

Juvenile Dependency Caseflow Management

Oregon Mini CANI

May 4, 2016

Leola L. McKenzie

Director

Juvenile & Family Court Programs Division (JFCPD)

Caseflow Management:

- The coordination of court processes and resources so that court cases progress in a timely fashion from filing to disposition.
- 8 Proven Practices in Caseflow Management:

Judicial Leadership

- Adopt and communicate the vision to timely achieve safe, permanent homes for children.
- Motivate juvenile court stakeholders to work cooperatively to identify resources and services for at-risk children and families.
- Encourage interagency cooperation and coordination for those serving children and families.
- Convene regular meetings of all key juvenile court stakeholders to collaboratively identify and resolve systemic problems, plan specialized training events, strategize about new services to fulfill needs, address resource and funding issues, improve service delivery and court processes and share their successes.
- Communicate regularly with local and state lawmakers and the public regarding juvenile court issues.

Court Control of Case Progress

- Have knowledge and understanding of court procedures and events as set out in Oregon laws.
- Require punctual commencement of all court proceedings.
- Ensure that parties are prepared for court on arrival.
- Enforce local rules.
- Issue orders within statutory timeframes.
- Make decisions in a prompt and timely manner.
- Develop and enforce a firm continuance policy.
- Treat parties, families and professionals with courtesy and respect.

Meaningful Court Events

- **Require that Court Reports be Submitted Early:** It is important that reports be distributed to the parties well in advance of the court proceeding.
- **Prepare and Distribute Timely Court Orders:** Orders should be created and distributed at the end of each court hearing and should include the date and time of the next court event.
- **Conduct Expedited, Issue Specific Hearings:** Some courts conduct “rocket dockets.” An expedited hearing allows a single issue or issues that require minimal court time to be heard earlier than the next scheduled court event.
 - A party’s failure to abide by a court order
 - Review of visitation plan
 - Review of placement
 - Review of services

Limited Continuances

- Develop and enforce written local rules that limit unreasonable or unnecessary interruptions in the case.
- Court hearings should never be subject to unnecessary delay due to continuances granted for trivial reasons.
- Court delays are a major barrier to children achieving timely, permanent placement.

Effective Calendaring Practices

- **Date/Time Certain Scheduling:** Scheduling cases on the calendar for a specific date and time ensures that cases are reached when scheduled. The expectation is that 100 percent of calendared cases will be heard on the day scheduled. Judges should establish specific days/times for shelter hearings, settlement conferences,... so that counsel for parent(s) and children, CASAs, and others can be “on call” to attend.
- **Continuous Scheduling:** Scheduling the next court event at any given court event, helps to ensure that no case will be delayed or lost in the system.
- **Coordination of Court Hearings & CRB Reviews:** Developing an intensive review schedule from 2 different perspectives – especially in the first year -promotes permanency and is an additional safeguard that the well-being of the child is being protected.



Citizen Review Board

- **Mission:** *We provide a citizen voice on the safety, stability, and supervision of children in foster care through impartial case review and advocacy.*
- **Vision:** *Citizens will shape public policy and actively promote conditions to ensure that every child lives in a safe, secure, healthy, and permanent home, preserving families whenever possible.*
- **Board Member Requirements**
 - A commitment to at least two years of service, with regular monthly attendance, punctuality and pre-review preparation
 - Completion of the CRB 16-hour Orientation Training
 - Eight hours of relevant additional CRB-approved training each year of service
 - CRB & Juvenile Court Observations
 - Criminal and Court Records Checks

Value of CRB to courts:

- **Citizen Input** - providing meaningful, independent review of our child welfare and juvenile justice systems to ensure that children, youth, and families are getting the services they need.
- **Common Sense Perspective** - that trained and committed CRB volunteers bring to dependency cases because this is the perspective that is so easy to lose when you spend every day on the “inside.”
- **Case Management Resource** – CRB reviews precede and inform court reviews.
- **Less Formal Environment Than Court Reviews** - the CRB may receive information that wouldn't otherwise be introduced in court. This provides another opportunity to inform the court of potential issues that may present as barriers to permanency... and encourages a more timely management of these issues.
- **Vital Link in Local Court Improvement Activities** - Field Staff and board members are experienced with DHS policies and procedures as well as juvenile law.

CRB Findings:

1. DHS made reasonable efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the child from the home.
2. DHS has made diligent efforts to place the child with a relative or person who has a caregiver relationship.
3. a) DHS has ensured that appropriate services are in place to safeguard the child's safety, health and well-being. b) DHS has taken appropriate steps to ensure that 1) the substitute care provider is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard, and 2) the child has regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age appropriate or developmentally appropriate activities.
4. DHS made reasonable efforts to provide services to make it possible for the child to safely return home.

CRB Findings (continued):

5. DHS made reasonable efforts in accordance with the case plan to place the child in a timely manner, and to complete the steps necessary to finalize the permanent placement, including an interstate placement if appropriate.
6. The parents have made sufficient progress to make it possible for the child to safely return home.
7. DHS has made sufficient efforts in developing the concurrent permanency plan.
8. DHS is in compliance with the case plan and court orders.
9. The permanency plan is the most appropriate plan for the child.
10. There is a continuing need for placement.



What does CRB need from Judges?

- Regularly reference CRB reports at both review and permanency hearings
- Court response page... comments
- Annual meeting with volunteer board members
- Twice a year meetings with field staff

Differentiated Case Management


- Improve child and family outcomes – shift focus from processing cases to achieving lasting change
- Specialization allows greater focus on high need families
- Quality of Judicial Process Enhanced
- Cooperation Among Agencies- Better Use of System Resources
- Public Perception of Court
- Case Disposition Time Reduced
- There must be agreement that all cases filed are not alike and some require more attention and management
- Sufficient caseload present to justify differentiation
- A key Judge to assume leadership throughout the process
- Justice system agencies must be willing to collaborate on the design and implementation
- The Court and other agencies involved must be willing to reorganize existing staff to support the operation of a DCM program

State & Federal Juvenile Dependency Time Standards & Measures




State Measure: Time to Jurisdiction

- This report shows the percent of dependency petitions, filed within a specified time period, that have a jurisdictional finding within 60 days of the petition file date.




Time to Jurisdiction on Both Parents, 2015
(Includes only Cases Filed in Odyssey)



State Measure: Time to 1st Perm. Hearing


- This report shows the percent of 1st permanency hearings held within 425 days of petition file date.



*Due to Odyssey implementation, statistics for 2012-2015 do not include all cases that were due for first permanency hearings during those years.

State Measure: Time to TPR

- The percentage of juvenile dependency cases for which there is a TPR judgment within 182 days of TPR petition file date.



*Due to Odyssey implementation, statistics for 2012 through 2015 do not include all cases due for resolution during those years.

Federal CIP Measures

Performance Measures		FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Federal CIP Required Timeliness Measures				
Time to First Permanency Hearing	Median	363	361	362
	Mean	397	360	348
Time to Termination of Parental Rights Petition	Median	427	422	411
	Mean	489	487	456
Time to Termination of Parental Rights	Median	609	629	591
	Mean	657	699	644
Time to Permanent Placement	Median	534	483	535
	Mean	688	646	729
Optional Measures				
<i>Time to Reunification</i>	Median	422	404	452
	Mean	577	520	641
<i>Time to Adoption</i>	Median	1,129	1,276	1,082
	Mean	1,171	1,368	1,286
<i>Time to Guardianship</i>	Median	473	772	523
	Mean	686	947	724
<i>Time to Emancipation</i>				
<i>Time to Subsequent Permanency Hearings</i>	Median	127	119	153
	Mean	181	179	192

Use of Information Systems to Monitor Age & Status Of Cases

- **County-level data reports**
- **Conor Wall – JCIP Data Analyst**
 - **503.986.5418**