

County of Santa Clara

Social Services Agency



353 West Julian Street
San Jose, California 95110-2335

DATE: February 6, 2024

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Daniel Little, Social Services Agency Director ^{DS} DL
Damion Wright, Director, Department of Family and Children's Services ^{DS} DW

SUBJECT: B.2 – DFCS Direction Regarding Role of County Counsel and DFCS Decision Making

At the December 19, 2023 Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the Board requested a report on “evolutions of direction DFCS provided social workers regarding the role of County Counsel in making determinations and the discretion that DFCS retains.” This memorandum provides the requested information related to direction DFCS has provided to social workers and DFCS’s decision making authority.

DFCS Request for County Counsel Support in Implementing Structured Decision-Making Model

DFCS has a long history of working closely and collaboratively with the County Counsel’s Office to ensure that DFCS is able to track and adapt to the ever-changing legal requirements applicable to child welfare work. County Counsel’s Child and Family Protection Team advises the department on a wide-ranging variety of matters, including all court-related matters associated with child welfare work. The County Counsel Child and Family Protection Team’s attorneys, paralegal, and support staff are physically co-located with DFCS at its main Julian Street location, and they are dedicated to supporting DFCS and representing social workers in dependency court proceedings.

In 2016, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) required that all counties use the Structured Decision Making (SDM) model, which gave rise to a major shift in child welfare practice throughout the state. Even though DFCS endeavored to transition quickly to the SDM, implementation of the SDM proved to be a difficult process – some in the department had grown accustomed to a prior tool, the Comprehensive Assessment Tool, while others were wary about the use of a standardized tool more broadly. These challenges are not specific to DFCS and are expected during any major practice change. DFCS relied on Evident Change, the entity that created and maintains the SDM for the State, to provide training on the new tool. However, the SDM was ultimately not being used consistently and

when it was used, it was often not being applied in a manner consistent with how the tool was supposed to be used under direction from CDSS.

Beginning in 2020, DFCS leadership requested that County Counsel begin playing a more proactive role in monitoring and supporting the department's compliance with SDM requirements. Under DFCS's long-standing practice, County Counsel provides legal guidance when social workers are contemplating taking an action requiring the filing of a warrant application or petition with the court, such as removing a child from the custody of their parents. The purpose of this consultation is to ensure that DFCS staff have an appropriate, legal basis for pursuing a warrant or petition for removal and that they have appropriately documented that basis for presentation to the court. Following this consultation, County Counsel assists DFCS in obtaining the warrant or order. *See attached Handbook 13-5: Protective Custody Warrants.*

DFCS leadership requested that when County Counsel attorneys engaged with staff for such a consultation, the attorneys confirm with social workers that they had fully completed the SDM. Moreover, DFCS leadership notified all DFCS supervisors, program managers, and coordinators that when County Counsel attorneys advised that there was insufficient evidence to petition for removal, such matters should be elevated to DFCS executives to make a final decision. In January of 2021, the Lead Deputy County Counsel for the Child and Family Protection Team and the DFCS director sent a joint communication to all relevant staff within DFCS reiterating this expectation. Three days later, the DFCS director sent staff a further message clarifying the role of County Counsel as follows:

County [Counsel] advised on when they feel we have sufficient evidence to support legally mandatory efforts to prevent the need for removal of children from their homes, as well as if we have enough evidence to support a removal. Instances where we are recommending a removal, but County Counsel feels we did not satisfy a legal mandate, one of the execs will be included in the process to weigh in. If we're going to recommend actions that go counter to County Counsel legal advice, I want to make sure we have a chance to review at all levels. This also places the burden of the final decision on the exec team. This process is in no way an attempt to remove the clinical expertise that is used to make decisions. If the tools we use were created correctly, our child welfare assessments and recommendations should be supported by legal mandates. In rare situations where this isn't the case, we just need to look a little deeper.

DFCS leadership's request that County Counsel play a more proactive role served two purposes. First, it helped to ensure consistent compliance with federal and state legal and regulatory requirements, as outlined by CDSS. CDSS oversees DFCS's child welfare work, and one of DFCS' core responsibilities is to ensure that its child welfare work meets the state's statutory and regulatory standards. Second, it reflected evolving research and understandings in the child welfare field showing that separation of children from their families often causes severe, long-term adverse impacts, and that such impacts fall disproportionately on low-income communities of color. In 2020, County data indicated that 90% of children in foster care were children of color, with particularly high representation amongst Latino and African Ancestry families. Recent state legislation reflects this research,

including a new law, SB 578, that became effective January 1, 2024 requiring that social workers consider and report to the court on both the harms of removal and alternatives to removal when seeking court intervention. DFCS's goal with increased support by County Counsel was to ensure that social worker assessments were complete and consistent with state law requirements around use of the SDM and the legal framework of child welfare was applied equitably and consistently to each family it serves. At all times, however, all decision-making responsibility regarding removals has resided with DFCS and, ultimately, DFCS's leadership.

To further support this transition, DFCS worked extensively with the founder of the Family Finding model, Kevin Campbell. In 2022, Mr. Campbell led multiple, day-long trainings with staff and stakeholders to teach about family healing and family finding, and to help work towards a more nuanced decision-making process that recognizes that removal is not a "harm free" option, and that family engagement around safety planning and building out a safety network is critical to long-term success for children and families involved in the child welfare system. In particular, this allowed for more children who could not safely remain with their parents to be cared for by relatives of other caring adults in their lives rather than being placed in a traditional foster home.

DFCS leadership reinforced this approach through communication with DFCS staff that emphasized fidelity to the SDM, ensuring compliance with the law, and escalation to DFCS executives when a social worker sought to remove a child against legal advice. For example, an April 2023 email to all DFCS staff read as follows:

As you all know, our ultimate responsibility as a child welfare agency is to make decisions in the best interests of children and families. Child safety and well-being are our first priority. These are often difficult decisions, and we are called upon to make them under intense and high-stakes circumstances. As we work together to make these decisions, we keep our core principles always in mind-- Children do best with their families. Families have the tools to solve their own problems if given the opportunity. Family engagement is not negotiable. There is no safety without healing.

As we do this work together, your management and executive teams are here to share in navigating the cases that challenge us as an organization. We strongly encourage you to elevate any case where you feel the circumstances warrant further discussion.

It is my continued expectation that a decision to proceed with a removal of a child from a family home against legal advice must be escalated and ultimately made by a DFCS Executive. My goal is to support you through the critical work you do.

Please keep in mind that before legal consultation is sought, SDM tools must be fully completed and current, and potential resources to establish safety in the family home should be fully vetted with the DFCS supervisor and division manager. If following legal consultation, the social worker wishes to pursue an action that differs from advice, please elevate the case for additional review.

November 2023 Interim Direction

Although, DFCS leadership sought to provide clear guidance in communications such as the above April 2023 email, some social workers reported frustration and confusion about the role of County Counsel attorneys in advising on case-specific matters. In particular, some reported a hesitancy to elevate a decision regarding a potential removal petition to DFCS executive leadership if attorneys advised that the evidentiary standard had not been satisfied.

Accordingly, on November 15, 2023, the DFCS director provided Interim Direction that updated the process for DFCS staff to request legal advice from County Counsel. Instead of social workers seeking legal advice directly from County Counsel attorneys and escalating the matter to DFCS executive leadership if DFCS staff wanted to take an action contrary to legal advice, social workers and their supervisors were instructed to request legal advice as needed through their Division Manager, and only after the social worker had completed their assessment and worked with their team to determine the level of intervention it believed was appropriate for the family. Under the Interim Direction, the Division Manager is responsible for consulting County Counsel prior to seeking County Counsel's assistance in filing a petition with the court. In turn, the Division Manager escalates matters to the DFCS Bureau Manager and DFCS executive leadership if needed for a final decision on how to proceed.

Potential Future Models of County Counsel Involvement

DFCS leadership is obtaining input and evaluating the Interim Direction and potential alternatives in collaboration with relevant DFCS staff at all levels, as described in the memo responding to item A.4b. While the Interim Direction has helped to facilitate the completion of robust social work and internal consultation with supervisors prior to seeking legal advice, some social workers have expressed frustration that they do not have direct access to legal counsel earlier in the investigatory process. Social workers have also expressed a desire to participate in the discussions when Division Managers are consulting with County Counsel. As described in the memo responding to item A.4b, DFCS is currently exploring a possible transition to a multi-disciplinary team (MDT) model.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Email from DFCS Director to DFCS staff, Subject: Emergency Response Advice (Jan. 7, 2021).
- Attachment B: Memorandum from DFCS Director to DFCS staff, Subject: Child Safety and Well Being (Apr. 3, 2023).
- Attachment C: Interim Direction memorandum from DFCS Director (Nov. 15, 2023).
- Attachment D: Handbook 9-1: Reasonable Efforts
- Attachment E: Handbook 13-5: Protective Custody Warrants

**Attachment A:
Email from DFCS
Director to DFCS staff,
Subject: Emergency
Response Advice (Jan.
7, 2021)**

January 7, 2021 Email

From: Little, Daniel <daniel.little@ssa.sccgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 12:20 PM
To: DFCS Supervisors <DFCSSupervisors@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Program Managers <DFCSProgramManagers@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us>; DFCS Coordinator II <DFCSCoordinatorII@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS DIRECT REPORTS <DFCSDIRECTREPORTS@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Program Managers WOOO <DFCSProgramManagersWOOO@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Supervisors WOOO <DFCSWOOOSupervisors@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us>
Cc: Kinnear, Wendy <Wendy.Kinnear@ssa.sccgov.org>; Hankins, Jamila <jamila.hankins@ssa.sccgov.org>
Subject: Re: Emergency Response Advice

Hi all and happy Thursday. I wanted to follow-up on this message as it's clear the intent of this practice does not match the impact that was felt by many of you. I apologize for the miss and see that we could have communicated this differently. I was operating under an assumption that the practice outline below had been in place for some time, but had not been sent out broadly.

As Hilary described below, County County advised on when they feel we have sufficient evidence to support legally mandatory efforts to prevent the need for removal of children from their homes, as well as if we have enough evidence to support a removal. In stances where we are recommending a removal, but County Counsel feels we did not satisfy a legal mandate, one of the execs will be included in the process to weigh in. If we're going to recommend actions that go counter to County Counsel legal advice, I want to make sure we have a chance to review at all levels. This also places the burden of the final decision on the exec team. This process is in no way an attempt to remove the clinical expertise that is used to make decisions. If the tools we use were created correctly, our child welfare assessments and recommendations should be supported by legal mandates. in rare situations where this isn't the case. we just need to look a little deeper.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns. My hope is that this can be a support to everyone, but I do understand it may feel like additional oversight.

Daniel Little, MSW
Director
Department of Family and Children's Services
Social Services Agency
County of Santa Clara
373 W. Julian Street, Ste 500
San Jose, CA 95110-2335
Daniel.Little@ssa.sccgov.org
[408-501-6802](tel:408-501-6802)

From: Kerrigan, Hilary <Hilary.Kerrigan@cco.sccgov.org>
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 3:49 PM
To: DFCS Supervisors <DFCSSupervisors@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Program Managers <DFCSProgramManagers@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us>; DFCS Coordinator II <DFCSCoordinatorII@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS DIRECT REPORTS <DFCSDIRECTREPORTS@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Program Managers WOOC <DFCSProgramManagersWOOC@ssa.sccgov.org>; DFCS Supervisors WOOC <DFCSWOOCSupervisors@ssa.co.santa-clara.ca.us>
Cc: Little, Daniel <daniel.little@ssa.sccgov.org>; Kinnear, Wendy <Wendy.Kinnear@ssa.sccgov.org>; Hankins, Jamila <jamila.hankins@ssa.sccgov.org>; CCO - JSO_CDU Attys <cco-jso_cdu.attys@cco.sccgov.org>
Subject: Emergency Response Advice

Good afternoon and Happy New Year to all. Please share the message below with your case-carrying staff.

Case carrying staff,

We write to confirm some management directions being re-issued cooperatively between DFCS and the Office of the County Counsel regarding emergency response advice. As you know, the County and our Departments are strongly committed to racial justice and to healing the historical wounds underlying disproportionate representation of children of color in the child welfare system. To that end, we are partnering to ensure better consistency in our emergency response work with respect to making and documenting legally mandatory efforts to prevent the need for removal of children from their homes, and to engage relatives and previously non-custodial parents before a removal wherever possible. When a removal cannot be avoided, legal counsel must be closely involved to individually assess whether the evidence meets the high legal standard for removal.

To ensure consistency, we are confirming management's direction that any action by the County involving a petition being filed in the court, a warrantless removal from a parent, or a warrant being sought to remove a child from a parent must be consistent with legal advice from the Office of the County Counsel, unless Wendy Kinnear, Jamila Hankins, or Daniel Little decides otherwise. Bhavit Madhvani will be the primary legal advisor on emergency response and petition review for the Office of the County Counsel beginning January 11, 2021. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Thank you,

Daniel Little and Hilary Kerrigan

**Attachment B:
Memorandum from
DFCS Director to DFCS
staff, Subject: Child
Safety and Well Being
(Apr. 3, 2023)**

County of Santa Clara

Social Services Agency



373 West Julian Street
San Jose, California 95110-2335

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 3, 2023
To: DFCS Staff
From: Daniel Little, Director
Subject: **Child Safety and Well Being**

As you all know, our ultimate responsibility as a child welfare agency is to make decisions in the best interests of children and families. Child safety and well-being are our first priority. These are often difficult decisions, and we are called upon to make them under intense and high-stakes circumstances. As we work together to make these decisions, we keep our core principles always in mind-- Children do best with their families. Families have the tools to solve their own problems if given the opportunity. Family engagement is not negotiable. There is no safety without healing.

As we do this work together, your management and executive teams are here to share in navigating the cases that challenge us as an organization. We strongly encourage you to elevate any case where you feel the circumstances warrant further discussion.

For your reference, here is the guidance I issued on January 7, 2021:

"In stances where we are recommending a removal, but County Counsel feels we did not satisfy a legal mandate, one of the execs will be included in the process to weigh in. If we're going to recommend actions that go counter to County Counsel legal advice, I want to make sure we have a chance to review at all levels. This also places the burden of the final decision on the exec team. This process is in no way an attempt to remove the clinical expertise that is used to make decisions. If the tools we use were created correctly, our child welfare assessments and recommendations should be supported by legal mandates. In rare situations where this isn't the case, we just need to look a little deeper."

It is my continued expectation that a decision to proceed with a removal of a child from a family home against legal advice must be escalated and ultimately made by a DFCS Executive. My goal is to support you through the critical work you do.

Please keep in mind that before legal consultation is sought, SDM tools must be fully completed and current, and potential resources to establish safety in the family home should be fully vetted with the DFCS supervisor and division manager. If following legal consultation, the social worker wishes to pursue an action that differs from advice, please elevate the case for additional review.

Please don't hesitate to raise any additional questions to my attention.

We are grateful for your strength and flexibility as we grow together.

Board of Supervisors: Sylvia Arenas, Cindy Chavez, Otto Lee, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith

**Attachment C:
Interim Direction
memorandum from
DFCS Director
(Nov. 15, 2023)**

County of Santa Clara

Social Services Agency

Department of Family & Children's Services

373 West Julian Street
San Jose, California 95110-2335



Date: November 15, 2023

To: DFCS Staff

From: Damion Wright, DFCS Director

Subject: Interim Direction

As we are in a very difficult time, the mission of DFCS is what I continue to focus on in guiding our next steps, and our work with all DFCS staff and our partners, ***to keep children safe and families strong by partnering with communities.***

Also, as we look at this complex and difficult work, there needs to be an understanding of where we currently are as a Department to identify our best practices in ensuring children are protected, and staff are supported.

In that, we need to have a clear approach to this work that must include:

- Determining the right support and intervention for the family from the beginning;
- Engaging families and communities to be part of safe solutions for children;
- Putting our eyes on and arms around vulnerable families in partnership with communities; and
- Establishing a safety culture through continuous quality improvement.

Our strategic focus areas have to be centered around safeguarding children, workforce support and development, race equity and leadership, and key partnerships.

As such, the department will be engaging in multiple clarification efforts to support collaborative decision making and to outline guidance. This is to ensure additional clarity and support is provided to our social workers, supervisors, and managers who are doing this complicated work. This is also ensuring that we are drilling down deeply into these critical decision making points with an overarching lens to ensure the immediate and ongoing safety of children.

In addition, there are children and youth that have higher risk factors because of their need and or vulnerability which are children 0 - 5 years and our older youth with complex needs; so, in making clear connective decisions around what we have learned, there will be some specific refinement in our work with "vulnerable children".

Lastly, we will continue to review all current practices, policies, and procedures including utilizing case reviews, data, and other information that can help drive our best decision making.

Please see the attached interim direction established around Safety Protocols here: [Safety Protocol](#) and Policy Update: Substance Exposed Newborns here: [Policy - Drug Exposed Infants](#) which will be reviewed after 60 days to determine whether any additional refinements are needed.

This interim direction, issued today, is effective immediately.



11/15/23

Safety Protocols**SDM Safety Assessment Completion**

Please continue to adhere to 3-16.2 SDM Safety and Substitute Care Provider Safety Assessments.

In reviewing **Safety Threats**, please ensure all safety threats in relation to referral allegations and investigation are reviewed, including but not limited to:

- #9: Current Circumstances, combined with information that the caregiver has or may have previously maltreated a child in his/ her care, suggest that the child's safety may be of immediate concern based on the severity of the previous maltreatment or the caregiver's response to the previous incident.
 - There must be both current, immediate threats to child safety AND related previous maltreatment that was severe and/or represents an unresolved pattern of maltreatment.
- #10: Other
 - Circumstances or conditions that pose an immediate threat of serious harm to a child, which are not already described in safety threats 1-9.
- All Safety Threats should be reviewed in relation to **Caregiver Complicating Behaviors**

DFCS Level of Intervention Determination

Please continue to adhere to 3-16.2 SDM Safety and Substitute Care Provider Safety Assessments in determining DFCS level of intervention.

Please continue to adhere to the SDM Safety Assessment Tool in accordance with the below-mentioned SDM policy and procedures:

- SECTION 4: PLACEMENT INTERVENTIONS
 - This section is only completed when, after considering complicating behaviors that may impact safety planning, household strengths and protective actions, the vulnerability of the child, and the in-home safety interventions that are available, the worker determines that placement is the only intervention for protection of the child.
 - If one or more safety threats are identified and the worker determines that in-home interventions are unavailable, insufficient, or may not be used, the final option is to indicate that the child will be placed by selecting placement interventions 10 or 11.

If Intervention #10 or #11 are indicated, the Social Worker, Supervisor, and Division Manager are to do the following:

- Discuss the case to confirm any necessary action; this is as guided by the SDM Safety Tool, Risk Assessment tool, and their clinical assessment.
- Division Manager is to discuss with County Counsel any legal parameters concerning the matter
 - This discussion will include only the Division Manager (and/or higher level manager or Executive Team). This meeting is for the purpose of legal consultation and is not case consultation.
- Division Manager will check in with Bureau Manager (or Assistant Director, if Bureau Manager unavailable) to determine DFCS' position in assessing for any Court intervention needed. This will take into account any legal parameters resulting from the Division Manager's legal consultation.
 - If DFCS' recommended direction is not in line with legal advice from County Counsel, a member of the Executive Team (Director or Assistant Directors) must be involved in the final decision
 - If an Assistant Director makes final decision not in line with County Counsel advisement, DFCS Director is to be notified at the time the decision is made.
 - Ultimate decision-making authority for all decisions related to child safety and placement is exclusively held by DFCS. County Counsel's role is to provide legal advice when requested to support compliance with legal requirements.
- After the final placement intervention decision is made:



DFCS Safety Protocols

- Division Manager is to circle back to the DFCS Social Worker and Supervisor providing the decision and direction via email; the subject line shall read “DFCS Intervention Determination”
- Supervisor is to immediately document this decision and direction in CWS/ CMS as an Activity Note, including the name of the Division Manager, Bureau Manger, and Executive Team member consulted in reaching the decision; the first line of this Activity Note shall read “DFCS Intervention Determination”, including the following:
 - The Safety Assessment guidance including but not limited to:
 - Safe *or* Safety Threat AND Safety Plan or Inability to Safe Plan, and if so,
 - Placement Intervention
 - the Risk Assessment details including but not limited to:
 - Final Risk Level
 - Recommended Decision
 - Planned Action
 - Any Supplemental Risk Items
- Division Manager is to work with County Counsel, if Court intervention is determined, and support the Social Worker and Supervisor, as needed.

Note: There will be a subsequent visual provided for this process.

Sibling Protocol

DFCS local policy is to generate a referral for any new child born to a parent within a DFCS case, both Voluntary or Court.

The referral will be generated based on safety/ risk concerns of siblings’ open case as indicated in most recent completed SDM tool(s), and **Factors Influencing Child Vulnerability** (i.e. age is 0- 5) of the newly born child.

The referral determination shall **not** be overridden to be evaluated out, and will require an in-person investigation to determine support and or level of intervention for the newly born child in relation to the current open case.

The CANC Screener **reports** the incident, as follows, by sending a copy of the Screener Narrative via email to the following:

- DFCS Sr. Leadership Team
- Assigned Case Social Worker and his/her supervisor
- Social worker assigned to referral and his/her supervisor
- Supervisor of CANC Screening Social Worker who received the referral

A Case Consultation is required for any newly born children to parents in open DFCS cases; this case consultation must include the primary Social Worker and their Supervisor/ Manager as well as the Emergency Response Social Worker and their Supervisor/ Manager.

All cases that result in a different intervention determination than that of the current case status of other children in the home, will require Bureau Manager approval (i.e. parents in Court Family Reunification/ Maintenance and if another child/children is recommended to be in a Voluntary Family Maintenance).

All other elements of [OPP Chapter 13-9 Sibling Protocol](#) will be followed.

Pos Tox Children

Please see accompanying policy document “Policy Update: Substance-Exposed Newborns”

High Risk or Very High-Risk Referrals

If the Safety Assessment tool is Safe with a Plan, the referral is determined High Risk/ Very High-Risk involving children that are 0 – 5, non-verbal, and/or special needs, and the referral is substantiated, the social worker will be required to file an Out of Custody Petition, as there is an identified Safety Threat along with a substantiated allegation of abuse/ neglect.



DFCS Safety Protocols

These cases will be considered as cases needing higher levels of intervention through Court and heightened DFCS monitoring in lieu of a Voluntary Family Maintenance Case.

In alignment with [3-16.4 Safety Planning](#), there should be a safety plan that matches the needs of the family including in-home visits, use of mandated reporters (i.e. PHN, mental health providers, etc.), providing in-home support or regularly viewing the child, and integration of others from safety network, as appropriate. As these are High Risk/ Very High-Risk cases, the minimum number of in-home visits as outlined in the safety plan/ case plan by the above-mentioned persons should ensure ongoing safety of a child in respect to their vulnerability.

DFCS local policy will be to not override any determination of “Promote” to a case for High Risk/ Very High-Risk cases where the referral is substantiated/ inconclusive for children that are 0 – 5, non-verbal and or special needs; the only exception to this policy will be as approved by a member of the Executive Team.



11/15/2023

Policy Update: Substance-Exposed Newborns

Background The type of response to a report of child abuse or neglect begins with an assessment of the child and family. The assessment must consider three factors and examine the interplay among those factors. The three factors are 1) imminent safety 2) future risk, and 3) current protective capacity. Both challenges and strengths must be identified in determining whether intervention by the Department of Family and Children's Services is necessary.

Update to Policy The purpose of this memo is to provide further clarity and direction on the interplay between DFCS Online Policies and Procedures (Section 1-8) and the Structured Decision Making (SDM) tool when determining the response to allegation of substance abuse exposed newborns to determine risk posed to the child's safety.

Updated Procedures DFCS local policy is *all* reports involving substance-exposed newborns shall be generated as referrals. This will be based on the SDM Hotline Tool as **Factors Influencing Child Vulnerability** section will have "Age 0 – 5 years" checked, and **SECTION 1A: CAREGIVER COMPLICATING BEHAVIORS** will have "substance abuse" checked as well.

Response Determination

Appropriate determinations will be made based on a child's discharge date:

- When there is an immediate discharge (i.e. child is to be discharged within 2 hours of the report being received by CANC), the referral will be determined as an Immediate Response with a required 2-hour response
- For any other discharge date, the referral will be determined an Immediate Response (within 24 hours)

The CANC screener will indicate the most up-to-date discharge date on the Screener Narrative.

Responsibilities of the Primary Emergency Response (ER) Social Worker

Throughout the time of the referral, the ER social worker will do the following:

- Keep the referral open for the maximum allowance of 29 days (**OPP 2-3 Conducting an Emergency Response Assessment/ Referrals Open Longer Than 29 Days**) to support monitoring caregiver acts of protection, if not opening a case
- Communicate with all providers including safety network regularly and document any contacts in CWS/ CMS within 24 hours
- Ensure the child is visited in the home at least weekly for the time period the referral is open, ensuring caregiver's involvement in services and ongoing safety of child; this will include assessing provisions, assessing caregiver's parenting ability, etc.
 - o The weekly visits can be done by the primary ER social worker, social worker I, and or PHN
 - o The primary ER social worker must visit the child at least twice, in-home, including an in-home visit, no more than three days prior to closure
- Communicate the importance of **safe sleep** with an newborn, and to assess the sleeping arrangements of the child



- Social worker must engage and document engagement with the attending medical professionals, presumably those involved in the child abuse and neglect call or completing needs assessment of the family, medical specialist and or the medical team providing or overseeing care of the child.
 - o The initial meeting should be centered around discharge planning, and a subsequent meeting prior to closure of the referral.
 - o These meetings can be accomplished through a Child and Family Team (CFT) meeting.

The purpose of this engagement will be to ensure the family or caregiver is receiving the treatment and appropriate services required by the plan and the infant is safe and receiving appropriate care.

A clear plan of ongoing care of the child must be completed and evidenced within the case file, and a Supervisor/ Division Manager must review the plan

If the SDM guidance is Safe with a Plan, the plan must include coordination with the medical professionals supporting the child and family, along with regular, well-child checks.

If the SDM decision is to “Promote”, this determination will be *unable* to be overridden to “Do not promote” to a case.

As these vulnerable children require a higher level of support to the family to ensure there is ongoing safety, there will be a need for confirmation of a clear safety network in place, regularly seeing the child, and or there must be a higher level of DFCS intervention.



Attachment D: Handbook 9-1: Reasonable Efforts

DFCS Operational Policies & Procedures (OPP)

Handbook 9: Court Related Issues

9-1 Reasonable Efforts

[<<< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#)

-
- [Policy](#)
 - [Purpose of Reasonable Efforts](#)
 - [When Are Reasonable Efforts Provided](#)
 - [Services to Establish Reasonable Efforts](#)
 - [Documentation of Reasonable Efforts](#)
 - [Indian Child Welfare Act \(ICWA\)](#)
 - [No Reasonable Efforts Finding](#)
 - [Contacts](#)
 - [Other References](#)
 - [Legal Basis](#)
-

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

Last Updated: December 23, 2020

Non CWS/CMS Forms:

- [Declaration of Reasonable Efforts Temporary Custody Report \(SCZ1554\)](#)
- [Services Documentation Log \(SC 909\)](#)
- [Initial Hearing Report Templates](#)

CWS/CMS Forms:

- Contact Section: Contact Notebook
-

POLICY

Public Law 96-272, passed in 1980, and California's Senate Bill (SB) 14, enacted in 1982, requires judges to determine whether reasonable efforts were provided to families during reunification. Public Law 105-89, passed in 1998, and Public Law 106-113, passed in 2001, requires judges to make a reasonable efforts finding at each review hearing, including permanent efforts finding is a judicial decision that determines whether or not the social worker has provided reasonable services.

DESK GUIDE

PURPOSE OF REASONABLE EFFORTS LAW

The reasonable efforts provision in the laws is intended to insure that:

- No child is placed into foster care who can effectively be protected in his/her own home.
 - The social worker must show a good faith effort in preventing removal. Under Welfare and Institutions Code 16002.5, when a child is placed into temporary custody, the social worker must decide whether there are any reasonable services available to the family, including public assistance, which, if provided, could eliminate the need to remove the child from the parent's or caregiver's home.
- When removal is necessary, reunification is attempted before any other permanent arrangement is sought, unless it would endanger the child's safety.

That the goal is to return the child to a safe home or develop and finalize a permanent plan for the child.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

WHEN ARE REASONABLE EFFORTS PROVIDED

Reasonable efforts can take place:

- Before the family becomes involved with the Department of Family and Children's Services.
 - A family may have used services in the community to try to resolve family issues, prior to coming to the court. This includes these services when identifying reasonable efforts in reports to the court.
- After a referral on the family has been made to the Department of Family and Children's Services.
- If the child has been adjudged a Dependent Child of the Court, during the 6 to 18 month period when Famil

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

SERVICES TO ESTABLISH REASONABLE EFFORTS

Services that should be provided to fulfill the Reasonable Efforts requirement are those that are:

- Linked to the safety concerns and risk factors affecting the caregiver's ability to protect the child.
- Reasonable efforts should aim to increase the protective capacity of the caregiver. They should not include a do not link directly to the department's identified concerns.
- **Available and within Geographic Access**

The services should be within reach. Often this is defined in terms of distance, with travel time less than 30 minutes an appointment or service and the wait, once a client reaches the service agency, if services are provided out of the
- **Obtainable and within the Client's Financial Access**

The services should be affordable. The assessment should consider direct and indirect costs, e.g., bus fare, gas costs needs such as food and housing.
- **Acceptable**

The services should be acceptable to the client. Usually this means that some standard is maintained, e.g., confiden rapport and satisfaction with services.
- **Socially and Culturally Appropriate**

The services should be compatible with the client family's ethnic and sociocultural background. This includes the we composition and training of the staff and staffing patterns. It refers to the service or treatment models employed by appropriateness of services includes considering how conflicting values and attitudes of the staff and client (e.g., sti impede a family's access and utilization of services and hinder compliance with regimens set forth in the case plan.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

DOCUMENTATION OF REASONABLE EFFORTS

It is extremely important that the social worker document any services that are provided to the child and the parent

- When a child is placed into temporary custody, the Emergency Response, Assessment Center or Early Intervener [Declaration of Reasonable Efforts Detention Report \(SCZ1554\)](#). This form is submitted to the court if a petitioner
 - The report should include any activities that the ER, Assessment Center or EI social worker has done to p include:
 - Conferences with law enforcement
 - Case and/or computer review of prior services
 - Immediate on-site assessment or evaluation
 - Interviews with children and/or other family members

- Referrals to service
 - Attempts to develop a safety plan to control immediate danger in the parent's household
- If Dependency Investigations files a petition, the social worker must complete a reasonable efforts question (# Report).
 - It is not acceptable to simply state "No reasonable efforts due to the emergency nature of the situation.
 - The statement should include any activities that the ER or DI social worker has done to prevent removal, that can control safety threats which the child or youth remains in the home.
- Court reports must document clearly, what services have been offered to the parents and child so that the court can determine if reasonable efforts have been made. The social worker should track all services offered to the clients in the Contact Notebook or on an SC 909. Report at the following hearings:
 - Initial Petition Hearing.
 - Dispositional Hearing.
 - Six Month Review Hearing.
 - Twelve Month Review Hearing.
 - Eighteen Month Review Hearing.
 - Selection and Implementation Hearing (W&I Code 366.26).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT (ICWA)

Specific reasonable efforts expectations apply for children who are subjects to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). [OPP Chapter 13-12 Indian Child Welfare Act \(ICWA\)](#).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

NO REASONABLE EFFORTS FINDINGS – What Happens?

The court makes the final decision as to whether or not adequate reasonable efforts services have been provided in court makes a finding that reasonable efforts have not been provided:

- The court may extend court-ordered service for another 6 months.
- The court may, at a hearing regarding termination of parental rights, decline to order the termination of a parent's reasonable efforts finding at each previous Status Review Hearing.

DFCS loses Federal funding for that case.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

CONTACTS

-

OTHER REFERENCES

- [OPP Chapter 13-12 Indian Child Welfare Act \(ICWA\)](#)

LEGAL BASIS

- [Welfare and Institutions Code \(WIC\) § 309](#)
- [WIC§ 319\(d\)\(1\)](#)

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

Department of Fami

Attachment E: Handbook 13-5: Protective Custody Warrants

 **DFCS Operational Policies & Procedures (OPP)****Handbook 13: Cross Program Protocols****13-5 Protective Custody Warrants**

[<<< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#)

-
- [Policy](#)
 - [Standard for Issuing a PC Warrant to Remove a Child from the Family Home](#)
 - [Approval to Request a PC Warrant](#)
 - [Procedure for PC Warrants](#)
 - [Executing the PC Warrant for Removal of a Child from the Family Home](#)
 - [After the Warrant Is Served and the Child Is Removed](#)
 - [PC Warrants for Children Missing from Care](#)
 - [Contacts](#)
 - [Other References](#)
 - [Legal Basis](#)

[from the Home](#)

Effective Date:

04/01/2006

Last Updated:

10/31/2023

Non-CWS/CMS Forms:

- [Application and Declaration in Support of PC Warrant \(SCZ835\)](#).
- [Warrant Memo \(SCZ 1411\)](#).
- [Placement/Address Change \(SCZ 17\)](#).

CWS/CMS Forms:

- Contact Notebook
-

POLICY

Under Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 340, a Superior Court judge may issue a Juvenile Court

Protective Custody Warrant, placing a child in temporary custody, when the Court deems that the circumstances of the child's home environment may endanger the health, person, or welfare of the child, or whenever a dependent minor has run away from a court-ordered placement. In Santa Clara County, the warrant application is submitted using the Application and Declaration in Support of PC Warrant (SCZ835), which a judge must sign. Protective custody (PC) warrants are issued under specific circumstances for both dependent and non-dependent children.

Unless the standard for a warrantless removal, outlined in [OPP Chapter 2-7](#) is met, DFCS social workers must request and obtain a protective custody warrant before removing a child from their parent or guardian's care.

DESK GUIDE

STANDARD FOR ISSUING A PC WARRANT TO REMOVE A CHILD FROM THE FAMILY HOME

The Juvenile Court may only issue a protective custody warrant to remove a child from a family home if the Court finds each of the following by probable cause:

- The child is a person described by WIC § 300, **and**
- There is a substantial danger to the safety or the physical or emotional health of the child, **and**
- There are no reasonable means to protect the child's safety or physical health without removal.

- **Note:** If the substantial danger to the child's safety is not imminent, then DFCS has time to make or to continue making reasonable efforts to prevent removal.
- In addition to these statutory requirements, absent narrow circumstances, there must also be a connection or nexus between the parent's conduct to the imminent and substantial danger to the child's safety.
 - Nexus issues often arise in cases where the parent suffers from a substance abuse disorder. A parent's substance abuse on its own is not sufficient grounds for removal or Juvenile Court intervention. In these cases, DFCS must show that the parent suffers from a substance abuse disorder **and** explain how that substance abuse poses an imminent and substantial danger to the child's physical safety, keeping in mind that risk of physical harm is not presumed from substance abuse.
 - Similarly, a child born with a positive-toxicology is not, on its own, a sufficient basis for juvenile court intervention or removal. See [Penal Code § 11165.13](#).

Even in cases where these legal factors are met, social workers should consider whether the trauma from removal outweighs the risk to the child of remaining in their home. Social workers should consult with their supervisors and program managers to ensure thorough clinical consideration for the significant impact of involuntary family separation on a child. Factors to consider may include the:

- Child's attachment to their parents, siblings, relatives, and others in their household,
- Importance of parent-child bonding, whether newborns are able to breastfeed,
- Parent's knowledge of a child's special needs,

- Child's feelings about removal versus staying in the parent's care, and
- Importance of the child's community and school, which may be lost a result of removal (including connections with teachers, neighbors, coaches, religious leaders, etc.).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

ASSESSING THE NEED FOR A PC WARRANT

Even in cases where the legal factors listed in the section above ([Standard for Issuing PC Warrant to Remove a Child from the Family Home](#)) are met, DFCS is required to demonstrate reasonable efforts have been made to prevent removal. Social workers should consider factors, which alleviate safety concerns and address continued risk. This includes the use safety planning efforts with the family, if appropriate, based upon the SDM safety assessment and social worker's clinical safety assessment. Please refer to [OPP 3-16.2 Safety and SCP Safety Assessments](#) and [3-16.4 Safety Planning](#) for more information.

Additionally, please refer to section below regarding the required [approval to request a PC warrant](#).

Social workers should consult with their supervisors and program managers to ensure thorough clinical consideration for the significant impact of involuntary

family separation on a child. Factors to consider may include the:

- Child's attachment to their parents, siblings, relatives, and others in their household,
- Importance of parent-child bonding, whether newborns are able to breastfeed,
- Parent's knowledge of a child's special needs,
- Child's feelings about removal versus staying in the parent's care, and
- Importance of the child's community and school, which may be lost a result of removal (including connections with teachers, neighbors, coaches, religious leaders, etc.).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

APPROVAL TO REQUEST A PC WARRANT

Protective custody warrants may be requested for dependent or non-dependent* children.

In either case, the social worker and their supervisor must receive approval for the removal from either their division manager or higher (or through a Child and Family Safety Staffing) and consult with county counsel to ensure legal sufficiency exists to request a protective custody warrant.

***Note:** Prior to requesting a warrant for a non-dependent child, when safe and possible, a Child and Family Team (CFT) Meeting should be scheduled prior to placing a child into protective custody (PC), as part of reasonable efforts to avoid removal. Please refer to the

[OPP Chapter 13-8 Child and Family Team \(CFT\) Meetings.](#)

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

PROCEDURE FOR PC WARRANTS

Warrants are, by definition, urgent. They should only be requested and approved where the substantial danger to the child is imminent and unavoidable. Social workers should work closely with their supervisor, division and/or bureau manager, and county counsel to ensure warrant applications are completed expediently after approval.

- Social workers must complete the [Application and Declaration in Support of PC Warrant \(SCZ835\)](#). (See section below [Completing the Application and Declaration in Support of a PC Warrant -SCZ835](#) for detailed instructions) and [Warrant Memo \(SCZ 1411\)](#).
 - Both forms should be reviewed and approved by the supervisor or manager.
 - Upon supervisor or manager approval, the social worker should email the approved SCZ835 to county counsel (cocodocumentreview@cco.sccgov.org) for legal sufficiency review.

NOTE: The social worker must sign the SCZ835 under penalty of perjury. Before the SCZ835 is finalized, the social worker should ensure the form is factually accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Once both forms (the SCZ835 and 1411) are finalized, the social worker:

- Emails them (Word version) to DFCS clerical at the following address: ssa-dfcslegalclerks@ssa.sccgov.org.
- Request that clerical finalize the warrant applications.
 - Clerical will have the social worker sign the SCZ835 via DocuSign, and will work with County Counsel to send the warrant application to the Juvenile Court for review.

NOTE: For after-hours warrants, social workers should upload the SCZ835 to DocuSign and complete the DocuSign themselves, and then email the signed warrant application to County Counsel, who will coordinate after-hour review of the warrant directly with the on-call judge.

WHEN THE COURT APPROVES THE WARRANT APPLICATION

If the judge signs the warrant application,

- DFCS clerical will email a copy of the signed warrant to the social worker and social work supervisor.
- The warrant should be executed the day it is signed by the Court.
 - Review section below [Executing the PC Warrant for Removal of a Child from the Family Home.](#)
 - Social Workers should discuss any concerns around nighttime removals when discussing the case with their supervisor, division and/or bureau manager, and county counsel.

- When executing a warrant, the social worker must provide the parent(s) or guardian(s) with a copy of the signed warrant.
 - See [OPP Chapter 2-7: Taking a Child into Temporary Custody](#).
 - **See** sections below [After the Warrant Is Served and the Child Is Removed from the Home](#) and [Recalling a Warrant](#)
- Clerical will have the signed warrant filed the next day.

NOTE: County Counsel will email signed after-hours warrants to the social worker and supervisor. The social worker should connect with DFCS clerical the following day to ensure that the signed warrant has been filed.

WHEN THE COURT DOES NOT SIGN WARRANT APPLICATION

If the judge ***does not sign*** the warrant application, the social worker should immediately confer with their supervisor, division and/or bureau manager, and county counsel to discuss the next steps.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

COMPLETING THE APPLICATION AND DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF A PC WARRANT (SCZ835)

The social worker completes the [Application and Declaration in Support of PC Warrant \(SCZ835\)](#) with support from their supervisor, division manager, and County Counsel as needed. To complete the SCZ835 for a PC warrant, the social worker:

- Fills out all blank fields at the top half of the front page, including:
 - Social Worker's Phone, DFCS # case number, and Worker #
 - The child's name
 - The JD Petition No. (for dependents only)
 - The Court Department No. (for dependents only)
- Marks the box "Protective Custody Warrant" on the top half of the front page
- Enters their name as the Petitioner
- Checks the first box under Section 1, "Petitioner's Professional Qualifications"
- Checks the appropriate box under Section 2, "Child's Status"
- Checks the box for Section 3, "Request for Protective Custody Warrant"
- When applicable, check the appropriate boxes under Section 3 for the Indian Child Welfare Act.
- Checks the appropriate box(es) in Section 4
- Does **not** check the box in section 5
- If there is additional information, checks Section 6 (a), "Additional Information."
 - This item must contain the factual basis for the warrant application and a clinical assessment necessitating the removal of the child.
 - Clearly write why the child needs to be removed at the start of the

narrative.

- Write the narrative in complete sentences and do not use abbreviations.
- Refer to any adults in a formal style, e.g., Mrs. Jones or Mr. Romero.
- Include and/or attach any exculpatory evidence* and other information to support the warrant.

**Exculpatory evidence is evidence favorable to the parent(s)/legal guardian(s), whom is an alleged perpetrator of the allegations, of child safety in their care.*

- Enters information in Section 6 (b) regarding efforts to eliminate the need for removal or explains why such efforts could not be made.
- Enters information in Section 6 (c) regarding information for the Indian Child Welfare Act, if applicable.
- Prints their name, signs, and dates the warrant application.
- Under “**Findings and Orders**” on the SCZ835, the social worker checks:
 - Box 2 (a), “Protective Custody”
 - The appropriate box under 2(a).
 - The appropriate box under 3 for the Indian Child Welfare Act.
 - Box 4 (a) for protective custody warrant.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

EXECUTING THE PC WARRANT FOR REMOVAL OF A CHILD FROM THE FAMILY HOME

Social worker should discuss with their supervisor the most appropriate plan for executing the warrant giving consideration to social worker safety and likely trauma the removal will have on the child(ren). A protective custody warrant removing a child from the family home may be executed in one of three ways, based upon the individual circumstances of the situation.

The social worker may:

- Take the child into temporary custody without law enforcement assistance.
- Hand-deliver an endorsed, filed copy of the SCZ835 and the SCZ1411 to the law enforcement agency with jurisdiction in the matter and request law enforcement to accompany the worker and assist with the removal.
- Take a copy of an endorsed filed SCZ835 and the SCZ1411 to a location near the removal site, phone the law enforcement agency with jurisdiction in the matter, and request that a law enforcement officer meet the social worker at the home to assist with the removal.

At the time of removal, if not previously discussed, the social worker should ask the parents/legal guardians about any relatives of NREFM who may be available to take emergency placement of the child(ren).

Please refer to [OPP Chapter 7-1 Emergency Placement](#).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

AFTER THE WARRANT IS SERVED AND THE CHILD IS REMOVED FROM THE HOME

The social worker who places the child in temporary custody completes the following:

- Investigation Narrative
- Declaration of Reasonable Efforts
- SDM Safety Assessment
- "Contacts" in CWS/CMS

If...	Then...
The child is a non-dependent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The referral is transferred to a Dependent Intake social worker who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Schedules a CFT meeting to explore placement options for the child. ◦ Completes the referral investigation. ◦ Amends the 300-warrant petition to update information regarding the removal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attach the original warrant to the amended petition worksheet for forwarding to the Court with the amended petition.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Writes the 300 Juris/Dispo Report.
The child is a dependent	<p>The referring social worker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedules a CFT meeting to explore placement options for the child. • Completes the referral investigation. • Works with County Counsel to amend the 387 warrant petition to update information regarding the removal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Attach the original warrant to the amended petition worksheet for forwarding to the Court with the amended petition. ◦ Writes the 387 Juris/Dispo Report.

Note: When a child is taken or missing from placement and it is thought or known that a parent has abducted the child, the social worker and their supervisor should consult with the division manager and County Counsel. A report to law enforcement may be required and DFCS, after consultation with the division manager and County Counsel may consider contacting the District Attorney's Office, Child Abduction Unit for further assistance in locating the child.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

LIFE SPAN & RECALLING A WARRANT

LIFE SPAN OF A WARRANT

A protective custody warrant remains active until it is recalled by the Court, even if it has been served. The Court should recall the warrant at the first hearing after the child has been taken into temporary custody. However, when dismissing a case, a social worker verifies that all outstanding warrants are recalled by checking court minute orders. Information regarding outstanding warrants can be obtained by contacting the [Juvenile Dependency Court Clerk](#).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

RECALLING A WARRANT

Warrants are generally recalled at the conclusion of the Initial Hearing. In the event that there is no Initial Hearing or the **warrant is not recalled** at the Initial Hearing, the social worker may submit an Ex-parte Application and Order to the Court to request the recall.

- If an Ex-parte Application and Order is submitted, a copy of the signed order recalling the warrant is returned to the social worker for filing in the case file.

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

PC WARRANTS FOR CHILDREN MISSING FROM CARE

Generally, no warrant petition is necessary when completing a Protective Custody Warrant for a Dependent child who is missing from placement. However, if the department wants to recommend a more restrictive placement for the youth upon the return from being missing from care, social worker will need to work with County Counsel on a 387-warrant petition shall be included in the PC warrant packet.

Upon learning that a child is missing from a court-ordered placement, the social worker:

- Instructs the caretaker or facility to file a missing person's report with the local law enforcement agency.
 - The social worker follows up with the caretaker or facility to assure that a missing person's report has been completed. If there is a delay, the social worker completes the missing person's report.
- Prepares a Warrant Memo (SCZ1411):
 - Under "Comments" on the SCZ1411:
 - Add any descriptive information about the child or the child's whereabouts.
 - State that the child is missing from a court-ordered placement.
 - If there is reason to believe that the child might be staying at the location, provide the address and any information.

- Prepares the Application and Declaration in Support of PC Warrant (SCZ835)

If...	Then the social worker...
No Warrant Petition included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes a copy of the SCZ835 and SCZ1411 to file in the case file. • Attaches the original and one copy of the SCZ1411 to the SCZ835 • Places the SC1411 and SCZ835 in the Court Report basket for forwarding to the Court.
Warrant Petition to be included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works with a County Counsel to prepare the 387warrant petition. • Makes a copy of the warrant petition, SCZ835, and SCZ1411 to file in the case file. • Attaches the original and one copy of the SCZ1411 to the SCZ835 • Places the warrant petition, SCZ1411, and SCZ835 in the Court Report basket for forwarding to the Court.

- Completes the Placement/Address Change (SCZ17)
 - Check scenario 1: "Child's whereabouts unknown (abducted or runaway).
 - The SCZ17 initiates the termination of foster care to the out-of-home caregiver.
- Upon the child's return into custody, schedules a Child and Family Team to identify placement options for the child.

See [OPP Chapter 6-13: Missing from Care](#) and Closing a Case of a Youth With History of Running From Placement in [OPP 12-7: Closing Cases](#).

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

CONTACTS

- [Juvenile Dependency Court Clerk](#)
- [Sheriff Dept. Warrants Desk](#)
- [County Counsel- Child and Family Protection Team](#)

OTHER REFERENCES

- [OPP Chapter 2-7: Taking a Child into Temporary Custody](#)
- [OPP Chapter 2-7.1: Notifying Hospital Staff of Placing a Child in Temporary Custody](#)
- [OPP Chapter 6-13: Missing from Care](#)
- [OPP Chapter 7-1: Emergency Placement](#)
- [OPP Chapter 12-7: Closing Cases](#)
- [OPP Chapter 13-1: Case Consultations](#)
- [OPP Chapter 13-3: Home Entry Orders](#)
- [OPP Chapter 13-9: Sibling Protocol](#)
- [Agency Announcement: Returning Protective Custody Warrants to the Court \(11/12/2009\)](#)

LEGAL BASIS

- [Welfare and Institutions Code \(WIC\) § 340](#)
- [WIC § 300](#)
- [Penal Code \(PC\) § 11165.13](#)

[< Return to OPP Table of Contents](#) | [^ Back to Top of Page](#)

Department of Family & Children's Services, County of Santa Clara
SSA