



Nevada's Court Improvement Program

Data Strategic Plan FY 2010 - FY 2014

*Supreme Court of Nevada
Administrative Office of the Courts*



August 2009

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER 2 – STRATEGIC PLAN.....	4
<i>Data Collection, Analysis and Sharing Objectives</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Data Collection, Analysis and Sharing Strategies and Activities</i>	<i>5</i>
CHAPTER 3 – COLLABORATION EFFORTS	20
<i>Collaboration Efforts to Date.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Planned Collaboration Efforts</i>	<i>21</i>
APPENDICES.....	22
<i>Appendix A – CIP Select Committee Roster.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Table 1 – Table of Collaborative Partners.. ..</i>	<i>23</i>

Chapter 1 – Introduction

The Court Improvement Program (CIP) has existed in Nevada since 1995 and is overseen by the CIP Select Committee. Grant funding is received from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (ACF).¹ Since its inception, CIP has funded numerous successful pilot projects throughout the Nevada Judiciary: Children's Attorneys Project (CAP) Pro Bono Lawyer and Surrogate Education Advocacy, Children's Attorneys Project (CAP) Adoption Subsidy, Great Basin CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate), Nevada CASA Association, Inc., Northeastern Nevada CASA, Licensed Kinship Caregivers, Parent to Parent Mentoring, and the Early Representation pilot project, to name a few.

In the past, most CIP efforts focused on the development and implementation of pilot projects in individual courts. During 2003-05, CIP worked closely with the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and other stakeholders to conduct Nevada's Child and Family Services Review (CFSR), develop its Program Improvement Plan (PIP), and conduct the CIP Re-Assessment. Over the past 12 months CIP has expanded its involvement with the judiciary with more than 40% judicial participation in a CFSR Survey developed and distributed by DCFS staff; an Associate Justice, 9 Judges and Masters, and the CIP Coordinator volunteering (court calendars permitting) in the CFSR in Nevada scheduled for August 31 through September 4, 2009; and an 82% judicial participation in a CIP Survey on representation practice in Nevada. This expansion has worked to help us plan and develop changes statewide that will significantly improve the handling of child welfare cases.

State judicial leadership was established when, in 2006, Chief Justice Robert Rose agreed to chair the Court Improvement Committee, and the Committee was brought under the auspices of the Judicial Council of the State of Nevada as a permanent Standing Committee. The Court Improvement Committee was renamed to reflect a broader scope of its mission. The Committee is now known as *Court Improvement for the Protection and Permanency of Dependent Children*.

¹ For a complete history, please go to <http://www.ssa.gov/history/childb1.html>.

With the appointment of Associate Justice Nancy M. Saitta and her exemplary leadership, the Committee revamped its Mission, Purpose, and Goals Statement in 2009 to: “The Court Improvement Program (CIP) is a multidisciplinary project which seeks improvement of interrelated systems that serve children and families who enter the child welfare system. The program operates through team-oriented court and agency initiatives. The goal of the CIP is to make the systems more effective.”

To maintain focus for CIP initiatives throughout the State, three strategic plans have been developed that focus on: administration and planning (this document); education and training; and data collection, analysis, and sharing. To maximize resources and outcomes, the strategies outlined in the three strategic plans (Basic, Training, and Data) incorporate coordinated and collaborative efforts identified in the first Program Improvement Plan, the statewide Assessment and Re-Assessments, as well as other efforts initiated by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), the Judicial Council, the State’s Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Clark and Washoe County Department of Social Services, and other entities involved in child welfare issues, both within Nevada and nationally.

A total of 21 strategies, (9 for Data), consisting of 99 activities (28 for Data), were identified to meet the goals and objectives of CIP in Nevada, and are contained in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 delineates the collaborative efforts, performed and planned across Nevada statewide, and with our federal partners and across the nation with other CIP Coordinators, staff from the AOC, Courts, Welfare Agencies, Law Enforcement, Schools, Service Providers, CASAs, University, Bar Associations, Hospitals, Foster and Adoptive Parent and other non-profit Organizations, Service Organizations, Churches, private businesses, and Indian tribes.

Chapter 2 – Strategic Plan

Each of the following strategies links specific activities to one of the three strategic plans, based upon their primary intent. The three strategic plans are:

- Basic [B] formerly referred to as Administration and Planning or [AP] (including planning required for Training and Data)
- Training [T] formerly referred to as Education and Training or [ED] and
- Data [D] (this plan) formerly referred to as Data Collection, Analysis, and Sharing [DC] (this plan)

Data Objectives

In the area of data planning, Nevada's CIP will focus on the data collection, analysis, and sharing capabilities of the three predominant court case management systems being utilized in Nevada: CourtView Justice Solutions, Tyler Odyssey, and ACS Contexte. The specific objectives in the data planning area are:

- Develop a statewide data collection, analysis, and planning mechanism for child welfare cases capable of working in conjunction with the three predominant case management systems used in Nevada courts
- Define and incorporate child welfare court performance measures into court procedures, and, where appropriate, incorporate the measures into the three predominant court case management systems and the Nevada Uniform System for Judicial Records (USJR) model
- Develop or enhance case management systems to track child welfare cases
- Emphasize the use of data as a critical and meaningful resource for all stakeholders in defining jurisdictional needs, identifying resources that positively impact outcomes for children and families, and planning for the allocation of personnel and other resources.

Data Strategies and Activities

The following eight strategies have been defined to meet the objectives stated above:

D1: Keep current on national trends and requirements pertaining to data collection, analysis, and planning related to child welfare cases

This strategy includes sending CIP representatives and other pertinent child welfare stakeholders to national conferences in order to keep current on national trends and requirements pertaining to data collection, analysis, and planning pertaining to child welfare case administration. By improving the quality of data collected, analysis can be tailored to specific jurisdictions and jurisdictional issues so as to engage local judges, court personnel, lawyers, and other stakeholders in assessing their local court's performance and planning collaboratively.

D2: Identify performance measures for courts responsible for any phase of abuse and neglect proceedings.

This strategy involves the identification of the court child welfare performance measures that are important to Nevada courts. Where appropriate, the performance measures published by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) will be incorporated into the Nevada Uniform System of Judicial Reporting (USJR) model. Lastly, this strategy identifies the procedures and interim solutions that will be used to collect, analyze, and publish statewide performance measures.

D3: Develop data exchange requirements

This strategy involves completing a statewide standard for exchanges between courts and child welfare agencies based upon the Global Justice XML data model (referred to as GJXDM or NIEM). As part of this strategy, Nevada is continuing collaborating with other states and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to convene national forums to develop a national child welfare data exchange model, which, when completely developed, will be adopted. It is envisioned that this effort will define appropriate case-level data sharing between child

welfare agencies and courts as well as the sharing of data between courts. It is further envisioned that these standards may also include the sharing of data with other major stakeholders in child welfare cases (e.g., prosecutor offices, CASA, and providers). Finally, the data exchange requirements would support the national child abuse and neglect performance measures.

D4: Identify Court Child Welfare Case Management System (CMS) requirements

This strategy involves identifying detailed child welfare functional requirements for court child welfare case management systems (CMS). Nevada currently is using three different case management systems (Tyler Odyssey system, CourtView Justice Solutions system, and ACS Contexte system). In this strategy, CIP will work with NCSC and the Second Judicial District Family Court to identify all required functionality desired in a court child welfare CMS. The outcome of this strategy will be used in strategy DC5 to develop court child welfare CMS standards. In addition to day-to-day management of individual cases, these requirements will include best practices in child welfare case management; functionality to capture, monitor, and report the performance measures identified in strategy DC2; and data exchanges identified in strategy DC3.

D5: Develop Child Welfare court Case Management System (CMS) standards

This strategy involves identifying and defining detailed child welfare functional and data standards for court case management systems (CMS). Nevada currently is using three different case management systems (Tyler Odyssey system, CourtView Justice Solutions system, and ACS Contexte system). It is envisioned that these vendors could each use the functional standards to better support court process of child welfare cases in their products. As part of this strategy, Nevada is collaborating with other states and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to convene national forums to develop national court child welfare CMS standards, including day-to-day management of individual cases. These requirements will include best practices in child welfare case management; functionality to capture, monitor, and report the performance measures identified in strategy DC2; and data exchanges identified in strategy DC3.

D6: Implement child welfare data exchanges

This strategy involves implementing the data exchanges identified in Strategy DC3. It is envisioned that implementation will be done between the Second Judicial District (ACS Contexte), the Eighth Judicial District (Tyler Odyssey), the rural counties (CourtView Justice Solutions), and the DCFS UNITY system. [Note: It is possible that data exchanges may also involve systems used by District Attorneys' offices and/or the State's Attorney General's office as well.]

D7: Implement Court Child Welfare Case Management System (CMS) standards

This strategy involves implementing the CMS functional and data standards identified in strategy DC5. It is envisioned that implementation will be implemented in the Second Judicial District (ACS Contexte), the Eighth Judicial District (Tyler Odyssey), and the rural counties (CourtView Justice Solutions).

D8: Implement Video Conferencing Capabilities in Courts for use in Child Welfare Cases

This strategy involves implementing video conferencing capabilities within courts and various locations around the state for use in child welfare cases. The purpose of utilizing video conferencing capabilities is to allow persons not within the geographic area served by the court the ability to participate in court proceedings (e.g., if the child is placed out of the district, the child, foster parents/guardians, and CASA representatives could participate in hearings without having to travel to the court).

D9: Provide Project Management Oversight for Data Projects

This strategy involves securing project management resources to oversee the various data projects.

The remaining pages of this chapter delineate each of these nine strategies. For each activity, the following is provided: description, accountable party(s), interim benchmarks, completion indicators, and an anticipated timeframe for performing the activity. [Please note that due to limited funding and resource availability, not all activities have been assigned a timeline.]

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D1. Keep current on national trends and requirements pertaining to data collection, analysis and planning for child welfare cases	D1.1 Send up to three representatives to the annual National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology conference	CIP Reps AOC Reps	Participation in national conference Training and materials from national conference and report back at next scheduled CIP meeting	Each fiscal year

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D2. Identify performance measures for courts in child welfare cases	D 2.1 Perform “business” analysis to determine best practices and implementation plan for performance measures in courts	AOC CIP Contractor Courts	Developed RFP for services Contractor selected Business analysis performed Best practices and implementation plan for performance measures	Jun 2009 Revised: June 2010 – July 2011
	D 2.2 Where applicable, include performance measures in USJR model Note: AOC lack of necessary personnel at this time makes it impossible to project realistic timelines.	AOC Supreme Court CIP	Appropriate performance measures for incorporation in USJR identified Appropriate performance measures incorporated into USJR model	Jan 2010 – Dec. 2010
	D 2.3 Develop procedures for collecting, analyzing, and publishing performance measures statewide (including interim solutions for collecting data until data exchanges are in place)	AOC CIP	Submission and analysis procedures documentation developed Interim solution(s) identified Interim solution document developed	Jan 2010 – Dec. 2010

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D3. Develop data exchange requirements	D 3.1 Review National Exchange Model and prioritize implementation order of exchanges in Nevada	NCSC CIP AOC IT Court Reps DCFS County CFS	National Exchange Model reviewed National Exchange Model exchanges prioritized Nevada Implementation Priority document	Oct 2008 – Jun 2009

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D4. Identify Court Child Welfare Case Management System (CMS) requirements (continued) D4 continued on next page	D 4.6 Identify ability of the 8th District Court Child Welfare CMS to support performance measures (data requirements and business rules)	Contractor CIP 8 th District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Analysis performed Analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jan. 2011 – July 2011
	D 4.7 Identify ability of 8th District Court Child Welfare CMS to support data exchanges identified in DC3	Contractor CIP 8th District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Analysis performed Analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jul. 2011 – Oct. 2011
	D 4.8 Identify gaps and inconsistencies between 8th District Court Child Welfare CMS and desired functionality	Contractor CIP 8th District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Gap analysis performed Gap analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jul. 2011 – Oct. 2011
	D 4.9 Identify gaps and inconsistencies between other CMS used in Nevada and desired functionality	Contractor CIP Court Reps CMS Vendor	Gap analysis performed for each system Gap analysis document for each system	Revised: Oct. 2011 – Dec. 2011

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D4. Identify Court Child Welfare Case Management System (CMS) requirements (continued)	D 4.10 Identify ability of the rural District Court Child Welfare CMS to support performance measures (data requirements and business rules)	Contractor CIP Rural District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Analysis performed Analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jan. 2012 – July 2012
	D 4.11 Identify ability of the rural District Court Child Welfare CMS to support data exchanges identified in DC3	Contractor CIP Rural District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Analysis performed Analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jul. 2012 – Oct. 2012
	D 4.12 Identify gaps and inconsistencies between rural District Court Child Welfare CMS and desired functionality	Contractor CIP Rural District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Gap analysis performed Gap analysis documentation developed	Revised: Jul. 2010 – Oct. 2012
	D 4.13 Identify gaps and inconsistencies between other CMS used in Nevada and desired functionality	Contractor CIP Court Reps CMS Vendor	Gap analysis performed for each system Gap analysis document for each system	Revised: Oct. 2012 – Dec. 2012

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D5. Develop Child Welfare court Case Management System (CMS) standards	D 5.1 Identify desired Child Welfare CMS functionality and issues within Nevada	Contractor CIP Court Reps CMS Vendor	Consultant contracted Court Child Welfare CMS data and functionality standards identified Nevada Court Child Welfare CMS data and functionality standards developed	Revised: Sept. 2010 – Aug. 2011
	D 5.2 Identify desired Child Welfare CMS functionality standards in National Standards forum	Contractor Nat'l Forum reps CMS Vendor	National Court Child Welfare CMS Standards forum identified NCSC contracted National Standards forum meetings held National Court Child Welfare CMS Standards interim document developed	May 2009 – Dec 2009
	D 5.3 Review National Child Welfare CMS functionality standards	Contractor CIP Court Reps CMS Vendor	National Standards forum meetings held National Court Child Welfare CMS Standards document developed	July 2008 – Sept. 2009
	D 5.4 Perform gap analysis between National Child Welfare CMS functionality standards and current functionality of CMS implemented in Nevada	Contractor CIP Court Reps CMS Vendor	Gap analysis performed for each system Gap analysis document for each system	Dec. 2012 – Sept. 2013

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D6. Implement child welfare data exchanges	D 6.1 Implement high-priority data exchange in pilot county (presumably between DCFS system and 2 nd District Court Child Welfare CMS)	2 nd District Court Reps CMS Vendor DCFS DCFS system support staff Middleware Vendor	Court CMS vendors, middleware vendor, and DCFS support staff contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Sept. 2009 – Oct. 2010
	D 6.2 Implement remaining data exchanges in pilot county (presumably between DCFS system and 2 nd District Court Child Welfare CMS)	2 nd District Court Reps CMS Vendors DCFS DCFS system support staff Middleware Vendor	Court CMS vendors, middleware vendor, and DCFS support staff contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct. 2010 – Sept. 2012
	D 6.3 Implement high-priority data exchanges between DCFS system and other CMS used in Nevada	Court Reps CMS Vendors DCFS DCFS system support staff Middleware Vendor	Court CMS vendors, middleware vendor, and DCFS support staff contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct 2012 – Sept 2014
	D 6.4 Implement remaining data exchanges between DCFS system and other CMS used in Nevada	Court Reps CMS Vendors DCFS DCFS system support staff Middleware Vendor	Court CMS vendors, middleware vendor, and DCFS support staff contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct 2012 – Sept 2014

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D7. Implement Court Child Welfare Case Management System (CMS) standards	D 7.1 Implement Court Child Welfare CMS requirements standards in 2 nd District Court Child Welfare CMS	2 nd District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Court CMS vendor contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct. 2011 – Dec. 2012
	D 7.2 Implement Court Child Welfare CMS requirements standards in 8 th District Court Child Welfare CMS	8 th District Court Reps CMS Vendor	Court CMS vendor contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct. 2012 – Dec 2013
	D 7.3 Implement Court Child Welfare CMS requirements standards in rural courts Child Welfare CMS	AOC IT Rural Court Reps CMS Vendor	Court CMS vendor contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Software enhancements accepted and placed into production	Revised: Oct. 2013 – Sept. 2014

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D8. Implement Video Conferencing Capabilities in Courts for use in Child Welfare Cases	D 8.1 Perform business analysis and develop implementation blueprint for video conferencing capabilities	AOC IT CIP	Business Analysis performed Business Analysis document developed Implementation blueprint identified Implementation Blueprint developed	Nov 2008 – Jun 2009
	D 8.2 Implement Video Conferencing Capabilities in pilot jurisdiction(s)	AOC IT Pilot Court(s) Pilot Jurisdiction IT Selected Vendor(s)	Pilot jurisdictions identified Video vendor(s) contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Video capabilities implemented	Jul 2009 – Dec 2009
	D 8.3 Update business analysis and implementation blueprint document	AOC IT	Business Analysis updated Business Analysis document updated Implementation blueprint updated	Revised: Dec. 2009 – July. 2010
	D 8.4 Develop Court Guidelines for using Video Conferencing Capabilities for Child Welfare cases	CIP Courts	Video Usage Guidelines developed	Revised: Dec. 2009 – July. 2010
	D 8.5 Implement Video Conferencing Capabilities in remaining jurisdictions	AOC IT Courts Jurisdiction IT Selected Vendor(s)	Video vendor(s) contracted or otherwise obligated Project work plans established Video capabilities implemented	Revised: July 2010 – Dec 2012

Strategy	Activity	Accountable Party	Benchmarks	Timeline
D9. Provide Project Management Oversight for Data Projects	D 9.1 Obtain part-time Project Manager to oversee identified data projects	AOC Contractor	Project Manager scope of services developed RFP Project Manager selected	Revised: Oct. 2010 – Jun 2014

Chapter 3 – Collaboration Efforts

Collaboration Efforts to Date

Child Welfare Working Group meetings facilitated under contract with CIP by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) have taken and continue to take place in order to generate at least two detailed, high volume, high impact, information exchanges; conduct outreach to other interested states; and to develop the framework for providing information exchanges between courts and child welfare agencies.

Committee charters, deliverable results, and membership established for three working groups at the national level. Those being the:

Outreach Group - The Outreach Group to initiate and coordinate communications and participation with other participants in the Child Welfare/Courts information exchange process. Specifically, focus on those roles and agencies that may be under-represented. Determine effective modes, and produce materials that will help inform the Child Welfare and Courts communities about the Information Exchange project and the resulting tools. In coordination with the Implementation Group, ensure that tools and advice for implementation are readily accessible.

Data Modeling Group - The Data modeling group to continue the data mapping modeling work undertaken in the Denver meeting. Complete the modeling and definition work for at least two exchanges among those mapped. Determine the number of exchanges remaining within the domain.

Implementation Group - The Implementation group to develop recommended methods and protocols for the use of the Exchange Model to send and receive data between Courts and Child Welfare agencies. As time allows, also offer guidance to pilot jurisdictions, and gather documentation that can be added to the IEPD repository.

A Deputy Director, the IT Manager for Data Integration, and the CIP Coordinator from the Nevada AOC have been participating in the three working groups.

An overwhelming majority of the judges stated they would strongly support the implementation of a video conferencing system and felt that it would save both the courts and the individuals involved (i.e., victims, litigants, etc.) the time and money it takes to travel (in many cases tens or hundred of miles) to the courthouse. One court stated it would provide access to the courts for people that are otherwise shut out.

Planned Collaboration Efforts

A priority for CIP is continuing the work that has been started with our national partners in developing and implementing data exchange standards, with our statewide partners on developing and implementing case management system functionality standards, and with our statewide partners on implementing videoconferencing capabilities.

Over the next grant cycle, CIP will work with staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts, Second Judicial District Court, and the Division of Child and Family Services to implement one data exchange between the courts and the Division of Child and Family Services.

Using technology in the most efficient manner will ultimately assist in improving outcomes for children and families by reducing errors in duplicative data entry and allow performance measurement capabilities, which will lead to more consistency and more timely outcomes. Appropriate use of technology can bring our state stakeholders closer together through use of video and teleconferencing on NRS 432B child welfare cases, NRS Chapter 62 and/or Child Support Cases; for purposes of training; to take testimony from any victim, witness, or expert witness, particularly in our resource and geographically challenged state; to allow communication between Judges both in-state and nationally; and can be used for allowing prisoners to participate in cases involving their families, ultimately providing better access to justice. CIP will continue to work with all stakeholders to implement technology appropriate to meeting its mission, purpose, and goals.

Judicial Council of the State of Nevada
COURT IMPROVEMENT FOR THE PROTECTION AND PERMANENCY
OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN (CIP) SELECT COMMITTEE

(Revised August 27, 2009)

Justice Nancy M. Saitta, Chair
Supreme Court of Nevada

Diane J. Comeaux

Administrator
Division of Child and Family Services

Judge Cynthia Dianne Steel

District Court Judge
8th Judicial District Court/ Family Division

William "Bill" E. Fowler

Executive Director
Nevada CASA Association, Inc.

Ron Titus

Director and State Court Administrator
Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

Tom Morton

Director
Clark County Dept of Family Services

Erika Pike Turner, Esq.

Attorney at Law
Gordon Silver

Kathleen M. O'Leary

Chief Deputy Public Defender
Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Janice Wolf, Esq.

Attorney at Law
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

Judge Andrew Puccinelli

District Court Judge
4th Judicial District Court

Members Emeritus

Judge Michael Gibbons

District Court Judge
9th Judicial District Court

Cynthia "Cindy" Pyzel

Chief Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Nevada Attorney General

Mary Herzik

Director
Washoe County CASA

Kevin Schiller

Director
Washoe County Dept of Social Services

Tammy Tovey Stephenson

Senior Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Nevada Attorney General

Judge Deborah E. Schumacher

District Court Judge
2nd Judicial District Court

Pat Thacker

Director
Clark County CASA

Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

Assembly District 30, Nevada

Chief Judge Teresa Sprouse

Tribal Judge
Duckwater Shoshone Tribal Court

Committee Staff

Sheryl A. Overstreet

Coordinator
Court Improvement Program (CIP)
Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

Robbie Taft

Assistant
Court Improvement Program (CIP)
Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

Table of Collaborative Partners for Data Grant

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Individual Names</u>
Administrative Office of the Courts	Deanna Bjork Anne Heck Patricia Hudgins Hans Jessup Robert Kastelitz Jan McGinty Scott Sosebee Anna Verbanac
<u>Courts</u>	
1st Judicial District Court	Judge David I. Nielsen Judge James Todd Russell Judge Jim Wilson
2nd Judicial District Court	Judge Buffy Dreiling Judge Deborah Schumacher
3rd Judicial District Court	Judge Leon Aberasturi Judge Stephen T. Grund Judge David A. Huff Judge Mike Lister
4th Judicial District Court	Judge William G. Rogers Judge Mike Memeo Judge Andrew Puccinelli Judge Mason E. Simons
5th Judicial District Court	Judge John P. Davis Judge Robert W. Lane Judge Joe Maslach Judge Margaret E. Whittaker
6th Judicial District Court	Judge Samuel Matheny Judge Michael Montero Judge Richard Wagner
7th Judicial District Court	Judge Steven Dobrescu Judge Dan L. Papez
8th Judicial District Court	Judge Jane Femiano Judge Cynthia Dianne Steel
9th Judicial District Court	Judge David R. Gamble Judge Michael P. Gibbons
National Resource Center on Legal & Judicial Issues	Tim Clark Paul Embly Gene Flango
Sierra Association of Foster Families	Joseph Galata
Waterhole Software, Inc.	Aaron Gorrell

Table of Collaborative Partners includes individuals who have at some time worked on a CIP-related project, including our contract and subgrant partners, and/or individuals or entities who share our common goal(s).