

Hummel Family Safety Assessment, Part 3

IV. Safety Analysis: As part of your analysis, respond to the following four questions:

How are Safety Threats manifested in the family?

The conditions in the home e.g. excessive drinking; physical altercations; lack of supervision appear to have been occurring since Earl moved into the Hummel household. With the exception of threat number 3 (caregivers cannot or will not explain the injuries to the child) all of the threats appear to be occurring on a daily basis. The alcohol abuse and physical altercations leading to threats numbers 5 (caregivers are violent and/or acting dangerously), 6 (caregivers cannot or will not control their behavior), and 14 (child is fearful of the home situation, including people living in the home or having access to the home) appear to happen more often at night when April is home from work and on weekends. It is also on weekends when the children have been left home alone in the past and would presumably be left home alone in the future unless intervention occurs.

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

While April has not physically injured her children and has a history of being protective, being emotionally aligned with, and being empathetic of her children, she is currently incapacitated by her relationship with Earl and is unable to protect her children. April has resources available to her whom she is not currently accessing that could potentially be resources to her and her children.

Is an in-home CCYA managed Safety Plan an appropriate response for this family?

April has verbalized alignment with the children and has stated that Earl will never strike any of the children again. While this is certainly a strength for this family it is uncertain that, given her relationship with Earl, April will be able to follow through with her statements. She has not demonstrated the ability to intervene and to be aligned with her children over Earl. Another strength in operation for the Hummel family is the resources that are available to them and could be implemented with the Hummel family in their home. However, given the instability of the current environment of the home e.g. the frequency and severity of the alcohol consumption and physical altercations in the home the home environment does not appear to be stable enough or calm enough to provide safety interventions in the home at this time. This is especially true if Earl continues to reside in the home. April may be in support of a short term, informal arrangement with one of her available resources to control the Safety Threats.

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

Appropriate supervision for David will need to be provided daily from the time that April leaves the home. Bobby and Cathy will also need supervision prior to school. All three children will need supervision whenever Earl and April fight, which is currently on a nightly basis. Given the frequency of the Safety Threats it may be necessary for the children to stay with an informal caregiver. Frank Hummel, the biological father of all three children is a willing resource. The Karing family has also volunteered to provide support to the Hummel family and is willing to watch the children prior to school and is also willing to have all three children stay at their home on occasional weekends. Both resources have been assessed as suitable and reliable and are committed to the care and welfare of all three children.

Hummel Family Safety Assessment, Part 3

V. Caregiver(s) of Origin and Children Who Were Not Seen: Every effort should be made to see each caregiver of origin and child in the family face-to-face to determine if the child(ren) is/are safe. If there is a caregiver of origin or child in the family that was not seen (e.g. child runaway or adult caregiver of origin out of town), list their name, age, role within the family, and provide justification as to why they were not seen, how long it has been since someone has seen them, and the plan identified to see/locate them and to assure that child's safety.						
Individuals Not Seen	Age	Family Role	Justification			
VI. Safety Decision -			List each child by name or suffix			
Decision Date:						
<u>Safe:</u> Either the caregiver(s) of origin's existing Protective Capacities sufficiently control each specific and identified Safety Threat, or no Safety Threats exist. Child can safely remain in the current living arrangement or with the caregiver(s) of origin. Safety Plan is not required.						
<u>Safe with a Comprehensive Safety Plan:</u> Either the caregiver(s) of origin's existing Protective Capacities can be supplemented by safety actions to control each specific and identified Safety Threat or the child must temporarily reside in an alternate informal living arrangement. No court involvement is necessary; however a Safety Plan is required.			A	B	C	
<u>Unsafe:</u> Caregiver(s) of origin's existing Protective Capacities cannot be sufficiently supplemented by safety actions to control specific and identified Safety Threats. Child cannot remain safely in the current living arrangement or with the caregiver(s) of origin; County Children and Youth Agency must petition for custody of the child. A Safety Plan is not required if the child is removed by court order as a result of the safety threat(s).						
VII. Signatures of Approval (Requires Supervisory Discussion)						
	Caseworker Name		Signature			Date
	Supervisor Name		Signature			Date