

# The Dependency Court Study: An Analysis of Findings Related to the Legal Process of Timely Permanency for Foster Children in Hillsborough County

---

## *Tampa Metropolitan Area YMCA*

### **Authors**

*Beth A. Barrett, M.A.*

*Victoria L. Hummer, M.S.W.*

### **Editor**

*Y Professional Services*

*Division of the Tampa Metropolitan YMCA*

*110 E. Oak Ave.*

*Tampa, Florida 33602*

### **For more information, call**

*Beth A. Barrett, Principal Investigator*

*813-224-9622*



# Acknowledgement

---

The Study Team and Authors would like to acknowledge and express gratitude to the following record reviewers: Rebecca Bell, Esq., Tricia Bratton, MSW, Cheryl English, BA, and Jon Parsons, MSW.

We would have been unable to successfully complete this study without the invaluable assistance and direction of Jeff Rainey and Molly Langer with the Court Administrators Office.

We would like to further acknowledge and express our gratitude to Shirley Mills with the Tampa YMCA for her organizational assistance in this study, the DCF Court Staff and the Attorney General's Office for their assistance in gathering the records, and Carla Snavely with the Clerk of Courts for assistance in the court records and facility support for the review.

## Dependency Study Advisory Group

---

Mary Lou Cuellar, Esq., Assistant Deputy Director,  
Office of the Attorney General, Tampa, Florida

Honorable Katherine G. Essrig,  
13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Judge, Tampa, Florida

Molly A. Langer, Esq., Court Operations Consultant,  
Administrative Office of the Courts, 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, Tampa, Florida

Bill Navas, Managing Attorney,  
Office of the Attorney General, Tampa, Florida

Charles Nelson, Esq., Program Director,  
Guardian Ad Litem, Tampa, Florida

Jeff Rainey, Senior Manager,  
Administrative Office of Court, 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, Tampa, Florida

Carla Snavely, Director of Juvenile Division,  
Clerk of the Circuit Court, 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, Tampa, Florida

# Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Executive Summary</b> .....                                      | <b>4</b>  |
| Highlights of the Study .....                                       | 4         |
| Challenging Child and Family Issues .....                           | 5         |
| Challenges Within the Dependency System .....                       | 5         |
| Highlights of Recommendations .....                                 | 5         |
| <b>Introduction</b> .....   | <b>7</b>  |
| Hillsborough County Data on Judicial Actions .....                  | 8         |
| Volume of Entry into Foster Care and Incident Rates .....           | 8         |
| Characteristics of Children in Foster Care and Length of Stay ..... | 8         |
| Critical Issues Impacting Length of Stay .....                      | 9         |
| Purpose of the Study .....  | 10        |
| <b>Methodology</b> .....  | <b>11</b> |
| Findings .....  | 11        |
| Child and Family Demographics .....                                 | 11        |
| Reason for Entering Dependency Court System .....                   | 13        |
| Other Challenges to Successful Reunification .....                  | 14        |
| Compliance with Mandatory Timelines .....                           | 14        |
| Other Reasons for Delays in Court Process .....                     | 16        |
| Guardian Ad Litem .....   | 17        |
| Changes in Personnel .....  | 17        |
| Documentation .....   | 18        |
| <b>Discussion</b> .....   | <b>19</b> |
| Recommendations .....   | 20        |
| Overall System Changes .....  | 20        |
| Child Welfare Agency Process and Procedures .....                   | 21        |
| Child Welfare Legal Processes and Procedures .....                  | 22        |
| Court Processes and Procedures .....                                | 22        |
| References .....  | 24        |
| Attachment A .....  | 25        |

# Executive Summary

The Children’s Board of Hillsborough County agreed to fund this study in an effort to fully and accurately inform the planning process of *Community Based Care*. This analysis is an effort to implement immediate changes in a backlogged system that was designed to intervene on behalf of children who have been abused or neglected. *The Dependency Court Study* involved all key stakeholders in this system: Department of Children and Families (DCF), Office of the Attorney General(OAG) Children’s Legal Services, the 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, and the Guardian Ad Litem office in its efforts to identify the barriers to moving children in a more timely fashion to permanent safe homes.

*The Dependency Court Study* was undertaken in response to the recognized need for understanding the problems and issues related to children in foster care achieving timely permanency. The study sought to answer the following:

- What, if any, are the barriers within the dependency system that delay children from achieving permanency?
- What resources need to be brought to bear in order to move children through the dependency court system in a more timely fashion?
- What system changes need to happen in order for children to move to permanency in a more timely fashion?

## Highlights of the Study

The findings of the analysis were not surprising to the authors or the advisory group. Indeed the study validated many of the concerns that prompted the group to undertake the analysis in the first place. The findings indicated that children who become “stuck” in the dependency system often bring unique, troubling challenges which, to date, the system has failed to resolve in a timely fashion, if at all. Successful resolution of these issues requires system changes within the Child Welfare System, the Dependency

Court System, and the Child Welfare Legal System. The following summarizes some of the key findings:

## ***Challenging Child and Family Issues***

---

Children and families in the dependency system who are unable to achieve resolution within 12 months are a group with multiple needs and significant risk factors:

- Most were very young at the time of their removal. Seventy-three percent of the children in this study were 6 years old or younger.
- More often these children were part of sibling groups, with 51% being a part of a sibling group of three or more.
- Twenty percent of these families had prior children removed, with many of these children growing up with relatives or adoptive parents.

Of the parents of this study, 70% had histories of substance abuse, often untreated. Other contributing factors that frequently were observed in the findings include domestic violence, prior child maltreatment history, criminal history and mental illness. These contributing factors supported and sustained environments that continue to be unsafe for their children. There was no evidence gathered during this study that would indicate any multiple system approach to working with these families. This report briefly describes the *Family Drug Court* initiative that has promising outcomes in other areas and is currently in the planning phase in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit.

## ***Challenges Within the Dependency System***

---

Involved agencies are just beginning to share the responsibility for outcomes in cases that are reviewed in Dependency Court. Across each of the separate agencies there were problems in meeting mandatory timelines designed to facilitate timely resolution. In addition, poor documentation of records further challenge a system that has high turnover in every group, except for the few children (20%) who are lucky enough to be appointed a guardian ad litem to follow the child and advocate for his or her best interest in all court action. The lack of a multi-system approach to working with families further delayed the identification, intervention and resolutions that brought these children into the dependency system.

## **Highlights of Recommendations**

The Dependency Court Improvement Project in Hillsborough County is already addressing many of the issues that create a backlog of cases in the system. The existing agencies currently charged with making efforts to meet the State and Federal mandatory permanency guidelines are also meeting on a regular basis to collaborate toward this end through monthly Court Improvement meetings. The Dependency Study Advisory Committee will follow-up on these recommendations:

- Facilitate a mechanism for ongoing data collection and report dissemination among all parties. The monthly local Court Improvement Meetings appear to be the best mechanism for keeping all parties informed of the on-going progress and any barriers to change.
- Develop a mechanism for strengthening interagency collaboration through the development of task forces, cross-system training, peer reviews, and multi-agency oversight.
- Continue to work towards clarification of roles among participants in overlapping systems through the monthly Court Improvement meetings and developing task forces.
- Implement a local *Family Drug Court* that is multi-systemic and has a holistic approach to working with children and families in resolving substance abuse and the frequently co-occurring issues of poverty, domestic violence, and child maltreatment.
- Develop a checklist for TPR that is consistent with state law for use by care managers and attorneys. This checklist will be used to assure all relevant processes are being followed, including diligent searches and other mandatory timelines.
- Develop a mechanism to access technical assistance on problems related to termination of parental rights in the form of full-day case consultations, special advice on difficult cases, and liaison work with the family court.
- Implement plans to co-locate and integrate all mandatory assessments on behalf of children and families in the dependency system. The 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit and HKI are facilitating this initiative, supported by Representative Sandy Murman with seed money for the first 4 years.
- Hire *Court Case Coordinators* for each of the dependency judges under the state Court Improvement funding. This would facilitate the communication between all parties, increase the likelihood that all parties show up for critical hearings, and assure stronger compliance with mandatory timelines. This should support less need for continuation of court action due to insufficient information presented to the judges.

To successfully implement the recommendations will require ongoing monitoring and support from the overall community. Families, child advocates, professionals and funding entities need to continue to be vocal and active in the reform actions in order to affect the timely permanency of Hillsborough County's children in foster care.

# Introduction

The Dependency Court Study was completed to inform the planning process of Hillsborough County's Community Based Care initiative, a process legislatively mandated for the privatization of child welfare services. The Tampa YMCA Y Professional Services, in cooperation with Hillsborough Kids, Inc., the selected lead agency for child welfare, assumed the task of developing a study. Department of Children and Families (DCF), child welfare legal services through the state Office of the Attorney General(OAG), the 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, and the Guardian Ad Litem office collaborated to further explore barriers to more effective permanency planning that were first noted in *Building a Better Child Welfare System: A Community Plan for Hillsborough County* (Barrett, Parsons, and Gilbertson, 2000). An initial project involved case review of 400 children who had been in out-of-home care with the DCF between 12 and 30 months. This review focused on the agency issues that created a delay in permanency. Delays in the legal process emerged, and further examination of the court files of 40 randomly selected cases were reviewed to identify specific barriers to permanency in the legal process.

The Adoptions and Safe Families Act of 1997 (ASFA) mandates particular timeframes to permanency for children in foster care. Specific provisions include: permanency planning hearings must be held within 12 months of a child's entry into care; a petition to terminate parental rights must be filed on behalf of any child, regardless of age, who has been in foster care 15 of the last 22 months; states can place children for adoption or in other permanent placement concurrently with efforts to reunify the child with his or her family; foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, or relatives caring for children must be given notice of and opportunity to testify at any reviews or hearings involving the children in their care; and agencies are not required to make reasonable efforts to reunify families under specific circumstances when the child or a sibling has been severely abused, or the parent has previously had parental rights terminated. In these latter cases, a permanency hearing must be held within 30 days and the state must make reasonable efforts to place the child or children in a permanent family (CWLA, 1998). A review of additional information on the length of stay in foster care in Hillsborough County reveals delays in each of the mandated timeframes in the Adoption and Safe Families Act.

## Hillsborough County Data on Judicial Actions

Reports to the Florida Abuse Hotline, investigations, shelter hearings, and disposition hearings have all increased since 1999, with a slight decline in the first six months of 2001. According to statistics released at a Community Forum on Foster Care held in August of 2001, the number of dependency petitions filed has gradually increased from fiscal year 1998-99 (1,113 filed) to fiscal year 2000-01 (1,560). In the first 6 months of 2001, there was another increase to 1,849 filed petitions. The number of protective services cases increased by nearly 50% in Hillsborough County from July of 1999 to July of 2001 (Department of Children and Families, 2001).

## Volume of Entry into Foster Care and Incident Rates

In the state of Florida, the total number of children placed in foster care increased approximately 35%, from 16,334 children in 1990-91, to 22,066 children in fiscal year 1999-00. From fiscal year, 1995-96 to 1999-00, there was a 77% increase in the number of new entrants to foster care. Hillsborough and Manatee counties (as the former District 6 of the Department of Children and Families) had the highest rate of children entering foster care in fiscal year 1999-00 (Brown, Lipien, Trinidad & Yampolskaya, 2000). Statistics provided by the Department of Children and Families show a slight decline in the number of children in foster care over the past year, from 1,505 in July of 2000 to 1,122 in July of 2001 (Department of Children and Families, 2001).

## Characteristics of Children in Foster Care and Length of Stay

According to *Measuring the Length of Stay Experiences of Florida's Foster Children* (Brown, et al., 2000), there were significant differences in race/ethnicity for those children entering care, as well as those children who remained in care the longest. In fiscal year 1999-00, black children identified as alleged victims were 1.65 times more likely to enter care than white children. Hispanic children were 1.64 times more likely to enter foster care than white children. There was no significant difference between male and females entering care. Children in the under 4 years old age range were shown to be 1.86 times more likely to enter care than those who are four years of age or older.

Males, minorities, and children between the ages of 13 and 15 were noted to remain in care the longest. Children who moved to adoptions also remained in care 12 months longer than those who left care due to other reasons. According to the *Substitute Care Report* prepared by the State Department of Children and Families for fiscal year 2000-2001, capturing cases active in July-August of 2000, the average length of stay by month for black clients was 41.9 months as compared to 30.7 months for white children. 71.9% of black children currently active had remained in care over 15 months as compared to 61.6% of white children and 88.9% of other. Ninety percent of children in all age groups (0-18) remained in care over 15 months, with the exception of children 0-5 years, of whom 88% were still in care 15 months after being sheltered.

According to the Department of Children and Families in the Suncoast Region, the length of stay for children in foster care has decreased slightly in the year 2001. From 1/01 through 6/01, 31.95% of Hillsborough County children in care exited foster care within 12 months, compared to 33.8% statewide. The total number of children in out-of-home care over 15 months in Hillsborough County decreased from 872 (first quarter of 2001) to 819 (second quarter). Similarly, the total number of children in care over 36 months in Hillsborough County decreased from 500 to 465 in the first two quarters of 2001. Brown, Lipien, Trinidad, and Yampolskaya (2000) calculated that children in 1999-00 spent approximately 34% less time in care than children entering care in 1990-91. Based on a thorough analysis of the data, it is estimated that 50% of children statewide who entered care in 1999-00 will exit in 14.1 months.

## Critical Issues Impacting Length of Stay

In a publication of the Child Welfare League of America, *Children Can't Wait: Reducing Delays in Out of Home Care*, the authors examine four programs funded by Adoptions Opportunities Grants and designed to address systemic barriers to permanency for children. Each of the programs contributed to the identification of the critical issues that impact the length of stay. The following critical issues were addressed: 1) Confusion about "reasonable efforts" toward reunification, 2) lack of legal representation for the agency; 3) high caseloads for agency social workers, defense attorneys, and attorneys assigned to represent the agency; 4) turnover in professional staff-social workers, defense attorneys, assistant attorneys general; 5) differing perspectives of Social Workers and Lawyers; 6) fragmentation of the system; 7) docketing and scheduling problems; 8) appeals; 9) proliferation of review hearings and inefficient use of judicial hearings; 10) poor casework documentation at intake; 11) lack of treatment and placement resources; 12) children who are institutionalized or with significant special needs; 13) special parental circumstances such as incarceration, chronic mental or physical illness; and 14) practice delays with children of color.

# Purpose of the Study

The Dependency Court Study was undertaken in response to the recognized need for understanding the problems and issues related to children in foster care achieving timely permanency. The study sought to answer the following:

- What, if any, are the barriers within the dependency system that delay children from achieving permanency?
- What resources need to be brought to bear in order to move children through the dependency court system in a more timely fashion?
- What system changes need to happen in order for children to move to permanency in a more timely fashion?

Additionally, the study sought to understand and inform the system reform activities noted previously and provide valuable information to each of the different agencies responsible for key activities of the Dependency System (i.e., Clerk of Courts, Department of Children and Families, Office of the Attorney General, and Guardian Ad Litem).

# *M*ethodology

The study gathered data on children who had been adjudicated dependent under DCF between 12 months and 30 months and in out-of-home care in Hillsborough County at the time of selection of cases (February 1, 2001). All children between birth and nineteen years old were considered for the random selection. 40 children's cases were selected and individual case records were pulled from DCF, Clerk of Courts, Guardian Ad Litem, and Office of the Attorney General Office on each of the selected children. A total of 126 records involving all four of the above agencies were reviewed. Demographic, service system information, and court related activities and timelines on these children was provided by each of the entities. Attachment 1 is the protocol used to gather the related information.

Further, an advisory group and individual interviews were used to gather information related to the development of the protocol, the summary of the findings, and the determination of the recommendations found in this report from key stakeholders of the dependency system (See Attachment 2).

The following presents the demographic information on the 40 children and their families, the findings of the record review data analysis, and qualitative information gathered through individual interviews and the advisory group.

# Findings

## Child and Family Demographics

Demographic information is reported on the 40 individual children studied who had been adjudicated dependent under DCF for at least 12 months and up to 30 months in Hillsborough County at the time of selection of cases (February 1, 2001), and their families.

### *Child's Age*

---

Table 1 below illustrates the children's ages at the time they were first sheltered in out-of-home placement. All children were between the ages of birth and 17 at time of shelter, with the majority of children (63%) under 3 years old at time of initial shelter.

| <b>Age at time of first removal</b> |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 0-3 years                           | 63% |
| 3+-6 years                          | 10% |
| 6+-9 years                          | 0%  |
| 9+-12 years                         | 3%  |
| 12+-15 years                        | 15% |
| 15+-older                           | 10% |

## ***Siblings under the same court case***

Of the 40 children reviewed for this study, 70% had siblings under the same court case and sheltered at the same time as the study child. In addition, at least 20% of the children had older siblings that were involved in previous dependency action, many of these involved prior termination of parental rights (TPR). Table 2 and 3 illustrate the number of children involved in the study case and those who had prior siblings removed and/or parents with terminated parental rights.

| <b>Table 2</b>                               |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Number of children in same court case</b> |                |
| 20%  | 1 child        |
| 29%  | 2 children     |
| 28%  | 3–4            |
| 15%  | 5–6            |
| 8% over                                      | 6 (Range 6–17) |

| <b>Table 3</b>  |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <b>Children with older siblings with prior removal</b>                          |                                 |
| 20%   | Prior removals of older sibs*   |
| 80%   | No prior removals of older sibs |
| *Involved termination of parental rights on older sibs prior to this court case |                                 |

## **Reason for Entering Dependency Court System**

In the cases reviewed, children were most often brought into shelter due to neglect, followed by family violence threatened harm, and physical abuse. Table 4 illustrates

the top five reasons children were brought into care. Many of the children reviewed had two or more different maltreatment findings prior to removal.

| <b>Table 4</b>  |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Reasons for Entering Service</b>   |     |
| Neglect   | 45% |
| Family violence threatens harm  | 33% |
| Physical Abuse  | 23% |
| Abandonment   | 20% |
| Other<br>(substance exposed newborns, hazardous conditions, inadequate conditions, child in need of services) | 18% |
| ** Note: May have more than one allegation  |     |

Most children entered the formal child welfare system in an out-of-home placement licensed by DCF. Eighty percent of the children studied were placed in a foster home or a group shelter placement. Only 20% were placed with relatives at time of shelter. Substance abuse was most often a factor found AFTER the initial reason the child entered services.

## Other Challenges to Successful Reunification

| <b>Table 5</b>  |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Contributing Factors</b>   |     |
| Parental substance abuse history                                    | 70% |
| Prior child maltreatment history                                    | 50% |
| Parental/Family history of Domestic Violence                        | 28% |
| Parental criminal history   | 23% |
| Parental mental illness<br>(more often mother)                      | 18% |
| Most (80%) of the cases reviewed had 2 or more of the above factors |     |

Most of the cases reviewed involved numerous challenges to case planning and successful, timely permanency. Among the most significant findings are the high percentage of parental substance abuse identified after the initial reason for services and the co-occurrence of high-risk issues that further challenge successful case resolution. Table 5 further illustrates these challenges.

In addition, 35% of cases noted other factors that would challenge the treatment team and further add to the complication of achieving a timely reunification. These issues included parents with low intelligence, teen parents, homelessness, parental history of foster care, and deceased parents.

## Compliance with Mandatory Timelines

A critical component of the study involved an analysis of the compliance of the different agencies in meeting state and federal mandatory timelines intent on moving children towards permanency in a timely fashion. The findings below indicate that Hillsborough County is compliant on some key timelines, such as judicial review of cases, but is failing to identify permanency within the ASFA guidelines.

### ***Shelter Hearings***

---

Children who are removed due to safety issues must have their cases reviewed within 24 hours by a dependency judge to determine if the out-of-home placement is warranted by the facts. These shelter hearings are the first step in the dependency process. This review found that in 100% of the cases these hearings were held on time within the 24 hours period of time.

### ***Dependency Petitions***

---

The actual dependency petition must be filed within 21 days of shelter according to state law. The DCF Protective Investigator writes the petition outlining the facts involved in the child maltreatment and the reason dependency status is being requested. This timeline was met in 67% of the cases reviewed, but was not met in 33% of those cases. In most cases where this timeline was missed, it was only missed by a few days.

### ***Arraignment Hearing***

---

Arraignment hearings are held within 28 days of the shelter petition. This determines the status of the parent(s) willingness to agree with the petition. This is also the court process where most parents are appointed their own attorney. In 65% of the cases, this hearing occurred on time. It was unclear why 35% of the cases did not have arraignment hearings on time. It is typically the responsibility of the Office of the Attorney General to prepare the paperwork. At the arraignment hearing, parents are given the option of consenting to the petition, which is an acknowledgement of the facts in the petition or

refusing to give consent. In 40% of the cases reviewed consent was obtained. With consent, the case should process through the system more timely. This review did not find that consent made any significant difference in the timeliness of the overall case.

## ***Diligent Searches***

---

In cases of missing parents, the Department must order a diligent search. The search demonstrates to the court evidence of the Department attempting to locate the parent and have the parent participate in the process of the court. In 85% of the cases this diligent search occurred on time.

## ***Filing of Case Plan***

---

One of the most critical court processes is the filing of the case plan, used to guide the parents' activities in correcting the issues that required the dependency involvement. A troubling finding is that only 53% of the plans were filed within 60 days. This corresponded with a significant delay in cases, as families were not beginning case plan activities until plans were approved and filed with the Court.

## ***Case Plan Conference***

---

Another problematic finding is that only 30% of cases had documentation of case plan conferences being held. When documentation was found, it was more often found in the Attorney General's files as the attorney usually initiated this conference. Parents were not always in attendance. The case planning conference usually involved the Department, the OAG, and the parent's attorney.

| <b>Disposition hearing within 15 days of arraignment or adjudication:</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| 65%   | yes |
| 35%   | no  |

## **Other Reasons for Delays in Court Process**

As noted previously, state and federal mandates are designed to move children towards a timely resolution of permanency. With unnecessary delays and continuations the Hillsborough County child welfare community is concerned. Overflowing court dockets make it necessary to reschedule hearings months in advance. The continuations further delay cases from progressing through the dependency system. Eighty-eight percent of the cases reviewed had at least one continuance of a court action, with the majority

of cases having two or more. The reviewers were unable to determine the reason for the continuance due to poor documentation in over 50% of the cases across the agencies reviewed. From the 50% of records where the reason was noted in one or more of the agency files, non-appearance of the parent was the number one reason for the continuance. Other reasons for continuance included lack of diligent search for missing parent, request for a new service such as an evaluation or drug treatment of the parent, or a referral to mediation of the parties. Table 5 further illustrates the findings on continuances.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Non-appearance of parent  | 80% |
| Required paperwork not filed  | 65% |
| Failure to notice one or more parent  | 65% |
| Additional information requested  | 60% |
| Failure to notice other parties   | 50% |
| Other   | 13% |
| *Percentages are based on the 50% of noted continuances where documentation included the reason |     |

## Guardian Ad Litem

Children who enter the dependency system frequently need and benefit from an independent advocate. The Guardian Ad Litem Program in Hillsborough County is a program managed by the 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit to recruit, train, supervise and retain volunteers to provide the Court an opinion of the best interest of the child in the dependency action. The study sought to determine the effects of this program on permanency for children who had a guardian on their case.

This study gathered data on the number of children for whom the court appointed a guardian and the number of children who actually received a guardian. In Hillsborough County, as is true in most areas of Florida, volunteers have been difficult to find. The Judges are well aware of this and may limit the numbers referred to the program. Only 48% of the children reviewed were referred to the program with only 20% of the children actually receiving a guardian. Florida statute only requires a guardian to be appointed at the point of termination of parental rights hearings.

## Changes in Personnel

A significant finding of this study is the high number of different professionals who had been involved throughout the case history. There was high turnover of the professionals handling the court case in every domain except the Guardian Ad Litem and the court appointed parent attorney. It is uncertain whether this turnover was due to staff leaving positions, or to policies within the agencies that allow for different staff to rotate activities through the life of a case. Table 6 illustrates the number of changes in personnel across the life of the cases reviewed.

| <b>Table 6</b><br><b>Changes in Personnel Across the Life of a Case</b>      |
|--|
| Judges: 60% had 3 or more  |
| DCF: 92% had 3 or more; 35% had 5 or more*<br>(*Includes DCF Court Staff)    |
| OAG: 100% had 3 or more, 70% had 5 or more (Range 5-10)                      |
| GAL: only 8% with any changes, most had only 1 GAL                           |
| Parent Attorneys: only 10% with any changes, most had only 1 parent attorney |

## Documentation

An additional finding that was consistent across agencies was the poor documentation observed in the records of this study. The Clerk of Court records more often showed documentation of each court process, but were often missing information on what parties were in attendance and the specific outcome of the procedure documented. The Guardian Ad Litem records were also adequate in reporting the process, but, at times, gave conflicting information from the DCF record and the OAG record. The DCF and OAG documentation was consistently poor, frequently missing critical information on the court process and procedures. DCF records also had some inaccurate or inconsistent information on the progress that the family was making documented in chronological notes and what was reported in the judicial review filed with the court.

# *D*iscussion

Children entering the dependency system in Hillsborough County have multiple issues that prevent a timely resolution of their cases, including factors within their own families that challenge the current system in identifying and implementing viable permanency plans. As the above findings indicate, over 50% of the children who are currently lingering in the dependency system entered care as infants. Most children also entered with a sibling group of two or more. As is typical of most children entering care, 45% of the children had a maltreatment finding of neglect. Most families experiencing neglect also have a myriad of other problematic issues that can jeopardize child safety: domestic violence, parental substance abuse, parental criminal history, parental mental illness, and prior histories of child maltreatment. These families are extremely challenging for judges, social workers, and intervention staff as they love their children and want to work on getting them back, but frequently lack the resources to do so without intense intervention.

Many issues common to the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Dependency process are similar to those in other areas of the country. This study found that the court process appeared to move more quickly in the later stages of court involvement once a decision is reached to terminate parental rights. Although delays are prevalent in the TPR process, and the TPR trial itself, the practice of assigning one attorney through the Office of the Attorney General at the point of TPR appears to keep this moving in a timely fashion. There is also at times hesitancy on the part of the caseworker to pursue severance due to the relationship that has developed with the family. The process is also time and labor intensive, and requires extensive and accurate documentation at the front end of the case. Caseworkers often must proceed without the benefit of supportive and consistent legal counsel. Interviews with key participants indicated attorneys representing the parents may discourage other alternatives such as family case conferencing, mediation and voluntary surrender of parental rights.

As the findings also indicate, state and federal mandatory timelines, designed to keep a case moving through the dependency system, are frequently missed. Especially troubling is the finding that only 53% of these cases had case plans filed within 60 days, with only 30% having any documentation of a case plan conference. Federal timelines through the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) and Florida Statute should guide practice to move forward from the first contact with the family in establishing a case plan that directly seeks to correct the problems that necessitated the child entering out-of-

home care. A permanency decision must be reached within 12 months, except in the case of a few noted exceptions granted by the Court. The children involved in this study should have had a viable permanency plan, approved by the Court, already in place. In most cases, the permanency plan of record was family reunification, but family progress toward correcting the issues that brought the child into care was lacking, minimal, or poorly documented.

Continuations of court proceedings were found in most cases (88%). Although documentation was problematic in all of the records this study reviewed, where documentation was appropriate the findings indicate that non-appearance of parents and missing paperwork were the two top reasons for a case being continued. With high caseloads experienced by every professional in the dependency system, it is evident that there needs to be a check and balance process to assure that all parties and paperwork are appearing in court without delays.

## Recommendations

The Dependency Court Improvement Project in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit is already addressing many of the issues that create a backlog of cases in the system. There are plans to implement a “Rocket Docket”, where cases ready for closure can be disposed. In addition, there are plans to hire two attorneys to serve as General Masters to hear certain proceedings, including Judicial Reviews and uncontested motions. Future plans include the hiring of court specialists and support staff to assist with the coordination of those cases with the goal of minimizing continuations. The existing agencies currently charged with making efforts to meet the mandatory permanency guidelines are also meeting on a regular basis to collaborate toward this end through monthly Court Improvement meetings.

In meeting with the Dependency Study Advisory Group, the following recommendations were developed to address strategies for change within the overall system, the supporting legal system, the child welfare system, and the Dependency Court system. Recommendations include the level of strengths and needs of the professionals who appear in court to represent the child and family.

## ***Overall System Changes***

---

There is much that can be done to improve the overall system with strong community and agency support. The newly formed Hillsborough Kids, Inc. (HKI) has agreed to continue to lead the following efforts:

- Facilitate a mechanism for ongoing data collection and report dissemination among all parties. The monthly local Court Improvement meetings appear to be the best mechanism for keeping all parties informed of the on-going progress and any barriers to change. HKI is in the process of establishing a management information system that will facilitate and

expedite communication with DCF, the Office of Attorney General, Courts, and the Guardian Ad Litem Office.

- Develop a mechanism for strengthening interagency collaboration through the development of task forces, cross-system training, peer reviews, and multi-agency oversight.
- Continue to work towards clarification of roles among participants in overlapping systems through the monthly Court Improvement meetings and developing task forces.
- Increase technical skill with special problems such as substance abuse, domestic violence, and parents who are mentally or physically handicapped to all parties including judges, attorneys, child welfare workers, and other supporting professionals.

## ***Child Welfare Agency Process and Procedures***

---

HKI will begin serving children and families in April of 2002. The following Advisory Group recommendations will be implemented through its system reform:

- Consolidate the DCF current format for TPR staffings from three different staffing to one to facilitate more timely movement towards achieving permanence within 12 months.
- Through its team approach to care management, HKI will review cases at set periods of times and processes to assure the focus of the casework is on timely permanency. This team, along with Unit Supervisors, will be trained to assist the practice surrounding each child and family in identifying viable permanency goals, including the identification of children who are more likely to need an adoptive home or alternative long-term option.
- Develop a checklist for TPR that is consistent with Florida Statute for use by care managers and attorneys. This checklist will be used to assure all relevant processes are being followed, including diligent searches and other mandatory timelines. HKI plans to integrate this checklist into its management information system, which will allow for electronic prompts to all relevant parties of upcoming timelines, as well as past due events.
- Develop a written protocol outlining the respective duties of caseworkers and attorneys in starting dependency legal action. A model protocol was developed by the ABA Center on Children and the Law that can be amended per state and county. These protocols can be incorporated into the written working agreements that have been established with the key parties.
- Develop a missing parents checklist that records actions such as letter, contacts with relatives and neighbors, and checks with governmental agencies informing the diligent search.
- Develop a mechanism to access technical assistance on problems related to termination of parental rights in the form of full-day case consultations, special advice on difficult cases, and liaison work with the family court.

## ***Child Welfare Legal Processes and Procedures***

---

Children's Legal Services will remain with the Office of the Attorney General. The Advisory Group acknowledged that this group is also currently making its own changes to seek stronger outcomes. The following recommendations will assist their efforts:

- Immediately begin monthly meetings with OAG, DCF, HKI, and Adoption Specialists that will assist in overcoming barriers to achieving TPR, when appropriate.
- Implement a salary equity survey of other similar agencies that hire attorneys including: Office of the Florida State Attorney, Department of Children and Families Child Welfare Legal, and the Office of the Public Defender to assure that salaries at the Office of the Attorney General are not a barrier to attorney longevity.
- Develop a strategic plan that seeks to improve the turnover rate of attorneys through changes in salary and benefits, supervision, and available advancement tracks.
- Eliminate or significantly reduce the practice of attorneys covering other attorney's cases in court except when schedule conflicts prohibit this. One attorney should be assigned to each dependency case and held responsible for every court action involved in the case. The Advisory Group was in support of the current practice of transferring the case at the point of preparation for termination of parental rights due to the complexity of the legal processes that support TPRs, but felt that any change in attorneys should follow a structured staffing that is well documented.
- Develop internal mechanisms to assure the quality of the legal work and documentation that would include a consistent, on-going record review.

## ***Court Processes and Procedures***

---

The Thirteenth Judicial Circuit aggressively sought resources to strengthen its ability to handle the volume of child welfare hearings and processes. The Advisory Committee strongly supports its efforts and will advocate for the following initiatives:

- Implement plans to co-locate and integrate all mandatory assessments on behalf of children and families in the dependency system. The 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit and HKI are facilitating this initiative, supported by Representative Sandy Murman with seed money for the first 4 years. This initiative seeks to provide to the court and the community stronger assessment and evaluation components to facilitate stronger case plans and shorter timeframes to resolving the dependency issues and getting children into a permanent, safe home, free from future abuse and neglect.
- Expand the court's ability to hear judicial reviews and common court action requests, such as permission to take foster children out of state on vacation or changes in visitations with birth families. Funding has been approved to hire two *General Court Masters* who will be fully operational

by January of 2002. This will allow Dependency Judges to concentrate on critical court action, such as dependency and termination of parental rights hearings, allowing the time needed to properly review the critical issues surrounding these cases.

- Hire *Court Case Coordinators* for each of the dependency judges under the Model Dependency Court Improvement funding. This would facilitate the communication between all parties and assure stronger compliance with mandatory timelines and less need for continuation of court action due to insufficient information presented to the judges.
- Support the Clerk of Court efforts to bring additional resources to improve accuracy and efficiency. This office is notably under staffed and working with an antiqued management information system. Plans to purchase the *Juvenile Banner* information system should help facilitate stronger documentation and communication across all parties.
- Assist the community in the development of a *Family Drug Court* for families in the dependency system. A local initiative involving the substance abuse provider community, HKI, DCF, Office of the Attorney General, Parent Defense Attorneys, University of South Florida and the Court is currently in the early stages of designing a pilot for Hillsborough County. With continued support and funding it is anticipated this pilot will be operational by fall of 2002.

# References

---

- Barrett, B.A., Parsons, J.R., and Gilbert, R.B., (2000). *Building a Better Child Welfare System: A Community Plan for Hillsborough County*, Tampa, Florida: The Child Welfare Institute, Hillsborough Kids, Inc., Tampa Metro YMCA, and the Children's Board of Hillsborough County.
- Brown, E., Lipien, L., Trinidad, V. & S. Yampolskaya (September, 2000). *Measuring the Length of Stay Experiences of Florida's Foster Children*. Tampa, Florida: Florida Mental Health Institute. University of South Florida.
- Cahn, K. and Johnson, P., Eds. (1993) *Children Can't Wait: Reducing Delays in Out-of-Home Care*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Child Welfare League of America. (1998). *Summary of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997*. Retrieved from: [www.cwla/advocacy/The Adoption and Safe Families Act](http://www.cwla/advocacy/The%20Adoption%20and%20Safe%20Families%20Act).
- Department of Children and Families, Suncoast Region, Florida, presented at *Foster Care Community Briefing* sponsored by the Children's Board of Hillsborough County in Tampa, FL, on August 22, 2000 at Hyde Park United Methodist Church.
- State of Florida Department of Children and Families, Family Safety, Data Support (July-August, 2000) *Substitute Care Report- Child Welfare Services, Fiscal Year 2000-2001*.

# Attachment A

## Dependency Case File Review

6/27/01

**Family File #**                      **UCN#**                      **Division**                      **Review Date**                      **Reviewer:**

### **GENERAL CASE INFORMATION**

Name of Child: \_\_\_\_\_ file: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Children under same Case Number \_\_\_\_\_

Child DOB: \_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_ Gender: F M Race: African Amer Cau His BiRacial Ind Asian

Number of fathers: 1 2 3 Unknown

Most Recent Allegation (Please circle):

|                         |                        |                                      |                                       |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Physical Abuse          | Severe physical injury | Egregious abuse of child or sib      | Sibling death inv. parents/caretakers |
| Excessive corp. punishm | Neglect                | Potentially life-threatening neglect | Substance exposed child               |
| Abandonment             | Severe emotional abuse | Family Violence threatened harm      | Sexual abuse                          |
| Other                   |                        |                                      |                                       |

Contributing Factors:

Initial Removal Date: (if any) \_\_\_\_\_ Most Recent Removal Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Placement At Time of Removal: Shelter care Relative Parent(s) Non-relative

### **Shelter Hearing**

Initial Shelter hearing date: \_\_\_\_\_

Most recent hearing date: \_\_\_\_\_ Shelter hearing held within 24 hours of removal? Y N

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other \_\_\_\_\_

Placement Type at Shelter: Shelter care Parent(s) Relatives Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: \_\_\_\_\_ OAG of Record: \_\_\_\_\_

GAL of Record: \_\_\_\_\_ GAL Attorney of Record: \_\_\_\_\_

M Attorney of Record: \_\_\_\_\_ F1 Attorney of Record: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_



Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

Placement: Shelter care Parents Relatives Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

Written Hearing Notice Given? Y N

Record checks and Home Study on placement completed? Y N

Attempts made to locate relatives? Y N

Outcome: Petition dismissed Dependency granted Withhold of adj.

**Case Plan**

First Case Plan filing date:

Most recent Case Plan date: Plan filed within 60 days? Y N

Case Plan Conference held? Y N If so, date of Case plan conference:

Case Plan accepted/approved at disposition or 30 days of dispos? Y N If so, acceptance date:

Most recent Case Plan filing date:

Case Plan reflects current permanency goal? Y N

**Disposition Hearing**

Disposition Hearing date: Was Disposition Hearing held within 15 days of arraignment? or 30 days of adjudicatory order? Y N

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

Parties present m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

## Judicial Reviews

|                           |  |   |              |
|---------------------------|--|---|--------------|
| 1st Judicial Review date: | 1st Judicial Review within 90 days of Disposition or 180 days of removal?  | Y | N            |
| Parties present:          | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____                           |   |              |
| Placement:                | Shelter                  Foster Care                  Parents                  Relatives          Adoptive parents |   | Non-relative |
| DCF Counselor of Record:  | OAG of Record:   |   |              |
| GAL of Record:            | GAL Attorney of Record:  |   |              |
| M Attorney of Record:     | F1 Attorney of Record:   |   |              |
| Judge:                    |  |   |              |
|                           |  |   |              |
| 2nd Judicial Review date: | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?  | Y | N            |
| Parties present:          | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____                           |   |              |
| Placement :               | Shelter                  Foster Care                  Parents                  Relatives          Adoptive parents |   | Non-relative |
| DCF Counselor of Record:  | OAG of Record:   |   |              |
| GAL of Record:            | GAL Attorney of Record:  |   |              |
| M Attorney of Record:     | F1 Attorney of Record:   |   |              |
| Judge:                    |  |   |              |
|                           |  |   |              |
| 3rd Judicial Review date: | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?  | Y | N            |
| Parties present:          | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____                           |   |              |
| Placement :               | Shelter                  Foster Care                  Parents                  Relatives          Adoptive parents |   | Non-relative |
| DCF Counselor of Record:  | OAG of Record:   |   |              |
| GAL of Record:            | GAL Attorney of Record:  |   |              |
| M Attorney of Record:     | F1 Attorney of Record:   |   |              |
| Judge:                    |  |   |              |
|                           |  |   |              |
| 4th Judicial Review date: | 4 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?  | Y | N            |
| Parties present:          | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____                           |   |              |
| Placement :               | Shelter                  Foster Care                  Parents                  Relatives          Adoptive parents |   | Non-relative |
| DCF Counselor of Record:  | OAG of Record:   |   |              |
| GAL of Record:            | GAL Attorney of Record:  |   |              |
| M Attorney of Record:     | F1 Attorney of Record:   |   |              |
| Judge:                    |  |   |              |

Judge:

5th Judicial Review date: 5th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review? Y N

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

6th Judicial Review date: 6th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review? Y N

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

7th Judicial Review date: 7th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review? Y N

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

8th Judicial Review date: 8th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review? Y N

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other\_\_\_\_\_

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

|                            |  |             |                  |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|------------------|
| 9th Judicial Review date:  | 9th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?                                      | Y           | N                |
| Parties present:           | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____ |             |                  |
| Placement :                | Shelter  | Foster Care | Parents          |
|                            |  |             | Relatives        |
|                            |  |             | Adoptive parents |
|                            |  |             | Non-relative     |
| DCF Counselor of Record:   | OAG of Record:   |             |                  |
| GAL of Record:             | GAL Attorney of Record:  |             |                  |
| M Attorney of Record:      | F1 Attorney of Record:   |             |                  |
| Judge:                     |  |             |                  |
| 10th Judicial Review date: | 10th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?                                     | Y           | N                |
| Parties present:           | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____ |             |                  |
| Placement :                | Shelter  | Foster Care | Parents          |
|                            |  |             | Relatives        |
|                            |  |             | Adoptive parents |
|                            |  |             | Non-relative     |
| DCF Counselor of Record:   | OAG of Record:   |             |                  |
| GAL of Record:             | GAL Attorney of Record:  |             |                  |
| M Attorney of Record:      | F1 Attorney of Record:   |             |                  |
| Judge:                     |  |             |                  |
| 11th Judicial Review date: | 11th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?                                     | Y           | N                |
| Parties present:           | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____ |             |                  |
| Placement :                | Shelter  | Foster Care | Parents          |
|                            |  |             | Relatives        |
|                            |  |             | Adoptive parents |
|                            |  |             | Non-relative     |
| DCF Counselor of Record:   | OAG of Record:   |             |                  |
| GAL of Record:             | GAL Attorney of Record:  |             |                  |
| M Attorney of Record:      | F1 Attorney of Record:   |             |                  |
| Judge:                     |  |             |                  |
| 12th Judicial Review date: | 12th Judicial Review within 180 days of last review?                                     | Y           | N                |
| Parties present:           | m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other_____ |             |                  |
| Placement :                | Shelter  | Foster Care | Parents          |
|                            |  |             | Relatives        |
|                            |  |             | Adoptive parents |
|                            |  |             | Non-relative     |
| DCF Counselor of Record:   | OAG of Record:   |             |                  |
| GAL of Record:             | GAL Attorney of Record:  |             |                  |
| M Attorney of Record:      | F1 Attorney of Record:   |             |                  |
| Judge:                     |  |             |                  |



Placement : Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

Expedited TPR? Y N Voluntary surrenders signed? Y date: N  
 GAL appointed prior to advisory or at advisory? Y N

Attorney for parents already appointed or appointed at advisory? Y N

TPR trial ? Y N If so, date

Parties present: m, f1, f2, DCF, OAG, GAL, GAL Attorney, M Attorney, F1 Attorney, F2 Attorney, other \_\_\_\_\_

Placement : Shelter Foster Care Parents Relatives Adoptive parents Non-relative

DCF Counselor of Record: OAG of Record:

GAL of Record: GAL Attorney of Record:

M Attorney of Record: F1 Attorney of Record:

Judge:

TPR (continued)

TPR granted? Y N If so, date:

Best interests of child established in order? Y N

Placement with adoptive parents? Y N

Adoption finalized? Y N Finalization date:

**Status**

Last known placement/status:  
 Shelter Care Foster Care Parents Relative Adoptive parents  
 Non-relative

**Permanency**

Review hearing date: Hearing held within 12 months of removal? Y N

Permanency achieved date: Permanency achieved within 12 months of removal? Y N

Permanency outcome: Reunification Guardianship Long-term custody Independent living Adoption  
 TPR Long-term licensed custody Emancipation None  
 Other:

Reunification date: Child re-sheltered? Y Date: N





Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #7:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork  
 not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of  
 parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #8:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork  
 not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of  
 parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #9:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork  
 not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of  
 parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #10:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #11:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

*Continuance #12:* Date:  
 Continuance requested by (circle one): Court DCF OAG Parent/parent attorney Unknown Other

REASON:  
 DCF unprepared OAG unprepared Scheduling conflict Parent/parent atty unprepared Non-appearance  
 Failure to notice Non-service of parties Discovery not completed Diligent search not completed GAL not appointed  
 GAL unprepared Appointment of counsel Unknown Motion Paperwork not filed  
 Paternity not established Parent not transported Referrals not given Waiting list for program Change of parent atty  
 Other:

Continuance documented by (circle one): Motion/order Notice of hearing Clerks notes  
 Other\_\_\_\_\_

Continuance stage: Shelter Arraignment Adjudication Disposition Case plan hearing  
 Judicial review TPR hearing Mediation

---

---

**Personnel History**

|                          |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Total # of Judges        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of DCF           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of OAG           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of GALs          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of GAL Attorneys | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of M Attorneys   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total # of F1 Attorneys  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |









