In compliance with The Oklahoma Pinnacle Plan Point 3 Initiative 7, the Oklahoma Department of Human Services Training Unit in partnership with The University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, and The University of Oklahoma’s Anne & Henry Zarrow School of Social Work developed Hands on Testing. This competency evaluation will assess critical skills needed for child welfare workers to achieve positive outcomes for children and families. According to the Pinnacle Plan it is critical to employ a competent, committed, trained, and resourced Child Welfare workforce, and Hands on Testing will help achieve that goal.

Hands on Testing is comprised of four skills-based components structured to support the successful execution of the Pinnacle Plan. Performance reached through Hands on Testing is directly linked to Child Welfare Services’ goal of improving outcomes for the children and families we serve. Participants will achieve successful completion of Hands on Testing once they have demonstrated skills on all four components; child interview, adult interview, safety assessment, and KIDS navigation.

**Pinnacle Plan Point 3 Initiative 7:**

Effective September 1, 2012, training for new Child Welfare Specialists requires successful completion of a performance competency evaluation prior to caseload assignment.
Component One – Interview of a Child

Details

During this portion of the competency evaluation, the participants conduct an interview with an adult actor playing a child. The interview is based on the participant’s primary role within Child Welfare: Child Protective Services, Permanency Planning, Foster Care, Adoptions, or Hotline. The interview is conducted one-on-one with an adult actor portraying a child in a neutral setting. Participants are expected to engage the child and gather information regarding safety, permanency, and well-being. Participants are provided a specific time frame of one hour to prepare and conduct the interview.

Component Two – Interview with an Adult

Details

During this portion of the competency evaluation, the participants conduct an interview with an adult actor. The interview is based on the participant’s primary role within Child Welfare: Child Protective Services, Permanency Planning, Foster Care, Swift Adoptions, or Hotline. The interview is conducted one-on-one with an actor portraying the parent of a child involved in a Child Welfare case. The parent actor being interviewed is the parent of the child previously interviewed during component one of the competency evaluation. Participants are expected to engage the parent/PRFC and gather information regarding safety, permanency, and well-being. Participants are provided a specific time frame of one hour to prepare and conduct the interview.

Documentation

Based on the participant’s primary role within Child Welfare, they are required to document either the adult or child interview completed in component one or two of the competency evaluation. The documentation must accurately reflect information obtained within the interview. Participants are provided a specific time frame of one hour to document the interview in a Word document.
Adoption:

1) Child Interview— the worker will be given one hour to complete this task. The interview is based on a worker visit to a child placed in a Trial Adoptive Home. There is no documentation for this task.

2) Adult Interview— the worker will be given a partially completed DCFS 11 to discuss with the prospective adoptive parent. The worker will be given two hours to complete this task; one hour to prepare and interview and one hour to document. The interview is based on an adoptive parent wishing to be a placement. Workers must pass both elements.

CPS Workers:

1) Child Interview—the worker will be given two hours to complete this task; one hour to prepare and interview and one hour to document. The interview is a new referral of abuse or neglect; child will be interviewed at school. Workers must pass both elements.

2) Adult Interview—the worker will be given one hour to complete this task and will only be graded on the interview. The interview is with the PRFC/Parent of the child previously interviewed. There is no documentation for this task.

Foster Care:

1) Child Interview—the worker will be given one hour to complete this task and will only be graded on the interview. The interview will be with a biological child of a Bridge Family during a re-assessment. There is no documentation for this task.

2) Adult Interview—the worker will be given a partially completed DCFS 10 to discuss with the prospective kinship parent. The worker will be given two hours to complete this task; one hour to prepare and interview and one hour to document. The interview is based on a kinship parent wishing to be a placement. Workers must pass both elements.

Hotline:

1) Child Interview—the worker will be given one hour to complete this task. The interview is a new referral of abuse or neglect; child will be interviewed at school. There is no documentation for this task.

2) The ability to interview an adult and document that interview. The worker will be given two hours to complete this task; one hour to prepare and interview and one hour to document. The interview is with an individual wishing to report abuse/neglect. Workers must pass both elements.
Permanency Planning/ Family Centered Services:

1) Child Interview—the worker will be given one hour to complete this task. The interview is based on a worker visit to a child placed in out-of-home care; it will be the child of the parent previously interviewed. There is no documentation for this task.

2) Adult Interview—the worker will be given two hours to complete this task; one hour to prepare and interview and one hour to document. The interview is conducted with a parent regarding the Family Functional Assessment (FFA). The worker must pass both elements.

Comprehensive workers will be assigned a testing track according to their majority assignment in KIDS however supervisors will be e-mailed to verify assignment.

Component Three – Safety Assessment

Details

During this portion of the competency evaluation, the participants receive an Assessment of Child Safety form in which the six key questions are completed. The worker reads the six key questions and determines the safety threat, which includes articulating the unsafe behavior beneath the safety threat (#1-11) chosen, whether the child(ren) is safe or unsafe, and which PRFC the safety threat applies to. Participants are provided a specific time frame of one hour to read and complete the Assessment of Child Safety.

Component Four – KIDS Navigation

Details

During this portion of the competency evaluation, the participants are required to enter written information into the KIDS system. The information includes three parts: (1) Contact Guide with an Addendum, (2) Adjudication Order (3) Change in Placement.
Testing Details:

Testing will begin at **8:30 am** on the assigned testing day and will conclude once the worker has finished all sections of assessment. The worker will meet with a member of the Training Unit and the graders of their adult and child interviews to receive their results. They will be given oral and written feedback.

If a worker completes all of the testing areas they will have successfully completed CORE and may be assigned a child welfare case load.

If a worker receives an incomplete in any of the areas of testing they will be allowed to retest on the next available date. The worker will only test on the area they were not successful in completing.

If a worker is unsuccessful a second time, they will be referred back to the county office. **Please note, without successful completion of CORE and HOT, a worker must not be assigned a caseload.**

For workers who have been out of Child Welfare Services for 18 months or less, there are 2 options:

1. Workers can attend CORE as a new worker and they will have 2 chances to test at the end of CORE.

2. Workers can test prior to attending CORE and if they successfully complete all 4 areas, they will not be required to attend CORE.
   a. If workers receive an incomplete, even in one area, they will be required to attend CORE and test at the end (only the area they were not able to successfully complete). They will retain two HOT opportunities after completing CORE.

If you and your worker choose to test prior to attending CORE, the worker must complete the items on the checklists attached.

The role of the Supervisor:

Supervisors have a critical role in helping their workers prepare for HOT. They need to ensure their workers complete Pre-CORE and OJT homework to assure they have the opportunity to practice each area on which they will be tested.

The checklists below must be signed by the supervisor and the worker showing they have completed the tasks.
**Post-CORE Activities Checklist – CPS/HL Assignment**  
(Must be completed and submitted to the Coordinator upon return for Hands-On Testing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completed (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assigned secondary on one investigation and one assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On the assigned cases, completed (at a minimum) the following tasks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At least two face to face child interviews;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At least two face to face interviews with a parent or guardian;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documentation of all completed interviews in the appropriate KIDS screens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided with at least two (2) example Assessments of Child Safety, worker completed the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Correctly make a safety decision for each child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Correctly identify the PRFC for each safety threat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Correctly identify the safety threats for all children and articulate the behaviors of the PRFC that makes the child unsafe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Documented a change of placement on KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entered a court hearing in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Entered a completed worker contact in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor and mentor provided detailed and specific verbal and written feedback on all activities (see below), provided additional assistance where worker appeared to struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific strengths noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): __________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Specific need areas noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): __________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Worker has spent time, in addition to activities above, working on the following (circle all that apply): Interviewing  Safety threats and decision making  KIDS

Participants should complete all of the above activities. This completed checklist must be completed and signed by the supervisor and participant.

___________________________________                        __________________________________
SUPERVISOR/DATE                                             PARTICIPANT/DATE

January  14, 2015
Post-CORE Activities Checklist – PP/FCS or Comprehensive Assignment
(Must be completed and submitted to the Coordinator upon return for Hands-On Testing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completed (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assigned secondary on one Permanency case (ideally a new case needing a completed FFA) with court involvement in the worker’s county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On the above assigned case, completed at minimum the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Family Functional Interview with at least one parent and child;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilized all information gathered to document the complete Family Functional Assessment (FFA). If no FFA could be scheduled for the worker, the supervisor and/or mentor communicated with nearby counties to schedule and complete this activity on a case in the nearby county;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A worker visit with a child and documented on KIDS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided with at least two (2) example Assessments of Child Safety, worker completed the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly make a safety decision for each child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identify the PRFC for each safety threat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identify the safety threats for all children and articulate the behaviors of the PRFC that makes the child unsafe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Documented a change of placement on KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entered a court hearing in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Entered a completed worker contact in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor and mentor provided detailed and specific verbal and written feedback on all activities (see below), provided additional assistance where worker appeared to struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific strengths noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): 
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Specific need areas noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): 
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Worker has spent time, in addition to activities above, working on the following (circle all that apply): Interviewing Safety threats and decision making KIDS

Participants should complete all of the above activities. This completed checklist must be completed and signed by the supervisor and participant.

SUPERVISOR/DATE ___________________________ PARTICIPANT/DATE ___________________________
**Post-CORE Activities Checklist – Bridge Resource Assignment**  
(Must be completed and submitted to the Coordinator upon return for Hands-On Testing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completed (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assigned secondary on one kinship or other Bridge pre-resource and/or resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On the above assigned resource, completed at minimum the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completed the initial home visit, walkthrough and/or re-assessment, addressed any concerns or issues noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completed all written documentation, including applicable KIDS screens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided with at least two (2) example Assessments of Child Safety, worker completed the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly make a safety decision for each child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identify the PRFC for each safety threat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correctly identify the safety threats for all children and articulate the behaviors of the PRFC that makes the child unsafe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Documented a change of placement on KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entered a court hearing in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Entered a completed worker contact in KIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor and mentor provided detailed and specific verbal and written feedback on all activities (see below), provided additional assistance where worker appeared to struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific strengths noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): ____________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Specific need areas noted by supervisor and mentor (and discussed with worker): ____________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Worker has spent time, in addition to activities above, working on the following (circle all that apply): Interviewing Safety threats and decision making KIDS

Participants should complete all of the above activities. This completed checklist must be completed and signed by the supervisor and participant.

SUPERVISOR/DATE ___________________________ PARTICIPANT/DATE ___________________________

January 14, 2015
HOT will primarily take place in Norman, regardless of where workers attend CORE. The testing locations are as follows:

**Norman-OU/DHS Training Annex**, 1200 W Rock Creek Rd., Norman, OK 73069

**Tulsa-Skyline Building East**, 6128 E. 38th Street, Tulsa, OK 74135

If an emergency occurs and a worker is unable to attend their HOT scheduled date they will have to test with the next available group.

Graders include Supervisors, District Directors, and Field Managers from all over the state. **Supervisors will not be allowed to evaluate their own worker.**

On the HOT testing dates, graders will need to arrive to the training site by 8:00am. They will be given instructions, the scenario and testing instruments. Graders will have 30 minutes to look over the material and prepare. Testing will begin at 8:30am.

Some key things to remember to have a successful CORE and HOT:

1) Workers must have a minimum of two weeks in the county office to acclimate to OKDHS and get a feel for child welfare.

2) If you have leave scheduled during CORE training or HOT you will need to be withdrawn and rescheduled in an alternate CORE. Due to the intensive and comprehensive way that training is conducted, missing any portion will result in incompletion. Emergencies do occur and determinations on making up CORE or HOT due to an unforeseen event will be determined on a case by case basis.

3) Be punctual, prepared and professional.

Attached below are some helpful checklists to help your workers prepare.
## Adult Interview—Adoptions

### Section One—Engagement
(At least 4 out of 5 elements)

1. Worker introduced self, the purpose of the interview, and their role.  
   Yes  No
2. Worker explained the House Assessment form and and importance of a safe living environment.  
   Yes  No
3. Worker used the House Assessment form as a guiding tool to address the conditions of the living environment.  
   Yes  No
4. Worker gathered information on the family's willingness to partner with DHS to provide for the child's needs and follow DHS policies  
   Yes  No
5. Worker inquired about the family's willingness to accept/work with a child who has experienced trauma.  
   Yes  No

### Section Two

**Rapport** (at least 6 out of 8)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to client
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of client's situation
- strength based (acknowledged client's protective capacities/strengths)
- communicated empathy

**Communication:** (at least 6 out of 8)

- basic use of active listening (not interrupting, reflection of feeling/thought)
- used open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed client to speak (appropriate use of silence)
- appropriate use of paraphrases
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- interview flowed well (questioning sequence made sense)
- developmental appropriate use of terms

**Assessing Safety:** (at least 4 out of 6)

- gauged Adoptive Parent's understanding of the needs of children in DHS Custody
- appropriately used questioning/confrontation
- took an opportunity to explore a safety issue relating to the House Assessment
- used follow –up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)
- used clarification statements (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)
- was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information regarding past history/trauma relating to children in care
### Section One—Engagement

(At least 4 out of 5 elements)

1. Worker introduced self, the purpose of the interview, and their role.  | Yes | No
2. Worker maintained the confidentiality of the reporter.  | Yes | No
3. Worker advised the PRFC they have spoken to their child  | Yes | No
4. Worker advised PRFC of the concerns/allegations in the referral.  | Yes | No
5. Worker gathered demographic information regarding the family.  | Yes | No

### Section Two

**Rapport** (at least 6 out of 8)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to client
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of client’s situation
- strength based (acknowledged client's protective capacities/strengths
- communicated empathy

**Communication:** (at least 6 out of 8)

- basic use of active listening (not interrupting, reflection of feeling/thought)
- used open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed client to speak (appropriate use of silence)
- appropriate use of paraphrases
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- interview flowed well (questioning sequence made sense)
- developmental appropriate use of terms

**Assessing Safety:** (at least 4 out of 6)

- gauged PRFC’s understanding for the reason for CW concern
- appropriately used questioning/confrontation
- took an opportunity to explore a safety issue relating to the FFA
- used follow-up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)
- used clarification statements (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)
- was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information regarding safety
### Adult Interview—Foster Care

**Section One—Engagement**

(At least 4 out of 5 elements)

1. Worker introduced self, the purpose of the interview, and their role. Yes No
2. Worker explained the Initial Kinship Placement form and requirements of kinship. Yes No
3. Worker used the Kinship Placement form as a guiding tool to address finances, sleeping arrangements, training, etc. Yes No
4. Worker gathered information on the family's willingness to partner with DHS to provide for the child's needs and follow DHS policies Yes No
5. Worker inquired about the family's willingness to protect the child. (protective capacities) Yes No

**Section Two**

**Rapport** (at least 6 out of 8)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to client
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of client's situation
- strength based (acknowledged client's protective capacities/strengths
- communicated empathy

**Communication:** (at least 6 out of 8)

- basic use of active listening (not interrupting, reflection of feeling/thought)
- used open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed client to speak (appropriate use of silence)
- appropriate use of paraphrases
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- interview flowed well (questioning sequence made sense)
- developmental appropriate use of terms

**Assessing Safety:** (at least 3 out of 5)

- appropriately used questioning/confrontation
- verbally followed up to a cue regarding a safety concern
- used follow—up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)
- used clarification statements (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)
- was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information regarding safety
### Section One—Engagement

(At least 4 out of 5 elements)

1. Worker introduced self, the purpose of the interview, and their role. & Yes & No 
2. Worker explained the Family Functional Assessment. & Yes & No 
3. Worker used the FFA as a guiding tool (did not read word for word). & Yes & No 
4. Worker gathered information on family functioning, past and present. & Yes & No 
5. Worker inquired about functional areas that have impacted child safety. & Yes & No 

### Section Two

**Rapport** (at least 6 out of 8)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to client
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of client’s situation
- strength based (acknowledged client's protective capacities/strengths
- communicated empathy

**Communication:** (at least 6 out of 8)

- basic use of active listening (not interrupting, reflection of feeling/thought)
- used open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed client to speak (appropriate use of silence)
- appropriate use of paraphrases
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- interview flowed well (questioning sequence made sense)
- developmental appropriate use of terms

**Assessing Safety:** (at least 4 out of 6)

- gauged PRFC’s understanding for the reason for CW concern
- appropriately used questioning/confrontation
- took an opportunity to explore a safety issue relating to the FFA
- used follow –up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)
- used clarification statements (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)
- was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information regarding underlying behaviors
# Child Interview

## Section One—Engagement
(At least 3 out of 4 elements)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Worker introduced self and their role.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Worker explained the purpose of the interview.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Worker used the appropriate tool to engage/interview the child.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Worker listened to and responded to the child's questions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section Two

**Rapport** (at least 6 out of 8 for CPS, 5 of 7 for all others)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to client
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of client's situation
- strength based (acknowledged client's protective capacities/strengths
- communicated empathy

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPS Only</strong></td>
<td>assured child they were not in trouble with worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Interviewing: (at least 5 out of 7)

- used tell me invitations/open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed child to speak (not interrupting, appropriate use of silence)
- was attentive to body language
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- appropriate use of clarifying questions
- demonstrated the ability to speak on the appropriate developmental level

## Assessing Safety: (at least 5 out of 7 for CPS; 4 out of 6 for all others)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPS Only</strong></td>
<td>gauged child's understanding for the reason for CW concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was able to gauge child's understanding of safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used follow-up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used clarification statements at least one time (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriately used questioning/confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>took an opportunity to explore a safety issue at least one time (addressed allegations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information to assess safety more than one time <strong>If only 2 or 3 times—comments required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Child Interview-Foster Care

#### Section One—Engagement

(At least 3 out of 4 elements)

1. Worker introduced self and their role. Yes No
2. Worker explained the purpose of the interview. Yes No
3. Worker used the appropriate tool to engage/interview the child. Yes No
4. Worker listened to and responded to the child's questions. Yes No

#### Section Two

**Rapport** (at least 5 of 7)

- casual conversation prior to investigatory questions
- presented as warm and engaging, receptive (smiled, made eye contact)
- was respectful to child
- non-threatening
- non-judgmental
- exhibited understanding of child's fears/concerns
- communicated empathy

**Interviewing:** (at least 5 out of 7)

- used tell me invitations/open ended questions
- avoided leading and coercive questions
- allowed child to speak (not interrupting, appropriate use of silence)
- was attentive to body language
- effective use of redirection and summarization
- appropriate use of clarifying questions
- demonstrated the ability to speak on the appropriate developmental level

**Assessing Safety:** (at least 5 out of 7)

- gauged child's understanding of being a Bridge Family
- was able to gauge child's understanding of safety
- used follow-up questions at least 2 times (tell me more)
- used clarification statements (I heard you say..., is that accurate?)
- appropriately used questioning/confrontation
- took an opportunity to explore the family dynamics (discipline, daily routines, etc.)
- was able to ask probing questions/questions with intent to gather information to regarding child's perception of foster care
## KIDS

### Contact & Placement (at least 8 out of 11)

**Contact**

- "Face to Face Placement Provider" Selected
- Today's Date Entered
- Completed
- Correct Child (ren) in the Client Box
- "Worker Visit" selected as Purpose
- First 3 boxes completed on the Contact Guide (only 3 sentences per box required)
- Child Age tab says "Yes" for each child (addendum)

**Placement**

- Exited child from prior placement with correct date
- Selected correct exit reason
- Selected correct placement
- Entered correct date and time of placement

**Hearing** (at least 9 out of 13)

- Entered court number for all children
- Added clients who participated in this hearing from the court order
- Added correct hearing type (adjudication)
- Added correct judge
- Added correct date of hearing
- Added DA's name
- Documented Hearing Results (includes more than 3 sentences)
- Documented Adjudication
- Documented Findings
- Documented Next Hearing (date and time)
- Documented Adults included in next hearing
- Added Child's Attorney
- Added Adult's Attorney
Guy Willis, Program Administrator, Norman
405-325-1902
Guy.Willis@okdhs.org

Amanda Beard, Programs Supervisor, Norman
405-325-8960
Amanda.Beard@okdhs.org

Mark Carson, Program Field Rep, Tulsa
918-794-7530
Mark.Carson@okdhs.org

Jamie Savage, Program Field Rep, Norman
405-325-9921
Jamie.Savage@okdhs.org

Michele Roberts, Program Field Rep, Norman
405-325-8279
Michele.Roberts@okdhs.org

Mandy Dembowski, Program Field Rep, Norman
405-325-9189
Amanda.Dembowski@okdhs.org

Jeff Kuhns, Program Field Rep, Norman
405-325-9192
Jeffrey.Kuhns@okdhs.org

Beth Oleson, Programs Field Rep, Norman
918-794-7545
Beth.Oleson@okdhs.org

Tammy Grindstead, Programs Field Rep, Norman
405-573-9191
Tammy.Grindstead@okdhs.org

Robby Hadden, Programs Field Rep, Norman
405-573-9191
Robert.Hadden@okdhs.org

Carla Shackelford, HOT Coordinator
405-325-9403
Carla.ctr.Shackelford@okdhs.org

Julie Sanders, CORE Coordinator
405-325-9069
Julie.ctr.Sanders@okdhs.org

Elizabeth Adeseye, CORE Coordinator
405-325-6574
Elizabeth.ctr.Adeseye@okdhs.org

Jenny Fain, CORE Coordinator
405-325-3273
Jenny.ctr.Fain@okdhs.org

Stephanie Heinen, Tulsa CORE Coordinator
918-794-7553
Stephanie.ctr.Heinen@okdhs.org

www.ou.edu/cwtraining