

6/2/2017

188.2

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF _____ COUNTY, KANSAS

IN THE INTEREST OF

Name _____ Case No. _____
Year of Birth _____ A ☐ male ☐ female

***PERMANENCY HEARING ORDER BASED ON THE CITIZEN REVIEW BOARD**
RECOMMENDATIONS HEARING
POST-TERMINATION

Pursuant to K.S.A. 38-2264 and 42 U.S.C. 671 *et seq.*

CRB Report must be attached

(Orders pertaining to more than one child must include findings specific to each child listed in the caption.)

NOW on this _____ day of _____, 20_____, the above-captioned matters comes on for consideration of the attached Citizen Review Board permanency hearing recommendations.

The Court finds the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) is not applicable. *(If there is reason to know the child is an Indian child, use the appropriate ICWA form.) (If ICWA applies please use the appropriate ICWA permanency hearing form.)*

The Court finds termination/relinquishment of parental rights occurred on _____

- ☐ The child is 14 years of age or older and has been given notice of the time and place of the permanency hearing.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS:

1. ☐ a. Appropriate public or private agencies have made reasonable efforts to accomplish the current permanency goal(s) set out in the permanency plan.

OR

- ☐ b. Appropriate public or private agencies have not made reasonable efforts to accomplish the current permanency goal(s) set out in the permanency plan.

2. The progress toward achieving the permanency plan goal(s) of _____
_____ ☐ is ☐ is not adequate.

3. The child's needs ☐ are ☐ are not being adequately met. *(If the child's needs are not being met, explain.)* _____

6/2/2017

4. ☐ **The child is 14 years of age** or older and the court finds the following efforts have been made by the Secretary to help the child prepare for the transition from custody to a successful adulthood. _____
5. The Court has considered in-state and out-of-state permanent placement options. The child ☐ **is** ☐ **is not** in out-of-state placement, and such placement ☐ **continues** ☐ **does not continue** to be appropriate and in the best interest of the child.
6. The reasonable and prudent parenting standard ☐ **has been** ☐ **has not been** met. _____
7. The child ☐ **has had** ☐ **has not had** on-going opportunities to engage in age or developmentally appropriate activities. _____
8. The Court, having reviewed the file and recommendations of the Citizen Review Board ☐ **approves and adopts the proposed permanency plan as the plan for permanency in the present matter** or ☐ **does not approve the proposed permanency plan and orders a new permanency plan submitted to the Court within 30 days.**
9. ☐ The above name child shall remain in custody of the Secretary.
10. The previous orders of this Court ☐ **shall continue in full force and effect** ☐ **except as hereby modified** ☐ **are hereby rescinded and the following orders are hereby issued pursuant to K.S.A. 38-2255.**

Comment [LN1]: Per Taskforce discussion.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5"

THE COURT ORDERS that the following CRB recommendations, set out in the attached report, are adopted as the order of the Court: *(List the adopted recommendations in full or by the numbers corresponding to those in the report.)* _____

☐ ☐ The Secretary ☐ Court Services ☐ _____ shall complete reports and submit them to the Court by _____.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS this matter set for _____ hearing before ☐ **the Court** ☐ **the CRB** on the _____ day of _____, 20____, at ____: ____ ☐ **a.m.** ☐ **p.m.**

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS _____ day of _____, 20____.

6/2/2017

Judge of the District Court

Authority

K.S.A. 38-2264 and 42 U.S.C 671 *et seq.*

Notes on Use

This is the form for use when a Citizen Review Board has conducted a permanency hearing. The CRB report, with recommendations, must be attached, and no other journal entry is required or advised.

Supreme Court Rule 174 requires the use of this form or another form approved by the Supreme Court as meeting [the Adoption and Safe Families Act \(ASFA\)](#) requirements. -Failure to make and properly document the findings required by ASFA will result in the loss of federal funding—Federal funding is not available when the court finds reasonable efforts have not been made unless the court also finds the efforts were not required. -The loss of federal funding continues until the court finds reasonable efforts have been made and the court's findings are properly documented.

After termination of parental rights, permanency hearings continue to be required at least every 12 months from the date the child first entered out of home placement.- Termination of parental rights does not change the requirement for permanency hearings, and they shall continue until the child is adopted, a permanent custodian is appointed or jurisdiction is terminated. During the permanency hearing the court shall consider whether reasonable efforts have been made to achieve the case plan goals.- If the court determines that reasonable efforts have not been made or progress is not sufficient, the court may rescind its prior orders and enter other orders regarding custody and adoption that are appropriate under the circumstances.- K.S.A. 38-2264(h).

If the permanency hearing is for a child 14 years of age or older, the court shall require notice of the time and place of the permanency hearing. -The notice shall request the child's participation in the hearing by attendance or by report to the court. -A sample report from may be obtained [on the Kansas Judicial Council website or through the Office of Judicial Administration](#).

When a court has reason to know a child involved in a child in need of care proceeding is an Indian child, the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) applies; notice requirements, findings and procedure are dictated by ICWA, and the ICWA forms must be used. **If ICWA applies, use form 221.2 instead of this form.** In addition to the federal ICWA statutes, all federal regulations (25 C.F.R. 23) must be followed. The court should also consult the BIA December 2016 guidelines (www.bia.gov/bia/ois/dhs/icwa).

If there is reason to know the child is an Indian child but the court does not have sufficient evidence to determine that the child is or is not an Indian child, the court must treat the child as an Indian child, unless and until it is determined on the record that the

child does not meet the definition of an Indian child. 25 C.F.R. 23.107(b). The court “has reason to know” a child is an Indian child if:

- “(1) Any participant in the proceeding, officer of the court involved in the proceeding, Indian Tribe, Indian organization, or agency informs the court that the child is an Indian child;
- (2) Any participant in the proceeding, officer of the court involved in the proceeding, Indian Tribe, Indian organization, or agency informs the court that it has discovered information indicating that the child is an Indian child;
- (3) The child who is the subject of the proceeding gives the court reason to know he or she is an Indian child;
- (4) The court is informed that the domicile or residence of the child, the child’s parents, or the child’s Indian custodian is on a reservation or in an Alaska Native village;
- (5) The court is informed that the child is or has been a ward of a Tribal court; or
- (6) The court is informed that either parent or the child possesses an identification card indicating membership in an Indian Tribe.” 25 C.F.R. 23.107(c).

~~When a court has reason to believe a child involved in a child-in-need-of-care proceeding is an Indian child, the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), 25 U.S.C. 1901 *et seq.* applies; notice requirements, findings and procedure are dictated by ICWA, and the ICWA forms (Forms 209—223) must be used. The circumstances under which a court has reason to believe a child is an Indian child as defined by 25 U.S.C. 1903(5) include, but are not limited to, the following: any party to the case, Indian tribe, or agency informs the court that the child is an Indian child; any agency involved in child protection services or family support has discovered information suggesting that the child is an Indian child; the child gives the court reason to believe he or she is an Indian child; the residence of the child, parent(s), or custodian is known to be a predominantly Indian community; a parent of the child is enrolled in a tribe; or an officer of the court has knowledge that the child may be an Indian child. Compliance with ICWA is jurisdictional. Failure to comply with ICWA may render orders devoid of authority. Department of the Interior, BIA Guidelines for State Courts, Indian Child Custody Proceedings.~~

When the term “or” stands alone between optional findings/orders, more than one choice may be checked. -Each choice checked must be justified as instructed, e.g. *specify basis for finding.*