

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Children, Families, and Elder Affairs

BILL: CS/SB 1650

INTRODUCER: Senator Montford

SUBJECT: Child Abuse, Abandonment, and Neglect

DATE: January 30, 2018

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Preston	Hendon	CF	Fav/CS
2.			GO	
3.			RC	

Please see Section IX. for Additional Information:

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE - Substantial Changes

I. Summary:

CS/SB 1650 makes a number changes to ch. 39, relating to dependency proceedings for children, to improve coordination and communication among parties in dependency proceedings and adds accountability measures to remove barriers to, and expedite permanency for, abused and neglected children. Specifically, the bill:

- Revises grounds for termination of parental rights, changes notice to parents regarding these grounds, limits the continuances available, expedites service referrals, and increases the frequency of hearings.
- Adds the requirement that a parent notify the parties or the court of barriers to compliance with a case plan task soon after discovering the barrier. If a parent fails to do so, he or she cannot cite the barrier as a reason for noncompliance when the court is considering termination of his or her parental rights. Once notified of the barrier, DCF must provide parents with strategies to overcome them.
- Requires the Department of Children and Families (DCF or department) to make service referrals sooner and increase reporting to the court on case progress. It limits continuances by the court's own motion and requires more frequent permanency hearings after the child has been in out-of-home care for 12 months but has not achieved permanency.

CS/SB 1650 also amends s. 39.202, F.S., relating to confidentiality of reports and records in cases of child abuse or neglect, to protect the confidentiality of instructional personnel as defined in s. 1012.01(2), F.S., school administrators as defined in s. 1012.01(3)(c), F.S., and educational support employees as defined in s.1012(6)(a), F.S., who have provided information as collateral

contacts to child protective investigators, even if the individual was not the individual reporting the alleged maltreatment to the Hotline.

The bill has no impact on state or local government and has an effective date of July 1, 2018.

II. Present Situation:

Permanency for Children in the Child Welfare System

When children are placed in out-of-home care, it is critical that child welfare agencies find safe, permanent homes for them as quickly as possible. In most circumstances, children can be reunited with their families, but in some cases children find homes with relatives, fictive kin, or adoptive families. Both federal and state laws provide requirements related to permanency for children.¹

Many of the federal requirements related to the dependency process can be traced to the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997. The ASFA expanded the use of detailed case planning, while emphasizing the well-being of children at all critical points during the dependency case process. It further requires that states make timely decisions regarding permanency. The permanency goal is enforced primarily via a requirement that states terminate the parental rights of children who have spent 15 or more months of the past 22 months in foster care.²

Current Florida law requires the court to set at least one permanency goal for a child. If that goal is reunification with the child's parent, it may also set a second concurrent goal to provide more options for the child. A "permanency goal" is defined as the living arrangement identified for the child to return to or identified as the permanent living arrangement of the child.³ Permanency goals available under this chapter, listed in order of preference, are::

- Reunification;
- Adoption, if a petition for termination of parental rights has been or will be filed;
- Permanent guardianship of a dependent child;
- Permanent placement with a fit and willing relative; and
- Placement in another planned permanent living arrangement.

The goal of maintaining and strengthening the placement with the child's parent is also an option under certain circumstances, such as when the child has been reunified with a parent but the case is still under the court's jurisdiction. The court must hold hearings at least every 12 months to assess progress toward

¹ U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, Children's Bureau, Child Welfare Information Gateway, *Achieving and Maintaining Permanency*, available at: <https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/permanency/> (last visited January 30, 2018).

² Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, P. L. No. 105-89, H.R. 867, 105th Cong. (1997).

³ Section 39.01(53), F.S.

Reasonable Efforts

Beginning with the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980,⁴ federal law has required states to show, except in certain circumstances such as where the parent committed an especially egregious act, that they have made “reasonable efforts” to provide assistance and services to prevent a child’s removal or to reunify a child with his or her family prior to terminating parental rights. The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 stated, however, that the child’s health and safety are the primary concern when assessing the degree to which a state has to go in order to demonstrate making reasonable efforts.⁵

Ch. 39, F.S., addresses the issue of reasonable efforts by the department. That section states that the department’s failure to make reasonable efforts to reunify the parent and child may excuse the parent’s noncompliance with the case plan, leading to invalidate such noncompliance as grounds for a termination of his or her rights. However, the section also allows a court to exempt DCF from having to make reasonable efforts to preserve and reunify families if the parents have engaged in certain conduct, such as subjecting the child to aggravated child abuse or murdering the child’s sibling; or if the court has taken certain actions, such as involuntarily terminating the parent’s rights to the child’s sibling.⁶

Case Plans

Throughout the dependency process, DCF must develop and refine a case plan with input from all parties to the dependency case that details the problems being addressed as well as the goals, tasks, services, and responsibilities required to ameliorate the concerns of the state.⁷ The case plan follows the child from the provision of voluntary services through dependency, or termination of parental rights. Once a child is found dependent, a judge reviews the case plan, and if the judge accepts the case plan as drafted, orders the case plan to be followed.⁸

Specifically, the law provides for:

- The development of the case plan and who must be involved, such as the parent, guardian ad litem, and if appropriate, the child. This section also details;⁹
- What must be included in the case plan, such as descriptions of the identified problems, the permanency goal, timelines, and notice requirements; and¹⁰
- The types of tasks and services that must be provided to the parents as well as the type of care that must be provided to the child. The services must be designed to improve the conditions in the home, facilitate the child’s safe return to the home, ensure proper care of the child, and facilitate permanency.¹¹

When determining whether to place a child back into the home he or she was removed from, or whether to move forward with another permanency option, the court seeks to determine whether

⁴ Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, P. L. No. 96-272, H.R. 3434, 96th Cong. (1980).

⁵ Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, P. L. No. 105-89, H.R. 867, 105th Cong. (1997).

⁶ Section 39.806, F.S.

⁷ Sections 39.6011 and 39.6012, F.S.

⁸ Section 39.521, F.S.

⁹ Section 39.6011, F.S.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Section 39.6012, F.S.

the circumstances that caused the out-of-home placement have been remedied to the extent that the safety, well-being and health of the child are not endangered by an in-home placement.¹² To support]the permanency goal, the court continues to monitor a parent's efforts to comply with the tasks assigned in the case plan.¹³

Parental Responsibilities and Terminations of Parental Rights

Parents involved in the child welfare system have a number of responsibilities they must carry out in order to be reunified with their children, if that is a permanency goal. A primary responsibility is to comply with the case plan. Lack of compliance with the case plan requirements is grounds for termination of parental rights--specifically, a parent's failure to have substantially complied for 12 months after the child's adjudication of dependency or when a child has been in care for 12 of the last 22 months, or a parent's materially breaching the case plan such that noncompliance is likely before the expiration of time to comply. However, generally, if the noncompliance was due to the parent's lack of financial resources or the department's failure to make reasonable efforts, grounds for termination are not established.¹⁴

Section 39.6011, F.S., requires the case plan to contain a written notice that a parent's noncompliance with the case plan may lead to the termination of his or her parental rights. This message is also delivered by the judge during the hearing on the child's placement in a shelter and¹⁵ the adjudicatory hearing.¹⁶

State Specific Factors Affecting Permanency

The federal Department of Health and Human Services, through the Children's Bureau, conducts periodic Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) in each state. As authorized by federal law, these reviews assess states' compliance with the federal requirements for child welfare systems in Title IV-B and Title IV-E of the Social Security Act. In particular, the Children's Bureau examines whether desired child outcomes are being achieved and whether the child welfare system is structured appropriately and its processes operate effectively. These have been taking place every four years.

The report summarizing Florida's results from the third round of reviews was issued in late 2016. The report indicated the following related to achieving permanency:

- Despite establishing timely and appropriate permanency goals, case review results found that agencies and courts struggle to make concerted efforts to achieve identified permanency goals in a timely manner.
- Delays in achieving reunification and guardianship goals are affected by case plans not being updated timely to reflect the current needs of the family, delays in referral for services, and failure to engage parents.
- The agency and court do not make concerted efforts to achieve the goal of adoption timely in nearly half of applicable cases.

¹² Section 39.522, F.S.

¹³ Section 39.621, F.S.

¹⁴ Section 39.806, F.S.

¹⁵ Section 39.402, F.S.

¹⁶ Section 39.507, F.S.

- Barriers affecting timely adoptions include the lack of concurrent planning when a parent's compliance level is minimal, and providing parents additional time to work on case plan goals.
- In over half of applicable cases, the agency failed to make concerted efforts to provide services, removed children without providing appropriate services, or did not monitor safety plans and engage the family in needed safety-related services.¹⁷

The report also concluded that there are concerns with gaps in key services, long waiting lists, insurance barriers, and an inability to tailor services to meet the cultural needs of the diverse population. Substance abuse and domestic violence are the main reasons for the agency's involvement in many cases. The review found that substance abuse, in particular, contributes to various safety concerns for children. Stakeholders noted that there are major gaps in services to address both substance abuse and domestic violence in the non-metro areas of the state.¹⁸

Confidentiality of Records

Section 39.202, F.S., currently only protects the confidentiality (i.e., identity or name) of the individual who reported the alleged abuse or neglect to the Florida Abuse Hotline (Hotline). There are currently no provisions for protecting the confidentiality of any individual who has shared information with a child protective investigator because of being interviewed as part of the investigative process.

Collateral Contacts

Collateral contacts in a child abuse investigation can include the referral source, other family members, and other community professionals who have contact with the family or people in the community, whose contact with one of the family members may have given them knowledge that would relate to the family situation. Collateral contacts may be able to provide information such as identifying information – full name, dates of birth/age, address, parents' names and social security numbers – as well as information about family dynamics and relationships.

School Personnel

School personnel, particularly teachers and school nurses, can be excellent sources of corroborating information that can help confirm or deny the allegation being considered. They are often able to provide information on children's behaviors, have insight into the child's relationship with his or her family members or have observed medical or psychological conditions that might be associated with the allegations of abuse or neglect.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Section 1. Amends s. 39.001, F.S., relating to purposes of chapter, to recognize the responsibility of the parent of a child who has been placed into out-of-home care, the department

¹⁷ U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services, Children's Bureau, Child and Family Services Reviews, Florida Final Report, 2016, available at: <http://www.centerforchildwelfare.org/qa/CFSRTools/2016%20CFSR%20Final%20Report.pdf>. (last visited Jan.30, 2018).

¹⁸ *Id.*

and its community-based providers and the court to achieve timely permanency for the child. It also provides that the guardian ad litem or attorney ad litem's name must be entered on all orders of the court so that a child will have the ability to contact his or her guardian ad litem and requires parents to take action to comply with the case plan, including notifying the department and the court of barriers to case plan compliance.

Section 2. Amends s. 39.0136, F.S., relating to time limitations; continuances, to require the department to ensure parents have contact information for the caseworker and updated contact information when the caseworker changes. It also provides that the court may deny a request for an extension of time to achieve case plan compliance if the parent failed to notify the parties of a barrier to completion of the case plan.

Section 3. Amends s. 39.202, F.S., relating to confidentiality of child abuse and neglect records and reports, to protect the confidentiality of instructional personnel as defined in s.1012.01(2), F.S., school administrators as defined in s. 1012.01(3)(c), F.S., and educational support employees as defined in s.1012(6)(a), F.S., who have provided information to child protective investigators, even if the individual was not the individual reporting the alleged maltreatment to the Hotline.

Section 4. Amends s. 39.402, F.S., relating to placement in a shelter, to require the court order to specify the new court day for the continued hearing when a continuance or extension of time is granted. It also requires the court in plain language to advise the parents what is expected of them a achieve reunification with their children.

Section 5. Amends s. 39.507, F.S., relating to adjudicator hearings and orders of adjudication, to require the parents to provide identification and location information on relatives identified as a potential placement for the child.

Section 6. Amends s. 39.521, F.S., relating to disposition hearings and powers of disposition, to clarify current language related to provision of copies of the case plan.

Section 7. Amends s. 39.522, F.S., relating to postdisposition change of custody, to provide that any time before a child achieves the permanency option approved at the permanency hearing, a child may be brought before the court by the department or any additional interested person upon a filing of a motion alleging a need for a change in the conditions of protective supervision or in the placement.

Section 8. Amends s. 39.6011, F.S., relating to case plan development, to require parents to notify the parties of any barriers to completion of the case plan. It also requires the department to work with the parent to overcome any barrier to case plan completion and requires that service referrals be completed not more than 7 days after case plan approval with exceptions.

Section 9. Amends s. 39.6012, F.S., relating to case plan tasks; services, to require the case plan to include strategies for overcoming barriers to case plan completion and to require parents to notify the parties if a new barrier is discovered.

Section 10. Amends s. 39.6013, F.S., relating to case plan amendments, to conform a reference to changes made by the act.

Section 11. Amends s. 39.621, F.S., relating to permanency determination by the court, to provide that if the court determines that the child's goal is appropriate but the child will be in out-of-home care for more than 12 months before achieving permanency, in those cases where the goal is reunification or adoption, the court shall hold permanency status hearings for the child every 60 days until the child reaches permanency or the court makes a determination that it is in the child's best interest to change the permanency goal.

Section 12. Amends s. 39.701, F.S., relating to judicial review, to provide that if concurrent planning is already being used, the department must file with the court, and serve on all parties, a motion to amend the case plan to reflect the concurrent goal as the child's primary permanency goal, document the efforts the department is taking to complete the concurrent goal, and identify any additional services needed to reach the permanency goal by a date certain. The court may allow the parties to continue to pursue a secondary goal if the court determines that is in the best interest of the child.

Section 13. Amends s. 39.806, F.S., relating to grounds for termination of parental rights, to clarify that a parent may materially breach a case plan by their action or inaction.

Section 14. Amends s. 39.811, F.S., relating to powers of disposition; order of disposition, to require the court to enter a written order of disposition within 30 days after the conclusion of the hearing to terminate parental rights.

Section 15. Provides an effective date of July 1, 2018.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

Staff of contracted entities may have an additional workload related to expedited timeframes for referrals and attending the additional hearings mandated by the bill.

C. Government Sector Impact:

The bill has an indeterminate impact on the state court system due to the higher frequency of hearings regarding permanency.

The bill has an indeterminate impact on DCF. To the degree it expedites permanency for children, the system may experience a cost savings due to the shorter time in care. Alternatively, to the degree there is a higher number of terminations of parental rights rather than reunifications and subsequently children do not achieve permanency and instead remain in care, costs could increase.

The department would need to provide training to those individuals responsible for redacting confidential information prior to release of records as allowed and defined in s. 39.202(2)(d), F.S., to make sure school personnel identified in 39.202, F.S., are also afforded the same confidentiality protections as reporters of alleged maltreatment to the Hotline. In addition, there may be minimal impact on the workload of those who redact records. The training and redaction of records is considered a part of doing business and can be absorbed within existing resources.¹⁹

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Statutes Affected:

The bill substantially amends ss. 39.001, 39.016, 39.202, 39.402, 39.507, 39.521, 39.522, 39.6011, 39.6012, 39.6013, 39.621, 39.701, 39.806, and 39.811 of the Florida Statutes.

IX. Additional Information:**A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

CS by Children, Families, and Elder Affairs on January 29, 2018:

The amendment does the following:

- Makes a number changes to ch. 39, relating to dependency proceedings for children, to improve coordination and communication among parties in dependency

¹⁹ The Department of Children and Families, 2018 Agency Legislative Bill analysis, SB 1650. January 23, 2018.

proceedings and add accountability measures to remove barriers to, and expedite permanency for, abused and neglected children.

- Revises grounds for termination of parental rights, changes notice to parents regarding these grounds, limits the continuances available, expedites service referrals, and increases the frequency of hearings.
- Adds the requirement that a parent notify the parties or the court of barriers to compliance with a case plan task soon after discovering the barrier. If a parent fails to do so, he or she cannot cite the barrier as a reason for noncompliance when the court is considering termination of his or her parental rights. Once notified of the barrier, DCF must provide parents with strategies to overcome them.
- Requires the department to make service referrals sooner and increase reporting to the court on case progress. It limits continuances by the court's own motion and requires more frequent permanency hearings after the child has been in out-of-home care for 12 months but has not achieved permanency.

B. Amendments:

None.