

# Statewide Confirming Safe Environments Instrument Assessing Relative, Fictive Kin, and Foster Care Homes

Case Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Caregiver's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Caregiver's Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Placement Type:            Relative                            Fictive Kin                            Foster Home

Assessment Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Children Assessed:

Child Name	DOB	Age

## Confirming Safe Environments (CSE)-Instructional Guide

The Caseworker must attempt to collect information related to the assessment items on the instrument at every opportunity and during all contacts with the placement provider (i.e. routine, required monthly contact.) The instrument should be completed any time that a worker has any concerns about the quality of the placement as a safe environment and must be completed for each placed child. The CSE instrument must be completed at a minimum of 5 months post placement and then every 6 months thereafter (Note: Clark County has additional assessment requirements. The CSE instrument will be completed every 90 days in conjunction with the Protective Capacity Progress Assessment and prior to Permanency Court hearings).

When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference (i.e., more than one rating difference) with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference. For instance, if the foster mother is considered to be at a 4 rating on a particular assessment question and the foster father is considered to be at a 2, select the 4 rating based upon the foster mother and then explain what the assessment is of the foster father that is notably different than the foster mother.

For all CSE assessments, there are seven attributes for safe environments that are common to relatives/fictive kin and foster parents. Relatives/fictive kin have two additional attributes (questions 8K and 9K), while foster parents have three (8F, 9F and 10F.)

An explanation is required for attributes that are assessed to have a 1 or 2 rating that includes a justification for how the attribute potentially puts the child in an unsafe situation; the caregivers understanding and response and what is being done to address the rating. At the time any attribute of the safe environment is assessed to have a 0 rating, the case must be immediately staffed with a Supervisor or Manager to discuss any action needed to ensure child safety.

When the final conclusion (total rating) is 1.4 or lower, an immediate staffing must occur with a Supervisor or Manager to consider a change to the Safety Plan. Staffing decisions must be documented in UNITY case notes. The Caseworker must document in the Assessment Summary Narrative of the CSE instrument the decisions reached during the staffing concerned with continuing or discontinuing the placement and the alternative Safety Plan.

## Safe Environment: Relative Fictive Kin or Foster Family

### 1. Children: What are the indicators of safety for the children currently placed in the home?

*This question considers the family's own children; unrelated children who have been living with the family. Foster children may be included when studying foster homes with due respect to the status of their functioning. Judgments are based on considering all the children generally. If one child is assessed remarkably different than other children, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats; and how the other children are assessed to have higher ratings. If there are multiple children in the placement, the rating should be on the child who is considered to have the **lowest** score. Use "a" ratings for older/verbal children and "b" for infants and toddlers.*

*Identify the date, time, location, and names of the children that were interviewed face-to-face in a UNITY case note.*

- 4a. Openly assertive; comfortable speaking mind; self-protective; indignant at being threatened; describes environment as safe; supportive siblings; no indication of maltreatment; very low vulnerability.
- 4b. Seeks comfort from their placement caregiver without hesitation; enjoys being held and highly interactive with household members; easily consoled; highly consistent eating and sleeping patterns; is advancing through developmental milestones at a faster pace than prior to placement; very low vulnerability.
- 3a. Somewhat assertive; with encouragement speaks mind; generally self-protective; describes environment as generally safe; siblings may or may not be supportive of each other; no indication of maltreatment; low vulnerability.
- 3b. Sometimes seek comfort from their placement caregiver; appears to be happy/content; consistent interactions with household members; playful and comfortable in their environment; separation anxiety is experienced normally by the child; has regular eating and sleeping patterns; making improvements in developmental milestones; low vulnerability.
- 2a. Reserved; uncomfortable speaking mind freely; ability to protect self-questionable; limited ability to make needs known to others; uneasy about describing environment; siblings seem detached from each other; behavior may be consistent with being maltreated; somewhat vulnerable.
- 2b. Some discomfort or ambivalence in placement is suspected; appears to be uncomfortable in their environment; child has marginal interactions with household members; normal eating and/or sleeping patterns; developmental milestone achievement appears to be the same as at initial placement- or is making very slow progress; somewhat vulnerable.
- 1a. Withdrawn; verbally inaccessible; cannot protect self; reluctant to seek assistance or protection; avoids discussing environment; behavior is consistent with being maltreated and feeling threatened; vulnerable.
- 1b. Observed insecurity and/or discomfort in the placement (i.e. often crying, unhappy, fussy, etc.); child has limited interactions with household members (i.e. usage of car seats, high chairs, play pens or cribs); some difficulty with eating and/or sleeping; appears that developmental milestone achievement is not improving since initial placement- or appears to be regressing; vulnerable.
- 0a. Intimidated; afraid; avoids communicating with others; avoids direct communication with anyone; not self-protective; behaves in ways suggesting presence of threatening environment: alert for danger; siblings may be antagonistic, blaming, or overly dependent; indications of maltreatment; very vulnerable.

- 0b. Observed child to appear fearful, detached, and/or have significant anxiety in the placement; household members avoid interacting with the child and/or child withdraws; child is not eating and/or sleeping regularly; household member describe child as cause of problems/stress; notable regression in developmental milestone achievement and/or an emergence of significant behavioral concerns; very vulnerable.
- N/A (Select N/A if there are no other children residing in the home the first time this instrument is completed. For scoring purposes only, see special instructions at the conclusion of this instrument.)

**Assessment Narrative:**

2. Caregivers: What are the indicators of safety based upon Caregiver Protective Capacities in the adults currently living in the home?

*This question considers foster parents, step-parents, grandparents, relatives, fictive kin or other adults in the home who take an active or primary role in caring for and supervising the family's children. Judgments are based on considering the primary caregivers generally. If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers, consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

*Identify the date, time, location, and names of the caregivers that were assessed (face-to-face/ phone contact/email/ etc.) in a UNITY case note.*

- 4. Very open; shows conscience and empathy; general history of concern for children's well-being; closely bonded to own children; self-aware; highly motivated; examples of protective behavior; products of nurturing environments; acknowledges and takes responsibilities; accurate viewpoint of placed child; has personal support for caregiver role; effectively compensate for limitations in spouse as applicable.
- 3. Generally open; acceptable conscience and empathy; a history of protectiveness for own children; attached to own children; generally motivated; limited self-awareness; no indications of negative history; generally acknowledges and takes responsibility; acceptable viewpoint of placed child; has some support for caregiver role. Generally successful in compensating for limitations in spouse as applicable.
- 2. Reserved; displays conscience and minimal empathy; some evidence of previous parenting difficulties; minimally attached to own children; minimally motivated; limited self-awareness; few examples of protective behavior; product of unhappy histories; varies in acknowledging and taking responsibility; detached viewpoint of placed child; no support for caregiver role. Challenged to effectively compensate for limitations in spouse as applicable.
- 1. Manipulative; avoiding; difficult to determine conscience, empathy or history of protectiveness; questionable attachment to own children; somewhat unmotivated; poor self-awareness; history as child uncertain; tendency toward blaming others for difficulties; no specific empathy or individualized viewpoint of placed child; some support against caregiver role. Cannot effectively compensate for limitations in spouse as applicable.
- 0. Closed; indifference/lack of empathy apparent in manner; poor parenting history; lack of concern for own children's well-being; somewhat detached from own children; unmotivated; distorted self-awareness; no evidence of protective behavior; likely maltreated/unsafe as child; does not take responsibility; possesses an inaccurate viewpoint of placed child; considerable support against caregiver role. Is subject to and influenced by limitations in spouse as applicable.

**Assessment Narrative:**

3. Household: What are the indicators of safety within the relative, fictive kin or foster family?

*This question considers all household members. This is a judgment about the overall environment that a placed child is routinely exposed to. It seeks to qualify the home as being one in which children can have their needs met in positive and appropriate ways. (Note: Clark County has an additional requirement to immediately take photographs of all areas in the home observed during routine visits that would result in a 1 or below rating, consult with a Supervisor or Manager and complete the CSE instrument the same day.)*

- 4. Clear roles and positive relationships; value and practice honesty; family is coping and/or experiencing low stress; available protection and supervision; access to sufficient health and other resources; transportation/phones/email; can meet unusual and specific child needs; excellent living arrangements; socially integrated into community. (Including all weapons/ammunition stored and locked appropriately.)
- 3. Generally accurate reality testing; general role clarity and acceptable relationships; honest; protective; family is experiencing limited stress; environment is calm and with appropriate routine/structure; available protection and supervision; access to acceptable health and other resources; transportation/phones/email; acceptable and safe living arrangements; some social integration. (Including all weapons/ammunition stored and locked appropriately.)
- 2. Limited accuracy in reality testing; imprecise role definition and unsatisfying relationships; generally honest; family coping varies with moderate stress; some examples and history of protectiveness; supervision may vary; environment varies, sometimes chaotic with varied routine/structure; sometimes resource challenged including transportation/phones/email; generally safe living arrangements; casual social integration.
- 1. Often view reality inaccurately; varied role effectiveness and tense relationships; sometimes deceptive; limited evidence of protectiveness; limited coping or experiencing moderate to high stress; difficulty managing limited resources; questionable living arrangements (including suggested evidence that weapons /ammunition are not stored and locked appropriately); condition of the home is questionable as related to potential hygienic issues; superficial or conflictual involvement with community.
- 0. Inaccurate reality testing; ineffective roles and hostile, neglectful, detached manipulative relationships; usually deceptive, secretive and dishonest; some history, evidence or concern for maltreatment; poor family coping and/or experiencing high stress; environment is usually chaotic and disorganized; unsafe and/or unsanitary living arrangements (weapons/ammunition are not stored and locked appropriately); home presents with physical hazards (i.e.: exposed wires, broken glass, etc.); utilities not functioning properly closed and avoids community.

**Assessment Narrative:**

4. Community: What are the indicators of safety within the caregivers' community?

*This question considers formal and informal aspects of the community, other extended family, friends, neighbors, clubs, organizations, non-child welfare and child welfare agencies and providers and other professionals.*

- 4. Family/children have daily to weekly contact with others in community; friends, neighbors, relatives or others routinely provide support and assistance; family/children involved with professionals or agencies currently working under a planned agreement or involvement and contact is routine and frequent.
- 3. Family/children have weekly to bi-weekly contact with others in community; generally family receives support from friends, neighbors, relatives and others; family/children involved with professionals or agencies currently working under a planned agreement or involvement and contact is occasional.
- 2. Family/children have bi-weekly to monthly contact with others in the community; friends, neighbors, relatives or others occasionally provide support and assistance; family/children sporadically involved with professionals or agencies but are not currently working under a planned agreement or involvement.
- 1. Family/children have monthly or less contact with others in the community; friends, neighbors, relatives or others do not provide support and assistance; family/children are not involved with professionals or agencies.
- 0. Family/children have virtually no contact with others in the community; friends, neighbors, relatives or others are antagonistic; family/children avoid professionals or agencies.

**Assessment Narrative:**

5. Acceptance: Do/will the relative, fictive kin or foster family members accept the child into the home?

*This question considers the family's children as well and other non-relatives who may reside in the home.*

- 4. Placed child is fully embraced as part of the household; positive/fulfilling interaction/relationship exists between the placed child and others in the home; placed child helped to fit in; is always included in activities and provided for the same as others; placed child is cherished; other children - placed child attachment; placed child is not held accountable for circumstances requiring placement.
- 3. Placed child accepted as part of the household; acceptable interaction/relationship between the placed child and others in the home; the placed child is encouraged to participate in activities and provided for the same as others; other children - placed child acceptance; the placed child is highly valued personally.
- 2. Placed child is accommodated as part of the household; casual/courteous interaction/relationship exists between the placed child and others in the home; minimal attempts in assisting placed child to fit in; placed child sometimes not included in activities; may be provided for differently from others; the placed child is generally valued personally; other children - placed child indulgence; may be some reservations about placed child's responsibility for need for placement.
- 1. Placed child is tolerated; likely not viewed as part of family; strained/difficult interaction/relationship exists between the placed child and others in the home; little effort to assist placed child to fit in; placed child frequently excluded from activities; clearly provided for differently than others; other children - placed child antagonism; the placed child is valued generally as a relative; consider placed child somewhat responsible for placement.
- 0. Intolerant toward placed child; do not accept placed child; conflicted interaction/relationship exists between placed child and others in home; not allowed to fit in; segregated from activities; does not receive the same provisions as others; other children - placed child hostility; the placed child is not valued; blamed for placement.

**Assessment Narrative:**

6. Plan: Is the relative, fictive kin or foster family's plan sufficient to ensure the child's safety?

*This question considers specific plans and intentions, methods, assurances, feasibility, commitment.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers, consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

- 4. Caregivers fully understand/are attentive to the placed child's vulnerability/need for protection; a very effective general plan for caring for the placed child exists/will meet the child's needs; an acceptable, specific protective/ supervision plan exists including responsibilities, timing, activity, acceptable effective means for child management and discipline; high commitment/capability for carrying out plans.
- 3. Caregivers generally understand/are respectful of placed child's vulnerability/need for protection; a reasonable plan for caring for the placed child exists, likely will meet child's needs; an acceptable protective/supervision plan exists; care givers are generally committed to and capable of carrying out plans; plans include an acceptable means for child management and discipline.
- 2. Caregivers partially understand placed child's vulnerability/need for protection; a vague/nonspecific plan for caring for placed child exists; a vague/nonspecific protective/supervision plan exists; caregivers are moderately committed to/somewhat capable of implementing plans; plans do not include references to child management and discipline. Plans do not take into account the demands of having several children in the home.
- 1. Caregivers do not understand placed child's vulnerability/need for protection; an inadequate plan for caring for placed child exists; an inadequate protective/supervision plan exists; caregivers' commitment to and capacity for implementing plans are uncertain; plans include undesirable means for child management and discipline. There may be too many children in the home.
- 0. Caregivers do not believe and/or care about placed child's vulnerability/need for protection; no or an unacceptable general plan for caring for placed child exists; no or an unacceptable protective/supervision plan exists; caregivers are not committed to and capable of creating or implementing plans. There are too many children in the home to assure safety.

Assessment Narrative:

7. Oversight: Are the relatives, fictive kin or foster family and the home conditions amenable to agency staff oversight?

*This question considers tendencies toward inclusion; examples of cooperation with outsiders; access; proximity.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

- 4. Family very open/routinely include/involved with non-family entities; eager to work actively; guarantee and seek out agency staff home visits; readily make child available at home/other locations; always accessible in person/by phone; go out of way to be available; will seek help from agency staff and other appropriate persons.
- 3. Family generally open/often include/involved with non-family entities; willing to work on case issues; agreeable to agency staff home visits; will make child available at home/other locations; usually accessible in person/by phone; generally available; likely to seek help from agency staff and other appropriate persons.
- 2. Family somewhat cautious/sometimes include/involved with non-family entities; place limits on working on case issues; accept agency staff home visits; will make child available at home; sporadically accessible in person/by phone; availability often a matter of convenience; may seek help from agency staff.
- 1. Family guarded/seldom include/involved with non-family entities; hedges making commitment to work with agency staff or superficial agreement; avoid agency staff home visits; do not always make child available at home/other locations; seldom accessible in person/by phone; generally not available; unlikely to seek help from agency staff/may seek other appropriate persons as a first option.
- 0. Family closed and/or manipulative/do not include/not involved with non-family entities; want to work independent of agency staff; refuse or protest need for agency staff home visits; do not make child available at home/other locations; not accessible in person/by phone; not available; will not seek help from agency staff/other appropriate persons.

Assessment Narrative:

8K. Natural Family – Fictive Kin/Relatives: What is the nature of the relationship among the fictive kin or relatives?

*This question considers the extent to which relationships can contribute to or detract from the placed child's safety and the capacity of the fictive kin or relative to follow through.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

- 4. Natural parents – fictive kin or relative relationships respectful/accepting/mutual affection. Natural parents accept/support fictive kin or relative caregiver's role/will not interfere/intrude/inappropriately become involved with their home/responsibilities/view fictive kin/relatives as best place for child; fictive kin/relative caregivers share agency staffs view of the natural parents' capacity to care for their children. Fictive kin/relative caregivers strongly believe the child should be placed; can effectively/independently fend off natural parents' attempts to countermand placement plans; fictive kin or relatives fully collaborating with agency staff with respect to natural parents.
- 3. Natural parents - fictive kin/relative relationships generally respectful/accepting/mutual affection. Natural parents generally accept/support fictive kin/relatives caregiver role; natural parents unlikely to interfere/intrude/attempt to inappropriately/become involved with fictive kin/relatives home/responsibilities; accepting of fictive kin/relatives as best place for child. Fictive kin/relative caregivers generally share agency staffs view of the natural parents' capacity to care for their children; agree with placement; can effectively gain assistance to fend off natural parents' attempts to countermand placement plans; fully cooperating with agency staff with respect to natural parents.
- 2. Natural parents – fictive kin/relative relationships generally passive/detached/minimal involvement. Natural parents question fictive kin/relative caregiver's role; likely to manipulate, interfere, intrude or attempt to inappropriately become involved with the fictive kin/ relative's home or responsibilities; not accepting of fictive kin/relatives as best place for child. Fictive kin/relative caregivers not certain of agency staffs view of the natural parents' capacity to care for their children; accept the child should be placed; cannot effectively gain assistance to fend off natural parents' attempts to countermand placement plans; minimally cooperating with agency staff while being influenced by natural parents.
- 1. Natural parents – fictive kin/relative relationships generally tense/conflicted/suspicious. Natural parents challenge fictive kin/relative caregiver's role; will manipulate/interfere/intrude/attempt to inappropriately become involved with the fictive kin/relative's home or responsibilities; adamantly disapprove of fictive kin/relative's placement. Fictive kin/relative caregivers generally do not share agency staffs view of natural parents' capacity to care for their children; not certain of need for placement; avoiding agency staff in favor of the natural parents.
- 0. Natural parents – fictive kin/relative relationships hostile/reinforces dysfunction. Natural parents support fictive kin/relative caregiver role for self-interest; connive with fictive kin/relatives; view fictive kin/relatives as place for child for own purposes. Fictive kin/relative caregivers do not share agency staffs view of the natural parents' capacity to care for their children; do not believe child should be placed; fictive kin/relatives and natural parents are in collusion.

Assessment Narrative:

9K. Placed Child – Fictive Kin/Relatives: What is the nature of the relationship between the placed child and the fictive kin or relative’s family?

*This question considers history, familiarity, attachment, level of affection, current or most recent involvement.*

- 4. Warm/belonging/affectionate relationship between placed child/fictive kin/relatives; placed child very close to fictive kin/relatives children; fictive kin/relative caregivers have life-long involvement with placed child, are very familiar with placed child and his/her uniqueness/ needs; placed child experiences comfort and security with fictive kin/relatives.
- 3. Generally warm/accepting/familiar relationship between placed child/fictive kin/relatives; placed child gets along well with fictive kin/relative’s children; fictive kin/relative caregivers have months of involvement with placed child, are generally familiar with placed child and his/her uniqueness/needs; placed child generally feels relaxed with fictive kin/relatives.
- 2. Casual/cordial/not well-developed relationship between placed child/ fictive kin/relatives; placed child and fictive kin/relative’s children not familiar with each other; fictive kin/relative caregivers have short-term involvement with placed child, are minimally familiar with placed child and his/her uniqueness and needs; placed child apprehensive with fictive kin/relatives.
- 1. Tense/detached/unfamiliar relationship between placed child/fictive kin/relatives; placed child feels intimidated by, out-of-place with or is scapegoat of fictive kin/relative’s children; fictive kin/relative caregivers have unpleasant or no involvement with placed child, are unfamiliar with placed child’s uniqueness/needs; placed child experiences tension and dread with fictive kin/relatives.
- 0. Distrustful/disliking/hostile/un-accepting relationship between placed child/fictive kin/relatives; placed child is fearful of fictive kin/relative’s children; fictive kin/relative caregivers have established negative involvement with placed child, are unconcerned with or non-accepting of placed child’s uniqueness and needs; placed child is fearful with fictive kin/relatives.

Assessment Narrative:

8F. Fostering Experience: Is there anything within the foster care history/experience that could affect the placed child's safety?

*This question considers history prior to fostering; the original study; preferences; background; pertinent training and other forms of preparation.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

- 4. Original study and updates or addendums indicated excellent foster home prospect; foster parents' child preference similar to placed child; fostering experience excellent; successfully cared for children for long period; very successful current placements; foster parents specifically prepared for placed child; have accurate knowledge of maltreatment victims; appropriate perceptions of maltreating parents/maltreatment victims.
- 3. Original study and updates or addendums indicated good foster home prospect; foster parents' child preference accommodates placed child; fostering experience good; successfully caring for children for a limited period; successful current placements; generally prepared for placed child; have some knowledge of maltreatment victims; have acceptable perceptions about maltreating parents/maltreatment victims.
- 2. Original study and updates or addendums indicated acceptable foster home prospect; foster parents expressed no child preference; fostering experience acceptable; has been satisfactorily caring for children for a long period; acceptable placements; minimally prepared for placed child; limited knowledge of maltreatment victims; limited perceptions about maltreating parents/ maltreatment victim
- 1. Original study and updates or addendums indicated concerns about foster home prospects; foster parents' child preference somewhat different than the placed child; fostering experience questionable; has been acceptingly caring for children for a limited period; current placements minimally acceptable; not prepared for the placed child; have inaccurate knowledge of maltreatment victims; have inaccurate perceptions about maltreating parents/maltreatment victims.
- 0. Original study and updates or addendums indicated reservations about foster home prospect; foster parents' child preference very different than placed child; fostering experience problematic; has been unsatisfactorily caring for children for a limited period; current placements under scrutiny; not prepared for the placed child; have distorted knowledge of maltreatment victims; have distorted perceptions about maltreating parents/maltreatment victims.

**Assessment Narrative:**

9F. Interaction Dynamics: What interaction dynamics could potentially affect the placed child's safety?

*This question considers what is known about children who are currently placed with foster home; interaction dynamics prior to placed child; needs of placed child, other placed children, family's own children; how foster parents address and manage different child needs; the general family dynamics - adults and children.*

- 4. Previously placed children interact very well; interact very well with family's own children. Needs/behaviors of placed child, previously placed children and family's own children noncompetitive/mutually compatible. Foster parents aware of all children's differences/needs/ behaviors; effective at managing/meeting needs; warm/nurturing interaction with placed child.
- 3. Previously placed children interact in acceptable ways; interact in acceptable ways with the family's own children. No indication needs/behaviors of placed child/previously placed children/family's own children conflict or create vulnerability. Foster parents generally aware of all children's differences/needs/behaviors; are able to manage and meet needs; accepting/supportive interaction with placed child.
- 2. Previously placed children interaction includes tension, teasing, harassing, bickering; interact with family's own children in suspicious/challenging/anxious ways. Needs/behaviors of placed child/previously placed children/family's own children stimulate unrest/conflict/ disturbance. Placed child susceptible to influence of previously placed children and/or family's own children. Foster parents have a limited awareness of all children's differences/needs/behaviors; with support/assistance are able to manage/meet needs/behaviors of children; interaction with the placed child is tense or superficial.
- 1. Previously placed children interaction distant, scapegoating, blaming, etc.; interaction conflicted, tense with the family's own children. Needs/behaviors of placed child/previously placed children/family's own children create competition and "in fighting" for attention/ satisfaction. Placed child vulnerable to acting out by placed children or family's own children. Foster parents have difficulty managing/meeting needs/behaviors of all children; interaction with placed child is contentious.
- 0. Previously placed children interaction includes fighting/other acting out; interact in hostile/aggressive ways with family's own children. Needs/behaviors of all children will stimulate hostility and aggression. Placed child vulnerable to aggression/assault. Foster parents unable to effectively manage/meet needs/behaviors of all children; interaction with placed child conflicted.

**Assessment Narrative:**

10F. Current Status: What current issues within the home could affect the child's safety?

*This question considers foster parents' objectives in caring for children; present demands the home is experiencing.*

*When rating assessment questions in placement homes with two caregivers consider ratings for both caregivers; then select the rating of the caregiver who is judged to have the highest rating. If there is a notable difference with respect to how caregivers might be rated, explain what contributes to the difference.*

*If any primary caregiver has remarkably different (diminished) Caregiver Protective Capacities than others, an explanation should be made specifically indicating the extent to which this raises any concern for the quality of parenting or the presence of threats.*

- 4. Foster parents fully believe they are currently caring for children meeting their preference; placed child also fits their child preference; have had successful experience caring for a child very similar to placed child; caring for placed child is consistent with foster parents' motivation/intent; no demands with current placements; no unusual stress.
- 3. Foster parents believe they are caring for children similar to their preference; placed child generally fits their child preference; have had acceptable experience caring for a child similar to placed child; caring for placed child is generally consistent with foster parents' motivation/intent; minimal demands with current placements; no unusual stress.
- 2. Foster parents believe they are caring for some children different than their preference; placed child does not fit their child preference; have limited successful experience caring for a child similar to the placed child; caring for placed child inconsistent with foster parents' motivation/intent; moderate demands in the home with current placements; some stress.
- 1. Foster parents believe that all children they are caring for are different from their preference; placed child does not fit their child preference; have had no experience caring for a child similar to the placed child; caring for placed child challenges foster parents' motivation/intent; significant demands with current placements; unusual stress.
- 0. Foster parents prefer not to be caring for the children placed with them; placed child is very different than their child preference; have had unsuccessful experience caring for a child similar to the placed child; not motivated or have wrong intentions for caring for placed child; current placements create unusually high demand; experiencing significant stress.

**Assessment Narrative:**

# Confirming Safe Environments

**Conclusion:** In the boxes below, enter the rating values from the previous checked assessments. Total the rating values and divide by 9 if it is a relative/fictive kin home or divide by 10 if it is a foster home. For placed children, enter the lowest rated child's scores. For assessed caregivers, enter the highest rated caregiver's scores. Print a hard copy for the file that contains the date and signature of both the Caseworker and the Supervisor.

**Special Instructions:** If you selected N/A for question number 1, total the rating values and divide by 8 for a relative fictive/kin home or divide by 9 if it is a foster home.

## Family:

### Fictive Kin/Relative or Foster

Children

Acceptance

Caregivers

Plan

Household Members

Community

Oversight

### Fictive Kin/Relatives

Natural Family - Fictive Kin/Relatives

Placed Child – Fictive Kin/Relatives

### Foster

Fostering Experience

### Total Ratings

Fictive Kin/Relatives

Foster

Please calculate your score and enter it here:

### **3.1 – 4.0 Child Safety = High Degree of Confidence in Safe Environment**

Abundance of signs demonstrating capacity to provide safe and protective care; placed child valued; collaborative with Agency; positive history; life success; child rearing success.

**2.3 - 3.0 Child Safety = Significant Degree of Confidence in Safe Environment**

Significant signs demonstrating capacity to provide safe and protective care; supportive of the placed child; will work with Agency; acceptable history; satisfaction in life and child rearing generally.

**1.5 - 2.2 Child Safety = Average Degree of Confidence in Safe Environment**

Moderate signs demonstrating capacity to provide safe and protective care; generally accepting of placed child and cooperative with agency; some difficulties and adjustment problems in adult and family life and in child rearing; alternative placement may be indicated.

**0.8 - 1.4 Child Safety = Low Degree of Confidence in Safe Environment**

Significant signs demonstrating a lack of capacity to provide a wholesome environment; ambivalent about placed child and/or questionable objectives; avoid agency involvement/oversight; generally a negative history/life adjustment/child rearing; risk of maltreatment. Concern about or evidence of child maltreatment.

Concern should exist for other children in the home; alternative placement should be pursued. This rating requires immediate supervisor consultation.

**0 - 0.7 Child Safety = No Confidence in Safe Environment**

Abundance of negative conditions; a threat to placed child's safety; antagonistic toward placed child, in collusion with the child's parents/ resistant/manipulative history of criminal behavior, family violence, child maltreatment; concern should exist for other children in the home. Immediately remove placed children; consider safety of other children in the home. This rating requires immediate supervisor consultation.

**Assessment Summary Narrative:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Caseworker

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date