

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
SDM CASE PROMOTION GUIDANCE**

Safety	Risk	Allegation Conclusion	Recommended Interventions	Key Questions and Other Considerations
Unsafe	Any	Any	<p>Child/youth should come into care via warrant or emergency removal if exigent circumstances exist.</p> <p>Remove to another parent, court involvement, Voluntary Family Reunification (VFR) in rare circumstances.</p> <p>Consider Family Preservation (FP) 30–60 days before reunification or when child/youth is with noncustodial parent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What got in the way of creating a safety plan? Could anything more have been done? • What support network exists for this child/youth and family? Have they been identified and engaged? • Was a CFTM set up? • Have all placement options been considered, and was family finding utilized? • Was the safety threat explained in clear language to the family? • Were steps needed to achieve reunification explained in clear language to the family? • Have visitation plans been established? • If the original allegation was inconclusive, but a new concern was found to be unsafe, add an allegation
Safe With Plan	Any	Substantiated or Inconclusive	<p>There is an active safety threat and DCFS involvement needs to continue. Create an SDM safety plan.</p> <p>Consider: ARS (substantiated/inconclusive, 1+ prior referrals), P&A (inconclusive), Court Family Maintenance (FM) or Voluntary Family Maintenance (VFM) with a plan to monitor the safety plan. Include FP services in most situations with an active safety threat. If the safety threat is resolved in 30 days (for most safety plans) reassess for safety and close. <i>Note:</i> Some safety plans must be reassessed at seven (7) days - refer to 0070-548.25.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the safety threat explained in clear language to the family? • Was a support network established that knows the concerns and is able to help with the plan? • Is there a clear strategy to monitor the plan? • Is there a timeframe for when the review of the plan will take place? • Was a CFTM set up? • Is there a clear way to assess whether the original safety threat has been controlled for at the end of the safety planning period?

For current community-based resource program eligibility criteria, please refer to [Community-Based Resources 0070-548.00](#)

Safety	Risk	Allegation Conclusion	Recommended Interventions	Key Questions and Other Considerations
Safe	High or Very High	Substantiated	<p>Prioritize for ongoing DCFS intervention—consider VFM or court-FM depending on the severity of the allegation and abuse. Include FP when needed.</p> <p>Close without further DCFS intervention only rarely and only when it is clear family has connected to intensive community service such as Alternative Response Services (ARS), Partnerships for Families (PFF) or similar. Verify family engagement with the service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of history: What was the first, worst, and most recent allegation? Use that to help decide court-FM versus VFM. • If there was prior history, what was the outcome of prior intervention? Was it successful? Prioritize previous interventions that were not successful for court-FM. • What is the age/vulnerability of child/youth? Use that to help with court-FM versus VFM decision. • Share the notion of risk transparently with the family so they know about the likelihood of future system involvement. Knowing the risk can lead a family to new actions. • Was a CFTM set up? • Explore family supports to help address needs.
Safe	Low or Moderate	Substantiated	<p>Consider closing at the end of investigations and referring to ARS or Prevention and Aftercare (P&A) if unresolved needs remain.</p> <p>Consider VFM in rare circumstances (ARA approval needed) or court-FM only if the nature of the allegation and response to investigations suggest that further assessment related to household safety is needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of history: What was the first, worst, and most recent allegation? Use that to help decide court-FM and VFM versus closure at the end of investigation. • If there was prior history, what was the outcome of prior intervention? Was it successful? Prioritize previous situations that were not successful for VFM. • If the desire is to open to open a FM or VFM case, what is the case plan goal? Can this goal be achieved in 6–9 months? • Would a community agency have a better chance at engaging this family? • Was a CFTM set up? • Explore family supports to help address needs.
Safe	High or Very High	Inconclusive or Unfounded	<p>Close, refer to ARS, PFF, P&A to address high risk, or consider VFM.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of history: What was the first, worst, and most recent allegation? Discuss underlying needs with family. Use both of those to help decide what service is most needed at the end of the investigation. • Share the notion of risk transparently with the family so that they know the situation about likelihood of maltreatment in future. Knowing the risk can lead a family to new actions. • Was a CFTM set up? • Explore family supports to help address needs.
Safe	Low or Moderate	Inconclusive or Unfounded	<p>Close, refer to Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, & Treatment (CAPIT) or P&A.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore family supports to help address unresolved needs. • Offer CFTM if needed.