

New Training Manual for Florida's Supervised Visitation Programs

Referrals to Supervised Visitation in Child Sexual Abuse Cases

Overview of the Manual

The manual is divided into seven chapters in addition to this one:

- 1. Train the Trainer Instructions and Resources Section**
- 2. What is Child Sexual Abuse?**
- 3. The Impact of Child Sexual Abuse**
- 4. Juvenile Sexual Abuse Dynamics**
- 5. System Response to Sexual Abuse Allegations**
- 6. Best Practice Guidelines for Assessing Referrals and Court Orders in Child Sexual Abuse Cases**
- 7. Best Practices for the Visit: Intake, Intervention, Documentation, Termination**

Introduction

The Keeping Children Safe Act requires supervisors of visits in sexual abuse cases to have specialized training in child sexual abuse dynamics. This manual provides such training, and can be supplemented by local training.

Child sexual abuse negatively affects the victimized child, the family of that child, and society as a whole. It is important for supervised visitation providers to become knowledgeable about the dynamics of child sexual abuse in order to effectively protect vulnerable children and non-offending parents. This involves rebutting the myths that surround child sexual abuse victimization, as well as understanding

how sexual abuse can be part of **polyvictimization** – multiple forms of abusive family dynamics that may exist in the family.

The manual provides supervised visitation monitors with information about the ways that different systems respond to allegations of sexual abuse. The manual will include the requirements for reporting suspicions of child maltreatment, the process of making a report, as well as how the legal system and the Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF) respond to allegations of child sexual abuse.

In addition, staff will learn about new research that reveals the extent of juvenile sexual offending, the strategic process of how abusive adults victimize vulnerable children, and how visitation staff can protect children at every stage of the investigation.

Finally, staff will learn how to prepare to monitor cases that involve allegations or confirmed cases of sexual abuse, as well as to protect children during supervised visits.

What will I learn in this chapter?



Upon completion of this chapter, a visit monitor will be able to:

- Understand the Keeping Children Safe Act
- Understand other relevant cases that set precedence in family cases
- Apply this knowledge to better serve families in supervised visitation

The Keeping Children Safe Act

Florida Statutes § 39.0139

Intent of the Keeping Children Safe Act

Section 39.0139, *Florida Statutes*, which is cited as the “Keeping Children Safe Act,” is a response by the Florida Legislature “**to protect children and reduce the risk of further harm to children who have been sexually abused or exploited by a parent or other caregiver.**” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(2)(b) (2016).

When creating the Keeping Children Safe Act, the Legislature found that:

- For some children who are abused, abandoned, or neglected by a parent or other caregiver, abuse may include sexual abuse,
- These same children are at risk of suffering further harm during visitation or other contact with the child’s abuser, and
- Visitation or other contact may be used to influence the child’s testimony. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(2)(a).



The Keeping Children Safe Act attempts to reduce the risk of such further harm by creating a special judicial process relating to approval of visitation or contact between a child victim and certain abusive parents or guardians to whom the Act applies. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(2)(b).

What type of cases does the Keeping Children Safe Act apply to?

The **Keeping Children Safe Act only applies in cases brought under Chapter 39** of the *Florida Statutes*, which primarily involves dependency and termination of parental rights cases. The focus of the Keeping Children Safe Act is to protect children who are abused, abandoned, or neglected.

For example, the Keeping Children Safe Act will not apply in a Chapter 61 dissolution of marriage case where the custody of the children is being fought over.

Who is the Keeping Children Safe Act applicable to?

Subsection (3)(c) of the Act states that if a person meets certain criteria that create a “rebuttable presumption of detriment” to a child, they **may not visit or have contact with a child victim without a hearing and order by the court.** Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(3)(c).



Subsection (3)(a) gives the criteria for when a presumption of detriment is created, as follows:

1. A court of competent jurisdiction has found probable cause exists that a parent or caregiver has sexually abused a child as defined in s. 39.01;
2. A parent or caregiver has been found guilty of, regardless of adjudication, or has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere to, charges under the following statutes or substantially similar statutes of other jurisdictions:
 - a. Section 787.04, relating to removing minors from the state or concealing minors contrary to court order;
 - b. Section 794.011, relating to sexual battery;
 - c. Section 798.02, relating to lewd and lascivious behavior;
 - d. Chapter 800, relating to lewdness and indecent exposure;
 - e. Section 826.04, relating to incest; or
 - f. Chapter 827, relating to the abuse of children; or

3. A court of competent jurisdiction has determined a parent or caregiver to be a sexual predator as defined in s. 775.21 or a parent or caregiver has received a substantially similar designation under laws of another jurisdiction.

As used in this subsection, “substantially similar” means “any offense that is substantially similar in elements and penalties to one of those listed in this subparagraph, and that is in violation of a law of any other jurisdiction.” Fla. Stat. § 39.806(1)(d)(2) (2016).

Rebuttable Presumption

If a parent or guardian meets one of the criteria set forth in subsection (3)(a), a “rebuttable presumption of detriment” to the child has been created. If such a person wishes to have contact or visitation with the child victim, they have the right to a hearing to determine whether contact is appropriate. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(a).

During such a hearing, the court will presume that visitation or contact would be detrimental to the child. **It is up to the person to “rebut” this presumption – to show that visitation or contact would not endanger the safety, well-being, and physical, mental, and emotional health of the child.** Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(c).



Hearing Details

Prior to a hearing under the Keeping Children Safe Act, if an attorney or guardian has not already been appointed to represent the child, the court shall appoint one that has had special training in the dynamics of child sexual abuse. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(a). Such an attorney or guardian is known as an “attorney ad litem” or a “guardian ad litem.”

Evidence rules for a hearing are relaxed compared to other types of court hearings. **A court may rely upon “any relevant and material evidence** submitted to the extent of its probative value, including written and oral reports or recommendations from the child protection team, the child’s therapist, the child’s guardian ad litem, or the child’s attorney ad litem, **even if these reports, recommendations, and**

evidence may not be admissible under the rules of evidence.” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(b).

Possible Results of a Hearing

There are two possible results from a hearing under the Keeping Children Safe Act: the presumption of detriment is either (1) rebutted or it is (2) not rebutted:

- 1) If, after the hearing, the court finds that the person has **successfully rebutted** the presumption of detriment, the court **may allow visitation or other contact**. This is done by proving “by clear and convincing evidence that the safety, well-being, and physical, mental, and emotional health of the child is not endangered by such visitation or contact.” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(c).
 - In such a case, the court shall enter a written order setting forth findings of fact and specifying any conditions it still finds necessary to protect the child. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(c).
- 2) Alternatively, if, after the hearing, the court finds that the person **did not rebut** the presumption of detriment, the court shall enter a written order setting forth such findings of fact and **prohibiting or restricting visitation or other contact with the child**. Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(4)(d).
 - Any visitation or contact that is still allowed, despite not rebutting the presumption, must be limited by the conditions set forth in the Act in Section (5) – Conditions.

Conditions on Visits when Presumption Not Rebutted

Section (5) provides two alternative conditions that will be imposed on any visitation or contact that is ordered when a person does not rebut the presumption of detriment to a child under subsection (4)(d).

The visitation or contact will have one of the following requirements:

- **Supervised by a person who has special training in the dynamics of child sexual abuse, or**
- **Conducted in a supervised, approved visitation program.** Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(5)(a), (b).

If the contact is to be conducted in a supervised visitation program, subsection (5)(b) gives two requirements for the program:

- (1) “an agreement with the court and a current affidavit of compliance on file with the chief judge of the circuit in which the program is located affirming

that the program has agreed to comply with the minimum standards contained in the administrative order issued by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on November 17, 1999,” and

(2) “a written agreement with the court and with the department as described in Fla. Stat. § 753.05 containing policies and guidelines specifically related to referrals involving child sexual abuse.”

Additional Considerations

Influencing Testimony –

Subsection (6)(a) provides the procedure for when a person is attempting to influence the testimony of a child involved in a Chapter 39 case.

The subsection applies in two situations:

- once a rebuttable presumption of detriment has already arisen under subsection (3), or
- if visitation has been ordered under subsection (4).

At that point, **if a party or participant to the case informs the court that they have knowledge a person is trying to influence the testimony of the child, the court must hold a hearing within 7 business days.** Such a hearing is held to **determine whether it is in the best interests of the child to prohibit or restrict visitation or contact** with the person alleged to have tried to influence the child’s testimony.

Impeding Child’s Therapeutic Progress –

Subsection (6)(b) applies **when children are in therapy as a result of any finding or conviction included in subsection (3)(a).** The (3)(a) findings and convictions include when:

1. A court of competent jurisdiction has found probable cause exists that a parent or caregiver has sexually abused a child as defined in s. 39.01;
2. A parent or caregiver has been found guilty of, regardless of adjudication, or has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere to, charges under the following statutes or substantially similar statutes of other jurisdictions:

- a. Section 787.04, relating to removing minors from the state or concealing minors contrary to court order;
- b. Section 794.011, relating to sexual battery;
- c. Section 798.02, relating to lewd and lascivious behavior;
- d. Chapter 800, relating to lewdness and indecent exposure;
- e. Section 826.04, relating to incest; or
- f. Chapter 827, relating to the abuse of children; or

3. A court of competent jurisdiction has determined a parent or caregiver to be a sexual predator as defined in s. 775.21 or a parent or caregiver has received a substantially similar designation under laws of another jurisdiction.

If a child is in therapy as a result of any of the above findings or convictions and **the child's therapist reports that the visitation or contact is impeding the child's therapeutic progress**, the court shall hold a hearing within 7 business days. At the hearing, **the court will review and possibly adjust the terms, conditions, or appropriateness of continues visitation or contact.**



Appellate Cases and their Impact



Mahmood v. Mahmood, 14 So. 3d 1 (Fla. 4th DCA 2009).

Ultimate Impact:

- The **Keeping Children Safe Act** may only be invoked in cases brought under Chapter 39, which primarily relates to dependency and termination of parental rights.
 - It may not be invoked in cases brought under other Chapters, such as Chapter 61 dissolution of marriage cases.
- Part of the Act was concerning to the court, as it created a rebuttable presumption of detriment merely from an anonymous tip to an abuse hotline regarding a parent or guardian.
 - This part of the Act has since been deleted and replaced.

Background Facts:

Wahid Mahmood, husband, and Patricia Mahmood, wife, had a pending dissolution of marriage case under chapter 61, *Florida Statutes*, when Patricia Mahmood filed a motion to invoke the Keeping Children Safe Act, alleging sexual abuse by the father. Chapter 61 relates to dissolution of marriage and has its own guidelines to protect the interests of children when parents are getting divorced. Those guidelines specifically take into consideration evidence of abuse, neglect, abandonment, and sexual abuse of a child. Fla. Stat. § 61.13(3)(m) (2016).

Patricia Mahmood filed multiple motions to suspend the husband's visitation rights with their two children until a hearing under the Keeping Children Safe Act could be conducted, based on the claim that she had reported the husband to a child abuse hotline. At the time, one of the criteria of the Keeping Children Safe Act that would create a rebuttable presumption of detriment to a child was "a parent or caregiver has been the subject of a report to the child abuse hotline alleging sexual

abuse of any child as defined in s. 39.01.” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(3)(a)(1) (2008) (amended 2011).

What the Court Decided:

The Fourth District Court of Appeal found that **the Keeping Children Safe Act did not apply in dissolution of marriage proceedings and therefore the mother’s report to the child abuse hotline did not require suspension of the father’s visitation pending a hearing under the Act.** The court reasoned that the focus of the Act was to “provide an entry mechanism into the court system for children who need protection.” The court explained that when the Act referred to a “court” it was referring to a court assigned “to hear dependency and parental termination cases, not the circuit court in general or a family division of the circuit court primarily assigned to hear Chapter 61 dissolution of marriage cases.” *Mahmood v. Mahmood*, 14 So. 3d 1, 4 (Fla. 4th DCA 2009). Courts are already given broad powers to protect children who are mixed up in a chapter 61 dissolution of marriage proceeding. It was therefore not appropriate to invoke the Keeping Children Safe Act during a chapter 61 proceeding.

Additionally, **the court expressed concern that, under the Act at that time, an anonymous tip to an abuse hotline automatically triggered the presumption of detriment** and suspended visitation rights until a hearing could be held, under subsection (3)(a)(1). *See also* *In re: Potts*, No. 07–00742DPAWS (Fla. 6th Cir. Ct. 2007). This concern was legitimate, as **this subsection was later amended** by Chapter 2011-209, Florida Laws, which deleted the abuse hotline criteria and replaced it with the current subsection (3)(a)(1), which reads: “a court of competent jurisdiction has found probable cause exists that a parent or caregiver has sexually abused a child.” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(3)(a)(1) (2016).

Leneve v. Leneve, 64 So.3d 196 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011).

Ultimate Impact:

- The court restated that **the Keeping Children Safe Act only applies within Chapter 39 child dependency cases.**
 - Again, it could not be invoked in a Chapter 61 dissolution of marriage case.
- Again, the court was concerned that part of the act was unconstitutional. Specifically, the part that automatically created a rebuttable presumption of detriment merely when an anonymous tip was made to an abuse hotline regarding a parent or guardian.
 - This part of the Act has since been deleted and replaced.

Background Facts:

Tamela Chappell, former wife of William Leneve, wanted to invoke the Keeping Children Safe Act to modify the final judgment of dissolution of marriage between the former spouses. The former husband had been granted shared parental responsibility and shared custody in the final judgment, but was nearing the completion of a three-year prison sentence for bankruptcy fraud and had been denied phone contact with the children for two years when the former wife raised the allegations of sexual abuse. The Department of Children and Families investigated the allegations and found them unfounded and “highly suspicious,” noting that it was “quite obvious” that the boys had been coached.

What the Court Decided:

The Fourth District Court of Appeal **again found that the Keeping Children Safe Act could not and did not apply to chapter 61 dissolution of marriage proceedings.** See also *Mahmood v. Mahmood*, 14 So. 3d 1 (Fla. 4th DCA 2009). The court stated that the Keeping Children Safe Act “does not apply outside the context of a Chapter 39 child dependency proceeding.” *Leneve v. Leneve*, 64 So.3d 196, 197 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011).

The court again noted their concern that the circuit court in *In re: Potts* found portions of the Act unconstitutional. **The court agreed with the *In re: Potts* circuit court and again expressed their concern from *Mahmoud* that a mere anonymous tip would trigger the presumption of detriment under the Act.** The court noted that, at the time, legislation was pending that would ultimately become chapter 2011-209, Florida Laws, which deleted the abuse hotline criteria and replaced it with the current subsection (3)(a)(1), which reads: “a court of competent jurisdiction has found probable cause exists that a parent or caregiver has sexually abused a child.” Fla. Stat. § 39.0139(3)(a)(1) (2016).

In re S.C., 83 So. 3d 883 (Fla. 2d DCA 2012)

Ultimate Impact:

- **The Keeping Children Safe Act does not apply to children who have never been abused or exploited by a parent or guardian.**
 - The Act does not apply to a situation where a parent or guardian with a past child abuse offense wants to visit or contact a child who has never been abused or neglected.
- **A court must treat the presumption of detriment as rebuttable.** The Act specifically states that the presumption may be rebutted.

- Petitioners in the trial court to a Chapter 39 case qualify as “parties” under the Act, even though they are grandparents, and may therefore challenge a resulting order.

Background Facts:

Paternal grandfather, J.C., and paternal grandmother, C.C., were seeking review of the trial court’s Order under the Keeping Children Safe Act that prohibited contact between S.C., the grandson, and the grandfather, while the grandson was to remain in the care of the grandmother. Effectively, this prevented the grandfather from living with his wife.

The grandfather and grandmother had been caring for the grandson, who was two years old at the time of trial, since he was five months old, because the parents were abusing prescription drugs and the grandson was born dependent on methadone. When the grandson was approximately one-year-old, the parents executed power of attorney which gave the grandparents custody of the grandson. The father died of a drug overdose soon after. The grandfather had been living in a motel for two and a half months at the time of the trial.



The Keeping Children Safe Act was at issue because the grandfather was convicted of a misdemeanor involving molestation of his ten-year-old daughter in 1988. The hearing under the Keeping Children Safe

Act made it clear that the 1988 incident was strongly related to the grandfather’s substance and alcohol abuse at the time. The grandmother reported the incident immediately and the grandfather completed probation, counseling, and two substance abuse programs, and had been clean and sober for over twenty years since.

The child protective investigator and the appointed guardian ad litem that testified at the Keeping Children Safe Act hearing recommended that the grandson would be safe living with the grandparents and that there were no indications of

sexual abuse of the grandson. The grandfather had no objection to doing a substance abuse evaluation or a psychosexual evaluation.

However, after the hearing, the trial court entered a written order that prohibited the grandfather from any contact with the grandson and ordered that the grandson remain in the grandmother's custody. The order did not contain any findings of fact or explanation of the court's reasoning.



What the Court Decided:

The Second District Court of Appeal first noted that the grandparents were indeed "parties" to the order, contrary to the Department of Children and Family Services and Guardian Ad Litem Program's (the Department) argument that they were merely participants that would require additional standing to challenge the order regarding placement. The court quoted

the definition of "party" from section 39.01(51), *Florida Statutes* (2010), which included "the petitioner." As such, the grandparents were parties and had standing to challenge the order, which affected the grandfather's legal rights by preventing him from living with his wife.

Most importantly, **the court ruled that the intent of the Keeping Children Safe Act was "to protect children and reduce the risk of further harm to children who have been sexually abused or exploited by a parent or other caregiver,"** as stated within the Act at subsection (2)(b). **Therefore, since there was no suggestion that the grandson had ever been sexually abused, the Act did not apply to the grandson** and the trial court applied the incorrect law.

Additionally, the court stated that even if the Act was applicable to the grandson, **the trial court erred by not applying the rebuttable presumption that the Act specifically created.** The grandparents presented substantial uncontradicted evidence and testimony that there would be no issue for the grandfather to have contact with the grandson. **The trial court, however, did not appear to treat the presumption of harm as rebuttable, as it made clear that it believed that no amount of evidence could rebut the presumption of harm to the child.** Therefore, the trial court did not apply the

law correctly, as section 39.0139(3) provided for a rebuttable presumption, and the Second District Court of Appeal quashed the trial court's Order on the Keeping Children Safe Act.

Department of Children and Families v. P.F., 107 So. 3d 1123 (Fla. 5th DCA 2012).

Ultimate Impact:

- **During a Keeping Children Safe Act hearing, it is not a court's job to review whether there was enough probable cause that sexual abuse had previously occurred.**
- **If a judge previously issued an arrest warrant regarding sexual abuse of a child, then that is enough to trigger Subsection (3)(a)(1) and create the rebuttable presumption of detriment.**
 - This holds true even if the charges surrounding the arrest are later dropped due to lack of evidence.
 - **The hearing is meant to be an opportunity for the person to attempt to rebut the presumption**, not a review of a previous court's finding of probable cause.

Background Facts:

The Department of Children and Families (the DCF) and the father of K.A., the child, were seeking review of the trial court's order on a Keeping Children Safe Act hearing. The hearing had granted the child's maternal grandfather access to the child. The DCF and father claimed that the trial court did not follow the procedure provided for by the Keeping Children Safe Act.

After changing custody several times, the child had been put into the custody of the maternal grandfather's long-term companion, D.K. The DCF objected to this placement for two reasons. First, there had not been an approved home study. Second, there was a verified finding of sexual abuse of the child by the maternal grandfather one year prior, although the charges were eventually dropped due to lack of reliable evidence. The court nonetheless placed the child with D.K. and ordered the grandfather to leave the residence until a Keeping Children Safe Act hearing could be held, but permitted the grandfather to have supervised visitation.

When the Keeping Children Safe Act hearing was held, the court looked at a wide range of evidence. The evidence included testimony by the child protective investigator who investigated the allegations of sexual abuse by the grandfather. The court also heard testimony by a member of the Child Protection Team that interviewed the child and gave her a medical exam after the previous allegations of

sexual abuse. Both of these witnesses stated that the child, who was four years old, disclosed that the grandfather had sexually abused her. Testimony was also given by the detective that interviewed the grandfather regarding the sexual abuse and the detective stated that the grandfather displayed “obvious signs of deception through all the interviews.” The detective also testified that the mother revealed that she had heard that the grandfather had previously abused her sister and step-brother. Additionally, the maternal grandmother had informed him that she had previously witnessed the grandfather abusing their daughter, who was seven years old at the time.

Nonetheless, the court indicated that it would watch the recordings of the Child Protection Team interviews and then allow the grandfather to testify to rebut the presumption of detriment under the Keeping Children Safe Act. After watching the films, the court announced that it did not need to hear anything else, found no probable cause for abuse, and allowed the grandfather to return home. The court acknowledged that the grandfather had been arrested and charged with two counts of sexual battery on a child under the age of 12 and was in custody for a month, but stated the following:

“Upon personally reviewing the evidence of the child's statements that lead to the necessity of a KCSA hearing, this Court finds no probable cause that Mr. Flanagan has sexually abused the child. The child's statements were inconsistent and unreliable. There was no evidence that the child will be endangered by her grandfather.”

The DCF appealed the case on the grounds that the trial court did not follow the requirements of the Keeping Children Safe Act in two ways: “1) the trial court incorrectly interpreted the probable cause determination that triggers the rebuttable presumption of detriment to the child pursuant to section 39.0139(3)(a)(1), Florida Statutes; and 2) the grandfather did not meet his burden to rebut the presumption or to support the court's findings and grant of custody.”

What the Court Decided:

The Fifth District Court of Appeal ruled that the trial court incorrectly interpreted what type of probable cause had to be present in order to trigger the rebuttable presumption of harm provided for in the Keeping Children Safe Act. The trial court appeared to look back at the evidence surrounding the arrest and decide that there was not enough evidence to prove probable cause in a trial, which was indeed why the charges were eventually dropped. However, this was an incorrect interpretation of the probable cause requirement of section 39.0139(3)(a)(1), *Florida Statutes*.

The trial court's responsibility was to determine whether a court of competent jurisdiction had already found probable cause, and then allow the grandfather to attempt to rebut the presumption of harm that was triggered by that probable cause. In the case before the court, probable cause existed when the arrest warrant was granted to arrest the grandfather, because under the Florida Rules of Juvenile Procedure, in the context of a shelter hearing, "the issue of probable cause shall be determined in a nonadversarial manner, applying the standard of proof necessary for an arrest warrant. Fla. R. Juv. P. 8.305(b)(3)."

The court stated that the objective of the hearing was for the grandfather to prove clearly and convincingly that he was not a threat to the child, but this did not happen due to the trial court's misinterpretation of the Act. The court then quashed the order given by the trial court and remanded the case for a new Keeping Children Safe Act hearing, whereby the grandfather would attempt to rebut the presumption of harm.

Preparation for Training



Before using the new manual, the Clearinghouse recommends that program directors take specific steps to prepare themselves and staff.

First, directors should read over all of the chapters of this manual. The Clearinghouse conducts monthly training and technical assistance calls during which these chapter will be discussed with program directors and lead staff.

Second, directors should prepare their staff for the emotional impact of this training. This is a crucial component of training because of the tragic nature of child sexual abuse. Non-offending adults often have very strong reactions to child abuse, including a full range of negative emotions. Program directors and trainers should be prepared to acknowledge and deal with these emotions during and after training. In addition, because of the prevalence of child sexual abuse, it is possible that individual staff members were themselves abused as children. It is important that these staff members are provided opportunities to deal with their own trauma histories before they are assigned to supervise families that have been affected by similar trauma.

Third, directors should make full use of the resources that the Clearinghouse has compiled from publically available platforms. Choose one of the online videos that we have provided links to. Offer multimedia training, so that participants can have the messages of the curriculum reinforced. *Lauren's Kids* has excellent resources, as do a number of prominent websites. Call the Clearinghouse if you have questions.

Child Sexual Abuse Online Resources

1. **RAINN** The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network is one of the largest anti-sexual violence organizations in the country. They run an [online hotline](#) for sexual assault victims and their family and friends, and provide specific resources [for children](#), [members of the military](#), and [for Spanish speakers](#). RAINN also carries out programs to prevent sexual violence, help victims, and ensure that perpetrators are brought to justice. <https://www.rainn.org/>
2. **Safe Horizon** Safe Horizon provides support for victims of sexual abuse, domestic violence, human trafficking, and more. Safe Horizon also offers free legal information and advice, [direct legal assistance](#) to low-income victims, and connects victims with advocates who can help them report their assaults or find counseling. <https://www.safehorizon.org/>
3. **National Sexual Violence Resource Center** NSVRC connects people with the information, resources, tools, and expertise needed to effectively address and prevent sexual violence in all communities. NSVRC offers e-learning courses related to the prevention and intervention of sexual violence like [“Bringing hope: Responding to disclosures of child sexual abuse”](#) and [“From Approach to Practice: Improving outcomes for children after sexual abuse.”](#) Their [extensive online library](#) is also a resource for researchers. <http://www.nsvrc.org/>
4. **Men Can Stop Rape** Man Can Stop Rape promotes nonviolent expressions of masculinity by mentoring male youth and teaching them about consent. It also lists many resources for male sexual assault victims and male perpetrators of sexual violence. <http://www.mencanstoprape.org/>
5. **1in6** One in six men experienced unwanted sexual conduct before the age of 18—and 1in6 provides resources for those men and their families, such as an online hotline, a questionnaire focused on helping men [sort out their experiences](#), and more. <https://1in6.org/>
6. **Darkness to Light** Darkness to Light is a nonprofit committed to empowering adults to prevent child sexual abuse through public awareness and education campaigns. Darkness to Light also provides a hotline for information, referrals to local resources, and training and education



programs for educators, the faith community, and physicians on recognizing and responding to signs of child sexual abuse. Darkness to Light offers an award winning Stewards of Children training that helps adults prevent, recognize, and react responsibly to child sexual abuse.

<http://www.d2l.org/about/success-stories/>

7. **LAUREN'S KIDS** Lauren's Kids offers a parent toolkit designed to educate and encourage conversations between parents and children about making safer and smarter choices. There are sections for children to practice safe choices, videos to learn valuable lessons, and kid and parent tips. <http://laurenskids.org/curriculum/safer-smarter-kids/>
8. **STOP IT NOW!** Stop It Now! prevents the sexual abuse of children by mobilizing adults, families, and communities to take actions that protect children before they are harmed. Stop it Now! provides programs such as help services, prevention advocacy, prevention education, and technical assistance and training in an effort to prevent child sexual abuse. <http://www.stopitnow.org/>
9. **Parenting Safe Children** The Parenting Safe Children workshop is a lively 4-hour workshop aimed at keeping children safe from child sexual abuse. <http://www.parentingsafechildren.com/>
10. **Safesport** The U.S. Center for SafeSport goal is to prevent and respond to emotional, physical and sexual abuse. Safesport delivers tools to help sport organizations across the country champion respect and diversity on and off the field. <https://www.safesport.org/>

More Videos on How to Recognize Child Sexual Abuse

1. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gix6pM7WK3E>

Short film/documentary about child sexual exploitation. Discusses some of the signs of child sexual abuse. 20 min, 30 secs long.

2. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZfMmq3ZnG2A>

Short video listing 14 signs of child sexual abuse. 2 min, 17 secs long

3. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=teG_vi72M_g

Comprehensive video covering the physical and behavioral warning signs of child sexual abuse and what to do if you suspect child sexual abuse. Video is geared towards child care providers/teachers. 10 min, 52 secs long.

4. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DyeLLu0Oxsx>

Short video covering signs of sexual abuse. 2 min, 35 sec