

*WHAT ARE THE STRATEGIES, IF ANY, THAT STATES ACROSS THE NATION EMPLOY WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE FAMILY COURTS TO WORK COLLABORATIVELY ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN IN CARE?*

**STATE SUMMARY: WEST VIRGINIA**

**State CFSR**

Several court improvement board members were included on the CFSR preparation team. They participated in frequent meetings, and conducted reviews, during both the self-assessment and on-site review phases. Board members were interviewed by the feds on specific portions of the CFSR.

The PIP was approved in October 2002. Court personnel were somewhat involved in the drafting process. Although there were no set drafting meetings that included court and agency representatives, the court was given the opportunity to make recommendations and give their input as to what should go into the PIP. The court also reviewed the PIP before it was submitted to the feds.

**Collaboration Following the Release of the PIP**

Since the PIP was approved in October 2002, the courts and agency have worked together on various projects, some which are part of the PIP, others that are not. The working relationship between the courts and agency is quite unique, as a few CIP board members are key players on the agency side. For example, one CIP board member also serves as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Children and Families. Such dual responsibilities help forge a cooperative working relationship between the courts and agency.

**Ongoing Collaboration**

Court and agency representatives have formed various work groups and committees to address the PIP and related issues. Such collaboration is very constructive and an efficient use of time. Please see Appendix A for more details.

*Legislation.* For every abuse and/or neglect case, a multi-disciplinary team (MDT) is formed, which includes the agency caseworker(s), the attorneys, and the family (the parents, and when appropriate, the child). This team makes recommendations to the court about a specific child's placement and services, for example what reunification efforts should be employed. The court reviews every pending case on a quarterly basis; a team representative must be present at each of these reviews. This requirement exists through the permanency planning review stage.

Before the 2003 legislative change, a judge could simply ignore the recommendations of the MDT. This is because it is ultimately a judicial decision as to where a child should be placed and what services the child should receive.

In 2003, the agency successfully pursued a change in state law to require a judge who does not agree with the MDT's recommendations to hold a hearing to consider evidence from the team as to its rationale for the proposed service plan. If the judge still does not agree with the MDT, the judge must make specific written findings justifying the decision not to adopt the MDT's recommendations. This tends to be an issue in status offense/juvenile delinquency cases more so than in abuse/neglect cases. Judges are more likely to have a difference of opinion from the MDT when it comes to placing and providing services to a status offender or juvenile delinquent. The main rationale behind this legislative change is to make judges more accountable for their decisions.

In addition, court and agency representatives are forming a legislative work group that will craft various legislation, including providing a monitoring agency to address statewide systemic issues, and expanding MDT membership to include school personnel. The goal is to draft this legislation in time for the upcoming legislative session that starts in January.

Committees. Community Service Managers (CSMs), which are local agency directors, plan to start meeting quarterly with judges, and other members of the legal community to deal with reoccurring systemic issues related to the case planning and review process, such as timely psychological evaluations of children and parents.

A hurdle with planning these meetings is that judges, and other members of the legal community, feel separated from the agency, at least in the context of ethical obligations. Judges and attorneys find it hard to discuss the case planning and review process without getting into case specifics. An interdisciplinary work group, that includes both court and agency representation, is designing a protocol to facilitate this process. The goal is to have the protocol researched, drafted, and approved by the state Supreme Court by May 2004.

The Commissioner, along with other agency personnel, represents the agency on the Court Improvement Oversight Board. The goal of this representation is to incorporate agency efforts into the CIP Strategic Plan. The Commissioner also meets quarterly with the Prosecuting Attorney's Institute. The Institute provides training and support for county prosecutors (55 counties), as well as special prosecutors if a prosecutor is disqualified from a particular case.

Court representative will be appointed to the agency's Quality Improvement Council (QIC) any day now. QIC members track and review the progress of the PIP, and make sure goals are being met.

Title IV-E. There has been agency and court collaboration to provide a set of Title IV-E form orders for judges to use in child protection cases. Downloadable software that provides abuse and neglect form orders is available at <http://www.wvjanis.com>. Once all of these forms get final approval from the state Supreme Court, they will all be available online, hopefully by the end of this year. Juvenile delinquency and status offender form orders are not part of Janis yet, so they are not available online yet.

Trainings. All court trainings are coordinated with the agency's training committee, so that the agency and courts are not going in different directions, and do not schedule simultaneous

trainings. There are six trainings every year from January through the summer. There are two tracks, a basic and an advanced track. The basic track focuses on the essentials in West Virginia law and procedures; the advanced track is more specific, and focuses on detailed areas of the law, such as special needs. The trainings are done regionally, and include up to six counties at a time. Between 40-150 people attend each training session.

On October 22, 2003, the annual statewide judicial conference included a presentation jointly prepared and presented by the court and agency on what judges can do to help implement the PIP.

### **Conclusion**

There is collaboration between the courts and agency on various parts of the PIP. This will continue as the goals of both the PIP and CIP Strategic Plan are implemented and achieved.

**APPENDIX A: WEST VIRGINIA PIP EXTRACT**

Other items that we had identified that the review confirmed was the involvement of children and families in the treatment planning process. The frame work of CAPS will require that the family and child, if of the age and ability to participate, will be involved in the treatment planning process. The treatment planning process in West Virginia is referred to as the Multi-Disciplinary Team or MDT. To strengthen the involvement of families and the recommendations made by the MDT, the Bureau got a change made in our state law in the 2003 legislative session making families a part of the MDT process and strengthening the decisions made by the MDT with the court. As a result judges who do not agree with the recommendation of the MDT must hold a hearing to consider evidence from the team as to its rationale for the proposed service plan. If the court does not adopt the team's recommended service plan, it shall make a specific written finding as to why the team's recommended service plan was not adopted. As part of the CAPS framework the CAPS coordinator and DHHR worker will have a Family Meeting to discuss the assessment process/findings and the MDT. The purpose is to explain the MDT process and the need for their participation in the meeting.

All of the aforementioned efforts are directed at improving the quality of services and outcomes to children and families. It is recognized that the Department cannot achieve all of these initiatives alone. We are heavily dependent on our collaborative relationships with stakeholders such as: private providers, court and judicial systems, as well as education and mental health systems. We look forward to strengthening existing relationships and forging new ones in order to achieve the outcomes of safety, permanency and well-being for the children and families in West Virginia.

<p>Item 9: Adoption</p> <p>Items contributing to Non-Conformity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DHHR has not made diligent efforts to achieve adoptions in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Caseworkers do not believe that adoption is an option for all children, particularly older children.</li> <li>• Caseworker attitudes.</li> <li>• Lack of concurrent planning.</li> <li>• Inconsistencies regarding level of knowledge among workers regarding adoption and subsidy.</li> <li>• More training of staff on permanency and adoption issues.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Increase the number of adoptions completed within 24 months from 26.4 to 29.4%.</p>	<p>1. See Item #7, step 1</p>	<p>Case reviews</p>	<p>1a. See Item 7, 1a-1c</p>	<p>Projected: 1a. 7-04</p>	<p>Projected:</p>
				<p>2. Increase stakeholder knowledge and awareness of Adoption, Permanency, and Concurrent planning. (BCF Commissioner)</p>		<p>2a. Training module developed and integrated in PRIDE.</p> <p>2b. See Item 6, Benchmark 3a-e</p> <p>2c. Technical Assistance from NRC on Legal and Judicial Training requested. State technical assistance request approved by ACF regional office.</p> <p>2d. Legal training completed in conjunction with the Supreme Court Improvement Board's PIP requirements.</p>	<p>2a. 1-04</p> <p>2b. See Item 6 Benchmark 3a-e</p> <p>2c. 10-03</p> <p>2d. 6-04</p>	

<p>Item 9: Adoption</p> <p>Items contributing to Non-Conformity: <b>Continued</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time required to complete the adoption home studies.</li> <li>• Failure to identify and engage fathers early in the process.</li> <li>• <u>Court delays and continuances.</u></li> <li>• Transfer of cases from the caseworker to the adoption worker after TPR.</li> <li>• Relatives who wish to adopt do not always receive the necessary financial and service supports, including an adoption subsidy.</li> <li>• Foster parents not always seen as first option for adoption, not encouraged to adopt, and not provided adoption information.</li> <li>• Child Planning Agencies do not encourage adoption because they lose the foster home.</li> </ul>			<p>Increase the number of adoptions completed within 24 months from 26.4 to 29.4%. <b>Continued</b></p>	<p>3. Remove barriers to timely adoptions. (BCF Commissioner)</p>	<p>Case reviews AFCARS</p>	<p>3a. Subsidy approval process decentralized.</p> <p>3b. Standardized case transfer process developed (statewide)</p> <p>3c. Implemented standardized case transfer process.</p> <p>3d. Approved all providers as foster/adoptive in initial study.</p> <p>3e. Developed performance and incentive based contracts with specialized foster care agencies.</p> <p>3f. New contracts implemented.</p> <p>3g. Feasibility study for electronic C.I.B completed.</p>	<p>Projected: 3a. 12-03</p> <p>3b. 10-03</p> <p>3c. 11-03</p> <p>3d. 1-04</p> <p>3e. 8-03</p> <p>3f. 9-03</p> <p>3g. 6-04</p>	
<p>Item 9: Adoption <b>Continued</b></p>			<p>Increase the number of adoptions completed within 24 months from 26.4 to 29.4%. <b>Continued</b></p>	<p>4. Identify absent parents (see WB-1, Item 17 Action Step 3).</p>	<p>Case reviews AFCARS</p>	<p>4. see WB-1, Item 17 Action Step 3</p>	<p>Projected: 4. see WB-1, Item 17 Action Step 3</p>	
<p>Length of Time To Achieve Permanency Goal of Adoption (Statewide data indicator relating to Item 9)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Improve quality of data around discrepancies between FC and Adoption databases to 98% accuracy.</p>	<p>1. FACTS refresher training to address appropriate use of “exit reasons” in cases where children are leaving care to adoption. (Assistant Commissioner, Information Technology and Training)</p> <p>2. Develop and utilize report to capture data discrepancies between FC and Adoption databases. (Assistant Commissioner, Information Technology and Training)</p>	<p>AFCARS</p>	<p>Training to adoption staff and supervisors completed.</p> <p>2a. Report developed.</p> <p>2b. Ninety-eight (98%) of cases reviewed showed consistency between the FC and Adoption databases.</p>	<p>Projected: 12-03</p> <p>Actual:</p> <p>2a. 10-03</p> <p>2b. 6-04</p>	<p>Projected:</p> <p>Actual:</p>

<p>Item 25: Provides a process that ensures that each child has a written case plan to be developed jointly with the child's parent(s) that includes the required provisions. <b>Continued</b></p>			<p>1. Increase involvement of parents, children, foster parents, pre-adoptive, and relatives caregivers in the case planning case review process from 50% to 70% by June 2005. <b>Continued</b></p>	<p>6. <u>CSMs and Regional Attorneys will meet quarterly with Circuit Court Judges as needed to address all issues pertaining to the case planning and review process.</u> (BCF Deputy Commissioner)</p> <p>7. <u>Commissioner will represent the DHHR Secretary on the Court Improvement Oversight Board and meet quarterly with the Prosecuting Attorney's Institute.</u> (BCF Commissioner)</p>	<p>OPQI District Reviews Peer Reviews FACTS management reports Supervisory reviews <b>Continued</b></p>	<p>6. First meeting with Circuit Court Judges.</p> <p>7a. <i>Attended quarterly meetings of the Court Improvement Oversight Board.</i></p> <p>7b. Attended the Prosecuting Attorney's Institute.</p>	<p>Projected: 6. 8-03</p> <p>7a. 6-05</p> <p>7b. 6-05</p>	
<p>Item 26: <u>Provides a process for the periodic review of the status of each child, no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. <u>Increase the percentage of administrative and judicial reviews completed for children by 10% from established baseline.</u></p>	<p>1. Establish a baseline. (Assistant Commissioner, Planning &amp; Quality Improvement)</p> <p>2. Develop a process guide for periodic reviews. (Assistant Commissioner, Child &amp; Family Policy)</p> <p>3. See Item 25 Action Steps 5 &amp; 6.</p>	<p>FACTS report Case review</p>	<p>1. Baseline established.</p> <p>2a. Process guide developed.</p> <p>2b. Process guide implemented.</p> <p>3. See Item 25, Benchmark 5 &amp; 6.</p>	<p>Projected: 1. 10-03</p> <p>2a. 1-04</p> <p>2b. 4-04</p> <p>3. See Item 25 Benchmark 5 &amp; 6.</p>	<p>Projected:</p>
<p>Item 27: <u>Provides a process that ensures that each child in foster care under the supervision of the State has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Increase the percentage of permanency hearings for children, within 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter, by 10% from established baseline.</p>	<p>See Items 25, Steps 1-6 &amp; Item 26 Step 1</p>		<p>See Items 25, Benchmark 1-6 &amp; Item 26 Benchmark 1</p>	<p>See Items 25, Benchmark 1-6 &amp; Item 26 Benchmark 1</p>	
<p>Item 38: <u>In implementing the provisions of the CFSP, the State engages in ongoing consultation with tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals and objectives of the CFSP.</u></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<p>Projected:</p>	<p>Projected:</p>

<p>Item 29: Provides a process for foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care to be notified of, and have an opportunity to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. Increase the percentage of cases which demonstrate notification to foster parents, pre-adoptive, and relatives caregivers in the case planning case review process by 10% from established baseline.</p>	<p>1. Establish baseline. (Assistant Commissioner, Planning &amp; Quality Improvement)</p> <p>2. See Item 25, Steps 1-6</p> <p>3. <u>Staff will provide the Prosecuting Attorney with the necessary information to notify all parties entitled to notice of judicial hearings.</u> (BCF Deputy Commissioner)</p> <p>4. <u>Staff will follow up on notifications to all parties entitled to notice of Judicial Hearing and/or other reviews.</u> (BCF Deputy Commissioner)</p>	<p>FACTS reports Case review</p>	<p>1. Baseline established.</p> <p>2. See Item 25 Benchmarks 1-6</p> <p>3. Start notifications to Prosecuting Attorneys.</p> <p>4. Start follow-ups on notifications.</p>	<p>Projected: 1. 10-03</p> <p>2. See Item 25 Benchmarks 1-6</p> <p>3. 7-03</p> <p>4. 7-03</p>	
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	---	---	--

**WEST VIRGINIA’S STRATEGIC PLAN EXTRACT**

Issue to be addressed	Activity	Responsibility	Timeline	Interim Benchmark	Outcome	Indicator
<p>Safety -- Risk of harm to children.</p>	<p>1) <u>Provide cross-disciplinary training on:</u> assessing and providing services to disabled parents and children with special needs; and identifying and addressing the interplay between domestic violence and child maltreatment.</p> <p><u>1a) Annually determine regions of State where cross-training needed.</u></p> <p><u>1b) Coordinate with Bureau for Children &amp; Families (BCF) regarding assessment/services training issues.</u></p> <p><u>1c) Cross-training scheduling.</u></p> <p><u>1d) Complete cross-training sessions targeted each year.</u></p>	<p>1a) CIP Training Subcomm./Dom. Viol.-Child Maltreatment Joint Task Force/Children’s Justice Task Force</p> <p>1b) CIP Training Subcommittee/BCF Assist. Comm’r for Inform. Tech. &amp; Training/Dom. Viol.-Child Maltreatment Joint Task Force/Children’s Justice Task Force</p> <p>1c) CIP Training Subcommittee</p> <p>1d) CIP Training Subcommittee with contract agency for support services (Kanawha Valley Family Services)</p>	<p>1a) 9/30 ann.</p> <p>1b) 9/30 ann.</p> <p>1c) 1/15 ann.</p> <p>1d) 8/30 ann.</p>	<p><u>Judges, lawyers, and CPS staff in targeted regions trained on disability/special needs issues and impact of domestic violence on child safety.</u></p>	<p>Increase percentage of cases from 74% to 80% that are rated as a strength in reducing risk of harm to children.</p> <p>(CFSR Outcome S2 Item 4)</p> <p>(1996 CIP Assmt Rpt/ Imp Plan-Recommendations for Improvement in Leadership, Management and Review, Rec. 3)</p>	<p>State CFSR Baseline: 74%</p> <p>State Goal: 80% (6/05)</p>
<p>Safety -- Risk of harm to children.</p>	<p>2) Provide legislation to create a</p>	<p>2a) C. J. Sup. Ct./ Judge</p>	<p>2a) 8/1/03</p>	<p>Submission of proposed</p>	<p>Increase percentage of cases</p>	<p>State CFSR</p>

Issue to be addressed	Activity	Responsibility	Timeline	Interim Benchmark	Outcome	Indicator
	<p>mechanism to monitor child maltreatment cases, enforce ASFA-compliant statutes, court rules and agency policies, and address systemic deficiencies in achieving timely permanency outcomes.</p> <p>2a) <u>Form interdisciplinary workgroup for legislation.</u></p> <p>2b) Research legislation from other jurisdictions.</p> <p>2c) Review existing WV legislation.</p> <p>2d) Draft report and proposed new/amended legislation.</p> <p>2e) Review, revise, and approve report and proposed legislation.</p> <p>2f) Submit report and proposed legislation to legislature.</p> <p>2g) Prepare further revisions and testimony as needed.</p>	<p>Reed/Sec'y Nusbaum</p> <p>2b) Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>2c) Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>2d) Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>2e) Legislation Workgroup/Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>2f) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Comm'r Boothe</p> <p>2g) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Comm'r Boothe</p>	<p>2b) 10/1/03</p> <p>2c) 10/1/03</p> <p>2d) 11/15/03</p> <p>2e) 12/15/03</p> <p>2f) 1/15/04</p> <p>2g) 3/1/04</p>	<p>bill to legislature for enactment.</p>	<p>from 74% to 80% that are rated as a strength in reducing risk of harm to children.</p> <p>(CFSR Outcome S2 Item 4)</p>	<p>Baseline: 74%</p> <p>State Goal: 80% (6/05)</p>
<p>Permanency -- Permanency goal for child.</p>	<p>3) Update and revise the forms and orders relating to the Multidisciplinary Treatment Team (MDT) and permanency reviews in the Juvenile Abuse &amp; Neglect Information System (JANIS) software application.</p> <p>3a) <u>Establish interdisciplinary workgroup for forms.</u></p> <p>3b) Research and draft revised and/or new forms.</p> <p>3c) Incorporate draft forms into JANIS.</p> <p>3d) Workgroup review and finalize proposed forms.</p> <p>3e) Pilot court test of new forms.</p> <p>3f) Revised and tested forms submitted to Sup. Ct. for approval.</p> <p>3g) Updated forms released in new JANIS version for Statewide use.</p>	<p>3a) C. J. Sup. Ct./ Judge Reed/ Comm'r Boothe</p> <p>3b) Hedges/Conley</p> <p>3c) Hedges/Conley with contractor-programmer On-Site Services, Inc.</p> <p>3d) Forms Workgroup</p> <p>3e) Designated pilot court(s)</p> <p>3f) Judge Reed/Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir.</p> <p>3g) Hedges/Conley with On-Site Services</p>	<p>3a) 8/1/03</p> <p>3b) 11/15/03</p> <p>3c) 1/30/04</p> <p>3d) 3/15/04</p> <p>3e) 6/1/04</p> <p>3f) 6/15/04</p> <p>3g) 7/15/04</p>	<p>Tested forms approved by Supreme Court.</p>	<p>Children will have appropriate permanency goals established and achieved in a timely manner.</p> <p>(CFSR Outcome P1 Item 7)</p> <p>(1996 CIP Assmt Rpt/ Imp Plan-Recommendations for Improvement of Court Orders, Rec. 1, 2 and 3)</p>	<p>Children with appropriate and timely permanency goals established in 75% of cases reviewed (9/05)</p>
<p>Permanency -- Permanency goal for child.</p>	<p>4) Draft and provide legislation making appropriate school personnel mandatory members of MDT when a child is of school age.</p> <p>4a) <u>Form interdisciplinary workgroup for legislation.</u></p> <p>4b) Review existing WV legislation.</p> <p>4c) Draft report and proposed</p>	<p>4a) C. J. Sup. Ct./ Judge Reed/Sec'y Nusbaum</p> <p>4b) Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>4c) Conley/DHHR Counsel</p> <p>4d) Legislation</p>	<p>4a) 8/1/03</p> <p>4b) 9/1/03</p> <p>4c) 10/15/03</p> <p>4d) 12/1/03</p> <p>4e) 1/15/04</p> <p>4f) 3/1/04</p>	<p>Submission of proposed bill to legislature for enactment.</p>	<p>Children will have appropriate permanency goals established and achieved in a timely manner.</p> <p>(CFSR Outcome P1 Item 7)</p> <p>(1996 CIP Assmt Rpt/ Imp</p>	<p>Children with appropriate and timely permanency goals established in 75% of cases reviewed (9/05).</p>

	new/amended legislation. 4d) Review, revise, and approve report and proposed legislation. 4e) Submit report and proposed legislation to legislature. 4f) Prepare further revisions and testimony as needed.	Workgroup/Conley/DH HR Counsel 4e) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Comm'r Boothe 4f) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Comm'r Boothe			Plan-Recommendations for Improvement of Court Orders, Rec. 1, 2 and 3)	
Permanency -- Need for increased understanding and training on permanency and adoption issues.	6) <u>Provide cross-disciplinary training on ASFA, permanency planning, preparation for adult living, and the role and effective functioning of MDTs.</u> 6a) Annually develop proposed training curriculum. 6b) Review and approve training curriculum. 6c) <u>Determine training regions.</u> 6d) <u>Cross-training scheduling.</u> 6e) <u>Complete cross-training targeted each year.</u>	6a) CIP Training Subcom./BCF Assist. Comm'r for Inform. Tech. & Training 6b) CIP Board 6c) CIP Training Subcomm./BCF Assist. Comm'r for Inform. Tech & Training 6d) CIP Training Subcomm. 6e) CIP Training Subcomm. with contract agency for support services (Kanawha Valley Family Services)	6a) 11/1 ann. 6b) 12/15 ann. 6c) 2/1 ann. 6d) 4/1 ann. 6e) 1/30 ann.	<u>Judges, lawyers, and CPS staff in targeted regions trained on ASFA requirements, permanency planning, independent living, and the MDT process.</u>	Increase the number of adoptions completed within 24 months from 26.4% to 29.4%.  (CFSR Outcome P1 Item 9)  (1996 CIP Assmt Rpt/ Imp Plan-Recommendations for Improvement in Leadership, Management and Review, Rec. 3)	State Baseline: 17.3% (FY 2000 State Data Profile)  Goal: 29.4% (6/06)
Permanency -- Insures a timely process for achieving safe permanency for children in accordance with the provisions of ASFA.	7) Inform and educate judges on permanency efforts and timeframes under federal and State law, and provide resource materials to promote judicial leadership. 7a) <u>Provide presentation on judicial roles and responsibilities in the CFSR/PIP process at Statewide Judicial Conference.</u> 7b) <u>Research and draft updated narrative and checklists for CIP Abuse &amp; Neglect Benchbook.</u> 7c) <u>Review and revise updated drafts for Benchbook.</u> 7d) <u>Produce and distribute updated Benchbook.</u> 7e) <u>Post updated Benchbook on Sup. Ct./ CIP/DHHR websites.</u> 7f) Provide presentations and training to judges and prosecutors concerning JANIS at education conferences and in circuits as requested.	7a) Judge Reed/AO Judicial Ed. Dir./ ABA Child Res. Ctr. 7b) Hedges/Conley 7c) CIP Board 7d) AO Staff 7e) AO/CIP/DHHR Webmasters 7f) Conley	7a) 10/15/03 7b) 8/15/03 7c) 9/15/03 7d) 10/15/03 7e) 10/15/03 7f) 12/15/04	Judges are trained and fully informed on the permanency requirements and timeframes under ASFA and State law, and have form orders to address all requirements for timely achieving permanency.	Children in care will have appropriate permanency goals established and achieved in a timely manner.  (CFSR Outcome P1 Item 6, Item 7, Item 9, Item 10)  (1996 CIP Assmt Rpt/ Imp Plan-Recommendations for Improvement in Leadership, Management and Review, Rec. 4)	State Baseline of cases rated as having substantially achieved permanency: 38%  Goal: 50% (6/05)  State Date Profile of children achieving a finalized adoption within 24 months of entry into care: 17.3%  Goal: National Standard of 32% (6/05)
Case Review System -- Provides a process that ensures that each child has a written case plan developed jointly with the child's parent(s) that includes the required provisions.	8) <u>Establish by court rule or protocol quarterly meetings with circuit court judges, DHHR community service managers and regional attorneys, and</u>	8a) C. J. Sup. Ct./ Judge Reed/ Comm'r Boothe 8b) Hedges/DHHR Counsel	8a) 12/1/03 8b) 3/1/04 8c) 4/15/04 8d) 5/1/04	Promulgation of rule/protocol for quarterly collaborative meetings in each judicial circuit for	Timely and effective implementation of child and family case plans and use of the MDT process to increase	Involvement of parents, children, foster parents, pre-adoptive parents,

	<p><u>other appropriate stakeholders for the purpose of addressing systemic issues pertaining to the case planning and review process.</u></p> <p>8a) <u>Form interdisciplinary workgroup for collaborative rule/protocol.</u></p> <p>8b) Research and draft proposed rule/protocol.</p> <p>8c) Review and revise propose rule/protocol.</p> <p>8d) Submit proposed rule/protocol to Sup. Ct. for approval.</p> <p>8e) Provide training on approved collaborative rule/protocol.</p>	<p>8c) Rule/Protocol Workgroup</p> <p>8d) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Judge Reed</p> <p>8e) Sup. Ct. AO Judicial Education Dir./TA from ABA Child Welfare Resource Center</p>	<p>8e) 10/1/04</p>	<p>addressing systemic issues pertaining to the case planning and review process.</p>	<p>involvement of parents, children, foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative-caregivers in the case planning/case review process.</p> <p>(CFSR Outcome SF2 Item 25)</p>	<p>and relative-caregivers in the case planning/ review process</p> <p>State Baseline: 50%</p> <p>State Goal: 70% (6/05)</p>
<p>Case Review System -- Provides a process for the periodic review of the status of each child, no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.</p>	<p>10) <u>Design and secure funding for an automated information system to track cases, notify and remind circuit courts of upcoming case deadlines, measure performance, generate data reports, and facilitate linkage or data sharing with the DHHR-FACTS database.</u></p> <p>10a) Secure CIP representation on the Sup. Ct. Technology Committee.</p> <p>10b) Investigate information systems in other state court systems.</p> <p>10c) Obtain TA from ABA Child Res. Ctr.</p> <p>10d) Draft report to CIP Board.</p> <p>10e) Design model AIS for abuse and neglect cases.</p> <p>10f) Submit grant proposals and obtain funding for AIS for abuse and neglect cases.</p>	<p>10a) Sup. Ct. Admin. Dir./Judge Reed</p> <p>10b) AO Tech. Comm. Members</p> <p>10c) CIP Tech. Comm. Members</p> <p>10d) CIP Tech. Comm. Members</p> <p>10e) AO Tech. Comm. Members</p> <p>10f) CIP Tech. Comm. Members</p>	<p>10a) 8/15/03</p> <p>10b) 2/15/04</p> <p>10c) 4/15/04</p> <p>10d) 7/1/04</p> <p>10e) 11/1/04</p> <p>10f) 12/1/05</p>	<p>AIS for abuse and neglect cases fully designed.</p>	<p>Provide and implement an automated information system for management and tracking abuse and neglect cases in circuit courts.</p>	<p>Operation of AIS for abuse and neglect cases in 2 pilot courts by 12/06.</p>
<p><u>Quality Assurance System -- Collaborative efforts between the State agency and the court system to ensure standards in quality services that protect the safety and health of children.</u></p>	<p>11) <u>Secure CIP representation on State/ Regional agency Quality Improvement Council.</u></p>	<p>11) Judge Reed/BCF Comm'r Boothe</p>	<p>11) 8/1/03</p>	<p>CIP Board nominees identified.</p>	<p>Continued strength in development and implementation of standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their safety and health.</p>	<p>CIP representation on State Quality Improvement Council.</p>