

Family Safety Quality Assurance Review of Courtney Alisa Clark Initial Findings

Introduction

On June 18, 2007, Secretary Bob Butterworth ordered a Quality Assurance review when he learned a missing Florida child had been located in the State of Wisconsin. He also directed the Office of the Inspector General to conduct an investigation.

The missing and now recovered child, Courtney Clark, was under the jurisdiction of the Sixth Judicial Circuit and was being served by the Sarasota Family YMCA. The Sarasota Family YMCA was conducting business as the Safe Children Coalition, the community-based care provider in Pinellas County, Florida.

This report of initial findings from the Office of Quality Management focuses on factual data as currently known through the review process.

Additional critical information is still under investigation by the Office of the Inspector General and will be addressed in an independent report at a later date.

Quality Management Overview

The Department of Children and Families Office of Quality Management is responsible for the ongoing review and assessment of the work being conducted within the state's child welfare system. Quality Assurance staff, within the Office of Quality Management and posted throughout the state, monitor the quality of services provided to children and families. They are charged with determining compliance with Florida Statutes and federal requirements for the delivery of child welfare services. Quality Assurance Review Specialists are highly experienced, subject-matter-experts in child welfare case practice.

Quality Assurance functions include assessing local care systems, detecting trends for performance management, and conducting reviews of individual cases to determine the quality of the services provided either by the Department or its contracted providers. The information collected from these reviews helps ensure the Department and its contracted providers work in the best interest of children.

Child Protection System

The Florida Department of Children and Families is responsible for investigating allegations of abuse, neglect or abandonment. Through Florida's Abuse Hotline, the Department receives reports of abuse allegations. Those reports are assigned

to trained investigators responsible for investigating the allegations, visiting the child and the parents or caretakers, and determining if services or some type of court action is needed to make certain that a child is safe.

Child abuse investigations are conducted by professionals hired and trained by the Department or by Sheriff's offices. The Department performs these duties in sixty-one counties and in the remaining six, Pinellas, Pasco, Manatee, Hillsborough, Broward, and Seminole counties, local law enforcement performs this function. When a child is removed from his or her home or the court determines protective services should be provided in the home, those services are provided by community-based care lead agencies under contract with the Department.

There are 20 community-based care lead agencies in the State of Florida, each with responsibility for foster care and related services in a given geographic area. The cornerstone of lead agency services is case management, which entails supervision of children and families under the jurisdiction of the Department of Children and Families. Lead agencies may provide case management services directly or may subcontract with another provider for this service.

The Sarasota Family YMCA, Inc., is a not-for-profit, community-based care lead agency whose geographic area includes Pinellas County. Case management for children 0 – 5 years of age in Pinellas County is subcontracted to Directions for Mental Health, Inc., a community mental health service provider. Regardless of whether the lead agency provides or subcontracts for case management services, the lead agency remains accountable for compliance with all terms and conditions of its contract with the Department.

Placement of Children

Florida law provides for several options to consider when removing children from the care of their parents and placing them outside the home. The court must approve all placement decisions for these children, and it is the Department's responsibility to keep the court informed of any changes that may occur. Placement options include:

Emergency Shelter – a judge reviews initial evidence and decides if a child can be safely returned to parents. If a return to parents is not possible, the judge will order that the child be placed in emergency shelter status in the temporary custody of the state. The child can physically be placed either in a licensed foster care home or with approved relatives or non-relatives while in the custody of the state. Emergency shelter status of a child could only extend for several weeks while actions are taken to solve the problems that caused the removal. If the child cannot be safely returned home, the judge can keep the child in the custody of the state in licensed foster care, or place the child in the custody of relatives or non-relatives.

Relative Care – A judge can place children in the custody of relatives, such as aunts, uncles or grandparents. Prior to this placement, relatives must undergo a Home Study that includes criminal records checks and a thorough assessment of the type of home they are able to offer a child. Placement with relatives is the preferred option for children when they cannot remain with their parents.

Licensed Foster Care – If relative care is not appropriate, a judge can have a child remain in the custody of the state in a licensed foster care home. Licensed foster parents must also go through a Home Study and records checks. In addition, foster parents must successfully complete extensive training courses on caring for a very diverse variety of children who may be placed with them. Licensed foster homes also undergo thorough inspections at regular intervals and must meet strict regulations on home environments that are not required of relative and non-relative placements.

Non-Relative Care – As an alternative to relative care or licensed foster care, a judge can place children in the custody of family friends, referred to as “non-relatives.” As in placement with extended family members, non-relatives must go through a Home Study that includes criminal records checks and a thorough assessment of the type of home they are able to offer a child.

Of the children in out-of-home care in Florida, about 49 percent are in licensed foster care, about 43 percent are in approved relative placements and the remaining 8 percent are in approved non-relative placements.

Two documents filed with the court enable judges to make informed decisions about placing children and determining safety of children:

Case Plans – Written agreements between parents and social services agencies are developed outlining what parents need to do in order to ensure the safety of their children. Case plans are developed both when children remain with parents under supervision of case workers, and when children are removed from parents and placed with relatives, non-relatives or in licensed foster care homes. Case plans inform parents of what is expected of them and the support they will receive to achieve their goals.

Home Studies – Before a judge can place a child in the custody of a relative or non-relative, social services must carefully assess the background of potential caregivers. Home studies include local, state and national criminal records checks as well as Abuse Hotline checks. Home studies must be provided to judges for their review and approval for placement of a child. Home studies include details about the physical environment of a home, financial information, interviews regarding the

ability to ensure that a child's medical, mental, educational and daily life needs can be met and a description of the type of support available from the state.

Statutory and Regulatory Authority

Chapter 39, Florida Statutes, *Proceedings Related to Children*, is Florida's child protection law. This chapter provides for the care, safety and protection of children.

Florida Administrative Code provides the administrative rules used by government agencies to carry out the laws enacted by the Legislature. Rules are the framework within which the child protection programs operate.

The rules in Chapter 65C of Florida Administrative Code relevant to this case are listed below:

Chapter 65C-28, Out-of-Home Care – The Out-of-Home Care rule provides guidance for implementing the provisions of Florida statutes that relate to children residing in out-of-home care.

Chapter 65C-29, Protective Investigations – The rule on Child Protective Investigations provides direction in implementing Florida's statutory requirements for the centralized abuse hotline and child protective investigations functions.

Chapter 65C-30, General Child Welfare Provisions – The General Child Welfare Provisions rule provides a description of services, interventions, and case conduct expectations unique to the child protection system. It explains the scope of responsibilities attached to various child protection professionals at critical stages in a case.

The Department develops operating procedures to provide further guidelines on how to put the laws and rules into practice. Operating procedures delineate the requirements, responsibilities, and steps to follow. The contracts between the Department and community-based care lead agencies require that lead agencies comply with Department operating procedures or develop their own operating procedures approved by the Department.

Computer Systems Referenced

This report makes reference to several automated systems. The following summary is provided to assist the reader who may not be familiar with these systems.

HomeSafenet: This is a statewide computer system that includes information on all allegations of abuse or neglect as well as information on the outcomes of investigations and information regarding children in the child welfare system. State regulations require that information regarding all contacts or attempted contacts be documented in the case file within two working days. HomeSafenet is considered the primary case file record for each investigation and case.

Missing Child Tracking System: The Department's internal missing child reporting system used by community-based care providers and the Department to document events related to children believed to be missing from the care and supervision of the state. The Missing Child Tracking System is linked to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement database and is updated daily.

Florida Crime Information Center/ National Crime Information Center: A law enforcement information database containing information collected by criminal justice agencies used to perform legally authorized, required functions. All missing child reports generated by local law enforcement are required to be entered into the database by the agency that took the report.

Other Organizations Referenced

Florida Department of Law Enforcement/Missing Children Information Clearinghouse: The Missing Children Information Clearinghouse is located within the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Division of Criminal Justice Information Services and is a central repository of information regarding missing children. The information is collected and disseminated to assist law enforcement agencies, public and private organizations and the citizens of Florida in locating missing children. The Missing Children Information Clearinghouse is utilized as a resource center and information exchange service, and complements the state and federal computerized missing persons files.

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children: The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's mission is to help prevent child abduction and sexual exploitation; help find missing children; and assist victims of child abduction and sexual exploitation, their families, and the professionals who serve them.

Methodology

A Quality Assurance review was conducted from June 18, 2007, through June 25, 2007, by headquarters Quality Assurance staff.

The scope of this review included review of prior child protective investigations conducted by the Department and Seminole and Pinellas County Sheriff's Offices; HomeSafenet chronological case recordings; and the open case management services record provided by the Sarasota Family YMCA.

In addition, Quality Assurance reviewers accompanied investigators from the Office of the Inspector General during two interviews with staff. The results of interviews conducted by the Inspector General will be contained in their report.

Brief Background

The following is a listing of the organizations involved in providing protective services to Courtney Clark from February 2006 to present.

Department of Children and Families <i>Tallahassee</i>	Responsible for child welfare services in the state of Florida
Department of Children and Families <i>SunCoast Region</i>	Responsible for child welfare services in DeSoto, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas and Sarasota counties. Performs protective investigations for DeSoto and Sarasota counties
Sarasota Family YMCA <i>Safe Children Coalition</i>	Community-based care lead agency providing child welfare services for Pinellas, Pasco, DeSoto, Manatee and Sarasota counties under contract with the Department of Children and Families
Directions for Mental Health <i>Pinellas County</i>	Sub-contracted provider of the Sarasota Family YMCA, responsible for providing case management services
Lake County Sheriff's Office	Local law enforcement entity of Lake County, Florida
Pinellas County Sheriff's Office	Local law enforcement entity; also performs protective investigations function in Pinellas County

Seminole County Sheriff's Office

Local law enforcement entity; also performs protective investigations function in Seminole County

The Sarasota Family YMCA in Pinellas County began providing services to Candice Farris, aka Candice Clark, and her child, Courtney, in February 2006. Courtney was removed from her mother because Ms. Farris was incarcerated for identify theft and the child had been found living in hazardous conditions. During this separation a second child was born to Ms. Farris. Courtney was reunified with her mother, who was reportedly working on several activities required in her case plan. Ms. Farris and her daughters moved to Seminole County where Ms. Farris was arrested on a larceny charge. Case documentation indicates Ms. Farris asked that her children be placed with family friends, Cynthia and Mark Martell, in Lake County.

On September 23, 2006, Ms. Farris abducted Courtney and also took her younger sibling after reportedly telling the Martells that she had completed the activities in her case plan. The family's whereabouts remained unknown until June 14, 2007, when the children were recovered in Portage, Wisconsin. The situation in the Wisconsin home presented a dangerous environment for the children; therefore the State of Wisconsin has assumed protective custody of the children. At this time, it is not in Courtney's best interest to experience another change in placement. Therefore, a Motion to Transfer Jurisdiction to Wisconsin has been filed in Pinellas County.

Focus of Quality Assurance

The Quality Assurance review of this case revealed five areas with significant findings in how this family's case was managed. Key finding areas include:

- I. Reporting a Missing Child**
- II. Reunification**
- III. Assessment of New Child Born Into an Active Case**
- IV. Home Study**
- V. Courtesy Supervision**

Findings

I. Reporting a Missing Child

Issue: There was a four-month gap from the time Courtney was taken from her court-ordered placement to notifying appropriate local law enforcement authorities for entry into the Florida Crime Information Center/ National Crime Information Center database.

Requirement: Administrative rule and state and local operating procedures require that any child that is believed to be missing from a placement should be immediately reported to local law enforcement so that the case can be entered by local law enforcement in the Florida Crime Information Center/ National Crime Information Center and the case can be forwarded and opened by Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse.

Chapter 65C-30.019, Florida Administrative Code, Department Operating Procedure 175-85, and Sarasota Family YMCA Policy Number 100.009 provide the specific authority and direction related to missing children. The procedures require that as soon as it is determined that a child is missing, staff will begin making appropriate contacts in an effort to locate the child. The procedure for reporting missing children is attached.

Findings: Case documentation indicates that the Martells were informed via phone conversations with Judith McInerney, case manager for Directions for Mental Health, of the restrictions on releasing Courtney, and copied on the *Order to Modify Custody* issued by Judge Fleming dated August 23, 2006. The order clearly instructs the Martells to notify local law enforcement and the Department immediately if at any time the child is determined to be missing or if Courtney's whereabouts become unknown. On September 23, 2006, Ms. Martell violated the court order and allowed Courtney to leave with her mother.

Case notes document that Ms. Martell did not tell her assigned case manager, Carmen Caballero with Directions for Mental Health, a sub-contracted provider for the Sarasota Family YMCA, what happened until October 4, 2006. Case notes indicate that Ms. Martell said "she made a big mistake" by returning Courtney to her mother.

According to documentation, Ms. Caballero did not instruct Ms. Martell to contact local law enforcement in accordance with requirements noted above, nor did Ms. Caballero notify local law enforcement officials within a timely manner as required in "all cases of missing children whose location is not determined" in accordance with the regulations in the Sarasota Family YMCA's policy, the Department's operating procedure and Florida Administrative Rule.

The only notification made on October 4, 2006, was to the Assistant State Attorney responsible for child welfare legal services in Pinellas County in order to request a pick-up order as Ms. Caballero thought that the mother and child might be in Colorado to appear at a scheduled court hearing.

The chronological notes documenting the October 4, 2006, telephone call from Ms. Martell to Ms. Caballero was entered into HomeSafenet on October 16, 2006. Administrative rules require such entry within two business days.

Documentation indicates a series of e-mails were exchanged between the Department of Children and Families' SunCoast Region and the Sarasota Family YMCA pertaining to Courtney. The SunCoast Region's Family Safety Program Specialist, Kathleen Matthews, contacted the Sarasota Family YMCA approximately nine times through e-mail from October 6 to December 28, 2006 (see Appendix 4). Included in the e-mails were alerts that Courtney had not been seen by her case manager as required and requests for status updates on her case. Documentation does not reflect that Ms. Matthews' e-mails prompted the Sarasota Family YMCA to take appropriate action, nor does it reflect any actions were taken to comply with existing missing child policies as required. In addition, despite inclusion of administrators/managers from the SunCoast Region and the Sarasota Family YMCA in the distribution of e-mail correspondence, interventions were not taken by leadership to ensure compliance with the policy.

Despite prompts from the SunCoast Region to the Sarasota Family YMCA, along with numerous HomeSafenet entries pertaining to Courtney's status as missing, the issue was not acted on by senior leaders at Sarasota Family YMCA or senior managers in the Department. Prompt, effective action to report the child as missing was not taken by either organization.

Major steps of the missing child protocol were not followed that included immediate reporting to local law enforcement that Courtney was missing, notification within four hours by the case manager once she knew Courtney was missing, and completion of the required Missing Child Reporting Form by the case manager within one day.

The Missing Child Reporting Form was not completed until December 29, 2006. The Sarasota Family YMCA Operating Procedure 100.009 requires reporting incidents within one working day upon learning that a child is missing.

As part of the Sarasota Family YMCA's internal quality management plan, Courtney's case was included in a sample pool of cases reviewed by Trish Adams, Missing Child Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA. Adams reviewed Courtney's case on January 2, 2007, and noted deficiencies for general case practice requirements involving safety, placement stability,

reunification, case manager visitation, and case worker supervision. Also, Ms. Adams indicated that procedures were not followed pertaining to an abducted and missing child. Despite identifying these child safety concerns, their review did not result in any documented action on the part of the Sarasota Family YMCA.

Local law enforcement officials were not contacted for the purposes of issuing a missing child report until January 19, 2007, nearly four months after the child was known to be missing.

A review of the Department's Missing Child Tracking System indicates that the Directions for Mental Health case manager, Carmen Caballero, was knowledgeable about the notification process for missing children. She had previously entered a total of ten missing child episodes prior to this report, of which nine had been reported to local law enforcement in a timely manner, and all but two had been entered in the Missing Child Tracking System within approximately one working day of learning of the event.

When the missing child report was made with the local law enforcement agency in Lake County, there was a delay in the case being entered into the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center by local law enforcement. After some collaboration between the SunCoast Region, Sarasota Family YMCA and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the child was finally listed in the appropriate databases on February 18, 2007.

Recommendations: Immediate action is recommended to:

Establish a zero tolerance policy for failure to follow procedures related to reporting and locating missing children.

Begin local review of cases where in-state children have not been seen by a caseworker for 55 days or more, and if a child is missing, immediately report that child to local law enforcement. Technical assistance and operational support shall be provided by region and headquarters staff. The goal is to reduce the review time period for children not seen by a caseworker to 31 days. Currently, caseworkers are required to see children in care every 30 days.

Further explore technology options to verify the whereabouts of children in the state's care.

Direct the Department's General Counsel to review standard community-based care contract language to make sure that all statutory and regulatory requirements are included.

II. Reunification

Issue: A reunification staffing (a meeting to consider progress toward reunifying Ms. Farris with her daughter) was held on March 6, 2006, with Ms Farris and Judith McInerney, Directions for Mental Health case manager, as well as Anita Sylvia, Supervisor, and Tanya Liebau, Assistant Director of Operations both with the Sarasota Family YMCA. The recommendation of the staffing team to reunify was not fully in accord with the Sarasota Family YMCA's policy 100.018 or the Department's procedure (CFOP 175-38), as described below.

Requirement: Administrative Rule, state and local operating procedures define requirements in the reunification process. These include Chapters 65C-28.006, 65C-30.008, 65C-30.013, and 65C30.014 of Florida Administrative Code, Departmental Operation Procedure 175-38, and Sarasota Family YMCA Policy Number 100.018.

Findings: Courtney was removed from her mother on February 21, 2006, and placed in licensed foster care in Pinellas County. The placement became necessary when the mother was arrested for identity theft and the child was found living in hazardous conditions. From the period of February 21, 2006 through April 13, 2006, Courtney resided in four separate licensed foster homes. Courtney was reunified with her mother on April 13, 2006.

The Sarasota Family YMCA developed a case plan with Ms. Farris, approved by the court, which included several tasks to be completed while she was under court-ordered protective supervision. The case plan required Ms. Farris to: participate in a psycho-social assessment, complete a parenting program, enroll Courtney in Healthy Start, maintain contact with Sarasota Family YMCA case manager, have no further law violations, and secure stable housing and financial stability.

Ms. Farris completed a psycho-social assessment and was maintaining contact with the Sarasota Family YMCA. The tasks of no new law violations, stable income, stable housing, participating in Healthy Start and completing a parenting program were tasks listed as "in progress." However, the staffing team determined Ms. Farris was in "substantial compliance" with her case plan.

There is minimal documentation to support Ms. Farris' compliance with tasks. Case notes do not reflect the rationale for considering Ms. Farris in "substantial compliance," nor is there documentation from other service agencies to indicate Ms. Farris' participation in completing tasks.

In addition, no documentation was found that a risk assessment had been completed prior to reunification as required by local and state protocol. Nor

was documentation found that child care arrangements had been arranged prior to reunification as required by local protocol.

The safety plan, agreed to upon reunification, specified the case manager would conduct weekly visits for four weeks and risk was then to be “re-assessed.” Weekly visits occurred for the first four weeks, however, there is no documentation of a risk assessment or supervisory conference occurring.

One month after reunification, as required in her case plan, Ms. Farris stated Courtney was enrolled in daycare three times a week. No documentation was found to indicate the case manager verified through visits or contacts that the child was in attendance.

Recommendations: Review local operating procedures to ensure guidelines are in place to reflect the following:

- Document key decision-making steps leading up to reunification, including supervisory and legal review and approval.
- Document the determination of substantial compliance with case plans.
- Meet all post-reunification supervision requirements.

III. Assessment of New Child Born Into an Active Case

Issue: Ms. Farris delivered a child on March 25, 2006, while there was an active dependency case involving her and Courtney. The newborn remained in her mother's custody. There is no documentation to indicate the Sarasota Family YMCA followed its own protocol as provided in Policy 100.045, “Children Born into Active Cases.”

Requirement: Administrative Rule, state and local operating procedures define requirements for adding new children into an active case. These include Chapter 65C-30.016, Florida Administrative Code, Departmental Operating Procedure 175-72, and Sarasota Family YMCA Policy 100.045. These procedures require the case manager to immediately report to the supervisor: a pending birth, a child born into a family, or any other circumstance involving a new child who is living in the home where all other children are currently in out-of-home care or under in-home protective supervision or post-placement supervision. Additionally, the case manager must visit the home and conduct an assessment to determine the safety of the child in the home.

Findings: The case record contains no documentation as to how Sarasota Family YMCA case management staff reached the decision to leave the newborn child in Ms. Farris’ custody without either court-ordered or voluntary

services in place. Given the recent removal and reunification, a newborn child increased the risks to family stability.

There is no documentation to indicate that a staffing was held by Sarasota Family YMCA with supervisors or legal services to assess the impact of a new child born into the family. The newborn was not entered into any automated tracking system such as HomeSafenet or the Sarasota Family YMCA's database as per their Policy 100.045, "Children Born into Active Cases." Contrary to a reported mechanism used by Sarasota Family YMCA of tracking "other children," i.e., children who are not included in the dependency process, there is no documentation to support the newborn was "tracked." Another opportunity was missed to add the newborn to the dependency process when placement became necessary again on July 22, 2006.

Recommendation: Direct appropriate legal staff to review all local operating procedures regarding active cases that involve additional children subsequent to the original pleadings for conformance with law and rule.

IV. Home Study

Issue: A Home Study, completed by the Seminole County Sheriff's Office Child Protective Investigator, Traci Gritter, does not fully disclose the nature of the non-relative caregivers' abuse history, nor does it provide enough descriptive detail for the Sarasota Family YMCA and/or the court to make an informed decision for placement.

Requirement: Administrative Rule, state and local operating procedures define requirements for conducting home studies and background record checks. These include Chapters 65C-28.004, 65C-28.011, 65C-28.012, 65C-29.009, and 65C-30.011, Florida Administrative Code.

Findings: As a result of Ms. Farris' arrest on a larceny charge July 22, 2006, during which there was an open investigation alleging "environmental hazards," Courtney and her sister went to stay with family friends, Cynthia and Mark Martell who reportedly had known the family for some time.

On July 26, 2006, Tracy Gritter, Child Protective Investigator with the Seminole County Sheriff's Office learned Ms. Farris had been extradited to Colorado and that the children would remain with the Martells longer than anticipated.

On July 27, 2006, Judith McInerney, the Directions for Mental Health case manager, informed Ms. Gritter that Pinellas County had an open case on Courtney and that she needed a completed Home Study on the Martell's residence in Lake County in order to do a modification of placement from Ms. Farris to the non-relative. Traci Gritter completed the Home Study on the

Martell home in Lake County on July 27, 2006, and it was approved by Kelly Roberts, Seminole County Sheriff's Office supervisor.

The Home Study indicates Mark and Cynthia Martell were both caregivers in the home. Ms. Martell stated she had known "Candice Clark" (alias of Ms. Farris) for a year and saw the family on a daily basis.

The approved Home Study references an Abuse Hotline abuse report received on November 7, 2003, which was closed with "some indicators" of abuse and neglect. This report contained allegations of sexual battery, sexual molestation and mental injury. This report was closed with "some indicators" of sexual battery-abuse, sexual molestation-abuse, and mental injury-threatened harm. The Investigative Decision Summary indicates that local law enforcement was notified.

The approved Home Study also references another Abuse Hotline abuse report from 1995 alleging sexual molestation in the home. The case was closed by the Department with no indicators of abuse. However, there was information in the allegation that was potentially relevant to the Home Study.

Specific information regarding these allegations needed to be addressed in the Home Study which would have allowed the Sarasota Family YMCA and the presiding judge to more accurately assess whether this was an appropriate placement for the children.

Recommendation: Direct the Office of Family Safety to convene a workgroup to review current Home Study requirements and propose remedies to lack of clarification for informed decision-making. The workgroup shall consider legislative language for changes to our child protection laws that will clarify limitations for judicial approval of non-relative care placements of children.

V. Courtesy Supervision

Issue: There is no documentation Sarasota Family YMCA initiated a request for courtesy supervision in accordance with their Policy 100.007, "Courtesy Supervision," which states that "case managers requesting services in another locale will follow the Department of Children and Families Operating Procedure 175-43."

Requirement: Administrative rule, state and local operating procedures define requirements for courtesy supervision. These include Chapters 65C-30.007, 65C-30.008, 65C-30.011, 65C-30.018, Florida Administrative Code, Departmental Operation Procedure 175-43, and Sarasota Family YMCA Policy 700.007.

Findings: Courtney Clark entered the state dependency system in Pinellas County and was under court-ordered supervision. Courtesy supervision of her well-being should have been requested if she moved to another county.

There is no documentation that reflects courtesy supervision was requested when Ms. Farris first moved Courtney to Seminole County, nor was any documentation found to indicate courtesy supervision was requested when the child was placed with the Martells in Lake County, even after a Modification of Placement was approved by the court.

Judith McInerney, Directions for Mental Health case manager, requested Lake County Department of Children and Families' Child Protective Investigations do a wellness check on Courtney in the Martell home. The wellness check was conducted on August 30, 2006. This was the only time she was seen in that placement prior to her abduction by Ms. Farris.

Recommendations: Direct Regional Directors to convene a meeting with Department of Children and Families Circuit Administrators, Sheriff's Offices and lead agencies to review the execution of statewide working agreement for transfer and acceptance of Courtesy Supervision cases, and determine if local processes conform to administrative rule requirements.

Continue the ongoing work to execute the statewide working agreement according to Chapter 65C-30.018, Florida Administrative Code.

Direct the Family Safety Program Office to develop training materials available through the Center for the Advancement of Child Welfare Practice.

Additional Recommended Actions

Require the Sarasota Family YMCA to develop a corrective action plan to address all issues cited in the findings of this report as well as the findings and recommendations of the pending Inspector General's report.

Appendices

1. Child Location Process
2. Listing of Professionals
3. Relative Care, Non-Relative Care, Licensed Care Matrix
4. Detailed Time Line

Appendix 1

Child Location Process

Department Operating Procedure 175-85

Tasks in Bold are Required by Chapter 65C-30.019, Florida Administrative Code

1. The case manager or caregiver determines that a child is missing, i.e., the child's whereabouts are unknown.
2. The case manager or caregiver determines under what conditions the child went missing and if immediate notification to local law enforcement is required.
 - Immediate notification to local law enforcement is required when a child's whereabouts are unknown and the child is under the age of thirteen, believed to be in an unsafe situation for their age and development, in a life threatening situation, in the company of others who could endanger their welfare.
 - Notification to local law enforcement is required within four hours in all cases of missing children whose location is undetermined.
- 3. The case manager, the caregiver or community-based care Child Location Point of Contact reports the child as missing to local law enforcement and requests a police report number.**
 - If local law enforcement will not generate a missing child report, the case manager or the community-based care Child Location Point of Contact attempts to clarify the reason(s) why the report was not taken and address them in an effort to encourage local law enforcement to generate the missing child report.
 - Available resources to assist the case manager and the community-based care Child Location Point of Contact are: the Watch Commander of the local law enforcement agency not accepting the report; the community-based care Child Location Point of Contact; the District/Region Department's Child Location Point of Contact; the Department's Child Location Unit/Tallahassee, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse.
4. Local Law enforcement enters the missing child report into the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center databases.
 - Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center identifies the child as missing to all law enforcement agencies in Florida and throughout the country.

5. A missing child report is entered into the Department's Missing Child Tracking System

- The entry of a missing child report in the Missing Child Tracking System allows for an alert to be activated in HomeSafenet and for the missing child case to be opened with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement.

Note: At this point:

- Notification that a child is believed to be missing has been provided to the Department, local law enforcement, and to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Missing Children Information Clearinghouse. In addition, there is an active missing child report in Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center available to all law enforcement agencies throughout the country.
 - Local law enforcement has an open case on their investigative case load and a Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Child Analyst has been assigned the case.
- 6. As soon as possible, the case manager shall notify the court that the child has been reported as missing.**
- 7. In addition to the efforts of local law enforcement and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to locate the child, the case manager will attempt to locate the child at least once per week for the first three months, then monthly thereafter until the child is located.**

Appendix 2 Listing of Professionals

Name	Title/Role	Agency
Trish Adams	Quality Management Compliance Specialist/Missing Child Point of Contact	Sarasota Family YMCA/ Safe Childrens' Coalition
Carmen Caballero	Case Manager	Directions for Mental Health
Cindy Ennis	Assistant State Attorney	Pinellas County State Attorney's Office
Marion Fleming	Circuit Court Judge	Sixth Judicial Circuit
Traci Gritter	Child Protective Investigator	Seminole County Sheriff's Office
Lee Johnson	Executive Vice-President	Sarasota Family YMCA
Christy Kane	Senior Vice-President of Community-Based Care Operations	Sarasota Family YMCA
Melanie Laurella	Missing Children's Information Clearinghouse Analyst	Florida Department of Law Enforcement
Tanya Liebau	Assistant Director of Operations	Safe Childrens' Coalition
Kathleen Matthews	SunCoast Region Family Safety Program Specialist	Department of Children and Families
Judith McInerney	Case Manager	Directions for Mental Health
Melissa Remy	Missing Children's Information Clearinghouse Analyst	Florida Department of Law Enforcement
Kelly Roberts	Child Protective Investigator Supervisor	Seminole County Sheriff's Office
Barbara Simmons	Senior Director of Community-Based Care Data Services	Sarasota Family YMCA
Anita Sylvia	Case Manager Supervisor	Directions for Mental Health
Jim Vachon	Detective	Lake County Sheriff's Office

Appendix 3
Relative, Non-Relative and Licensed Care Matrix

Issue	Relative Placements	Non-Relative Placements	Licensed Placements
<p>Background Screening For all household members and frequent visitors to home, age 12+ (city, county, FDLE/FCIC, FAHIS, Out of State Abuse Checks, Arrest History, DJJ (age 12-26), NCIC name check and Fingerprints (age 18+).</p> <p>Include injunctions & police call-outs</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-28.011 F.A.C.</p> <p>Best practice.</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-28.011 F.A.C.</p> <p>Best practice.</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-13.022 F.A.C.; also, civil courts records check.</p> <p>Annual re-screening for re-licensure includes local criminal check, FAHIS check and may include call-outs and 911 calls; FDLE re-checked every 5 years.</p>
<p>Prior Court Approval For emergency placements in exigent circumstances (placement to be made within 72 hours).</p>	<p>Not needed, but results of all background screens (except fingerprints) must be back prior to making the placement. Court approval is then needed within 24 hours.</p>	<p>Not needed, but results of all background screens (except fingerprints) must be back prior to making the placement. Court approval is then needed within 24 hours.</p>	<p>Not needed. Court approval within 24 hours <u>after</u> placement.</p>
<p>Prior Court Approval For non-emergency, non-exigent (planned) placements.</p>	<p>Needed, and results of background screens (including fingerprints) must be reviewed prior to recommending placement to court.</p>	<p>Needed, and results of all background screens (including fingerprints) must be reviewed prior to recommending the placement to the court.</p>	<p>Not needed, but as soon as practical after making the decision to change placements.</p>

Issue	Relative Placements	Non-Relative Placements	Licensed Placements
<p>Home Study Including (at a minimum) an interview with the proposed caregivers and an assessment of their ability to meet the child's need for protection; background screening (as above); an assessment of the home's physical environment; a determination of caregiver's financial security and ability to provide child with long-term permanency if needed; a determination of childcare needs; counseling on the dependency process, and available community support, etc.</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-28.012 F.A.C., within 30 days following the placement (but typically completed prior to the placement); also, completed pursuant to 39.521(2)(r) F.S., and filed with the court as part of the PDS within 72 hours prior to the Disposition Hearing.</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-28.012 F.A.C., within 30 days following the placement (but typically completed prior to the placement); also, completed pursuant to 39.521(2)(r) F.S., and filed with the court as part of the PDS within 72 hours prior to the Disposition Hearing.</p>	<p>Needed, pursuant to 65C-13.024(5); same info as others, plus: health dept. inspection of home; employment history and income verification; medical history; water safety; work and personal references; school references for children already in the home; family strengths and needs; background and marital history; childhood experiences; hobbies; church/group affiliations, etc. Home Study updated annually.</p>
<p>Preservation of Family Ties and Continuity in Relationships (ASFA)</p>	<p>Second only to non-custodial parent in terms of out-of-home placement priority and least restrictive; preserves family ties and connections; child often knows the relative, thereby reducing the trauma of out-of-home</p>	<p>Next placement priority (and next in terms of least restrictive), right after relative placement. Non-relative may have prior relationship with child (and parents), thereby minimizing</p>	<p>Last placement priority.</p>

Issue	Relative Placements	Non-Relative Placements	Licensed Placements
	placement; child's visitation/contact with parent may be more easily handled.	traumatic effect of out-of-home placement. Child sometimes "chooses" non-relative (favorite teacher, friend's parent, etc.).	
Remuneration	Pursuant to 39.5085, F.S., can receive Relative Caregiver funds (monthly) if eligible.	Non-relative receives no monetary benefit.	Receives foster care board payments (monthly).
Required HomeVisits w/Children Face-to-face contacts with the child in the home, including both pre-disposition (shelter status) and post-disposition visits. Face to face contacts shall occur more frequently than every 30 days when the child's situation dictates more frequent contact, per determination by the Supervisor or the court (per 65C-30.007 F.A.C.).	While in shelter status, once every 7 days for the first 30 days after removal, then may be modified to no less frequently than once every 30 days until disposition; no less frequently than every 30 days thereafter. Once every 3 months, the home visit is to be unannounced.	While in shelter status, once every 7 days for the first 30 days after removal, then may be modified to no less frequently than once every 30 days until disposition; no less frequently than every 30 days thereafter. Once every 3 months, the home visit is to be unannounced.	While in shelter status, once every 7 days until disposition, and then no less frequently than once every 30 days thereafter. Once every 3 months, the home visit is to be unannounced.
Service Referrals Made by CPIs and Caseworkers to ensure all needs of child and caregiver are met.	Made as needed.	Made as needed.	Made as needed.

Issue	Relative Placements	Non-Relative Placements	Licensed Placements
Training Pre-Service/In-Service	None required.	None required.	MAPP (30-hour) Pre-Service training is required as a condition of licensure; 8 hours of annual in-service training is required for re-licensure (per 65C-13.025 F.A.C).

Appendix 4 Detailed Time Line

Candice Farris aka Clark aka Sisk

02/21/2006 – Abuse report is received. Investigated by Pinellas County Sheriff child protective investigator. Courtney Clark is sheltered as a result of verified findings of “parent incarcerated” and some indications of environmental hazards.”

03/25/2006 – Ms. Farris gives birth to daughter—sister of Courtney. Child was not added to court petition and remained in the custody of Ms. Farris even though Courtney Clark was currently placed in out-of-home care.

03/29/2006 – Abuse report is received. Allegations that Courtney Clark was being abused by her foster parent while in care. Report is closed with no indicators of physical abuse to Courtney Clark while she is in foster care.

04/04/2006 – Chronological notes indicate a Home Study was completed on Ms. Farris for the purposes of reunification with Courtney.

04/07/2006 – Reunification case staffing held. Recommendations include unsupervised visits for Ms. Farris with Courtney. Case manager is required to visit home once per week for the first four weeks.

04/13/2006 – Motion to reunify Courtney with Ms. Farris is filed by case manager. Motion granted by the court and Courtney returned to Ms Farris’ care.

04/22/2006 – Home visit completed. HomeSafenet notes indicate home was “hazard free” and that Courtney’s ear infection and cold are “gone.” She has a rash on her buttocks.

04/28/2006 – Complaint filed with case manager alleging Ms. Farris is driving without placing the children in a car seat; the infant has a dirty diaper; and Ms. Farris is stealing complainant’s identity. Home visit completed same day by case manager. Courtney Clark is observed to have a scratch on the left side of her face and a bruise under her eye. Ms. Farris reports incident happened at Chuck E. Cheese when Courtney got into a fight with another child. Ms. Farris states she is taking child to doctor at 11 a.m. this date. Ms. Farris also reports to case manager that the child’s rash is getting better.

05/05/2006 – Home visit by case manager. Unidentified person is also in home with Ms. Farris, Courtney Clark, and Courtney’s sister. Courtney is observed to have pink eye. Ms. Farris stated she has medication for the child. Ms. Farris stated she is on waiting list for day care. Courtney’s sister is observed to have a scratch to her eyelid and Ms. Farris stated that Courtney inflicted the scratch.

05/12/2006 – Home visit by case manager. Ms. Farris' unidentified friend remains in home. There is no documentation that background check was completed on the friend. Case notes reflect that Ms. Farris states her father is ill and that she needs to go to Kentucky from 05/16/2006 to 05/26/2006 with Courtney. Ms. Farris reports Courtney's rash is healed and that child is attending day care three times per week.

05/26/2006 – Due to inconsistencies in the conditions regarding the maternal grandfather's demise, case manager staffed case with Assistant State Attorney (Child Welfare Legal Services) who reports Ms. Farris is to verify reason for trip, provide information from the funeral home, or provide information for an individual with whom the child could be sheltered while Ms. Farris is traveling.

05/27/2006 – Home visit by case manager. Courtney's sister is present along with Ms. Farris' friend who appeared to be caring for the baby while mother was out of state. Ms. Farris reports Courtney Clark "ate several cigarettes and threw up." She also states that Courtney gags herself after eating. Case manager also documented that home was messy and that baby (sister) smelled of vomit. Ms. Farris stated that Courtney's sister had a "stomach bug." When asked by case manager for paperwork regarding the funeral, mother states she does not have it, the maternal grandmother does and she will produce for case manager at a later time. Ms. Farris states she needs to return to Kentucky on 05/29/2006 and 05/30/2006.

06/02/2006 – Case manager checks with parenting class provider to confirm Ms. Farris' attendance as required in her case plan. Provider states that Ms. Farris has never contacted them to initiate the program.

06/06/2006 – Initial Judicial Review Hearing held. Ms. Farris was found to be partially compliant with the tasks in her case plan. Ms. Farris reports during hearing that Courtney Clark has a staph infection in her foot and she was going to take Courtney to the emergency room.

06/29/2006 – HomeSafenet note indicates that Ms. Farris has moved to Seminole County. Courtney Clark was seen in the office with Ms. Farris. Ms. Farris reports that Courtney was recently seen at Seminole County General Care and is not currently enrolled in day care. Courtney was observed to have a scratch on the right side of her face. Ms. Farris states it was a scar "that she always had." Courtney also had a cut on her forehead which was reportedly from the "Grandpa's tooth."

07/21/2006 – Abuse report received. Investigated by Seminole County Sheriff's child protective investigator. Allegations are: conditions hazardous to a child; dirty home and allegations related to another family/child in the home. Candice Farris, Courtney Clark and her sister are reported to be living in the home.

07/22/2006 – Supplemental abuse report received alleging environmental hazards. Candice Farris was arrested for unknown reasons. Courtney and her sister's whereabouts are unknown. Reporter later called back and provided information that Ms. Farris had been arrested for grand theft. Children are currently with a friend (believed to be Cynthia Martell, also spelled Martel.)

Child protective investigator from Seminole County Sheriff's Office contacted Cynthia Martell via phone and obtained demographic information. Ms. Martell resides in Lake County. Ms. Martell reported she could take care of Courtney and Courtney's sister while Ms. Farris was in jail. Seminole child protective investigator obtained background checks and approved Ms. Martell to care for the children.

07/26/2006 – Case manager receives telephone call from Cynthia Martell (current non-relative caregiver) who reports she had cared for the children while mother was out of state. Ms. Farris did not attend her father's funeral in Kentucky, however, she did go to North Carolina with her paramour, Michael Sisk. Ms. Farris also forged a letter of compliance from Healthy Start and had forwarded to the case manager.

07/27/2006 – Abuse report received. Allegation: "There were concerns that the child, Courtney (DOB 12/18/2004) may have been sexually abused while in the care of her mother, Candice Farris, due to the number of men that the mother was involved with." At the time of this report Courtney was found living in Seminole County in the home of the daughter of Cynthia Martell. Ms. Martell resided in Sorrento and the reason for the report being assigned to Lake County. DCF Lake County child protective investigator initiated contact to ensure the child victim was seen within 24 hours. There was also an open report in Seminole County initiated on 7/21/2006 which alleged conditions hazardous involving Courtney and two other children in the home. During the contact with Ms. Martell, the DCF child protective investigator was advised that Seminole County Sheriff child protective investigator had completed a Home Study on her residence in Lake County. Abuse report was closed on 7/31/2006, with no findings for the maltreatment.

08/08/2006 – Motion to modify custody of Courtney Clark to non-relatives, Cynthia and Mark Martell, filed with Pinellas County Juvenile Court.

08/10/2006 – Motion to modify custody of Courtney Clark to non-relatives, Cynthia and Mark Martell, granted by Pinellas County Juvenile Court.

08/14/2006 – Ms. Farris was informed by the case manager that her children are now in custody of non-relative caregiver. Ms. Farris indicates she will hire a private attorney and will get children back. Case manager documents that a reunification staffing would be held and Ms. Farris would need to provide proof of

compliance with case plan tasks in order to regain custody of her children. Ms. Farris was advised of terms of the case plan.

08/15/2006 – Staffing held with the Pinellas/Pasco Assistant State Attorney. Psychological assessment to be added to case plan tasks for Ms. Farris. Custody was changed to non-relative placement and Sarasota Family YMCA was not given the discretion to reunify the child.

08/15/2006 – Telephone call from a relative who reports being concerned Ms. Farris will abscond with children upon her return to Florida. (Ms. Farris was incarcerated in Colorado at this time).

08/16/2006 – Case manager called to verify that the two doctors that Ms. Farris stated she had taken the children to had in fact seen the children. One doctor did not exist and the other had not seen the children.

08/30/2006 – Child wellness check completed by Lake County child protective investigator during a home visit for case manager.

08/30/2006 – Abuse report received alleging that Courtney's sister was noticed with bruises all over her body, bruises are dark blue in color, and are located on her hands and legs. The report further alleged that "it is unknown what happened to her, but she has been under the care of her maternal grandmother, Cynthia and Candice, her mother, does not live in the home and is not caring for (Courtney's sister) because she (Candice) has liver problems and cancer." Cynthia and Mark Martell were the caretakers for Courtney Clark and her sister at this time. Lake County child protective investigator observed the children on 08/30/2006 and noted no injuries to the children. The Lake County Sheriff's Department also conducted a child wellness check for Pinellas County to ensure Courtney's safety on the same day. The police report documented the child (Courtney) was seen and reflected no concerns. There were no visible injuries to the children in the home.

09/07/2006 – Abuse report was closed on 09/07/2006, with no findings of other physical injuries-threatened harm.

10/04/2006 – Case manager received a call from caregiver, Cynthia Martell, stating that she had "made a big mistake" and allowed Ms. Farris to leave with the children, Courtney Clark and her sister on 09/23/2006. Only Courtney Clark had an open court-ordered case plan at this time. Ms. Martell stated that Ms. Farris told her that at the court hearing that day, that the case was closed and that Courtney was to be returned to her. Ms. Martell stated to case manager, that she believed the mother, therefore did not question her or notify the case manager until 10/4/2006 **[Entered into HomeSafenet 10/16/2006]**.

10/04/2006 – Case manager contacted Assistant State Attorney Cindy Ennis to inform her of the situation. Ms. Ennis stated that she would issue a pick up order first thing in the morning [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/05/2006 – Case manager obtained pick up order on the child [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/05/2006 – Case manager contacted Grand Junction Police Department (Ms. Farris was believed to be in Colorado, where she had previous charges) to request assistance with the pick up order. Case manager spoke to Cindy at dispatch. She said that she would relay message to an officer and have them return case manager's call [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/05/2006 – Case manager received call from an Officer Dixon of the Grand Junction Police Department. He requested that the case manager fax a copy of the pick up order. Records check by Officer Dixon indicated that Ms. Farris had a court appearance scheduled for the next day [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/06/2006 – SunCoast Region Family Safety Program Office Specialist Kathleen Matthews forwarded e-mail to Sarasota Family YMCA to advise that Courtney Clark had not been seen in 37 days.

10/06/2006 – Case manager faxed copy of pick up order to Officer Dixon. He went to the courthouse and called the case manager back stating he had just missed Ms. Farris as she left the courthouse a few minutes before he arrived. He offered to check the home address, if one was available [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/06/2006 – Case manager received call from Joseph Jueschke, Colorado child protective investigator. He requested that case manager mail a certified copy of the pick up order to him in Colorado [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/11/2006 – Case manager made a copy of the certified pick up order for file and provided original to office assistant to be mailed overnight [\[Entered in HomeSafenet 10/16/2006\]](#).

10/30/2006 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews forwarded e-mail to Barbara Simmons at the Sarasota Family YMCA stating that Courtney Clark had not been seen for 61 days. Request is made that Sarasota Family YMCA update as to the reason Courtney has not been seen. Copied on the e-mail are Christy Kane and Lee Johnson of the Sarasota Family YMCA and several Administrators with the Department of Children and Families SunCoast Region.

10/30/2006 – Case manager contacted Officer Dixon of the Grand Junction Police Department to see if there were any updates as to the whereabouts of Ms. Farris or Courtney Clark. Officer Dixon stated that they have not been able to track her down yet and that Ms. Farris failed to appear in court three days ago. A warrant for her arrest had been issued. Her bond was set at \$30,000. Ms. Farris' paramour (Michael Sisk) also had a warrant out for his arrest with a bond of \$15,000. The officer stated that they had a few addresses in the case file including one given in court during her last hearing. He stated law enforcement responded to these addresses but had not been able to locate the mother [Entered in HomeSafenet 10/31/2006].

11/06/2006 – An additional e-mail is sent to the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews stating that Courtney Clark has not been seen in 68 days. Request is made by SunCoast Family Safety Program Office that a missing child report be completed for Courtney Clark by the supervising agency. Administrators from the Sarasota Family YMCA and the Department of Children and Families Suncoast Region are among the recipients of this information.

11/08/2006 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews sends correspondence to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA, requesting an update on status of the case and the need for paperwork to be completed.

11/10/2006 – Case manager contacted Officer Dixon of the Grand Junction Police Department to ask for a report number for Ms. Farris' case. Officer Dixon stated that they never took a report, but that they have been attempting to locate Ms. Farris. He said that the case was recorded with the dispatch when the case manager made the call requesting assistance. Officer Dixon stated that he believed that Ms. Farris, the paramour (Mr. Sisk) and her children are in Kentucky [Entered in HomeSafenet 11/10/2006].

11/28/2006 – E-mail sent, to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for Sarasota Family YMCA from the SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews asking why law enforcement had not taken a missing child report and for Sarasota Family YMCA to follow up immediately.

11/30/2006 – Case manager contacted Cynthia Martell (non-relative caregiver) to inquire if she had heard anything from Ms. Farris. Ms. Martell was not available and the case manager left a voicemail message requesting a return phone call [Entered in HomeSafenet 11/30/2006].

11/30/2006 – Case manager entered a note in HomeSafenet that the whereabouts of the mother and child were unknown. The reason a face-to-face visit was not attempted was – Absconded/Abducted [Entered in HomeSafenet 11/30/2006].

12/18/2006 – Memo to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for Sarasota Family YMCA, from the SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews requesting update on efforts to locate and recover child from State of Colorado. Requested due date of 12/19/2006.

12/19/2006 – Response received from Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA, with a timeline of the actions taken by the case manager since child was removed by Ms. Farris. Request for information re-sent as to status of the pick-up order being provided to law enforcement in Colorado, along with a request for a missing persons report so that Courtney could be placed in the National Crime Information Center database.

12/27/2006 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews stating that Courtney Clark was still not officially listed as a missing child in the Department's Missing Child Tracking System due to additional information being needed.

12/28/2006 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews requesting an update on status of reporting Courtney Clark missing. Ms. Matthews offered assistance with this process if needed.

12/29/2006 – The Missing Child Reporting Form was completed by Sarasota Family YMCA and child entered into the DCF Missing Child Tracking System. Missing Child Alert for Courtney Clark is activated in HomeSafenet.

01/02/2007 – Courtney Clark case begins appearing on the Department's Daily Missing Child Issue List as not having an active missing child case entered into the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center data systems.

01/02/2007 – A file review of Courtney Clark's case was completed by Trish Adams as part of a Sarasota YMCA Tier 1 quality assurance process. Findings of the review included deficits in general case practice requirements involving safety, placement stability, reunification, case manager visitation, case worker supervision and indicated procedures were not followed pertaining to an abducted child. The case file review did not result in an issuance of a Request for Assistance or other actions by the Sarasota YMCA.

01/03/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews. Daily issues list dated 01/03/2007 was forwarded.

01/04/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews. Daily issues list dated 01/04/2007 was forwarded.

01/08/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews. Daily issues list dated 01/08/2007 forwarded with comments on list stating “Provide status of obtaining p/u order and LE report to FSPO by Wed. 01/10/2007 COB.”

01/12/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews. Daily issues list dated 01/12/2007 forwarded with comments on list stating “Still no P/U order filed. Please provide status of obtaining p/u order and making LE report by Wed. 01/17/2007.”

01/16/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews. . Daily issues list dated 01/16/2007 forwarded with comments on list stating “What is status of P/U order and LE report? Provide status by 01/17/2007.”

01/17/2007 – E-mail correspondence sent to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA from SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews with possible address information on potential family and non-relative resources for follow-up related to missing child efforts to locate.

01/19/2007 – HomeSafenet notes show that the case manager attempted to report Courtney Clark as missing to the Lake County Sheriff’s Office. Case manager is told according to internal policy of the Lake County Sheriff’s Office that a missing child report must be made in person. Lake County Sheriff’s Office refers case manager to the Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office to collect the information needed for reporting purposes and to request that the Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office fax the report back to the Lake County Sheriff’s Office for case opening **[Entered in HomeSafenet 01/25/2007]**.

01/19/2007 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews received a response from Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA stating that the Sarasota Family YMCA had checked the address provided on 01/17/2007 indicating no one living at the address had any information on this case.

01/23/2007 – Case manager contacted Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office in an effort to report Courtney Clark as missing. An officer is dispatched to the case manager’s office and a missing child report is taken **[Entered in HomeSafenet 01/25/2007]**.

01/24/2007 – Case manager checks to make sure that the Lake County Sheriff's Office has received the faxed report. Lake County Sheriff's Office indicates that they had not received the report [Entered in HomeSafenet 01/25/2007].

01/25/2007 – Case manager checks to make sure that the Lake County Sheriff's Office has received the faxed report from the Pinellas County Sheriff's office. Lake County Sheriff's Office indicates that they had received the report from the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office and that the case manager should call back in the morning to receive the case number [Entered in HomeSafenet 01/25/2007].

01/26/2007 – Detective Vachon* of the Lake County Sheriff's Office provides the case manager with a missing child report case number (07-014081)
*HomeSafenet note shows name as Dechon. Should be Vachon.

02/08/2007 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews spoke with Melanie Laurella, a Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse Analyst, regarding Courtney Clark. Ms. Matthews told Ms. Laurella that Courtney is missing from a non-relative placement and that Lake County Sheriff's Office has taken a report. Ms. Matthews further explained it is the impression of the Lake County Sheriff's Office, as advised by the Assistant State Attorney's Office in Lake County "it appears the child cannot be listed as missing in the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center databases because the mother's rights were not terminated, she only violated a civil order." Ms. Matthews advised the Lake County Sheriff's Office that the mother was not supposed to have custody of Courtney. Ms. Laurella also noted that the Pinellas County pick-up order had not been entered into Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center databases.

02/09/2007 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews sends correspondence to Melanie Laurella, Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse Analyst, with six potential names, addresses and contact numbers on individuals who may have information on the whereabouts of Ms. Farris and Courtney Clark.

02/13/2007 – SunCoast Family Safety Program Specialist Kathleen Matthews sends e-mail correspondence to Trish Adams, Child Location Point of Contact for the Sarasota Family YMCA, regarding the lack of a missing child report into the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center data systems.

02/13/2007 – Ms. Laurella, Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearing House Analyst, contacted the Lake County Sheriff's Office. Ms. Laurella requested that Detective Vachon fax a copy of the pick-up order. The court documentation states that Ms. Farris is not to have custody of Courtney Clark and that law enforcement can take the child "into custody using whatever force necessary and/or by any means necessary." Ms. Laurella spoke with the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office about the pick-up order.

02/14/2007 – Ms. Laurella, Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearing House Analyst, is advised by Pinellas County Sheriff's Office that the warrant division does not enter pick-up orders into Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center. Pick-up orders are turned over to the Child Protection Unit so the determination can be made to enter the pick-up order into Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center. (From summary information provided by Ms. Laurella on 06/19/2007.)

02/16/2007 – Ms. Laurella, Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse Analyst, and Florida Department of Law Enforcement Special Agent Supervisor Condon spoke with Lake County Sheriff's Office about the case. (From summary information provided by Ms. Laurella on 06/19/2007.)

02/18/2007 – Courtney Clark's missing child case is entered into the Florida Crime Information Center/National Crime Information Center data systems by the Lake County Sheriff's Office (Missing child report case number 07-014081).

02/19/2007 – Missing child case is transferred to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Information Clearinghouse for case opening. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement/Missing Children Information Clearinghouse transfers missing child case to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for case opening.

04/18/2007 – Case manager receives case opening packet from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children **[Entered in HomeSafenet 04/18/2007]**.

06/13/2007 – Melissa Remy, Florida Department of Law Enforcement/Missing Children Information Clearinghouse Analyst, identifies possible location for Michael Sisk in Wisconsin. Information is forwarded to Detective Vachon of the Lake County Sheriff's Office.

06/14/2007 – Courtney Clark is recovered by the Portage, Wisconsin Police Department.