

**PRESS RELEASE**

**July 7, 2005**

James Roger Brown  
Director  
THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER  
P.O. Box 2075  
North Little Rock, AR 72115-2075  
thesociologist@earthlink.net  
(501) 374-1788

**EMERGENCY NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION  
SYSTEM ORGANIZED CRIME ALERT**

**CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES, MENTAL HEALTH, AND SOCIAL WORK  
ORGANIZED CRIME OPERATING IN THE CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM ARE SET  
TO FURTHER CONSOLIDATE CONTROL OF THE UNITED STATES CHILD  
PROTECTION SYSTEM**

**[With 3 Exhibits]**

**SUBJECT: THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER IS ISSUING AN EMERGENCY NATIONAL  
CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM ORGANIZED CRIME ALERT AS A SUPPLEMENT TO  
THE 2005 NATIONAL ADVISORY ON ORGANIZED CRIME IN THE CHILD  
PROTECTION SYSTEM**

(<http://www.thesociologycenter.com/GeneralBibliography/NationalAdvisory2005.pdf>)

**Exhibit 1**

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges has established national judicial policy recommendations for State Juvenile and Family Court Judges that include maximizing State child protection system federal fund claims as a factor in judicial decisions to place children in State custody. Several specific references to “**as required to be eligible for federal matching funds**” occur in *RESOURCE GUIDELINES: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse & Neglect Cases* as a factor justifying the removal of children from parental custody and placing children in State custody. This emphasis on a blatant financial incentive for removing children from their homes occurs despite warnings against the dangerous corrupting influence of the desire to obtain federal funds contained in the very same *RESOURCE GUIDELINES*.

**RESOURCE GUIDELINES  
Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse & Neglect Cases**

Authored by the Publication Development Committee

Victims of Child Abuse Project  
Honorable David E. Grossmann, Chairman  
Spring 1995

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges  
Louis W. McHardy, Executive Director  
University of Nevada, Reno

Approved by National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges  
Officers and Board of Trustees  
January 1995

<http://www.ncjfcj.org/images/stories/dept/ppcd/pdf/resguide.pdf>

Page 11

**B. Purpose of Guidelines**

The purpose of these resource guidelines is to set forth the essential elements of properly conducted court hearings. The guidelines describe the requirements of juvenile and family courts in fulfilling the role now placed upon them by federal and state laws. These guidelines also describe how court calendars can be efficiently managed to achieve efficiency and avoid delays; explain the court staffing and organization necessary to make the judicial process run smoothly; and clarify costs associated with such reforms. **These guidelines are meant to influence future administrative and funding decisions concerning juvenile and family courts.** They are intended to help correct the gaping discrepancies that presently exist between legislative demands and judicial resources for child abuse and neglect cases.

Page 40

**G. The Court's Written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law at the Preliminary Protective Hearing Should:**

- Be written in easily understandable language which allows the parents and all parties to fully understand the court's order.

**If child is placed outside the home:**

- Describe who is to have custody and where child is to be placed;
- Specify why continuation of child in the home would be contrary to the child's welfare (**as required to be eligible for federal matching funds**);  
**[Red text emphasis added. JRB]**
- Specify whether reasonable efforts have been made to prevent placement (including a brief description of what services, if any, were provided and why placement is necessary);
- Specify the terms of visitation.

**Whether or not the child is returned home:**

- Provide further directions to the parties such as those governing future parental conduct and any agency services to the child and parent agreed upon prior to adjudication.
- Set date and time of the next hearing.

Page 44

**The court's written findings of fact and conclusions of law at the preliminary protective hearing should:**

- Be written in easily understandable language which allows the parents and all parties to fully understand the court's order.

**If child is placed outside the home:**

- Describe who is to have custody and where child is to be placed;
- Specify why continuation of child in the home would be contrary to the child's welfare  
(as required to be eligible for federal matching funds); **[Red text emphasis added. JRB]**
- Specify whether reasonable efforts have been made to prevent placement (including a brief description of what services, if any, were provided and why placement is necessary);
- Specify the terms of visitation.

**Whether or not the child is returned home:**

- Provide further directions to the parties such as those governing future parental conduct and any agency services to the child and parent agreed upon prior to adjudication.
- Set date and time of next hearing.

Page 108

**The court's written findings of fact and conclusions of law at the preliminary protective hearing should:**

Be written in easily understandable language which allows the parents and all parties to fully understand the court's order.

**If child is placed outside the home:**

- Describe who is to have custody and where child is to be placed;
- Specify why continuation of child in the home would be contrary to the child's welfare (as required to be eligible for federal matching funds); **[Red text emphasis added. JRB]**
- Specify whether reasonable efforts have been made to prevent placement (including a brief description of what services, if any, were provided and why placement is necessary);
- Specify the terms of visitation.

**Whether or not the child is returned home:**

- Provide further directions to the parties such as those governing future parental conduct and any agency services to the child and parent agreed upon prior to adjudication.
- Set date and time of next hearing.

#### **APPENDIX C, Page 139**

#### **Improving Implementation of the Federal Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980**

By Judge Leonard P. Edwards

(Paragraph 2)

This article examines the implementation of the Act and the reasons why it is not working as well as it might. It offers technical assistance to judges, court administrators, social service agencies, attorneys and other interested persons regarding the Act's implementation. It focuses upon the judicial oversight of abused and neglected children when they are removed from parental custody. The premises of this paper are that many social service agencies do not effectively deliver preventive and reunification services to families, that juvenile court oversight of social service delivery has been ineffective or nonexistent, and that many juvenile courts do not ensure that children in out-of-home care attain a permanent home in a timely fashion. **As a result, many state child welfare systems do not serve children and families well, and most states risk losing federal funding for social services. [Red text emphasis added. JRB]** This paper concludes with recommendations on how a strong judiciary and specialized training can improve implementation of the Act and ensure that it operates as Congress intended.

#### **Appendix C, Page 141**

**The major tenets of the Act and of the state implementing legislation are as follows:**

1. To qualify for federal funding, the state must prepare a state plan describing the services it will provide to prevent children's removal from parental custody and to reunite child and parents after removal. The plan must include a provision that the social service agency will make foster care maintenance payments in accordance with section 472 of the Act.

Note 13, page 158

13. Congress anticipated this response from the courts, but concluded that the judiciary would take the newly-created responsibility seriously. Child Welfare Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-272, Legislative History (U.S. Congress, Washington D.C.) 1980, at 1465. The committee is aware of allegations that the judicial determination requirement can become a mere pro forma exercise in paper shuffling to obtain federal funding. While this could occur in some instances, the committee is unwilling to accept as a general proposition that the judiciaries of the states would so lightly treat a responsibility placed upon them by federal statute for the protection of children. *Id.*

**Appendix C, Page 142**

*The committee feels the elimination of the requirement for judicial determinations would be directly contrary to the purposes of the legislation in that it would move in the direction of providing additional incentives for States to choose foster care placements over the more difficult task of returning children to their own homes or placing them in adoptive homes. Moreover, such a change would eliminate an important safeguard against inappropriate agency action.*

The federal government's role under the Act is to ensure compliance by auditing court records. **Where the social service agency complies with the Act and the court records compliance with the correct findings and orders, the federal government will not penalize the state by demanding that federal funding be returned. If, however, the court records do not reflect compliance with the federal law, the state will be required to return some of the federal monies that have been provided. [Red text emphasis added. JRB]**

**Appendix C, Page 143**

An attorney representing children in dependency actions in Pittsburgh, Pa. wrote of her inability to meet the demands of increasing caseloads:

*This afternoon I am in the midst of a paper mountain, trying to acquire information about the 120 plus children I will represent in over 55 hearings this Friday before my county's Juvenile Court. I have been a lawyer with Child Advocacy for over ten years, have seen caseloads triple and funding decrease, so that my four full-time colleagues and myself have responsibility for more than 1100 cases each.*

**[IMPORTANT NOTE: The following citation may directly explain the source of the judicial instructions on how to tailor court orders and rulings to maximize child protection system federal funds written into the CALIFORNIA JUDGES BENCHGUIDES: BENCHGUIDE 200: Juvenile Dependency Initial or Detention Hearing. See following California Benchguide cites in Exhibit 2.]**

**Appendix C, Page 148-149**

California is currently experimenting with a training model designed to address deficiencies in the federal Act's implementation. The State Department of Social Services has agreed to include funding for judicial training in its budget. Leaders from the judiciary and social services agencies will hire and train several persons to serve as local experts in implementing the Act. These persons will work under the auspices of the California Judicial Council. They will visit every judicial officer in the state who hears juvenile dependency cases to conduct an on-site training session regarding the Act. The training will include the courtroom clerk, the court officer from the social service agency, and anyone else critical to the implementation of the law. The trainers will explain the federal Act, its philosophy and main provisions, the necessity for judicial oversight of social service delivery, and the ways in which court orders must be to offer

technical assistance to the court and staff concerning all aspects of the Act's implementation. To overcome possible reluctance from judges to participate, the Judicial Council will introduce and promote this training. If necessary, other judges will accompany the trainers. A unique aspect of this training is that it will be financed principally by federal funding provided under federal regulations which permit state and local training for foster care and adoption assistance under Title IV-E. Such training will also be extended to attorneys and all others who appear on behalf of children, parents, and the social service agency. Attorneys who appear in these proceedings must understand the Act and address the issues on which the court must make findings pursuant to it. Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASAs) and guardians ad litem also must be trained in the law so they can assist the court by commenting on those issues in their court reports.

Correct implementation of the Act is vitally important to all participants in dependency cases. If the court fails to make or incorrectly records the required findings, the social service agency could lose valuable resources and children and families may suffer unnecessarily lengthy or needless separations. One means to provide education for all members of the legal and social service community is to have a local or statewide conference devoted to fully implementing the Act. California has developed a useful model with its annual Beyond the Bench Conference. Co-sponsored by the Juvenile Court Judges of California, the State Department of Social Services, and the County Welfare Directors, this conference brings together all major participants in the dependency process for two days each year. Participants help plan the conference agenda so that issues are examined on an interdisciplinary basis. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges has participated in each conference, bringing both technical assistance and nationally known speakers to enrich the proceedings. The result has been an improved child welfare system in which the participants have a better working relationship with one another, a more complete appreciation of the federal law, and an understanding of each participant's role.

**Appendix C, Page 158, Note 15**

15. Two commentators summarize the barriers facing judicial oversight:

*[T]he authority of judges in these matters is often limited; they do not have the power to order the agency to provide services to an individual. In some states, the courts will make a positive "reasonable efforts" determination regardless of agency efforts in order to ensure federal funding. Judges are not trained in matters over which the juvenile court has jurisdiction and, because of rotation schedules, remain in the assignment for a short period of time. Consequently, they do not acquire the experience needed to handle these sensitive cases. While judges in some localities make a good faith effort to determine whether adequate services have been offered to the family, in many localities a positive finding is merely a matter of checking a box on a preprinted form.*

Susan Goodman and Joan Hurley, *Reasonable Efforts: Who Decides What's Reasonable?* (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington,

D.C.) 1993, at 8.

**Appendix C**, Note 110, Page 162

110. In many jurisdictions the trial judge must merely check a box on a preprinted court form to indicate that reasonable efforts were provided in the case. Shotton, *supra* end. 3. In some other jurisdictions the court order forms simply include a preprinted statement that reasonable efforts were made, thus making the finding possible without the judge's even checking a box. *Id.*, at 227. In some states, courts and agencies have taken a cynical approach, seeking to assure receipt of federal funding without the court taking a meaningful look at reasonable efforts. In such states, words indicating the agency has made reasonable efforts are preprinted into court order forms used when removal of a child is authorized, and laws are structured so a judge cannot authorize a foster placement without a positive finding of reasonable efforts. Hardin, *supra* end. 7, at 54

## **Exhibit 2**

The following citations from *CALIFORNIA JUDGES BENCHGUIDES: BENCHGUIDE 200* demonstrate that the policy recommendations of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges emphasizing maximizing State federal fund claims as one of the justifications for placing children in State custody are being implemented in State Juvenile and Family Courts.

**CALIFORNIA JUDGES BENCHGUIDES**  
**BENCHGUIDE 200**  
**Juvenile Dependency Initial or Detention Hearing**  
2004  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
Education Division  
Center for Judicial Education and Research

**[NOTE: The following text was retyped from a downloaded PDF document which apparently had disabled text block copy. Any differences between the original text and the retyped text below is unintentional. James Roger Brown]**

Page 100-13 CALIFORNIA JUDGES BENCHGUIDES: BENCHGUIDE 200: Juvenile Dependency Initial or Detention Hearing

“If the case is continued under Welf & I C §322 or for any other reason, the court must order the child's release or find that remaining in the parent or guardian's home is contrary to the child's welfare. Welf & I C §319(c); Cal Rules of Ct 1422(c)(2), 1443(a). The court may enter the "contrary to the child's welfare" finding on a temporary basis without prejudice and may reevaluate it at the continued detention hearing. Cal Rules of Ct 1442(c)(2), 1433(a).

- ☛ JUDICIAL TIP: Failure to make this finding may cause permanent loss of **federal funding** for foster care. See discussion of other required findings in §100.36. The court may make this a temporary finding pending the continued detention hearing."

Page 100-38 CALIFORNIA JUDGES BENCHGUIDES: BENCHGUIDE 200

"Whether the child is released or detained, the court must make one of the following reasonable efforts findings concerning efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal (see Cal Rules of Ct 1446(c)):

- (1) Reasonable efforts have been made, or
- (2) Reasonable efforts have not been made.

- ☛ JUDICIAL TIPS:

For a county to be eligible for Title IV-E **federal foster care funding**, the judge must have made specified reasonable efforts findings. See 45 CFR §1356.21(b)(2)(ii). Therefore, it is strongly advised that the court find that "reasonable efforts to prevent removal were made" in a situation in which it might previously have found that the failure to make efforts was reasonable or that reasonable efforts were excused. If the court determines that DSS's concern for the child's safety was a valid basis for not providing services to prevent or eliminate the need for removal, it may find that the level of effort was reasonable, and should thus make a finding that reasonable efforts were made.

Some judges require DSS workers to file a separate declaration of reasonable efforts at each stage of the proceedings. However, in many counties, the social worker's statement of efforts is included within the normal DSS reports.

If the court orders the child detained, the court must also make the following findings in order **to ensure eligibility for Title IV-E funding**:

Continuance in the home of the parent or guardian would be contrary to the child's welfare. Welf & I C §319(b); Cal Rules of Ct 1445(a)(2), 1446(a)(2). See also 42 USC §672(a)(1).

Temporary placement and care are vested with the child welfare agency pending disposition or further order for the court. Welf & I C §319(e); Cal Rules of Ct 1446(d). See also 42 USC §672(a)(2)."

### **Exhibit 3**

In 2004 the Pew Charitable Trusts developed "a set of recommendations for improving practice in handling of child abuse and neglect cases, largely drawn from



NCJFCJ's 1995 benchbook *RESOURCE GUIDELINES: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases.*" (See Pew web site <http://pewfostercare.org/> for report and see Exhibit 1) These recommendations became the basis for the Fostering Results Project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts.

June 22, 2005 the following announcement was made in Washington, D.C.:

<http://releases.usnewswire.com/GetRelease.asp?id=49223>

Nation's Leading Judicial Organizations Partner to Improve Foster Care, Eliminate Court Delays Which Sentence Children to Foster Care Drift; New Curriculum Sets Goal of Reducing the Time Children Spend in Foster Care Before Finding Safe, Permanent Homes

6/22/2005 10:00:00 AM

To: National Desk

Contact: Gina Russo, 202-421-3578 (cell) or Linda Lenzini, 217-415-9514 (cell), both for Fostering Results

WASHINGTON, June 22 /U.S. Newswire/ -- A groundbreaking new curriculum developed by the nation's leading judicial organizations identifies court delays as a key factor that prolongs children's time in foster care. Released today at an event sponsored by the national, nonpartisan Fostering Results at the Washington, D.C. Family Court, the "National Curriculum" reveals that "despite many efforts, children remain too long in foster care during the time that their cases are pending in court."

The "National Curriculum for Caseload Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care" was inspired by a desire to recognize and eliminate the delays that often plague child welfare cases. These delays – caused by everything from insufficient information collection, to postponement of hearings because all parties are not present, to miscommunication between parties – can result in children lingering in foster care "limbo," drifting from foster home to foster home without achieving safety and permanence.

"As a former judge, I am all too aware of the adverse effects of these delays on children in foster care," said Nancy Salyers, co-director of Fostering Results and former Presiding Judge of the Cook County (Ill.) Juvenile Court's Child Protection Division. "Children and families pay the price when courts lack needed tools and resources."

Leading national judicial organizations partnered to create the curriculum, including: The ABA Center on Children and the Law, American Public Human Services Association, Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts, Conference of State Court Administrators, Fostering Results, The Judicial Education

Reference, Information and Technical Transfer Project, The Justice Management Institute, National Center for State Courts, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National Association of Council for Children, New York Administrative Office of the Courts, the Ohio Administrative Office of the Courts and the Texas Office of Court Administration.

"The goal of the 'National Curriculum' is to improve the court system's ability to oversee the movement of foster care cases to shorten the time needed for children to reach permanent placement," stated Douglas Somerlot, executive vice president of the The Justice Management Institute and "Curriculum" co-author.

The curriculum emphasizes the need for state courts and child welfare agencies to work together to improve outcomes for children. It is designed to foster collaboration between these key entities.

"The curriculum is a readily available proven method for teaming court and agency personnel so that they can work together to identify shared goals, areas of delay and then devise a specific strategy for collaboration that will work in their community," stated Maureen Conner, executive director of the Judicial Education Reference, Information and Technical Transfer Project.

"Ensuring safe, timely permanency for children in foster care depends on the collection and sharing of sufficient and reliable information so that judges can make the best and most informed decisions for the children before them," stated Anita Light, director of the National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators, American Public Human Services Association.

Child welfare agencies' personnel and judges are the "gatekeepers" of the foster care system and must work together to ensure improved outcomes for children in care.

"Courts and child welfare agencies share responsibility for protecting children and mending families. Without active collaboration between the two, both can be hindered in fulfilling these critical responsibilities," cautioned Howard Davidson, director of the ABA Center on Children and the Law. The ABA Center on Children and the Law and Fostering Results issued "Improving Outcomes Together," a companion to the curriculum which includes real-life examples of successful collaboration in states including Florida, Ohio, Minnesota, California, Kentucky, Utah, Washington, Arizona, Kansas, Massachusetts and others. The paper was authored by Cecilia Fiermonte of the ABA Center and Nancy Salyers of Fostering Results.

Development of the curriculum was funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts as a part of its commitment to advancing policy solutions to ensure children do not languish in foster care. "This new innovative curriculum reflects many of the

nation's leading judicial organizations resolve to remedying delays in the courts that oversee foster care cases," said Maureen K. Byrnes, director, Policy Initiatives and the Health and Human Services Program at The Pew Charitable Trusts. "It builds on the recommendations of the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care and provides useful guidance to decision makers in helping children move from foster care to safe, permanent homes in a timely manner."

Said Mary Mentaberry, executive director of the National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges, "Collaboration can result in real change for children in terms of the amount of time they spend in foster care. The National Curriculum can be a first step in helping effect this change and improve the lives of children in foster care."

---

EDITOR'S NOTE: To download the "National Curriculum," please visit The Judicial Education Reference, Information and Technical Transfer (JERITT) Project's Web site: <http://jeritt.msu.edu>.

-----

#### ABOUT FOSTERING RESULTS

Fostering Results is a national, nonpartisan public education project to raise awareness of issues facing children in foster care. It is supported by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts to the Children and Family Research Center at the School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. For more information, please visit: <http://www.fosteringresults.org>.

<http://www.usnewswire.com/>

/© 2005 U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/”

The alleged intent of this *Curriculum* presented over 2.5 days is to resolve problems that cause delays in the resolution of foster care cases:

The "National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care" was inspired by a desire to recognize and eliminate the delays that often plague child welfare cases. These delays – caused by everything from insufficient information collection, to postponement of hearings because all parties are not present, to miscommunication between parties – can result in children lingering in foster care "limbo," drifting from foster home to foster home without achieving safety and permanence.

As has been documented in evidence books submitted to Congress, the problems which keep children “in foster care “limbo”” are the use of science fraud by mental health and social work practitioner used as “experts” in the child protection system, systematic falsification of evidence and records by caseworkers, and organized crime feeding off the numerous federal fund programs connected to the child protection system. (For details see the following Congressional Evidence Books: (1) COMPENDIUM OF DOCUMENTATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME METHODS AND PROCEDURES INTEGRATED INTO STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES THROUGH STATE AND FEDERAL CHILD PROTECTION, MENTAL HEALTH, AND SOCIAL WORK SYSTEMS. James Roger Brown (File size 3.6 MB) <http://www.thesociologycenter.com/EvidenceBooks/COMPENDIUM.pdf>; (2) Assembled information regarding Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder fraud. Fred A. Baughman Jr., MD. (File size 8.0 MB) <http://www.thesociologycenter.com/EvidenceBooks/FredBaughman.pdf>.

Nowhere in the entire 2.5 day *Curriculum* agenda is there a single item about improving the efficiency of the foster care system by eliminating science fraud, eliminating systematic falsification of evidence and records by caseworkers, or shutting down organized crime in the child protection system. There is also no evidence of screening procedures to prevent criminals operating in the child protection system from participating in any of these planned *Curriculum* events.

There is one spine chilling item on the curriculum agenda that ties all of these foster care system problems together in the worst possible way. At 3:30 PM on day two of the curriculum there is Small Group Exercise 7:

#### ANALYZING FACTORS AFFECTING CHANGE AND INITIAL TASK IDENTIFICATION

##### Learning Objectives:

By the end of this session the attendees will

Know the likely supporters and adversaries of the changes that will be made by the improvement plan

Develop strategies for utilizing the supporters and neutralizing or converting the adversaries

##### Process:

The teams will complete an exercise that identifies those agencies, entities, and individuals who will support or oppose the changes and rate the strength of the proponents and opponents. Based on the assessment the team will begin brainstorming how to utilize the supporters and neutralize the adversaries.

The majority of any ten people selected at random from the street will probably be able to identify in short order that the major tools for “neutralizing or converting enemies” available to child protection system workers, prosecutors, and juvenile or family court judges will center around accusing individuals of being unfit parents, accusing individuals of crimes against their children, prosecuting them for being unfit parents or for committing crimes against their children, and finding them guilty of crimes against their children or issuing court orders terminating their parental rights.

Since this *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* does nothing to address the core problems of science fraud, systematic evidence and records falsification, and organized crime that are the actual major reasons the foster care system fails, the only purpose it will serve is as a tool for the organized criminals to further consolidate their control of the entire child protection system.

For those who think organized crime can not gain control of the child protection system of a civilized Western Nation, we have the example of the Swiss *Verdingkinder* Scandal. The Swiss were forced to close down their *Verdingkinder* child protection system in 1950, after nearly one hundred years of operation, because it had become a child trafficking operation that auctioned off children at government sponsored sales for child slave labor on farms and in factories. The survivors of the Swiss *Verdingkinder* scandal have the exact same lack of social and survival skills as children who currently age out of the United States foster care system.

The collective failure of the massive list of alleged professionals involved to address *ANYWHERE* in the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* the major problems of mental health and social work science fraud, systematic evidence and record falsification by caseworkers, and the child protection system organized crime problem rises to the level of gross negligence and gross incompetence, **and that only if they are honest**. The worst possible explanation for this glaring failure is that the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* was designed to allow organized crime to further consolidate control of entire United States child protection system and collectively “Develop strategies for utilizing the supporters and neutralizing or converting the adversaries.” Someone on this list of developers should come forward and explain which of the three possible explanations for this failure is the correct one.

It is as if the Rilya Wilson case never happened. Apparently, no one involved in development this *Curriculum* learned anything from the Rilya Wilson case. No one has yet found Rilya Wilson because her case records and reports to the court were falsified for eighteen months. You are what you do. The only interest demonstrated by the Florida State CPS worker was in using a missing child to continue justifying federal funding claims. In the Rilya Wilson case that is *at least* two crimes.

Corruption in. Corruption out. If maximizing federal funding is the one outcome

goal common to caseworkers, attorneys, prosecutors, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and judges at each step a child takes through the system, then it will also be a unifying outcome goal as they participate in the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care*.

There is no criteria based definition of the best interest of the child used at the State or Federal level, so there is no objective standard to determine if a child benefits or is harmed at any point through the system. When every participant is able to believe their actions benefit children without any reality check, the feel good factor is going to be how much money did I generate.

This is an excellent example of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's insight that for men to do evil they must first convince themselves they are doing good. There is universal interest in maximizing federal fund income to "improve" delivery of services to children in foster care and absolutely zero interest in ending science fraud, systematic evidence and records falsification, and organized crime which cause the foster care system to fail.

This is the ancient conflict of serving two masters. You can not simultaneously meet the goals of minimizing the time children spend in foster care and maximizing the time children spend in foster care to maximize federal fund claims. An additional self-defeating contrary financial interest to the goal of minimizing time a child spends in foster care is that a child who never enters foster care generates no federal fund claims. Children only serve the shared financial interest to maximize federal funds if they are in foster care generating federal fund claims for services delivered regardless of whether or not the child ever actually needed help. No one involved seems to be able to deal with the answer to the question "What services does this child Need?" being "none."

The vital importance of accurate information to make decisions based in the reality of a child's situation is know to the "experts" who collaborated to create the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care*. The Children and Family Research Center produced the report *Improving Outcomes Together: Court and Child Welfare Collaboration*. This report contains many references recognizing the necessity of having accurate and complete information available to judges who must decide custody and other issues that directly affect the life of a child. (References to "information" are highlighted in red.)

"This paper explores the ways in which juvenile and family courts and child welfare agencies across the country are sharing data and **information**, and collaborating with one another outside the courtroom in order to improve outcomes for the children in their care. (*Fostering Results*, p. 1)

"According to Judge Nancy Salyers, former Presiding Judge of the Cook County Juvenile Court's Child Protection Division and co-director of

Fostering Results, a public education and outreach project of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign supported by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Collaboration between courts and agencies is in the best interests of the child for whom they share responsibility. When courts and child welfare agencies work together, share **information**, and engage in activities like cross-training, children can attain the safety, security and permanence they need." (*Fostering Results*, p. 2)

"Several key recommendations highlight the need for effective collaboration in order to promote the protection and well being of children. Specifically, the Commission recommends:

- That the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) require that the state IV-E plans, program improvement plans, and Court Improvement plans demonstrate effective collaboration;
- HHS should require states to establish state commissions on children in foster care, ideally co-directed by the each state's child welfare agency director and Chief Justice;
- That Congress appropriate \$10 million to train court personnel – a portion of which should be used for joint training of child welfare agency staff and court personnel;
- That courts and agencies at the local and state levels collaborate and plan for the collection and sharing of all relevant data and **information** that can aid in making better decisions and creating better outcomes for children." (*Fostering Results*, p. 2-3)

**"Yet without cooperation and collaboration, dependency courts cannot fulfill their responsibilities. They cannot hold timely and meaningful permanency hearings unless the agency provides complete, accurate, timely information.** Courts must recognize the importance of thorough judicial findings, providers must gather necessary **information**, and agencies must devise strategies to provide the **information** in a useful format and in a timely manner. Thus, no one party holds the key to effective permanency planning hearings.

According to Nancy Salyers of Fostering Results, **"Only when judges have as much information as possible about the child before them, their wants and needs, can we ensure that children in foster care can have the safe, permanent and loving families that they need. Collecting and sharing this information is a responsibility that courts should undertake with child welfare agencies."** (*Fostering Results*, p. 4)

Regardless of the amount collaboration, coordination, and sharing, false information produced by science fraud, evidence and records falsification, and organized crime is absolutely worthless when deciding custody and other issues that can destroy a child's life and end the relationship with the child's natural parents.

The is no indication that any of the thirty (30) organizations listed on the JERITT Project web site as co-developers of the *National Curriculum* or as partners on the Fostering Results web site at any time addressed science fraud, systematic evidence and records falsification, or child protection system organized crime as sources of error or corruption contaminating information relied upon by judges to make custody and other child related decisions. There are only three possible explanations for this failure, gross negligence, gross incompetence, and complicity.

The major documents describing the development and operation of *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* can be accessed at the JERITT web page <http://jeritt.msu.edu/whatsnew.asp>. The key document links are all labeled "Click."

The organizations listed as contributing to developed of the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* are:

1. ABA Center on Children and the Law at:  
<http://www.abanet.org/child/home.html>  
E-mail: [ctrchildlaw@abanet.org](mailto:ctrchildlaw@abanet.org)  
Howard A. Davidson, J.D. Director  
ABA Center on Children and the Law  
740 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 662-1720  
Fax: (202) 662-1755

2. American Public Human Services Association at:  
<http://www.aphsa.org/home/news.asp>  
E-mail Form Page: <http://www.aphsa.org/Home/Contact.asp>  
APHSA  
810 First Street, N.E.  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20002  
Phone: (202) 682-0100  
Fax: (202) 289-6555

3. Arizona Supreme Court's Dependent Children's Services Division at:  
<http://www.supreme.state.az.us/dcsd>  
E-mail: [casa@supreme.sp.state.az.us](mailto:casa@supreme.sp.state.az.us)  
William Stanton, Director  
Arizona Supreme Court  
Dependent Children's Services Division  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Phone: (602) 542-9400

4. Center for Families, Children and the Courts at:



<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/>  
E-mail: [cfcc@jud.ca.gov](mailto:cfcc@jud.ca.gov)  
The Judicial Council  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Ave., 6th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
Phone (415) 865-7739  
Fax (415) 865-7217

5. Fostering Results at: <http://www.fosteringresults.org/>  
Judge Nancy S. Salyers, Co-Director  
E-mail: [nsalyers@uiuc.edu](mailto:nsalyers@uiuc.edu)  
Phone: 312-641-2505 ext. 37  
Mark Testa, Ph.D., Co-Director  
E-mail: [mtesta@uiuc.edu](mailto:mtesta@uiuc.edu)  
Phone: 312-641-2505 ext. 16  
Fostering Results  
Children & Family Research Center  
2 N. LaSalle, Suite 1700  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Phone: (312) 641-2505  
Fax: (312) 641-2337  
(Also see "FOSTERING RESULTS PARTNERS" list below or at  
<http://www.fosteringresults.org/results/partners.htm>)

6. JERITT Project at: <http://jeritt.msu.edu>.  
Maureen E. Conner, Ph.D.  
Executive Director  
JERITT Project  
Michigan State University  
1407 South Harrison, Suite 332  
Nisbet Building  
East Lansing, MI 48823-5239  
Phone: (517) 353.8603  
Fax: (517) 432.3965  
E-mail: [connerm@msu.edu](mailto:connerm@msu.edu)

The JERITT Project  
Judicial Education Reference, Information and Technical Transfer Project  
Michigan State University  
Suite 330 Nisbet  
1407 S. Harrison  
East Lansing, MI 48823-5239  
Phone: (517) 353.8603  
Fax: (517) 432.3965  
E-mail: [jeritt@ssc.msu.edu](mailto:jeritt@ssc.msu.edu)

7. Justice Management Institute at: <http://www.jmijustice.org/> (All my efforts to access this web site generated an Alert that "The connection was rejected. . .")

The Justice Management Institute  
1900 Grant Street, Suite 630  
Denver, CO 80203-4306  
Phone: 303/831-7564  
Fax: 303/831-4564  
Web Site: <http://www.jmijustice.org>

Contact Person: Mr. Douglas Somerlot  
Executive Vice President  
937 Stony Creek Lane  
Yorkville, IL 60560-9026  
Phone: 630/730-0850  
Fax: 630/385-2082  
E-mail: [dsomerlot@jmijustice.org](mailto:dsomerlot@jmijustice.org)

8. National Association of Council for Children at:  
<http://www.naccchildlaw.org/>

Marvin Ventrell, JD  
President/CEO  
E-mail: [ventrell.marvin@tchden.org](mailto:ventrell.marvin@tchden.org)  
National Association of Counsel for Children  
1825 Marion Street  
Suite 242  
Denver, CO 80218  
E-mail: [advocate@NACCchildlaw.org](mailto:advocate@NACCchildlaw.org)  
Phone: (888) 828-6222

9. National Center for State Courts at: <http://www.ncsconline.org>

Kay Farley  
NCSC Government Relations Director  
Phone (703) 841-5601  
Richard Van Duizend  
Principal Court Management Consultant  
National Center for State Courts  
2425 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 350  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(800) 532-0204

10. National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges at:

<http://www.ncjfcj.org/>  
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges  
P.O. Box 8970  
Reno, NV 89507

E-mail: [staff@ncjfcj.org](mailto:staff@ncjfcj.org)  
Phone: (775) 784-6012  
Fax: (775) 784-6628

The organizations listed as “FOSTERING RESULTS STATE AND NATIONAL PARTNERS” are:

## FOSTERING RESULTS STATE AND NATIONAL PARTNERS

### **STATE PARTNERS**

1. Arizona Children's Action Alliance at:  
<http://www.azchildren.org/caa/welcome.asp>  
Carol Kamin, Ph.D.  
President/CEO  
Children's Action Alliance  
4001 North Third Street, Suite 160  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
E-mail: [ckamin@azchildren.org](mailto:ckamin@azchildren.org)  
Phone: (602) 266-0707

2. The Children's Law Center of Los Angeles at: <http://www.clcla.org>  
Miriam Aroni Krinsky  
Executive Director  
Children's Law Center of Los Angeles  
201 Centre Plaza Drive, Suite 10  
Monterey Park, CA 91754-2178  
E-mail: [krinskym@clcla.org](mailto:krinskym@clcla.org)  
Phone: (323) 980-1700  
Fax: (323) 980-1708

3. County Welfare Directors Association of California at:  
<http://www.cwda.org/>  
Frank J. Mecca  
Executive Director  
E-mail: [fmecca@cwda.org](mailto:fmecca@cwda.org)  
925 L Street, Suite 350  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 443-1749  
Fax: (916) 443-3202

4. Connecticut Voices for Children at: <http://www.ctkidslink.org/>  
Shelley Geballe, J.D., M.P.H.  
President  
E-mail: [Yalie4567@aol.com](mailto:Yalie4567@aol.com)  
Connecticut Voices for Children  
33 Whitney Ave

New Haven CT 06510  
E-mail: [voices@ctkidslink.org](mailto:voices@ctkidslink.org)  
Phone: (203) 498-4240  
Fax: (203) 498-4242

5. Iowa Child Advocacy Board at:  
<http://www.state.ia.us/government/dia/CAB.html>  
Jerry R. Foxhoven, Administrator  
E-mail: [jfoxhoven@dia.state.ia.us](mailto:jfoxhoven@dia.state.ia.us)  
Child Advocacy Board  
Iowa Department of Inspections and Appeals  
Lucas State Office Building  
321 East 12th Street  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0083  
Phone: (515) 242-6392

6. Middleton Center for Children's Rights (Iowa) at:  
<http://www.middleton.drake.edu/>  
Joan & Lyle Middleton Center for Children's Rights  
Drake University Law School  
2400 University Avenue  
Des Moines, IA 50311-4505  
Phone: (800) 443-7253 ext. 2824 or (515) 271-3851

7. Citizens for Missouri's Children at: <http://www.mokids.org/>  
M. Elizabeth Griffin  
Executive Director  
Citizens for Missouri's Children  
One Campbell Plaza, Suite 2A  
St. Louis, MO 63139  
E-mail: [cmchild@mokids.org](mailto:cmchild@mokids.org)  
Phone: 314-647-2003  
Fax: 314-644-5437  
[cmchild@mokids.org](mailto:cmchild@mokids.org)

8. Citizens' Committee for Children of New York at: <http://www.kfny.org/>  
Heidi Stamas, Chairman  
(212) 673-1800 ext. 24  
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.  
105 East 22 Street  
New York, NY 10010  
E-mail: [info@cccnewyork.org](mailto:info@cccnewyork.org)  
Phone: (212) 673-1800  
Fax: (212) 979-5063

9. Public Children Services Association of Ohio at: <http://www.pcsao.org/>

Crystal Ward Allen  
Executive Director  
E-mail: pcsaocrystal@sbcglobal.net  
The Public Children Services Association of Ohio  
510 E. Mound Street, Suite 200  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
E-mail: pcsao@sbcglobal.net  
Tel: (614) 224-5802  
Fax: (614) 228-5150

10. Texas CASA at: <http://www.texascasa.org>  
Texas CASA  
1145 West 5th St., Suite 300  
Austin, Texas 78703  
Phone: 1-877-894-2272  
Local: (512) 473-2627  
Fax: (512) 473-8271  
Email: [txcasa@texascasa.org](mailto:txcasa@texascasa.org)

11. Center for Public Policy Priorities (Texas) at: <http://www.cppp.org>  
F. Scott McCown  
Executive Director  
E-mail: [mccown@cppp.org](mailto:mccown@cppp.org)  
Center for Public Policy Priorities  
900 Lydia Street  
Austin, TX 78702  
E-mail: [hutchison@cppp.org](mailto:hutchison@cppp.org)  
Phone: 512-320-0222  
Fax: 512-320-0227

12. The Child and Family Policy Center at the Vanderbilt Institute for  
Public Policy Studies (Tennessee) at:  
<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/VIPPS/C&FPC/>  
Debbie Miller  
Director  
The Child and Family Policy Center  
1207 18th Ave. S.  
Nashville, TN 37212  
E-mail: [debbie.miller@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:debbie.miller@vanderbilt.edu)

13. Wisconsin Association of Family & Children's Agencies at:  
<http://www.wafca.org>  
John Grace  
Executive Director  
E-mail: [jgrace@wafca.org](mailto:jgrace@wafca.org)  
131 West Wilson Street, Suite 901

Madison, WI 53703  
Phone: (608)257-5939  
Fax: (608) 257-6067

**NATIONAL PARTNERS**

1. American Public Human Services Association at: <http://www.aphsa.org/>

Jerry W. Friedman

Executive Director

APHSA

810 First Street, N.E.

Suite 500

Washington, DC 20002

E-mail Form Page: <http://www.aphsa.org/Home/Contact.asp>

Phone: (202) 682-0100

Fax: (202) 289-6555

2. Child Welfare League of America at: <http://www.cwla.org>

Shay Bilchik

President and CEO

Child Welfare League of America

440 First Street, NW, Third Floor

Washington, DC 20001-2085

E-mail Form Page: <http://www.cwla.org/cgi-bin/webassistance.htm>

Phone: (202) 638-2952

Fax: (202) 638-4004

3. Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research at:

<http://www.iaswresearch.org/>

Joan Levy Zlotnik, Ph.D., ACSW

Executive Director

Phone: (202) 336.8393

E-Mail: [jlziaswr@naswdc.org](mailto:jlziaswr@naswdc.org)

Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research

750 First Street, N.E.

Suite 700

Washington, DC 20002-4241

Phone: (202) 336.8385

Fax : (202) 336.8351

E-Mail: [iaswr@naswdc.org](mailto:iaswr@naswdc.org)

4. National CASA at: <http://www.nationalcasa.org/index-1.htm>

National CASA Association

100 W. Harrison - North Tower Suite 500

Seattle WA 98119

E-mail: [inquiry@nationalcasa.org](mailto:inquiry@nationalcasa.org)

Phone: (800) 628-3233

Fax: (206) 270-0078

5. National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges at:  
<http://www.ncjfcj.org/>  
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges  
P.O. Box 8970  
Reno, NV 89507  
E-mail: [staff@ncjfcj.org](mailto:staff@ncjfcj.org)  
Phone: (775) 784-6012  
Fax: (775) 784-6628

6. North American Council on Adoptable Children at:  
<http://www.nacac.org/>  
Joe Kroll  
Executive Director  
E-mail: [joekroll@aol.com](mailto:joekroll@aol.com)  
North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC)  
970 Raymond Avenue, Suite 106  
St. Paul, MN 55114  
E-mail: [info@nacac.org](mailto:info@nacac.org)  
Phone: (651) 644-3036  
Fax: (651) 644-9848  
e-mail: [info@nacac.org](mailto:info@nacac.org)

7. Voices for America's Children at: <http://www.childadvocacy.org/>  
Voices for America's Children  
1522 K Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1202  
E-mail: [voices@voicesforamericaschildren.org](mailto:voices@voicesforamericaschildren.org)  
Phone: (202) 289-0777  
Fax: (202) 289-0776

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PUBLIC**

Contact the thirty organizations listed above as contributors or partners in the *National Curriculum for Caseflow Management in Juvenile Dependency Cases Involving Foster Care* and ask them to revise the *Curriculum* to include in the 2.5 day “collaboration” of caseworkers, attorneys, prosecutors, judges and other attendees to: (1) develop methods for identifying and removing psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers who use science fraud on children and families involved in the foster care and child protection system; (2) develop methods for identifying and removing falsified records and evidence BEFORE they are placed before a judge to use in decision making; and (3) develop methods for identifying, arresting, prosecuting, and convicting organized criminals operating in the child protection, mental health, and social work systems.

James Roger Brown  
Director  
THE SOCIOLOGY CENTER  
(501) 374-1788  
[www.thesociologycenter.com](http://www.thesociologycenter.com)  
[thesociologist@earthlink.net](mailto:thesociologist@earthlink.net)