

The Clearinghouse on Supervised Visitation Annual Report: The Supervised Visitation Database Case and Client Statistical Analysis



November, 2022

Karen Oehme, J.D.
Director
koehme@fsu.edu

Kelly O'Rourke, MSW
Database Manager

Table of Contents

Case and Client Statistical Analysis Results	3
October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022	3
Referral Source	4
Reason for Referral (Condensed)	4
Additional Allegations	5
Primary Service Requested	6
Description of Services	6
Person Providing Service	7
Child’s Gender	7
Child’s Race	8
Child’s Age	8
Parent’s Marital Status	9
Visitor’s Gender	9
Visitor’s Race	10
Visitor’s Relationship to Child	10
Visitor’s Annual Income	12
Custodian’s Gender	12
Custodian’s Race	13
Custodian’s Relationship to Child	13
Custodian’s Income	14
Florida Child Support Program Participation	14
Domestic Violence Reporting	15
Critical Incidents: Serious Disruptions in Service	15
Critical Incident Outcomes	16
Cancellation of Visits	17
Case Closures	18
Closure Variables	19
Substance Abuse	19
Arrests for Violent Crime	20
Implications and Recommendations	21

Case and Client Statistical Analysis Results

October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022

Cases: 1,674 Clients: 6,642 Services: 28,588

In this report we present the results of the annual Clearinghouse on Supervised Visitation's Database Case and Client Analysis. This report covers October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022, the 12 months since the last report. A total of 45 supervised visitation programs in Florida contributed information to the database during this timeframe.

For the year, from 10/1/2021 to 9/30/2022, the total number of documented cases sent to supervised visitation programs was 1,674, the number of clients served was 6,642 (2,966 children, 1,897 visitors, 1,779 custodians/others), and the number of services provided was 28,588. This is the number of completed or terminated services only, and does not include intake sessions, scheduled but cancelled services or no-shows.

New for the last two years is an added variable denoting whether the visitor or custodian for each case is participating in the Florida Child Support Program. The new variable was approved and added in January, 2020. All programs were asked to retroactively add this data to their cases, as well as collect this information during intake going forward. Because some cases were already closed and the client information unobtainable, the response to this variable was lower than what would have normally accumulated over a full year. Now that this question has been added to intake forms, we have obtained significantly more data — the 2020 report had only 38 entries while the 2021 report showed 181 entries and the 2022 report has 232 entries. We expect this to continue to rise as sites revise their intakes to reflect this item.

The amount of missing data has *continued to decline* over the last five years, probably due to Clearinghouse training on the database, periodic reminders to programs to enter all data correctly, and requirements within the database to enter specific information before being allowed to move forward.

Percent vs. Valid Percent - The percent shown in each table is the percent of the total number of cases showing one particular answer, factoring in any cases for which the data is missing or is zero. The valid percent is the percent of the total number of cases showing one particular answer but *not including* any cases with blank cells or missing data. If there are no missing data for a particular variable, then the percent and valid percent will be identical.

The following are the 2022 findings.

Referral Source

In the database, there are seven options for the variable Referral Source. This is a mandatory variable, in that, database users cannot continue until this information is inserted. For the most part, the trends have remained steady as dependency court continues to be the most common referral source. Domestic violence injunctions account for the next largest source of referrals but dropped from 16% to 7%. Last year there was a significant increase in domestic violence (DV) referrals, up from 9% to 16%. This may reflect the increase in domestic violence cases during the height of the pandemic.

Referral Source

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Dependency Case</i>	1406	84	84
<i>DV Injunction</i>	118	7	7
<i>Dissolution of Marriage</i>	84	5	5
<i>Never Married/Paternity</i>	33	2	2
<i>Criminal Case</i>	8	.5	.5
<i>Self-Referred</i>	16	.1	.1
<i>Other</i>	9	.5	.5
TOTAL	1,674	100	100

Reason for Referral (Condensed)

For each case, multiple reasons can be cited for the referral to supervised visitation. However, the database user is required to enter one primary reason for the referral first. The percentage of DV cases increased slightly and child abuse/neglect cases referrals decreased from the previous year. The percentage of substance abuse cases remained the same after rising steadily since 2015.

It is possible that more programs are identifying that one factor behind child abuse/neglect may be substance abuse. In addition, substance abuse increased markedly during the 2020 quarantine periods. **Remember that this is the *primary reason for referral* and may reflect only the main issue of the case as noted in the referral document.**

Reason for Referral (Condensed)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Child Abuse / Neglect</i>	321	19	19
<i>Domestic Violence</i>	519	31	31
<i>Parental Substance Abuse</i>	686	41	41
<i>Parental Mental Health</i>	100	6	6
<i>Parental Criminal Activity</i>	9	.4	.4
<i>Other Parental Misconduct</i>	34	2.5	2.5
<i>Other</i>	5	.1	.1
TOTAL	1,674	100	100

Additional Allegations

The table below lists the allegations noted **in addition to the primary allegation** or reason for referral. As many items as needed may be checked for each case. While 41% of cases this year were referred to supervised visitation primarily for parental substance abuse, 17% of the remaining cases listed parental substance abuse as an additional allegation, making it one of the most common issues facing clients. However, overall parental substance abuse allegations did fall from 27% in 2021 to 17% this year. In addition, while 6% of cases had parental mental health as a primary reason for referral, 11% of cases listed it as an additional issue. Mental health, often related to substance abuse, is clearly a comorbid issue in supervised visitation cases.

Additional Allegations

	Frequency	% of all Cases
<i>Child Abuse / Neglect</i>	269	16
<i>Domestic Violence</i>	272	17
<i>Parental Substance Abuse</i>	285	17
<i>Parental Mental Health</i>	184	11
<i>Parental Criminal Activity</i>	37	3
<i>Other Parental Misconduct</i>	194	12
<i>Fear of Abduction</i>	(85)	
<i>Environmental Concerns</i>	(40)	
<i>Undermining Custodial Parent</i>	(33)	
<i>Failure to Protect</i>	(36)	
<i>Other</i>	61	1

<i>None</i>		33
TOTAL	1,302	100

Primary Service Requested

This chart identifies the primary service for which the client was referred. The most common reason for referral remains supervised visitation followed by parent education services which may include parenting classes, one-on-one parental education and training, or parent services. Most clients also receive parent education and assistance as a secondary service. The number of monitored exchange cases dropped over the last year and fell to a new low once again this year. While supervised visitation centers were once a haven for parents who needed to exchange their children with one another in a safe, secure location, it seems Florida’s programs are underutilized for this service. In fact, many programs housed in caseworker offices, as opposed to dedicated SV centers, do not even offer monitored exchange services.

Primary Service Requested

	Frequency	% of all Cases
<i>Supervised Visitation</i>	1345	81
<i>Monitored Exchange</i>	49	3
<i>Parent Education</i>	149	9
<i>Therapeutic Supervision</i>	14	.5
<i>Additional Services Only</i>	19	1
<i>Supervised Phone Visit</i>	78	4.5
TOTAL	1674	100

Description of Services

The chart below identifies the distribution of service types provided to clients. The most common service remains supervised visitation. This year saw a marked decrease in phone/internet visits as programs fully returned to in-person visits. While Zoom calls are still an option for some programs, most use them only in a few situations.

Description of Services

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>(In person) Supervised Visitation</i>	23,586	83	83
<i>Monitored Exchange</i>	1,156	4	4

<i>Supervised Phone/Internet Visit</i>	1,690	5	5
<i>Therapeutic Supervision</i>	1,796	6	6
<i>Intake/Additional Service</i>	360	2	2
TOTAL	28,588	100	100

Person Providing Service

Paid staff members continue to be the main provider of services in Florida's supervised visitation programs, followed by interns, and volunteers. After several years of rising intern/volunteer involvement, their participation fell 4% in 2021 but increased this year after Covid restrictions ended, and colleges and universities restarted their internship programs.

Person Providing Service

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Paid Staff</i>	27,416	96	98
<i>Intern</i>	724	3	2
<i>Volunteer</i>	46	.01	.01
<i>Total</i>	28,186	99	100
<i>Missing</i>	402	1	
TOTAL	28,588	100	

Child's Gender

The next three charts contain demographic information on the child clients of Florida's Supervised Visitation programs. This year, cases contained from 1 to 8 children per case. As in previous years, the number of boys and girls remains roughly even.

Child's Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Male</i>	1,450	48.9	48.9
<i>Female</i>	1,516	51.1	51.1
<i>Unknown</i>	0	.00	.00
TOTAL	2,966	100	100

Child's Race

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, approximately 78% of the U.S. self-reports as white, 13.4% as Black, and 18.5% as Hispanic (some people choose more than one race.) In comparison, Blacks appear to be generally over-represented while whites and Hispanics are underrepresented as supervised visitation center clients. Compared to the previous year, there was an increase in Black children for 2022.

Child's Race

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>White</i>	1,562	53	53
<i>Hispanic</i>	282	10	10
<i>Black</i>	886	29	29
<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	5	.1	.1
<i>American Indian/Alaska Native</i>	15	.1	.1
<i>Two or More Races</i>	212	8	8
<i>Unknown</i>	0	.00	.00
<i>Total</i>	2,962	99.9	100
<i>Missing</i>	4	.1	
<i>TOTAL</i>	2,966	100	

Child's Age

More than 77% of children in Florida's Supervised Visitation programs are under age 10. The majority of those children are age 6 and under (57%).

Child's Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>0 - 3</i>	980	33	33
<i>4 - 6</i>	682	24	24
<i>7 - 9</i>	593	20	20
<i>10 - 12</i>	356	12	12
<i>13 - 15</i>	237	8	8
<i>16+</i>	88	2.5	3
<i>Total</i>	2,936	99.5	100

<i>Missing</i>	30	.5	
<i>TOTAL</i>	2,966	100	

Parent's Marital Status

According to the collected data, a larger percentage of parents receiving Supervised Visitation services have never been married to each other. This percentage has remained about the same at around 65-69% for the last four years.

Parent's Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Unmarried</i>	1,898	64	65
<i>Married</i>	201	6.5	6.5
<i>Separated</i>	639	22	22
<i>Divorced</i>	188	6.5	6.5
<i>Total</i>	2,926	99	100
<i>Unknown</i>	40	1	
<i>TOTAL</i>	2,966	100	

Visitor's Gender

The following data represents information on the *primary* visitor in each case. The visitor is normally someone who does not have custody of the child, but the person with whom the child will have supervised visits. So that all parental visitors can be counted, the Clearinghouse encourages programs to have a separate case for each non-custodial parent that is visiting children. However, cases with two parents visiting but not separated, as well as additional visitors such as grandparents, siblings and other relatives, account for the additional 223 visitors.

Visitor's Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Male</i>	552	33	33
<i>Female</i>	1,121	67	67
<i>Unknown</i>	1	.001	.001
<i>TOTAL</i>	1,674	100	100

In the last decade, men and women were almost equally represented as visitors participating in supervised visits. Since 2018 the percentage of women has increased steadily from 60% in 2018 to 67% in 2022. This likely reflects that most cases are dependency cases.

Visitor's Race

The majority of visitors continues to be white. In 2022, Black visitors continue to outpace Hispanic visitors. According to the 2020 U.S. Census, approximately 78% of the U.S. self-reports as white, 13.4% as black, and 18.5% as Hispanic (some people choose more than one race.) Compared to their general population, Hispanics and whites are underrepresented as visitors while Black people are overrepresented as visitors in Florida's Supervised Visitation programs.

Visitor's Race

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>White</i>	1,059	56	56
<i>Hispanic</i>	263	14	14
<i>Black</i>	491	26	26
<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	9	.5	.5
<i>American Indian/Alaska Native</i>	15	.5	.5
<i>Two or More Races</i>	56	3	3
<i>Other</i>	0	0	0
<i>Total</i>	1,893	99.8	100
<i>Unknown</i>	4	.002	
TOTAL	1,897	100	

Visitor's Relationship to Child

By far, the most common *primary* visitor (1 per case) was a parent to the child client (97-98%). As in all previous years (with the exception of 2011) mothers showed higher representation as visitors than fathers. Women are the most common head of single parent households and therefore, more susceptible to poverty and the issues that accompany it. It is not surprising that women are the most common visitor in

dependency cases and fathers are the most common visitors in cases referred from domestic violence sources.

Visitor's Relationship to Child

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Mother (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	1,087	64.5	64.8
<i>Father (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	558	33.2	33.5
<i>Grandparent</i>	26	1.5	1.5
<i>Sibling</i>	1	.2	.2
<i>Other Family Member</i>	0	0	0
<i>Non-Relative Caregiver</i>	0	0	0
<i>Total</i>	1,672	99.8	100
<i>Unknown</i>	2	.2	
TOTAL	1,674	100	

The following chart represents the 223 additional visitors to the primary visitors. Approximately 78% are parents. Some cases show both parents as non-custodial visitors, and the Clearinghouse encourages database users to separate those cases into two different cases, one for each parent. Most additional visitors that are parents, are stepparents visiting with the actual parent.

Additional Visitors

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Mother (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	101	45.5	46
<i>Father (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	75	33.5	34
<i>Grandparent</i>	23	10.5	11
<i>Sibling</i>	12	3	3
<i>Other Family Member</i>	10	4.8	4.8
<i>Non-Relative Caregiver</i>	0	0	0
<i>Other</i>	2	1.2	1.2
<i>Total</i>	219	98.5	100
<i>Missing</i>	4	1.5	
TOTAL	223	100	

Visitor's Annual Income

As in previous years, the majority of visitors are below the poverty level – approximately 77% below \$20,000 and perhaps as much as 89.5% if the family poverty line is used (includes less than \$29,999 category). The number of visitors in the lowest category has slowly risen from 2017- 2022.

Visitor's Annual Income

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Less than \$10,000</i>	1,073	56.9	57.0
<i>\$10,000 - \$19,999</i>	381	20.1	20.2
<i>\$20,000 - \$29,999</i>	237	12.5	12.5
<i>\$30,000 - \$39,999</i>	136	7.2	7.2
<i>\$40,000 and above</i>	58	3.1	3.1
<i>Total</i>	1,885	99.8	100
<i>Unknown</i>	12	.2	
<i>TOTAL</i>	1,897	100	

Custodian's Gender

The following four sections represent information on the custodian(s) in the case.

Custodian's Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Male</i>	318	21.0	81.6
<i>Female</i>	1,345	17.0	18.4
<i>Unknown</i>	11	1.0	
<i>TOTAL</i>	1,674	100	100

Clearly women were, by far, the most common *primary* custodian, the person having legal custody of the child client. This may be in part due to the fact that most Foster Parents are listed as females. Additional custodians (105) may include a custodian's spouse, stepparents, siblings, and grandparents, among others. As many primary custodians are women, the higher number of men listed as additional caregivers represents their spouses.

Custodian's Race

The majority of the custodians continue to be white. However, this year, the number of custodians identifying as white increased somewhat from 55% (2020), 61% (2021) to 63% in 2022. In addition, the number identifying as two or more races increased about 3%.

Custodian's Race

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>White</i>	1,127	63.0	63.3
<i>Hispanic</i>	230	12.9	12.9
<i>Black</i>	329	18.5	18.5
<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	8	.5	.5
<i>American Indian/Alaska Native</i>	8	.5	.5
<i>Two or More Races</i>	76	4.3	4.3
<i>Total</i>	1,778	99.7	100
<i>Unknown</i>	1	.3	
TOTAL	1,779	100	

Custodian's Relationship to Child

Custodian's Relationship to Child

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Mother (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	306	15.7	15.7
<i>Father (biological, adoptive, or step)</i>	229	12.9	12.9
<i>Grandparent</i>	238	13.4	13.4
<i>Sibling</i>	3	.1	.1
<i>Other Family Member</i>	108	6.1	6.1
<i>Non-Custodial Relative</i>	142	8.0	8.0
<i>Foster Parent</i>	711	40.0	40.0
<i>Group Home</i>	20	2.6	2.6
<i>Other</i>	19	1.1	1.1
<i>Unknown</i>	3	.01	.01
TOTAL	1,779	100	100

Previously, the most common custodian was a parent to the child client but parents as custodians has been steadily dropping as Foster Parents as the Custodian has steadily risen. This year, Foster Parent (40%) supersedes Parent as the most popular caregiver (28.63%) once again. Following foster parents, parents and then grandparents were the most common custodians.

Custodian's Income

There is often some missing data on the custodian's income since many programs and case managers do not have access to this information,. This year a larger than normal number of new programs were added and most have yet to add Custodian Income to their intake forms. Therefore, the number of unknown rose. The number of custodians across the range of incomes is fairly similar. It appears that almost 38-39% of the custodians earn less than \$20,000 per year. With federally designated poverty levels at \$27,750 for a family of four, a significant number of clients fall beneath the poverty threshold. Also, 55% percent of custodians fall below the 125% of poverty level mark.

Custodian's Income

	Frequency	Percent	Valid %
<i>Less than \$10,000</i>	321	18.0	19.7
<i>\$10,000 - \$19,999</i>	314	17.7	18.9
<i>\$20,000 - \$29,999</i>	373	20.91	22.8
<i>\$30,000 - \$39,999</i>	295	16.6	17.7
<i>\$40,000 and above</i>	337	18.9	20.9
<i>Total</i>	1,660	92.1	100
<i>Unknown</i>	139	7.9	
<i>TOTAL</i>	1,799	100	

Florida Child Support Program Participation

The newest variable added to the database in 2020 was inquiring whether the Visitor or Custodian was participating in the Florida Child Support Program. During the first full year of data intake, the numbers increased significantly. The category of *Don't Know* dropped from 63% to 26% over the last two years, indicating that the data is being routinely collected far more often.

Florida Child Support Program Participation

	Frequency	% of all Cases
<i>YES</i>	368	10
<i>NO</i>	2,142	64
<i>Don't Know</i>	838	26
<i>TOTAL</i>	3,348	100

*Total of 3,348 represents both Visitor and Custodian for 1,674 cases.

Domestic Violence Reporting

In each case, the person entering data is required to note whether domestic violence was a component of, or was present in the case upon intake (according to the referral.) In 2021, 42% indicated **YES**, up from 38% in 2020. However, 2022 saw a significant drop with just 31.6% of cases reporting domestic violence. The decline may be a result of the end of Covid quarantines which were shown to have a serious impact on domestic violence cases.

Domestic Violence Reporting

	Frequency	% of all Cases
<i>Domestic Violence YES</i>	528	31.6
<i>Domestic Violence NO</i>	1,146	68.4
<i>TOTAL</i>	1,674	100

Critical Incidents: Serious Disruptions in Service

A *Critical Incident* is a serious disruption in service: an event that occurred before, during, or immediately after the service was initiated, that was so problematic as to require monitor intervention, the cancellation or termination of the service, or the removal of the offending party from the premises.

Critical Incidents

	Critical Incident Cases	% of all Cases
<i>2018</i>	193	8.7%
<i>2019</i>	179	8.4%
<i>2020</i>	87	5.1%
<i>2021</i>	174	9.4%
<i>2022</i>	156	9.3%

The purpose of this variable was not only to identify significantly dangerous situations, but also learn what smaller problems might be occurring during visits that require attention. Although called a *critical incident* this could be as minor as having to redirect a visitor multiple times. In 2020, the rate fell dramatically to only 87 critical incidents, or 5.1% of cases. No doubt, this was because for almost six months, most programs were only offering virtual visits which provide less opportunity for critical incidents to occur. In 2021 and 2022 the numbers rose again with the return of in-person visits and the inherent risks associated with them. The Clearinghouse continues to emphasize the need for enhanced safety measures and consistently offers support and training on the issue of safety in supervised visitation, especially when services are conducted in case worker offices not equipped for security emergencies.

Critical Incident Outcomes

Number of cases with Critical Incidents: **156 (9.3% of all cases)**

Total number of Critical Incidents: **174 (.61% of all services)**

Critical Incident Types

	# of Incidents
<i>Visitor became ill</i>	4
<i>Visitor showed favoritism</i>	1
<i>Visitor threatened other adult</i>	4
<i>Visitor arrested on-site</i>	3
<i>Child accidentally injured</i>	13
<i>Visitor refused staff directions</i>	46
<i>Visitor physically harmed child</i>	4
<i>Visitor threatened child</i>	13
<i>Visitor came to visit intoxicated</i>	11
<i>Visitor used corporal punishment</i>	9
<i>Visitor left unexpectedly</i>	6
<i>Child refused to participate</i>	25
<i>Child abuse observed</i>	4
<i>Child became ill</i>	9
<i>Custodian refused redirection</i>	18
<i>Custodian harmed child</i>	2
<i>Other</i>	2
TOTAL	174

In 2022, the number of critical incidents returned closer to norms as expected because of the return to in-person visits. Visitors refusing direction and children refusing to participate are the most common issues.

The generally low number of critical incidents also reflects the well-trained staff of Florida's SV programs who were quite successful in preventing critical incidents from occurring as well as handling them safely and quickly. Programs with proper security

measures in place for both virtual and in-person visits often have more successful outcomes in cases of critical incidents.

But any critical incident is concerning and may be quite dangerous. Proper security measures are always necessary to prevent potential tragedies from occurring.

Below are the noted actions taken in each case experiencing a critical incident. Several actions might have been taken for a particular incident, therefore allowing for a higher number of actions than incidents themselves.

Critical Incident Outcomes

<i>Action Taken</i>	# of Incidents
<i>Case worker notified</i>	21
<i>Incident report written</i>	18
<i>Incident discussed with violator</i>	96
<i>No action taken</i>	4
<i>Police/Sheriff/emergency personnel called</i>	8
<i>Service terminated</i>	38
<i>Staff called abuse hotline</i>	9
<i>Violator was arrested</i>	2
<i>Closed case due to critical incident</i>	6
<i>Other</i>	2

Cancellation of Visits

Scheduled visits are often cancelled before they can take place. Below is a cumulative list of those responsible for cancelling services. Most often, the visit is cancelled by the visitor for various reasons. Also note that often 28 sites will not enter a service cancellation or enter the data itself if no service is accomplished. However, the Clearinghouse has urged them to take the time to enter this information so we can all better understand why clients might cancel or no-show.

Cancellation of Visits

Cancelled By	# of Incidents
<i>Visitor</i>	3,924
<i>Custodian (not foster parent)</i>	650
<i>Foster parent</i>	480
<i>DCF/CBC</i>	319
<i>SV program</i>	554
<i>Other</i>	604
<i>Missing</i>	4
TOTAL	6,565

Reasons for cancellation are varied and listed below. Most often, no reason is given, especially when cancellation messages are left on center voicemail. In addition, one or more parties are often reported as “No Show” for a service, meaning they did not officially cancel and did not show up for the scheduled appointment time.

Approximately 14% of all scheduled services were No-Shows. Also of note is the number of services cancelled for Non-Confirmation: 885. Many sites are requiring confirmation of the visit to ensure their program resources are not wasted on no-shows.

Reason for Cancellations

<i>Reason for Cancellation</i>	<i># of times</i>
<i>Conflicting appointment</i>	375
<i>Transportation</i>	734
<i>Work</i>	478
<i>Illness</i>	936
<i>Holidays</i>	365
<i>Weather</i>	498
<i>Death</i>	30
<i>Child’s activities</i>	187
<i>Incarceration</i>	108
<i>Vacation</i>	256
<i>Change in court order</i>	142
<i>Child refused to visit</i>	279
<i>Staff resources unavailable</i>	228
<i>Other emergency</i>	229
<i>Non-confirmation</i>	885
<i>Other</i>	253
<i>Unknown</i>	1,008
<i>Security Unavailable</i>	27
TOTAL	6,565

Case Closures

In the 2021-2022 analysis period, 671 cases were closed. It is noteworthy that programs often forget to close cases, especially if clients simply stop coming over time. The Clearinghouse has made an effort to remind programs to review and close cases that are no longer active.

Reason for Case Closure

<i>Reason for Case Closure</i>	<i># of times</i>
<i>Excessive no-shows/cancellations</i>	186
<i>Completion of court ordered term of service</i>	75
<i>Moved to unsupervised visits (per court)</i>	74
<i>Termination of parental rights or court ordered cessation of visits</i>	76
<i>Loss of contact with visitor or custodian</i>	58
<i>Family reunified</i>	32

<i>Child refused to visit</i>	36
<i>SVP's time or visit limit reached</i>	13
<i>Safety concerns</i>	43
<i>Termination for violation of other rules</i>	2
<i>Excessive demands on program resources</i>	8
<i>Critical incidents</i>	6
<i>Refusal to pay fees</i>	49
<i>Other</i>	19
<i>Total</i>	671

The number of cases closed for safety reasons dropped in 2020 and 2021, but bounced back to 6.4% in 2022.

Case Closures Due to Safety Reasons

Case Closure Due to Safety Reasons	
2015	59
2016	52
2017	55
2018	42
2019	48
2020	22
2021	12
2022	43

Closure Variables

When closing a case, programs are asked to report on substance abuse and arrests for violent crime before, during, and after the completion of services. If the program answered yes, they were provided the opportunity to expand on their information. Below is the summary of this data from the 671 cases closed this year and the percentage of closed cases the numbers represent.

Substance Abuse

About 40% of clients came to supervised visitation this year with substance abuse as their *primary* issue. Twenty-seven percent of new cases also listed substance abuse as an *additional* allegation, meaning 67% of cases named substance abuse (SA) as an issue for the supervised visits. The actual number may be higher as substance abuse is known to be severely underreported. Some substance abuse issues continue during the SV services, sometimes even during a service.

It appears that a majority of the substance abuse in cases occurs before SV services are initiated and might in fact contribute to a client's placement in the SV program. Data show that during services, substance abuse may be, at least for a time, decreasing.

Note that many programs do not have the resources available to track clients after they leave.

Closure Variables: Substance Abuse

	Yes	% of Closed Cases Indicating SA was Present	No	Unknown
<i>SA Present</i>	151	22.5%	520	
<i>SA Prior to services</i>	115	76% of SA cases	8	206
<i>SA While case was open</i>	38	23% of SA cases	10	491
<i>SA During a service</i>	6	3% of SA cases	16	515
<i>SA Known after services</i>	3	1% of SA cases	5	527

Arrests for Violent Crime

In the 671 cases that programs **closed** in the 2021-2022 year, 5% of cases included a client who had been previously arrested for a violent crime. Fortunately, the percentage of those perpetrators becoming violent during supervised visitation services is low.

Closure Variables: Violent Crime

	Yes	% of Closed Cases Indicating AVC was Present	No	Unknown
<i>Arrests for violent crime (AVC)</i>	34	5%	637	
<i>AVC Prior to services</i>	27	80% of AVC cases	6	500
<i>AVC While case was open</i>	5	15% of AVC cases	23	506
<i>AVC During a service</i>	4	13% of AVC cases	19	514
<i>AVC Known after services</i>	2	5% of AVC cases	6	527

While the number of known offenses after case closure reported is only 2, this may be due to the fact that many programs do not have access to records after their clients complete services. In addition, some programs do not have the time or funding to follow up with their clients' post-services.

Yet, previous data which included a review of client arrest records for two years post services did indicate a significant decrease in reported violent crimes. This may also be reflected in the decreasing numbers above as, based on previous Clearinghouse research, arrests for violence decreases dramatically during and after SV services.

Implications and Recommendations

Florida's programs are underfunded across the state. Yet there is always a demand for services in every county, and demand exceeds supply throughout the state.

Once again, this annual report reflects the fact that supervised visitation programs in Florida provide a valuable service to the community statewide. DCF funds ongoing training for all programs to augment safe practices for families and communities. However, there is much more work to be done to provide the financial support that these crucial programs require.

In 2022 the Clearinghouse provided judicial training on supervised visitation through the Office of the State Courts Administrator. Judges were asked to remember the serious dynamics that exist in some families. Allowing untrained family members and friends to provide oversight in these cases leaves children vulnerable. Trained programs offer the most attention to safety.

The data presented here demonstrates the continued need for on-site security to keep vulnerable children and families, program staff, as well as the community safe during visits. Yet a large gap remains in Florida's SV system without meaningful standards (that have never been passed by the Florida Legislature, despite years of bills submitted by individual lawmakers) and funding for security at SV programs.

The Clearinghouse list of Florida SV programs includes both non-profit and for-profit programs. Programs that do not receive funding from the CBCs or DCF are not required to enter data into the Clearinghouse database — **that could be corrected by the court system if judges require programs that have an Agreement with the Court to participate in the Clearinghouse's database.** (Note that some non-funded programs do enter data into the database voluntarily as it is a useful resource and mechanism for organizing case and client information.)

There has never been a mechanism to monitor or certify any of these programs to ensure that they follow the current or recommended standards. **As in years past, the Clearinghouse will alert DCF and the Office of the State Courts Administrator to both the need for the implementation of standards statewide and increased funding, especially for onsite security personnel, to keep families safe at SV programs.**

*Submitted by Karen Oehme, Director
Clearinghouse for Family Violence Studies
November, 2022*