



---

## Regional Report: Child Maltreatment Identification, Part 1 - Bay Area Academy: December 2007 -

---

### Overall Results

	Overall	Toby	Miko	Crystal	D'Shan
Percentage Meeting Criteria for Part A	37.0%	66.7%	92.6%	70.4%	51.9%
Percentage Meeting Criteria for Part B	96.3%	92.6%	92.6%	96.3%	92.6%
Percentage Meeting Criteria for Part C	11.1%	55.6%	92.6%	85.2%	14.8%

#### Data Included:

Date Range: One class from 2/2/07

Sub-regions represented: N/A

(N= 27)

Curriculum version: 1.2

Answer sheet version: 1.1

Answer sheet version 1.05 made slight modifications to the wording of factors 1, 4, 8, 10, and 11. Version 1.1 made additional changes to items 3 and 5. Answer sheet versions 1.1 and 1.2 presented the Toby scenario first, rather than last as in earlier versions. Answer sheet version 1.1 was also used with a two-hour timeframe for the evaluation.

**Scoring:** Preliminary criteria for adequate performance were established by the CAT team for CMI1 as follows:

- To “pass” Part A the trainee needs to have 9 of the 13 items for each scenario correct.
- To “pass” Part B the trainee must have the correct decisions for 3 out of 4 scenarios.
- To “pass” Part C the trainee has to correctly identify 3 of the correct options.

The table above shows the percentage of trainees meeting each criterion. The overall columns for Parts A and C show the percentage of people meeting criteria on all four scenarios. The overall percentage for Part B is the percentage meeting the Part B criterion. Scenario-specific percentages are shown only to provide diagnostic information about where the decision errors are occurring.

**Results:** These findings should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of participants and the fact that findings are based on one class only. To the extent that the same patterns have been found as in other earlier reports, they are more likely to be stable indicators of how people are responding.

**Part A:** As in the past, participants did the best job of analyzing the individual decision-making elements on Part A for the Miko scenario and had more trouble with the other three. Moving Toby to the first position did not appear to have an effect on the percentage of people meeting the criteria of 9 out of 13 elements correct. This is encouraging in that time does not appear to be a substantial issue in participants' performance on this section.

- On the Toby scenario, the same items (2, 3, 4, 9, and 10) continued to be problematic. Item 10 was re-keyed from “no” to “yes” as the correct answer. In the scenario, mention of a “cracked tooth” was changed to a less serious “chipped tooth.” Neither change resulted in a substantial change in elements that tended to be answered incorrectly. Items 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 - dealing with his injuries, developmental level, and possible unreported maltreatment - were still answered correctly by fewer than 2/3 of participants.
- For D'Shan, items 2 and 3 dealing with his injuries and item 10 dealing with possible unreported maltreatment continued to be problem areas, despite some clarification in the scenario regarding information from D'Shan's family doctor. In this analysis, items 1, 7, and 9 also were missed by more than 1/3 of participants.
- For Crystal, items 1, 5, 7, 10, and 11 continued to be problems despite some small clarifications in the scenario.
- Item 9, developmental abilities, continued to be problematic in the Miko scenario. The scenario was changed to make Miko 3 months old in an effort to make it clearer that she was unlikely to have rolled off the couch by herself. However, participants continued to struggle with this item. Item 10 dealing with possible unreported maltreatment also continued to be difficult for participants.

**Part B:** Overall performance was very strong on decision making in Part B. Participants performed better on all scenarios during this reporting period than they had during the period covered in the July 2007 report.

**Part C:** Participants continued to vary in how well they were able to match the key decision-making elements identified by the curriculum developers in Part C. As in previous reports, participants did the best job on the Miko and Crystal scenarios and had the most difficulty on the Toby scenario where abuse did not occur.

Details of performance on specific elements is shown in the tables below.

## TOBY CASE SCENARIO

### A. Part A Item Analysis (Shaded percentages are correct.)

Element	Yes	No	Need More Information
1) Location/scene of incident	18.5%	70.4%	11.1%
2) Location of injuries on the body	33.3%	63.0%	3.7%
3) Type(s) of injury	40.7%	55.6%	
4) Severity/extent of current injuries	37.0%	55.6%	3.7%
5) Frequency of injuries over time	66.7%	25.9%	7.4%
6) Explanation of injuries	18.5%	66.7%	11.1%
7) Child's overall appearance	66.7%	25.9%	7.4%
8) Chronological age of child	22.2%	77.8%	
9) Developmental abilities of child	22.2%	51.9%	25.9%
10) History of unreported maltreatment -of these children by any caregivers -by these caregivers toward any children	11.1%	37.0%	51.9%
11) History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers	3.7%	88.9%	7.4%
12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood maltreatment	3.7%	11.1%	85.2%
13) Current caregivers' substance abuse		7.4%	92.6%

\* Missing or uncodable responses over 5%

Underlined and italicized items had percentages correct of less than 2/3rds. They might need a second look to be sure that the scenario itself and/or the teaching of the decision point is clear.

- 1) Location/scene of incident—These injuries appear to have occurred in the home and at the skate park. The skate park location does not suggest abuse. The home location does not affect whether these injuries meet the definition of abuse one way or the other.
- 2) Location of injuries on body—Locations of some of the injuries are more consistent with accident than with abuse (little toe, knees, elbows, and especially shins). The location of the other injuries (arm, face) could be either. “A chipped tooth, while located in the head, is not necessarily a problematic location for injury.”
- 3) Type of injury—Toby has several types of injuries (broken bone, chipped tooth, bruises), none of which is more associated with infliction than with accident.
- 4) Severity/extent of current injuries —A broken bone is a severe injury.
- 5) Frequency of injuries over time—Toby has many injuries over time.
- 6) Explanation of injuries—The explanation for the injuries all consistent with the injuries themselves. Toby, his mother, and his brother all agree on the explanation, and neither child appears to be coerced.
- 7) Child's overall appearance—Child appears overweight and often is disheveled: his clothes are torn and sometimes dirty and his long hair is often messy. In addition, he has multiple bruises on the

shins and evidence of skinned elbows and knees. It should be noted that some of these characteristics can be understood within a cultural context (e.g., skateboarder culture).

- 8) Chronological age of child—This child is older.
- 9) Developmental abilities of the child—This child appears to be developmentally on target.
- 10) History of unreported maltreatment: -of these children by any caregivers, -by these caregivers toward any children—There is no known history.
- 11) History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers—There is no CWS history.
- 12) Current caregivers’ history of own childhood maltreatment—There is no information on this yet.
- 13) Current caregivers’ substance abuse—There is no information about this yet.

**B. With the information currently available and based on your assessment of the elements what MOST LIKELY will be your decision: (Shaded item is correct.)**

- 1) Child maltreatment occurred 3.7%
- 2) Child maltreatment did not occur 92.6%

**C. Of the following elements, which THREE were MOST significant to you in making your decision in Question B? Any three of the shaded options is considered correct. Percentages are percentages of participants who checked that option. Low percentages in a shaded area may signal that the importance of that factor was missed. However, it may also just mean that other factors were viewed by most participants as more important so that factor didn’t make the top three.**

- |              |     |  |
|--------------|-----|--|
| <u>44.4%</u> | 1)  | Location of incident   |
| <u>63.0%</u> | 2)  | Location of injuries on the body   |
| <u>63.0%</u> | 3)  | Type(s) of injury  |
| <u>14.8%</u> | 4)  | Severity of injuries   |
| <u>3.7%</u>  | 5)  | Frequency of injuries over time  |
| <u>81.5%</u> | 6)  | Explanation of injuries  |
| _____        | 7)  | Overall appearance of child  |
| <u>44.4%</u> | 8)  | Chronological age of child   |
| _____        | 9)  | Developmental abilities of child   |
| _____        | 10) | History of unreported maltreatment: -of these children by any caregivers, -by these caregivers toward any children |
| _____        | 11) | History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers                                     |
| _____        | 12) | Current caregivers’ history of own childhood abuse   |
| _____        | 13) | Current caregivers’ substance abuse  |

Toby does not appear to have been abused. The elements are:

- The types and locations of the injuries fit with the explanation of them and the fact that both children explain the injuries in the same way as their mother does and that neither child appears to be coerced.
- Toby appears to be in good health and is old enough to let others know if he is being hurt or at least to give signs that he is afraid. He does not appear to be afraid.

## MIKO CASE SCENARIO

### A. Part A Item Analysis (Shaded percentages are correct.)

Element	Yes	No	Need More Information
1) Location/scene of incident	77.8%	18.5%	3.7%
2) Location of injuries on the body	100%		%
3) Type(s) of injury	100%		
4) Severity/extent of current injuries	88.9%		3.7%
5) Frequency of injuries over time	3.7%	77.8%	14.8%
6) Explanation of injuries	92.6%	3.7%	3.7%
7) Child's overall appearance	11.1%	85.2%	
8) Chronological age of child	100%		
9) Developmental abilities of child	29.6%	40.7%	29.6%
10) History of unreported maltreatment -of these children by any caregivers -by these caregivers toward any children	3.7%	40.7%	55.6%
11) History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers		88.9%	11.1%
12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood maltreatment		11.1%	88.9%
13) Current caregivers' substance abuse		7.4%	92.6%

\* Missing or uncodable responses over 5%

Underlined and italicized items had percentages correct of less than approximately 2/3rds. They might need a second look to be sure that the scenario itself and/or the teaching of the decision point is clear.

- 1) Location/scene of incident—The couch in the family's home is a concern because it is a dangerous place to leave an infant who is learning to roll over unattended. However, the fact that the couch is two feet off the ground and on a rug suggests that any injury sustained would likely be minor unless the falling infant hit something besides the floor first.
- 2) Severity/extent of current injuries—The leg of a young infant is not a likely locale for an accidental injury because the baby cannot crawl.
- 3) Type of injury—The baby has a spiral fracture, an injury which occurs only if the baby's leg is twisted (as explained to the father by the nurse). This is highly unlikely to occur by accident.
- 4) Severity of injury—A broken leg is a serious injury.
- 5) Frequency of injuries over time—This is the first known injury of this baby.
- 6) Explanation of injuries—Babies who roll off of couches do not twist their legs. This baby's leg was twisted. The explanation does not fit with the facts.
- 7) Child's overall appearance—Child appears healthy except for this injury.
- 8) Chronological age of child—This child is very young and thus vulnerable.
- 9) Developmental abilities of the child—This infant's age indicates that her developmental abilities are on track by age.

- 10) *History of unreported maltreatment*:-of these children by any caregivers,-by these caregivers toward any children—There is no evidence or concern that prior unreported maltreatment of Miko has occurred or that her parents have maltreated another child.
- 11) History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers—There is no CWS history.
- 12) Current caregivers’ history of own childhood maltreatment—There is no information on this yet.
- 13) Current caregivers’ substance abuse—There is no information about this yet.

**B. With the information currently available and based on your assessment of the elements what MOST LIKELY will be your decision: (Shaded item is correct.)**

- 1) Child maltreatment occurred 92.6%
- 2) Child maltreatment did not occur 0%

**C. Of the following elements, which THREE were MOST significant to you in making your decision in Question B?** Any three of the shaded options is considered correct. Percentages are percentages of participants who checked that option. Low percentages in a shaded area may signal that the importance of that factor was missed. However, it may also just mean that other factors were viewed by most participants as more important so that factor didn’t make the top three.

<u>33.3%</u>	1)	Location/scene of incident
<u>40.7%</u>	2)	Location of injuries on the body
<u>81.5%</u>	3)	Type(s) of injury
<u>44.4%</u>	4)	Severity of injuries
_____	5)	Frequency of injuries over time
<u>77.8%</u>	6)	Explanation of injuries
<u>3.7%</u>	7)	Overall appearance of child
<u>44.4%</u>	8)	Chronological age of child
<u>7.4%</u>	9)	Developmental abilities of child
_____	10)	History of unreported maltreatment:-of these children by any caregivers,-by these caregivers toward any children
_____	11)	History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers
_____	12)	Current caregivers’ history of own childhood abuse
_____	13)	Current caregivers’ substance abuse

## CRYSTAL CASE SCENARIO

### A. Part A Item Analysis (Shaded percentages are correct.)

Element	Yes	No	Need More Information
1) Location/scene of incident	51.9%	48.1%	
2) Location of injuries on the body	100%		
3) Type(s) of injury	100%		
4) Severity/extent of current injuries	66.7%	25.9%	7.4%
5) Frequency of injuries over time	59.3%	18.5%	22.2%
6) Explanation of injuries	92.6%	7.4%	
7) Child's overall appearance	14.8%	51.9%	33.3%
8) Chronological age of child	25.9%	70.4%	3.7%
9) Developmental abilities of child	88.9%	3.7%	7.4%
10) History of unreported maltreatment -of these children by any caregivers -by these caregivers toward any children	40.7%	18.5%	40.7%
11) History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers	37.0%	55.6%	7.4%
12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood maltreatment	7.4%	7.4%	85.2%
13) Current caregivers' substance abuse	3.7%		96.3%

\* Missing or uncodable responses over 5%

Underlined and italicized items had percentages correct of less than approximately 2/3rds. They might need a second look to be sure that the scenario itself and/or the teaching of the decision point is clear.

- 1) Location/scene of incident—These injuries happened at home and there is nothing about this location that suggests that this has an impact on whether the injuries meet the definition of abuse or not.
- 2) Location of injuries on body—The injuries are on multiple spots on the back of her legs—an unlikely place for accidental multiple injuries.
- 3) Type of injury—The injuries are bruises and they are due to whipping with a belt.
- 4) Severity/extent of current injuries—While the bruises are not severe, the fact that there are multiple bruises means that she was struck repeatedly, which increases severity.
- 5) Frequency of injuries over time—Grandfather says he has hit her before this incident in the same way (with a belt).
- 6) Explanation of injuries—Grandfather acknowledges that he hit her with a belt and this left bruises.
- 7) Child's overall appearance—No information is provided.
- 8) Chronological age of child —The child is older.
- 9) Developmental abilities of the child—Crystal is developmentally delayed.
- 10) History of unreported maltreatment: -of these children by any caregivers, -by these caregivers toward any children—Crystal was neglected as a baby by her mother. Her grandfather acknowledges that he hit her with a belt on two occasions.

- 11) History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers—There is a CWS history—Crystal was neglected by her mother as a young child. There is no known CWS history with the grandparents who are now raising her.
- 12) Current caregivers’ history of own childhood maltreatment—There is no information on this yet.
- 13) Current caregivers’ substance abuse—There is no information about this yet.

**B. With the information currently available and based on your assessment of the elements what MOST LIKELY will be your decision: (Shaded item is correct.)**

- 1) Child maltreatment occurred 96.3%
- 2) Child maltreatment did not occur 0%

**C. Of the following elements, which THREE were MOST significant to you in making your decision in Question B? Any three of the shaded options is considered correct. Percentages are percentages of participants who checked that option. Low percentages in a shaded area may signal that the importance of that factor was missed. However, it may also just mean that other factors were viewed by most participants as more important so that factor didn’t make the top three.**

- |                |     |  |
|----------------|-----|--|
| <u>7.4%</u>    | 1)  | Location of incident   |
| <u>74.1%</u>   | 2)  | Location of injuries on the body   |
| <u>48.1%</u>   | 3)  | Type(s) of injury  |
| <u>29.6%</u>   | 4)  | Severity of injuries   |
| <u>22.2%</u>   | 5)  | Frequency of injuries over time  |
| <u>85.2%</u>   | 6)  | Explanation of injuries  |
| <u>      %</u> | 7)  | Overall appearance of child  |
| <u>      %</u> | 8)  | Chronological age of child   |
| <u>55.6%</u>   | 9)  | Developmental abilities of child   |
| <u>3.7%</u>    | 10) | History of unreported maltreatment:-of these children by any caregivers,-by these caregivers toward any children |
| <u>3.7%</u>    | 11) | History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers                                     |
| <u>      %</u> | 12) | Current caregivers’ history of own childhood abuse   |
| <u>      %</u> | 13) | Current caregivers’ substance abuse  |

Crystal was abused. The elements are:

- The location of the bruises are on the back of the legs.
- The injuries are bruises resulting from a whipping with a belt, which grandfather acknowledges.
- The child is developmentally delayed which likely makes it harder for her to protect herself. (This is a good point to clarify the importance of differentiating the elements of chronological age from developmental level.)

## D'SHAN CASE SCENARIO

### A. Part A Item Analysis (Shaded percentages are correct.)

Element	Yes	No	Need More Information
1) Location/scene of incident	25.9%	63.0%	7.4%
2) Location of injuries on the body	51.9%	40.7%	3.7%
3) Type(s) of injury	55.6%	37.0%	3.7%
4) Severity/extent of current injuries*	22.2%	66.7%	3.7%
5) Frequency of injuries over time	18.5%	70.4%	7.4%
6) Explanation of injuries	18.5%	77.8%	
7) Child's overall appearance	22.2%	63.0%	11.1%
8) Chronological age of child	77.8%	18.5%	
9) Developmental abilities of child*	11.1%	40.7%	40.7%
10) History of unreported maltreatment -of these children by any caregivers -by these caregivers toward any children	25.9%	25.9%	44.4%
11) History of CWS involvement: -with these children and/or -with these caregivers	77.8%	14.8%	3.7%
12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood maltreatment		14.8%	81.5%
13) Current caregivers' substance abuse		14.8%	81.5%

\* Missing or uncodable responses over 5%

Underlined and italicized items had percentages correct of less than approximately 2/3rds. They might need a second look to be sure that the scenario itself and/or the teaching of the decision point is clear.

- 1) Location/scene of incident—The location of the injuries appear to be in the home and there is no reason to think this affects the decision about whether this situation meets the definition of abuse in one way or another.
- 2) Location of injuries on body—Two of the injuries are on parts of the body that could be due to accident or have been inflicted (lower back and forehead). One location (shin) is highly associated with accidents only. Also, the mark on the forehead is close to the brain and could indicate some type of head trauma.
- 3) Type of injury—The two injuries are bruises. The third mark is a birthmark.
- 4) Severity/extent of current injuries—Neither of the injuries is severe.
- 5) Frequency of injuries over time—There are only two injuries from separate times. In addition, it is not possible to date bruises based on bruise coloration.
- 6) Explanation of injuries—Mother's explanation of injuries as accidental is consistent with the injuries and corroborated by her sister.
- 7) Child's overall appearance—Child appears healthy.
- 8) Chronological age of child —This child is young.
- 9) Developmental abilities of the child—This child appears on target developmentally.
- 10) History of unreported maltreatment:-of these children by any caregivers,-by these caregivers toward any children Although trainees might mark "yes" for this element, there is no evidence or

concern that prior unreported maltreatment of D'Shan has occurred or that his parents have maltreated another child.

- 11) History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers—There is a CWS history—one prior report based on D'Shan's father having left D'Shan alone at two months of age while responsible for babysitting him.
- 12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood maltreatment—There is no information on this yet.
- 13) Current caregivers' substance abuse—There is no information about this yet.

**B. With the information currently available and based on your assessment of the elements what MOST LIKELY will be your decision: (Shaded item is correct.)**

- |                                     |              |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1) Child maltreatment occurred      | <u>3.7%</u>  |
| 2) Child maltreatment did not occur | <u>92.6%</u> |

**C. Of the following elements, which THREE were MOST significant to you in making your decision in Question B? Any three of the shaded options is considered correct. Percentages are percentages of participants who checked that option. Low percentages in a shaded area may signal that the importance of that factor was missed. However, it may also just mean that other factors were viewed by most participants as more important so that factor didn't make the top three.**

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| <u>63.0%</u> | 1) Location of incident  |
| <u>59.3%</u> | 2) Location of injuries on the body  |
| <u>48.1%</u> | 3) Type(s) of injury   |
| <u>11.1%</u> | 4) Severity of injuries  |
| _____        | 5) Frequency of injuries over time   |
| <u>81.5%</u> | 6) Explanation of injuries   |
| <u>14.8%</u> | 7) Overall appearance of child   |
| <u>22.2%</u> | 8) Chronological age of child  |
| <u>7.4%</u>  | 9) Developmental abilities of child  |
| _____        | 10) History of unreported maltreatment:-of these children by any caregivers,-by these caregivers toward any children |
| <u>7.4%</u>  | 11) History of CWS involvement:-with these children and/or-with these caregivers                                     |
| _____        | 12) Current caregivers' history of own childhood abuse   |
| <u>3.7%</u>  | 13) Current caregivers'  |

D'Shan is likely not abused. He has only two injuries and one is almost certainly a result of an accident (bruise on shin). The other injury is explained adequately by the mother and her explanation is corroborated by her sister. The third mark is not an injury. There are no other indicators that make this situation suspicious.

Note that there are many areas where bias could influence decision making in this case. These include:

- Young age of mother.
- Mother is African American.
- Mother is annoyed—Could be seen as having an attitude and not cooperative.

- A crisis in mother's family led to use of the provider who reported to CWS. (Mother's brother was in hospital being stitched up for injuries incurred as a result of having been beat up by peers. This led to grandmother being unable to take care of D'Shan.)
- Child's other parent once left him alone and CWS became involved.