

## Parent-Child Representation Performance Standards Work Group

### Question List for January 13, 2017 meeting

#### Standard 1

- Page 4 (Child) and Page 9 (Child). Quotes from ABA Commentary is no longer current. How would you like to treat? I've added "former."
- Page 5 (Child), Page 10 (Parent), and Page 11(Parent). How would you like to address these footnotes? For the time, I've incorporated them into the text.
- Page 9 (Child). Would you like the citation to the *Smith* case in the body of the document? In later documents, citations have been removed.

#### Standard 2

- Page 2 (Child). Language was moved from Sec B to Sec A along with the corresponding commentary on Pages 3 (Parent) and 4 (Child).
- Page 4 (Parent). The small group determined that "court-approved conditions for return" is inaccurate terminology. The group could not reach consensus on the appropriate language. This phrase also shows up on Page 5 (Parent).
- Page 5 (Parent). Should v. Must concerns. (Note: the should v. must issue comes up in a number of locations).
- Page 5 (Parent). Language from the Commentary was moved into a separate Action. The Commentary (Page 6 (Parent)) was wordsmithed.
- Page 7 (Parent and Child). Which language works better?
- Page 10 (Parent). The small group suggested adding in language from Parent's B. I've added the language. Please confirm this works
- Page 10 (Child and Parent). The group earlier discussed the description of the child and parent feeling angry and whether that language should be included. A final decision has not been reached.
- Page 13 (Parent and Child). Section F. Which language works better?
- Page 16 (Parent). Language from Child Standard regarding interpreters.
- Page 16 (Child). Crossover language possibly added here. Liz Wakefield to review before final decision to be made.
- Page 16 (Parent and Child). Which Section G would you prefer?
- Page 18 (Child). Is the program in Mult County still active?
- Page 20 (Parent). Inge and Shannon to consult on updated language.
- Sections B and J were moved around to provide an apples to apples comparison. If I should not move them back, please let me know

## Parent-Child Representation Performance Standards Work Group

### Question List for January 13, 2017 meeting

#### Standard 3

- Are Sub B, the two actions, and the commentary appropriately worded to apply to both privately retained lawyers and public defenders?
- Page 4. (Parent and Child). Are there particular guidelines for the Bureau of Indian Affairs Guidelines that should be linked to?

#### Standard 4

- Page 2 (Child). The commentary needs an additional look. It was copied verbatim in 2014. While I've switched "parent" to "child" I want to make sure I haven't missed any nuances.
- Page 3, 4 (Parent and Child). Should Sub D be updated to incorporate the work done on Agency Representation?
- Page 5 (Parent and Child) If unable to attend the meeting, \_\_\_\_\_. What is the best way to complete this sentence? Angela and Inge expressed discomfort with "delegate."
- Page 6 (Child). Language regarding reunification. Is it in the appropriate place?

#### Standard 5

- Page 1 (Parent and Child). Would you like to add or remove "and, if available, the record of the case . . ."
- Page 2 (Parent). Made the first Parent Action on the page consistent with the Child Action.
- Page 2 (Child). Updated language to better describe use of protective order.
- Page 2 (Parent and Child). Does the social media language work in this location?
- Page 2 (Child). Does the SJIS language work in this location?
- Page 3 (Child). Mirrored the current parent standard into the child standard for three actions.
- Page 5 (Parent and Child). Would you like to add or remove "under the statute?"
- Page 6 (Parent and Child). Would you like to add or remove "the parent's lawyer should obtain . . . ?"
- Page 6 (Parent and Child). Sub C. Does the language clean-up work?
- Page 7 (Parent and Child). Which version of the first action would you like to use?
- Page 8 (Parent and Child). Which version of the Commentary would you like to use?
- Page 8 (Parent) Should Sub E. be mirrored in the Child Standards? If yes, should it be split between 5 and 6?

## **Parent-Child Representation Performance Standards Work Group**

### **Question List for January 13, 2017 meeting**

#### **Standard 6**

- Page 1 (Parent and Child). Would you like the commentary to be consistent? Which version would you prefer?
- Page 3 and 4 (Parent and Child) Does there need to be a mention of SIJS on the parent side?
- Page 4 (Parent and Child). Should the “e.g. . . .” be added to the child standard?
- Page 9 and 10 (Parent and Child). Would you like to make the commentary consistent?
- Page 11 (Child). Any reason not to move Section G back to Section E?
- Page 14 (Child). Standard 7 subgroup called this language out as a point of discussion.

#### **Standard 7**

- Page 4 (Parent and Child). Shannon to propose a redraft of 7(D) to address when a parent or child contacts own lawyer. Does an action need to be added for parents?
- Page 6 (Parent). Shannon to draft additional section to address what happens if a parent does not attend a hearing.

#### **Standard 8**

- No questions.

#### **Standard 9**

- Page 1 and 2 (Parent and Child). Updated language from Angela.
- Page 5 and 6 (Parent and Child). Updated language from Megan.