

**Washington State Court Improvement Program
2013 Annual Self-Assessment Report**

- 1. Provide a bulleted list of the workgroups, committees or planning groups your CIP currently participates in with the child welfare agency, tribes, and other important partners. Concisely summarize the purpose of each group and the role of the CIP in that group.**

Washington CIP currently participates with the following partners:

- **CIP Advisory Committee** consists of representatives from Superior Court Judges' Association Family and Juvenile Law Committee (FJLC), Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators, Tribal Courts, Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration (CA), Office of the Attorney General, Office of Public Defense, Casey Family Programs, Northwest Justice Project, and Washington Court Appointed Special Advocates. The purpose of the committee is to provide input and direction regarding the administration of CIP grant funds for improving outcomes for children and families in the child welfare system by increasing collaborative efforts of courts and child welfare partners.
- **Title IV-E Waiver Advisory Committee.** Child welfare partners, including CIP, advise CA regarding the implementation of the Family Assessment Response IV-E demonstration project. The role of CIP is to provide the perspective of the court and share information regarding the project with FJLC.
- **Family Support & Related Services Roundtable.** Child welfare partners, including CIP, advise CA regarding the Family Support and Related Services Performance Based Contracting Request for Proposal to replace their current system of contracting for services. CIP provides the court's perspective to workgroup sessions.
- **Commission on Children in Foster Care** meets to improve collaboration between the courts, child welfare partners and the education system to provide all children in foster care with safe, permanent families in which their physical, emotional, intellectual and social needs are met. CIP reports to commission about projects and receives input from commission members.
- **Children's Justice Task Force** provides recommendations to CA in the development, establishment and operation of programs that promote safety and protection of children, especially regarding child abuse and neglect. Task force members plan and participate in the annual Children's Justice Conference. CIP training staff work with the task force to develop the judicial educational sessions

for the conference. CIP promotes and coordinates judicial attendance at the conference.

- **Washington State Racial Disproportionality Advisory Committee** explores the root causes of and makes recommendations for remediation of the overrepresentation of children of color in the child welfare system. CIP data staff have provided research and presentation of findings to the committee.
- **Superior Court Judges' Association Family and Juvenile Law Committee (FJLC)** provides leadership and advocacy to assure an accessible court system that is responsive to the needs of children and families. CIP staffs the committee and the co-chairs of this committee also serve as co-chairs of the CIP Advisory Committee.
- **Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA)** coordinate on a statewide basis policies, programs and funding for juvenile courts. WAJCA provides a representative on the CIP Advisory Committee. CIP funds a vision retreat every two years between the FJLC and WAJCA to discuss issues surrounding youth who cross-over between the child welfare system and juvenile offenders.
- **Washington State Program Improvement Plan (PIP) Team.** CIP director, as well as data and training staff, worked with CA to develop, implement and report on strategies to address PIP benchmarks.
- **Tribal/State Court Consortium.** CIP coordinated and provided funding for a meeting between tribal judges and state court judges to form a consortium to work on developing judicial relationships to better resolve issues related to both courts.
- **Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)** in conjunction with CA and Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) annually submits the [*Plan for Cross-System Collaboration Report*](#) to the Legislature. This report provides the status of the state's plan to promote educational stability and improve educational outcomes for foster children pursuant to the requirements of the federal fostering connections to success and increasing adoptions act, P.L. 110-351. CIP meets with OSPI and CA on a quarterly basis.
- **Mockingbird Society** works collaboratively with youth, families and community partners for child welfare system reform and improvement. CIP attends and provides funding for the annual Foster Youth and Alumni Leadership Summit, where youth from around the state present youth-led ideas for reform to the Commission on Children in Foster Care and other leaders.
- **DSHS Extended Foster Care/Juvenile Rehabilitation Stakeholder and Youth Consultation.** CIP participated with this workgroup to provide recommendations regarding dependent youth's access to extended foster care services once released from juvenile rehabilitation. Recommendations will be provided to the governor and legislature.

- **Family Time/Visitation Advisory Group** developed the *Washington State Family Time/Visitation Guidance for Young Children (Birth to 5 Years) in Out of Home Care*. CIP served on the work group to provide perspective from the courts and will assist with the distribution of the document, once it is approved by the CCFC.
- **King County Model Court Advisory Committee** incorporates judicial leadership, collaboration and CQI to develop and support innovative court-based practices. CIP participated in planning meetings, and CIP funds paid for the contract with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) to provide technical assistance.

2. List all projects that involved assessments or evaluations completed in federal FY 2013 (Oct 2012-September 2013). Briefly explain: 1) the purpose of each evaluation or assessment; 2) action steps taken; 3) data collected or generated; and 4) how the information will be used to inform continuous quality improvement.

The King County Model Court implemented a mediation pilot program for juvenile dependency cases to improve efficiency of case processing. Mediation is offered prior to adjudication to families coming in to the dependency court system. NCJFCJ evaluated the pilot program and provided findings. A preliminary assessment, Phase I, was completed in 2010. Phase II followed cases through permanency hearing and case closure in order to examine the long-term effects. In 2013, Phase III examined long-term outcomes of mediated cases versus non-mediated cases and explored satisfaction with the mediation process. NCJFCJ found that parents who participated in mediation felt they had a voice and were respected during mediation; parents and stakeholders were satisfied overall with the process and outcomes of mediation; and mediated cases were more likely to result in reunification (see attached report). This information will be shared with other courts in Washington State as an example of how mediation could improve efficiency of case processing, allowing more time for courts to address more difficult and complex cases.

The objective of the King County Parent for Parent (P4P) program is to improve engagement and outcomes for families involved in the dependency system. Process and outcome evaluations were performed by the NCJFCJ. Staff collected and analyzed data and found that participating in the P4P program and attending Dependency 101 training resulted in increased compliance with case plans and visitation, and participants had a greater rate of reunification and a lower rate of termination of parental rights compared to non-participants. Due to the success of the P4P program in King County, the model was used to develop P4P programs in three other counties using CIP funds. The goal is to implement this program statewide as funding becomes available.

3. Identify and describe any projects currently underway that are utilizing child welfare administrative data (i.e., SACWIS, AFCARS, NCANDS, NYTD, or other data reports that may be provided by the title IV-B/IV-E agency).

Child welfare data obtained from AFCARS and FamLink are matched with court records from the Administrative Office of the Courts' Superior Court Management and Information System (SCOMIS) to provide comprehensive dependency reports. FamLink is the case management system used by Washington State Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration (CA). AOC has a memorandum of understanding with CA to allow data sharing between the two agencies. The *Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes* annual reports are produced by the Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR). This report is provided to the courts, Children's Administration, the Office of Attorney General, the Office of Public Defense, legislators and other child welfare system stakeholders to inform policy makers as they create and shape dependency laws in an effort to improve the outcomes for children in the dependency system. It also assists the courts in tracking their own progress in meeting the performance measures that have been developed to address the most pressing problems facing those who are involved in the child welfare system.

In addition to the annual report, WSCCR provides courts with more frequent opportunities to monitor their dependency caseloads and take corrective action if needed. The Interactive Dependency Timeliness Report (IDTR) is a web-based application which addresses the need for frequent and robust feedback to the field. The tool allows users to view data for the state, their own county, or any other county. Users specify data filter criteria and level of detail. Improvement to the data exchange schedule between the WSCCR and CA allows for more frequent updates to the interactive reports. Current court data is updated monthly and CA data is updated quarterly. Through continual and expanding cooperation from CA, quality assurance teams, county clerks, Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Plan coordinators, and the Court Improvement Training Academy, the IDTR is also enhancing direct training efforts, providing the needed data to more accurately assess training needs, which ultimately improve outcomes for children and families.

WSCCR contracted with Washington State Department of Social and Health Services Research and Data Analysis (RDA) to conduct a more in-depth analysis evaluating the impact of racial disproportionality on processes and outcomes regarding dependent children. The analysis will look at the following:

- The effect of court compliance with case processing objectives on dependency case length.
- Court differences in case processing compliance rates, adjusting for differences in case characteristics.

- Court differences in rates of foster care re-entry and new founded allegations of child abuse/neglect following case dismissal.
- Counts and case-identifying information of failed adoptions for each court.
- Expansion of the study of the effect of court compliance with case processing objectives on dependency case length to a time-dependent covariate analysis framework.
- Initial assessment of data availability and recommendations for future analyses of the impact of services on dependency case timeliness: what and how to track.
- Development of child well-being indicators for use in future analyses of court processes and outcomes.

Research staff will use FamLink in conjunction with SCOMIS to perform the analyses. WSCCR and CA will continue to look for ways to improve data system integration and collaboration between the two agencies.

4. Summarize your current capacity on the below technology and data topics. With respect to the required timeliness measures, please explain how the measures are or will be used by your statewide multi-disciplinary task force to promote CQI:

a. the required timeliness (toolkit) measures;

[*The Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes 2012 Annual Report*](#) includes data regarding fact finding within 75 days, review

hearings every six months, permanency planning hearing within 12 months, permanency before 15 months of out-of-home care, TPR petition filed within 15 months of out-of-home care, adoption within six months of termination order.

With the IDTR, described above, counties are able to see, in nearly real time, how they are performing in comparison to other counties in the State and look at problematic cases to see what needs to be done to get the cases back on track, a process that supports CQI. The CIP Advisory Committee will use information from the report to guide the development of the CIP strategic plan and funding decisions to improve timeliness measures.

b. data sharing and data exchange between the child welfare agency and the courts, the department of education, or other relevant stakeholders (where applicable list any regular data reports that are run for interested parties and how those reports are used);

WSCCR continues to work with CA and RDA to exchange data. This effort contributes to the dependency reporting produced by the WSCCR which includes the annual report, as well as monthly and quarterly online updates. These updates provide court-specific reporting with drill-down capability (described in number 3 above) that supports the development of multiple systems of performance management in the courts, Children's Administration, Office of Attorney General, Office of Public Defense, and other child welfare system partners. The Court

Improvement Training Academy uses the IDTR to more accurately assess training needs and improve outcomes for children and families.

c. data accessibility and interpretation (include efforts to make data more useful to decision-makers, including efforts to make dashboards, graphics and other data displays);

As mentioned before the *Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes* report is provided annually to legislature. In addition, the monthly update to the IDTR is provided to the CIP Director, CITA, Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) coordinators, Attorney General's Office, and Office of Public Defense. CITA works closely with WSCCR to interpret and use data to assist in determining what the needs are of each county court system to support training efforts. FJCIP coordinators use the data to track timeliness in their court system and make changes as needed.

WSCCR and RDA jointly presented findings regarding child welfare racial disproportionality to the Washington State Racial Disproportionality Advisory Committee, as well as the Superior Court Judges' Association Family and Juvenile Law Committee. The data was presented using graphs and charts displayed via PowerPoint along with a verbal description and an opportunity for questions.

d. additional toolkit measures, child well-being measures, or other process or quality indicators your program has or is working to implement.

WSCCR has been working in conjunction with RDA to study disproportionality in dependency. The data shows time in process, with plans to develop better indicators in well-being. These new initiatives will take several years to produce results and it will take time for system changes to be reflected in the data in Washington State. The initial look at racial differences in the length of dependency cases shows a substantial difference by race, which seems to exist statewide across courts, not related to geography or whether the court processes cases more or less expeditiously. The nexus for why is unclear, as the issues surrounding dependency can be very complicated. With dependency, faster isn't necessarily better than slower. Some of the issues raised that could cause delays are the need for interpreters and availability of services. Termination of parental rights isn't always a good result. Kinship care can slow the decision-making process, but bring better results. Cultural customs can keep kids in the system longer, i.e., the Native Americans have different ideas on family, kinship care and adoption; and African Americans tend to prefer extended families. Other factors could include the degree of poverty. Local level conversations are needed to look

at decision points and how we can research why the system may be different for different kinds of kids.

A new project pertains to cross-over (multi-system) youth who are involved in more than one system related to child welfare, juvenile offending, and juvenile status offending. Recent studies have shown that contact with the child welfare system was associated with offender referrals at a younger age, longer time spent in detention, more serious offending and greater likelihood of repeat offending. The [2011 Doorways to Delinquency](#) report, produced for King County, Washington, by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, showed that 37% of youth referred to the King County Juvenile Court on offender matters had either an accepted moderate or high risk child protection referral or had a petition filed or were placed outside the home. CIP provided funding to WSCCR to expand the reporting to every county in Washington State to identify characteristics and needs of the cross-over youth to inform policy and program development. Researchers will use data from Famlink, SCOMIS, and the Juvenile Court System. The resulting reports and presentations will be given to the CIP Advisory Committee, courts, CA, Office of Attorney General, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), WAJCA, CCFC, FJCIP and FJLC. The report to the courts will also be shared with members of the legislature. The goal is to use this information to identify targets for system reform and effective interventions for youth.

5. Identify and describe your efforts to implement CQI to ensure measurable outcomes in the below areas, including a description of methodologies used, instruments developed, and any relevant performance measurements:

a. timely, thorough, and complete court hearings;

A steady improvement has been seen across the state in timeliness of hearings. CQI plays an important role through the continuous feedback received by courts and stakeholders, with significant improvements made in the collection and analysis of the data based on that feedback. It is difficult to measure and apply CQI to the quality of hearings, which is closely associated with adequate length of hearings. Due to limited judicial resources, the length of hearings in many, if not most, Washington courts is not adequate for courts to conduct truly quality hearings. The [Dependent Children in Washington: Case Timeliness and Outcomes Annual Report](#), lays out best practices in terms of both cost and evidence base. Feedback from users of this report will be used to develop better practices. The CIP data researcher compiles data on outcomes and shares them with the courts on a monthly basis, again creating another feedback loop for CQI.

CQI procedures are also used in the Child and Family Service Review Program Improvement Plan (CFSR PIP). Data analysis was used to pinpoint areas that needed to focus, rather than spend time and money on a broad-sweeping statewide approach to training. CIP data researcher, CITA and court staff were able to more easily identify issues and take corrective action to improve the timeliness measures. Focus on the courts with the higher rates of non-compliance has decreased the percentage of non-compliance for those counties, which in turn effected the statewide numbers.

The [Washington State Dependency Best Practices Report](#), discussed in the 2012 CIP Self-Assessment Report, was distributed to every judicial officer in juvenile court and will be provided to judicial officers as their rotation places them in juvenile court. The report is a compendium of court best practices and of services available to children and families in dependency cases and is a living document that will include CQI.

b. high quality legal representation for parents, children and the title IV-B/IV-E agency;

The Washington State Office of Public Defense (OPD) provides high-quality representation for parents in dependency and termination cases in 66% of Washington's counties. The program has been evaluated as increasing reunifications (OPD and the Washington State Center for Court research, 2010) and speeding permanency for children (Mark Courtney and Jennifer Hooks, 2011). In 2013, the Washington State Legislature appropriated an additional \$3.4 million to implement the program in additional counties; as of July 2014, the program will be expanded to 85% of the state.

The legislature is considering a bill to require attorney representation for children in Washington State. Currently each court has their own policy regarding children's representation, some providing representation for certain age groups and others providing it on an as needed basis. The courts support this legislation from a policy prospective, however, because Washington State does not have a unified court system, the cost for supplying attorney representation would fall on the individual counties, who do not have funds available to cover the expense. The courts will continue to monitor the progress of this bill to assure adequate funding will be provided to support the legislation, if passed.

Due to budgetary issues for the Attorney General's Office (AGO), it has been difficult to retain high quality legal representation for Children's Administration, causing delays in the filing of petitions. Rather than AGO approaching the

legislature to request funding for just their agency to fill their specific need, agency partners (Courts, OPD, AGO, and CA) are working together to provide a systemic approach to present information to the legislature that would not only shorten the time in dependent care for children, but also decrease the overall cost to the state.

c. engagement of the entire family in child welfare proceedings;

After successful implementation of a Parent for Parent (P4P) program in King County Model Court, CIP funds were used to contract with Catalyst for Kids to expand the program into three other counties in Washington State. In each county veteran parents familiar with the child welfare system were recruited and trained to engage families earlier in services and reduce resistance to the court process. This includes a Dependency 101 orientation class. Each P4P leadership team takes ownership for developing the program at their sites and is responsible for oversight and support. The team includes representatives of the county Superior Court, Office of the Attorney General, Office of Public Defense, parent representatives, social workers, CA, CASA, and local community service organizations. Catalyst for Kids developed a *Parents for Parents Program Start-Up Guide* which aids in the development of a program customized for the particular needs of the area being served. Parents for Parents provides the framework and infrastructure for parent advocacy work and develops the capacity of veteran parent leadership and creates within the sometimes skeptical community an appreciation for the roles that veteran parents can play. In 2014, DSHS will be rolling out the first phase of the Family Assessment Response (FAR) project. Two of the three pilot sites, have P4P in place and communication has begun regarding potential roles for veteran parents in the FAR system. Surveys are used as a tool to measure success for the P4P program. Parents, judicial officers, CASA, CA caseworkers, Assistant Attorney Generals, parent's attorneys and P4P staff complete surveys, which are provided to the P4P leadership team for consideration and appropriate implementation

The Family Time Guidance Workgroup drafted the *Washington State Family Time/Visitation Guidance for Young Children (Birth-5 Years) in Out of Home Care*. The purpose of the document is to provide judicial officers and legal professionals with developmentally appropriate guidance for determining visitation (family time) in dependency cases involving young children, birth to 5 years old. The guidance was requested by the legal community in response to mounting evidence of the critical role that parent-child relationships play in early childhood development. The multi-disciplinary workgroup consisted of representatives from AOC, AGO, OPD, CA, King County Superior Court, Parents

for Parents, Partners for Our Children, Center for Children and Youth Justice, and an early childhood policy expert. The work is informed by neuroscience research, protocols adopted by other states, and recommendations from national organizations and experts. The requirements of state law and CA policies and practices are also reflected in the document. The final draft is expected to be approved for distribution in 2014.

d. physical, social and emotional well-being needs of children and youth;

CIP provides funding to the Mockingbird Society to sponsor the annual [Foster Youth and Alumni Leadership Summit](#). Youth from across the state propose reforms aimed at eliminating barriers to education, housing and normal childhood experiences. Policymakers, advocates and community members work alongside youth throughout the year to address the proposed reforms. The proposals are presented by the youth at the summit to the Washington State Supreme Court Commission on Children in Foster Care. These proposals initiate a year-round effort to bring positive changes that will benefit those currently in foster care as well as those who have yet to enter the system.

As of September 2013, nearly 8,000 children in Washington State were in foster care. More than 5,000 were school age and represented some of the most vulnerable students in the state. The CIP Director works with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and CA on improving educational outcomes for students in foster care. School records are now available between schools and electronic records can be transferred between OSPI and CA. A geomap of licensed foster care homes by school district has been created and is available on the OSPI website. This map will assist efforts to target foster home recruitment based on identified needs for foster care homes in certain locations, which will in turn reduce the need for foster children transferred to another home to also have to change schools or increase transportation. Next steps for the AOC/OSPI/CA partnership will be to invite communications specialists from each agency to brainstorm the best ways to inform the community about kids in foster care and educational outcomes. The hope for this public outreach is to increase the number of licensed homes, mentors and educational liaisons.

The sharing of information and cross-agency collaboration is significantly breaking down the barriers, resulting in more public educators becoming involved in guiding education decisions for foster care students, as well as more comfortable and comprehensive involvement in schools by CA field staff. Increased collaboration has improved the working relationships between agencies. For the first time, schools and districts have the permission and ability to know

which of their students are currently in foster care. This allows for directed student accommodations, focused student/staff training, and concentrated wrap-around services. These efforts should improve education outcomes and increase the number of foster care students being on track to graduate, which in turn will assist them in becoming successful adults.

e. Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) compliance;

The King County Model Court utilized the ICWA Implementation Discussion Guide developed by NCJFCJ to review practices, policies and resources available to improve compliance with ICWA. The NCJFCJ, University of Washington, Casey Family Programs, and the Minneapolis American Indian Center (MAIC) assisted the court with evaluating court compliance with the ICWA. ICWA compliance will continue to be reviewed to improve outcomes for children and families in tribal communities. The ICWA discussion guide will be offered to other courts in Washington State to generate discussion among members of judicially-led meetings with child welfare stakeholders and tribal partners.

The CIP Director supported the efforts of the Supreme Court Gender and Justice Commission and Minority and Justice Commission to sponsor a statewide planning meeting to discuss forming a Tribal State Court Consortium in Washington State. Eleven tribal judges and 17 state court judges were in attendance. Washington State Supreme Court Chief Justice Madsen, and Tulalip Tribal Court of Appeals Chief Justice Jane Smith, along with several other tribal and state court judges introduced the topics for discussion. The meeting was facilitated by Judge William Thorne (Ret.) from Utah and Fred Fisher, Casey Family Programs. Discussion centered on how tribal and state/municipal courts are already collaborating. Interest was expressed in participating in a tribal-state court consortium. Participants also discussed local issues that need to be addressed such as truancy, domestic violence, sharing criminal histories/background checks, resources for families and dependent youth, chemical dependency, mental health services and child support agreements. Participants were encouraged to contact their counterparts to begin developing relationships between the tribal and state court partners. The group will meet again after the first of the year. Three judges that had attended a cross-site visit through the model courts program provided leadership of this collaborative event. This project is an example of how the model court and CIP funds have expanded to benefit the entire state.

In addition to the meeting, a bench guide is being developed to assist judicial officers in understanding the differences and similarities between state courts and

tribal courts, information on ICWA and domestic violence, and to provide contact information to assist in communication efforts between the courts. The CIP Director will continue to support the efforts to further ongoing and meaningful collaboration with tribes, as recommended by the court improvement program guidelines.

The CIP Director participated in an initial planning meeting for a pilot project between the Tulalip Tribal Court and Snohomish County Superior Court regarding dependent youth and truancy. The same youth may be seen by both courts for different reasons and a collaborative approach between the two would be beneficial for all involved. Future meetings will also include the Office of Superintendent of Public Schools, Snohomish School District, CA and AGO. The CIP Director will continue to support the efforts and share the results

- f. Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) work; and other CQI projects or activities not mentioned above that you would like to highlight.**

- 6. Describe the methods you are using to evaluate the effectiveness of CIP training activities. Where possible, provide one specific example of an evaluation effort that was helpful in understanding the success of a training event.**

In general, the effectiveness of CIP training efforts is measured first and foremost by whether indicators reported in the Interactive Dependency Timeliness Report (IDTR) are improving both on the statewide level and in individual jurisdictions. CITA training efforts include essentially two types of learning opportunities: 1) more traditional classroom and workshop style training, such as, the Reasonable Efforts Symposia (RES), judicial trainings, and Continuing Legal Education sessions; and 2) more technical assistance oriented efforts, such as, Tables of Ten and work done regarding Washington State Program Improvement Plan (PIP). These efforts overlap a great deal, but merit different types of evaluation.

For the more formal learning opportunities, i.e., RES and judicial trainings, evaluation is primarily through feedback from participants. Traditional training evaluation questionnaires are directed not only to whether participants “enjoyed” the training or thought it was informative, but also whether they believed the opportunity would create changes in their practice following the training or event. Data collected from RES participants, for example, confirmed our understanding that information provided at such events must be coupled with adequate time and process during the session to allow for participants to digest the information and work with colleagues to determine how to

implement the new information to ongoing practice. CITA also seeks informal feedback from participants when engaging smaller groups on more focused projects as to whether and how these more formal learning opportunities have been helpful in improving outcomes.

Technical assistance type interventions allow CITA to more directly measure the outcomes of their efforts. Generally speaking, CITA measures success in these endeavors through informal use evaluation. More specifically, interventions are typically tied to measures reported in the IDTR. A specific example of this kind of effort is the work on Washington's Child and Family Service Review Program Improvement Plan (PIP). One PIP requirement related directly to child welfare courts was the need to improve compliance with the federal requirement to file a termination of parental rights petition within 15 months of a child being placed out of home, unless the court made a "good cause finding" that a termination petition was not warranted in that particular case. In collaboration with AOC and CA, CITA created a short 5-minute electronic presentation to provide substantive information related to the issue, which was distributed to all judicial officers conducting child welfare proceedings and other system stakeholders. Data from the IDTR was used to identify which of the 13 largest jurisdictions in Washington State fell below the state-wide compliance average for this measure and efforts were made to directly contact those jurisdictions about the issue. This review of the data resulted in CITA focusing efforts in six counties below the state average.

CITA worked directly with each of the six counties (and others who sought assistance) to not only train their personnel on the issue, but to drill down into the data to a case-level analysis of what exactly caused the problem and then designed specific interventions to address those issues. Statewide compliance on this issue has improved by 5% from 2012 to 2013. Our largest jurisdiction, King County, improved its compliance rate by 9% over that same time period and another county achieved a 19% improvement.

In summary, use of IDTR data allowed CITA to engage in a process of focusing on specific counties with high impact potential. It also allowed the counties to drill down into case level data to craft locally relevant solutions to the issue and engage the problem in a way that would not have been possible from a generalized training effort resulting in improved outcomes and conservation of CIP training grant funds. CITA is currently developing a more in-depth evaluation of this effort to examine the mechanism by which this change occurred.

Although we are able to gauge the impact of CIP training efforts through analysis of IDTR data, in many cases, not all of our work is tied to specific IDTR measures. For

example, in collaboration with the University of Washington School of Medicine and DSHS and using information provided by the NCJFCJ, CITA was part of a collaboration that created a Washington-specific bench card for child welfare court judicial officers to use when addressing the issue of psychotropic medication prescriptions and use among the population of foster youth appearing before those courts. This effort was in response to Medicare data showing significantly higher rates of psychotropic prescriptions among foster youth compared to the general population of youth and the court's reaction to that data. Through a process that took more than a year, the bench card was developed. Training of judicial officers on the bench card began in December 2013. In conjunction with the bench card, The University of Washington School of Medicine, in collaboration with the Washington State Department of Health, created a state map that showed the different rates at which foster youth are receiving prescriptions for psychotropic medications, broken out by county. The mapping of rates of prescriptions was used to establish baselines for judicial officers for their county, and may be used as a proxy measure to examine the effect of the bench card as part of the CQI process.

7. Describe your largest challenges in implementing CQI into the overall approach of your statewide multi-disciplinary team and any particular challenges you may have experienced with CQI in specific projects or activities.

The challenge this past year in implementing CQI is mostly due to the learning curve of a new CIP Director. As we start a new year in 2014, the CIP Director plans to convene the CIP Advisory Committee for a meeting to look at the data and issues surrounding foster care in Washington State and create a vision which will better direct CIP efforts and in making funding decision for CIP projects.

8. Identify the types of technical assistance that would be most helpful in supporting your CQI efforts. Provide specific examples of projects or activities for which TA would be most helpful.

Completed by: Cindy Bricker, Sr. Court Program Analyst/CIP Director

Telephone: 360-705-5306

Email: cindy.bricker@courts.wa.gov