



STATE OF DELAWARE
STATE COUNCIL FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

MARGARET M. O'NEILL BUILDING
410 FEDERAL STREET, SUITE 1
DOVER, DE 19901

VOICE: (302) 739-3620
TTY/TDD: (302) 739-3699
FAX: (302) 739-6704

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 23, 2013
TO: Ms. Elizabeth Timm, DFS
Office of Child Care Licensing
FROM: Daniese McMullin-Powell, Chairperson
State Council for Persons with Disabilities
RE: 17 DE Reg. 608 [DFS Proposed Child Placing Agency Regulation]

The State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD) has reviewed the Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families/Division of Family Services (DFS)/Office of Child Care Licensing's (OCCL's) proposal to amend its regulations regarding the *Delacare Requirements for Child Placing Agencies*. The proposed regulation was published as 17 DE Reg. 608 in the December 1, 2013 issue of the Register of Regulations. SCPD has the following observations

In July 2013, the DFS published regulations revising its standards applicable to child placing agencies. SCPD submitted twenty-eight (28) comments on the proposed standards. A copy of the July 25, 2013 SCPD memo is attached for facilitated reference. Rather than adopt a final regulation, the Division is publishing a revised set of proposed regulations. SCPDs analysis will follow the order of commentary in the July 25 memo earmarked with italics.

1. In §4.0, definition of "Adoptive Parent", the word "means" is omitted. It should be inserted.

Revision: The word "means" was inserted.

2. In §5.0, definition of "Child Appointed Special Advocate", substitute "litem" for "lite". SCPD also recommends substituting "neglected or dependent child" for "neglected and dependent child" since the terms are disjunctive, i.e. a child can be either abused, neglected, or dependent.

Revision: DFS substituted "neglected or dependent child" for "neglected and dependent child". It deleted the reference to Guardian ad lite(m). It substituted "Court Appointed Special Advocate" for

“Child Appointed Special Advocate”.

3. In §5.0, the definition of “Developmentally Appropriate” could be improved. The current definition only addresses age and omits any consideration of other characteristics, including disability. As a result, §73.0 would literally require a foster parent to provide a 10 year old child with severe cognitive limitations to use only a fifth-grade reading level book. In contrast, the child’s service plan is expected to reflect disability-related considerations. See §§62.1.2 and 62.1.4. Consider the following revision: “Developmentally Appropriate” means...age, is consistent with the child’s special needs, and encourages development...” The term “special needs” is defined in §5.0.

Revision: DFS adopted a variation of the suggested language.

4. In §6.1.1, there is a dangling conjunction (“and”).

Revision: The extraneous “and” was deleted.

5. Section 12.0 contemplates the posting of a license “at an Agency location”. Section 8.1 indicates that a license is issued “for the address of the Agency’s actual site where services are being provided.”. The Division could consider amending §12.0 so the license would be posted at the actual licensed site rather than any agency location.

Revision: DFS amended the provision to require posting “at the address of the Agency’s actual site where services are being provided.”

6. Section 16.0 allows licensees to request a “variance” or waiver of specific standards. It would be preferable to include some provision for notice to affected individuals (e.g. foster and adoptive parents; foster children) to facilitate input. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3310, §12.1.4; and 16 DE Admin Code 3301, §9.1.5.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still recommends that the regulation include some provision for notice to affected individuals.

7. In §18.0, it would be preferable to include a provision disallowing retaliation against individuals both initiating or cooperating with a complaint investigation. Compare analogous §44.3 and 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §19.2.

Revision: DFS added a §18.8 which recites as follows: “A Licensee shall not discourage, inhibit, penalize or otherwise impede any staff member from reporting any suspected or alleged incident of child abuse or neglect.” This is identical to §44.3. However, the provision could be improved. First, it could be modified to cover volunteer reporting as well. See analogous DFS regulation, 9 DE Reg. 105, §13.1.13.2. Second, neither §44, §17, nor §18 bar a provider from retaliating against staff who have cooperated with a post-report DFS investigation. Non-retaliation provisions facilitate State agency investigations and support sanctions if a provider penalizes cooperating staff.

Cf. Title 16 Del.C. §§1134(g), 1135, and 1154(b). Based on these concerns, the following standard could be adopted: “A Licensee shall not discourage, inhibit, penalize or otherwise impede any staff member or volunteer from reporting any suspected or alleged incident of child abuse or neglect or cooperating with a Department investigation of the incident.” The term “Department” is used based on §18.2.

8. Section 18.3 requires DFS to categorically notify the licensee and agency that a complaint is being investigated. DFS may wish to reconsider this no-exceptions requirement. Such notice may prompt a wrongdoer to initiate “cover-up” action. Such notice could also compromise a criminal investigation initiated under §18.7. DFS may wish to consult the Attorney General’s Office concerning this provision.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still supports this recommendation. In addition, SCPD respectfully requests clarification whether or not DFS consulted the Attorney General’s Office in this context.

9. In §19.0, DFS could consider requiring notice of incidents involving “exploitation” of a child. See §75.0. DFS could also review analogous regulations to broaden the scope of reportable incidents. See, e.g., 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §24.0; and 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §19.7, including elopement and attempted suicide as reportable incidents.

Revision: Section 19.2.3 has been amended to cross reference the definition of abuse or neglect in Title 10 Del.C. §901(1). That statute defines abuse as including exploitation. SCPD still recommends that DFS expand the list of reportable incidents. An elopement or attempted suicide without injury would not be reportable incidents under the current §19.0. The cited DHSS regulations, by analogy, would require reporting of such events.

10. Section 19.2.6 and 101.10 allow facilities to maintain a temperature of 85 degrees. This standard is assessed “at floor level” (§101.10). Since hot air rises, this means that the ambient room temperature may be significantly hotter than 85 degrees. Moreover, Delaware’s high humidity levels exacerbate the effects of high temperatures. Query whether maintaining an infant in a high-humidity room with ambient room temperature between 85-90 degrees is a prudent regulatory standard. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §17.3 (maximum 81 degree temperature); 16 DE Admin Code 3310, §5.4 (temperature and humidity “provide a comfortable atmosphere”). In other contexts, the regulation recognizes that children should be accorded some choice in “comfort” contexts. See, e.g., §77.5.4 (authorizing substitution of foods subjectively “disliked” or “unacceptable”) and §81.4 (allowing children to keep personally “special” belongings). DFS could incorporate analogous consideration of a child’s temperature tolerances as well. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §17.3 (“A resident with an individual temperature-controlled residential room or unit may heat and cool to provide individual comfort.”). At a minimum, the 85 degree standard should be lowered.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still supports this recommendation.

11. Section 42.4 is somewhat “overbroad”. It bars employment “in any capacity” of “any person convicted of...offenses against a child”. This bar would apply to individuals with no contact with children (e.g. accountant). This bar would apply to convictions remote in time and irrespective of rehabilitation. There is no definition of “offense against a child” which could be construed to include minor offenses and offenses not implicating child abuse/neglect. Although some discretion for exceptions is authorized by §42.6.6.1, that subsection ostensibly is only applicable to §42.6, not 42.4.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still believes that Section 42.4 is overbroad and encourages DFS to revisit this issue.

12. Section 42.6 would literally require the licensee to fire anyone “indicted” but not convicted of certain offenses. This is ostensibly inconsistent with federal guidance shared with DFS in connection with commentary on its proposed regulation published at 16 DE Admin Code (May 1, 2013). The Council included the following italicized commentary on that regulation:

Eighth, §7.0 is “overbroad”. For example, §7.1.1.1 contemplates consideration of arrest records without conviction. This is inconsistent with recent EEOC guidance. See attachments. Consistent with the EEOC Q&A document, Par. 7, the Enforcement Guidance preempts inconsistent state laws and regulations. In the analogous context of adult criminal background checks, the DLTCRP recently adopted the following regulatory standard deferring to the EEOC guidance:

8.3. DHSS adopts the guidance from the Equal Opportunity Commission, Consideration of Arrest and Conviction Records in Employment Decisions Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 915.002, issued 4/25/2012.

16 DE Admin Code 3105, §8.3.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still believes that Section 42.6 would literally require the licensee to fire anyone “indicted” but not convicted of certain offenses, and is therefore ostensibly inconsistent with federal guidance previously shared with DFS.

13. Section 44.4 categorically bars notification of parents of investigation of abuse or neglect in which their child was allegedly victimized: “Staff shall not contact the parent/guardian of a child who is the alleged subject victim to advise them that either a report has been made or that the Division or law enforcement officer is conducting an investigation of an allegation of abuse or neglect.” It is “odd” to bar notice to a parent of alleged abuse/neglect of a child. Indeed, the bar is “at odds” with §71.1 which requires the licensee to report to a parent any “incident involving serious bodily injury or any severe psychiatric episode involving the child”. Parents will be justifiably upset if agencies conceal information about abuse/neglect of their children.

Revision: DFS amended the sentence as follows: “Staff shall ~~not contact~~ follow the protocol(s) of the investigating agency regarding informing the parent/guardian of a child who is the alleged subject victim to advise them that either a report has been made or that the Division or law enforcement officer is conducting an investigation of an allegation of abuse or neglect is being conducted”. The phrase “is being conducted” is redundant and should be deleted.

14. DFS may wish to consider transferring the concepts embodied in §75.0 to §44.0.

Revision: DFS deleted §75.0 in its entirety. The previous version was as follows: “A licensee shall ensure that a foster parent does not subject a child to exploitation in any form.” The concept is not explicitly addressed in §44.0.

15. Section 78.1.4 ostensibly authorizes “locking a child in a room” as long as not “for a long period of time”. This is highly objectionable. The Division should bar locking a child in a room.

Revision: DFS amended the reference to bar “locking a child in a room”. See new §77.1.4.

16. Section 78.1.6 could be embellished with conduct (e.g. throwing child; hitting with closed fist) prohibited by Title 11 Del.C. §468(1)c.

Revision: Instead of embellishing this subsection with conduct which is prohibited by the statute, DFS deleted the specific references to prohibited conduct altogether. See new §77.1.6. It would be preferable to retain the specific examples of prohibited conduct, including shaking, hair pulling, slapping, pinching, and spanking. Many individuals would not view shaking, slapping, etc. as forms of corporal punishment.

17. Section 78.0 occasionally uses the terminology “is prohibited” (§78.1.9) but generally uses the terminology “shall be prohibited”. SCPD recommends generally using present tense, i.e., “is prohibited”. Otherwise, it appears that the conduct will be barred in the future.

Revision: DFS converted multiple references in new §77.0 to present tense.

18. In §78.1.12, insert ‘disability’ after ‘family’.

Revision: The insertion was made in new §77.1.12.

19. Section 78.0 could be improved by including a bar on chemical restraint. Compare recently enacted S.B. No. 100. See also 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §20.11.11.

Revision: DFS added a new §77.1.7 barring chemical restraint and physical restraint.

20. DFS should review both S.B. No. 100 and 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §20.11 for examples of limitations on behavior management that could be incorporated into §78.0.

Revision: DFS deleted the following ban on mechanical restraint which appeared in §78.1.7: “A child shall not be tied, taped, chained or caged or place(d) in mechanical restraints as a consequence of inappropriate behavior.” This is a major, unfortunate amendment. SCPD strongly recommends reinstatement of the sentence or a variation of the sentence. Otherwise, there is not prohibition on use of mechanical restraint.

21. In §80.2, substitute “places” for “place”.

Revision: The correction was made in new §79.2.

22. In §80.5 or §72.0, DFS may wish to address the use of bumper pads in cribs. *See* <http://pediatrics.about.com/od/babyproducts/a/crib-bumpers.htm>.

Revision: New §79.5.1 has been added which addresses not only bumper pads, but pillows and “other soft products” as well.

23. In §86.4, DFS should consider insertion of the word “approaching” prior to “eighteen”. As reflected in §86.3, providing a list of community services as the individual is “walking out the door” on the individual’s 18th birthday is not prudent. DFS should also consider adding other preparation/orientation activities, including completion of selective service registration. SCPD recommends that DFS review the findings in the preamble to H.B. No. 163 for insight. For example, if 82% of males exiting foster care are arrested by age 21, and a high percentage of females become pregnant by age 21, doesn’t it make sense to address prevention activities?

Revision: The word “approaching” was inserted. No other change was made.

24. Section 90.1 is somewhat “overbroad” since it does not address the passage of time or rehabilitation. If the substantiated neglect occurred 30 years ago, and the individual is now highly responsible, does it make sense to apply a categorical bar to serving as a foster parent?

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still believes that Section 90.1 is somewhat “overbroad” since it does not address the passage of time or rehabilitation, and encourages DFS to revisit this issue.

25. Section 96.1 categorically bars anyone over sixty-five (65) years of age becoming a foster parent. If there is no State statute which imposes such a limit, any State regulation limiting eligibility in a federally-funded program may run afoul of the federal Age Discrimination Act. *See* <http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/civilrights/resources/factsheets/age.pdf> and <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/discrimination/agedisc.htm>. It is also anomalous that the regulation contains no age limit for prospective adoptive parents. *See* §140.0.

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still supports this observation and encourages DFS to revisit this issue.

26. *Although there is a brief treatment of “pets” in §112.0, potentially dangerous pets are not covered in §112.0 or in §101.0. Thus, a prospective foster parent could conceal ownership of multiple pit bulls or snakes. The regulatory standards do not contemplate any inquiry on the safety aspects of pets, only other household members (§§90.2 and 136.4) and visitors (§124.0). DFS may wish to add a standard addressing potentially dangerous pets.*

Revision: No change was made. SCPD still believes that DFS should add a standard addressing potentially dangerous pets.

27. *SCPD previously questioned the general ban on children wearing a helmet around playground equipment. See §103.2.4.3. SCPD continues to question the rationale for the general ban. Intuitively, if a child falls from a height, the helmet would provide some protection from TBI.*

Revision: DFS provided the following response to the comment: “This prohibition is consistent with the recommendations of the American Academy of Pediatrics as found in Caring for Our Children, National Health and Safety Performance Standards, Guidelines for Early Care and Education, Third Edition which states that “helmets can be a potential strangulation hazard if...worn for activities other than when using riding toys.” (P. 286).” SCPD was unable to review the text of the above guidelines. The 2011 publication is available for purchase. However, further research corroborates the response. Consistent with the attached press release, the Consumer Products Safety Commission warns that children should not wear bike helmets when playing on playground equipment based on a strangulation risk.

28. *Section 113 literally would not require someone driving a child in a pickup truck or van to have a driver’s license and insurance. Consistent with §113.0, consider substituting “vehicle” for “automobile”.*

Response: The change was made.

SCPD has a few supplemental comments on the revised proposed regulation.

1. In §5.0, DFS may wish to revise the definition of “complaint investigation”. The definition limits the term to investigations by the OCCL. However, §18.2 contemplates investigations by the Department’s Institutional Abuse Investigation Unit in some cases.
2. In §5.0, the definition of “guardian” overlooks the concurrent authority of the Court of Chancery to also appoint guardians of children. See Title 12 Del.C. §3901(a).
3. In §44.5.1, DFS should substitute “incident” for “incidence”.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact SCPD if you have any questions or comments regarding our observations or recommendations on the proposed regulations.

cc: Ms. Vicky Kelly
Mr. William Love
Mr. Brian Posey
Mr. Brian Hartman, Esq.
Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens
Developmental Disabilities Council

P&I/17reg608 dscyf-dfs child placing registry 12-23-13



STATE OF DELAWARE
STATE COUNCIL FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES
MARGARET M. O'NEILL BUILDING
410 FEDERAL STREET, SUITE 1
DOVER, DE 19901

VOICE: (302) 739-3620
TTY/TDD: (302) 739-3699
FAX: (302) 739-6704

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 25, 2013

TO: Ms. Elizabeth Timm, DFS
Office of Child Care Licensing

FROM: Daniese McMullin-Powell, Chairperson
State Council for Persons with Disabilities

RE: 17 DE Reg. 62 [DFS Proposed Child Placing Agency Regulation]

The State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD) has reviewed the Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families/Division of Family Services (DFS)/Office of Child Care Licensing's (OCCL's) proposal to amend its regulations regarding the *Delacare Requirements for Child Placing Agencies*. The proposed regulation was published as 17 DE Reg. 62 in the July 1, 2013 issue of the Register of Regulations. SCPD has the following observations

1. In §5.0, definition of "Adoptive Parent", the word "means" is omitted. It should be inserted.
2. In §5.0, definition of "Child Appointed Special Advocate", substitute "litem" for "lite". SCPD also recommends substituting "neglected or dependent child" for "neglected and dependent child" since the terms are disjunctive, i.e. a child can be either abused, neglected, or dependent.
3. In §5.0, the definition of "Developmentally Appropriate" could be improved. The current definition only addresses age and omits any consideration of other characteristics, including disability. As a result, §73.0 would literally require a foster parent to provide a 10 year old child with severe cognitive limitations to use only a fifth-grade reading level book. In contrast, the child's service plan is expected to reflect disability-related considerations. See §§62.1.2 and 62.1.4. Consider the following revision: "Developmentally Appropriate" means...age, is consistent with the child's special needs, and encourages development..." The term "special needs" is defined in §5.0.
4. In §6.1.1, there is a dangling conjunction ("and").

5. Section 12.0 contemplates the posting of a license “at an Agency location”. Section 8.1 indicates that a license is issued “for the address of the Agency’s actual site where services are being provided.”. The Division could consider amending §12.0 so the license would be posted at the actual licensed site rather than any agency location.

6. Section 16.0 allows licensees to request a “variance” or waiver of specific standards. It would be preferable to include some provision for notice to affected individuals (e.g. foster and adoptive parents; foster children) to facilitate input. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3310, §12.1.4; and 16 DE Admin Code 3301, §9.1.5.

7. In §18.0, it would be preferable to include a provision disallowing retaliation against individuals both initiating or cooperating with a complaint investigation. Compare analogous §44.3 and 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §19.2.

8. Section 18.3 requires DFS to categorically notify the licensee and agency that a complaint is being investigated. DFS may wish to reconsider this no-exceptions requirement. Such notice may prompt a wrongdoer to initiate “cover-up” action. Such notice could also compromise a criminal investigation initiated under §18.7. DFS may wish to consult the Attorney General’s Office concerning this provision.

9. In §19.0, DFS could consider requiring notice of incidents involving “exploitation” of a child. See §75.0. DFS could also review analogous regulations to broaden the scope of reportable incidents. See, e.g., 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §24.0; and 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §19.7, including elopement and attempted suicide as reportable incidents.

10. Section 19.2.6 and 101.10 allow facilities to maintain a temperature of 85 degrees. This standard is assessed “at floor level” (§101.10). Since hot air rises, this means that the ambient room temperature may be significantly hotter than 85 degrees. Moreover, Delaware’s high humidity levels exacerbate the effects of high temperatures. Query whether maintaining an infant in a high-humidity room with ambient room temperature between 85-90 degrees is a prudent regulatory standard. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §17.3 (maximum 81 degree temperature); 16 DE Admin Code 3310, §5.4 (temperature and humidity “provide a comfortable atmosphere”). In other contexts, the Regulation recognizes that children should be accorded some choice in “comfort” contexts. See, e.g., §77.5.4 (authorizing substitution of foods subjectively “disliked” or “unacceptable”) and §81.4 (allowing children to keep personally “special” belongings). DFS could incorporate analogous consideration of a child’s temperature tolerances as well. Compare 16 DE Admin Code 3225, §17.3 (“A resident with an individual temperature-controlled residential room or unit may heat and cool to provide individual comfort.”). At a minimum, the 85 degree standard should be lowered.

11. Section 42.4 is somewhat “overbroad”. It bars employment “in any capacity” of “any person convicted of...offenses against a child”. This bar would apply to individuals with no contact with children (e.g. accountant). This bar would apply to convictions remote in time and irrespective of

rehabilitation. There is no definition of “offense against a child” which could be construed to include minor offenses and offenses not implicating child abuse/neglect. Although some discretion for exceptions is authorized by §42.6.6.1, that subsection ostensibly is only applicable to §42.6, not 42.4.

12. Section 42.6 would literally require the licensee to fire anyone “indicted” but not convicted of certain offenses. This is ostensibly inconsistent with federal guidance shared with DFS in connection with commentary on its proposed regulation published at 16 DE Admin Code (May 1, 2013). The Council included the following italicized commentary on that regulation:

Eighth, §7.0 is “overbroad”. For example, §7.1.1.1 contemplates consideration of arrest records without conviction. This is inconsistent with recent EEOC guidance. See attachments. Consistent with the EEOC Q&A document, Par. 7, the Enforcement Guidance preempts inconsistent state laws and regulations. In the analogous context of adult criminal background checks, the DLTCRP recently adopted the following regulatory standard deferring to the EEOC guidance:

8.3. DHSS adopts the guidance from the Equal Opportunity Commission, Consideration of Arrest and Conviction Records in Employment Decisions Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 915.002, issued 4/25/2012.

16 DE Admin Code 3105, §8.3.

13. Section 44.4 categorically bars notification of parents of investigation of abuse or neglect in which their child was allegedly victimized: “Staff shall not contact the parent/guardian of a child who is the alleged subject victim to advise them that either a report has been made or that the Division or law enforcement officer is conducting an investigation of an allegation of abuse or neglect.” It is “odd” to bar notice to a parent of alleged abuse/neglect of a child. Indeed, the bar is “at odds” with §71.1 which requires the licensee to report to a parent any “incident involving serious bodily injury or any severe psychiatric episode involving the child”. Parents will be justifiably upset if agencies conceal information about abuse/neglect of their children.

14. DFS may wish to consider transferring the concepts embodied in §75.0 to §44.0.

15. Section 78.1.4 ostensibly authorizes “locking a child in a room” as long as not “for a long period of time”. This is highly objectionable. The Division should bar locking a child in a room.

16. Section 78.1.6 could be embellished with conduct (e.g. throwing child; hitting with closed fist) prohibited by Title 11 Del.C. §468(1)c.

17. Section 78.0 occasionally uses the terminology “is prohibited” (§78.1.9) but generally uses the terminology “shall be prohibited”. SCPD recommends generally using present tense, i.e., “is prohibited”. Otherwise, it appears that the conduct will be barred in the future.

18. In §78.1.12, insert ‘disability’ after ‘family’.
19. Section 78.0 could be improved by including a bar on chemical restraint. Compare recently enacted S.B. 100 . See also 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §20.11.11.
20. DFS should review both S.B. 100 and 16 DE Admin Code 3320, §20.11 for examples of limitations on behavior management that could be incorporated into §78.0.
21. In §80.2, substitute ‘places’ for ‘place’.
22. In §80.5 or §72.0 , DFS may wish to address the use of bumper pads in cribs. See <http://pediatrics.about.com/od/babyproducts/a/crib-bumpers.htm>. (also attached).
23. In §86.4, DFS should consider insertion of the word ‘approaching’ prior to ‘eighteen’. As reflected in §86.3, providing a list of community services as the individual is ‘walking out the door’ on the individual’s 18th birthday is not prudent. DFS should also consider adding other preparation/orientation activities, including completion of selective service registration. SCPD recommends that DFS review the findings in the preamble to H.B. 163 for insight. For example, if 82% of males exiting foster care are arrested by age 21, and a high percentage of females become pregnant by age 21, doesn’t it make sense to address prevention activities?
24. Section 90.1 is somewhat ‘overbroad’ since it does not address the passage of time or rehabilitation. If the substantiated neglect occurred 30 years ago, and the individual is now highly responsible, does it make sense to apply a categorical bar to serving as a foster parent?
25. Section 96.1 categorically bars anyone over sixty-five (65) years of age becoming a foster parent. If there is no State statute which imposes such a limit, any State regulation limiting eligibility in a federally-funded program may run afoul of the federal Age Discrimination Act. See <http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/civilrights/resources/factsheets/age.pdf> and <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/discrimination/agedisc.htm>. (also attached). It is also anomalous that the Regulation contains no age limit for prospective adoptive parents. See §140.0.
26. Although there is a brief treatment of ‘pets’ in §112.0, potentially dangerous pets are not covered in §112.0 or in §101.0. Thus, a prospective foster parent could conceal ownership of multiple pit bulls or snakes. The regulatory standards do not contemplate any inquiry on the safety aspects of pets, only other household members (§§90.2 and 136.4)and visitors (§124.0). DFS may wish to add a standard addressing potentially dangerous pets.
27. The Council previously questioned the general ban on children wearing a helmet around playground equipment. See §103.2.4.3. SCPD continues to question the rationale for the general ban. Intuitively, if a child falls from a height, the helmet would provide some protection. from TBI.

28. Section 113.1 literally would not require someone driving a child in a pickup truck or van to have a driver's license and insurance. Consistent with §113.2, consider substituting "vehicle" for "automobile".

Thank you for your consideration and please contact SCPD if you have any questions or comments regarding our observations or recommendations on the proposed regulations.

cc: Ms. Vicky Kelly
Mr. William Love
Brian Hartman, Esq.
Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens
Developmental Disabilities Council

P&I/17reg62 dscyf-dfs child placing registry 7-25-13

Dangers of Crib Bumper Pads

Crib Safety Basics

By Vincent Iannelli, M.D., About.com Guide Updated October 18, 2011

About.com Health's Disease and Condition content is reviewed by the [Medical Review Board](#)

Free Pediatrics Newsletter!

Sign Up

Discuss in my forum

Crib bumpers were made obsolete a long time ago, once infants could no longer fit their head through the wider gap of the slats on older cribs. They continue to be popular, though, and are used by many new parents, often because they continue to be sold as a part of baby bedding sets.

But should you avoid crib bumpers?

Crib Bumpers

The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) says to avoid "pillow-like bumper pads."



Before your baby is born, be sure her crib is safe by taking the blankets, pillows, stuffed toys, and the crib bumper out.
 Photo by Vincent Iannelli, MD

Although the American Academy of Pediatrics used to say that "if bumper pads are used in cribs, they should be thin, firm, well secured, and not 'pillow-like,'" they now say that bumper pads are not recommended.

And even before they had a formal policy against the use of crib bumpers, there was advice on the AAP website that recommended that parents not use them because they are just decorative and may lead to rare, but preventable, deaths.

The AAP also warned that crib bumper pads should be removed once your baby begins to stand.

Dangers of Crib Bumper Pads

While the CPSC continues to investigate crib bumper pads, parents can decide if crib bumper pads are worth the risk. Originally designed to prevent babies from getting their head through the gap between crib slats, crib bumpers lost much of their real purpose when the crib safety regulations reduced the gap between slats in 1974.

Now they are purely decorative and are often sold as a part of crib bedding sets.

An article published in 2011 in *Pediatrics*, titled "Injuries Associated With Cribs, Playpens, and Bassinets Among Young Children in the US, 1990-2008," stated that "The use of crib bumper pads is strongly discouraged because the possibility for serious injury, including suffocation and strangulation, greatly outweighs any minor injury they may prevent."

Parents should also consider that a recent investigation by the *Chicago Tribune* suggests that deaths from crib bumper pads are likely under-reported.

Crib Bumper Safety

Why should crib bumpers be thin, firm, well secured, and not "pillow-like?"

If you do use crib bumpers, this can help to avoid the most common ways that crib bumper pads lead to injuries and death:

- strangulation by crib bumper pad ties
- suffocation against the crib bumper pads
- entrapment against the crib bumper pads and another object, such as the crib slats or crib mattress

Even these crib bumper safety tips won't prevent all injuries, as babies can get entrapped with a firm crib bumper, too.

Would a mesh crib bumper be a safer alternative to traditional crib bumpers? Most likely it would, but so would simply removing or never putting crib bumpers in your baby's crib in the first place.

Crib Bumpers - What You Need To Know

Making sure your baby's crib is safe is an important part of [baby proofing](#) your home.

Don't make your baby's crib less safe by adding an unsafe crib bumper to your baby's crib.

To recap, important things to know about crib bumpers include:

- The use of crib bumpers is now discouraged by most safety experts.
- If you do choose to use crib bumpers for decorative purposes, make sure that they are not pillow-like and that they are thin, firm, and well secured to your baby's crib.
- Be sure to remove crib bumpers once your baby is able to stand, so that he can't use them to help climb out of his crib.
- Many people think that deaths from crib bumpers are under-reported.
- The Canadian Paediatric Society and Health Canada have had a formal recommendation against using crib bumpers since 2004.

Parents should also keep in mind that crib bumpers are not thought to be needed to prevent serious injury from infants or toddlers getting their arms or legs caught between crib slats, which is one of the main reasons that they use crib bumpers in the first place.

Sources:

American Academy of Pediatrics Policy Statement. The Changing Concept of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome: Diagnostic Coding Shifts, Controversies Regarding the Sleeping Environment, and New Variables to Consider in Reducing Risk. *Pediatrics* 2005 116: 1245-1255.

Canadian Paediatric Society, Community Paediatrics Committee. Recommendations for safe sleeping environments for infants and children. *Paediatr Child Health*. 2004;9:659-663

Thech BT, Rutherford GW, Harris K. Deaths and injuries attributed to infant crib bumper pads. *J Pediatr*. 2007;151:271-274

Yeh, Elaine S. Injuries Associated With Cribs, Playpens, and Bassinets Among Young Children in the US, 1990-2008. *Pediatrics*, Mar 2011; 127: 479 - 486.

Top Related Searches [Baby Bedding Sets](#) [Infant Death Syndrome](#) [Crib Slats](#) [American Academy Of Pediatrics](#) [Crib Bumpers](#) [Product Safety Commission](#)



OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

KNOW ABOUT THE FEDERAL LAW THAT PROTECTS AGAINST AGE DISCRIMINATION

What is the Age Discrimination Act?

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 is a national law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. The Age Discrimination Act applies to persons of all ages. Under the Age Act, recipients of federal financial assistance may not exclude, deny or limit services to, or otherwise discriminate against, persons on the basis of age.

The Age Act does not cover employment discrimination, which is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), ensures that entities that receive federal financial assistance comply with this law.

The Age Discrimination Act contains certain exceptions that allow, under limited circumstances, the use of age distinctions or factors other than age. For example, the Age Discrimination Act does not apply to an age distinction contained in a Federal, State or Local statute or ordinance adopted by an elected, general purpose legislative body that: provides any benefits or assistance to persons based on age; establishes criteria for participation in age-related terms; or describes intended beneficiaries or target groups in age-related terms.

Office for Civil Rights

U.S. Department of Health
and Human Services

200 Independence Avenue, SW.
H.H.H. Building, Room 509-F
Washington, D.C. 20201

TELEPHONE

1-800-368-1019

E-MAIL

ocrmail@hhs.gov

TDD

1-800-537-7697

www.hhs.gov/ocr

How to file a complaint of discrimination with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR)

If you believe that you or someone else has been discriminated against because of age by an entity receiving financial assistance from HHS, you or your legal representative may file a complaint with OCR. Complaints must be filed within 180 days from the date of the alleged discrimination.

You may send a written complaint or you may complete and send OCR the Complaint Form available on our webpage at www.hhs.gov/ocr. The complaint form is also available on our webpage in a number of other languages under the Civil Rights Information in Other Languages section.

The following information must be included:

- Your name, address and telephone number.
- You must sign your name on everything you write. If you file a complaint on someone's behalf — e.g. spouse, friend, client, etc. — include your name, address, telephone number, and statement of your relationship to that person.
- Name and address of the institution or agency you believe discriminated.
- When, how and why you believe discrimination occurred.
- Any other relevant information.

If you mail the complaint, be sure to send it to the attention of the regional manager at the appropriate OCR regional office. OCR has ten regional offices and each regional office covers specific states. Complaints may also be mailed to OCR Headquarters at the following address:

Office for Civil Rights
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, SW.
H.H.H. Building, Room 509-F
Washington, D.C. 20201

To learn more:

Visit us online at www.hhs.gov/ocr

Call us toll-free at 1-800-368-1019

Email us: ocrmail@hhs.gov

TDD: 1-800-537-7697

Language assistance services for OCR matters are available and provided free of charge. OCR services are accessible to persons with disabilities.

www.hhs.gov/ocr

[Skip to page content](#)

United States Department of Labor

All DOL DOL [Advanced Search](#)

[A to Z](#) | [Site Map](#) | [FAQs](#) | [Forms](#) | [About DOL](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Español](#)

[DOL Home](#) > [Find It! By Topic](#) > [EEO](#) > [Age Discrimination](#)

Equal Employment Opportunity

Quick Links

- [Age Discrimination](#)
- [Disability](#)
- [Ethnic/National Origin, Color, Race, Religion, Sex](#)
- [Federal Financial Assistance Programs](#)
- [Veterans](#)
- [Immigration](#)

Age Discrimination

- [DOL Web Pages on This Topic](#)
- [Laws & Regulations on This Topic](#)

*

[The Age Discrimination Act of 1975](#) prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. The Act, which applies to all ages, permits the use of certain age distinctions and factors other than age that meet the Act's requirements. The Age Discrimination Act is enforced by the [Civil Rights Center](#).

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) protects certain applicants and employees 40 years of age and older from discrimination on the basis of age in hiring, promotion, discharge, compensation, or terms, conditions or privileges of employment. The ADEA is enforced by the [Equal Employment Opportunity Commission \(EEOC\)](#).

[Section 188 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 \(WIA\)](#) prohibits discrimination against applicants, employees and participants in WIA Title I-financially assisted programs and activities, and programs that are part of the One-Stop system, on the ground of age. In addition, WIA prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, political affiliation or belief, and for beneficiaries only, citizenship or participation in a WIA Title I-financially assisted program or activity. Section 188 of WIA is enforced by the [Civil Rights Center](#).

DOL Web Pages on This Topic

[Civil Rights Center](#)

Monitors and enforces the Age Discrimination Act in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

[Back to Top](#)

Laws & Regulations on This Topic

Laws

[29 USC §621](#)

Age Discrimination in Employment

[29 USC §6101](#)

Age Discrimination Act of 1975

Regulations

[29 CFR Part 37](#)

Implementation of the Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Provisions of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

[29 CFR Part 1625](#)

Age Discrimination in Employment Act — Interpretations

[29 CFR Part 1626](#)

Procedures, Age Discrimination Act