



Not a Single Day More: Conditions for Return

MDCANI – The First 75 Days



Conditions for Return

Statements of specific behaviors, conditions, or circumstances that must exist before a child can return and remain in the home with an **in-home** safety plan

What is required in the home environment and of caregivers to step down the level of intrusiveness and implement an **in-home** safety plan

Returning the children at the earliest point safety can be established in the home with the use of an **in-home** safety plan

Safety Plan Review: Safety Strategies

Out-of-Home:

- Caregivers voluntarily place the child outside the home (Voluntary Kinship)
- Legal action to place child outside the home (TAFC/DFCS custody)

In-Home:

- **Use family resources, neighbors or individuals in the community**
- **Use community agencies or services**
- **Alleged maltreater leaves the home**
- **Non-maltreating caregiver moves to a safe environment with the children**



Safety Plan Review: Behaviors and Circumstances

Out of Home:

- Safety threats are extreme
- Child's behavior is extreme or provocative
- The nature of the home environment is chaotic, unpredictable or dangerous
- The caregivers' willingness to accept an in-home option for the safety plan cannot be confirmed or relied upon



In-Home:

- The home environment is calm and consistent enough for safety actions to have the necessary effect; and safety services and safety service providers can be in the home and be safe while there.
- The caregivers are willing to accept services and support in the home
- Safety services are immediately available and adequate

Conditions for Return: A Safety Decision

- Does NOT mean dependency issues have been resolved
- NOT based on completion of case plan
- NOT meant for aggravating circumstances where return to the parent is not being considered

*The safety threats can be managed with an **in-home** safety plan*

AND

*ongoing child safety can be sustained **while** ongoing case plan services continue*



Concept of Conditions for Return



Maintains a focus on safety intervention rather than allowing treatment intervention to become the defining measure for a safety decision



Expects highly active ongoing safety management



Always adjusting in downward intrusiveness

Ask continually:

- What must be controlled?
- How can it be controlled?
- Can anyone other than the caregiver control it?
- Can anyone substitute for the caregiver?
- Can home or family circumstances be adjusted?

WHAT

WHERE

WHEN

HOW

WHY

WHO

Safety Analysis & Conditions for Return

Are the parents/legal guardians **willing** for an in-home safety plan to be developed and demonstrated that they would cooperate with all identified safety service providers?

Is the home environment **calm and consistent** enough for an in-home safety plan to be implemented and for safety service providers to be in the home safely?

Are safety services (formal or informal) **available** at a sufficient level and to the degree necessary in order to manage the way in which impending danger manifests in the home?

If a professional evaluation is needed, what needs to be learned from the evaluation in order to develop an in-home safety plan (not a treatment plan)?

If the parents/legal guardians do not have a **physical location** in which to implement a plan, what needs to happen in order to have a location?

Ms. Jones impulsively leaves her six-year-old daughter (Brittany) alone to go party. The child is often alone for several hours to more than a day at a time. Ms. Jones was hostile and uncooperative. She disagreed that there was a problem and minimized the extent to which she had failed to provide adequate supervision for her child.

1. Ms. Jones must acknowledge that her behavior jeopardized her child's safety. The acknowledgement demonstrates her acceptance of the responsibility for supervising and protecting her child.
2. Ms. Jones must manage her emotions and reactions to DFCS intervention, accept the need for DFCS intervention, and cooperate with DFCS and others involved with the safety intervention (e.g. service providers).
3. Ms. Jones must have a plan for supervision by a suitable babysitter when she is away from the home.
4. Ms. Jones must be willing to allow family members/DFCS to observe that she is either providing supervision or planning for Brittany's care at least a day in advance of the need for a babysitter.

Bryan and Sheila are the 18-year-old parents of a newborn. Both adults are mildly cognitively limited and socially immature. They have no knowledge or skill needed in providing basic care to the infant. In addition to the basic care problems, they mishandle the child and behave toward her like she is a doll, handling her roughly and leaving her strapped in her car seat the majority of the time, failing to recognize or respond to her cues.

- Bryan and Sheila will show they understand what the consequences for Heather could be if they don't learn how to keep her healthy and safe, and they will be taking actions to begin to learn how to safely care for Heather.
- Bryan and Sheila will be agreeable to having someone in their home daily to assist them in safely caring for their baby.
- Bryan and Sheila will demonstrate the ability to consistently handle Heather gently and carefully and will clearly understand the importance of doing so.
- A family member, volunteer or professional with suitable knowledge and skill to meet the safety and basic care needs of Heather will be present at all times to assist Bryan and Sheila in appropriately caring for Heather.

Documenting/Communicating

- The safety concerns and diminished caregiver protective capacities that created the need for the child(ren) to reside out of the home;
- The specific conditions and circumstances required for the safe return of the child (based upon the type and degree of change that is needed);
- How the changes will be implemented to achieve the safe and successful resolution of the safety concerns and the child(ren)'s return home; and
- The parent(s)/legal guardian(s) response to intervention and willingness to make the changes necessary for the child(ren) to return home.

Resources

- www.myflfamilies.com (CFOP 170-7)
- [2018-08-23 conditions-for-return.pdf \(gal2.org\)](#)
- ODIS
- www.dhs.state.or.us/caf/safety_model
- Todd A. Darling, USF Training Manager, DCF NE Region, *Safety Analysis and Conditions for Return*
- DFCS Kinship Training

**SPECIAL
THANKS
TO.....**



Samantha Walker
Reunification Manager
State Permanency Unit

Natalie R. Avery Green
Policy Specialist

Tripp P. Jones
Safety Manager
State Safety Unit