

**ELC Screening Workgroup
Meeting Notes
August 11, 2003**

Participants:

Tara Taylor, Licking County DJFS	Marcia Naugle, ODJFS Toledo FO
Max Bucey, PCSAO	Marlene Preston-Rombach, ODJFS Cincinnati FO
Rhonda Reagh, Greene County CSB	Michael Ring, ODJFS OCF
Randi Lewis, ODJFS Legal	Fran Rembert, ODJFS OCF
Buzz Long, Hardin County DJFS	Denise Stewart, Mahoning County CSB
Kelly Lynch, Guernsey County CSB	Crystal Allen, PCSAO
Leslie McGee, ODJFS OCF	Faye Weddington, Scioto County CSB
Roy Kasicky, Franklin County CSB	David Thomas, ODJFS OCF
Dean Sparks, Lucas County CSB	Sandy Haigford, Van Wert County DJFS
Brenda Bloom, Greene County CSB	Cathy Appel, Clark County DJFS
Helene Stulley, Pickaway County DJFS	Rich Opre, Cuyahoga County DCFS
Sarah Hay, Guernsey County CSB	

Notes:

What County Agencies Currently Utilize?

Guernsey County CSB:	Complete Risk Assessment on all reports that are screened in; no intervention on screened out referrals
Lucas County CSB:	Screening tool mirrors RA; alternate response for juvenile justice kids only; resource management; does not file dependency action in court; screen in abuse/neglect; unmarried services; screens in all post adoptive calls
Greene County CSB:	Screening protocol/procedures; abuse/neglect & dependency; do RA on everything except "intake assessment" referrals (concerns but does not rise to the level of an A/N; short term services; I&R; some upgraded to an A/N report and full RA completed)
Scioto County CSB:	I&R when not abuse/neglect; court liaison/diversion program
Hardin County DJFS:	Screen in abuse/neglect & dependency; new category in FACSIS (I&R) changing it to screen out; prosecutor opinion that reports from a mandatory reporter cannot be screened out?
Clark County DJFS:	Screen in abuse/neglect; dependency filing in court almost exclusively regardless of maltreatment in allegation; I&R; triage; Risk assessment on abuse/neglect; dependency shorter version RA unless opened for ongoing services; no RA on IV-E court cases
Pickaway County DJFS:	Abuse/neglect & dependency; other – court orders, courtesy interviews; PSUP from court; other can be "bumped up" if other

issues are found; I&R; Supervisory screens; referent told on the phone whether referral was accepted as a report

Van Wert DJFS: Same as above

Mahoning County CSB: Supervisory checks and balances; judges; commissioners; community; control what comes in as report; all come in as referrals then becomes report for investigation

Cuyahoga County DCFS: Archive category; non-referral screened out; other interviews; FYI - non A/N information on open cases; assessment without assessment tool; closures at hotline ("bogus referrals") – do RA because worker went out and made contact

Licking County DJFS: abuse/dependency/neglect and others; court cases; screen out less than 10%; less than 1/2 of screened out reports come back in; do RA on all reports; shortened version on "others"

What is screened in and screened out = criteria regarding behaviors and actions and worker supervisory discretion.

- A. Summary of Practice – all over board; inconsistent; county by county; not uniform in statewide practice (all concur big problem – possible litigation)
Screen in – all or some
Screen out – some dependency; juvenile justice cases; supervisor/worker; screener discretion
Keep Log/Documentation
Other categories – I&R, archive, triage
- B. Reporting law 2151.421 ORC and OAC 5101:2-34-06
- C. Screening Stage V CPOE – Data available this fall
- D. Other state models - Illinois, Virginia CFSR/PIP
Definitions ORC
Screening criteria/protocols
CPOE Stage V – analyzed for trends in practice
Feds/CAPTA
Media
Resource Center

Next meeting: October 17, 2003, 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM, 255 E. Main Street

Homework for next meeting:

1. Review ABA report on Ohio Screening processes and ORC implications (distributed at meeting)

2. Comparison of OAC rule 5101:2-34-06 to other state rule versions
3. ODJFS will seek CA/N statutes from other states
4. Seek HHS policies and protocols
5. COA Standards regarding screening
6. Review ORC sections 2151.421, reporting statute; 2151.03.031 - .04, neglected, abused, dependent child defined; 2919.22 child endangerment
7. CPOE screening analysis
8. PCSAO standards regarding screening procedures
9. OAC screening rules
10. Training (uniform statewide) – screeners and curriculums (quality of workforce)
11. County logs/records
12. Investigations and screeners – surveys/CPOE process
13. What happens to those screened out?
14. Q&A materials to be gathered and disseminated
15. Review ABA article on new CAPTA requirements