

The National CASA Association and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges are committed to providing judges and child advocates the tools they need to be effective in dependency cases. This issue of the Judges' Page highlights how courts can make appropriate and effective visitation decisions for foster children, their siblings and parents. — Judge J. Dean Lewis, Editor

Topics in this issue:

[Editor's Page—In This Issue](#)

Introduction from J. Dean Lewis, Judge (retired), Former Member, National CASA Association Board of Directors, Past President, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Page 3

[An Overview of Foster Care Family Visitation Issues](#)

J. Dean Lewis, Judge (retired), Former Member, National CASA Association Board of Directors, Past President, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Page 5

[Visitation Issues for Judges in Dependency Court](#)

Janine Cox and Paula Campbell, Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ

Page 8

[Visitation Protocol Project: Providing Appropriate Family Time for Children in Foster Care](#)

Judge Michael Key, LaGrange, GA, Board Member, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Page 10

[Planning a Child's Tomorrow Today: Creating Visitation Guidelines](#)

Judge Constance Cohen, Lead Judge, Polk County Model Court, Des Moines, IA Staff, Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ

Page 12

[Therapeutic Visitation](#)

Anne T. Henley, LCSW, Director, Family Solutions, Spotsylvania, VA

Page 13

Attachment, Bonding and Reciprocal Connectedness: Limitations of Attachment Theory in the Juvenile and Family Court

*David E. Arredondo, MD, Director, Office of Child Development and Mental Health and Affiliate of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)
Judge Leonard P. Edwards, Supervising Judge, Juvenile Dependency Court, Santa Clara County, CA and Past President, NCJFCJ*

Page 16

A CASA Volunteer's Role in Parent-Child Visitation

Kim Runyon Wilds, Program Director, Western Regional CASA Program, Huntington, WV

Page 17

Maintaining Sibling Relationships in Foster Care

*Judge Michael Nash, Presiding Judge, Los Angeles County Juvenile Court
Miriam Aroni Krinsky, Executive Director, Children's Law Center of Los Angeles*

Page 19

Parent-Child Visitation After Termination of Parental Rights

Judge Douglas F. Johnson, Separate Juvenile Court of Douglas County, NE and Secretary, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)

Page 22

Domestic Violence and Child Visitation: Focusing on the Best Interest of the Child

Chris Bailey, Director, NCJFCJ Permanency Planning for Children Department

Page 25

In Memory of Judge Stephen Herrell

Michael S. Piraino, CEO, the National CASA Association

Page 26

Online Resources: Foster Care Visitation

Janine Cox and Paula Campbell, Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ

Page 28



The *Judges' Page* Newsletter is a publication of **National CASA** in partnership with **The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges**. Find the *Judges' Page* Newsletter at nationalcasa.org/JudgesPage/index.htm. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges is dedicated to serving the nation's children and families by improving the courts of juvenile and family jurisdictions. Visit the NCJFCJ website: www.ncjfcj.org/

© 2006 National CASA Association

Editor's Page—In This Issue



*J. Dean Lewis, Judge (retired),
Former Member, National CASA
Association Board of Directors and
Past President, National Council of
Juvenile and Family Court Judges*

Summary

Judges can and should exercise a leadership role in facilitating the court, agencies and the community coming together to develop a plan to identify and resolve barriers to successful visitation among children in foster care, their siblings and parents.

In this issue, authors from across the nation share their experiences in developing appropriate visitation models. Professionals also share ideas that your own court and community may want to consider when undertaking an evaluation of the way you currently deal with visitation in dependency cases:

- I start by relating [background information and a composite story](#) to illustrate the complex issue of visitation in the child welfare system.
- [Janine Cox and Paula Campbell](#) of the Permanency Planning for Children Department (PPCD) review the visitation efforts of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) Model Courts and share research and resources.
- [Judge Michael Key](#) explains the development of a visitation protocol for dependency cases in Georgia.
- [Judge Constance Cohen](#) shares the Des Moines, Iowa collaboration that resulted in an effective visitation strategy.
- [Anne Henley](#) details the importance of court access to therapeutic visitation in dependency cases in which the child or parents have mental health issues and shares the Virginia experience.
- [Dr. David Arredondo and Judge Len Edwards](#) explain the concept of “reciprocal connectedness,” a term which comprises the process of bonding and attachment as well as the broader topic of human interaction necessary for normal brain and social development.
- [Kim Runyon Wilds](#), a CASA program director in West Virginia, offers details about supervised visitation and the role of the CASA/GAL volunteer.
- [Judge Michael Nash and Miriam Aroni Krinsky](#) explain the importance of preserving sibling connections.
- [Judge Douglas Johnson](#) cites a Nebraska appellate opinion in which the mother was allowed visitation following the termination of parental rights.

- [Chris Bailey](#), Director of PPCD, gives background on the provisions of the NCJFCJ Model Code relating to the need for supervised visitation in cases involving domestic violence.
- [Michael Piraino](#), National CASA CEO, and staff from the NCJFCJ remember Judge Stephen Herrell.
- [Janine Cox and Paula Campbell](#) of NCJFCJ share online resources related to visitation.

Farewell to Joey Binard



You will notice that Joey Binard no longer provides our regular online web resources article. She has been with us since the first issue of *The Judges' Page* and has contributed outstanding online research articles. Joey will be leaving her position as Senior Program Manager, Technical Assistance, at the NCJFCJ Juvenile and Family Law Department in July 2006, retiring after 22 years at NCJFCJ. All of us who subscribe to *Brevity* will miss our weekly email alert from Joey updating us on the latest information about children and families. Joey has been active in volunteer work in the Reno, Nevada area for years, including being a speaker at CASA graduations. She will now have more time to devote to those activities.

As her co-worker Dorothy Hall said: "Joey has been an enormous asset to NCJFCJ. She has been unfailingly kind to others, professional and dedicated in her work. She is persistently cheerful and has a wonderful sense of humor. When her life is difficult, she focuses on the lighter aspect of things. One day, when getting her daughter, Kate, to school was a bit of a challenge, she came in a few minutes late and explained that she had been handling the "crisis du jour." I've used that line a lot myself, as there always seems to be one. Joey always brings a laugh to the conversation, no matter the subject. Joey is a person of endless creativity, imagination, curiosity and old-fashioned determination. I will miss her very much."

Thanks for all you have done, Joey, not only here at *The Judges' Page* but in the Reno area and across the nation by helping educate and support judges and court staff. We will all miss you.

We also appreciate Janine Cox and Paula Campbell of the Permanency Planning for Children Department of NCJFCJ for taking over the preparation of our online resource column.

[Back to Top](#)

An Overview of Foster Care Family Visitation Issues

J. Dean Lewis, Judge (retired), Former Member, National CASA Association Board of Directors, Past President, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Summary

Judge Lewis provides an overview of how visitation works in the real world, including a composite story of a boy as he moves through the child welfare system.

Sam's Story Illustrates Dilemmas

Sam, age 6, is removed from his parents at the time of a hospitalization which would not have occurred but for the neglectful care provided by his substance-abusing parents. Sam was born with serious health problems. His parents have failed to provide for his medical needs as recommended by Sam's doctors after receiving nearly a year of in-home services prior to removal. Sam has two older sisters who have served as his primary caretakers even though they are only 12 and 13 years old. Sam, his sisters and parents have a strong family connection which was well established prior to the parents developing a substance abuse problem.

Neighbors indicate that the parents started drinking to excess due to depression over Sam's medical condition. When asked by social services if there are relatives who could assist, Sam and his sisters mention an Aunt named Betty but do not know where she lives. Sam is very attached to his elementary school nurse and teachers who have promoted his physical and emotional well-being as well as his education. Sam's sisters attend middle school and are excellent students. Sam is placed in a special needs foster home outside of his school district. This is the only foster home in the area equipped to provide for his health needs. Social services determines that the two sisters can remain in the home with an Order of Protection in place. At the removal hearing regarding Sam, the court must consider many issues, including Sam's safety; the continuity of family relationships and connections; and the provision of services to the family to enhance their capacity to provide for the child's needs.

Reasons for Visitation

A visitation plan for the foster child, parents and siblings should be developed promptly when a child enters foster care for many reasons:

- To reduce the child's sense of abandonment and loss upon removal
- To maintain the child's relationship with siblings, parents and other significant individuals
- To provide an opportunity for social services workers to assess the parent/child relationship
- To provide an opportunity for social services workers to assess the parents' needs for rehabilitative services such as parenting classes, substance abuse treatment or mental health intervention

The court should require periodic reports about the visitation and the impact on the child. The CASA/GAL volunteer can be helpful in observing visits and speaking with the child privately in preparation to make recommendations to the court on the child's best interest. The court should also receive periodic reports from social services and therapeutic visitation providers. Visitation should be reviewed at every court hearing.

Collaboration Is Key

Many issues continue to impede the visitation process. Collaboration among the court; child and family serving agencies; and the volunteer and charitable community is needed to achieve success, particularly in the following areas:

- Transportation for children, siblings and parents
- The issue of children placed outside the community and the need for adequate foster homes within the community
- Foster parents' schedules
- Provision of a safe, family-friendly and home-like environment for visitation
- Provision of neutral, well trained supervisors

Judges can and should exercise a leadership role in facilitating the court, agencies and the community coming together to develop a plan to identify and resolve barriers to successful visitation.

Communities and Technology

Communities, in particular those that are faith-based, have developed creative solutions in cooperation with courts and social services. In custody litigation, the world of technology has introduced a new strategy which could be adapted for foster care cases as well: "virtual visitation," whereby the child and absent parent visit through computers and webcams.

Success is possible if the community as a whole tackles this issue. I recommend an article by Dr. Peggy Hess, Professor and Director of Doctoral Studies, College of Social Work, University of South Carolina: "Visiting Between Children in Care and Their Families: A Look at Current Policy." (hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/downloads/visiting_report-10-29-03.pdf) While there are many articles on visitation relative to custody litigation between parents, this one focuses on visitation policies of child welfare agencies. An understanding of the foster care visitation issue from a national perspective will assure that you have the tools needed to make system changes at the local level.

Importance of Family Relationships

Looking at the visitation issues presented in Sam's case at the initial hearing, it is critical that he be transported from his special needs foster home to his elementary school due to the close and supportive relationship he has with the staff. Sam's sisters should continue to be an integral part of Sam's life with extensive contact. It should be possible for the sisters to visit Sam in the foster home after school. Sam's parents obviously need substance abuse treatment as well as additional guidance in caring for their fragile son. Appropriate visitation between Sam and his parents must be developed, keeping Sam safe while allowing the family connection to be sustained and fostered. Therapeutic visitation should be available for this family. A search should be made for relatives who could be available to support Sam and his family. A CASA/GAL volunteer should be appointed.

Best Practice Is Temporary Order

Best practice would be to enter a temporary order including the foregoing provisions at the initial hearing followed by a meeting of all attorneys, parties, professionals and child advocates to develop a detailed visitation plan.

For More Information

See the Children's Bureau's "Outcomes and Systemic Factors Assessed Through the Child and Family Services Review," (www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cwo01/appendix/appendg.htm) particularly noting Safety Outcome 1, Permanency Outcome 2 and Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1.

Visits have been called the "heart of reunification." See "Making the Most of Visitation," (ssw.unc.edu/fcrp/cspn/vol5_no4/making_most_visitation.htm) *Children's Services Practice Notes for North Carolina's Child Welfare Social Workers*, Vol. 5, No. 4.

"The Use of CASA Volunteers" (casanet.org/program-management/volunteer-manage/ncasa-resolution.htm) gives National CASA's position on when CASA volunteers can properly be involved in domestic relations custody cases (as opposed to our primary mission of serving children in abuse/neglect cases).

[Back to Top](#)

Visitation Issues for Judges in Dependency Court

Janine Cox and Paula Campbell, *Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ*

Summary

Early visitation can ease the trauma of separation and maintain parental involvement with the child during foster care. Learn what the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) Model Courts have done to facilitate visitation in foster care cases.

During the preliminary protective hearing, many key decisions are made regarding the safety and well-being of a child. One of the most important determinations is that of visitation. Early visitation can ease the trauma of separation and maintain parental involvement with the child throughout the case. As stated in the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges' *Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse & Neglect Cases*, judicial oversight of visitation helps to ensure that visitation is begun promptly, that it is permitted frequently and that unnecessary supervision and restrictions are not imposed. The court should make an initial decision concerning the frequency, duration and terms of visitation such as whether visitation should be supervised or unsupervised. The outcome of visitation is of utmost importance in decisions regarding whether reunification of the family is possible or other permanency placement options, such as adoption, are better for the child.

National Council Model Courts

The Permanency Planning for Children Department (PPCD) of the NCJFCJ currently works with over 30 National Council Model Courts throughout the United States. These dependency courts often find themselves addressing visitation issues and concerns. Many are drafting their own visitation guidelines, guidebooks, programs and checklists to assist with handling visitation issues. For example:

- **Buffalo, New York Model Court** has developed a multidisciplinary subcommittee to develop strategies for implementing best practices in visitation.
- **Los Angeles, California Model Court** developed visitation guidelines for greater consistency and to facilitate the goal of family reunification.
- **Brighton, Colorado Model Court** convened a subcommittee to develop a visitation assessment tool that could be used by social workers during visitations to track the various interactions between parents and children.
- **Louisville, Kentucky Model Court** utilizes the Family Place Visitation Center to provide a safe, site-based service for non-custodial parents to have court-ordered visits with their children.
- **Tucson, Arizona Model Court** developed a committee to produce video and written material to train kin visitation supervisors, guidelines for CPS case managers to use in assessing relatives and friends as visitation supervisors, and *Supervised Parent/Child Visitations: A Parent Guide for Court-Ordered Parent/Child CPS Visitations Handbook* (revised 2006).

- **Des Moines, Iowa Model Court** has created the *Polk County Model Court Visitation Guidebook*, which includes a visitation checklist that asks questions such as: 1) How many visits have taken place? 2) Where have the visits taken place? 3) What was the level of supervision for the visitations? 4) Did the parents miss any visits? and 5) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the visits?

For more information about the National Council Model Courts' visitation projects, contact Julie Wise, JD, Model Court Liaison, at (775) 784-1254. Or see an overview of National Council Model Courts (www.ncjfcj.org/content/view/81/145/) and profiles of individual Model Courts. (www.ncjfcj.org/content/blogcategory/112/151/)

[Back to Top](#)

Visitation Protocol Project: Providing Appropriate Family Time for Children in Foster Care

Judge Michael Key, LaGrange, GA, Board Member, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Summary

The Georgia Visitation Protocol Project seeks to produce a decision model to facilitate a family time plan that is consistent with the developmental and special needs of a specific child and family—and that will further the permanency plan for the child.

For most intact families, family time occurs intermittently and naturally throughout the day as family members pass one another in the hallway, sit around the dinner table, ride together in cars and participate in all sorts of other activities—sometimes structured and sometimes random and free flowing. This time together is important for conducting the business of the family, exchanging information and affection as well as building and maintaining healthy and nurturing relationships among family members. For children who are placed out of their own homes through state action, family time takes on even more importance because it supplies the only opportunity for these types of interaction.

Structured decision-making to guide the scheduling of family time for foster children is necessary because maintaining meaningful contact between children and families is far too critical to the future of the family and its individual members to be left to chance—or to be conditioned on the convenience of persons outside the family or on other arbitrary factors.

Group Finds Practices Inadequate

In August 2004, approximately 40 professionals from multiple and diverse disciplines (referred to herein as the “Workgroup”) convened in Atlanta, Georgia to review current visitation practices for children in state foster care, which practices the Workgroup generally found to be inadequate.

Although the project is called the Visitation Protocol Project, the Workgroup adopted the use of the term *family time*, rather than *visitation*, to describe the time that families spend together when children are placed in foster care. The thinking is that the term *visitation* does not adequately describe the time that families need to spend together when children are placed out of their home, either from a quantitative or qualitative standpoint. Nor does the term *visitation* adequately speak to the important issue of sibling visitation. Families need time together that is frequent, consistent and as “family-like” as possible given the state of disruption within the family.

Decision Model Guides Family Time

One major objective of the project was to produce a decision model to facilitate the development of a family time plan that is consistent with the developmental and special needs of a specific child and family—and that will further the permanency plan for the child. Included in the report is a working description of the initial decision model, which is being implemented in Troup County, Georgia as part of the project, and in other communities outside the scope of the project. The report is in the final drafting stage and should be completed within the next several months.

The model is based on certain default provisions (consideration is being given to the use of the term *presumptive family time* instead of *default family time*) for family time based on age within a developmental context. After determining the default family time, consideration is given as to whether there should be a variance based on special circumstances, some of which are listed and discussed in the report. The default provisions focus primarily on the duration and frequency of family time.

Issues pertaining to the content and quality of family time, though touched on to some extent, have been reserved for future discussions of the Workgroup. The default provisions contemplate only supervised visitation at this point, although Troup County has created a rebuttable presumption in favor of unsupervised visitation. Although the Workgroup agreed that the default provisions should be driven by the needs of the children and families, and not controlled by the resources readily available, participants also agreed that there had to be an overlay of reasonableness. Therefore, some of the default provisions do not provide as frequent family time as might be recommended by child development professionals if the child welfare system operated in a perfect world.

The default provisions were developed based on the presumption that reunification is the permanency goal. The reasons for that are listed in the report. In Troup County's model, if visitation is not unsupervised by the time of the first periodic review at the fourth month the child is in care, or if the family plan does not provide for unsupervised visitation by the sixth month in care, the case is set for a review by the court. The idea is that, if the case has not progressed to the point where the parents can have at least some unsupervised visitation by the end of the sixth month in care, it is probably not a reunification case—at least within the ASFA timeframes—and the case should move in another direction.

This article is an adaptation of a portion of the Workgroup's report, which remains a work in progress without final approval. Comments are welcome and should be directed to Judge Michael Key at (706) 884-6601. You may also request the current draft version of the full report.

[Back to Top](#)

Planning a Child's Tomorrow Today: Creating Visitation Guidelines

*Judge Constance Cohen, Lead Judge, Polk County Model Court, Des Moines , IA
Staff, Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ*

Summary

Collaboration among the court, community members and public and private child-serving agencies in Polk County, Iowa led to establishment of visitation guidelines appropriate to the developmental age of children in foster care.

In 2004, the Polk County Model Court, led by Model Court Lead Judge Constance Cohen, developed a visitation philosophy and accompanying guidelines which focused on providing increased visitation services that met the developmental needs of the child while enhancing the parent-child bond. These guidelines were developed by the Polk County Model Court's Visitation Subcommittee comprising judges, attorneys, agency supervisors, a CASA representative, therapists and a law school professor.

Under these new guidelines, every family was to receive visitation three times per week. To meet this expectation for every family, the Model Court developed a pilot project which enabled 10 families to receive visitation three times a week between removal and adjudication.

When the Model Court Visitation Subcommittee met to discuss next steps to expand the pilot, the Department of Human Services indicated its support for system-wide implementation. To continue enhancing visitation services, the Polk County Model Court sought the assistance of Dr. Cal Seda, a local service provider, and NCJFCJ Permanency Planning for Children Department staff to develop a survey that would identify the information that was critical to good judicial decision-making regarding visitation. The results of this survey, given to judges, lawyers and social workers, will be used to determine the effectiveness of visitation processes and utilized by the agency to modify report forms to better assist visitation.

For More Information

For complete documentation of the Polk County Model Court process, see Planning a Child's Tomorrow Today.

nationalcasa.org/download/Judges_Page/0606_planning_a_childs_tomorrow_today_0036.pdf

The plan includes establishment of shared values; determination of a visitation philosophy; visitation guidelines appropriate to the developmental needs of children according to age; and resources Polk County Model Court used to develop its plan.

[Back to Top](#)

Therapeutic Visitation

Anne T. Henley, LCSW, Director, Family Solutions, Spotsylvania, VA

Summary

Therapeutic visitation is a unique treatment modality that maximizes reunification efforts while generating valuable assessment data regarding permanency planning for children in foster care. A public-private visitation partnership in Virginia has been particularly effective in using this model with special needs children and mentally ill parents.

A disproportionate number of children in foster care have one or more parents diagnosed with a major mental health or substance abuse disorder. According to the National Mental Health Association, custody loss rates for parents with mental illness are significantly higher than for parents without mental illness, ranging as high as 70-80%. While the presence of mental illness or substance abuse does not indicate parental unfitness, these challenges are important considerations in service planning and delivery. Additionally, the removal of a child from parental care can be traumatic for any parent and thus may exacerbate symptoms, further impeding reunification.

The number of children in the child welfare system that present with special needs adds to the challenge of reunification efforts as well. Guidelines for classifying a child as having special needs vary by state. Common conditions include attachment disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), developmental disabilities, fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS), learning disabilities and oppositional defiant disorder (ODD).

The relationship between mental health and child welfare is a focus of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), established through the Child Health Service Act of 2000, emphasizing the need for greater understanding and relationships between the two systems. Families which cross both systems are often characterized by strained familial relationships, inappropriate parent-child roles and boundaries, symptomatic psychiatric illness and impaired parenting performance. As a result, they require highly trained, specialized mental health intervention. It is essential that interventions be flexible, individualized and integrated within a team approach to maximize reunification efforts.

Therapeutic Visitation

Therapeutic visitation is an *intensive* program which *combines* family therapy and parent training within a consultative model of service delivery that is both educationally and therapeutically based. Intensive parenting instruction pre- and post-visitation occurs between a master's level mental health clinician and the parents. Family therapy is incorporated within the visitation itself, scheduled in between parent education sessions. Additionally, the clinician provides ongoing consultative services for the social worker, foster parents, CASA/GAL volunteer, GAL attorney and others involved with the child. Services are provided in close proximity to law enforcement, with a police community work station located within the agency.

A child-specific parenting curriculum, developed by the assigned clinician, is tailored to the specific needs of the child as well as the cognitive and mental health functioning of the parent. Data is collected each session on specific variables identified at the time of referral to the program. The curriculum is progressive in nature with homework assignments and ongoing clinical observations of parent-child interactions. This visitation model provides an ideal opportunity for assessment of post removal parent-child relationship(s) as well as the parent's ability to apply, implement and generalize parenting skills.

If reunification is possible, continuity of care can be maintained by having the assigned clinician transition with the family in the capacity of intensive in-home service provider. Alternatively, the clinician's advanced assessment and intervention skills provide a valuable resource in providing quantifiable data to the court and, in some cases, advancing permanency timelines.

Essential Program Components

- Public-private partnership between mental health provider(s) and Department of Social Services (DSS)
- Local, state or grant funding
- Contract specifying estimated length of service, reporting requirements and cost differential for services
- Initial referral for therapeutic visitation by judge, foster care worker, CASA/GAL volunteer or GAL attorney
- Thorough assessment by agency clinician
- Comprehensive treatment plan with measurable therapeutic outcomes reflecting the reason for referral
- Comprehensive and detailed service contract with parent(s), foster parent(s) and DSS
- Availability of a wide variety of parenting curricula and resources as well as highly trained, licensed mental health professionals
- A minimum of quarterly community-based treatment team meetings
- Availability of clinician to render psycho-educational and behavioral interventions in various domains (foster home, school), which often occur secondary to visitation
- Availability of clinician's participation in a conjoint therapeutic session with the child's or parent's therapist if necessary
- Availability of consultation with psychologist and psychiatrist as necessary
- Availability of clinician's testimony

For More Information

NMHA Strengthening Families Fact Sheet
(www.nmha.org/children/custody.pdf)

SAMHSA Policies, Practices and Parents with Mental Illness
(mentalhealth.samhsa.gov/publications/allpubs/KEN-01-0109/ch5.asp)

SAMHSA Programs for Parents with Mental Illness and Their Families
(mentalhealth.samhsa.gov/publications/allpubs/KEN-01-0109/ch7.asp)

US Leads in Mental Illness, Lags in Treatment (*Washington Post* 2005)
(washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/06/06/AR2005060601651.html)

DHHS Foster Care Numbers & Trends Fact Sheet (2005)
(www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/factsheets/foster.cfm)

Glossary of Adoption Terms (Children Awaiting Parents)
(capbook.org/glossary.html)

Author Anne Henley can be contacted at Solution-Focused Family Intervention (Family Solutions), (540) 582-5820.

[Back to Top](#)

Attachment, Bonding and Reciprocal Connectedness: Limitations of Attachment Theory in the Juvenile and Family Court

David E. Arredondo, MD, Director, Office of Child Development and Mental Health and Affiliate of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)

Judge Leonard P. Edwards, Supervising Judge, Juvenile Dependency Court, Santa Clara County, CA and Past President, NCJFCJ

Summary

The clinical concepts of *bonding* and *attachment* are discussed, including their history and legal application. In making placement determinations, an evaluation of *reciprocal connectedness* is a better approach. Advice is provided in using mental health expertise in child custody cases.

Family and juvenile court judges are asked daily to determine child custody and visitation issues. These are among the most difficult decisions that judges face. They must consider numerous factors: parental competence to rear children, family dynamics, possibly the wishes of the child and—the overriding concern—the “best interest” of the child.

The full article linked below reviews the history of the clinical concepts of bonding and attachment. Then it introduces the concept of reciprocal connectedness along with its forensic and neurodevelopmental rationale. Representative examples of current legal applications of the concepts of bonding and attachment are presented. The article discusses the limitations and pitfalls of using these concepts to make child placement determinations and suggests that the concept of reciprocal connectedness takes better account of the child’s overall neurodevelopmental and emotional needs.

Use of Mental Health Expertise

The article linked below offers some suggestions for how judicial officers might best use mental health expertise in child custody cases. In particular, it argues that the term *attachment* (as usually conceived) is too narrow to be of much use to the court because it focuses primarily on security-seeking on the part of the child.

Reciprocal Connectedness

Reciprocal connectedness is more suitable for judicial use because it comprises both the processes of bonding and attachment and the broader spectrum of human interactions necessary for normal brain and social development. Its use will enable judges to assess more accurately the true condition of parent-child relationships and, thus, to make better decisions.

See the full article: “Attachment, Bonding, and Reciprocal Connectedness: Limitations of Attachment Theory in the Juvenile and Family Court,” (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdf/files/109arredondo.pdf) *Journal of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts*, Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, volume 2 (2000).

[Back to Top](#)

A CASA Volunteer's Role in Parent-Child Visitation

Kim Runyon Wilds, Program Director, Western Regional CASA Program, Huntington, WV

Summary

When a child has been removed from the parents and placed in out-of-home care, one of the most important—and challenging—responsibilities of the CASA volunteer is to observe visits between the parents and the child.

When a child has been removed from the parents and placed in out-of-home care, one of the most important responsibilities of the CASA volunteer is to observe visits between the parents and the child. This can also be one of the most challenging. In West Virginia, these supervised visits may take place at the Department of Health and Human Resources (DHHR)/Child Protective Services (CPS) or in the family home.

If the DHHR/CPS office has such a setup, the volunteer may observe behind a one-way mirror. Other visits may take place with observers in the same room. These observers may include a DHHR/CPS staff person, the CASA volunteer and others. DHHR/CPS personnel try to make these visits as normal as possible, with small rooms that are furnished with couches, chairs and toys. CASA volunteer Dr. Cheryl Brown explains, "It is important to see how the parents relate to their children even if the location of the visit is not exactly home."

CASA volunteers observe interaction between parents and the child—watching to see whether the parents engage the child or sit back and let the child entertain himself. Also important is how the parents and child greet one another and how they say goodbye at the end of the visit. The CASA volunteer looks for whether the parents put aside their grief and anger at temporarily losing custody of their child so that there is an enjoyable visit where bonding continues. In some situations, the parents are so angry that the visits are uncomfortable for the child.

The child's behavior towards the parents is of paramount interest and concern to the CASA volunteer. The CASA volunteer looks for indications of fear or discomfort from the child. Do the parents pay close attention to the child? CASA volunteer Vicki Boster learns a lot from these visits. "By observing visits between the parents and child, you eventually get to see the 'real' parent. If there are frequent visits, the parents will portray true parenting interactions." Boster says that visits help to inform the development of a permanency plan for the child by identifying any parenting needs. This will lead to services for the parents to address these needs so reunification can take place more quickly.

Also important are visits between siblings when they have not been placed together. CASA volunteers advocate to ensure consistent contact between separated siblings.

While CASA volunteers observe visits between children and their parents, they do not "supervise" the visits. The CASA volunteer is a neutral party in the case and there solely to focus on the best interests of the child. Our volunteers are independent observers at the visits and are busy watching the interaction between the parents and child, documenting their observations and not taking responsibility for supervision. The accurate recording of these observations is crucial to developing a meaningful report to be submitted to the judge.

Although CASA volunteers do not supervise visits, they do offer creative ideas for increased visits between parents and children in order to aid reunification efforts and preserve family bonds. "Reunification with parents is the hope for all of our CASA children if this can be achieved safely," says Monica Donohoe, state director of the West Virginia CASA Association.

The Western Regional CASA Program has developed a healthy relationship with the DHHR/CPS over the years in part by clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of CASA volunteers. All parties know that CASA volunteers attend visits to observe and take notes. Occasionally we are asked to supervise visits, but we are consistent with our “no supervision” policy. When we developed this policy, we clearly explained to the courts, attorneys and CPS the position of the CASA volunteer and the need for objective advocacy. This helps prevent unrealistic expectations, misunderstanding and undue pressure on the CASA volunteer during the course of their work with the child.

[Back to Top](#)

Maintaining Sibling Relationships in Foster Care

*Judge Michael Nash, Presiding Judge, Los Angeles County Juvenile Court
Miriam Aroni Krinsky, Executive Director, Children's Law Center of Los Angeles*

Summary

An issue with implications that extend far into the future for foster children is whether youth will be able to preserve consistent and healthy relationships with their brothers and sisters.

Children in foster care cannot count on things that all children should be able to take for granted – that they have constant, loving parents; that their home will always be their home; that their brothers and sisters will always be near; and that their neighborhoods and schools are familiar places.

—The Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care

In dependency cases, judges are called upon to make myriad decisions that will have a life-altering effect on abused and neglected children. The court must determine whether children should be placed in foster care or return home, where they will live if they enter the child welfare system, what educational and healthcare services they require and when and how they will leave the system.

One of the most difficult areas to implement, yet one with implications that extend far into the future for foster children, is whether youth living in foster care will be able to preserve consistent and healthy relationships with their brothers and sisters. The sibling relationship is, for most people, the longest lasting relationship in their life, lasting longer than most marriages and parent-child relationships.¹

Siblings Provide Anchor

In a 2005 survey, 65% of adult respondents reported communicating with a sibling at least once a week. Siblings—especially for youth in foster care—often provide an anchor in an otherwise tumultuous life; strong sibling ties can protect siblings from the effects of missing parental support. Survey respondents with low support from mothers and fathers tended to report healthy levels of well-being as long as they felt they could count on their siblings.²

Brothers and sisters who have experienced neglect or abuse evidence greater attachment to each other than siblings who have not experienced such trauma or losses.³ When asked what he did after finding out that he was to be placed for adoption with his older brothers, one foster youth stated poignantly: “I relaxed.”⁴

Given the significance of maintaining the sibling bond, most states have enacted statutes or policies to support these crucial relationships.⁵ Indeed, California requires the juvenile court to consider sibling placement and visitation at virtually every court hearing.⁶

Yet despite state laws or policies, it was estimated in 2000 that although between 56% and 85% of the children in foster care have siblings, as many as 75% have been separated from one or



“Family Forever” by James, age 16, who lives in a group home in Los Angeles, expresses the powerful attachment he feels for his siblings. Peruse the booklet from which the artwork comes, *My Voice, My Life, My Future*, (fostercarehomeatlast.org/reports/MyVoice.pdf) produced by Home At Last and the Children's Law Center of Los Angeles.

more of their siblings.⁷ While these numbers have improved over the past few years, the problem persists.⁸

The problem is further complicated by the fact that diverse family relationships and societal changes have caused us to define sibling relationships more broadly than ever before. Judicial decision-making must recognize that siblings entering foster care may be full siblings, half-siblings or step-siblings—or have other kinship bonds that model the brother/sister relationship.

Tracking and Linking Sibling Data

All of these considerations make it vital to collect information about siblings early on when children enter care. In order to make informed decisions, courts need the ability to track and link data on siblings as an essential part of each child's records. This is of overriding importance, since children may enter placement at different times and in different places.

Once in the foster care system, there are many avenues to help children sustain critically important sibling bonds. Clearly, placing siblings together is the most desirable approach. Siblings who are living in the same placement in foster care have been shown to fare better, experience fewer placement disruptions and transition more smoothly into new homes.⁹

But when joint placement cannot be accomplished, bench officers must recognize the importance of taking steps that will enable sibling relationships to flourish. Placing siblings in close proximity to one another with caregivers who are willing to allow frequent visitation among siblings is the next best alternative.

When siblings are, of necessity, separated and opportunities for regular interaction are limited, a variety of techniques for keeping siblings connected can be employed. Phone calls and letters containing photographs and other mementos can keep brothers and sisters connected. Encouraging caregivers who utilize respite care to use a common location, or to trade respite care back and forth, also benefits siblings. Additionally, bringing siblings together for special events, including birthday parties, picnics, outings to recreational sites, zoos, museums or even summer camp helps to support and sustain sibling relationships.

We must also listen to the youth themselves in crafting mechanisms for sibling visitation. Ensuring that foster youth are an engaged and respected part of the court and legal process enables us all to prioritize those considerations of greatest concern to the youth themselves.

As a former foster youth told the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care, "All kids deserve families...they need a family so they can believe in themselves and grow up to be somebody. This is a big deal that people don't realize. I wish everyone could understand."

In crafting visitation orders for brothers and sisters of children in foster care, judges must be cognizant of the importance of making consistent and diligent efforts to support healthy, lifelong relationships among siblings. The future well-being of our most vulnerable children may well depend on their maintaining this vital family tie.

¹ Dunn, J., *Sisters and Brothers*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1985). [back](#)

² Ibid. [back](#)

³ Lamb, M. and Sutton-Smith, B., *Sibling Relationships: Their Nature and Significance Across the Life Span*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum (1982). [back](#)

⁴ Riggs, Diane, "Sibling Ties Are Worth Preserving." *Adoptalk*, the North American Council on Adoptable Children (Spring 1999). [back](#)

⁵ *Policies on Siblings in Out of Home Care*, National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice, Hunter College School of Social Work (last updated December 28, 2005). [back](#)

⁶ See *California Welfare and Institutions Code* Section 16002. [back](#)

⁷. *CASCW Practice Notes*, Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare, University of Minnesota, Issue 9 (Fall 2000). [back](#)

⁸. Center for Social Services Research, University of California, Berkeley, *Child Welfare Services (CWS/CMS) Reports*. [back](#)

⁹. Staff, I., and Fein, E., "Together or Separate: A Study of Siblings in Foster Care," *Child Welfare*, vol. 71, 257-270 (1992). [back](#)

[Back to Top](#)

Parent-Child Visitation After Termination of Parental Rights



Judge Douglas F. Johnson, Separate Juvenile Court of Douglas County, NE and Secretary, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)

Summary

Does a juvenile court have jurisdiction to grant social services' petition to terminate a mother's parental rights *and* grant the mother's petition to have post-TPR visitation? In Nebraska, the answer is "yes."

Termination of parental rights extinguishes all relations between parent and child, including visitation. What can a judge do if both terminating parental rights *and* allowing continued visitation are in the best interests of the child? *In Re Interest of Stacy D. and Shannon D.* 12 Neb. App. 707, 684 NW2d 594 (2004) addresses this precise question.

The juvenile trial court judge terminated the parental rights of Pam D., the natural mother of Stacy D. and Shannon D. (ages 9 and 10) on June 9, 2003. The children had been placed in protective custody on July 7, 2000 after they were discovered living in a tent at a park with their putative father. Their mother, Pam, was incarcerated. This case review will deal only with Pam and her daughters.

Reunification Attempted

After adjudication on October 11, 2000, the juvenile court ordered psychiatric and chemical dependency evaluations. In December 2000, Pam completed an abbreviated mental health evaluation, with a resulting diagnosis of major depression. In June 2001, Pam was incarcerated for felony shoplifting. Release was expected by August. Due to Pam's non-compliance with prison treatment plans and goals, she was not released until December 2001. Pam utilized a prison-parenting program that allowed her to enjoy regular extended visits with Stacy and Shannon. The permanency objective was reunification with Pam, but she had not yet completed the previously ordered psychiatric and chemical dependency evaluations.

In September 2001, Stacy and Shannon started therapy to help them deal with self-esteem, anger control, relationship and friendship skills and adjustment to foster care. The therapist noted that the girls were struggling with the uncertainty of not knowing if and when they would be returned to their mother.

By December 28, 2001, Pam had not yet completed the psychiatric and chemical dependency evaluations. She missed numerous appointments, resulting in the facility refusing to accept Pam for the evaluations. A subsequent referral was made, but Pam again failed to attend. She maintained regular supervised visits with her daughters. The permanency objective was changed to a concurrent plan of reunification by April 30, 2002 *and* adoption or guardianship.

More Evaluation Needed

At the March 21, 2002 review hearing, the evidence showed that Pam completed a psychological evaluation rather than a psychiatric evaluation. She was again diagnosed with major depression and a history of social anxiety. The psychologist opined that Pam's capacity to parent her two daughters successfully was marginal at best. The evidence also showed that Pam had completed the chemical dependency evaluation and no services were recommended. Nevertheless, the

evaluator stated that Pam was most likely addicted to pain medication and should be further evaluated.

Pam obtained a second, self-initiated chemical dependency evaluation in June 2002. She admitted to recent use of opiates, cocaine, amphetamines and heroin. After seven months, Pam's therapeutic progress was unsatisfactory as she failed to participate and had continued positive urinalysis tests. She was still a patient in the program at the time of the termination of parental rights trial. Pam simultaneously participated in another chemical dependency evaluation and began another program but did not complete it.

On August 19, 2002, Stacy and Shannon's therapist reported that the girls had problems reconciling the possibility of their mother's parental rights being terminated and the uncertainty of their future. In other personal, educational and social areas, the girls were doing well with a consistent foster placement.

At the termination of parental rights trial, evidence was received regarding Pam's past visitation with her daughters and the possibility of continued contact with them in the event her parental rights were terminated. Pam's visitation with Stacy and Shannon had been consistent and generally appropriate.

Children Make Request

Counsel offered trial depositions from Stacy and Shannon. The girls testified that they would like to continue to see their mother in the future if they were not returned to her custody. The Child Protective Services worker also testified that a foster/adoptive relative was considering an open adoption for future contact of the girls with their mother.

The girls' therapist testified that it was in their best interests to maintain a relationship and have contact with their mother provided the contact was supervised and monitored to ensure the emotional stability of the girls. Child Protective Services agreed.

Pam testified that she was not able to have her daughters live with her due to her numerous problems. However, she requested that she continue to be a part of her daughters' lives. Pam testified that she would like to have Stacy and Shannon go to "a nice foster home" or adoptive home and be able to visit them.

Based on Pam's lack of therapeutic progress and Stacy and Shannon's prolonged placement in foster care, the juvenile court granted termination of parental rights. The request for continued visitation was denied for the reason that the court lacked jurisdiction to order such visitation when parental rights are terminated. Pam appealed.

Court of Appeals Steps In

The Nebraska Court of Appeals affirmed the termination of parental rights. However, the appellate court noted that Pam asserted her request for continued visitation prior to termination of parental rights being granted. The appellate court concurred with the juvenile court that once a termination of parental rights is granted, parents have no standing to assert a request for continued visitation with their children.

The appellate court noted that an "unusual situation" was presented in this case: the experts agreed that continued contact between Pam and her daughters, pending an adoptive placement, would be in the best interests of Stacy and Shannon. While finding no case law on point, the appellate court found that juvenile courts continue to have jurisdiction over adjudicated children either until their age of majority or until they are adopted. Until such time, the juvenile court has the authority to enter orders that are in the best interests of the children.

Thus, the Nebraska Court of Appeals held that the juvenile court retains continuing jurisdiction to enter orders following the termination of a parent's parental rights that are consistent with the best interests of children. These orders may include providing for continued contact with the natural parent. The appellate court reversed the juvenile court's finding that it lacked jurisdiction to grant post-termination of parental rights visitation. The case was remanded to the juvenile court to make specific findings as to the best interests of Stacy and Shannon regarding whether and what type of contact or visitation should occur.

Flexibility for Juvenile Judges

So what happened at the subsequent juvenile court hearing regarding visitation for Pam with Stacy and Shannon? The juvenile court judge granted continued visitation (as it had wanted to do) and encouraged open adoption (as it had all along) with contacts.

Do you want to know something else? The juvenile court judge was glad to be reversed. I know: I'm the judge!

Given the judicial ethical responsibility to follow the law, as it existed at trial, I ruled as I did. But fortunately, there is now a case precedent that gives juvenile judges the flexibility to address continued best interests of a child, including visitation with a parent after termination of parental rights. Perhaps this case will be helpful in your jurisdiction.

[Back to Top](#)

Domestic Violence and Child Visitation: Focusing on the Best Interest of the Child

Chris Bailey, Director, NCJFCJ Permanency Planning for Children Department

Summary

The coexistence of domestic violence and child maltreatment is well established. Judges should be knowledgeable of the safeguards which need to be in place when determining appropriate visitation which will ensure the child's safety.

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) developed the *Model Code on Domestic and Family Violence*, (www.ncjfcj.org/images/stories/dept/fvd/pdf/new_modelcode.pdf) which was approved by the NCJFCJ board of trustees in January 1994. This *Model Code* was the product of years of study and deliberation by the NCJFCJ Family Violence Committee and the Family Violence Department in collaboration with domestic violence experts from across the nation. The *Model Code* laid the groundwork for states to develop laws to protect victims of domestic and family violence based upon the recommendations of the nation's most learned professionals on the subject.

Sections 405 and 406 of the *Model Code on Domestic and Family Violence* deal with the issue of visitation between the perpetrator and children. Section 405(1) states: "A court may award visitation by a parent who committed domestic or family violence only if the court finds that adequate provision for the safety of the child and the parent who is a victim of domestic or family violence can be made." Section 406 deals with the need to establish a secure setting for supervised visitation which would allow court-ordered visitation in a manner that protects the safety of all family members.

The coexistence of domestic violence and child maltreatment is well established. Children who have been the victims of family violence may come to the attention of the child welfare agency and the dependency court as a result. Judges need to be knowledgeable of the safeguards which need to be in place when determining appropriate visitation assuring the child's safety. The Supervised Visitation Network (svnetwork.net) has developed standards and guidelines for visitation.

For More Information

- The October 2004 issue of *The Judges' Page*, in particular the article by the NCJFCJ Family Violence Department, "Safe Havens Supervised Visitation and Safe Exchange Grant Program." (nationalcasa.org/JudgesPage/Article_SafeHavens_10-04.htm)
- "Supervised Visitation in Cases of Domestic Violence" (nationalcasa.org/download/Judges_Page/0606_family_violence_supervised_visitation_0036.pdf) by Maureen Sheeran and Scott Hampton, NCJFCJ *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, Spring 1999, Vol. 50, No. 2.
- "Parenting Arrangements After Domestic Violence: Safety as a Priority in Judging Children's Best Interest" (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdffiles/5_Jaffe.pdf) by Dr. Peter G. Jaffe, Dr. Claire V. Crooks and Hon. Frances Q. F. Wong, *Journal of the Center for Families, Children and the Courts*, Volume 6, 2005.

[Back to Top](#)

In Memory of Judge Stephen Herrell

Michael S. Piraino, CEO, the National CASA Association



Summary

Judge Stephen B. Herrell, past president, former interim executive director and longtime friend and supporter of the NCJFCJ, passed away February 12, 2006 in Portland, OR.

Judges have always been crucial in helping us create high-quality CASA and volunteer guardian ad litem programs. Many have been the driving force in establishing programs in their courts. Others have worked closely with us on child-related policies and practices. Some have served on our board of directors.

Over the past 12 years, it has been a pleasure to consider many judges as colleagues, friends and sources of inspiration. What an honor it is when you find all three of these in one person.

One such person was Judge Stephen Herrell. You will read more about him in the article below, written by National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) staff. My personal recollections of Steve are powerful and wonderfully varied. As an officer of our board, he was a constant voice for careful consideration of all decisions. As a trusted advisor, he was a great help in discovering the most ethical and responsible paths in difficult situations.

And as a friend, Steve continues to contribute his sense of good humor, his genuine smile of pleasure in talking with others and his constant concern for the well-being of others. I may no longer look for Steve Herrell's physical presence, but his spiritual presence in my work and life, as in the lives of many others, is a powerful blessing.

—Michael S. Piraino

Judge Stephen B. Herrell, past president, former interim executive director and longtime friend and supporter of the NCJFCJ, passed away Feb. 12, 2006 in Portland, Oregon. He was 67.

A graduate of Georgetown University Law School, Judge Herrell worked in private practice until 1981 when he was appointed to the Multnomah County Circuit Court. He retired in 1999 and served as a senior judge throughout the state.

During his years on the bench, Judge Herrell was a tireless advocate for the needs of children and families. In 1986, he founded the first Court Appointed Special Advocate program in Oregon and served as vice president of the National CASA Association. A passionate crusader against domestic violence, Judge Herrell helped develop domestic violence units in local law enforcement and community justice agencies.

Colleague and friend Judge Dale Koch of Portland remembers Judge Herrell as “an inspiration to all of us. He demonstrated to us that we can and we must make a difference. His legacy will live on in all who he inspired and mentored during his life.”

According to Mary Mentaberry, NCJFCJ executive director, “Judge Herrell’s dedication to the NCJFCJ was legend. He regarded the NCJFCJ and its members as another family, and friendships made among our members last a lifetime. We will truly miss his kind and supportive spirit and his commitment to the work of the NCJFCJ.”

During his years of association with NCJFCJ, Judge Herrell served as president in 1997-98 and chaired numerous committees, including the Metropolitan Courts, Dispositions, Serious Offender and Constitution and Bylaw committees. Beginning in the 1980s, Judge Herrell was also an integral part of NCJFCJ’s family violence efforts as the first chair of the Family Violence Project. Through his leadership and insight, the Council’s Family Violence Department produced such groundbreaking publications as Family Violence: Improving Court Practice (Bluebook) and the Model Code for Family Violence. Judge Herrell also chaired the 1997 conference, “Full Faith and Credit: Passport to Safety.” During the NCJFCJ’s search for executive director in 2001, Judge Herrell volunteered his time for several months to serve as interim director.

Judge Herrell is survived by his wife, Alice M. Herrell, three children and six grandchildren.

In honor of Judge Herrell’s leadership, compassion and dedication to children and families, the NCJFCJ has established the Judge Stephen B. Herrell Circle. Call the NCJFCJ for more information at (775) 784-6012.

—NCJFCJ staff

[Back to Top](#)

Online Resources: Foster Care Visitation

Janine Cox and Paula Campbell, *Permanency Planning for Children Department, NCJFCJ*

Summary

Janine Cox and Paula Campbell have developed the following resource list of articles, reports and other information that may assist juvenile and family court judges in the area of foster care visitation.

General Visitation Issues

www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/lawlibrary/Documents/Html/Bibliographies/Visitation2.asp

Child Visitation Issues (bibliography), Law Library, Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County (May 2004).

familiesinsociety.org/Show.asp?docid=35

"A Framework for Family Visiting for Children in Long-Term Foster Care," Mapp, Susan C., *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, Vol. 83, No. 2 (2002).

childrensprogram.org/media/pdf/Len_Edwards.pdf

"Judicial Oversight of Parental Visitation in Family Reunification Cases," Edwards, Judge Leonard P., *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (Summer 2003).

www1.dshs.wa.gov/pdf/EA/GovRel/Leg0405/FamVisitRep.pdf

Report to the Legislature: Family Visitation for Dependent Children, Chapter 146, Laws of 2004, Washington State Department of Social & Health Services (December 30, 2004).

hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/downloads/visiting_report-10-29-03.pdf

Visiting Between Children in Care and Their Families: A Look at Current Policy, Hess, Peg, the National Resource Center for Foster Care & Permanency Planning, Hunter College School of Social Work (October 2003).

Visitation and Custody in Domestic Violence Cases

familyvio.ssw.fsu.edu/sv_index.html

The Clearinghouse on Supervised Visitation operates out of the Florida State University College of Social Work and provides informational updates, training manuals and newsletters. Topics include Florida visitation centers, national and international visitation centers and how to start a supervised visitation center.

aja.ncsc.dni.us/courtrv/cr39-2/cr39-2.pdf

Court Review—Special Issue on Domestic Violence, *The Journal of the American Judges Association*, Vol. 39, Issue 2 (Summer 2002).

www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/executvi/executvi.pdf

Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence & Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice, Schechter, Susan and Edelson, Jeffery L, Violence Against Women Online Resources, Recommendations from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Family Violence Department (1999).

lrcvaw.org/

The Legal Resource Center on Violence Against Women (LRC) was created to improve legal representation for domestic violence survivors in interstate custody cases so that victims are not forced to choose between their children and their safety. Since opening its doors in January 2005, the LRC has furthered its mission by developing a national network of qualified attorneys for interstate domestic violence and custody cases; providing technical assistance to attorneys and to victim advocates in such cases; researching and making available the relevant laws; conducting training institutes; and developing programs for law students. From their website, you can become part of the LRC's network of attorneys, request technical assistance or find out more about upcoming trainings.

www.mincava.umn.edu/

The Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse (MINCAVA) houses the MINCAVA Electronic Clearinghouse, which contains over 3,000 resources. Their articles and research on domestic violence include such topics as batterer intervention; children's exposure to domestic violence; criminal justice; disability; economic impact; health care; housing; immigration; internet safety; and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations.

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdffiles/5_Jaffe.pdf

"Parenting Arrangements After Domestic Violence: Safety as a Priority in Judging Children's Best Interest," Jaffe, Peter G., Crooks, Claire V. and Wong, Hon. Frances Q.F., *Journal of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts*, Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Volume 6 (2005).

praxisinternational.org/

Praxis International is a nonprofit research and training organization that works toward the elimination of violence in the lives of women and children. Among other things, it provides technical assistance to supervised visitation centers funded by the Office on Violence Against Women.

www.ncjfcj.org/content/view/129/250/

The Resource Center on Domestic Violence: Child Protection and Custody a project of the Family Violence Department of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, serves judges, court workers, advocates, lawyers, child protective workers, law enforcement personnel and other professionals. Services include technical assistance, training, policy development and publications on the issue of child protection and custody in cases involving domestic violence.

www.mincava.umn.edu/documents/commissioned/strategies/strategies.html

Strategies to Improve Supervised Visitation Services in Domestic Violence Cases, Maxwell M., Sharon, LCSW, PhD and Oehme, Karen, JD, Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse, Violence Against Women Online Resources (2001).

www.mincava.umn.edu/documents/supvisitation/supvisitation.html

The Troubling Admission of Supervised Visitation Records in Custody Proceedings, Stern, Nat and Oehme, Karen, JD, Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse, Violence Against Women Online Resources (2002).

www.vawnet.org/

VAWnet is operated by the National Resource Center on Violence Against Women and is an online resource for professionals working to end domestic violence, sexual assault and other violence in the lives of women and their children. VAWnet is an easily accessible and comprehensive collection of full-text, searchable electronic resources on domestic violence, sexual violence and related issues.

Visitation Issues for Caseworkers

nyc.gov/html/acs/downloads/pdf/asfa_3.pdf

ACS Best Practice Guidelines for Family Visiting Arrangements for Children in Foster Care, Administration for Children's Services, the City of New York (2000).

sww.unc.edu/fcrp/cspn/vol5_no4.htm

Parent-Child Visits, Children's Services Practice Notes, NC Division of Social Services and the Family and Children's Resource Program, Vol. 5, No. 4 (October 2000).

oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-04-03-00350.pdf

State Standards and Capacity to Track Frequency of Caseworker Visits with Children in Foster Care, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services (December 2005).

oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-04-03-00351.pdf

State Standards and Practices for Content of Caseworker Visits with Children in Foster Care, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services (December 2005).

cwla.org/pubs/pubdetails.asp?PUBID=8080

Using Visitation to Support Permanency, Wright, Lois, Child Welfare League of America (2000).

dcfswbresource.prairienet.org/bp/substitute_care/placement2-09.php#P599_87545

Visitation, Chapter 6, Department of Children and Family Services Web Resource, State of Illinois.

pcsa.org/CLA/VisitationGuidefinal.pdf

Visitation/Family Access Guide—A Best Practice Model for Social Workers and Agencies, Ohio Caseload Analysis Initiative in partnership with Protect Ohio Initiative (2005).

Supervised Visitation

childwelfare.net/resources/VisitationCenterManual/VisitationCenterManual.pdf

Community Supervised Visitation Centers: A Guide to Opening Your Own Center, Bruck, Rebecca, Hoffman, Theresa and White, Keri, Barton Child Law & Policy Clinic, Emory University (March 4, 2003).

familyvio.ssw.fsu.edu/fm.pdf

A Competency-Based Training Manual for Florida's Supervised Visitation Centers, the Clearinghouse on Supervised Visitation Institute for Family Violence Studies, School of Social Work, Florida State University, State of Florida, Department of Children & Families (1998).

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/family/custody/documents/NonProfGuide2005.pdf

A Guide for Non-Professional Providers of Supervised Visitation, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Council of California (2005).

svnetwork.net/StandardsAndGuidelines.html

Standards and Guidelines for Supervised Visitation Practices, Supervised Visitation Network (Edited May 2000).

Sibling Visitation

hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/downloads/policy-issues/Sibling_Visiting_Policies.pdf

Policies on Sibling Visits in Out of Home Care, National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning, Hunter College School of Social Work (December 28, 2005).

starbulletin.com/2002/05/28/news/story4.html

Program Rebuilds Family Bonds of Children Separated: Project Visitation Offers Joint Activities for Children Separated in the Foster Care System, Altonn, Helen, *Honolulu Star Bulletin*. (May 28, 2002).

hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/info_services/siblings.html

Sibling Resources, National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning, Hunter College School of Social Work.

[Back to Top](#)