

GUIDELINES FOR CHILD PROTECTION MEDIATION

DRAFT FOR COMMENT

November 22, 2011

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Instructions for Comments

Thank you for your interest in the Child Protection Mediation (CPM) Guidelines. These Guidelines were developed by the Child Welfare Collaborative Decision Making Network (CWCDMN). The Network operates with the support and guidance of a number of organizations including the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC), the American Humane Association (AHA), and the Werner Institute of Creighton University. Over the last two years, a Workgroup of Child Protection mediation practitioners, program administrators, researchers and academicians, along with other contributing organizations including the National Center for State Courts, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the National Association of Counsel for Children, worked diligently to create guidelines that incorporate CPM practices throughout North America.

The Workgroup is soliciting comments and feedback from a broad range of individuals and organizations throughout North America. A comments period has been established. The Draft CPM Guidelines are available for comment through **January 24, 2012** on the **Association of Family and Conciliation Courts** website at: <http://afccnet.org/>

Those who wish to comment should follow the following instructions:

- While general comments are appreciated, the more specific you can be the better;
- Identify the page, section, and paragraph in which you have comments;
- State your comments clearly; if you use any outside references, please include the citation;
- Send comments to the following address: cpmguidelines@gmail.com
- Because of the number of comments anticipated, individual replies will be limited to those that require further discussion or clarification.

Once the comment period has concluded, the Workgroup will reconvene to review all comments submitted and will prepare a final draft of the Guidelines for submission to the AFCC Board of Directors for consideration of adoption at their Board meeting in June 2012.

Child Protection Mediation Guidelines Workgroup

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

The Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation were written and edited through the collaborative efforts of the following individuals:

Kelly Browe Olson
Associate Professor and Director of Clinical Programs
University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Bowen School of Law
Little Rock, AR

Cynthia Bryant, Clinical Professor
University of Texas, School of Law

Susan Butterwick, Director
Family Programs
Wayne Mediation Center
Dearborn, MI

Andrea Clarke, Senior Policy Analyst/Program Manager
Child Protection Mediation Program
Family Justice Services, Justice Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General, Province of British Columbia

Liz Dunn, Court Program Manager (ret.)
Families & Children's Bureau
Oakland, CA

Crystal (Soderman) Duarte, MPA
Model Court Liaison
National Counsel of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Judge Leonard Edwards (ret.)
Judge – in – Residence
California Administrative Office of the Courts

Gregory Firestone, Ph.D., Director
University of South Florida Conflict Resolution Collaborative

Catherine Friedman, Esq.
New York City Family Court Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinator
New York, NY

Marilou Giovannucci, Manager
Connecticut Judicial Branch

Karen Largent, Mediation and Facilitation Services Manager
Alaska Court System

Bernie Mayer, Ph.D
Professor, The Werner Institute
Creighton University School of Law
Omaha, NE

Lisa Merkel-Holguin, MSW, Director

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

System and Practice Advancements in Child Welfare
American Humane Association
Englewood, CO.

Cynthia Schuler, Esq.
Chief Executive Officer
Kids Central, Inc.
Ocala, FL

Susan Storcel, Director
Circuit Court of Cook County
Child Protection Mediation and Facilitation Program
Chicago, IL

Nancy Thoennes, Ph.D.
Center for Policy Research
Denver, CO

Section 1: Introduction

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

1.1 What is Child Protection Mediation?

Child protection mediation (CPM) is a collaborative problem solving process involving an impartial and neutral person who facilitates constructive negotiation and communication among parents, lawyers, child protection professionals, and possibly others, in an effort to reach a consensus regarding how to resolve issues of concern when children are alleged to be abused, neglected or abandoned.

CPM encourages constructive communication and information sharing and fosters an environment where genuine engagement and agreement is possible. As a consensual decision making process, no agreement can be reached unless all the involved parties agree. In addition to reaching important decisions regarding children and families, CPM can lead to a greater sense of teamwork among all the involved participants and a greater understanding and ownership of resulting agreements.

1.2 Benefits of Child Protection Mediation

Today, the use of CPM is widely recognized as an invaluable service by child welfare stakeholders throughout North America, and in many other parts of the world. Numerous research and evaluation efforts have confirmed that CPM programs, once instituted, produce noteworthy benefits. A recent review of the research in the field¹ indicates that CPM:

- Is highly rated by participants, with both families and professionals perceiving the process to be fair and believing they had an opportunity to have their concerns heard by others;
- Produces a high level of settlements, with 60 to 80 percent of mediated cases reaching full agreements and another 10 to 20 percent reaching partial agreements;
- Is effective at all stages of case processing from the filing of the petition through an adoption;
- Helps to engage parents, with 70 to 80 percent of the professionals who work with families in the child protection system reporting that parents were more involved in case planning when mediation was used;
- Helps to engage extended families, with studies showing that programs typically invite extended family and friends to participate whenever the parties believe their participation would be useful;
- Effectively addresses communication issues among the parties and other types of problems that are rarely dealt with in a court hearing;
- Reduces case processing time, with a number of studies suggesting that mediation helps families achieve permanency in less time;
- Encourages greater parental compliance, as shown by reduced number of contested review hearings, and generally better performance on the treatment plan;
- Saves courts and agencies money and staff time, with evidence that mediation can help the system to meet legislated time frames for case processing and to reduce the length of time a child spends in foster care;
- Often results in mediated treatment plans that contain more services for children than do non-mediated plans;
- Results in greater use of kinship care than in non-mediated cases in some studies.

In addition to the above reported research, judges frequently have noted the benefits of CPM. For example, Judge Leonard Edwards, former President of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, wrote “CPM should be an integral part of every juvenile dependency court in the nation. From a judicial perspective it accomplishes a number of goals. Mediation saves court time; it produces better, more detailed, nuanced, and longer-lasting results than litigated cases; it creates a problem-solving atmosphere in the court environment (an atmosphere that better serves all parties); it engages the parents in the decision-making process, thus making it more likely that they will follow any plan that they have

¹ Portions of this section were adapted from “What We Know Now: Findings from Dependency Mediation Research” by Nancy Thoennes, Family Court Review, (2009).vol. 47. 21-37.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

helped draft; it reduces the time children remain in temporary care; and, finally, it shortens the time to permanency.”²

1.3 History and Mission

CPM programs have developed gradually on a community by community basis as an alternative to traditional litigation. Early proponents of CPM were frustrated with the slow pace and adversarial nature of litigation and were looking for a better, more timely and collaborative decision making process.

In 1995, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) published Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases³ which included a discussion of the benefits of CPM and recommendations for implementation of court connected CPM programs in the United States. These Resource Guidelines were subsequently endorsed by the American Bar Association to “encourage support for...and implementation of” the Resource Guidelines.

The use of CPM and other collaborative decision-making processes in Canada have been encouraged by the enactment of statutory provisions in child protection legislation in many jurisdictions across Canada. In British Columbia, its current provincial legislation was proclaimed in 1996, including principles and provisions for mediation and other dispute resolution processes, which greatly influenced the use of CPM. This led to building a strong infrastructure which brought together legal and child welfare professionals. Similar statutory provisions have been enacted in many other provinces across Canada since then.

In 1997, the Congress of the United States passed the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). The Act and ensuing federal regulations made child safety and permanency the primary focus of the law. New requirements emphasized more timely permanency decision-making, relative care, increased judicial oversight and expanded foster parents’ rights. When implementing ASFA, many jurisdictions developed CPM programs to aid the child welfare agencies and courts in meeting the new requirements. As such, these Guidelines build upon the recommendations included in the Resource Guidelines: published by NCJFCJ and reflect the collective wisdom and experience of CPM practitioners and successful CPM programs throughout North America and CPM research. The goals of these Guidelines are to:

- Articulate the principles and philosophy that guide effective CPM;
- Provide program developers and administrators with a template for creating and evaluating successful programs;
- Offer a standard that can be taken to funders, court systems, child welfare agencies, legislators, and others to promote high quality services;
- Help judges, social workers, lawyers, mediators and other professionals evaluate their approach to CPM and improve their skills and programs.

An additional need for these Guidelines comes from the diverse settings within which CPM takes place. While many of these settings may require a slightly different approach, these Guidelines are intended to apply across the numerous and distinctive legal, cultural and institutional frameworks in North America.

CPM programs can be organized and conducted in many different ways and still be effective provided they adhere to the highest standards of practice to ensure that children are protected, families are empowered and effectively engaged, and professionals collaboratively and meaningfully engage with one another and the children and families they seek to protect.

² Edwards, L, Child Protection Mediation: A 25 Year Perspective, Family Court Review, Vol. 47 No. 1, January 2009 p. 77.

³ Resource Guidelines Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, NCJFCJ 1995. Approved by the NCJFCJ Officers and Board of Trustees January 1995.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

1.4 How the Guidelines Were Developed

These Guidelines were developed by the Child Welfare Collaborative Decision Making Network. The Network operates with the support and guidance of a number of organizations including the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC), the American Humane Association (AHA), and the Werner Institute of Creighton University. For the development of the CPM Guidelines, AHA provided staff resources to facilitate the development of the process. AFCC, Werner and the University of South Florida Conflict Resolution Collaborative provided resources to assist with this effort. Other contributing organizations include The National Center for State Courts, The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the National Association of Counsel for Children.

The Network grew out of a number of Think Tanks on Collaborative Decision Making in Child Welfare, which have met annually since 2007 in conjunction with the annual meeting of the AFCC. It became clear during these discussions that the establishment of a more formal process that reflected the three decades of experience and the research on CPM would be the best foundation for these Guidelines. A Guidelines Work Group, consisting of mediation program administrators, mediators, researchers, mediation trainers, policy experts, child protection experts, and professional organization representatives from the United States and Canada drafted an initial set of proposed Guidelines and invited broad input from child protection, judicial, mediation and other experts. These Guidelines were then revised to reflect many of the constructive ideas and feedback received during the public comment period.

Section 2: Philosophy

While collaborative decision-making should be promoted throughout the entire child protection process, mediation provides invaluable assistance to the collaborative process by providing a constructive forum for the timely resolution of issues in a manner that best protects children while also promoting increased cooperation among the stakeholders. Mediation has the potential to assure that families can participate in the decision making process with other child protection professionals in a manner that enables the child's voice to be heard and promotes the safety and the well-being of the child.

- The child's "voice" is essential in child protection decision making. The safety, permanency, and the well-being of children are paramount.
- Genuine and sustained engagement of families in their child protection cases is supported by involving them as full participants in the discussions and decisions that affect their futures.
- Families are of critical importance to children and should be involved in making decisions about them.
- Cooperative relationships and collaborative decision-making best suit the resolution of most child protection concerns and should be promoted and sustained throughout the child protection system in ways that transcend formal mediation and other decision-making forums.
- Power imbalances inherent in child protection can be addressed and fair, voluntary, and informed decision making promoted when discussions are facilitated by impartial, competent mediators who are independent of the case.
- Preparation of participants to understand and be effective in mediation is essential.
- Timely resolution of disputes benefits all involved

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 3: Guiding Principles

While collaborative decision-making should be promoted throughout the entire child protection process, CPM provides invaluable assistance to the collaborative process by providing a constructive forum for the timely resolution of issues in a manner that best protects children while also promoting increased cooperation among the stakeholders. CPM has the potential to assure that families participate in the decision making process with child protection professionals in a manner that enables all voices including the child's voice to be heard and promotes the safety and the well-being of the child. In order to promote best practices, CPM should adhere to the following seven principles:

1 An inclusive process:

CPM should actively engage family members and child protection professionals to meaningfully participate in collaborative problem solving. Parents should safely participate in every aspect of CPM. When it is safe and appropriate, the child should also be given the opportunity to meaningfully participate in CPM, and in all cases there should be others present who can discuss and present the child's interests, desires and perspectives so that the child's "voice" will be heard in every mediation.

The participation of extended family, friends, and others may also play an important role in decision making and their participation may be essential if they will be impacted by decisions being made in mediation or are needed to implement any agreements reached in mediation.

CPM should be conducted with appropriate and reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities. Mediators and other mediation participants should seek to enhance each individual's capacity to effectively participate in mediation.

Respect, appreciation, and understanding of cultural, racial, religious, socioeconomic and other issues of diversity should be promoted in all parts of the CPM process.

2 A collaborative process:

CPM should be conducted in a manner that promotes constructive and open communication among the mediation participants and encourage participants to effectively address the needs of children and families in a collaborative manner. Through respectful dialogue and problem solving, mediation participants can find mutually acceptable solutions while at the same time improving the capacity of the family and professionals to constructively work together.

3 A timely process:

CPM needs to occur in a timely manner to encourage early engagement and collaborative problem solving, promote timely problem resolution, and ensure that CPM does not delay the progression of a case through the child protection legal system.

4 A safe process:

CPM must not compromise the safety of participants or non-participants who may be affected by the mediation process or outcome before, during or after the mediation session.

5 A confidential process:

Confidentiality is essential to the integrity and effectiveness of the CPM process so that parties feel free to speak openly with others. Participants need to understand the limits of confidentiality and privilege

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

that may exist so they can make informed decisions regarding their willingness to speak openly in mediation.

6 An ethical process:

CPM should be conducted in accordance with widely accepted standards of professional conduct for mediators that address all ethical issues including, but not limited to the following:

- Empowerment and Self-Determination of All Mediation Participants
- Impartiality and Neutrality of the Mediator
- Mediation Confidentiality
- Avoidance of Conflicts of Interests
- Mediator Competence

7 A supported quality process:

Leaders at the highest levels of child welfare stakeholder groups should be engaged in the development, implementation, evaluation and promotion of CPM and actively support CPM practice. Programs should ensure that competent and adequately trained mediators conduct CPM sessions. Programs should work to enhance stakeholder understanding, capacity and utilization of collaborative problem solving and should maintain meaningful process and outcome evaluation procedures in order to improve program effectiveness and increase participant satisfaction.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 4: Program Development, Design and Operation

Planning, designing and operating a successful CPM program is a challenging task that involves bringing together the various child protection stakeholders, obtaining judicial support and funding, and, in some cases, fostering a paradigm shift that creates greater collaboration between the stakeholders and parents and a commitment by all to better include families in the decision making process.

4.1 Planning the Program

CPM program planning should be a collaborative process that addresses the needs of program stakeholders and values their input. Designers should begin by identifying the various stakeholders essential to setting up an effective program. The make-up of stakeholder groups often includes:

- Child protection service administrators;
- Case workers (representing the child welfare authority) and their legal counsel;
- Domestic violence experts;
- Attorneys representing children, parents and other parties to the litigation;
- Guardians ad litem (GALs) or others representing the children;
- Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASAs);
- Native American, Aboriginal or other tribal representatives;
- Mediators and mediation experts; and
- The judiciary.

Those who might assist a stakeholder group include parents, foster parents and youth from the community being served, as well as individuals and organizations representing bar associations, universities, national child protection or professional development organizations and groups representing mental health, substance abuse issues and/or developmental disabilities.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Convening the Planning Group

Typically, the court, the child protection agency, or a private agency takes on the role of convening the planning group. Using a neutral facilitator from outside the group to conduct meetings can be helpful and to some extent models the mediation process. Once assembled, the stakeholder group should review and consider evidence based research and evaluation, literature and reports that document lessons learned from other programs. It is also helpful to hear from professionals having experience with established CPM programs in other localities.

4.2 Program Design and Operation

Every planning groups and/or program administrators will likely need to address certain design and basic operations issues which are identified in this section.

4.2.1 Program Start-Up

CPM may be fully instituted or started as a pilot project. A pilot provides an opportunity to test the effectiveness and viability of CPM in a jurisdiction before a significant amount of time and money are expended or when there is the initial resistance and opposition to a full program. Another advantage to a pilot program is that program design, protocol, and forms can be tested and modified as needed before the full program is launched.

Ideally, CPM programs should not be launched before the involved judges, attorneys and case workers participate in an orientation meeting lead by a professional mediation trainer. In addition to explaining the details of the pilot and the protocol, the training agenda should include: an introduction to mediation; an introduction to CPM; strategies to optimize the CPM experience for everyone involved; and a discussion of practical and ethical issues. To help the trainees envision themselves in mediation, a video or live demonstration of a CPM session should also be presented. In addition, involving judges, child protection workers and attorneys from a jurisdiction with a successful CPM program can help to address any concerns that individual stakeholders may have concerning CPM or their role in CPM.

4.2.2 Program Location

Where a program is housed will depend on many variables. The location of the program is not nearly as important as whether the participants perceive the location as an accessible, neutral and safe place and perceive CPM as a beneficial alternative to the options available through traditional litigation. Child protection programs are currently housed in a variety of locations, including community dispute resolution centers, state or provincial court administration offices, child welfare agencies, child welfare legal offices, private mediator offices, courts, universities, and attorney general or justice services offices. Each option has unique advantages but also may carry specific disadvantages.

4.2.3 Program Administration

CPM programs require a clear organizational structure and a program manager who will oversee the day-to-day operation, quality control, ongoing program development and public relations. Ideally, the manager should be a trained mediator who mediates as needed, but is allotted sufficient time to perform program management duties. This individual should also be the program's liaison to the judiciary and other stakeholders, and should maintain ongoing contact with the key stakeholders.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

4.2.4 Cases and Timing of Referrals

The vast majority of child protection cases are appropriate for mediation at every stage of the case. Severe abuse, family violence, mental illness, substance misuse and other considerations may impact how the session will be structured, what will be discussed, and who will be at the table, but they do not necessarily preclude mediation. Examples of cases which may be inappropriate for mediation include those involving family violence where the safety of the participants or others will be significantly endangered or where there may be an overwhelming imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim or those cases where the capacity of a party to meaningfully participate in mediation may be severely limited due to mental illness or substance abuse. With careful and ongoing safety screening and assessment and proper accommodation in mediation, most cases can be suitable for mediation.

Child protection issues generally vary according to the stage of a child protection case. At each stage, the actual issues for discussion will be identified by the mediation participants, by the court or both. The names of the stages provided below are intended as generic references with the understanding that exact names and practices may vary considerably from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Emergency Removal

Sometimes circumstances brought to the attention of the child protective services system result in the immediate need to remove children from their parents to ensure their safety and well-being.

Early use of CPM is an opportunity for professionals and the family to meet in a confidential and neutral environment, where, within the framework of the allegations and issues, the family's strengths can be identified in the spirit of designing change and making better decisions for the children in the future. Mediation conducted early encourages family engagement, collaborative decision-making, and a team approach to handling child protection cases.

CPM at the front end of a case also allows for a thorough discussion partially focused on identifying extended family members, friends, community members, and neighbors as potential placement options and resources for possibly assisting the family or supervising visitation. When children are not or cannot be placed with family or friends, early CPM allows the parents and temporary caregivers to meet in a safe and balanced setting where they can begin to foster a strong working relationship built upon respect, understanding, cooperation, and mutual concern for the child.

Preliminary Hearing

In this stage, the parents are provided an opportunity to respond to the allegations of abuse, neglect or abandonment. If the parents do not consent to the allegations of abuse, neglect or abandonment, the case then proceeds to an adjudicatory hearing where the court will determine whether child abuse or neglect has occurred and whether the court therefore has jurisdiction in the case to intervene on behalf of the child. As the issues at this stage are similar to the subsequent Adjudicatory and Dispositional Stages below, a more detailed discussion of the issues is provided immediately below.

Adjudication and Disposition

The Adjudicatory and Dispositional phases of a case focus on whether there will be a judicial determination of child abuse or neglect and, if the adjudication confirms that child abuse and neglect has occurred, a court adopted case plan. CPM at these stages provides an alternative to contested litigation and offers a collaborative process to reach agreement about whether the child may have been or be at significant risk of becoming abused, neglected or abandoned as well as resolution of dispositional issues such as placement decisions, evaluations, treatment, services, etc. CPM can help to engage the family and to assist in crafting service plans that are more family and case specific. Case plans can be drafted during the session or at meeting convened on a later date.

Permanency Planning

CPM at the permanency stage is an opportunity for a comprehensive discussion about the permanency goals available, how to support the goals, time frames for achieving the goals and their impact on the

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

family's future. Additional topics may include but are not limited to transition planning for youth aging out of care, maintaining important relationships, and identifying community services available after the case is closed.

Termination of Parental Rights/Relinquishment

CPM at this stage of the case is a forum in which this difficult subject can be explored in depth in a frank and deliberate manner. The topics addressed can include what a trial might look like, what the probable outcome might be, how damaging a contested and adversarial trial could be to important family relationships and whether voluntary relinquishment would minimize the damage, whether the parent(s) are likely to make a meaningful effort to remedy their problems at this late stage, and what other options are available.

Some jurisdictions allow open adoption whereby potential adoptive and birth families may enter into binding contracts for post-adoption contact. In jurisdictions without open adoption, informal agreements between the families related to continued contact following termination or relinquishment are still possible, though not legally enforceable. Consequently, in those instances, it is important that parents fully understand the difference between a promise and a binding legal contract.

Adoption

Discussions in CPM can include pre-and post-adoption challenges, contested adoptions between two or more competing potential adoptive families, the need for post adoption services, a potential adoption disruption, and whether open adoption is possible. Adoption laws vary by jurisdiction. Therefore, any program planning to mediate adoption cases should become familiar with their jurisdiction's statutes and practices.

4.2.5 Participants

As CPM is an inclusive process, programs should consider protocols and practices that support participation not only by parties to the litigation, but also by others involved with the family. These collateral participants often bring important resources and information to the discussion that may assist with finding solutions and options. The court may determine who is invited or ordered to participate in a CPM session. Other people who are important to the family may also participate with the consent of the mediation participants. CPM is most beneficial when everyone necessary to resolve the issues meaningfully and safely participates and contributes constructively.

CPM programs differ according to who is mandated to attend and who can be invited. Typically, parents, their attorneys, the child's representative and the service providers participate in CPM. Although some programs discourage attorney participation, participants should have the opportunity to have an attorney present during mediation. Others who frequently attend include, but are not limited to extended family members, foster parents, therapists, direct services providers, spiritual advisors, friends, and significant others. Increasingly programs are recognizing the value of including affected children in CPM discussions.

In some jurisdictions, Tribal and Aboriginal representatives are considered parties to the litigation. Regardless of party status, Tribal and Aboriginal representatives can help support cultural traditions in the mediation process. They can also help with planning and bring cultural and community resources into play as well as be supports to the child and family.

4.2.6 Roles of the Participants

Roles of Parents

The full and active engagement of parents is an essential element of the mediation process. In mediation, parents are given the opportunity to collaborate in the decision making process concerning their children and their families. Though their active participation in mediation, they can learn about and discuss the issues that brought the family to the attention of the CPS system. Most importantly, they can

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

express their own needs and those of their child as well as their desired outcomes for themselves and their children. Ideally, parents should be represented by attorneys. Each parent may need a separate attorney as often the parents' interests are not sufficiently aligned.

Some of the benefits of actively involving and empowering parents in CPM include the following:

1. Increase the exchange of information among the parties;
2. Improve the quality of the agreement due to greater input from all parties;
3. Reinforce the parents' role by providing them with the opportunity to contribute to the efforts to find a solution;
4. Increase the parent's sense of ownership and understanding of the agreement;
5. Increase the parental compliance with the agreement;
6. Reduce conflict between the parents and professionals and increase the group's ability to work effectively as a team; and
7. Increase the parent's confidence in the child protection process.

Roles of Parent's Attorney

Attorneys for the parents are responsible for preparing their clients prior to mediation session and for counseling and advising them before, during and after mediation, and at times advocating on behalf of their clients. They are charged with assisting parents in the negotiation process, helping parents to understand their situation, including their legal rights, and helping them to consider all their options and the legal consequences of any decisions made during mediation including any agreement they may enter into as a result of the mediation.

Role of the CPS Case Worker

The case worker from the social services or child protection agency is responsible for identifying and presenting the agency's understanding of the family's problems and concerns about the child and family. The case worker can propose possible interventions and services that may address their concerns and the agency's overall plan for how to achieve safety, stability and permanency for the child. For CPM to be most effective, the case worker should have full authority to settle the case during mediation.

Role of the Agency's Attorney or Attorney for State/Province

The case worker and the attorney for the agency or state/province both typically participate in the mediation. The attorney optimally meets with the case worker prior to the mediation to discuss the case and the agency's concerns. This attorney presents the legal issues in the case and represents the legal interest of the agency or the state/province during mediation. This attorney helps the case worker understand legal consequences of any decisions made at mediation, including any agreement they may enter into as a result of the mediation.

Role of Guardian Ad Litem or Court Appointed Special Advocate

Jurisdictions differ as to who represents the child's interest in a child protection case and when this individual is appointed. Some jurisdictions rely on Guardian ad Litem (GAL) or CASA. The GAL role in the case is to represent the child's interests. The GAL gathers information regarding the child's life prior to mediation and participates in the decision regarding the child's participation in mediation. During mediation, the GAL presents information that is pertinent to the child's case, and often makes recommendations believed to best address the child's interests.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Role of Attorney for Child

In some jurisdictions, the child may be represented by an attorney. While there are many variations, the attorney customarily represents the child's wishes. The attorney presents and frames the legal issues on behalf of the child during the mediation. The attorney will assist in determining if the child should participate in the mediation. If the child doesn't participate directly, the attorney may be the child's "voice" in the mediation. The attorney safeguards the legal interests of the child. If the child participates in mediation, the attorney should meet with and prepare the child prior to mediation. It is this attorney's responsibility to help the child to understand and consider what their options and legal rights are during mediation. Attorneys can support the child's participation and assist the child to articulate his/her wants and needs including but not limited to any services, visitation or placement options. This includes counseling the child as to the consequences of any decisions made during the mediation including any agreement that results from the mediation.

Role of the Child

Mediation programs should specify who will decide whether and how a child may participate in the process. Factors to be weighed in such a determination include the child's wishes, the child's age and developmental capacity, and child protective factors, including the nature of the allegations in case. There should be a meaningful inquiry to determine if the child understands mediation and if the child wants to participate. This discussion should occur between the child and the child's attorney, GAL or CASA, or other appropriate support person prior to mediation. A child should not attend a mediation session with an alleged perpetrator in cases where the confrontation could be harmful to the child as very likely would be the case if the allegations involved child sexual abuse.

If a child expresses an interest in participation, the mediator should work with the child's legal representative to determine the child's capacity to actively and safely participate in the mediation. If a child does not wish to participate or it is determined that the child should not participate in person, alternative methods for ensuring the child's "voice" is present include allowing the child to appear by video or teleconference or video tape, or permitting the child to write a letter to be read at the mediation or to express their concerns to their attorney, GAL, caseworker or other mediation participant who can then relay the child's concerns directly in mediation.

The child's attorney or other appropriate person should elicit the child's preferences in a developmentally appropriate manner, advise the child, and provide guidance. If the child has an attorney, the attorney should be present at the mediation session.

4.2.7 Time Allotted for Mediation

A key element of mediation, distinguishing it from both formal court hearings and mandated court conferences, is that discussions can proceed slowly, giving people an opportunity to ask questions, absorb information, and then process and react to the unfolding conversation. A clear protocol should be established to determine who will set the time for mediations and how they will be scheduled. Some programs may set a basic time frame for sessions such as two or three hours and then adjust it depending on the specifics of the case, the number of people involved, or whether or not attorneys will be present. Other program designs may allow for greater flexibility in order to be responsive to local cultures or needs. Time constraints, cost considerations, and other pressures exist in all systems, however, courts, child protection agencies, attorneys and others need to allow sufficient time for the mediation to succeed.

The program and individual mediators may need to resist or defuse pressure to conduct mediations quickly or shorten the sessions. It diminishes the effectiveness of the mediation when these vital interactions are compressed or truncated. To the extent possible, parties should decide for themselves when their conversation is concluded, reflecting the underlying principle of mediation which supports self-determination and requires that the mediation process be responsive to the needs of the participants.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

4.2.8 Mediation Communication Privilege/Confidentiality

Confidentiality is essential to the integrity and effectiveness of the mediation process. In CPM, confidentiality helps to create a forum in which parents may safely and openly discuss and consider alternatives for their children and themselves, as well as any pending legal issues. Lawyers, agency representatives, and other professionals are also able to more freely share and discuss their concerns including possibly the allegations of child maltreatment, concerns for the children or parents and other concerns.

Mediators should conduct mediations consistent with ethical standards governing the confidentiality of mediation communications in their jurisdiction. Prior to or at the beginning of the mediation, mediators should inform participants of the extent to which mediation communications are confidential and/or privileged in a manner clear to all participants. Mediators should be knowledgeable of the limits of mediation confidentiality protections and explain carefully that there are exceptions to mediation confidentiality which may include the reporting of new allegations of child abuse or neglect which may arise during CPM.

An agreement to mediate may be utilized to address confidentiality and privilege. The agreement should be written in plain language and mediators should discuss these provisions with participants prior to or at the beginning of mediation and obtain the mediation participant's informed consent.

If mediators conduct private sessions with a mediation participant or with fewer than all participants, the confidentiality of the private sessions must be maintained by the mediator unless the participants agree otherwise.

Mediators should inform their mediation program promptly if they are subpoenaed to testify in court or to disclose documents related to mediation. Mediators should consult legal counsel in responding to subpoenas that may require disclosure of information that relates to or arises out of the mediation process. Unless ordered otherwise by the court, mediators should honor all commitments made to the mediation participants concerning confidentiality.

4.2.9 Mediator Assignment and Selection and Co-Mediation

Ideally, the pool of potential mediators should reflect the population they serve. In addition, a program should have the capacity to provide mediators with specific characteristics or skills when appropriate for a particular case. For example, a mediator who has experience working with children and adolescents may be able to engage them more easily and be better able to help them participate effectively in the mediation process. Other cases where mental health issues are prominent can benefit from having mediators who are knowledgeable and comfortable working with this population.

Some CPM programs utilize one mediator while others utilize a co-mediation model. The decision to use a single mediator or a team may ultimately be made because of economic or resources considerations. Using a single mediator is obviously more cost effective and allows coverage of more cases. A co-mediator model allows greater diversity in terms of age, gender or ethnicity, expertise and competencies and permits each mediator to assume complementary roles in mediation.

4.2.10 Reporting Outcomes of CPM

Programs and their stakeholders must decide if, when and how to report outcomes of CPM sessions. Courts may order or expect that results of the outcomes of CPM will be reported to the court. Regardless of whether an agreement is reached in the mediation, the court may be required to take further action the case. Generally, CPM programs may advise the court regarding who attended mediation and whether a full or partial agreement has been reached or if the mediation has been adjourned and rescheduled for another session. Mediators should not provide any comments or make recommendations to the court as that practice will discourage frank and open communication in mediation and likely may violate mediator standards of practice as well as jurisdictional mediation confidentiality protections.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Writing and Enforcing Agreements

Programs need to consider many operational issues in designing their agreement process. Who will write the agreement, who will submit the agreement, and what the format of the agreement will be all need to be decided. Many programs have the mediator write up the agreement during or after the session. Other programs designate one of the attorneys to draft the agreement. CPM programs should be careful that the designation of one individual to draft agreements does not compromise the impartiality or neutrality of the CPM program in substance or in appearance.

When deciding who will be responsible for presenting an agreement to the court, the mediation program or one of the parties, much will depend on whether cases will go before the judge immediately after the conclusion of the mediation session. If the program or the court requires the parties to physically sign the agreement before it is submitted, then parties must either be willing to wait for it to be completed after a session or return to the program for signing.

Programs and their stakeholders should decide whether agreements may be written in the parties' own language or must use particular legal terminology required by the Court. To the extent possible, agreements should be written in plain understandable language. All participants' obligations should be included in clear terms with, when possible, specific timeframes for compliance to the extent determined by the parties.

When participants reach an agreement in mediation, mediators should encourage them to consider signing a written agreement that reflects their oral agreement. Mediators should encourage parties to consider whether an oral agreement will be enforceable at all or to the same extent as a written agreement given the confidential nature of mediation.

Under some circumstances, mediation participants may reach a voluntary agreement that may not be enforceable in whole or in part. Mediators should support the self-determination of mediation participants who choose to agree to such settlements and encourage discussions concerning the extent to which the agreement may or may not be enforceable.

4.2.11 Program Funding and Institutionalization

The source of funding for CPM programs is critical to the long term stability and success of the programs. Some sources include revenue from court fees or other common fees or line items in the court or child welfare agency budget, at the state, provincial, county or local level. Because these cases often involve indigent parties, CPM programs should not be expected to be self sustaining through the collection of fees for service.

Court rules and legislation mandating the use of CPM are helpful, but they are not a definitive means to sustainability. The survival of CPM depends upon CPM being institutionalized into the basic framework of the child protection and/or court systems. It is the responsibility of program staff to help the judiciary, lawyers, case workers and other stakeholders understand that CPM offers the family and child protection stakeholders a positive, empowering and constructive experience that is unavailable in most other forums. Committed, invested stakeholders are strong and effective allies and their continuing support is essential to program success.

4.2.12 Mediator Recruitment and Training

Mediators who conduct CPM must be developed through targeted, deliberate recruitment, training and supervision. Individual mediators must possess or be capable of acquiring and maintaining the skills, knowledge, ethics and qualities that are necessary to serve as a mediator for highly complex and emotion laden disputes involving children and their families.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Recruitment

It is important that mediators possess strong communication skills, education or experience in the helping professions and/or legal systems, be culturally competent and represent the diversity of the population who they will serve. CPM mediators frequently have prior experience as mediators in other areas or have backgrounds in other dispute resolution processes or methods. They may be attorneys, mental health professionals, or other qualified professionals.

Standards of Practice

CPM mediators should be governed by ethical principles and standards of professional conduct endorsed by most national mediation organizations (such as the Model Standards of Practice for Family and Divorce Mediation endorsed by the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts, The Family Law Section of the American Bar Association and other national organizations or the Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators endorsed by the Association for Conflict Resolution, American Bar Association and American Arbitration Association)) or court approved mediation principles and standards. In some cases there may be jurisdiction specific mediation standards or other professional association standards such as the NASW Standards of Practice for Social Work Mediators and mediators should strive to comply with all applicable standards.

Training Requirements

Child protection mediators should be required to complete at least 40 hours of CPM training. CPM Training should be conducted by highly experienced mediator trainers. Training should include both didactic and experiential learning. Final selection of mediators should be contingent on successful completion of training and mediation observation.

CPM training for mediators should include the following:

- Conflict Resolution Concepts in CPM
- Court Process in CPM
- Mediation Process and Techniques in CPM
- Communication Skills in CPM
- Standards of Conduct/Ethics for Mediators in CPM
- Treatment Options and Community Resources in CPM
- Diversity Issues in CPM
- Family Dynamics and Psychological Issues in CPM
- Issues Concerning the Needs of Children in the Context of Dependency Proceedings in CPM
- Child Protection Law in CPM
- Role of Parties and Participants in CPM.

There should be minimum requirements for continuing education and professional development for child protection mediators. CPM mediators should receive periodic updates on changes to laws, court rules and child welfare agency policies and practices. Additionally, CPM mediators should be encouraged to take advanced training in mediation ethics and mediation skills.

Mentoring and Supervision

New mediators should have the opportunity to observe or co-mediate with more experienced practitioners. Programs should create a skill building system of coaching and critiquing new CPM mediators as well as an established standardized practice for assessing mediator skills on an ongoing basis.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 5: Conducting Child Protection Mediation

There are a number of issues that the mediator and program administrator must consider before and during mediation sessions.

5.1 Conducting CPM in a Culturally Appropriate Manner

CPM brings together people from a rich diversity of backgrounds and cultures. Respect for heritage, ethnicity, race, religion, spiritual beliefs, traditions, customs, socioeconomic status, education, gender, age, and many other social characteristics should be at the heart of every CPM program. Furthermore, it is well documented that many cultural groups are overrepresented in the child welfare system, and it is essential that CPM programs are culturally sensitive and competent. Cultural competence should be reflected throughout the program in its principles, goals, operations, standards, hiring, professional development, service delivery and practice.

It is essential for mediators and others in the program to show a genuine interest in and respect for the culture of the CPM participants. Mediators should be sensitive to the norms regarding power structure, gender, role, child rearing and decision-making that may impact the mediation and outcome while at the same time ensuring that all parties can meaningfully participate in mediation.

5.2 Use of Translators and Interpreters

When there are language differences, translators or interpreters should be brought in to assist with the mediation process, even if the mediator is bi-lingual. It is better if these translator or interpreters are not otherwise involved in the case. Consideration should be given as to where to the translator or interpreter will be seated in the mediation to most effectively assist the process. Mediators should convey to the interpreter that the process is intended to assist everyone to better understand each other and the need for all communications to be translated. The mediator should also discuss with the interpreter the extent to which mediation communications are confidential and inquire as to when the interpreter may require a brief break from translating to ensure the interpreter's ongoing effectiveness and accuracy. Mediators should also promote a process where only one individual is talking at a time to enable adequate translation.

5.3 Mediation: Safety and Capacity

CPM Mediations are structured and conducted so as to address safety and capacity concerns, provide appropriate accommodation, and promote engagement of individuals with diminished capacity and/or disabilities. This notwithstanding, if an individual is unable to exercise self-determination, or if another impediment to mediation exists that cannot be remedied, a case may need to be excluded from mediation. Mediators should continue the assessment process throughout the course of mediation.

Safety Considerations

CPM programs should develop clear protocols that are designed to protect everyone's safety. When screening for safety concerns, CPM programs should seek to identify what, if any, accommodations can be offered to enable an individual to participate or whether mediation should take place. Consideration should be given to where CPM sessions can be safely conducted. When mediation is conducted in less secure facilities, assessment protocols may need to be more comprehensive.

Family Violence

The existence of family violence in child protection cases does not necessarily preclude mediation. However, mediation is not appropriate when a mediation party is unable to safely advocate for his or her needs and interests or anyone's safety may be endangered as a result of mediation. Considerations should be given as to whether participation in mediation will put the victim or others at risk before, during or after the conclusion of the session(s). CPM programs may draw upon pre-mediation questionnaires designed to

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

address safety concerns, court records, case worker records, etc. to determine if safety concerns exist prior to the scheduling of mediation. In some cases, a mediation intake session to address such concerns may be utilized.

If a case with family violence is deemed appropriate for mediation, the session(s) may be structured, through separate sessions or other modifications, to enhance safety protections. When evaluating the impact of family violence, it is important to look at more than physical abuse. Coercive and controlling behavior inhibits the opportunity for self-determination by all participants. Mediators need to be skilled at knowing when and how to encourage a family violence victim to speak up in mediation without endangering the safety of the victim or anyone else. Some techniques to achieve this goal include the following:

- Careful screening of cases
- Meeting in a “safe” facility such as a courthouse
- Keeping the victim and perpetrator in separate meeting rooms
- Utilizing a co-mediation model
- Allowing the victim to bring a support person

In addressing family violence concerns, the mediator should always adhere to recognized standards of professional conduct for mediators. In the event that family violence concerns increase and the mediator can no longer comply with these standards, the mediator should terminate mediation and take appropriate action to protect the safety of all involved.

Capacity

The mediator should assess whether a person is able to meaningfully participate and exercise self-determination and informed decision-making on his or her own behalf as well as the mediator’s ability to accommodate the participation and engagement of all participants. A determination of incapacity need not preclude a person from participating in mediation, as it may be possible to include a court appointed guardian, surrogate or other advocate to provide support for the incapacitated person. Some factors to consider when determining a party’s ability to exercise self-determination and meaningfully participate in mediation include whether he or she is able to understand the dispute, the facts relevant to the dispute, assess consequences to alternatives, freely make decisions, understand the mediation process, and be motivated to seek a positive outcome.

5.4 Power Imbalances

Nature of the Imbalances

In addition to the power imbalance that exists between a perpetrator and a family violence victim, there are often real or perceived imbalances of power between the state or province and the family. The mediator should promote a process that enables everyone to meaningfully participate in mediation and exercise self-determination in a balanced manner

Strategies to Address the Power Imbalance between the Parents and Child Welfare Agency

Power imbalances are best addressed by providing the parents with an equal opportunity to actively and meaningfully participate in mediation. As such, mediators should strive to:

- Educate parents and all mediation participants prior to mediation concerning CPM
- Include the parents from the beginning.
- Begin the mediation in a way that empowers the parents and builds trust in the process.
- Make the language of the mediation understandable to all participants.
- Treat all parties impartially and not favor any mediation participants.
- Respect the parent’s right to disagree with the professionals and to seek court intervention instead of resolving the issues in mediation.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

5.5 Maintaining Impartiality and Neutrality and Avoiding Conflicts of Interest

Mediators are ethically bound to be impartial to the mediation participants and neutral to the agreements reached in mediation. Mediators should maintain impartiality and neutrality throughout the mediation process and are obligated to assist all involved mediation participants.

Mediators should disclose potential conflicts of interest as soon as a mediator becomes aware of a conflict. If the mediation parties agree to continue the process after a mediator discloses a conflict, the mediator may continue to mediate if the conflict of interest does not compromise the impartiality of the mediator. When there is a clear or undisclosed conflict of interest, a mediator should decline to mediate or withdraw if mediation has begun. Mediators should not create a conflict of interest during the mediation. A mediator should not provide any services to a party that is not directly related to the mediation process before, during or after the mediation.

5.6 Participant Preparation

CPM programs should strive to educate mediation participants about CPM prior to the mediation session. Whenever possible, program specific print and/or audiovisual CPM mediation information should be developed and distributed to all mediation participants. Programs could also host pre-mediation meetings to help prepare participants for mediation. In addition, CPM programs should regularly conduct ongoing mediation training for child protection system stakeholders.

Preparing families is particularly important and challenging. Families participating in mediation for the first time have had no prior orientation. While mediation is a forum familiar to the professionals, it is likely foreign to families who may feel intimidated and incapable in anticipation of participating. Having someone thoroughly familiar with the mediation process prepare family members to participate is important. Whether the mediator does this him- or herself or the program has someone else specifically assigned to this role, it's critical that the family participants have an opportunity to receive information and have their questions answered so that they do understand the process (roles, extent and limitations of confidentiality, extent to which participation may be voluntary, etc.) and feel capable of participating.

In addition, at the beginning of mediation mediators should explain the following to mediation participants:

- The CPM process;
- The role of the mediator;
- The extent and limits of confidentiality;
- The extent to which the process is voluntary;
- The consensual nature of mediation;
- What will happen if agreements are reached; and
- What will happen if agreements are not reached.

5.7 Roles and Responsibilities of the Mediator: Conducting the Session

The mediator must maintain a neutral and impartial posture toward the participants and the issues in the mediation and model effective interpersonal communication and collaborative conflict resolution. As such, the mediator helps all the CPM participants to establish their own working agenda, and sets an example for the participants that emphasizes respect to differing perspectives and collaborative problem solving.

The mediator also must recognize when partial agreements are reached and check to be sure that the necessary mediation parties are in agreement. When agreements occur, the mediator should keep clear notes and be ready to accurately and fairly summarize them for the parties during the mediation.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

5.8 Roles and Responsibilities of the Mediator: Ending the Mediation

The mediator plays an important role at the end of the mediation by helping the parties to clarify and memorialize any final agreements. While the mediator need not write the agreement, the mediator should write the agreement if requested by the parties. The decision to assign the role of writing the agreement to someone other than the mediator should be made by the mediation participants so the mediator does not appear biased.

When a mediation session does not result in a whole or partial agreement, the mediator should acknowledge any constructive efforts the parties have made and encourage them to continue to strive to find common ground in the future. The mediator may also ask the parties if the parties wish to discuss how they will proceed to resolve the dispute after mediation and, if permitted, may offer to assist the parties in the future should there be interest and willingness to return to mediation later.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 6: Monitoring and Evaluation

6.1 Program Monitoring

It is extremely helpful to have a data collection mechanism in place before the program is launched. During the design phase, it is useful to think through the type of information that will be gathered for routine program monitoring, and, if relevant, the information needed for a full evaluation. It is also helpful to periodically review the collected data to determine what, if any, changes are necessary for improving the program.

Program monitoring should provide basic information that will allow program administrators to assess how well the CPM program is meeting the needs of families and stakeholders. If possible, consideration should be given to creating a simple automated management information system to record basic information about cases and outcomes. Programs will have to consider what type of information they will be asked to routinely produce (e.g., for annual reports) before deciding what information to collect. It is likely that the system should note the parties' names and contact information, the mediator, the dates of mediation, how long the session lasted, whether parties appeared for mediation, the outcome of the session. In addition, CPM programs should consider collecting confidential satisfactions surveys from mediation participants and maintain summaries of satisfaction surveys separate and apart from specific case information to insure the confidentiality of mediation sessions.

6.2 Program Evaluation

A full-scale evaluation can be used to address more complex questions about the process and its strengths and weaknesses. Such an evaluation might include collecting data to answer questions related to compliance to agreements, how agreements reached through the program differ from non-mediated agreements, or if there were certain types of cases where there were a lower percentage of agreements were reached. These questions will generally require the development of a comparison group, because at least some of the questions will need to examine the results of mediated cases and non-mediated cases. If the evaluation is longitudinal, the data will not be available immediately and this may mean reviewing court or agency documents or conducting interviews months or years after the mediation.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 7: Other Collaborative Decision Making Methods

Many child welfare and court systems employ a range of decision making processes from traditional approaches to those that are increasingly collaborative and involve children, their caregivers, extended family systems and others. In addition to CPM, other collaborative decision making processes include, but are not limited to: family group decision making, family group conferences, family case planning conferences, team decision making, integrated case management, and family team conferences.

A variety of approaches can help better meet the diverse needs of a wider range of families at all stages of their involvement in the child protection system. Multiple models may allow the family and professionals or the court to select the resolution method that best addresses fits the circumstances of the case.

While many communities are implementing multiple collaborative decision making processes, there is little research or literature on how to best coordinate these approaches. Having an array of decision-making approaches presents both challenges and opportunities and identifying what strategies that they should use to optimize their success can be quite challenging. Some steps include the following:

- Communities can conduct a survey of the various collaborative planning and decision making methods used in their area. At a minimum, multiple systems, including courts, child welfare, and mental health, should be surveyed.
- Stakeholders should exchange information concerning the strengths and weaknesses of various identified methods.
- Decision makers can map how these decision making processes can complement, rather than, compete with one another. Discussions around referral processes, policies, service agents, organization structures, and research/evaluation findings could help to create a framework for better coordinating these methods.
- Stakeholders should articulate through written literature and presentations how these processes fit together, for example, which are used at specific points in the legal continuum, how referral processes work, how each model works, and how referrals can be made between the different processes. These materials should identify through policies, training, and protocols, each model's potential, and clarify they add value to and create a continuum with each other.
- Stakeholders should conduct a continuous quality improvement process to periodically review the interface of the decision making processes, and make alterations as needed. Communities could bring together representatives from the agencies that play a significant role in these processes to review cases and discuss improvement mechanisms, model fidelity, referral processes between the approaches, etc.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 8: Conclusion

Whenever possible, child welfare agencies and courts should promote collaborative decision making opportunities including CPM before litigation or agency-based solutions are imposed on families. As reported in the Child Welfare Information Gateway published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "When families are part of the decision-making process and have a say in developing plans that affect them and their children, they are more likely to be invested in the plans and more likely to commit to achieving objectives and complying with treatment that meets their individual needs."⁴

CPM is a proven collaborative decision making process which holds the potential to better engage families; improve working relationships between families and professionals; produce high levels of settlements at all stages; save judicial time; promote more timely resolution of cases; and improve parental compliance with case plan tasks in a cost efficient manner that is highly rated by both families and professionals. In some studies there is also evidence that CPM has resulted in increased placement in relative care and decreased placement in non-relative foster care when compared to litigation.

In addition to assisting in the resolution of child protection disputes, the NCJFCJ also points out that "[T]he mediation process itself can also serve as a model for future nonviolent and constructive problem solving and conflict resolution."⁵ As such there are other potential benefits to CPM including the potential to improve the overall quality of child protection services and promote more constructive conflict resolution by both families and child protection professionals.

⁴ www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f_fam_engagement/

⁵ Resource Guidelines Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, NCJFCJ 1995, Approved by the NCJFCJ Officers and Board of Trustees January 1995, p. 135.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 9: Glossary of Terms

A

Adjudicatory Hearing: A hearing where the court determines whether the allegations in a petition have been proven; fact-finding hearing. Also known as: Jurisdictional Hearing

Aging out: Refers to youth who will no longer be eligible to remain in foster care because of their age, generally 18-21

ASFA (US Law): Adoption and Safe Families Act. Federal law establishing requirements for finding permanent homes for children in foster care.

Assigned Counsel: Attorneys paid under local law who are assigned by the court to represent indigent parties.

Attorney for the Child: An attorney appointed to represent the wishes and interests of a child. (see Law Guardian and Guardian Ad Litem)

C

CASA: Court Appointed Special Advocates: Trained community volunteers who perform different functions in different jurisdictions including collecting information for the court or representing the best interests of a child.

Caseworker: An employee of a social service agency, department, or ministry responsible for working with families in need of assistance. Caseworkers can but need not be social workers.

Caucus: A private meeting facilitated by mediators that includes only certain individuals participating in the mediation.

Confidentiality in CPM: A principle whereby communications, be they spoken, written or acted out, made during mediation should be held in confidence and not disclosed to anyone outside the mediation.

Conflict of Interest: A conflict of interest may include circumstances when the relationship between the mediator and the mediation participants or the subject matter of the dispute compromises or appears to compromise the mediator's impartiality.

Conditional Surrender: Where a parent agrees to give up a child under certain conditions such as adoption by a particular person. Requirements vary by jurisdiction.

Concurrent planning: When an agency is working with a parent to achieve reunification but is also developing an alternative plan for the child if return to parent is not possible.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

D

Disposition: The outcome of a case; a hearing where the court decides whether a child returns home and what services the family needs.

E

Emergency Removal Hearing: (Shelter Care Hearing): Hearing to determine whether children can return home when social service has done an emergency removal based on children being at imminent risk. Also known as Temporary Custody Hearing

Ex parte communication: When one party communicates with the court outside of the presence or knowledge of the other party (not permitted).

F

Fact-finding: Adjudication; a hearing where the court determines whether the allegations in a petition have been proven.

Finding: A court's determination of fact.

Foster care: A temporary placement of a child outside of their home with a family or in another setting, under the authority of an authorized agency or the local child protective system.

G

Guardian Ad Litem (GAL): Generally, a person who speaks on behalf of someone who is not able to speak for him/herself. In some jurisdictions, a GAL is an advocate for the child and works to promote the child's best interests. The GAL may or may not be an attorney. (See Law Guardian and Attorney for Child)

I

ICWA (US Law): The Indian Child Welfare Act

ICPC (US Law): Interstate Compact for Placement of Children: Agreement between sending state and receiving state required when children in foster care are placed out of state.

Impartiality: Includes freedom from favoritism or bias in word, action, or appearance.

K

Kinship (foster) care: Foster care placement with a non-parent family member.

L

Law Guardian: In some jurisdictions, an attorney who represents the child. (See Attorney for the child and Guardian ad Litem.)

M

Mandated Reporter: Certain professionals are required to report child abuse or suspected maltreatment of children to a central authority.

N

Neglect: Generally, when a child's physical, mental or emotional condition has been impaired or placed in imminent risk of being impaired due to failure by a parent or other person legally responsible for a child to provide adequate care, food, shelter or supervision.

Neutrality: Means a disengagement from or disinterest with the outcome or decision made by the mediation participants

O

Open Adoption: Adoptive families and birth parents enter into binding contracts for post-adoption contact between birth parents and child. Type of agreement varies by jurisdiction as does enforceability.

Order of Protection: Sometimes called Temporary Restraining Order. Order directing the defendant or respondent to comply with certain conditions or refrain from certain acts against a person. The order is

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

designed to protect the subject from injury and may include the requirement that the defendant stay away from the protected individual and their home, work or school.

P

Parties: Named participants in the legal proceeding.

Permanency Goals: Under ASFA, the options for children in foster care 1) Return to parent 2) Termination of parental rights and placement for adoption 3) referral for legal guardianship 4) permanency placement with a fit and willing relative or 5) placement in another planned permanent living arrangement with a connection to an adult willing to be a permanent resource to the child.

Permanency Hearing: A hearing required under ASFA to review details and status of a child protective case and to determine appropriate permanency plan and goal.

Petitioner: Person or entity who brings a case to court; here, the department of social services or a child welfare agency.

Placement: When a child is placed by the court in the custody of the commissioner of social services or other child welfare official, to reside out of the home in foster care or in another institutional setting. Sometimes a child can be "placed directly" with a relative who will provide free care for the duration of the case.

Privilege in CPM: A right, under certain circumstances, for an individual to not be required to testify or otherwise disclose information obtained during mediation.

Program Manager: An individual who oversees quality control and the day to day operation of a CPM program. Also known as: director, administrator, coordinator, supervisor, etc.

R

Reasonable Efforts: Actions taken by a child welfare agency to prevent or eliminate the need to remove a child from home or to make it possible for a child to return home safely.

Release with Supervision: Possible disposition to a child protective case where parent remains under the jurisdiction of the court and must comply with conditions set out by the child protective agency.

Relinquishment: See Surrender.

Removal: Action taken by child protective agency to remove child from home or care of parents when there is risk of imminent harm to the child.

Resources: Relative or other adult who could provide permanent home or permanent connection for a child whose parents' parental rights have been terminated.

Respondent: Defendant; the parent against whom a child protective case is brought

S

Service Plan: Requirements established by the child protective agency and authorized by the court which parent must complete to address issues which brought the family's case to court; required services to address needs of parent and children.

Shelter Care Hearing: See "Emergency Removal Hearing"

Surrender: Legal proceeding in which parent voluntarily permanently gives up rights to the care and custody of a child. Procedures vary by jurisdiction. Some jurisdictions permit surrenders to be conditioned on adoption by certain people.

Suspended Judgment: Possible disposition after trial to terminate parental rights. If parent complies with terms and conditions for set period of time, order to terminate rights will not be entered.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

T

Temporary Custody Hearing: See "Emergency Removal Hearing"

Termination of Parental Rights (TPR): Legal proceeding to permanently end parent's right to care and custody, and even contact with a child. With certain exceptions, under ASFA, required to be filed if child has been in foster care for 15 out of 22 months.

Transition Planning: Educational, vocational, housing and life skills planning done by the agency and youth to prepare the young person for when they age out of the foster care system; also includes identifying resources who will be permanent adult connections for youths.

V

Voluntary Placement: Agreement between a parent and the department of social services for a child to be placed temporarily out of the home in the care and custody of the department; agreements are for limited period of time during which parent must plan to resume care of the child or face termination of their rights.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

Section 10: Selected Readings

- Agusti-Panareda, J. (2004). "Power Imbalances in Mediation: Questioning Some Common Assumptions." *Dispute Resolution Journal*. 59(2): 24 - 31.
- Airey, P. (1999). "It's a Natural Fit: Expanding Mediation to Alleviate Congestion in the Troubled Juvenile Court System." *Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers*.16: 275-97.
- Ashford, J. B. & Faith, R.L. (2004). "Testing Models of Justice and Trust: A Study of Mediation in Child Dependency Disputes." *Social Work Research*. 28(1): 18-27.
- Baar, C. (1998). "Mandatory Mediation in Child Protection Cases." *Canadian Lawyer*. 22(6): 32-33.
- Baker-Jackson, M. & Orlando, M.G. (1997). "Parents Beyond Conflict Workshop: An Intervention in the Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Court." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 202-5.
- Baron, S. (1997). "Dependency Court Mediation: The Roles of the Participants." *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*, 35(2): 149-59.
- Barsky, A. (1999). "Community Involvement Through Child Protection Mediation." *Child Welfare*. 78(4): 481-501.
- Barsky, A. (1997). "Why Parties Agree to Mediate: The Case of Child Protection." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 164-83.
- Barsky, A. (1996a). "Essential Elements of Child Protection Mediation." Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED460517.pdf>.
- Barsky, A. (1996b). "Mediation and Empowerment in Child Protection Cases." *Mediation Quarterly*. 14(2): 111-34.
- Barsky, A. & Trocmé, N. (1998). "The Essential Aspects of Mediation in Child Protection Cases." *Children and Youth Services Review*. 20(7): 629-56.
- Benjamin, R. (1991). "Mediative Strategies in the Management of Child Sexual Abuse Matters." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 29(3): 221-43.
- Bernstein, M. (1998). "Child Protection Mediation: Its Time has Arrived." *Canadian Family Law Quarterly*.16(1): 73-119.
- Carruthers, S.E. (1997). "Mediation in Child Protection and the Nova Scotia Experience." *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(1): 102-26.
- Thoennes, N. (1998). "Dependency Mediation in the San Francisco Courts." Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Coogan, M. E. (2003). "Mediation is a Viable Tool for DYFS Cases." Retrieved June 6, 2007 from <http://www.kidlaw.org/main.asp?url=1003&di=227.htm&dt=0&sti=107&prnt=no>>.
- Courter Films and Associates. (2000). *A Plan for Joseph*. Crystal River, FL: Courter Films and Associates.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

- Crush, L. (2007). "When Mediation Fails Child Protection: Lessons for the Future." *Canadian Journal of Family Law*. 23(1): 55-91.
- . (2005). *Child protection mediation: A model for Ontario*. Kingston, ONT.
- Crush, L. (2005). "The State of Child Protection Mediation in Canada." *Canadian Family Law Quarterly*. 24(2): 191-219.
- Dobbin, S., Gatowski, S. & Litchfield, M. (2001). "Essex County Child Welfare Mediation Program: Evaluation Results and Recommendations." *Technical Assistance Bulletin*. 5(4):1-85. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- Drews, K. (1985). "The Role Conflict of the Child Protective Service Worker: Investigator-helper." *Child Abuse and Neglect*. 4:247-54.
- Edwards, L.P. (2009). "Child Protection Mediation: A 25-year Perspective." *Family Court Review*. 47:69-80.
- Edwards, L.P. (2004). "Mediation in Child Protection Cases." *Journal of the Center for Families, Children, and the Courts*. 5:57-69.
- Edwards, L.P. (1997). "Dependency Court Mediation: The Role of the Judge." *Family Court Review*. 35(2): 160-3.
- Edwards, L. P. & Baron, S. (1995). "Alternatives to Contested Litigations in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 33(3): 275-85.
- Edwards, L. P. & the Santa Clara County Model Court Team. (2002). "Mediation in Juvenile Dependency Court: Multiple Perspectives." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 53(4): 49-65.
- Emery, R., L., Laumann-Billings, M., Sbarra, W.D., & Dillon, P. (2001). "Child Custody Mediation and Litigation: Custody, Contact, and Co-parenting 12 Years After Initial Dispute Resolution." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 69: 323-32.
- Etter, J. (1988). "Use of Mediated Agreements in Adoptions." *Mediation Quarterly*. 22: 83-9.
- Etter, J., & Roberts, D. "Child Welfare Mediation a Permanency Tool." Unpublished paper. Eugene, OR: Teamwork for Children.
- (1997). *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. Issue focuses on child protection mediation.
- Firestone, G. (2009). "Empowering Parents in Child Protection Mediation: Challenges and Opportunities." *Family Court Review*. 47: 98-115.
- Firestone, G. (1997). "Dependency Mediation: Where Do We Go From Here?" *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 223-38.
- Firestone, G. (1996). "Update on Juvenile Dependency Mediation." *The Family Law Commentator*. 21(3): 1-11.
- Firestone, G. & Weinstein, J. (2004). "In the Best Interests of Children: A Proposal to Transform the Adversarial System." *Family Court Review*. 42(2): 203-215.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

- Flango, V. (2001). "Measuring Progress in Improving Court Processing of Child Abuse and Neglect Cases." *Family Court Review*. 39: 58-69.
- Flatters, N. A. (2003). "Family/Child Judicial Dispute Resolution (JDR): An Overview of One Canadian Court's Settlement Conference Approach to the Pretrial Resolution of Family and Child Welfare/Protection Matters." *Family Court Review*. 41(2): 182-98.
- Focus Consultants. (2003). *Evaluation of the Surrey Court Project, Facilitated Planning Meeting: Final report*. British Columbia, Victoria: Ministry of Attorney General, Dispute Resolution Office.
- Gatowski, S.L., Dobbin, S.A. Litchfield, M., & Oetjen, J. (2005). "Mediation in Child Protection Cases: An Evaluation of the Washington, D.C. Family Court Child protection mediation program." Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- Giovannucci, M. T. (1997). "Understanding the Role of the Mediator in Child Protection Proceedings." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 143-48.
- Giovannucci, M., & Largent, K. (2009). "A Guide to Effective Child Protection Mediation: Lessons from 25 Years of Practice." *Family Court Review*. 47: 38-52.
- Heath, D. T. (1998). "Qualitative Analysis of Private Mediation: Benefits for Families in Public Child Welfare Agencies." *Children and Youth Services Review*. 20(7): 605-27.
- Hehr, A. M. (2007). "A Child Shall Lead Them: Developing and Utilizing Child Protection Mediation to Better Serve the Interests of the Child." *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*. 22(2): 443-76.
- Henry, A. H. (2005). "Mediating Child Protection Disputes - A Canadian Perspective: Are We Leaving Room for the Child at the Table?" *The Advocate*. 63(6): 847(14).
- Herrnstein, B. H. (1996). "Women and Mediation: A Chance to Speak and to be Heard." *Mediation Quarterly*. 13(3): 229-241.
- Jensen, L. (1999). "Permanency Mediation - New Tool for Child Welfare Systems." *Advocate*. 42(2): 15(3).
- Jordan, K. (2009). Need to Be Heard: Increasing Child Participation in Protection Mediation through the Implementation of Model Standards. *Family Court Review*. 47(4): 715-736.
- Kathol, J. (2009). "Trends in Child Protection Mediation: Results of the Think Tank Survey and Interviews." *Family Court Review*. 47: 116-128.
- Kathol, J., & Mayer, B. (2007). Conflict Resolution in Child welfare: Collecting the Wisdom of 25 Years of Experience- A Think Tank on Child Welfare Decision Making. Retrieved from <http://www.afccnet.org/pdfs/ChildWelfareDecisionMediationReport.pdf>.
- Kaminsky, H. and Cosmano, R. (1990). "Mediating Child Welfare Disputes: How to Focus on the Best Interest of the Child." *Mediation Quarterly*. 7(3): 229-34.
- Lande, J. (2001). "Mediation: Child Protection Mediation Knowledge and Information Services." *The National Center for State Courts*. Williamsburg, VA.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

- Lande, J. (1997). "Mediation: Child Protection Mediation Knowledge and Information Services." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. Special Issue on Child Protection Mediation. 35(2).
- Lande, J. & Sadler, L. (1999). "Mediating Child Neglect." *Arkansas Democrat Gazette*. February 21, 1999.
- Landsman, M.J., Thompson, K., and Bother, G. (2003). "Using Mediation to Achieve Permanency for Children and Families." *Families in Society*. 83(2): 229-239.
- Largent, K. (2010). "Child Protection Mediation and Family Engagement." *Protecting Children*. 25(2): 27-38; 229-39.
- Law Society of Upper Canada. (1989). "Mediation in Child Protection: A New Alternative." Toronto, ON: Law Society of Upper Canada, Department of Education.
- Libow, J. (1993). "The Need for Standardization and Expansion of Nonadversary Proceedings in Juvenile Dependency Court with Special Emphasis on Mediation and Role of Counsel." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*. 44(3): 3-16.
- McHale, M.J., Robertson, I., and Clarke, A. (2009). "Building a Child Protection Mediation Program in British Columbia." *Family Court Review*. 47: 86-97.
- Maresca, J. (1995). "Mediating Child Protection Cases." *Child Welfare*. 74(3): 731-42.
- Martin, P. M. (2009). "Child Protection Mediation: The Cook County Illinois Experience-- A Judge's Perspective." *Family Court Review*. 47(1): 81-85.
- Mayer, B. (2009). "Reflections on the State of Consensus-Based Decision Making in Child Welfare." *Family Court Review*. 47: 10-20.
- Mayer, B. (1989). "Mediation in Child Protection Cases: The Impact of Third-party Intervention on Parental Compliance Attitudes." *Mediation Quarterly*. 24: 89-106.
- Mayer, B. (1987). "The Dynamics of Power in Mediation and Negotiation." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. 16: 75-86.
- Mayer, B. (1987). "Mediation and Compliance in Child Protection." (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver). Ann Arbor, MI: U.M.I. Dissertation Services, No. 8802810.
- Mayer, B. (1985). "Conflict Resolution in Child Protection and Adoption." *Mediation Quarterly*. 7(3): 69-81.
- Mayer, B. & Kathol, J. (2007). "Report on Survey and Interviews Conducted in Preparation for the September Think Tank on Child Protection Conflict Resolution." Omaha, NE: Werner Institute for Negotiation and Dispute Resolution, Creighton University.
- Maynard, J. (2005). "Permanency Mediation: A Path to Open Adoption for Children in Out-of-home Care." *Child Welfare*. 84(4): 507-26.
- McNeilly, G. K. (1997). Mediation and Child Protection: An Ontario Perspective. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 206-22.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

- Metzger, R. W. (1997). Mediation in Child Protection in British Columbia. *Family and Conciliation Review*. 35(4): 418-23.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. (1995). "Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases." p. 1-170. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- Olson, K. (2009). "Family Group Conferencing and Child Protection Mediation: Essential Tools for Prioritizing Family Engagement in Child Welfare Cases." *Family Court Review*. 47: 53-58.
- Olson, K. (2003). "Lessons Learned from a Child Protection Mediation Program." *Family Court Review*. 41(4): 480-96.
- Orlando, M. G. (1997). "Funding juvenile dependency mediation through legislation." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 196-201.
- Palmer, S. E. (1989). "Mediation in Child Protection Cases: An Alternative to the Adversary System." *Child Welfare*. 68(1): 21-35.
- Patton, W. (1992). "Child Abuse: The Irreconcilable Differences between Criminal Prosecution and Informal Dependency Court Mediation." *University of Louisville Journal of Family Law*. 31(1): 37-64.
- Pearson, J., Thoennes, N., Mayer, B., and Golten, M. M. (1986). "Mediation of Child-welfare Cases." *Family Law Quarterly*. 20(2): 303-22.
- Saunders, C., Baker-Jackson, M., Flicker, B., and Mclsaac, H. (1991). "Mediation in the Los Angeles County Superior Court Juvenile Dependency Court." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 29(3): 259-69.
- Savoury, G. R., Beals, L.R., and Parks, J.M. (1995). "Mediation in Child Protection: Facilitating the Resolution of Disputes." *Child Welfare*. 74(3): 743-62.
- Sheehan, R. (2006). Alternative Dispute Resolution in Child Protection Matters: The Victorian Experience. *Australian Social Work*. 59(2): 157-71.
- . 1998. "The Administration of Justice: The Use of Mediation to Improve Public Access to Dispute Resolution and Avoid Court in Child Welfare Matters." *Administration*. 46(3): 53-9.
- Stahler, G. J., DuCette, J. P., and Povich, E. (1990). "Using Mediation to Prevent Child Maltreatment: An Exploratory Study." *Family Relations*. 39: 317-22.
- Thoennes, N. (2009). "What We Know Now: Findings from Dependency Mediation Research." *Family Court Review*. 47: 21-37.
- Thoennes, N. (2002). "Mediating Disputes Including Parenting Time and Responsibilities." *Colorado's 10th Judicial District: Assessing the Benefits to Courts*. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Thoennes, N. (2001). "Dependency Mediation in Oregon and the Nation." Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Thoennes, N. (2000). "Dependency Mediation: Help for Families and Courts." *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*. 51(2): 13-22.

Guidelines for Child Protection Mediation

- Thoennes, N. (1997). "Child Protection Mediation: Where We Started." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*. 35 (2): 136-42.
- Thoennes, N. (1997). "An Evaluation of Child Protection Mediation in Five California Courts." *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*. 35(2): 184-95.
- Thoennes, N. (1995). "Mediation in the Contra Costa County Dependency Court." *A Report to the California Legislature in Compliance with SB 1420*. Denver CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Thoennes, N. (1994). "Child Protection Mediation in the Juvenile Court." *The Judges Journal*. 33:14-19; 40-43.
- Thoennes, N. (1991). "Mediation and the Dependency Court: The Controversy and Three Courts' Experiences." *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*. 29(3): 246-58.
- Tjaden, P. G. (1994). "Dispute Resolution in Child Protection Cases." *Negotiation Journal*.10: 373-90.
- Trosch, L. A., Sanders, L.T., and Kugelmass, S. (2002). "Child Abuse, Neglect, and Dependency Mediation Pilot Project." *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*. 53(4): 67-77.
- Vitkovitch, C. M., & Ahmadian, B. (2008). "Report on Decision-making and Conflict Resolution in Child Welfare: Think Tank II Summary." Retrieved from <http://www.afccnet.org/pdfs/ThinkTankTwo.pdf>.
- Wildgoose, J. (1987). "Alternate Dispute Resolution of Child Protection Cases." *Canadian Journal of Family Law*. 6(1): 61-84.
- Wildgoose, J. & Maresca, J. (1994). "Mediating Child Protection Cases." Retrieved from http://www.crnetwork.ca/publicatios/fund/child_protection.html.
- Wilhelmus, M. (1998). "Mediation in Kinship Care: Another Step in the Provision of Culturally Relevant Child Welfare Services." *Social Work*. 43(2): 117-26.