCYA must either execute a Voluntary Placement Agreement or petition the court to have the child placed in a substitute/congregate care setting.

If the determination is that a CCYA managed comprehensive Safety Plan is the least intrusive option that will ensure the child(ren)'s safety then the safety decision is **Safe with a Comprehensive Safety Plan**. This would include all plans put in place within the home of origin or in an alternate informal living arrangement.

## **Safety Intervention Analysis: Determining Level of Sufficiency**

There are several essential analysis questions that must be analyzed in order for CCYA to have heightened confidence in the sufficiency of the Safety Plan. The safety intervention analysis questions are as follows:

### **First Analysis Question: *How are Safety Threats manifested in the family?***

1. How long have conditions in the family posed a Safety Threat?
  2. How frequent or often does the family condition pose a Safety Threat?
  3. How predictable is the Safety Threat? Are there occasions when the Safety Threat is more likely to be an active influence?
  4. Are there specific times during the day, evening, night, etc. that might require “special attention” due to the way in which the Safety Threat is manifested?
  5. Do Safety Threats prevent a caregiver from adequately functioning in primary roles (i.e., individual life management and parenting)?
- It must be clear how Safety Threats are occurring and operating in the family before a determination can be made regarding the type of Safety Plan required (i.e., in-home Safety Plan, out-of-home Safety Plan or a combination of both).
  - If indications are that Safety Threats are constantly and totally incapacitating with respect to caregiver functioning, then an informal, temporary out-of-home Safety Plan is suggested. If that does not work upon further safety intervention analysis, then formal placement is suggested.

### **Second Analysis Question:**

#### ***Can an able, motivated, responsible adult caregiver adequately manage and control for the child's safety without direct assistance from CCYA?***

1. Is there a non-maltreating caregiver residing in the home?
2. Does the non-maltreating caregiver have sufficient Protective Capacities (strengths) and demonstrate a willingness to protect?
  - Has demonstrated ability to protect in the past?
  - Has a specific plan for protection?
  - Physically and emotionally able to intervene and protect?
  - Clearly understands specific threats to safety?
  - Properly attached?
  - Empathetic and believes the child?
  - Cooperating and properly aligned with CCYA?
3. Does the non-maltreating caregiver in the home have sufficient personal and family resources (as needed) including family network support and access which empower him/her to assist in safety planning? Fulfill protective responsibilities?
  - This is an extremely important judgment in safety decision making. It is crucial that the judgment is fully justified and supported by verifiable facts about the caregiver as evidenced through history, current behavior, expressed intent, demonstrated capacity, and assertive willfulness. If you are not certain if the caregiver is able, willing, motivated, and resolute about doing whatever is necessary to protect the child, that caregiver should not be made responsible for assuring the safety of the child.

**Third Analysis Question:**  
***Is an in-home CCYA managed Safety Plan an appropriate response for this family?***

**This question refers to whether or not a CCYA managed comprehensive Safety Plan is an option for this family (e.g. In the home of the caregiver of origin or in an alternate informal living arrangement.)**

1. Are caregivers residing in the home?
  2. Is the home environment calm and consistent enough at a minimal level so as to assure that a sufficient CCYA managed safety response can be provided in the home?
  3. Are the caregiver(s) willing for safety actions, tasks or safety services to be provided and accept and cooperate with an in-home Safety Plan response?
  4. Are there sufficient resources within the family or community to perform the safety actions, tasks, or services necessary to manage the identified Safety Threats?
- Rigor should be applied in considering the least intrusive measures possible to assure child safety. That requires CCYA to be able to fully justify any “no” answer to the questions concerned with considering in-home safety management as an option.
  - Question 4 is a general consideration of family and community resources that is considered in more depth if the answer is yes. To answer this question no, it must be well established that resources are so deficient that it is commonly known that some Safety Threats (as analyzed) cannot be managed because of the absence of family or community resources.
  - If the answer to any of the questions listed above is NO:** Proceed with a formal out-of-home Safety Plan (i.e. Petition the court to have the child placed in a substitute/congregate care setting). Analysis question 4 does not need to be completed.
  - If the answer to all of the questions above is YES:** Proceed to the next safety intervention analysis question.

### Fourth Analysis Question:

*What safety responses, services, actions, and providers can be deployed in the home that will adequately control and manage Safety Threats?*

This question looks at safety interventions that could be put into place within the home of the caregiver of origin or in an alternate informal living arrangement to support the decision of Safe with a Comprehensive Safety Plan.

1. Considering how Safety Threats are manifested, what specific safety responses/services are necessary (an effective match) for controlling Safety Threats?
  2. How are the selected safety actions intended to control the identified Safety Threats? How are safety responses/services going to work?
  3. What's the level of effort needed from safety service providers to adequately control and manage Safety Threats?
    - a. How much of a response seems reasonable in order to assure child safety?
    - b. How often during the week will the family require assistance and supervision in order to assure child safety?
    - c. How long and in what intervals seem necessary?
    - d. Are there special periods of time that require specific attention?
  4. Who can and will assure effective implementation of the comprehensive Safety Plan?
    - a. What natural supports and/or community resources has the family identified as being able to potentially assist in the safety response?
    - b. What community/service oriented resources are known to the agency that could potentially be used as a safety response?
  5. Are potential providers suitable to participate in the comprehensive Safety Plan?
    - a. Protective Capacities
    - b. Trustworthy
    - c. Committed
    - d. Properly aligned with CCYA
    - e. Supportive and encouraging
    - f. Flexible access
    - g. Promptly available
  6. Are necessary safety planning resources available and accessible to the family at the level of effort, frequency and amount required to assure child protection? Given the nature and intensity of the impending danger, are there sufficient lay or professional resources within the family and community to perform safety actions, tasks, or safety services necessary to manage the identified Safety Threats—existing impending danger.
- If the answer to questions 5 or 6 is NO**, the analysis does not support the use of a CCYA managed comprehensive Safety Plan (either in the home of origin **or in an alternate informal living arrangement**). Proceed with formal out-of-home Safety Plan (i.e. Petition the court to have the child placed in a substitute/congregate care setting).