

State Court Improvement Program 2022 Annual Self-Assessment Report Washington State

This self-assessment is intended as an opportunity for Court Improvement Programs (CIPs) to review progress on CIP projects, joint program planning and improvement efforts with the child welfare agency, and the ability to integrate (Continuous Quality Improvement) CQI successfully into practice. The self-assessment process is designed to help shape and inform ongoing strategic planning and should include meaningful discussion with the multi-disciplinary task force and candid reflection of key CIP staff. The self-assessment primarily focused on assessing efforts undertaken to date while the strategic plan maps out efforts going forward. Questions are designed to solicit candid responses that help CIPs apply CQI and identify support that may be helpful.

I. CQI Analyses of Required Projects *It is ok to cut and paste responses from last year, updating according to where you currently are in the process, and, if you do so, highlight text to show anything that is new. Complete the descriptions for CQI stages you have progressed through or are in. Though some upcoming stages will be inapplicable, consider whether your team may have preliminary thoughts that are relevant to those questions. Please also indicate if you need assistance from your federal or Capacity Building partners in a particular phase.*

Joint Project with the Child Welfare Agency:

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

[The Safety Summit Project](#) is the result of a training partnership between the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF). Originating from a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) strategy initiative (Strategy 4.2), Safety Summits were held in five Washington counties in 2021 ([King County](#), [Kitsap County](#), [Pierce County](#), [Chelan County](#), and [Mason County](#)), and two counties in 2022 ([Spokane County](#) and [Grays Harbor County](#)).

Safety Summits provide local court jurisdictions with high-quality training on safety framework practices within the context of a guided change management process that includes organization, planning, action, and evaluation phases. Safety Summits revolve around a half-day training event that focuses on helping local dependency court systems develop a shared understanding of how to assess and talk about child safety. Using a crosswalk of the [ABA Child Safety Guide](#) (Safety

Framework) and the DCYF Child Safety Framework, this training teaches systems how to effectively apply the safety framework to crucial aspects (safety assessment, safety planning, conditions for return, family time, and case planning) of cases in tangible ways that ultimately result in a more effective dependency system and better outcomes for families. The training included joint presentation by Rob Wyman, Judicial Education Consultant with Casey Family Programs and the DCYF Safety Program Manager (currently vacant).

The final hour of the Safety Summit involved action planning sessions where summit attendees are guided through two breakout room activities (one mixed-discipline; one discipline-specific). Using the information gathered from the action planning, CIP worked with each site to create a Strategic Plan that included the shared system vision, discipline group action steps, and the support available through CIP to assist in implementing the plan and supporting any resulting projects. Sites are at various stages in working through their strategic plans. New, creative innovations for practice change are already emerging from multiple sites (see [Safety Summit Showcase](#)). The training materials, video recording, and strategic plans for all Safety Summit sites can be found in each site's respective online [HUB](#).

Identify the specific safety, permanency, or well-being outcome(s) this project is intended to address. If this effort is linked to any agency measures, e.g. CFSR measures, please note those.

Safety Outcome 2 – Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Permanency Outcome 1 – Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Cross-system safety training is a Washington State DCYF Program Improvement Plan (PIP) strategy initiative (Strategy 4.2).

As a result of cross-disciplinary training and coaching, court partners and DCYF staff will understand and articulate consistent child safety language in court hearings, including:

- the current assessment of safety in the home (safety threats, child vulnerability, and parent protective capacity);
- safety planning;
- conditions of return;
- supervision and plan for family time; and
- case plan, including requirements to dismiss the case.

Caseworkers will submit a current DCYF Safety Assessment/Safety Plan with their standard court report.

Approximate date that the project began:

The official start date, according to the Program Improvement Plan was July 1, 2020, for the developing the safety crosswalk that is the underpinning for the summits. Planning for the Safety Summit Project started approximately June 1, 2021.

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

Phase V: Evaluate and Apply Findings

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

The need was identified through our Hearing Quality Project, which sought to apply the ABA Safety Guide to the context of Family Time (parent/child visit) decisions by courts. When introduced to the ABA framework for assessing safety, judicial officers found it useful and requested additional training for themselves and for court partners. The CFSR findings reflected a need for DCYF staff to improve their understanding and application of the department’s safety framework, utilizing critical thinking and assessment to drive practice. During 2020, CIP, DCYF staff and the court system-focused PIP team reviewed the data and identified that inconsistent application of DCYF’s safety framework impacts permanency decisions.

Root cause analysis of CFSR results determined that caseworkers do not have consistent support and oversight to complete required shared planning meetings and integrate the Safety Framework into practice. This results in an inability to clearly communicate safety threats to children, parents, the court, and court partners and to create individualized case plans that accurately identify needed services to support timely permanency.

At the request of Washington State CIP, the Capacity Building Center for Courts (CBCC) conducted a baseline evaluation of safety decision making practices of seven courts in Washington State. The following themes emerged:

- vulnerabilities, protective capacities, and conditions for return are rarely discussed at hearings;
- safety analysis and discussions of safety planning rarely occur in court;
- safety-related justifications for supervised family time were rarely articulated;
- need for child welfare and court professionals to better understand and be able to articulate how case plan progress relates to safety.

The author of the evaluation, Dr. Alicia Summers, provided the following suggestions for improvement:

- enhance understanding of all stakeholders through multidisciplinary trainings;
- engage parents to better understand concepts and language regarding safety considerations;
- enhance training of professionals around safety planning, conditions for return home, and case planning;
- enhance training to ensure knowledge translates to behavior change, where practice aligns with understanding of safety training concepts.

The baseline evaluation report, Washington Baseline Safety Decision-Making Practice, March 2021 can be found here: https://www.wacita.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Washington-Baseline-Safety-Hearing-Quality-Report_Final.pdf. In its current Program Improvement Plan, the Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) identifies the below root cause in Goal Area 4: Permanency. DCYF collaborated with the courts and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of PIP strategies to address this need:

“The lack of consistent support and oversight for caseworkers to complete ongoing shared planning meetings and integrate the Safety Framework into practice results in an inability to clearly communicate safety threats to children, parents, the court, and court partners and to create individualized case plans that accurately identify needed services to support timely permanency.”

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II).

Deliver interdisciplinary safety guide training:

SO THAT a shared understanding and language of safety is created;

SO THAT sufficient information is collected;

SO THAT threats of danger are identified and protective capacities are accurately assessed throughout the life of the case;

SO THAT effective safety plans and case plans are created;

SO THAT a child remains in the home;

OR THAT if a child is placed out-of-home, appropriate family time is ordered and conditions of return home are identified and understood;

SO THAT all parties are clear as to what strategies and services are necessary to achieve permanency;

SO THAT safe and lasting permanency is achieved in each and every case.

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

CFSR Program Improvement Plan:

Strategy 4.2: DCYF staff and court partners will develop, understand, and articulate consistent language regarding DCYF's Safety Framework and implement changes in caseworker and court practice related to the Safety Framework.

4.2.1 Establish a short-term multi-disciplinary workgroup of IDCC subgroup members, FJCIP coordinators, field AGO, HQ program managers, DCYF field, Court Improvement Training Academy (CITA), the Alliance, and other identified stakeholders to:

- Develop a crosswalk of DCYF Safety Framework, safety principles and existing court safety-related training and guidance.
- Identify impacted/related procedures and forms.
- Identify supportive resources available (i.e. safety framework posters for courtrooms)
- Make revisions (as needed) to current judicial/multi-disciplinary Child Safety Framework training as determined through the crosswalk including guidance for judges on specific questions related to safety threats and conditions for return home to be addressed at every court hearing.

4.2.3 Implement training, post-training supports such as peer exchanges and coaching, and supportive resources (including handouts, tools, and posters) in FJCIP jurisdictions to include:

- Providing information on updates to safety training (as a result of 4.2.1) and schedule of available trainings at the annual dependency training for judicial officers and FJCIP Coordinators
- Providing training to judges, multi-disciplinary partners, AGOs, and DCYF staff in FJCIP jurisdictions that have not completed the training, that identify safety principles that will be discussed at every Court hearing.
- Providing supportive resources to those who have already been trained per any changes or adjustments to the training curriculum.

4.2.4 Once the training is completed, incorporation of the concepts learned and practiced in the training will occur including:

- Judges asking questions related to safety threats and conditions for return home
- Attorneys asking questions within the Safety Framework
- Caseworkers submitting with their Court Report an updated safety assessment with the current active safety threat(s) clearly articulated. The Court Report will include conditions for return home, which clearly delineate what behavioral change, and supports are necessary to achieve reunification.

CIP created a state-level team to guide the development and delivery of a cross-system safety framework training program that would lead to individual court systems being able to make real practice change in safety practices. The team adapted the existing Safety Framework training curriculum (from the [ABA Child Safety Guide](#)) to include a crosswalk of the safety assessment and planning practices used by DCYF. This work guided the half-day cross system Safety Summit curriculum and local cross-system teams in planning the summit and enacting their strategic plans.

Spokane County previously completed a cross-system safety framework training and requested that CIP modify the Safety Summit curriculum to further build on the information learned in the basic training. CIP worked with the State Team, state partners, and the Spokane County planning team to host the 2022 Hope Summit: A Focus on Safety. This training curriculum expanded on the basic safety framework training to include understanding the harms of removal and the integration of HOPE science into the safety framework, specifically in the case planning process.

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

Safety Summits were held in five Washington counties in 2021 ([King County](#), [Kitsap County](#), [Pierce County](#), [Chelan County](#), and [Mason County](#)), and two counties in 2022 ([Spokane County](#) and [Grays Harbor County](#)). Each site formed a cross-system planning team and held at least one CIP-facilitated planning meeting in advance of the summit event. Depending on when the summit was held and the capacity of the system, sites are in various stages of the post-summit system improvement process. CIP provides technical assistance and project management support to sites in the implementation of their plans (e.g., printing/laminating system resource tools for Kitsap County; facilitating post-summit strategic planning meetings).

County	Event Date	Attendees
King County	October 4, 2021	107
Kitsap County	October 20, 2021	107
Pierce County	October 27, 2021	188
Chelan County	December 8, 2021	64
Mason County	December 9, 2021	67
Spokane County	February 10, 2022	163
Grays Harbor County	May 6, 2022	49

How are you 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.) and what results you have, if any. If you have already evaluated your effort, what do the data show, and how did you use these data to modify or expand the project?*

The project will be monitored through the PIP as identified in Strategy 4.2.6: Information obtained from the Hearing Quality Project evaluation will be used to determine improvement in outcomes related to the application of the Safety Framework in the Courts and to develop a plan to follow-up with additional support for areas that are not showing improvement in outcomes or fidelity to the application of the Safety Framework.

In 2020, Dr. Alicia Summers and the Capacity Building Center for Courts conducted hearing quality evaluations in seven court communities across the state (which included all of the 2021 Safety Summit sites). The evaluation employed a multi-method approach (hearing observation, case file review, and stakeholder interviews) to assess current practice related to safety decision-making in child welfare. Findings overall indicated that court systems, even those that demonstrated high understanding of the safety framework, were not applying the safety framework in practice. This was indicated by a lack of discussion about safety-related issues in hearings, including: ongoing assessments of safety, safety-related justifications for supervised family time, and how the case plan is intended to address safety threats. The [Washington Baseline Safety Hearing Quality Report](#) provided the baseline data for the Safety Summit project. Dr. Summers conducted the second round of hearing quality evaluations in February and March of 2022. Her report was provided to Washington CIP on June 20, 2022.

Have there been notable factors that delayed or accelerated this effort?

The Grays Harbor County Safety Summit was originally scheduled for December 10, 2021. On December 8, the State Team was notified by DCYF Headquarters of a critical incident related to a missing child who had previously been in foster care. The team decided to reschedule the event to May 6, 2022. As a result of this delay, Grays Harbor County was not included in the data collection for the hearing quality evaluation component of this project.

What assistance or support would be helpful from the Capacity Building Center for Courts (CBCC) or the Children's Bureau to help move the project forward?

The hearing quality evaluation for this project was completed June 20, 2022. Having an opportunity to review and discuss the findings of the report with CBCC will be helpful to CIP in being able to identify major trends and ask any clarifying questions.

Hearing Quality Project:

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

An evaluation comparing dependency hearings pre and post activities in the joint project described above. It is expected that judicial officers and attorneys will ask questions regarding safety threats and conditions for return home, and that caseworkers will be prepared and able to clearly articulate current active safety threats and the conditions for return home.

In 2020, Dr. Alicia Summers and the national Capacity Building Center for Courts conducted baseline hearing quality evaluations in all seven Safety Summit sites. Findings overall indicated that court systems, even those that demonstrated understanding of the safety framework, were not utilizing the safety framework in practice. This was indicated by a general lack of safety-related discussion in hearings, including ongoing assessments of safety, safety-related justifications for supervised family time, and articulating how the case plan can improve safety for the family ([Washington Baseline Safety Hearing Quality Report](#)).

The next phase of the hearing quality project involved partnering with Dr. Alicia Summers through CBCC to conduct a second round of safety practice hearing quality evaluations for the counties that held Safety Summits in 2021. Hearing data was collected January through March of 2022. This data was used to assess changes in safety-related court practice in the five court systems that held Safety Summits in 2021. The CBCC compiled the final report, which was completed June 20, 2022. Findings will be used to inform future training and technical assistance efforts aimed at improving safety practices within local court jurisdictions.

Approximate date that the project began:

Collection of post-training hearing data began in January 2022.

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

Phase IV – Plan, prepare, and implement

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

As part of the CQI process, it is important to know if the training provided in the joint project described above is reflected in the discussions that are happening in court hearings. During PIP planning it was decided to include this hearing quality project as part of the PIP.

In its current Program Improvement Plan, the Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) identifies the following root cause in Goal Area 4: Permanency:

“The lack of consistent support and oversight for caseworkers to complete ongoing shared planning meetings and integrate the Safety Framework into practice results in an

inability to clearly communicate safety threats to children, parents, the court, and court partners and to create individualized case plans that accurately identify needed services to support timely permanency.”

DCYF collaborated with the courts and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of PIP strategies to address this need.

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II)

Create a shared understanding and language of safety:

SO THAT sufficient information is collected;

SO THAT threats of danger are identified and protective capacities are accurately assessed throughout the life of the case;

SO THAT effective safety plans and case plans are created;

SO THAT a child remains in the home,

OR THAT if a child is placed out of the home, appropriate family time is ordered and conditions for return home are identified and understood;

SO THAT all parties are clear as to what strategies and services are necessary to achieve permanency;

SO THAT safe and lasting permanency is achieved in each and every case.

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

The following PIP activities have been identified:

4.2.2 With support from the Capacity Building Center for Courts, a multidisciplinary group including CIP, DCYF, AGO, the Court Improvement Training Academy (CITA), and the Office of Public Defense (OPD) will develop an evaluation action plan for a Hearing Quality Project related to the application of the Safety Framework in court hearings including, but not limited to:

- Baseline assessment of current court practice, specific to discussions of safety and family time.
- Implementation assessment of how judges/multidisciplinary court teams have made changes to practices based on prior safety guide trainings.
- Assessment of how current practice is related to specific CFSR outcomes of interest in a sub sample of sites.
- A structured evaluation process that includes professional services, parent surveys, court observation, court case file review, and administrative data.

4.2.4 Once the training is completed, incorporation of the concepts learned and practiced in the training will occur including:

- Judges asking questions related to safety threats and conditions for return home
- Attorneys asking questions within the Safety Framework
- Caseworkers submitting with their Court Report an updated safety assessment with the current active safety threat(s) clearly articulated. The Court Report will include conditions for return home, which clearly delineate what behavioral change, and supports are necessary to achieve reunification.

Now that Dr. Summers has finished the report for the second round of the evaluation, the CIP will work with CBCC, the Safety Summit State Team, and system partners to identify possible solutions/interventions for implementation and indicators to monitor the quality of ongoing court safety inquiries in courts that held a Safety Summit.

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

CIP assisted CBCC in gathering data for the second round of the hearing quality evaluation. Dr. Summers completed the evaluation and provided the report on June 20, 2022. CIP will work with CBCC, the Safety Summit State Team, and system partners to identify next steps for implementation and a plan to monitor the quality of ongoing court safety inquiries. Then CIP will disseminate the hearing quality evaluation and our recommendations to Safety Summit sites, DCYF leaders, and other court system partners. The State Team will then work with the Safety Summit sites to develop a plan for implementing any identified solutions/interventions, with consideration of each site's capacity and readiness for change.

How are you 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.) and what results you have, if any. If you have already evaluated your effort, what do the data show, and how did you use these data to modify or expand the project?*

The [Washington Baseline Safety Decision-Making Practice](#) conducted in 2021 by Dr. Summers, prior to any Safety Summits occurring, serves as the baseline evaluation of safety decision making practice in Washington State. The data showed the following themes:

- vulnerabilities, protective capacities, and conditions for return are rarely discussed at hearings;
- safety analysis and discussions of safety planning are rarely occurring in court;
- safety-related justifications for family time supervision were rarely articulated;
- need for stakeholders to better understand and be able to articulate how case plan progress relates to safety.

The hearing quality evaluation conducted by Dr. Summers used a combination of hearing observation and case file reviews to measure significant changes in safety-related hearing practice in counties that engaged in the Safety Summit Project. These findings will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Safety Summits in changing court practice and to identify indicators to continuously monitor the quality of safety inquiries in dependency courts.

Have there been notable factors that delayed or accelerated this effort?

In order to have the final report done in time to submit for the final PIP report deadline, hearing data collection for sites needed to occur by the end of March 2022, at the latest. This resulted in the two sites that held their summits in 2022 (Spokane County and Grays Harbor County) not being included in the data collection. It also meant that the sites that held their summits in December of 2021 (Chelan County and Mason County) had less than one-month to implement their strategic plans by the time data collection started.

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

The hearing quality evaluation for this project was completed June 20, 2022. Having an opportunity to review and discuss the findings with CBCC will help to identify major trends and ask any clarifying questions.

Quality Legal Representation Project:

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

Convene a diverse workgroup to review, develop, and update the standards of practice, caseload limits and training guides for the Children’s Representation Program. Assess the short- and long-term impacts of standards-based legal representation on case outcomes for children eight and older. Review available research and best practices and recommend to the legislature the appropriate model of representation of children under the age of eight, including timing of appointment, training and oversight needs, and other considerations.

Approximate date that the project began:

July 2021

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

Phase IV – Plan, prepare, and implement

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

Washington State is one of a few states in the nation that does not provide legal representation for all dependent children and youth. Under current Washington law, the court must appoint an attorney for a child in a dependency proceeding six months after granting a petition to terminate the parent and child relationship when there is no remaining parent with parental rights, if a young person is petitioning for their parent's parental rights to be reinstated, or if a youth is in extended foster care. The court may appoint an attorney to represent the child's position at any point in a dependency action on its own initiative, or upon the request of a parent, child, guardian ad litem, caregiver, or DCYF.

The system that Washington has operated under since 2014 has been a bifurcated one, where most of the attorneys who are representing children and youth are not required to engage in any mandatory training, have no caseload limits, do not need to practice consistent with practice standards, and are often not sufficiently compensated for their work. In 2014, RCW 13.34.100(6) was amended to provide for the mandatory representation of children and youth whose parents' parental rights had been terminated and who had not reached permanency after six months. The legislature appropriated money to be distributed by the Washington State Office of Civil Legal Aid (OCLA). Payment for attorney services under the statute was predicated on compliance with the practice standards that were adopted by the Washington State Supreme Court in 2010. These practice standards require training, caseload limits, and lay out the best practices when representing children and youth in dependency proceedings.

2SSHB 1219, which was passed in the 2021 legislative session, provides mandatory appointment of counsel for children and youth in dependency proceedings for:

- Children age 7 and younger, upon the filing of a termination petition;
- Children and youth age 8 through 17 when a new dependency petition is filed, with mandatory appointment made at or before the commencement of the shelter care hearing; and
- Any pending or open dependency case where the child is unrepresented and is entitled to the appointment of an attorney, mandatory appointment occurs at or before the next hearing.

Statewide implementation will occur in phases starting July 1, 2022, with full implementation by January 2027. Implementation will be prioritized in counties that have significant racial disproportionality in the number of dependent children (as compared to the general population) and in counties that currently do not appoint counsel for children.

While this legislation makes great strides towards legal representation for children in Washington State, there is still a need for children younger than eight-years-old to receive legal representation.

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II)

Update children's legal representation standards informed by best practice models, rigorous data analysis, race and other equity considerations:

SO THAT all children's attorneys are trained and held to those standards;

SO THAT quality legal representation is provided for all children in dependency and termination cases, regardless of age;

SO THAT all children's legal rights and stated interests are effectively advocated for in the court system;

SO THAT fewer children are disproportionately impacted by the system and avoid the foster care to prison pipeline;

SO THAT dependency case outcomes improve for children who experience the child welfare system, including increased family reunification rates, fewer placement changes, educational stability, statutorily required educational advocacy, and reduced time in out-of-home care.

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

Continue to support the Office of Civil Legal Aid in facilitating the Children's Representation Workgroup to review, develop, and update the standards of practice, caseload limits and training guides for the Children's Representation Program. Review available research and best practices and recommend to the legislature an appropriate model of representation of children under the age of eight.

The updated standards of practice, caseload sizes and training guides will be utilized by the Children's Representation Program as they initiate the phased implementation of child representation in counties across the state, as mandated by 2SHB 1219, codified at RCW 13.34.212. CIP will distribute the updated standards to courts and collaborate with OCLA to develop educational content for judicial officers and court partners in the CRP implementation communities. Training and resources for judicial officers will focus on understanding the key goals and features of child and youth representation in Washington, as well as ways that judicial officers can work with children, youth and their attorneys to ensure their voices are heard in court.

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

The Children's Representation Standards Workgroup of diverse system partners, young people and subject matter experts was brought together under the auspices of the Supreme Court Commission on Children in Foster Care (CCFC). The workgroup is co-chaired by the former director of OCLA's Child Representation Program and a young person with lived expertise in the child welfare court system. Members of the workgroup include: child and youth attorneys, tribal youth attorneys, judicial officers, a legal ethics expert, University of Washington School of Law child advocacy professor, and a representative from the National Association of Counsel for Children. The Child Representation Standards Workgroup was divided into subgroups charged with reviewing and updating the current standards of practice, caseload limits, and training guides for child and youth attorneys in Washington. The workgroup provided periodic updates on their progress to the CCFC.

The draft report on best practice for representation of children under eight was presented to the Commission on Children in Foster Care on June 17, 2022, for comment and feedback. The final report will be submitted to the legislature before the end of summer 2022. When completed, the updated representation standards will be presented to members of the CCFC for review and feedback at the September 2022 meeting. Once reviewed by the Commission, the standards will be finalized and shared with the legislature.

How are you or how do you intend to monitor the progress of the project? (Phase V).

In November of 2021, the Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR) published a comparative study of the impact of early representation of children in dependency cases. The 2021 Evaluation of the Washington State Dependent Child Legal Representation Program compared time to permanency, relevant child welfare indicators and outcomes, and potential cost savings from the appointment of attorneys for children at the shelter care hearing in "treatment counties" with those for children in "control counties" who are not represented.

The report showed that children and youth with mandatory legal representation:

- are more likely to experience reunification;
- have increased placement stability;
- enjoy greater stability and consistency in their education while in care and;
- produce cost savings to the state.

Following a positive cost-benefit analysis from the DCLR study, the state legislature endorsed the program by funding its gradual expansion to all courts in the state. The legislation provided for ongoing performance reporting and feedback to the implementing sites and recurring evaluation of the program's impact. In WSCCR, the next step is to recruit for the funded 0.5

researcher position, to review the data collection plan used in the initial study, and to establish and seek guidance about research questions and methods from a stakeholder group.

Have there been notable factors that delayed or accelerated this effort?

Presentation to the legislature of the report on best practices regarding representation of children under the age of eight did not occur on the due date of March 31, 2022, because a team from the University of Washington School of Law was still conducting research and interviews with child attorneys across the state and the nation. The final draft of the report was presented to the CCFC for questions and feedback on June 17, 2022. Members of the CCFC will provide comments that will be submitted with the report to the legislature by the end of the summer.

The final draft of the standards was delayed due to disagreement among the workgroup on appropriate caseload size for youth attorneys. The workgroup decided to hold additional meetings to attempt to work through differences. The report is now slated to be completed for CCFC review by August 15, 2022, and will include a majority and minority report, if the group cannot reach consensus.

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

None identified at this time.

II. Trainings, Projects, and Activities For questions 1-12, provide a *concise* description of work completed or underway to date in FY 2022 (October 2021-June 2022) in the topical subcategories below. For question 1, focus on significant training events or initiatives held or developed in FY 2022.

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>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Family Juvenile Court Improvement (FJCIP) Coordinators, court staff	15	Individual targeted training for FJCIP and court staff who request it	Coordinators/staff know what data is available in the Interactive Dependency Timeliness Report (IDTR) and how to access it.	<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Hearing quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	State judicial officers who hear child dependency cases	29	Judicial Academy on Reasonable & Active Efforts Findings (see below)	Improve quality and frequency of Reasonable and Active Efforts inquiry.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<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>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Improving timeliness/permanency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	State judicial officers who hear child dependency cases	29	Judicial Academy on Reasonable & Active Efforts Findings (2 days)	Increase ability of judicial officers to make quality reasonable and active efforts finding around preventing removal and finalizing permanency. Increase capacity of judicial officers to apply ICWA and appropriately inquire about reason to know that a child is an Indian child.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Quality legal representation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No					<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Engagement & participation of parties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	State and tribal judicial officers and court partners	194	ICWA Court Summit (see below)	Help state court partners understand and support native families' connection to tribes and culture to support healing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<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>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Well-Being: Compassion Conversations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	DCYF caseworkers and unit supervisors	63 (unduplicated)	Two-part online training series, held three times in 2021, delivered by parents with lived experience in child welfare.	Increase capacity of DCYF caseworkers to utilize compassion with themselves and when working with families to improve case outcomes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Well-Being: Science of Hope Scheduled 08/2022	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judicial officers, court staff, system partners, tribal partners, providers	TBD	2-hour interactive online training, will also be available as recorded training	Learn about science of hope and identify ways to apply it to the dependency system.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Court teams from other states participating in the National Center for State Courts Race Equity Summit	270	Virtual presentation on Washington's Equity and Engagement Framework project, as part of a national summit	Share approach WA is taking to engage, prepare and support lived experts to participate in system reform and education efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
ICWA/Tribal collaboration: ICWA Court Summit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judicial officers, Court Staff, System Partners, Tribal partners	194 from 11 state courts and 22 Tribal courts	3.5 hour interactive online training	Increase understanding of and interest in collaboration with tribes and encourage creation of ICWA specialty courts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Normalcy/Reason. Prudent Parent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No					<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<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>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No					<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Dependency judicial officers, court staff, and cross-system partners	665 (unduplicated) in seven counties	Virtual cross-system summit that included presentation/training (3 hours) and action planning workshop (1 hour).	Court partners and DCYF staff will understand and articulate consistent child safety language in court hearings and system practice.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Other: Family Time HB 1194 Webinar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Dependency judicial officers, court staff, and cross-system partners	165	Online webinar, also available online as recording	Courts and system partners will understand and implement the changes to Family Time resulting from passage of HB 1194 .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Other: Washington Child Advocates Program: Science of Hope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Washington Child Advocates/CASAs	Unknown	2 sessions 2-hour Interactive Online Training – part of WA Child Advocate Conference	Understand basic concepts of science of hope and identify ways to apply to the dependency system.	<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Other: Facilitating Effective Meetings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Coordinators from the Early Childhood Courts, Family Treatment Courts, and Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Programs	29 (not all attended entire series)	8-week series of 2-hour Interactive Online Trainings	Learn facilitation skills including styles of relating, listening and surfacing interests, meeting roles, pre- meeting activities, dealing with difficult behaviors, and meeting power dynamics.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
---	---	---	--	--	--	---

On average, how many training events do you hold per year? 15

What is your best prediction for the number of attorneys, judges, or other legal system stakeholders that will participate in training annually? 600

The Family First Prevention Services Act amended 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)¹ IN GENERAL.— In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a highest State court ... *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...*—

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.

The CIP Director and the Assistant Secretary for Prevention and Client Services have been in communication regarding FFPSA implementation and have included FFPSA in the work plan for the CIP multidisciplinary task force, the Family Well-Being Community Collaborative. Previously, Washington State House Bill 1900, regarding FFPSA, included changes to statutes regarding

¹ 42 U.S.C. § 629h(b); Social Security Act § 438(b)

the court's oversight of quality residential treatment program (QRTP). Implementation also included changes in pattern court forms for dependency hearings.

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

If yes, please describe what you have done.

Information on the legal requirements of FFPSA was included in module one of the Dependency 101 for Judicial Officers online course. Previously, to help courts implement the QRTP requirements, the CIP, in partnership with DCYF, the AG's Office, and OCLA, recorded a 35 minute training webinar that covers the law, DCYF's process for assessing and treating youth, and the [new court forms](#) and procedures. In September 2019, a dependency practice tip was emailed to all Superior Court judicial officers and administrators, and to dependency court partners that included links to the forms, as well as the following links:

FFPSA - <https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/practice/practice-improvement/ffpsa>

QRTP - <https://www.dcyf.wa.gov/practice/practice-improvement/ffpsa/residential/qntp>

A follow-up FAQ was developed and is available at the QRTP link above.

2. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>WA Dependency Data Share Efforts - Child data is extracted from the DCYF FAMLINK data system. This data is then used to match back to WA Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) case file data.</p>	<p>Agency Data Sharing Efforts</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>
<p>WA Annual Dependency Timeliness Report to the Legislature – Provides annual analyses of dependency court operations with respect to statutorily mandated timelines. Click here to find the 2021 Annual Report.</p>	<p>Case management systems</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>
<p>WA Dependency Data Dashboards/Reports - Interactive reports use Microsoft Excel pivot tables that allow the user to view state and individual county data for broad comparisons or person/case-specific information.</p> <p>A public facing Washington State Dependency Timeliness Dashboard was created in November 2017 using Tableau software. In February 2022, an update to the dashboard was released. The dashboard underwent a significant redesign and additional components to display numbers over time were added. Data on dependency filings and race/ethnicity of children is provided. The updated dashboard can be found here.</p> <p>Provided training to local court staff, judicial officers, and system professionals to access and utilize the online dependency dashboard. This was done as part of the COVID recovery interviews with courts and partners.</p>	<p>Data dashboards</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>

<p>Case Flow Tracking - Created case flow tracking system in iDTR. Utilized by FJCIP Coordinators to support effective court management.</p>	<p>Case Management Systems</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>
<p>Training for iDTR Users - On-going training for FJCIP, family treatment and early childhood court coordinators to use iDTR and incorporate data into local CQI efforts.</p>	<p>Fostering Court Improvement Data Projects</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
<p>WA ICWA Dependency Data Dashboards/Reports - In October 2021, FYJP co-hosted the Washington ICWA Court Summit. WSCCR created county level data analysis reports for each of the 11 state courts in attendance. The reports provided FY 2020 information from the iDTR to inform local discussions about ICWA courts and to help court communities identify opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>FYJP and NCJFCJ provided tailored outreach and technical assistance to courts after the summit to answer questions and encourage ICWA court practice changes.</p>	<p>Data dashboards</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>
<p>Good Cause Code Trainings and Resources - Training court staff and judicial officers how to accurately capture the Termination filed by 15 months Good Cause Code. Creating instructions for courts to guide them in the process ongoing. This need was identified through COVID recovery interviews with courts.</p>	<p>Fostering Court Improvement data projects</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
<p>Therapeutic Court Codes – Created new docket codes to track therapeutic court case events, including acceptance, completion, and withdrawal from Family Treatment Court and Early Childhood Court programs. Updated pattern forms and worked with FJCIP Coordinators and local court clerks to support implementation.</p>	<p>Case Management Systems</p>	<p>Evaluation/Assessment</p>

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

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

Reports are used to assist in determining which jurisdictions may need assistance in focusing their efforts on certain aspects of their dependency practice, including ensuring equitable access to specialty courts and other resources. Through the annual Dependency Timeliness Report and the Dependency Dashboard, data is employed to describe trends and identify high performing jurisdictions and effective court practices. Data reports are shared with child welfare and court system partners. Reports are also used to assess the impact of the pandemic on court operations.

3. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Hearing Quality Evaluations - Hearing quality evaluations are being conducted by Dr. Alicia Summers, through CBCC, of safety practices in the counties that held Safety Summits in 2021 and impact of participation in Judicial Academy on Active Efforts and Reasonable Efforts on judicial inquiries.</p>	<p>Court Observation/Assessment</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
<p>Jurist-in-Residence Program - CIP implemented a Jurist-in-Residence (JIR) program in 2021. This program supports high quality judicial practice by making three experienced, retired dependency court judges available to mentor and train sitting judicial officers across the state. JIRs have expertise in effective judicial practice, court management, dependency system leadership, and related areas. They contribute to the development of trainings, materials, policies, and multi-system collaborative efforts.</p>	<p>Process Improvements</p>	<p>Implementation</p>

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
ICWA Court Docket, Clallam County – After participating in the ICWA Court Summit, Clallam County court partners decided to create a dedicated ICWA docket. Building on existing relationships with local tribes, they are co-designing the program with tribal leaders and providers. CIP is supporting implementation and helping with data.	Specialty/Pilot Courts	Implementation

4. 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 improvement in specific outcomes such as around reunification, guardianship, adoption or a focus on APPLA and older youth.

Do you have a timeliness or permanency project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Judicial ASFA Training - Module 1: Introduction to Child Dependency , of the Dependency 101 for Judicial Officers online and on-demand course was created to provide judicial officers with a high-level view of child dependency cases, including the importance of permanency, types of permanent plans, and case processing timelines.	General/ASFA	Implementation

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
COVID Court Recovery and Timeliness - CIP met with court staff, judicial officers, and system professionals in each county to assess dependency court practice at the local level to inform allocation of CIP pandemic funding. As part of that work, CIP worked with local judicial officers and court partners to review their local timeliness data to identify delays and barriers to timely permanency. Resources and support are offered to courts to address system delays and barriers to timely case processing.	Continuances/Delays	Implementation
Meaningful Shelter Care Hearings - CIP Staff is partnering with dependency professionals from other organizations to identify the components of a meaningful shelter care hearing and create tools for courts to utilize to improve their processes and practices.	General/ASFA	Identifying/Assessing Needs
Ex Parte Removal Process - Cross system partners working to align the ex parte emergency removal process with new legislation HB 1227 with the goal having the consideration of emergency orders conducted on the record, with notice provided to parents.	General/ASFA	Identifying/Assessing Needs

- 5. Engagement & Participation of Parties.** Engagement and participation of parties includes any efforts centered around youth, parent, foster family or caregiver, or relative engagement, 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)
COVID Court Recovery - CIP Staff met with court staff, judicial officers, and system professionals in each county to assess dependency court practice at the local level to inform allocation of CIP pandemic funding. As part of that work, CIP, gathered feedback about the implementation of hybrid hearings in each county. Utilizing feedback from conversations with professionals, CIP is creating tutorial videos for court participants attending virtual hearings to increase engagement and participation in hearings.	Other	Implementation
Caregiver Report to Court Revisions – CIP staff participate in a cross-system team working to revise the Caregiver Report form in order to capture important information and decrease potential bias. Jurist in Residence will provide consultation.	Caregiver Engagement	Selecting a Solution

6. Well-Being. Well-being projects include any efforts related to improving the well-being of children and youth. Projects could focus on education, early childhood development, psychotropic medication, trauma, social network support, cultural connections, or other well-being related topics.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on well-being? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
The Science of Hope Webinar- Dr. Chan Hellman, author of Hope Rising; How the Science of Hope Can Change your Life, will present at a two-hour webinar to Washington dependency courts and professional partners on the science of hope, how and why systems should strive to increase hope for people who have experienced trauma, and how to measure hope.	Education	Identifying/Assessing Needs

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
The Science of Hope Community of Practice- Working with Dr. Chan Hellman to create a Community of Practice for dependency system leaders and innovators.	Social network supports	Identifying/Assessing Needs
Early Childhood Courts Judicial Training – Developed required training modules for Early Childhood Court judicial officers, which includes content on early childhood development and brain science.	Early Childhood Development	Implementation

7. Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA). These projects include any efforts related to improving equity in child welfare systems around race, sexual orientation or gender identity, national origin or immigration status, religion, persons with disabilities, geographic or otherwise.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on DEIA? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
State Team Action Plan- CIP staff work with system partners to refine and take action on the State Team Action Plan to Ensure Racial Justice in Child Welfare . The State Team met twice monthly, starting in May 2021, to identify team priorities, track the work of other groups, including the Keeping Families Together coalition, and create workgroups to move efforts forward. The State Team will monitor progress by meeting quarterly and updating the plan annually. The team identified “Reducing dependency filings that bring children into care” as a top priority.	Race	Implementation

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Equity and Engagement Framework- CIP facilitates a design team that includes youth, parent and caregiver lived experts and a consultant to create a framework for safely engaging lived experts in systems change work, and creating spaces of belonging in meetings and task forces.	Youth Engagement	Identifying/Assessing Needs

8. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Improving ICWA Practice - A cross-system team of state experts, including tribal attorneys, worked to create WA-specific resources on reasonable and active efforts findings, ICWA, and “Reason to Know” inquiries. This was work done in conjunction with the planning for the 2022 Judicial Academy on Reasonable and Active Efforts .	Hearing Quality	Evaluation/Assessment

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
ICWA Court Summit - In October 2021, FYJP hosted the Washington ICWA Court Summit in partnership with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges ICWA Courts (NCJFCJ) and Casey Family Programs. Washington State and Tribal courts interested in improving practices for ICWA families were invited to the summit to learn about active efforts, recent Washington Supreme Court ICWA decisions, and the value of ICWA courts for improving practice for native families. Representatives from 11 state courts and 22 Tribal courts attended the event.	Tribal Collaboration	Implementation
Creation of ICWA docket code- Developing multi-disciplinary workgroup to create new ICWA docket code to identify ICWA cases in court data system and enable comparison of timeliness and outcomes for ICWA cases and regular dependency cases. CIP will work with court partners and AOC to develop an ICWA case code identifier to distinguish cases where ICWA applies.	Data collection/assessment	Develop Theory of Change

9. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

10. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

11. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
FIRST Clinic – Supporting expansion of the Family Intervention Response to Stop Trauma (FIRST) Clinic , an innovative model that provides legal and peer support to pregnant and new parents struggling with substance use. The goal of the program is to keep infants safely with family and avoid entry into the dependency court system.	Secondary or tertiary prevention	Implementation
Mandated Reporter Workgroup – CIP is participating in a DCYF-led workgroup to identify opportunities to better support families who come to the attention of CPS through mandated reporters, including developing alternative, community-based responders focused on supporting families and connecting them to services.	Secondary or tertiary prevention	Identifying/Assessing Needs

12. 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

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
<p>Cross-System Safety Summits - Safety Summits provide training and action-oriented planning for sustainable, long-term safety practice improvement efforts at the local court level. A state-level partnership between AOC and DCYF guides court communities through a process to organize, plan and host a cross-system Safety Summit. After the Safety Summit, CIP and DCYF continues to work with sites to develop a Strategic Plan and assist in the implementation of any resulting projects, initiatives, or other action items.</p>	Other	Evaluation/Assessment
<p>Safety Framework Training for Judicial Officers - The Safety Framework module of the online Dependency 101 Course for Judicial Officers is currently in development and will provide a full, on-demand interactive course focused use of the safety framework throughout a case.</p>	Other	Implementation
<p>Safety Snapshots – Working with court partners, CIP is developing a series of short (1-3 minute), interactive modules that focus on the basics of the safety framework (i.e., safety threats, case plans vs. safety plans). The series will support ongoing learning for court and community partners.</p>	Other	Implementation

13. Project materials. From any of the work described above, do you have any documents or other materials that feel would be helpful to share with the national CIP community? For example, rigorous research, innovative approaches, compelling outcome data, etc. Please link here or note and include in your submission.

[Safety Summit Showcase](#)

[Judicial Community of Practice](#)

[Jurist-in-Residence Program](#)

[WA Guide on Reasonable & Active Efforts](#)

[Dependency 101 for Judicial Officers](#)

[Resources for Remote Court Operations](#)

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, 2022.

Does the CFSP include any of the following:

- the CIP/Agency Joint Project
- the Hearing Quality Project
- the Legal Representation Project
- other judicial strategies
- other attorney strategies

If yes, please describe.

CIP provided DCYF with the results of the Safety Summit hearing quality evaluation and descriptions of cross-systems improvement projects.

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.

The CIP has not participated to date in this review.

3. Please describe how the CIP was or will be involved in preparing and completing round 4 of the CFSR and PIP.

Washington State is not involved in round 4 of the CFSR and PIP, however CIP staff have attended several Children's Bureau round 4 webinars to begin preparing for our turn.

Only states that will be participating in round 4 of the CFSR and PIP in your state this reporting year need to complete these questions. However, working to organize meaningful engagement of a broad array of legal and judicial stakeholders and to support collaboration with other system partners is useful for other major CIP projects as well, so others may wish to consider these with your teams. See the PI at page 9 for further explanation.

a. Regarding engaging the legal and judicial stakeholders with a broad representation of perspectives in CFSR/PIP processes:

i) What barriers do you foresee in engaging stakeholders at an appropriate breadth and depth?

ii) What do you believe will facilitate engaging stakeholders at an appropriate breadth and depth?

b. Are there other leadership structures for legal and judicial stakeholders and how can those facilitate the processes around the CFSR/PIP?

c. How will legal stakeholder involvement in the CFSR/PIP be managed? e.g. CIP is the lead, via the Multi-Disciplinary Task force, a sub-committee established by the child welfare agency, etc.

d. What court, judicial, or attorney data could be integrated into the CFSR/PIP process?

e. How might participation vary in stages of the process?

f. What feedback loops will be needed to keep stakeholders informed?

g. What supports do you need from the Children's Bureau or Capacity Building Centers for participating in the CFSR/PIP?

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 [Family Well-Being Community Collaborative \(FWCC\)](#) is co-chaired by the CIP Director and DCYF Assistant Secretary of Prevention and Client Services. The group has a diverse, multi-disciplinary membership committed to collaborating to keep families together and

supported in their communities and to radically reduce inequities in the child welfare system. The FWCC seeks to work upstream to avoid entry into the dependency system by addressing the impacts of poverty and trauma on families. For those families who require the oversight of court, the group is committed to ensuring that they receive effective, culturally relevant services in a system that is equitable, accountable, and hope-centered. The FWCC is structured to be action-oriented, with facilitated workgroups meeting regularly on time limited projects. The group decided to focus its work in 2022-23 on training and supporting courts to effectively implement the [Keeping Families Together Act \(E2SHB 1227\)](#) and the [Strengthening Parent-Child Visitation law \(E2SHB 1194\)](#).

The Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) was created in 2008 to help local dependency courts assess and improve how they operate and serve families by providing a dedicated coordinator to work with judicial officers, DCYF and court partners. The program creates local capacity to launch system wide educational and CQI efforts, and to support the adoption of new programs and practices, such as Early Childhood Courts and ICWA-focused dockets. As high-end users of data, FJCIP Coordinators are valuable partners in the Continuous Quality Improvement of the iDTR database. In 2022, the AOC requested and received additional funds from the Washington State Legislature to fully funding ten existing FJCIP coordinator positions, adding six new courts, and creating staff positions at AOC to oversee and evaluate the program.

Co-chaired by a Supreme Court Justice and the Secretary of DCYF and staffed by CIP, the [Commission on Children in Foster Care \(CCFC\)](#) promotes communication, collaboration, and cooperation among court, child welfare, legislative, tribal and community stakeholders. The Commission oversees and supports several workgroups focused on improving the child welfare and dependency court systems to ensure justice and better outcomes for the children and families they serve. The group has worked collaboratively to develop processes and share information on topics such as: addressing racism and bias in the system, family time, delaying unnecessary termination of parental rights trials and the mental health needs of children and youth. The CCFC also convenes several workgroups, including the FWCC and the Children's Representation Standards Workgroup. The Children's Representation Workgroup is charged with reviewing and updating existing standards of practice, caseload limits, and training guidelines for child and youth attorneys and making recommendations to the legislature for representation of children under the age of eight years old.

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

The lack of critical child welfare data, particularly data related to Family Time and well-being, makes it difficult to identify improvement opportunities and assess the impact of policy and practice changes. DCYF has data system challenges that prevent it from collecting and sharing data related to the provision of Family Time. Recent changes to Washington law created a presumption that the court will order Family Time visits to be unsupervised, unless a party presents convincing evidence that supervision or monitoring are required to keep a child safe during a visit. Court and system partners anticipated that this would decrease supervision levels and speed up reunification for some

families. However, DCYF and system partners are unable to assess the impact of the new law on Family Time and case outcomes because DCYF is unable to collect and extract the data needed.

Turnover within the system has always been a challenge to sustaining court system improvement efforts; however, the pandemic significantly exacerbated this issue. DCYF has been hardest hit, with many local offices facing high rates of staff turnover and disruption, but headquarters staff have also experienced staff changes and vacancies. Service providers, particularly Family Time providers, have struggled to retain enough staff to meet the demand for in-person visits and transportation. In some counties, judicial officers with dependency court experience have been re-assigned to criminal dockets to reduce COVID-related backlogs. This has put additional strain on a decentralized court system that already struggled to maintain consistent, educated court leaders.

Another barrier is the limited amount of CIP staff resources available to reach out and work with all local jurisdictions on improving their dependency system. CIP staff frequently get stretched too thin and have difficulty with follow up. Also, staffing costs needed to support the breadth of work performed by the CIP Team leaves few resources to support local projects and travel. Our hope is that the increased CIP funding currently contained in the President's budget will be approved so that we can have additional resources necessary to provide more support at the local level, which should improve practice.

6. Regarding collaboration on training with the child welfare agency...

- a. Regarding training needs across the child welfare system, what is your process to work with the agency to consider how to maximize the impact of complementary resources and ensure there is no undue duplication of efforts?**

We participate in cross-system training efforts with DCYF, working together to develop and deliver educational content for the Children's Justice Conference and the Indigenous Children, Youth and Families Conference. Recently, CIP was approved to offer education credits for social workers. CIP training staff meets regularly with the Alliance, the provider of Core Training for DCYF social workers, to share what we're working on and identify opportunities to share resources.

The FWCC has established a good working relationship with DCYF staff developing the agency's policy and training plans related to implementation of the Keeping Families Together legislation. As training and materials are developed by both groups, we will share language and resources to support continuity and avoid duplication of efforts.

- b. 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?**

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?

Yes and No. Child Advocate (voluntary guardian ad litem) training is included in the Title IV-E Training Plan and DCYF has a contract with Washington Association of Child Advocate Programs to reimburse training expenses. Several judicial officers attend the annual child advocate training conference. We are exploring options to expand beyond child advocate training to incorporate more holistic, multidisciplinary trainings into the Title IV-E Training Plan that include judicial officers, attorneys and court personnel to support initiatives addressed in the PIP and CFSP.

7. Have you talked with your agency about accessing Title IV-E funding for legal representation for parents or for children? Is your state currently planning to seek or currently receiving reimbursement? If yes, describe any plans, approaches, or models that are under consideration or underway.

Yes. In January 2019, the CIP Director facilitated a meeting with the DCYF Budget Director, Office of Public Defense Director (parent representation program), and Office of Civil Legal Aid (child representation program), and the Co-Chair of the CIP Steering Committee, to talk about funding for legal representation for parents and children. The DCYF Budget Director brought the issue to DCYF leadership for their approval to move forward. OPD and OCLA have each negotiated a memorandum of understanding with DCYF and the IV-E reimbursements are occurring. Last year, expenses for OPD social workers were added to the MOU. The next step is to begin discussions regarding reimbursement of expenses for parent allies, as part of the parent defense team, and look at how to incorporate preventative representation for candidates of child welfare, which is part of our State Team Plan.

IV. CQI Current Capacity Assessment

1. Has your ability to integrate CQI into practice changed this year? If yes, what do you attribute the change to?

Yes. CIP has recently adopted more of a train the facilitator approach to working with courts, instead of relying on CIP staff to provide facilitation and coordination of court improvement efforts. CIP staff and consultants developed and delivered training to local FJCIP, Family Treatment Court and Early Childhood Court Coordinators on facilitation, conflict resolution and system improvement skills. The FWCC adopted an action-oriented, CQI approach to structuring our cross-system court improvement work.

2. Which of the following CBCC Events/Services have you/your staff engaged in this past year?

- Attorney Academy
- Judicial Academy

- CIPShare 2.0
- CQI Consult (*Topic: Race Equity Data*)
- CQI Workshop
- Constituency Group - Data/Evaluation
- Constituency Group - Family First Prevention Services Act
- Constituency Group - Hearing Quality
- Constituency Group - ICWA
- Constituency Group - Legal Representation
- Constituency Group - New Directors
- Constituency Group - Race Equity
- Constituency Group – Regional CIP Calls
- Constituency Group - Virtual Hearings/Court Processes
- Constituency Group - Other _____

CIP All Call – *What % of All Calls does your CIP participate in?* 100%

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

- CIP staff with data expertise
- CIP staff with evaluation expertise
- CIP staff 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: CIP staff with data visualization and web-design expertise

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

If yes, are they audio video

b. Can you remotely access your court case management system? *For example, Odyssey systems often allow remote access to case files.*

Yes No

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

Odyssey, statewide with the exception of King and Pierce Counties

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

Articulate360: CIP purchased one license for access to the Articulate360 suite of applications designed for e-learning course creation and instructional design. This new technology has enabled us to create virtual, on-demand courses (e.g., [Module 1: Introduction to Child Dependency](#), along with online, publicly accessible HUBS that CIP uses to centralize all information, materials, and video recordings of individual training events, e.g., [Safety Summit Project HUBS](#)).

e. Do any of these systems include an electronic filing system?

Some courts utilize e-filing and others do not. Through our COVID recovery project, we shared the benefits of e-filing with courts that were hesitant to adopt the technology.

4. Please describe any continuity planning the CIP has led or has been involved in if not noted above. Continuity planning includes prevention and recovery planning for threats such as public health crises, natural disasters, or cyber-attacks. This may include, for example, technology support for remote hearings or legal representation, developing guidance, coordinating with other agencies, or otherwise ensuring back-up approaches are in place to ensure needed services are able to continue.

In addition to the COVID recovery projects described above, CIP staff co-lead the Child Welfare Committee of the [BJA Taskforce](#). The Child Welfare committee is developing a juvenile court rule to allow court participants to appear remotely. Once the rule is finalized, CIP staff will share it with courts and develop training and/or resources to support implementation.

5. Considering 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?

Phase V – evaluation. We understand and value hearing quality evaluations and would like to develop capacity within our CIP to collect, code and analyze hearing quality data.

6. 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 more information about how to incorporate project evaluation into the planning process, as well as information about best practices for evaluating different types of projects. Data collection is challenging due to staffing issues and limited access to child welfare and well-being outcome measures.

Resources and information about how to best support people in court systems who experience “critical incidents” such as child or parent deaths. In general, we are interested in trauma-responsive and hope-centered practices that help families and professionals manage stress and reduce recidivism and burnout.

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 CQI Phases

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.

Paperwork Reduction Act

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. The OMB control number for this collection is 0970-0307 and it expires 11/30/2022. The estimated time to complete the CIP Complete Application is 92 hours