



Mother first contends the court erroneously failed to make findings as to whether SRS' s assistance hampered her progress. See In re J.S. & S.S., 168 Vt. 572, 573-74 (1998) (mem.) (addressing question whether stagnation was caused by events " beyond the parents' control" ). Mother asserts that the evidence shows she was subjected to differing advice from different service providers about proper parenting skills, thereby potentially confusing her with conflicting information. The testimony to which she refers, however, does not support the claim. Irene Delabruere, a parent-educator who instructed mother in parenting skills and supervised many of her visits with the children testified that it was " possible" Donna Bowen, who had also supervised some of the visits, " may" have offered mother " a little different advice." Bowen acknowledged that mother had spoken with her, and explained that she then consulted with Delabruere to ensure that they were coordinated on the information that mother was receiving. Similarly, Patricia Moccia, an SRS social worker, stated that different service providers have " different styles" and acknowledged that it was possible mother had received " different good advice from different people." Neither Bowen, nor Delabruere, nor Moccia, nor any other witness, including mother, testified that mother had actually received conflicting advice or that she had been confused or hampered in her efforts as a result. On the contrary, mother claimed that she had " learned a lot" from SRS. Accordingly, the evidence does not support mother' s claim that SRS provided conflicting advice that contributed to her lack of progress.

Mother also contends that she was " provided with adverse visiting conditions." The only evidence to which she refers in this regard is her social worker' s testimony that the room for supervised visits at the SRS offices is " small," and acknowledgment that the environment can be " artificial" and " might make someone a little nervous." This evidence does not remotely show that the substantial problems which occurred during mother' s visits with the children were caused by SRS or some outside agency. There was no evidence that SRS contributed to mother' s failure to make progress, or that her failure was due to circumstances beyond her control. Accordingly, the court did not err in failing to make findings on these issues.

Mother further contends the court improperly grounded its decision, in part, on her financial difficulties. Mother' s case plan required, among other things, that she retain employment and demonstrate an ability to provide the children with a secure and stable environment. The court' s findings noted that mother had been evicted from an apartment for nonpayment of rent, been fired from her job at Shaw' s for writing checks that were returned for insufficient funds, and shown a general inability to manage her finances despite efforts to assist her in this regard. These findings were relevant to mother' s ability to provide a stable and secure environment, and the court' s conclusion that despite having received extensive services, mother had failed to acquire adequate skills to resume her parenting role. See In re E.B. & J.B., 158 Vt. 8, 14 (1992) (parents' failure to find stable housing and employment, and inability " to organize and regulate the most basis elements of day-to-day living," supported decision to terminate parental rights). Accordingly, we discern no error.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

John A. Dooley, Associate Justice

---

Denise R. Johnson, Associate Justice

---

Marilyn S. Skoglund, Associate Justice

