

State Court Improvement Program 2020 Annual Self-Assessment Report

This self-assessment is intended as an opportunity for Court Improvement Programs (CIPs) to review progress on required CIP projects, joint program planning and improvement efforts with the child welfare agency, and the ability to integrate CQI successfully into practice. Questions are designed to solicit candid responses that help CIPs apply CQI and identify support that may be helpful.

- i. **CQI Analyses of Required CIP Projects** (Joint Project with Agency, Hearing Quality Project) *It is ok to cut and paste responses from last year, but please update according to where you currently are in the process.*

Joint Project with the Child Welfare Agency:

STATEWIDE JUVENILE DEPENDENCY MEDIATION PROGRAM

Provide a concise description of the joint project selected in your jurisdiction.

The purpose of the Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program (JDMP) is to improve system processing of dependency cases; to better engage families; thereby decreasing time to permanency and termination of parental rights (TPR). In so doing, it helps stabilize children's lives by getting them into safe, stable, and permanent homes in a timely manner consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

Mediation has been used to enhance the quality of the dependency process by providing the parties an opportunity to enter into a discussion in which the parties voluntarily resolve the issues that brought the family into the dependency system and produce a written agreement in lieu of a contested hearing. Contested hearings tend to be especially painful for children, as they may be required to testify against their parents. Mediations allow children to avoid this trauma, as mediations tend to focus on the family's strengths. Benefits of mediation in child dependency cases include: improved outcomes for children from decreased time to permanency to improved well-being, enhanced parental engagement to safely reunify with the child, time and cost savings, and system efficiency.

Dependency mediation has been identified by child welfare, the judiciary and the Community Improvement Councils (CIC) throughout the State as an intervention to ameliorate timeliness issues. Following extensive research to verify that mediation was an appropriate service, the Division of Child and Family Services and CIP agreed that this was indeed a viable, evidence-

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-13), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number with expiration date. The estimated time to complete the CIP Annual Self-Assessment is 77 hours.

based best practice to help the children move into a permanent home situation in a more timely manner. Former parent's counsel Emilie Meyer, perhaps, said it best when she observed, "*Dependency mediation creates a humane place for these discussions.*" It finds solutions that offer better outcomes for children and a quicker path to permanency for the child outside the litigious and often traumatizing environment of the courtroom.

Identify the specific safety, permanency, or well-being outcome(s) this project is intended to address.

The specific outcome expected as a result of implementing a statewide juvenile dependency mediation program is to improve timeliness to permanency and TPR by improving case processing and parental engagement.

Approximate date that the project began:

July 1, 2016

Which stage of the CQI process best describes the current status of project work?

Implemented and constantly being fine-tuned. The value of JDMP to the courts has been demonstrated to such an extent that the Nevada Supreme Court memorialized funding for JDMP in its budget.

How was the need for this project identified? (Phase I)

Dependency Mediation was initially identified in the 2nd Judicial District's (JD) CIC action plan as a means to improve timeliness to permanency and termination of parental rights (TPR) by improving case processing and parental engagement. This area in need of improvement was identified during the Round Two of the Child and Families Services Review (CFSR) and, again, during Round Three of the CFSP (2019) resulting Program Improvement Plans (PIP). The 2nd draft of the most current PIP outlined several Outcomes and Systemic Factors to be addressed during the PIP implementation period. Specifically, Outcome 1, Item 4 "Is the child is a stable placement?", Item 5, "Did the agency establish appropriate permanency goals for the child in a timely manner, and Item 6, "Did the agency make concerted efforts to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanency living arrangement for the child". And Systemic Factors under Case Review System, Item 22, to ensure timely filing of TPRs.

CIP first funded dependency mediation as a pilot project in the 2nd JD in 2011. Research indicates that programs implemented in a manner consistent with national and state guidelines and best practices can be expected to offer an improvement over traditional child welfare proceedings. National evaluations of mediation programs find that mediations tend to result in full or partial agreement in at least 70% of cases. Of course, simply producing agreements is not the only goal of mediation. There is substantial support across a variety of studies that mediation provides parents and other participants an opportunity to talk and discuss the issues they believe are

necessary for the family's success. The ability to be heard has been a consistent theme in the JDMP's exit surveys which provide quantitative and qualitative data on non-professional (parents, foster parents, etc.) and professional participant's response to mediation.

As a result of the success of the pilot juvenile dependency mediation project in the 2nd JD, using the same refined protocols, four more pilots were launched in Clark, Nye, the northern rural Nevada Counties, and the Washoe Tribe. These four programs met with similar success – 78% to 100% agreement rates, improved parental engagement particularly in hearings, and enhanced communication among case parties.

Research has demonstrated that not only is juvenile dependency mediation successful in producing agreement at every stage of a dependency case, but it also provides an atmosphere in which all parties feel heard. When parties are heard they are likely to become more engaged in the case with an increased likelihood of positive outcomes. Additionally, research has shown that time from petition to permanency is less for mediated cases when compared to a control group of cases not mediated. Prior research has shown that mediation is an empirically supported practice with a demonstrated relationship to engaging parents and improving outcomes in child welfare cases (Gatowski, Dobbin, Litchfield, & Oetjen, 2005; Thoennes, 2008). Nevada's mediation program has promising findings from two early studies of the Washoe County mediation program: better involvement of fathers following mediation and a higher likelihood the case will achieve reunification (Summers, Wood, Bohannon, Gonzalez, & Sicafuse, 2013). A more recent Nevada mediation study showed mediations have higher rates of adoption than non-mediated cases, and that mediations are more likely to result in reunification with both parents (Siegel, Ganasarajah, Gatowski, Sickmund, & Devault, 2017).

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II) If you do not yet have a theory of change and/or would like assistance, please indicate such in the space below.

The engagement of all case parties in a non-adversarial dispute resolution process when disagreements occur (e.g., denial of the petition or TPR petition, and disagreements over case plan or placement), is expected to reduce contention among the parties, lead to agreement, and allow both the professionals and the parents to feel fully engaged and vested in the process. This is expected to lead to increased parental engagement in future hearings and increased likelihood that parents will work their case plans. This will, in turn, lead to long term outcomes such as improved time to permanency and reunification rates.

Court hearing quality studies, including those conducted in Nevada, indicate that hearings in which children, parents, and their attorneys are present are more likely to result in reunification. When parents are offered the opportunity to be heard, their children are less likely to age out of the system. When parents engage in discussion of efforts to reunify, the time to permanency for their

children is decreased. If one extrapolates, such characteristics of quality hearings and positive outcomes to mediation, it would be expected that mediation would have similar positive impacts.

Some of the lack of timeliness to permanency and TPR may be due to the fact that parents may not be engaged in working their case plans. Research has demonstrated that not only is mediation successful in producing agreement across a wide range of case types, but it also provides an atmosphere in which all parties feel heard. When parties are heard they are likely to become more engaged in the case with an increased likelihood of positive outcomes. Additionally, research has shown that time from petition to permanency is less for mediated cases when compared to a control group of cases not mediated.

Mediation is used to improve the quality of the dependency process by providing the parties an opportunity to enter into a discussion in which the parties voluntarily resolve the issues that brought the family into the dependency system and produce a written agreement in lieu of a potentially traumatic contested hearing. Mediations tend to focus on the family's strengths. Benefits of mediation in child dependency cases include: time savings, efficiency, parental engagement, and improved outcomes for children.

Have you identified a solution/intervention that you will implement? If yes, what is it? (Phase III)

Yes, Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation (JDMP) implemented in a consistent manner using a facilitative, co-mediation model with continual quality improvement. The JDMP is administered by a highly qualified mediator with a specifically trained mediation panel.

What has been done to implement the project? (Phase IV)

As a result of the pilot mediation programs' success, the CICs, Child Welfare and CIP launched the Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program (JDMP) on July 1, 2016, with a full panel of mediators who were specifically trained and certified in dependency mediation. Another 40-hour dependency mediation training was conducted in April 2018 and another in July 2019, enlarging the panel of mediators to accommodate the increased demand and the expansion of JDMP's model to co-mediation. A highly skilled Administrator manages the Program and guides the mediators, ensuring fidelity to program design and process across the state. She conducts monthly mediator trainings, schedules mediations as they are received via court order or direct referral from Child Welfare, co-mediates with mediators on particularly difficult mediations, and assists judicial districts in creating their internal mediation referral processes. All JDMP mediations throughout the state follow the facilitative co-mediation model.

In all districts, the judges and their CICs have been actively involved in determining how mediation will function within their districts. The program design allows referral to mediation at any stage

during the legal process. It includes collecting participant and outcome data with standardized data collection tools designed by NCJFCJ.

Protocols, procedures, and forms have been created to ensure consistent implementation. Brochures were developed (Appendix 1) explaining the mediation process and expected outcomes to the parents. The intent is for the court to note time, date, and location of the mediation on the brochure at the time the judge ordered mediation. However, in some of the smaller jurisdictions child welfare has taken an active role in advocating for mediation when a case gets “stuck” by contacting the CIP Coordinator directly. The brochure has become an educational tool for other stakeholders, as well.

The JDMP Administrator, as well as the CIP Coordinator, provide trainings to child welfare, attorneys, and judges regarding the use and benefits of JDMP and their unique role both before and during the mediations. The attorney training conducted in the 8th JD was video-taped (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKAwJrLEcQS_j4eAfcq7zqQ) for future use. The JDMP developed extensive forms and protocols for the program and created an implementation “toolkit” complete with a video on YouTube (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OaD4M-EaNk>) that fully explains dependency mediation.

“Children’s Attorney Program (CAP) attorneys have been very pleased with mediation and would like to see it expanded to the other contested proceedings. The process is a genteel and respectful alternative to the winner-take-all mentality of litigation. We can’t say enough about the caliber and professionalism of our mediators.”

Janice Wolf, Director of CAP at LACSN

Mediation is available at all stages of a dependency or TPR case. Once ordered by the court, participation in mediation by all parties to the case is mandatory with the exception of domestic violence cases and cases in which a parent lacks the capacity to make a decision in mediation. CIP received a VOCA grant to fund the mediation portion of the program, and a grant from the Children’s Justice Act Task Force for the trainings, videos, and protocol and brochure development. CIP funded the administration and evaluation of the Program. During the 2019 session of the Nevada Legislature, the Nevada Supreme Court requested and received a budget enhancement to fully fund and expand JDMP into a co-mediation model.

Mediators participate on monthly mediator trainings via facilitated peer to peer conference calls with the JDMP Administrator and CIP Coordinator to discuss program improvements, new issues, and difficult cases. An additional monthly call is held with the lead judge and other judicial leaders in the 8th JD discussing particular implementation issues that arise in this larger jurisdiction where calendaring, for example, became an issue simply because so many courts were ordering mediations into a limited number of slots each week.

What is being done or how do you intend to monitor the progress of the project? (Phase V). Be specific in terms of what type of evaluation (e.g., fidelity or outcome, comparison group, etc.) or data efforts you have in place or plan to have in place to assess your efforts. If you have already evaluated your effort, how did you use these data to modify or expand the project?

As part of the CIP continual quality improvement efforts and to ensure fidelity of implementation, CIP contracted with Drs. Alicia Summers and Sophia Gatowski to conduct an impact assessment on JDMP during the summer of 2019 with results presented during the 2019 CIC Summit. This study was completed with the findings presented at the 2019 CIC Summit.

In 2017, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) was contracted to design the stakeholder surveys and conduct process and satisfaction assessments for the JDMP. NCJFCJ also conducted an impact assessment of the 2nd JD's program because it has been in place long enough for cases to have closed.

During the piloting of dependency mediation in Nevada, NCJFCJ was contracted to conduct assessments of the 2nd, 5th, and 8th JD's mediation programs. NCJFCJ also conducted an initial impact assessment of the 2nd JD's program because it had been in place long enough for cases to have closed.

The NCJFCJ's key findings from their process and satisfaction assessment of the mediation program in the 2nd JD indicate that there is a general perception that mediation is successful. Stakeholders agreed that mediation lessened their workload in preparation and hearings, and is a good alternative to court. The majority of the mediations (78%) resulted in agreement, and non-professional participants felt heard, respected, and treated fairly. Mediated cases had fewer default orders in the 2nd JD. Key findings from the 2nd JD's impact assessment indicate that mediated cases are more likely to result in reunification of the children with their families when compared to non-mediated cases. Among mediated cases that had closed, 88% resulted in reunification. Among the non-mediated closed cases, only 50% resulted in reunification. Findings show that fathers who participated in mediation were more engaged and were present at more hearings compared to fathers who did not participate in mediation. Fathers who participated in mediation attended 72% of all hearings, while those who did not participate in mediation only attended 50% of their hearings (Summers, Wood, Bohannon, Gonzalez, & Sicafuse, 2013). A more recent Nevada mediation study showed mediations have higher rates of adoption than non-mediated cases, and that mediations are more likely to result in reunification with both parents (Siegel, Ganasarajah, Gatowski, Sickmund, & Devault, 2017).

As with the 2nd JD process evaluation, the JDMP process evaluation primarily focused on data obtained from exit surveys completed by participants (e.g., mothers, fathers, children, relatives, foster parents, and others) and professional/system stakeholders (e.g., social workers, deputy district attorneys, attorneys for parents, attorneys for children, and others) at the completion of

their mediation sessions.¹ The surveys received from each district court were aggregated to present process evaluation findings for the statewide mediation program as a whole. In addition to satisfaction indicators drawn from these surveys, preliminary data were also collected from JDMP case data sheets to provide some initial indicators of statewide program performance and outcomes.

Although mediation is available to be used at any point in a case, the initial analyses conducted for this report showed that most cases used the JDMP at the Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) stage of a case. The predominance of TPR cases in the statewide program is largely a reflection of mediation cases in Clark County which has employed all or most of its mediation sessions in TPR matters.

The statewide process evaluation involved analyses of 113 participant surveys and 267 professional stakeholder surveys that were completed during the study period (July 2016 through April 2017) to determine satisfaction levels and to prepare initial suggestions for continued mediation program improvements. These survey figures represent the total numbers of surveys completed by statewide program participants and stakeholders during this 10-month time frame.

Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program Process Evaluation: Key Findings

1. A substantial majority of non-professional program participants (85%) and dependency system stakeholders (98%) expressed overall satisfaction with the statewide mediation program;
2. In this sample, a majority of participants (75%) and stakeholders (72%) indicated that their cases reached full or partial agreements during mediation (the overall agreement rate for the total population July 1, 2016 through June 9, 2017 is **84.4%**). Without mediation, contested issues may have delayed reunification of children with their families and/or delayed other permanency options for children;
3. The results of the surveys administered at the end of the mediations indicate that 95% of the participants felt that they were treated with respect and were able to be part of finding answers to the problems discussed. Additionally, 99% believed that they had an opportunity to voice their opinions. All (100%) of the participants felt that the mediator treated everyone fairly and explained the process clearly. Stakeholders felt that the mediations were conducted fairly (99%), they were treated with respect (99%), they were heard (96%), and had an opportunity to voice their opinions (99%).
4. Participants who expressed satisfaction with mediation (on some questions) reached full or partial agreements more frequently than those who expressed less satisfaction (this finding was shown to be statistically significant for all satisfaction survey questions);
5. No statistically significant differences between the stage in the case when mediation was held and stakeholder satisfaction with mediation were found. This indicates that

¹ In some jurisdictions, assistant attorneys general may represent the state in dependency or TPR matters.

stakeholders were generally satisfied with mediation regardless of the type of legal action or case stage;

6. Nearly half of the mediations resulted in vacated hearings.

Additionally, the program's praises are being sung by the judiciary as exemplified in the 2nd JD's final mediation program report, reflecting on the Dependency Mediation Program in the 2nd Judicial District, Judge Egan Walker observes:

"In cases where the dependency process results in termination of parental rights, mediation is likely one of the few humane processes which we can offer. In the great majority of cases which remain, mediation is reaping benefits through earlier participation of parents and the tantalizing possibility that mediation will be a significant tool with which to accelerate the safe and effective reunification of families."

The dependency mediation pilot program in the 8th JD launched in early 2013 and only had completed 13 mediations at the time the assessment began. Consequently, this assessment conducted by the NCJFCJ only included process and satisfaction evaluations as it was too early to be able to assess the program's impact. As in the 2nd JD, there was a general perception in the 8th JD that mediation is successful and that parties feel heard, respected, and treated fairly during the process. The majority (92%) of the mediations resulted in agreement. Most stakeholders felt that mediation is successful in increasing cooperation among parties and in engaging parents.

The NCJFCJ also completed a process evaluation of dependency mediation in the 5th JD. The results of that process evaluation demonstrate that the dependency mediation program in the 5th JD has had a successful start. Although only 5 mediations have been held, all five have resolved with agreements. There is a general perception from all parties that mediation is a helpful tool in moving their case forward toward permanency for the child.

The data used to assess reduction in time to permanency and TPR are court timeliness and child welfare data from UNITY and Chapin Hall, University of Chicago and AFCARS and NCANDS data compiled by Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina. Last year Nevada added another data resource: the University of North Carolina's Chapel Hill Fostering Court Improvement Data Project. The most recent data provided by Chapel Hill indicates that Exits to Adoption in less than 24 months are trending positively. The fact that all the statistical measures are trending in the directions of improvement since 2010 or 2011 suggests that a systemic change is taking place in Nevada. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of the exits to adoption are taking place in less than 24 months as compared to only 14.6% in 2010. While overall exits to adoption are taking 29.4 months compared to 36.3 months in 2010. (See chart below in Hearing Quality section).

JDMP is growing and successful:

- The overall agreement rate for JDMP is 74%.
- Reduced workload for 69% of stakeholders.
- 94% of stakeholders felt they had an opportunity to voice opinions.
- 98% of stakeholders felt they were treated fairly.

Continued growth during COVID-19:

- Mediators facilitated 269 mediations.
- JDMP has saved 95.65 days in court.
- The agreement rate for JDMP is 70%.

In all districts, the judiciary, Child Welfare, and the CICs have been actively involved in determining how mediation will function within their districts. The program design allows referral to mediation at any stage during the legal process. These referrals can be initiated by any of the parties. It also includes collecting participant and outcome data with tools designed by NCJFCJ.

Mediation is used to improve the quality of the dependency process by providing the parties an opportunity to enter into a discussion in which the parties voluntarily resolve the issues that brought the family into the dependency system and produce a written agreement in lieu of a potentially traumatic, contested hearing. Mediations tend to focus on the family's strengths. Benefits of mediation in child dependency cases include: time savings, efficiency, parental engagement, and improved outcomes for children.

The greatest consequence of foster care is on the children themselves. National and international studies have proven the devastating impact varies from depression to behavioral problems such as aggression and delinquency. In adulthood, former foster children have difficulties establishing long lasting relationships, have lower levels of education and employment, and are more often homeless, arrested, and imprisoned.

“The Dependency Mediation Program is a great example of how a modest investment of dollars early can reap untold rewards in positive outcomes for the children later.”

Judge Egan Walker, Second Judicial District Court

What assistance or support would be helpful from the CBCC or the Children's Bureau to help move the project forward?

Nevada would like to collaborate with other CIPs interested in piloting the dependency mediation modeled in Nevada to determine the effectiveness of such a program in other jurisdictions. After several states have piloted JDMP, CBCC assistance in assessing a more global effectiveness would be appreciated.

At the Nevada level, as the program continues to expand CBCC guidance on additional, appropriate data to gather and how to gather beyond exit surveys, and how to best analyze these data would be helpful. It would also be helpful to receive guidance on analyzing administrative data to determine if correlational improvements may be occurring.

It would also be helpful to have regular review of JDMP processes to ensure that fidelity to the model is being adhered to. Guidance on how to conduct informative, multi-disciplinary focus groups would also be useful.

Hearing Quality Project:

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT COUNCILS

Provide a concise description of the hearing quality project selected in your jurisdiction.

In response to the PIP from the 2nd round CFSR, the courts were asked to develop a workgroup to address the need to reduce barriers to adoption and TPR. Rather than create one large workgroup, CIP asked each judicial district to create a platform/forum for ongoing identification of strengths and opportunities as they pertain to child welfare outcomes. As a result each judicial district created a Community Improvement Council (CIC) of local stakeholders to identify barriers to timely permanency, adoption, and TPR and develop and implement solutions to these barriers in its locale.

The courts and their CICs are regularly informed of their data metrics and how to interpret the data and evidence-based best practices that have demonstrated improvement in specific areas. The members of each CIC agree on the areas in need of improvement and, using expert advice and guidance, select the interventions that best fit their local circumstances and needs.

By providing the courts and their CICs data to help them identify areas needing improvement and information about evidence-based and best practices, with CIP support and guidance, the courts have made systemic changes to improve timeliness and hearing quality. Because each judicial district is unique, the specific local activities and interventions for that district have been built on a foundation of empirical data and consensus among the key stakeholders and constituency of that district.

Approximate date that the project began:

October 2010

Which stage of the CQI process best describes the current status of project work?

Implemented and continually improving.

How was the need for this project identified? (Phase I)

The Community Improvement Councils (CICs) were created after the Nevada Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) and the resultant Program Improvement Plan (PIP) identified that Nevada needed to improve its time to permanency particularly in the areas of adoption and termination of parental rights (TPR). The PIP outlined several Systemic Factors to be addressed during the PIP implementation period. Specifically, Primary Strategy (3) “Improve the Timeliness and Appropriateness of Permanency Planning across the Life of the Case” and goal #1 under that strategy “Reduce the number of children in out of home care for 18 months or longer and reduce barrier to adoption and TPR.” The creation of CICs helped address this area of needed improvement.

In October 2010, Justice Nancy Saitta, Chair of the CIP Select Committee, requested that each lead district court dependency judge create a workgroup or Community Improvement Council (CIC) of local stakeholders to identify barriers to timely permanency, adoption, and TPR and develop and implement solutions to these barriers.

The expectation was that time to permanency and TPR would decrease with state-level support of the CICs’ concerted efforts to systemically improve court processing of abuse and neglect cases (Nevada Revised Statutes 432B cases) by implementing evidence-based best practices and continually assessing and improving their execution.

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II) If you do not yet have a theory of change and/or would like assistance, please indicate such in the space below.

The theory is that by providing the judiciary and their CICs data to help them identify areas needing improvement and information about evidence-based and best practices, the judiciary and stakeholders will have increased knowledge of what constitutes a quality hearing, and judges will have a better understanding of what constitutes reasonable efforts which will lead to an increase in depth of information brought to court by all parties because stakeholders will better understand the information needed by the court. The data and training provided will lead to increased identification of barriers and creation of action steps to improve outcomes. This will, in turn, lead to long term outcomes such as improved time to permanency and overall timeliness of cases.

Because each judicial district is unique, the specific local activities and interventions for that district were built on a foundation of empirical data and consensus among the key stakeholders and constituency of that district. Implementation of the resultant annual action plans will result in the immediate short and long term outcomes as defined by CICs.

Have you identified a solution/intervention that you will implement? If yes, what is it? (Phase III)

The courts and their CICs were informed of their data metrics and how to interpret these data, and evidence-based best practices that had demonstrated improvement in their specific areas of interest. The CICs agreed on the areas in need of improvement within their own systems and, using expert advice and guidance, selected the interventions that best fit their local circumstances and needs. This now happens annually.

What has been done to implement the project? (Phase IV)

Following receipt of Justice Saitta's letter (October 2010) requesting the formation of a CIC in each judicial district, every lead district court judge in the state created a CIC under the guidance and with the support of Nevada CIP. The two new Judicial Districts, 10 and 11, have also formed CICs and have been meeting regularly, created and are implementing annual action plans.

CIP produces quarterly and annual data packets containing court timeliness, child welfare, and trend metrics. The timeliness data metrics distributed to the CICs quarterly allow for comparison over time as well as comparison among judicial districts. The court performance measures quarterly report (Appendix 2) generated by the SACWIS (State Automated Child Welfare Information System) was modified to include a comparison of the median days to permanency per year for each judicial district and the proportion of children for whom the first permanency hearing falls within the mandatory requirements. This enables the courts to quickly assess their progress in improving timeliness. It became apparent that some old case data were continuing to skew the impact of recent court case processing improvements. The report now contains columns of information looking back only 2 years, as well. That is what we are calling the "modified" report.

Data are used by the CICs to assess the impact of interventions on areas targeted for improvement in their action plans. The CICs utilize the quarterly and annual data packets, and information on targeted evidence-based and best practices provided at the annual CIC Summit to create annual logic models designed to improve some aspect of court functioning identified at the local level as in need of improvement).

These data are also used to guide CIP's discussions with the judiciary and their CICs so local stakeholders can work to improve timeliness and resolve systemic problems. For example, many courts were not allowing children to be present in the courtroom. Several CICs included developing protocols to allow input from children at the hearings when appropriate. CIP attends most local CIC meetings, reaching out to each CIC to help them identify evidence-based and best practices that may be applicable in their jurisdictions, technical assistance to move forward on planning their implementation, and other brainstorming support. The Coordinator is also able to note similar areas of difficulty or success across the State to address. CIP writes and distributes a quarterly newsletter to all CIC members updating on action plan and program implementation and CQI status throughout the state.

CIP has contracted with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) to assist the CICs with data interpretation and analysis. As a result, all 11 local CICs are working on improving court hearing processes and quality, and have been doing so since 2011.

Initially each judicial district developed an action plan to identify barriers to permanency, timely adoptions, and termination of parental rights; and solutions to resolve these barriers in their districts. With help from the NCJFCJ, CIP conducts targeted annual convenings of stakeholder teams from each of the judicial districts. During the last five annual Summits, judicial roundtables) have been facilitated by Nevada Supreme Court Justice Nancy Saitta, Ret. and a judicial facilitator during which the judicial officers share and discuss their issues of concern.

During the annual CIC Summits each of the judicial district's CICs are provided with their local timeliness performance measures from UNITY (Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth, the Nevada SACWIS) and child welfare information from the Chapin Hall web tool and Fostering Court Improvement. Guidance is provided by NCJFCJ and CBCC to help the CICs begin assessing how their systems' timeliness measures compare to federal mandates and to the State as a whole. Training the judges and key stakeholders on performance measurement, helping them to think about their goals, and how and what to measure has been CIP's strategy to advance a CQI mindset throughout the State. NCJFCJ was contracted to develop and present "A Guide to Integrating Continuous Quality Improvement into the Work of the Community Improvement Councils" at the 2015 CIC Summit (Appendix 3). This Guide offers practical suggestions for steps to fully integrate CQI into planning and action within the CIC and is being used by the CICs as they strategize on how to improve hearing quality. During the 2016 CIC Summit, they were provided a primer on how to access the Chapin Hall web-tool and interpret the available data. During the 2017 CIC Summit, Christopher Church, JD introduced some new data concepts such as survival curves for reunification. As a result several CICs included in their annual action plans the intention to smooth the curves thus indicating that reunification was taking place as was appropriate for the child and family, not whenever the court hearing may have been scheduled.

Using their local data to inform the process, the CICs each created two action plans (around timeliness and child safety decision-making) during the CIC Summits in September 2012 and 2013. The 2014 and 2015 Annual CIC Summits focused on timeliness to permanency and the principles of quality hearings and specific evidence-based strategies to improve hearing quality, and concluded with development of action plans to improve court timeliness and hearing quality. The 2016 CIC Summit focused on producing the best outcomes for children and their families. In 2017, the Summit focused on "Collaboration: The Key to Unlocking a Quality Hearing Door".

To ensure fidelity of implementation, the CICs are guided by CIP as they develop and grow. The integrated and ongoing collection and provision of information (data that are available and

covering an extensive range of measures and potential evidence-based strategies for improvement), combined with efforts to address challenges as they arise has a solid foundation in Nevada's CICs. As a matter of fact, the CICs have proven to be so effective that CIP used the CIC action plans upon which to build CIP's Strategic and Funding Plan and updates.

To ensure that all parties' due process rights are protected, most of the CICs have included access to high quality legal representation for children, parents, and the child welfare agency in their action plans. Nearly all are appointing parents' counsel and legal representation to children. The recently passed Nevada Senate Bill 305 requires that all children be appointed legal counsel. Child welfare reports that in 15 of the 17 Nevada counties, the District Attorney represents the agency. The CICs have made a concerted effort in this area. In the rural judicial districts, for the most part, the Attorney General's Office represents the Agency during TPRs because until the recent passage of Nevada Senate Bill 432, TPRs were not part of the dependency process. Courts may now choose to either have a separate petition filed for a new proceeding or a TPR motion filed under the dependency case.

What is being done or how do you intend to monitor the progress of the project? (Phase V) Be specific in terms of what type of evaluation (e.g., fidelity or outcome, comparison group, etc.) or data efforts you have in place or plan to have in place to assess your efforts. If you have already evaluated your effort, how did you use these data to modify or expand the project?

The CICs are asked to report on implementation status and processing changes annually. Most also review progress during their local CIC meetings. During the year, the CIP Coordinator participates in these CIC meetings to monitor implementation, help interpret quarterly data reports to assess impact, and guide implementation changes that may be necessary. In the past, Nevada CIP has been able to contract with NCJFCJ and other neutral contractors to provide technical assistance related to CQI of current statewide and local court improvement projects. NCJFCJ and other expert contractors also conduct satisfaction, process, and impact evaluations on the best practices implemented by the courts. Recommendations for program improvement are then implemented. The Capacity Building Center for Courts (CBCC) is helping CIP develop an additional means to assess CIC implementation of the action plans to compliment CIP observation and the CICs verbal report out at the CIC Summit.

What assistance or support would be helpful from the CBCC or the Children's Bureau to help move the project forward?

Provide assistance analyzing and presenting administrative data to demonstrate trends similar to what Christopher Church does would be helpful.

Continued assistance developing and analyzing CIC annual action plans to help them move forward on identifying how to measure the impact of activities designed to improve hearing

quality. The courts consistently struggle with measuring what and the impact of what practice changes they have made.

Guidance on CIC Summit agendas to include most useful and effective data elements regarding hearing quality and legal representation.

II. Trainings, Projects, and Activities For questions 1-12, provide a *concise* description of work completed or underway to date in FY 2020 (October 2019-June 2020) in the below topical subcategories. For question 1, focus on significant training events or initiatives held or developed in FY 2020.

1. Trainings

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>How many persons attended?</i>	<i>What type of training is it? (e.g., conference, training curriculum/program, webinar)</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>
Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	NV Child Welfare, dependency judiciary and their Community Improvement Council Members	23	On-line training	Chapin Hall, through their Foster Care Data Archive, works with states to compile their child welfare data in a meaningful way. These data are often more current than the publicly available data and can be examined by each judicial district in the state providing child welfare and legal professionals an opportunity to track their data over time. This training will introduce professionals to the Foster Care Data Archive website and walk people through the basic steps for exploring their own data in a meaningful way.
Hearing quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Improving timeliness/permanency	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Quality legal representation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>How many persons attended?</i>	<i>What type of training is it? (e.g., conference, training curriculum/program, webinar)</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>
Engagement & participation of parties	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Well-being	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
ICWA/Tribal collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Sex Trafficking	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Normalcy/R. Prudent Parent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
Other: Mediation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Mediators	16	Webinar	Distance mediation
Other: Mediation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judiciary, legal, child welfare staff, and other dependency stakeholders.	Launched 7/20 with 10 people completing; Child Welfare agencies have mandated 50% of their court involved staff will complete by Jan. 31, 2021	On-line Training	How to effectively participate in the mediation process to support decision-making, how the various aspects of mediation work to obtain group consensus and resolve complexities of the case, across the life of the case to support family decision-making prior to child removal.

On average, how many training events do you hold per year?

Two or three training events are held each year with additional webinars and on-line trainings recorded and available. However, due to COVID-19 most trainings were virtual and will continue to be in the near future.

What is your best prediction for the number of attorneys and judges that will participate in a training annually?

400 attorneys and judges have been trained by our various trainings annually. CIP has trained at least that many CASAs, child welfare workers and administrators, court administrators, and other

community stakeholders, as well. Although training has moved to a virtual platform, we predict to have similar results in participation.

The Family First Prevention Services Act amends the Social Security Act adding an eligibility criterion for the training of judges and attorneys on the congregate care provisions of the Act. See the highlighted portion below.

(1)² IN GENERAL.— In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a highest State court shall have in effect a rule requiring State courts to ensure that foster parents, pre- adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of a child in foster care under the responsibility of the State are notified of any proceeding to be held with respect to the child, *shall provide for the training of judges, attorneys, and other legal personnel in child welfare cases on Federal child welfare policies and payment limitations with respect to children in foster care who are placed in settings that are not a foster family home*, and shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and including such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

States have an option to delay implementation of the congregate care provisions by two years. The decision will have a direct impact on when judicial determinations and CIP training requirements must begin.

Do you know when your state plans to implement Family First? Yes No

If yes, when? Originally Nevada was planning to implement October 1, 2019. The Nevada Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) has now contracted with The Institute for Innovation and Implementation at the University of Maryland, School of Social Work to assist with planning the implementation and expects to implement after the Children’s Bureau approves DCFS’s submitted plan or October 2021, whichever comes first.

Have you been involved in planning with the agency on implementing Family First?

Yes No

If yes, please describe how the CIP has been involved. DCFS is very inclusive of CIP in planning for FFPSA. Most recently, May 21, 2019, CIP was included in a day-long training/discussion with the three representatives from the Institute for Innovation and Implementation. As part of DCFS’s contract with the Institute, they included a presentation at the upcoming CIC Summit, on trauma-focused communication. This will address both key activities in the PIP and FFPSA implementation. FFPSA has been a topic of discussion during the monthly Statewide Quality Improvement Committee meetings, DCFS provides regular updates to the CIP Select Committee, and DCFS developed that Judicial FFPSA Committee.

Have you been developing your Family First judicial training plan? Yes No

If yes, please describe what you have done. Because Nevada was originally planning to implement FFPSA in October of 2019, CIP developed and conducted our Family First judicial training September 2019 at the annual Judicial Officers’ Round Table and the CIC Summit.

² Sec. 50741(c) of P.L. 115-123 revised sec. 438(b)(1) to add language regarding training. Effective as if enacted on 1/1/18 (sec. 50746(a)(1) of P.L. 115-123).

NCJFCJ conducted both trainings and helped the CICs develop FFPSA centered action plans and overarching statewide plans such as a public relations campaign to help the public understand the Act, as well. With modifications to FFPSA and the passage of time, follow-up judicial and CIC trainings will be included in the work of the Institute for Innovation and Implementation with the State of Nevada.

Data Projects. Data projects include any work with administrative data sets (e.g, AFCARS, CCWIS), data dashboards, data reports, fostering court improvement data, case management systems, and data sharing efforts.

Do you have a data project/activity? Yes No (skip to #3)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Centralized Case Index (CCI): The purpose of this project is to provide court performance measure data near real-time to help them manage caseloads and thereby achieve additional key timeliness milestones and improve outcomes for children. To this end, CIP undertook several technical proofs of concept (POC) initiatives. Two POCs were designed to prove that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case and case party information from the child welfare agency (e.g., removal date, permanency goals, placement information) and information provided by the family court (e.g., assigned judicial personnel, hearing dates, petition filing dates, adoption dates) can be combined into a single data store and provide a consolidated view of case information; • Timeliness reports can be generated on-demand through a browser-based system and presented to the user in an easily understandable format. <p>Fiscal year 2019 has been a successful one for the Nevada AOC Centralized Case Index (CCI). After many years of coordination, planning, designing and developing we have successfully connected and implemented interfaces with the 2nd Judicial District Context Court Case Management System and the state of Nevada DCFS Case Management System known as UNITY.</p>	Data dashboards	Implementation

(a) Do you have data reports that you consistently view? Yes No

(b) How are these reports used to support your work?

All decisions, projects, activities and support to courts and CICs undertaken by CIP is data driven. The CICs regularly reference their data during meetings and when assessing impact of their activities. CIP uses all the data sources to determine where CICs may wish to focus their work.

2. Hearing Quality. Hearing quality projects include any efforts you have made to improve the quality of dependency hearings, including court observation/assessment projects, process improvements, specialty/pilot court projects, projects related to court orders or title IV-E determinations, mediation, or appeals.

Do you have a hearing quality project/activity? Yes No (skip to #4)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Each of the 11 judicial districts has created Community Improvement Councils which meet regularly to implement their annual action plans developed at the annual CIC Summit.</p> <p>These action plans focus on improving the quality of their court hearings. Each judicial district focuses on different aspects of the process for improvement dependent upon where their challenges appear. The courts are in the process of implementing the changes they believe will best improve their hearings.</p> <p>The State CIP is focusing on encouraging judges to: engage parties present by explaining the hearing process and asking if they understand, include children in the hearings, address ICWA, discuss child’s safety and why child cannot return home today, and emphasize well-being in all hearings, review permanency and concurrent plans more frequently possibly by utilizing case plan summaries as a tool.</p> <p>With assistance from CBCC. CIP will work with the CICs on assessing the impact of their systems’ changes.</p>	<p>Process Improvements</p>	<p>Implementation</p>

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Through a partnership between the Nevada Division of Child and Family Services and CIP the Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program was launched in August 2016. The overarching goal of the mediation program is to reduce the time to permanency for children. The mediation program also aims to understand and resolve legal and non-legal issues, provide opportunities for parties to speak for themselves and hear others, and build relationships. In mediation, parties are able to meet in a neutral setting to address case issues and identify available options with the help of an impartial third party. Previous research in Nevada and in other jurisdictions throughout the country has shown that mediation can enhance case processing (i.e., improve timeliness of court events), increase key participant (i.e., parents, children, relatives, and foster parents) and system stakeholder (i.e., prosecutors, parents' and children's attorneys and advocates, social workers, and others) engagement in the case process, and improve juvenile dependency case outcomes in a non-adversarial manner (i.e., reunification, timeliness of permanency).</p>	Mediation	Implementation
<p>Court order templates are being developed for every dependency court hearing to ensure that all state and federal requirements are included appropriately. The CIP Court Order Template Subcommittee with review and input from all stakeholders statewide are working on these. They will include orders for judges, masters' recommendations including a set of orders for ICWA cases.</p>	Courts Orders/Title IV-E	Implementation

3. Improving Timeliness of Hearings or Permanency Outcomes. Timeliness and permanency projects include any activities or projects meant to improve the timeliness of case processing or achievement of timely permanency. This could include general timeliness, focus on continuances or appeals, working on permanency goals other than APPLA, or focus on APPLA and older youth.

Do you have a timeliness or permanency project/activity? Yes No (skip to #5)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Integration of all CIP efforts and programs is designed to improve ASFA timeliness and permanency outcomes. The recent PIP focused on</p>	General/ASFA	Evaluation/Assessment

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)

4. Quality of Legal Representation. Quality of legal representation projects may include any activities/efforts related to improvement of representation for parents, youth, or the agency. This might include assessments or analyzing current practice, implementing new practice models, working with law school clinics, or other activities in this area.

Do you have a quality legal representation project/activity? Yes No (skip to #6)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Quality Legal Representation Survey*	Assessment	Evaluation/Assessment
*Project on hold due to Covid-19		

5. Engagement & Participation of Parties. Engagement and participation of parties includes any efforts centered around youth, parent, foster family, or caregiver engagement, as well as projects related to notice to relatives, limited English proficiency, or other efforts to increase presence and engagement at the hearing.

Do you have an engagement or participation of parties project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
The Statewide Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program described above has been demonstrated to increase parental participation in their case.	Parent Engagement	Evaluation/Assessment

6. Well-Being. Well-being projects include any efforts related to improving the well-being of youth. Projects could focus on education, early childhood development, psychotropic medication, LGBTQ+ youth, trauma, racial disproportionality/disparity, immigration, or other well-being related topics.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on well-being? Yes No (skip to #8)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)

7. ICWA/Tribal collaboration. These projects could include any efforts to enhance state and tribal collaboration, state and tribal court agreements, data collection and analysis including of ICWA practice.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on ICWA or tribal collaboration? Yes
 No (skip to #9)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
The 4 th JD held an all-day CIC meeting to train its county stakeholders and tribal members on ICWA and the new regulations. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges conducted the day long training that was deemed highly successful by those who attended. Other CICs and tribal courts were invited to attend.	ICWA Notice	Implementing Changes

8. Preventing Sex Trafficking. These projects could include work around domestic child sex trafficking, a focus on runaway youth, collaboration with other agencies around this topic, data collection and analysis, data sharing, or other efforts to fully implement these sections of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act into practice.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on preventing sex trafficking/runaways? Yes
 No (skip to #10)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Nevada Strategic Plan to Address the Commercial Sexual Exploration of Children (CSEC)	Sex Trafficking	Implementation
Nevada CSEC Model Coordinated Response Protocol and Toolkit developed	Sex Trafficking	Implementation
Resource guide to prevent CSEC	Sex Trafficking	Implementation

9. Normalcy/Reasonable and Prudent Parent. These projects could include any work around normalcy or the reasonable and prudent parent standard or practices, collaboration with other agencies around this topic, data collection and analysis, data sharing, or other efforts to fully implement these sections of the Preventing Sex and Strengthening Families Act into practice.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on normalcy/reasonable prudent parenting?

Yes No (skip to #11)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)

10. Prevention. Prevention projects include work around preventing child maltreatment including primary prevention (preventing maltreatment from occurring in the first place), secondary, and tertiary prevention.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on prevention? Yes No (skip to #12)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)

11. Safety. Safety projects are those that focus on decision-making around safety including decision-making practices in substantiation, removal, family time/visitation, and decisions about safety in out of home placements.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on safety? Yes No (skip to sec. III)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)

III. CIP Collaboration in Child Welfare Program Planning and Improvement Efforts

1. Please describe how the CIP was involved with the state’s CFSP due June 30, 2019.

Because the CFSP is being written at the same time as the PIP and because CIP has always participated in the Statewide Quality Improvement Committee and the APSR, CIP is fully involved in the development of the 2019 CFSP. At the request of Region 9 Children’s Bureau, DCFS decided to include all key activities of the PIP in the CFSP and to move some of these PIP key activities exclusively to the CFSP or extend them into the CFSP. CIP was a key participant in writing and editing the Permanency and Well-being portion of the CFSP.

a. Does the CFSP include any of the following:

- legal/judicial strategies
- the CIP/Agency Joint Project
- the CIP Hearing Quality Project

If yes, please describe.

Legal/judicial strategies: court order templates with caregiver notification, diligent search and judicial inquiry regarding relatives, judicial inquiry and explanation about concurrent planning using scripts across the system including the judiciary and attorneys, trauma-focused communication and trauma-informed system, TPR process assessment, develop, implement, and assess legal advocacy project, services resource app for electronic devices.

CIP/Agency Joint Project: Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program to expand to co-mediation model with requisite training for all stakeholders including child welfare staff who regularly participate in mediations.

CIP Hearing Quality Project: The Community Improvement Councils (CIC) are the hearing quality project. Child welfare will continue to participate in both local meetings and the annual CIC Summit.

2. Please describe how the CIP was or will be involved in the most recent/upcoming title IV-E Foster Care Eligibility Review in your state.

Nevada has been so focused on the CFSP, PIP, APSR, modifying the 3 CIP strategic plans to include PIP key activities and CFSP items, and the CIP annual self-assessment, that a IV-E Review has not been discussed.

3. Please describe how the CIP is or was involved in preparing and completing the latest round of the CFSR and PIP, if required, in your state. Please check all the ways that the

CIP or Court Personnel were involved (or plan to be involved) in the CFSR and PIP Process. Feel free to add additional narrative to explain your involvement in the process.

Nevada CIP has been deeply entrenched in the CFSR/PIP process from input into the Statewide Assessment. Although the CIP Coordinator was trained and certified to conduct the case file reviews, she was not needed during the recent CFSR file reviews. CIP helped coordinate the CFSR and State Assessment interviews with legal and judicial stakeholders and was interviewed herself. CIP was present for the CFSR exit conference, as well as the CFSR report out. CIP shared the final report and the PowerPoint presentation to all 11 judicial districts.

CIP Coordinator was invited to co-chair one of 4 PIP Teams, Team 3 – Achieving Timely Permanency. At CIP's request, Alicia Summers from the CBCCC was assigned as Team 3's liaison to assist with data collection, root cause analysis, and interpretation. Team 3 included 21 members, 11 of whom were judicial officers. The Team met weekly for 3 months and developed a comprehensive PIP section and then correlated the Achieving Timely Permanency section with the Engagement section.

CIP became a member of the Permanency/Well-Being CFSP Team and has been actively, collaboratively writing that section and integrating both PIP and CFSP into the 3 CIP Strategic Plans as both include the court/agency joint project and the hearing quality project as well as multiple practice changes to be made by both courts and attorneys in conjunction with agency actions. For example, to better integrate relatives into the case plan including but not limited to as placements, the agency will review the diligent search policy to ensure that these searches are done regularly up to permanency is achieved and will create and utilize a diligent search tracking form which will be attached to each court report. Judges will make inquiries regarding relatives at each hearing. The CIP Court Order Template Subcommittee will include disclosure of relatives and caregiver notification in the court orders. Attorneys will explain to clients the value of having supportive relatives who can not only act as placements, but support the families in fulfilling their case plans. This process in turn is supportive of the concurrent planning and social summary updating included in both the PIP and the CFSP.

Education on these processes are scheduled to take place during the annual CIC Summits as well as by the agency for caseworkers and supervisors.

The Juvenile Dependency Mediation Program is deeply embedded in both the PIP and the CFSP as the joint agency/court CIP project. To ensure that all agency personnel who regularly participate in mediations are well trained on expectations and how to participate successfully in mediations, DCFS Leadership will put forth an Information Memorandum requiring attendance at CIP produced trainings.

The Community Improvement Councils (the hearing quality project) are an integral part of the PIP as they have become integral in the dependency system.

Because CIP is a voting member of the PIP CORE Team, CIP will be intensively involved in the PIP implementation.

- not involved at all
- involved in planning the statewide assessment
- CFSR reviewers, **trained but not needed**
- interviewed for CFSR
- invited to the exit conference at the close of the CFSR review
- invited to the final CFSR results session at the conclusion of the report, **as were all 11 judicial districts.**
- final CFSR report was shared with you
- final CFSR report shared with courts broadly across the state, **All courts received a copy of the CFSR report and the PowerPoint presentation at the report out meeting.**
- part of a large group of stakeholders engaged to assist in design of the PIP
- high level of inclusion during the entire PIP process, **process From February 2019 to present, CIP has engaged daily with DCFS in writing either the PIP, the CFSP, or the APSR and correlating them with the CIP strategic plans.**
- made suggestions for inclusion in the PIP, **CIP co-chaired the Achieving Timely Permanency PIP Team made up 21 multidisciplinary members including 9 judicial officers.**
- suggestions made by CIP for inclusion in the PIP were put forward by the child welfare agency, **CIP wrote an entire section of the PIP on Achieving Timely Permanency PIP Team 3.**
- had an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the PIP before it was submitted **and was involved in every weekly meeting with Region 9 and the PIP CORE Team on writing the PIP and revising the 1st draft.**
- meet (or plan to meet) ongoing with the child welfare agency to monitor PIP Implementation, **CIP is a voting member of the ongoing PIP CORE Team which will continue to meet to facilitate PIP implementation.**

The current version of the PIP includes (check all that apply):

- court strategies
- court/agency shared strategies
- the court/agency joint project described above
- the CIP hearing quality project
- specific practice changes that judges will make
- specific practice changes that attorneys will make

4. *What strategies or processes are in place in your state that you feel are particularly effective in supporting joint child welfare program planning and improvement?*

The Community Improvement Councils and annual CIC Summit inclusive of all dependency system stakeholders.

An amazing collaborative and supportive working relationship between DCFS and CIP that engenders an easy flow of information and data back and forth.

A willingness to explore beyond the boundaries of the usual throughout the system.
Trust!

5. *What barriers exist in your state that make effective joint child welfare program planning and improvement challenging?*

None

6. *Does the state child welfare agency currently offer professional partner training to judges, attorneys, and court personnel as part of its Title IV-E Training Plan?*

Not yet

If yes, please provide a brief description of what is provided and how.

If no, have you met with child welfare agency leadership to discuss and explore utilizing professional partner training for judges, attorneys and court personnel?

This has been discussed. It requires an update of the IV-E Plan which leads to other entanglements yet to be resolved

7. *Have you talked with your agency about accessing Title IV-E funding for legal representation for parents or for children? Yes*

Is your state currently planning to seek reimbursement? This is being further researched

If yes, describe any plans, approaches, or models that are under consideration or underway.

IV. CQI Current Capacity Assessment

1. *Has your ability to integrate CQI into practice changed this year? Yes*

If yes, what do you attribute the increase in ability to?

CIP has been making increased use of the Fostering Court Improvement website. Some at DCFS question the reliability of the data because they believe there may be data entry errors on the part of the workers. These are the same data sent to the Children's Bureau for AFCARS and NCANDS which are thoroughly scrubbed prior to submission.

2. Which of the following CBCC Events/Services have you/your staff engaged in in the 2020 Fiscal Year?

- Judicial Academy
- CQI Consult (Topic: _____)
- Constituency Group - Hearing Quality
- Constituency Group - CFSR
- Constituency Group - ICWA
- Constituency Group - New Directors
- Constituency Group - Virtual Hearings/Court Processes
- Constituency Group - Other _____
- CIP All Call -- What % of All Calls does your CIP participate in? 80%

3. Do you have any of the following resources to help you integrate CQI into practice?

- CIP staff with CQI (e.g., data, evaluation) expertise
- Consultants with CQI expertise
- a University partnership
- a statewide court case management system
- Contracts with external individuals or organizations to assist with CQI efforts
- Other resources: _____

3a. Do you record your child welfare court hearings? Yes No

If yes, are they audio video

Most courts in the state have an audio recording system. These are not maintained by the Supreme Court; although CIP has helped some courts purchase these systems.

3b. Can you remotely access your court case management system? For example, Odyssey systems often allow remote access to case files. Yes No

Clark County is the only county that has Odyssey and is able to provide remote access

3c. What court case management software does your state use? If multiple, please indicate the most common:

Contexte

3d. Have you employed any new technology or applications to strengthen your work?

CIP coordinated efforts with multiple Judicial Districts to provide grant funded Vaddio Bridges so essential hearings could continue to take place during the pandemic. We also

purchased multiple Zoom Accounts for mediators of the JDMP to continue mediation efforts, via distance mediations.

4. *Consider the phases of change management and how you integrate these into practice. Are there phases of the process (e.g., Phase I-need assessment, Phase II-theory of change) that you struggle with integrating more than others?* No

5. *Is there a topic or practice area that you would find useful from the Capacity Building Center for Courts? Be as specific as possible (e.g., data analysis, how to evaluate trainings, more information on research about quality legal representation, how to facilitate group meetings, etc.)*

We can always use help with data collection, analysis, and interpretation techniques. The continued success of CIP hinges on demonstrated effectiveness and impact.

How to institutionalize court data collection without a statewide court case management system or courts capable of handling this on their own (too busy and no real understanding or knowledge of this area)?

How to develop and implement a quality legal advocacy project pulling together a variety of interests into a cohesive whole?

Best way to educate the entire system – courts, legal, child welfare – on overarching topics such as concurrent planning, engaging relatives, trauma-informed system.

Self-Assessment – Capacity Continued

We would like you to assess your current capacities related to knowledge, skills, resources, and collaboration by responding to the following 2 sets of questions. In questions 6 and 7, we ask about CQI. When we say CQI we mean the entire change management process including root cause analysis, theory of change, strategy selection, implementation and evaluation.

6. Please indicate your level of agreement to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have a good understanding of CQI.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to integrate CQI into all our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am familiar with the available data relevant to our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to interpret and apply the available data.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency have shared goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency collaborate around program planning and improvement efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We have the resources we need to fully integrate CQI into practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have staff, consultants, or partners who can answer my CQI questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. How frequently do you engage in the following activities?

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
We use data to make decisions about where to focus our efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We meet with representatives of the child welfare agency to engage in collaborative systems change efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We create theories of change around systems change projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We use evaluation/assessment findings to make changes to programs/practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We evaluate (beyond monitoring outputs) our efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Definitions of Evidence

Evidence-based practice – evidence-based practices are practice that have been empirically tested in a rigorous way (involving random assignment to groups), have demonstrated effectiveness related to specific outcomes, have been replicated in practice at least one, and have findings published in peer reviewed journal articles.

Empirically-supported- less rigorous than evidence-based practices are empirically-supported practices. To be empirically supported, a program must have been evaluated in some way and have demonstrated some relationship to a positive outcome. This may not meet the rigor of evidence-base, but still has some support for effectiveness.

Best-practices – best practices are often those widely accepted in the field as good practice. They may or may not have empirical support as to effectiveness, but are often derived from teams of experts in the field.

Definitions for Work Stages

Identifying and Assessing Needs – This phase is the earliest phase in the process, where you are identifying a need to be addressed. The assessing needs phase includes identifying the need, determining if there is available data demonstrating that this a problem, forming teams to address the issue.

Develop theory of change—This phase focuses on the theorizing the causes of a problem. In this phase you would identify what you think might be causing the problem and develop a “theory of change”. The theory of change is essentially how you think your activities (or intervention) will improve outcomes.

Develop/select solution—This phase includes developing or selecting a solution. In this phase, you might be exploring potential best-practices or evidence-based practices that you may want to implement as a solution to the identified need. You might also be developing a specific training, program, or practice that you want to implement.

Implementation – the implementation phase of work is when an intervention is being piloted or tested. This includes adapting programs or practices to meet your needs, and developing implementation supports.

Evaluation/assessment – the evaluation and assessment phase includes any efforts to collect data about the fidelity (process measures: was it implemented as planned?) or effectiveness (outcome measures: is the intervention making a difference?) of the project. The evaluation assessment phase also includes post-evaluation efforts to apply findings, such as making changes to the program/practice and using the data to inform next steps.