

OFFICE OF JUDICIAL EDUCATION

3/2026



RELEASE NO. 5

EDITION (1980)

MARCH 2026

TO: Consumers of the Wisconsin Jury Instructions – Children

FROM: Wisconsin Court System, Office of Judicial Education

Enclosed is Release No. 5 for the 1980 edition of Wis JI-Children. The release contains material approved by the Wisconsin Juvenile Jury Instructions Committee through January 2026.

The following material is included in Release No. 5:

New Instructions	
None	
Revised Instructions	
JI 324	JI 372

Filing Instructions. The material is preceded by filing instructions which should be followed carefully. It is recommended that the Filing Instructions page be retained in the front of Volume I as a record of the proper filing of this release.

Questions. If you have any questions concerning the publication process, this release, or the juvenile jury instructions project in general, please direct them to Bryce Pierson at Bryce.pierson@wicourts.gov.

[This page is intentionally left blank]

OFFICE OF JUDICIAL EDUCATION

3/2026



RELEASE NO. 5	EDITION (1980)	MARCH 2026
----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

The following pages should be removed from and inserted into each volume of the Wis JI-Children binders as indicated below. Follow all placement notes carefully before filing.

REMOVE	Left column — pages to pull out	INSERT	Right column — new pages to file in their place
---------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---

Volume I

REMOVE Old Pages Titled	INSERT New Pages Titled
Volume I Cover Page (Release No. 4)	Volume I Cover Page (Release No. 5)
Committee List (2/2025)	Committee List (3/2026)
Summary of Contents (2/2025)	Summary of Contents (3/2026)
Table of Contents (2/2025)	Table of Contents (3/2026)
Comparative Table of Statutes (2/2025)	Comparative Table of Statutes (3/2026)
324 (1/2024)	324 (3/2026)
372 (1/2024)	372 (3/2026)
Table of Cases Cited (2/2025)	Table of Cases Cited (3/2026)
Index (2/2025)	Index (3/2026)

Filing Confirmation	Date Filed	Initials
Release No. 5 (March 2026) filed by:		

[This page is intentionally left blank]



WISCONSIN JURY INSTRUCTIONS

CHILDREN

VOLUME I

**Wisconsin Juvenile Jury
Instructions Committee**

[Cite as Wis JI-Children]

- Includes 3/2026 Supplement (Release No. 5)

[This page is intentionally left blank]

WISCONSIN JURY INSTRUCTIONS — JUVENILE

Committee Member List

Prepared for the Wisconsin Judicial Conference by its Juvenile Jury Instructions Committee, with assistance from the Office of Judicial Education.

Committee Members		Judges
Name	Role / Title	
Hon. Maria Lazar	Chair	
Hon. Tammy Jo Hock	Member	
Hon. Brittany Grayson	Member	
Hon. Kristine Snow	Member	
Hon. Galen Bayne-Allison	Member	
Hon. Natasha Torry	Member	
Hon. Lyndsey Brunette	Member	
Hon. Maureen Boyle	Member	
Hon. Jodi Meier	Member	
Assistance Provided By		
Bryce Pierson	Office of Judicial Education Legal Advisor	

[This page is intentionally left blank]

Wisconsin Jury Instructions

Juvenile

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Release No. 5 — March 2026

Juvenile Jury Instructions Committee
Table of Contents
Comparative Table: Statute–Instruction Numbers

VOLUME I

General Instructions

Preliminary Instructions	50–75
Trial Procedure, Conduct & Evidence	100–165
Burdens of Proof	170–175
Verdicts	180–197

Child or Unborn Child in Need of Protection or Services (CHIPS)

Preliminary Instructions	200–202
Grounds for CHIPS	205–295

Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights

Preliminary Instructions	300–302
Grounds for Termination	303–375

Indian Child Welfare Cases: CHIPS and Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights

CHIPS (Out-of-Home Care Placement)	410–414
Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights	420–424
Causal Connection	430

Special Materials

SM-1–SM-2

Table of Cases Cited

Index

[This page is intentionally left blank]

WIS JI-CHILDREN

TABLE OF CONTENTS — VOLUME I

Instruction Title	No.	Year
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS		
Jurors’ Duties		
Suggested Order of Instructions: Child in Need of Protection or Services (CHIPS) or Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) Case	10 Renumbered Criminal-JI 120	2016
Comment: Gender-Neutral Language	15	7/2024
Preliminary Instruction: Before Trial.....	50	7/2024
Juror Questioning of Witness.....	57	2018
Notetaking Not Allowed	60	2018
Notetaking Permitted	61	2018
Transcripts not available for deliberations; reading back testimony.....	70	1/2023
Recording played to the jury	75	1/2023
Confidentiality: Preliminary Instruction	100	2018
Opening.....	101	2018
Remarks and Arguments of Counsel	110	2018
Objections of Counsel.....	115	2018
Ignoring Judge’s Demeanor	120	2018
Impeachment of Witness: Prior Conviction or Juvenile Adjudication	125	2018
Stricken Testimony	130	2018
Credibility of Witnesses; Weight of Evidence.....	140	2018
Special Verdict Questions: Interrelationship	145	2018
Witness Exercising Privilege Against Self-Incrimination: Termination of Parental Rights Proceeding	149	1/2024
Witness: Absence.....	150	2018
Closing: Short Form.....	151	2018
Closing: Long Form.....	152	2018
Exhibits	155	2018
Expert Testimony: General	160	2018
Expert Testimony: Hypothetical Questions	165	2018
Burden of Proof: Ordinary	170	2018
Burden of Proof: Middle	175	2018
Appropriate Date for Jury’s Finding.....	180	2016
Five-Sixths Verdict	185	2018
Supplemental Instruction Where Jury is Unable to Agree.....	195	2018
Instruction after Verdict is Received	197	2018

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Child or unborn child in need of protection or services (CHIPS) (UCHIPS)

Preliminary Instruction	200	2009
Unborn Child in Need of Protection or Services: Preliminary Instruction	202	2009
Child Without a Parent or Guardian	205	2005
Abandonment.....	210	2005
Relinquishment of Custody of Newborn Child.....	212	7/2024
Abuse by Physical Injury	215	7/2024
Abuse by Methamphetamine Manufacturing.....	216	2010
Abuse by Sexual Intercourse or Contact.....	217	2010
Abuse by Sexual Exploitation: Violation of Wis. Stat. § 948.05(1)(a).....	218	2010
Abuse by Sexual Exploitation: Violation of Wis. Stat. § 948.05(1)(b)	218A	2010
Abuse by Sexual Exploitation: Violation of Wis. Stat. § 948.05(2).....	218B	2010
Abuse by Causing a Child to View or Listen to Sexual Activity:		
Violation of Wis. Stat. § 948.055	218C	2010
Abuse: Exposing or Causing a Child to Expose Genitals or Pubic		
Area: Violation of Wis. Stat. § 948.10	218D	2010
Abuse: Prostitution: Violation of Wis. Stat. § 944.30	219	2010
Abuse: Advisory Verdict as to Perpetrator	220	2010
Substantial Risk of Physical Abuse	222	2010
Substantial Risk of Abuse (Methamphetamine Manufacturing).....	223	2010
Substantial Risk of Sexual Abuse	224	2010
Parent (Guardian) Unable or Needs Assistance to Care for.....	230	2015
Parental Inability to Control.....	231 Withdrawn	1997
Parent (Guardian) Unable or Needs Assistance to Provide Necessary		
Special Treatment or Care	232	2015
Parent Fails to Provide Care	233	2010
Guardian Unable or Needs Assistance to Care for; Unwilling or Unable		
to Sign Petition	234	2009
Guardian Unable or Needs Assistance to Provide Special Treatment or		
Care; Unwilling or Unable to Sign Petition.....	234A	2009
Placed for Care in Violation of Law	235	2/2025
Placed for Adoption in Violation of Law.....	236	2005
Inadequate Care During Period of Parental Absence (Missing)	240	2/2025
Inadequate Care During Period of Parental Absence (Incarcerated)	241	2/2025
Inadequate Care During Period of Parental Absence (Hospitalized).....	242	2/2025
Inadequate Care During Period of Parental Absence (Institutionalized)	243	2/2025
Parental Neglect, Refusal, or Inability to Provide.....	250	2/2025

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Substantial Risk of Neglect, Refusal, or Inability to Provide	255	2012
Emotional Damage.....	260	2008
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Impairment.....	265	2005
Unborn Child in Need of Protection or Services	280	2009
Habitual Truancy	290 Withdrawn	1997
Delinquent Act (Under Age of 12)	295 Withdrawn	1997
 Involuntary termination of parental rights (TPR)		
Preliminary Instruction (General)	300	2009
Consideration of Child’s Best Interests in Termination Proceedings	301	2015
Separate Parents and Separate Verdicts in Termination Proceedings.....	302	2016
Relinquishment	303	2005
Abandonment (60 days).....	305	2006
Abandonment: Left Without Provision for Care.....	307	2009
Abandonment: When Child Under One Year	308	2005
Abandonment: Placement and Failure to Visit or Communicate for Three Months	313	7/2024
Abandonment: Left with Another Person and Failure to Visit or Communicate for Six Months	314	2018
Continuing Need of Protection or Services.....	323 Withdrawn	2011
Continuing Need of Protection or Services [Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a)]	324	3/2026
Continuing Need of Protection or Services (April 21, 2006, and where 2017 Wis. Act 256 does not apply) [Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a)]	324A Withdrawn	1/2023
Continuing Need of Protection or Services (Before April 21, 2006, and where 2017 Wis. Act 256 does not apply) [Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a)1].....	324B Withdrawn	1/2023
Continuing Need of Protection or Services: Three or More CHIPS Orders	325	2011
Continuing Parental Disability.....	330	2011
Continuing Denial of Periods of Physical Placement or Visitation	335	2016
Abuse: Pattern of Abusive Behavior and Felony Conviction	340	2016
Abuse: Pattern of Abusive Behavior and Prior Removal by Court Order (Removal of Abused Child from Parent’s Home).....	342	2011
Failure to Assume Parental Responsibility (Where Paternity Determined Since Petition Was Filed).....	345 Withdrawn	2011
Failure to Assume Parental Responsibility	346	2018
Failure to Assume Parental Responsibility: Knowledge of Paternity [Wis. Stat. § 48.415(6)(a)].....	346A	2018
Failure to Assume Parental Responsibility: Incarcerated Parent [Wis. Stat. § 48.415(6)(a)].....	346B	1/2024
Incestuous Parenthood	350	2011

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Homicide or Solicitation to Commit Homicide of Parent.....	370	2011
Parenthood as a Result of a Sexual Assault (Where a Judgment of Conviction or Adjudication of Delinquency Exists)	371	2011
Parenthood as a Result of a Sexual Assault (Where No Judgment of Conviction or Adjudication of Delinquency Exists)	371A	2011
Commission of a Felony Against a Child	372	3/2026
Prior Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights	375	2011
 Indian child welfare cases: CHIPS and involuntary termination of parental rights		
CHIPS (Out-of-Home Care Placement): Verdict [Wis. Stat. § 48.028(4)(d)]	410	2015
CHIPS (Out-of-Home Care Placement): Serious Emotional Damage or Serious Physical Damage [Wis. Stat. § 48.028 (4)(d)1.].....	412	2010
CHIPS (Out-of-Home Care Placement): Active Efforts [Wis. Stat. § 48.028 (4)(d)2.]	414	2/2025
Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights: Verdict [Wis. Stat. § 48.028(4)(e)]	420	2018
Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights: Serious Emotional Damage or Serious Physical Damage [Wis. Stat. § 48.028 (4)(e)1.].....	422	2018
Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights: “Active Efforts” [Wis. Stat. § 48.028 (4)(e)2.].....	424	2/2025
Causal Connection	430	2/2025
 SPECIAL MATERIALS		
Analysis of effective dates of juvenile legislation and jury instructions on the new elements	SM-1	1997
Use of summary judgments, jury waivers, stipulations, and directed verdicts in termination and CHIPS proceedings	SM-2	2015
Table of Cases Cited		2/2025
Index		2/2025

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Wis JI-Children

Comparative Table Statute — Instruction Numbers

The jury instruction in the right-hand column in most cases defines the offense proscribed by the statute in the left-hand column. Where the cited statutes do not define an offense, the instruction deals with the statute in a substantive way. This is not a list of all statutes cited in the instructions.

Wis. Stat. §	Wis JI Children
48.02(1)(a)	215
48.02(1)(b)	217
48.02(1)(c)	218, 218A, 218B
48.02(1)(e)	218C
48.02(1)(f)	218D
48.02(1)(g)	216
48.02(5j)	412, 422
48.02(14g)	412, 422
48.028(4)d1.	410, 412, 414
48.028(4)(d)(2)	410
48.028(4)(e)	420
48.028(4)(e)1.	422
48.028(4)(e)2.	424
48.13	SM-1
48.13(1)	205
48.13(2)	210
48.13(2m)	212
48.13(3)	215, 216, 217, 218, 218A, 218B, 218C, 218D, 219
48.13(3m)	222, 223, 224
48.13(4)	230, 223, 231, 232
48.13(4m)	234
48.13(5)	235, 236
48.13(6)	290
48.13(8)	240, 241, 242, 243
48.13(9)	233

WIS JI-CHILDREN

48.13(10)	250
48.13(10m)	255
48.13(11)	260
48.13(11m)	265
48.13(12)	295
48.133	202, 280
48.235(6)	200, 202, 300
48.299(1)	100
48.415	SM-1, 300
48.415(1)(a)1	305
48.415(1m)	303
48.415(1)(a)1m	307
48.415(1)(a)1r	308
48.415(1)(a)2	313
48.415(1)(a)3	314, 313
48.415(2)(a)	324, 324A
48.415(2)(a)1	324B
48.415(2)(am)1	325
48.415(3)	330
48.415(4)	335
48.415(5)(a)	340
48.415(5)(b)	342
48.415(6)(a)	346, 346A, 346B
48.415(6)(a)2	345
48.415(7)	350
48.415(8)	370
48.415(9)	371, 371A
48.415(9m)	372
48.415(10)	375
48.42(2m)	346, 346A, 346B
48.81	236
48.833	236
48.92	236
903.01	314
938.13	SM-1
944.30	219

WIS JI-CHILDREN

948.01	217
948.02	217
948.05(1)(a)	218
948.05(1)(b)	218A
948.05(2)	218B
948.05(3)	218, 218B
948.055	218C
948.085	217
948.10	218D
961.41(1)	223

[This page is intentionally left blank]

324 INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS: CONTINUING NEED OF PROTECTION OR SERVICES [WIS. STAT. § 48.415(2)(a)]¹ (AS AMENDED BY 2017 WISCONSIN ACT 256) (SEE 324B FOR PREVIOUSLY NUMBERED JURY INSTRUCTION 324)

The petition in this case alleges that (child) is in continuing need of protection or services which, is a ground for termination of parental rights. Your role as jurors will be to answer the following questions in the special verdict.

1. Has (child) been adjudged to be in need of protection or services and placed outside the home for a cumulative total period of six months or longer pursuant to one or more court orders containing the termination of parental rights notice required by law?

If the answer to question 1 is “yes,” answer the following question:

2. Did the _____ County Department of Social Services make a reasonable effort to provide the services ordered by the court?

If the answer to question 2 is “yes,” answer the following question:

3. Has (parent) failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of (child) to (parent)’s home?

[NOTE: If the child has been placed outside the home for less than 15 of the most recent 22 months, give the following:

If the answer to question 3 is “yes,” answer the following question:

4. Is there a substantial likelihood that (parent) will not meet these conditions by the date on which (child) will have been placed outside the home for 15 of the most

recent 22 months, not including any period during which the child was a runaway from the out-of-home placement or was residing in a trial reunification home?]

Before (child) may be found to be in continuing need of protection or services, (petitioner) must prove the following (three) (four) elements by evidence that is clear, satisfactory, and convincing, to a reasonable certainty.

First, that (child) was adjudged to be a child (an unborn child) in need of protection or services and placed or continued in placement outside the home of (parent) for a cumulative period of six months or longer pursuant to one or more court orders containing the termination of parental rights notice required by law. **[Add the following language if there is no dispute as to this element:** Because there is no dispute in the evidence to this question, I have answered this question. My answer has no bearing whatsoever on what your answer should be to the other questions in the special verdict form.]

Second, that (agency) has made a reasonable effort to provide the services ordered by the court. “Reasonable effort” means an earnest and conscientious effort to take good faith steps to provide those services, taking into consideration the characteristics of the parent or child [or of the expectant mother or child], the level of cooperation of the parent [or expectant mother], and other relevant circumstances of the case. You may find the agency’s effort was reasonable even though there were minor or insignificant deviations from the court’s order. Question 2 of the special verdict addresses this element. **[Possible additional language applicable only in cases where the child has been placed outside the home**

less than 15 of the past 22 months, and post-petition evidence has been admitted: In answering question 2, you may consider all evidence bearing on that question, including evidence of events and efforts occurring since the filing of the petition on (_____). Your answer must reflect your finding as of today's date.]²

Third, that (parent) has failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of the child to the home. Question 3 of the special verdict addresses this element. In answering question 3, you must consider the facts and circumstances as they existed on (_____), which was the date on which this petition was filed. Your answer must reflect your finding as of that date.

[NOTE: Add the following paragraph if the child has been placed outside the home for less than 15 of the most recent 22 months:

Fourth, that there is a substantial likelihood that (parent) will not meet the conditions for the safe return of (child) by the date on which the child will have been placed outside the home for 15 of the most recent 22 months, not including any period during which the child was a runaway from the out-of-home placement or was residing in a trial reunification home. (Note: If there is no dispute to this date, add: That date will be (_____).) “Substantial likelihood” means that there is a real and significant probability rather than a mere possibility that (parent) will not meet the conditions for the safe return by that date. Question 4 of the special verdict addresses this element. In answering question 4, you may consider all evidence bearing on that question, including evidence of events and conduct

occurring since the filing of the petition on (_____). Your answer must reflect your finding as of today's date.]

In determining whether (parent) failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of (child) to the home or whether there is a substantial likelihood that (parent) will not meet the conditions for the safe return of (child) by (_____), you may consider the following: the length of time (child) has been in placement outside the home; the number of times (child) has been removed from the home; the parent's performance in meeting the conditions for return of the child; the parent's cooperation with the social service agency; parental conduct during periods in which (child) had contact with (parent); and all other evidence presented during this hearing which assists you in making these determinations.

Before you may answer any question in the special verdict "yes," you must be convinced by evidence that is clear, satisfactory, and convincing, to a reasonable certainty, that the question should be answered "yes." If you are not so convinced, you must answer the question "no."

SPECIAL VERDICT

1. Has (child) been adjudged to be in need of protection or services and placed outside the home for a cumulative total period of six months or longer pursuant to one or more court orders containing the termination of parental rights notice

required by law?

Answer: _____

Yes or No

If the answer to question 1 is “yes,” answer the following question:

2. Did the _____ County Department of Social Services make a reasonable effort to provide the services ordered by the court?

Answer: _____

Yes or No

If the answer to question 2 is “yes,” answer the following question:

3. Has (parent) failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of (child) to (parent)’s home?

Answer: _____

Yes or No

[NOTE: Add the following verdict question if the child has been placed outside the home for less than 15 of the most recent 22 months:

If the answer to question 3 is “yes,” answer the following question:

4. Is there a substantial likelihood that (parent) will not meet these conditions by the date on which (child) will have been placed outside the home for 15 of the most recent 22 months, not including any period during which (child) was a runaway from the out-of-home placement or was residing in a trial reunification home]?

Answer: _____

Yes or No]

NOTE

1. This instruction was drafted in accordance with 2017 Wisconsin Act 256. Refer to Children’s JI-324B for the instructions that were formerly numbered as Children’s JI-324.

2. Earlier versions of this instruction recommended consulting the unpublished case State v. Stacey P., 2012AP167-169, for guidance if the user intended to incorporate the optional bracketed language into the instruction. In that matter, the court held that “whether the agency has, since the petition’s filing, continued to help the parent to meet the conditions of return is a factor that the jury must consider.” However, since the Stacey P. decision, there has been a significant amendment to Wis. Stat. 48.415(2)(a)3.

Prior to April 2018, the statute provided:

...there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet these conditions with the 9-month period following the fact-finding hearing under s. 48.424.

Thus, under the previous version of the statute, at the grounds hearing, the fact finder was required to look to the future nine months from the date of the grounds hearing to determine whether the parent had a substantial likelihood of meeting the conditions established by the court for the safe return of the child.

However, when Wis. Stat. 48.415(2)(a)3 was amended in April 2018, it replaced the forward-looking nine-month period with a 15 of the most recent 22 months timeframe. As the court of appeals clarified in the unpublished decision In re Z.Y., 2021AP1729, “Only if the child has been placed outside the home for less than 15 of the most recent 22 months may the factfinder consider whether there ‘is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet the conditions as of the date on which the child will have been placed outside the home for 15 of the most recent 22 months.’ If the child has been placed outside the home for more than 15 of the most recent 22 months, the third subpart is satisfied by evidence proving that the parent failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of the child.” Id., citing In re T.L.E.-C., 2021 WI 56, ¶19, 397 Wis.2d 462, 960 N.W.2d 391.

The amendment eliminated the petitioner’s obligation to show a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet the conditions of return within the nine months following the fact-finding hearing in cases where the child has been in out-of-home care for over 15 months. In cases like these, the fact finder should not be asked if there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet the conditions by some future date. Therefore, the court should refrain from incorporating the optional bracketed language in situations where the child has been in out-of-home care for more than 15 months.

COMMENT

This instruction was approved in 2018 following the enactment of 2017 Wisconsin Act 256. It replaced an earlier version of Wis JI-Children 324, which was based on Wis. Stats. § 48.415(2)(a) prior to a 2006 revision. The earlier version of Wisconsin JI-Children 324 was renumbered Wis JI-Children 324B. The comment was revised in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023. The 2023 revision updated footnote one and provided additional clarification in the “possible additional language” section of the second element, specifying that it does not apply in situations where a child has been placed outside the home for fifteen out of the most recent twenty-two months. This revision was approved by the Committee in January 2026. It amended the optional verdict question in the “Impossibility to Perform” comment below and added a clarifying note immediately following the comment emphasizing that the defense requires a total—not partial—inability

to comply.

New Legislation. 2017 Wisconsin Act 256 removes the requirement of showing that there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will continue to fail for the next nine months to meet the conditions established for the safe return of the child to the home in a continuing CHIPS TPR proceeding. The act replaces this requirement with a requirement for the petitioner to show that if the child has been placed outside the home under a CHIPS order for less than 15 of the past 22 months, there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet the conditions established for the safe return of the child to the home at the time the child will have been placed outside of the home for 15 of the last 22 months. For the instruction to be used in cases predating the law change, see Wis JI-Children 324A and 324B.

Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a) (as amended by 2017 Wis. Act 256) reads:

48.415. Grounds for involuntary termination of parental rights. At the fact-finding hearing, the court or jury shall determine whether grounds exist for the termination of parental rights. If the child is an Indian child, the court or jury shall also determine at the fact-finding hearing whether continued custody of the Indian child by the Indian child's parent or Indian custodian is likely to result in serious emotional or physical damage to the Indian child under s. 48.028 (4) (e) 1. and whether active efforts under s. 48.028 (4) (e) 2. have been made to prevent the breakup of the Indian child's family and whether those efforts have proved unsuccessful unless partial summary judgment on the grounds for termination of parental rights is granted, in which case the court shall make those determinations at the dispositional hearing. Grounds for termination of parental rights shall be one of the following:

(2) Continuing need of protection or services. Continuing need of protection or services, which shall be established by proving any of the following:

(a) 1. That the child has been adjudged to be a child or an unborn child in need of protection or services and placed, or continued in a placement, outside his or her home pursuant to one or more court orders under s. 48.345, 48.347, 48.357, 48.363, 48.365, 938.345, 938.357, 938.363 or 938.365 containing the notice required by s. 48.356 (2) or 938.356 (2).

2. a. In this subdivision, "reasonable effort" means an earnest and conscientious effort to take good faith steps to provide the services ordered by the court which takes into consideration the characteristics of the parent or child or of the expectant mother or child, the level of cooperation of the parent or expectant mother and other relevant circumstances of the case.

b. That the agency responsible for the care of the child and the family or of the unborn child and expectant mother has made a reasonable effort to provide the services ordered by the court.

3. That the child has been placed outside the home for a cumulative total period of 6 months or longer pursuant to an order listed under subd. 1., not including time spent outside the home as an unborn child; that the parent has failed to meet the conditions established for the safe return of the child to the home; and, if the child has been placed outside the home for less than 15 of the most recent 22 months, that there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet these conditions as of the date on

which the child will have been placed outside the home for 15 of the most recent 22 months, not including any period during which the child was a runaway from the out-of-home placement or was residing in a trial reunification home.

Applicability of this Instruction. 2017 Wis. Act 256 was effective as of April 6, 2018. The Supreme Court has affirmed the application of the revised Continuing CHIPS elements in a TPR case filed after the Act's effective date, although the underlying CHIPS case predated the revision. See Eau Claire County Department of Human Services v. S.E., 2021 WI 56, 397 Wis.2d 462.

Note that 2005 Wis. Act 293 previously modified the fourth element of Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a) to shorten, from twelve months to nine months, the post-petition timeline for parents to meet conditions for the safe return of the child. That enactment specifically provided that it applied to cases where orders for out-of-home placement were granted on or after the effective date. 2017 Wis. Act 256 does not contain such a provision.

In a 2019 decision, the Court of Appeals affirmed the application of revised § 48.415(2) to a TPR case that was filed after April 6, 2018, even though the original underlying CHIPS order and several extensions were made prior to that date. See Dane County Department of Human Services v. J.R., 2020 WI App 5, 390 Wis.2d 326, 938 N.W.2d 614. In 2021, the Wisconsin Supreme Court affirmed a court of appeals' decision agreeing with the circuit court and held that the amended version of Wis. Stat. 48.415(2)(a)3 applied during a TPR proceeding, even though the underlying CHIPS order was entered in 2016. See Eau Claire County DHS v. S.E., 2021 WI 56, 960 N.W.2d 391.

Failure of Prior Order to Contain Warning. In 2016, the Wisconsin Supreme Court reviewed an earlier decision, Waukesha County v. Steven H., 2000 WI 28, 233 Wis.2d 344, 607 N.W.2d 607, which involved whether the parent was given a proper warning of possible termination. The Wisconsin Supreme Court in St. Croix County Dep't of Health and Human Services v. Michael D., 2016 WI 35, 368 Wis.2d 170, 880 N.W.2d 107, said the plain language of § 48.415(2) does not require that the written notice must be in the last order or that six months must pass after the last order before the petition to terminate parental rights may be filed.

The Court held that the notice the mother received satisfied the statutory notice element of a TPR action grounded in continuing CHIPS set forth in Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2). The notice required under Wis. Stat. § 48.356(2)(a)1. was satisfied. Specifically, the Court said:

In a TPR case based on the continuing CHIPS ground, Wisconsin Stat. §

48.415(2) does not require proof that notice was given in every CHIPS order removing a child from the home or extension thereof; it also does not require proof that notice was in the last CHIPS order. Rather, it requires proof that one or more of the CHIPS orders removing a child from the home, or extension thereof, contain the written notice required under § 48.356(2).

The court further held that Steven H. did not establish an unequivocal “last order, plus six-months rule.” It said:

Wisconsin Stat. § 48.415(2) does not use the term last order; rather, the legislature

chose to use the phrase “one or more.” Accordingly, if “one or more” of the CHIPS orders in a TPR case contains the statutorily prescribed written notice, regardless of whether it was the first, last, or any order in between, the notice satisfies the phrase “one or more.” Likewise, the statutes do not require that six months must pass after the last CHIPS order before a TPR petition can be filed. Rather, the relevant statute requires proof that a child was “outside the home for a cumulative total period of 6 months or longer.” Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2)(a)3.

Relevancy of Post-Petition Evidence on Substantial Likelihood of Not Meeting Conditions. The Committee believes that evidence of post-petition conduct may be relevant to the allegation that there is a substantial likelihood that the parent will not meet the conditions for the return of the child in the future. A sentence was added to the instruction on the fourth element to allow the jury to consider events and conduct since the petition was filed. See In re T.M.S., 152 Wis.2d 345, 448 N.W.2d 282 (Ct. App. 1989). For a decision discussing a parent’s argument that the court erred in not admitting post-petition efforts of a parent, see the unpublished opinion Jefferson County Dep’t of Human Services v. J.V., Appeal No. 2622. In another unpublished opinion, the court said it was error to instruct the jury with both Wis JI-Children 180 and 324A. In the case, the court said it was harmless error to give Wis JI-Children 180 because the jury was not asked to answer any question “comporting with Wis JI-Children 180.” Portage County Dep’t of Health and Human Services v. Tanya G., Appeal No. 2014AP86.

In Utero. The time while the child is in utero should not be counted when calculating the duration of a placement outside the parent’s home.

Relevancy of Pre-CHIPS Disposition Events. Pre-CHIPS disposition events may be admissible as relevant to the element of the likelihood that a parent will meet the conditions of return within the requisite period following the TPR hearing. LaCrosse Cty. v. Tara P., 2002 WI App 84, 252 Wis.2d 179, 643 N.W.2d 194. The court rejected the argument that this type of evidence is barred as “other acts” evidence. The court of appeals also noted that “events predating dispositional orders may be relevant to another issue at termination proceedings: whether a county department of social services made ‘reasonable’ efforts to provide services ordered by a court.” 2002 WI App. 84, fn.4.

For a decision discussing Tara P. and involving the admissibility of “historical information” about the parent pre-dating the CHIPS order, see State v. Roberta W., Appeal No. 2013AP936 (not published; one-judge decision).

Indian Child Welfare Cases. For the use of this instruction and verdict in a TPR case involving the Indian Child Welfare Act 25 U.S.C. §§ 1901-1963 and Wis. Stat. § 48.028(e), see Wis JI-Children 420-424.

Impossibility to Perform. The trial judge must decide on a case-by-case basis whether to ask the jury about impossibility to perform where the parent alleges impossibility to meet the conditions of the dispositional order. See Kenosha County v. Jodie W., 2006 WI 93, 293 Wis.2d 530, 716 N.W.2d 845, where the Supreme Court examined whether a court may constitutionally find a parent unfit based solely on the parent’s failure to meet an impossible condition of return. If the jury is asked to make a finding on impossibility, then the following special verdict question could be asked:

5. Was it impossible for (parent) to meet each of the conditions established for the

safe return of (child) to (parent)'s home?

Note: Submit this question only if the parent asserts that all required conditions were impossible to fulfill. The jury should answer “yes” only if it finds that every condition for return was beyond the parent’s control or ability. If the parent was capable of meeting even one condition and failed to do so, then the parent has not proven that performance was impossible.

For a decision discussing Jodie W. and whether the ground for termination was based on conditions for return that were impossible for the parent to meet, see Portage County Department of Health and Human Services v. Julie G., Appeal No. 2014AP1057 (one-judge decision, July 31, 2014). See also State v. Kiwana L., Appeal No. 2014AP2306 (one-judge decision, January 13, 2015). In Kiwana L., the parent argued that the circuit court violated her substantive due process rights when it found grounds for termination because she believed that the conditions of return were not narrowly tailored to address her mental health needs and financial hardships.

Verdict Question Answered by the Court. In most cases, there will be a determination by the trial judge as to question 1. It is recommended that the phrase “Answered Yes by the Court” be typed on the line. See SM-2 for a discussion of partial summary judgments, directed verdicts, and jury waivers/stipulations.

Judicial Notice of Underlying CHIPS Procedure. In some cases, it may be helpful to the jury and reduce the need for trial testimony to have the judge explain to the jury what CHIPS procedures have occurred leading up to the TPR proceeding. An optional explanation that could be used for this purpose is presented in SM-2 (Section No. 4). The Committee recommends that the parties stipulate to its use.

Stating the Specific Services to be Provided. In Sheboygan County DHHS v. Tanya M.B., 2010 WI 55, 325 Wis.2d 524, 785 N.W.2d 369, the parents argued that the CHIPS dispositional orders were insufficient because they did not separately list the “specific services” to be provided by the department. The Supreme Court disagreed. Wisconsin Stat. § 48.355(2)(b)1. provides that the dispositional order be in writing and contain the following:

1. The specific services to be provided to the child and family, to the child expectant mother and family, or to the adult expectant mother and, if custody of the child is to be transferred to effect the treatment plan the identity of the legal custodian.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court concluded:

As stated, we conclude that the dispositional orders contained “specific services,” as required by Wis. Stat. § 48.355(2)(b)1. We so conclude because § 48.355(2)(b)1. does not require a CHIPS dispositional order to separately list each individual service that the Department is ordered to provide so long as the Department is ordered to provide “supervision,” “services,” and “case management,” and the order also provides detailed conditions that the parents must complete in compliance with the dispositional order.

The court said the dispositional order’s conditions “implicitly” required the county department to provide services necessary to assist the parents in meeting the court-ordered conditions for the return of

their children. The Supreme Court reasoned that the apparent purpose of § 48.355(2)(b)1. is to assure that the department will arrange services that are necessary to assist parents in meeting court-ordered conditions for the return of their children. However, the court recognized that how best to assist parents in meeting those conditions may change as parents make progress or encounter difficulty in changing their behavior. The court said that allowing the department flexibility in the manner in which it provides services to parents permits the department to accommodate a parent's changing needs.

The decision in Tanya M.B. has been applied in several recent unpublished appellate decisions. Dane County DHS v. Samuel W., Appeal No. 2009 AP 2606 (decided October 14, 2010); Ozaukee County DHS v. Sarah H., Appeal No. 2010 AP 416 (decided August 18, 2010); Dane County DHS v. Tierra M., Appeal No. 2010 AP 1646 (decided September 23, 2010).

In Sarah H., *supra*, the court applied Tanya M.B. to the parent's claim that the dispositional order did not specify the services to be provided. The parent contended that the order was defective because it did not require the department to provide "supervision," "services," or "case management." The court of appeals disagreed with the parent's position stating:

¶5 We disagree. What this comes down to is an argument that the dispositional order must contain a magical phrase—"supervision, services and case management" and that the order specifically be directed, in the same breath, with a named social service department. We reject that argument. What the supreme court pointedly held was that "specific services" need not be listed in the order—all that is needed is a command by the trial court that the named social services department *do* services, *do* supervise the parent and *do* manage the parent and that the parent knows and the department knows that this is what needs to be done. The order in this case did just that. It orders services to be provided by the department and it orders the Department to take "responsibility" for the care of the parent-child relationship.

Opinions of Case Manager on Parenting Skills as Expert Testimony. For a discussion characterizing the testimony of a case manager that the parent would not be able to meet conditions necessary for the return of children in the future, see an unpublished decision (decided by one judge), State v. Gloria C., Appeal No. 2012AP1693. This decision considered whether expert testimony was required on this element in the TPR case based on continuing need. The trial court held that there is no requirement that an expert testify as to the fourth prong of a continuing CHIPS TPR case. The appellate decision held that a social worker with proper experience may testify as an expert witness as to a party's parenting skills. The court also noted that the legislation enacted on expert witness testimony (Wis. Stat. § 907.01, 907.02, and 907.03) was not effective when this action was commenced, 2011 Wisconsin Act 2, § 45.

Criminal History of Parent. In a 2012 case, a parent argued that the trial court should not have let the jury know about "his criminal history in its entirety." The trial court ruled that the parent's criminal history was relevant to whether the parent had met court-ordered conditions for the return of his children and, if not, whether the parent would be able to meet those conditions. The appellate court said the trial court was correct in permitting the jury to see how the parent lived and how that affected where he placed his children on the spectrum of what he deemed important and where he would likely place them in the future. State v. Stacey P., 2012 AP167 (unpublished); decided June 12, 2012.

Cognitive Limitations of Parent. For a case involving a parent's argument that her cognitive

limitations made it impossible for her to fulfill the conditions of return, see State v. Ebony, Appeal No. 2013AP613 (not published; one-judge decision). The parent argued that the conditions for return were not narrowly tailored to the children's safety needs and to her cognitive limitations.

For a case involving a parent's request that this instruction be modified to require the jury to first separately answer whether the county's services took into account the parent's characteristics ("specifically her learning disability") before answering whether the county had made a "reasonable effort to provide the parent the necessary services," see the unpublished opinion Barron County Dep't of Health and Human Services v. J.H., Appeal No. 2015AP1529 (one-judge). The decision said that modification of the verdict form to require the jury to separately answer whether the services the county provided considered the parent's characteristics was not legally required and was unnecessary given the circuit court's instruction to the jury and the parent's counsel's closing argument and questioning on the issue.

Parental Failures Prior to Incarceration. For a case examining whether the jury should have received a special instruction that an incarcerated parent's rights may not be terminated based solely upon conditions that were impossible to perform while incarcerated, see Ozaukee County Dep't of Human Services v. Callen D.M., Appeal No. 2013AP1157 (not published; one-judge decision). The court noted that the parent's inability to fulfill the conditions of return was due to her own failures prior to incarceration, not after. The decision differentiated the facts of the case from those in Kenosha Cty. DHS v. Jodie W., 2006 WI 93 ¶19, 293 Wis.2d 530, 716 N.W.2d 845. There were 14 conditions in the dispositional order, several of which the parent failed to meet long before her incarceration. The court in Callen D.M. noted that the parent had over two and one-half years to comply with the CHIPS conditions before she entered custody.

For another decision discussing Jodie W. and a parent's conduct prior to incarceration, see Portage County Department of Health and Human Services v. Julie G., Appeal No. 2014AP1057 (one-judge decision, July 31, 2014).

**372 INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS:
COMMISSION OF A FELONY AGAINST A CHILD [WIS. STAT.
§ 48.415(9m)]**

NO INSTRUCTION IS RECOMMENDED.

COMMENT

Wis JI-Children 372 comment was approved by the Committee in 1997 and revised in 1999, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2016, and 2023. This revision was approved by the Committee in January 2026; it added to the comment.

Wis. Stat. § 48.415(9m) reads:

48.415. Grounds for involuntary termination of parental rights. At the fact-finding hearing, the court or jury may make a finding that grounds exist for the termination of parental rights. Grounds for termination of parental rights shall be one of the following:

(9m) Commission of a felony against a child. (a) Commission of a serious felony against one of the person's children, which shall be established by proving that a child of the person whose parental rights are sought to be terminated was the victim of a serious felony and that the person whose parental rights are sought to be terminated has been convicted of that serious felony as evidenced by a final judgment of conviction.

(am) Commission of a violation of s. 948.051 involving any child or a violation of the law of any other state or federal laws, if that violation would be a violation of s. 948.051 involving any child if committed in this state.

(b) In this subsection, “serious felony” means any of the following:

1. The commission of, the aiding or abetting of, or the solicitation, conspiracy or attempt to commit, a violation of s. 940.01, 940.02, 940.03 or 940.05 or a violation of the law of any other state or federal law, if that violation would be a violation of s. 940.01, 940.02, 940.03 or 940.05 if committed in this state.

2. a. The commission of a violation of s. 940.19 (3), 1999 stats., a violation of s. 940.19 (2), (4) or (5), 940.225 (1) or (2), 948.02 (1) or (2), 948.025, 948.03 (2) (a), (3) (a), or (5) (a) 1., 2., or 3., 948.05, 948.051, 948.06 or 948.08, or a violation of s. 940.302 (2) if s. 940.302 (2) (a) 1. b. applies.

b. A violation of the law of any other state or federal law, if that violation would be a violation listed under subd. 2. a. if committed in this state.

3. The commission of a violation of s. 948.21 or a violation of the law of any other state or federal law, if that violation would be a violation of s. 948.21 if committed in this state, that resulted in the death of the victim.

The Committee concluded that a jury instruction for this ground was neither necessary nor appropriate except in the rare case where parenthood is in question. In a case based on § 48.415(9m)(a), there will be a question of whether the child was the respondent's child. The statute provides that the fact of conviction in the underlying criminal proceeding, as evidenced by the final judgment of conviction, is conclusive in establishing this ground for termination. See Lee v. State Board of Dental Examiners, 29 Wis.2d 330, 139 N.W.2d 61 (1966); In re Estate of Safran, 102 Wis.2d 79, 306 N.W.2d 27 (1981). Whether the conviction resulted from a trial, guilty plea, or no contest plea, the judgment of conviction is admissible and determinative. Lee, *supra* at 334-35; Safran, *supra* at 97.

Child Trafficking. In April 2012, 2011 Wisconsin Act 271 went into effect, which allows courts to terminate parental rights in cases involving child trafficking. Under existing law, the parental rights of a parent to his or her child may be terminated involuntarily if the person commits a serious felony against one of his or her children. 2025 Wisconsin Act 56 amended the trafficking statutes without changing their elements. The Act increased the penalty for trafficking of a child under s. 948.051 from a Class C felony to a Class B felony, imposed a mandatory minimum 15-year term of initial confinement for convictions under s. 948.051, created a 10-year mandatory minimum for human trafficking under s. 940.302, and extended the statute of limitations for prosecuting human trafficking. These changes do not affect the definition of a “serious felony” under s. 48.415(9m). A parent’s final judgment of conviction for child trafficking remains conclusive evidence of this ground for termination.

Child neglect resulting in death, as a party to a crime. The court of appeals has held that a conviction for neglect resulting in death, as party to a crime, qualifies as a serious felony if the individual in question directly committed the offense. In the Matter of Termination of Parental Rights to R.M., 2023 WI App 27, 407 Wis.2d 893.

Use of Summary Judgment and Directed Verdicts. The Wisconsin Supreme Court has held that summary judgment is available in the first phase of a TPR proceeding at which parental unfitness is determined. In re Termination of Parental Rights to Alexander V., 2004 WI 47, 271 Wis.2d 1, 678 N.W.2d 856. See Wis JI-Children SM-2, which discusses this decision and the use of summary judgments and directed verdicts.

Conviction. Trial courts need also be aware that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals held that the term “conviction,” as used in Wis. Stat. § 48.415(5)(a) (child abuse), means a “conviction after the appeal as of right has been exhausted. The appeal as of right is limited to the right to appeal to the court of appeals under sec. 808.03, Stats.” Monroe County v. Jennifer V., 200 Wis.2d 678, 690, 548 N.W.2d 837 (Ct. App. 1996).

Attempts. The Committee believes that attempts to commit a serious felony are within the statute's language.

Indian Child Welfare Act. For a termination case involving an Indian child, see Wis JI-Children 420-424.

In 2016, the Wisconsin legislature passed 2015 Wisconsin Act 366, which created the crime of

engaging in repeated acts of physical abuse of the same child. The act requires that to be found guilty; the defendant must have engaged in at least three acts of physical abuse against the child within a specified period.

[This page is intentionally left blank]

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Wis JI-Children Table of Cases Cited

The jury instruction in the right-hand column cites the case in the left-hand column. This is not a list of all cases cited in the instructions.

Case Name	Wis JI Children
A	
Adoptive Couple v. Baby Girl	420, 422, 424
American Family Mut. Ins. Co. v. Dobrzynski	140
Andersen v. Andersen	160
Anderson v. Eggert	160
Ann M. M. v. Rob S.	346, 346A, 346B
Ayala v. Farmers Mut. Auto Ins. Co.	430
B	
Barron County Dep't of Health and Human Services v. J.H.	324A
Black v. General Elec. Co.	160
Brown County v. Shannon R.	324, 324A
C	
Carlson & Erickson v. Lampert Yards	175
Coenen v. Van Handel	140
Collier v. State	140
D	
Dane County Dep't of Human Services v. Hershula B.	313, 314
Dane County Dep't of Human Services v. J.D.	335
Dane County Dep't of Human Services v. John L.-B.	346B
Dane County Department of Human Services v. Ponn P.	335
De Keuster v. Green Bay & W. R.R.	140
Door Cnty. DHFS v. Scott S.	149, SM-2
E	
Eau Claire County Department of Human Services v. S.E.	324
F	
Fischer v. Fischer	60, 61

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Frion v. Craig	115
G	
Giese v. Montgomery Ward, Inc.	185
Grognet v. Fox Valley Trucking Serv.	149
H	
Hareng v. Blanke	195
I	
In Interest of F.Q.	149
In re Alexander V.	370
In re C.E.W.	200
In re Christopher D.	314
In re Estate of Safran	303, 308, 370, 372, 375
In re Gabriella M.	346
In re J.A.B.	303, 308, 370, 372, 375
In re Jason P.S.	SM-1
In re Jessica N.	313, 314
In re Kristeena A.M.S.	301, 303, 308, 335, 370, 372, 375
In re Kyle S.-G.	314
In re Matthew A.H.	SM-1
In re Phillip W.	303, 335, 370, 372, 375
In re T.L.E.-C.	324
In re T.M.S.	324, 324A
In re Z.Y.	324
In the Matter of Termination of Parental Rights to R.M.	372
J	
Jandrt v. Milwaukee Auto Ins. Co.	175
Jefferson County Dep't of Human Services v. J.V.	324A
John M.S. v. Marcy J.S.	230, 232
Johnson v. Cintas Corp. No. 2.	115
Johnson v. Ray	175
Jones v. State	70
K	
K.C. v. B.S.-S.	340

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Kelley v. State	195
Kenosha County v. Jodie W.	324A, SM-2
Kenwood Equip., Inc. v. Aetna Ins. Co.	110
Kewaunee County Dept. of Human Services v. R.I.	420, 422, 424
Klipstein v. Raschein	175
Kohlhoff v. State	70
Koss v. State	125
Kruse v. Horlamus Indus.	175
Kuehn v. Kuehn	170, 175
L	
LaCrosse County v. Tara P.	324A
Lee v. State Board of Dental Examiners	303, 308, 370, 372, 375
Lewandowski v. Continental Casualty Co.	195
Liphford v. State	125
M	
Madison v. Geier	175
Manitowoc County HSD v. Allen J.	SM-2
Manitowoc County HSD v. Ralph B.	301
McCarty v. Weber	140
McGaw v. Wassman	165
Merco Distrib. Corp. v. O. & R. Engines, Inc.	110
Meurer v. ITT General Controls	145
Michelle T. v. Crozier	375
Milbauer v. Transport Employees' Mut. Benefit Soc'y	160, 165
Millonig v. Bakken	140
Monroe County v. Jennifer V.	308, 340, 370, 372, 375
Monroe County v. Kelli B.	350
Mullen v. Reinig	110
Murray v. Holiday Rambler, Inc.	145
N	
Nicholas v. State	125
Nommensen v. American Continental Ins Co.	170, 185
Northern States Power Co. v. Bugher	375

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Novitzke v. State	165
O	
O'Brien v. Chicago & N.W. Ry.	140
Oneida County v. Nicole W.	375
P	
P.M.H. v. Kenosha County	200
Payne v. State	155
Pfeifer v. Standard Gateway Theater, Inc.	430
Portage County Department of Health and Human Services v. Julie G.	324A
Portage County Department of Health and Human Services v. Tanya G.	180, 185, 324A
Q	
R	
Rabata v. Dohner	160, 165
Racine County Human Services Department v. L.H.	185
Racine County Human Services Department v. Latanya D.K.	SM-2
Racine County v. Latasia D.M.	SM-2
S	
S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. v. Morris	149
Salladay v. Town of Dodgeville	70
Schulz v. St. Mary's Hosp.	165
Shawver v. Roberts Corp.	140
Sheboygan County DHHS v. Tanya M.B.	324A
Solberg v. Robbins Lumber Co.	140
St. Croix County Dept of Health and Human Services v. Michael D.	324A
State ex rel. Brajdic v. Seber	170
State ex rel. J.A.S. v. M.E.S.	371, 371A
State v. Alexander	70, 75
State v. Anderson	70, 75
State v. Bobby G.	180, 346, 346A, 346B, SM-2
State v. Connie P.	SM-2
State v. Darcy N. K.	57
State v. Delano W.	346B
State v. Gloria C.	324A

WIS JI-CHILDREN

State v. Gregory L.S.	180
State v. Jimmy J.	185
State v. Kiwana L.	324A
State v. Kruzycki	125
State v. Kuntz	125
State v. Michelle M.	346
State v. Midell	125
State v. Queentesta H.	SM-2
State v. Smith	125
State v. Sohn	125
State v. Stacey P.	180, 324, 324A
State v. Tarrell	70
Steven V. v. Kelly H.	SM-2
Sullivan v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & S.S.M.R. Co.	170
T	
Tammy W-G. v. Jacob T.	346, 346A, 346B
U	
V	
Victorson v. Milwaukee & Suburban Transport. Corp.	170
W	
Walworth County DHHS v. Andrea L.O.	SM-2
Walworth County DHHS v. Roberta J.W.	SM-2
Wangen v. Ford Motor Co.	170, 175
Waukesha County Department of Social Services v. C.E.W.	185
Waukesha County v. Steven H.	324A
Y	
Z	

[This page is intentionally left blank]

WIS JI-CHILDREN

Wis JI-Children

Index

References are to Instruction Numbers

A

Abandonment,
 CHIPS, 210
 left with another person, 314
 left without provision for care, 307
 TPR, 60 days, 305
 TPR, left without care, 307
 TPR, six months, 314
 TPR, three months, 313
 TPR, when child under one year, 308

Absent witness, 150

Abuse,
 advisory effect, 220
 identity of person committing alleged, 220
 methamphetamine manufacturing, 223
 physical, 222
 prostitution, 219
 sexual, 217, 222, 224
 sexual exploitation, 218, 218A, 218B

Abusive behavior, 340, 342

Active efforts (Indian Child Welfare), 410, 414, 420, 424

Adoption, illegal, as CHIPS ground, 236

Advisory verdict, CHIPS abuse, 220

Alcohol,
 consumption of, by expectant mother, 280
 impairment, as CHIPS ground, 265

Arguments of counsel, 110

B

Best interests, child's, in termination proceeding, 301

Burden of proof, 170, 175

C

Care, failure to provide, as CHIPS ground, 233, 250, 255

Care, inadequate, 240, 241, 242, 243

Causal connection, 430

Child trafficking, 372

Child without a parent or guardian, 205

CHIPS,
 abandonment, 210
 abuse, advisory verdict, 220
 abuse by causing child to view or listen to sexual activity, 218C
 abuse by exposing or causing child to expose genitals or pubic area, 218D
 abuse by manufacturing methamphetamine, 216, 223
 abuse by physical injury, 215
 abuse by prostitution, 219
 abuse by sexual contact, 217
 abuse by sexual exploitation, 218, 218A, 218B
 alcohol impairment, 265
 custody, relinquishment of, 212, 303
 drug impairment, 265
 emotional damage, 260
 failure to provide care, 230, 232, 233, 234
 hospitalized parent, 242
 illegal adoption, 236
 illegal placement for care, 235
 inadequate care, 241, 242, 243, 244
 incarcerated parent, 241
 institutionalized parent, 243

WIS JI-CHILDREN

missing parent, 240
parental neglect, refusal, or inability to provide care, 250
physical abuse, 215
placement for care, 235
preliminary instruction, 200
sexual abuse, 217, 218, 218A, 218B, 218C, 218D
substantial risk of abuse by manufacturing methamphetamine, 223
substantial risk of neglect, 255
substantial risk of physical abuse, 222
substantial risk of sexual abuse, 224
without a parent or guardian, 205

Closing, 151, 152

Cognitive limitations of parent, 324A

Composite instruction at conclusion of evidence, 150

Conduct,

pre-petition, 180 (comment)

post-petition, 180 (comment)

Confidentiality, 100, 200, 220, 300

Consideration of best interests, 301

Continuing need of protection or services, 324, 324A, 325, SM-2

Counsel, remarks and arguments of, 110

Credibility, 140

Custody, relinquishment of newborn's, 212, 303

D

Date for jury's finding, 180

Delinquent act (withdrawn), 295

Denial of visitation, 335

Developmental disability of parent, 330

Directed verdict, SM-2

Disabled parent, as TPR ground, 330

Drug impairment, as CHIPS ground, 265

Dual purpose evidence, 301

E

Emotional damage, 260, 412, 422

Evidence, dual purpose, 301

Exhibits, 155

Expert testimony, 160, 165

F

Facts, date of, for jury findings, 180

Failure to assume parental responsibility, 346, 346A, 346B

Failure to provide care, 233, 250, 255

Failure to provide food, clothing, medical or dental care, shelter, 250, 255

Felony against child, 372

Five-sixth verdict, 152, 185, 302

G

Gender-Neutral Language (Comment), 15

Guardian, conduct by, 230, 232, 233, 234, 234A

H

Homicide of parent, 370

Hospitalized parent, 242, 330

I

Identity of alleged abuser, 217, 218, 218A, 218B, 218C, 218D, 220, 222, 223, 224

Impairment, drug or alcohol, 265

Impeachment of witness, 125

Inability to care for, 230

Inability to control, 231

Inadequate care, 240, 241, 242, 243

Incarcerated parent, 241, 324A (comment), 346B

Incestuous parenthood, 350

Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), 120

(comment), 150 (comment), 324 (comment), 324A (comment), 410, 412, 414, 420, 422, 424

Institutionalized parent, 243

J

Judge's demeanor, 120

Judicial notice, SM-2

Juror questions, 57

Jury findings, date for, 180

Jury waiver, SM-2

WIS JI-CHILDREN

K

Knowledge or reason to believe of paternity, 346A

L

Left with another person, 314
Left without provision for care, 307

M

Mental illness of parent, 330
Methamphetamine, manufacturing, 216, 223
Missing parent, 240

N

Necessary care, failure to provide, 250, 255
Neglect,
 parental, as CHIPS ground, 250
 substantial risk of, 255
Newborn, relinquishment of custody of, 212, 303
Notetaking, 60, 61

O

Objections of counsel, 115
Opening, 101
Order of instructions, 10
Other like incapacities, parental disability, 330

P

Parent,
 disability of, 330
 homicide of, 370
 hospitalized, 242, 330
 incarcerated, 241, 324A (comment), 346B
 institutionalized, 243
 mental illness of, 330
 missing, 240
 separate verdict for, 302
 without a, 205
Parental,
 disability, 330
 failure to provide care, as a CHIPS ground, 233

 inability, as CHIPS, 230, 232
 responsibility, failure to assume, 346
Paternity, knowledge of or reason to believe, 346A, 346B
Perpetrator, advisory verdict as to, 220
Physical abuse, substantial risk of, 222
Placement,
 denial of, 335
 for care, illegal, as CHIPS ground, 235
Postpetition conduct, 180 (comment)
Pre-birth behavior of mother, 346 (comment)
Preliminary instruction, 50, 200, 202, 300
Prior involuntary termination, 375
Prostitution, 219
Providing necessary care, parental inability, as CHIPS ground, 232

Q

Questioning of witnesses by jury, 57

R

Reasonable discipline, 215 (Note No. 3)
Reasonable efforts, 324A
Recording played to the jury, 75
Relinquishment of custody of newborn, 212, 303
Remarks of counsel, 110
Responsibility, failure to assume, 346, 346A, 346B
Risk,
 of abuse by manufacturing
 methamphetamine, 223
 of neglect, 255
 of physical abuse, 222
 of sexual abuse, 224

S

Separate grounds, consideration of, 302
Separate verdict for parents, 302
Serious emotional damage, 414, 424
Serious felony against child, 372
Serious physical damage, 412, 422
Sexual abuse,

WIS JI-CHILDREN

CHIPS, 217, 218, 218A, 218B, 218C, 218D, 219
substantial risk of, as CHIPS ground, 224
Sexual assault, parenthood as result of, 371, 371A
Sexual exploitation, 218, 218A, 218B, 218C, 218D
Solicitation of homicide, 370
Special care or treatment, inability to provide, 232, 234
Special verdict questions, interrelationship, 145
Stipulations, SM-2
Stricken testimony, 130
Substantial risk,
of neglect, 255
of abuse by manufacturing methamphetamine, 223
of physical abuse, 222
of sexual abuse, 224
Suggested order of instructions, 10
Summary judgments, see SM-2
Supplemental instruction, 195

T

Termination of parental rights,
abandonment, 305, 307, 308, 313, 314
abusive behavior, 340, 342
commission of serious felony against child, 372
continuing denial of placement or visitation, 335
continuing need, 324, 324A, 325
continuing parental disability, 330
failure to assume parental responsibility, 346, 346A, 346B
homicide of parent, 370
incestuous parenthood, 350
Indian child, 420–424
preliminary instruction, 300
prior TPR, 375
sexual assault, 371, 371A
solicitation of homicide, 370
Transcripts not available for deliberations, 70
Truancy (withdrawn), 290

U

Unable to care for, 230, 233, 234
Unable to provide necessary special treatment or care, 232, 234
Unborn child,
in need of protection or services, 280
preliminary instruction, 202

V

Verdict,
advisory, 220
five-sixth, 185, 302
instruction after, 197
Visitation, denial of, 335

W

Waiver of jury, SM-2
Weight of evidence, 140
Without a parent, child, 205
Witness,
absence of, 150
exercising privilege against self-incrimination, 149
impeachment of, 125

X

Y

Z
