

MINUTES
STATE FAMILY LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE
December 1, 2006

Multnomah Juvenile Justice Center
Portland, Oregon

Judge Brownhill called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

Members Present: Hon. Paula Brownhill, Stephen Adams, Jim Adams, Ernie Mazorol, Lauren MacNeill, Linda Scher, Robin Selig, Bill Howe, Ed Vien, Hon. Robert Selander, Hon. Terry Leggett, Hon. Maureen McKnight, William “Butch” Castor

Members Absent: David Hakanson, Ramona Foley

Guests: Karen Olson, Sandy Purnell

Staff: Bealisa Sydlik, Maria Hinton

Introductions were made of Committee members and guests.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Minutes from September 29, 2006: Motion was made to approve the September 2006 minutes. Minutes were approved as written.

POLICY CONCERNS AND DEVELOPMENTS—Old Business

***Update of Performance Measure #10 Refinement Workgroup—Jim Adams and Ernie Mazorol**

Quality Self-Represented Services:

Percent of litigants satisfied with family law facilitation services received

Jim Adams reported that the Performance Measures Advisory Committee (PMAC) struggled with this proposed measure because of its uniqueness in that it was a compound measure instead of being singular in nature. This measure had multiple layers and because of this, the PMAC adopted the latter part of the measure which addresses the “percent of litigants satisfied with family law facilitation services received” through a survey.

Jim stated that:

- The PMAC is deeply committed to trying to institutionalize facilitation programs throughout Oregon
- The SFLAC and PMAC have set aspirational goals, not just practical, and Jim would be willing to talk to any facilitators concerned that the goals may not be

achievable. Jim stated that if goals are not achieved, it indicates an inadequate resource base and will lend direction for future improvements. The goals are not intended to harm the facilitation programs but rather foster them. Judge Brownhill stated that the concerns voiced by the facilitators present at the last SFLAC meeting were taken seriously by the PMAC.

Survey development was the next topic of discussion. Ernie suggested that caution be exercised when developing the survey. The SFLAC should suggest that before a survey is developed, first steps need to include appropriate wording of the instrument, a clear picture of what is being measured, and how the instrument will be distributed in the courts. A professional (evaluation expert) should review the instrument and plan for distribution and the process for evaluating the information. Ernie suggests the SFLAC strongly indicate that the SFLAC provide leadership for evaluating facilitation programs. He said evaluation experts in Oregon should be consulted.

It was asked how Ernie's concerns fit in with the pilot evaluation project that Karen Olson is currently undertaking in two counties. Karen has scheduled an interview with the Family Court Supervisor in Marion county, and Karen will use two interview instruments. One is a 13 page generic interview instrument, the other is a 5 page insert that has taken into account the Marion County service structure. Karen will draft additional instruments in the next few days and is willing to share her documents with the SFLAC before progressing further into the process. Ernie stated that he felt the SFLAC should have a part in giving the project some direction.

BeaLisa mentioned that Christopher Hamilton, Analyst for Court Programs and Services Division, attended a SFLAC meeting in June to solicit input from the SFLAC. At that meeting, SFLAC discussed several issues it thought should be addressed during the evaluation process.

Jim Adams stated that he believes these two issues are different. Jim explained that Karen's work is a detailed, professional analysis of specific programs. The Performance Measure is a customer satisfaction survey with emphasis on access. Jim agrees with Ernie that the satisfaction survey needs to be done correctly the first time, because once you start accumulating data, that data becomes the reference point and it is difficult to change it in the future. The survey development should have an appropriate amount of time dedicated to it in order to ensure quality and long lasting results. Karen stated she was asked to prepare an instrument for the two courts that she will be evaluating and would welcome feedback from SFLAC.

***SFLAC Task Force re: Alternative Methods of Resolving Family Matters – Lauren Mac Neill**

The Task Force has had difficulty finding a meeting time and has postponed the meeting until after the first of the year. Lauren MacNeill indicated she would provide a report at the March 2007 meeting.

POLICY CONCERNS AND DEVELOPMENTS–New Business:

Legislative Issues – BeaLisa Sydlik

SFLAC agreed that it would be a reasonable expectation that, if the SFLAC has concerns about any of the legislation discussed during or after the SFLAC meetings, members would bring them to BeaLisa's attention so she can forward comments to the State Court Administrator (SCA).

LC 847: OJD Bill – removes all the statutory forms in ORS Chapter 107 and states “these forms shall be as prescribed by the State Court Administrator”. Forms affected include (pgs 2-3) Pre and Post Judgment Temporary Protective Order hearing requests, (pgs 5-7) requests for hearing on Immediate Danger Changes of Custody or Parenting Time; (pg 9) Summary Dissolution forms; (pg 49) FAPA forms; and (pg 51) Waiver of Personal Service.

This bill appears to be a first step towards getting statewide forms consistent with the Chief Justice's expedited information technology strategic plan. Some courts have spent a lot of time and effort developing their own FAPA forms, and this bill may require that all courts use the SCA's forms. Some attorneys and law enforcement are concerned that there is a variety of forms, especially FAPA forms, throughout the state, and law enforcement in one county may have difficulty recognizing a FAPA order from another county. Another problem is that the Domestic Violence subcommittee had a workgroup that worked on the revision of the FAPA forms as a result of the 2005 legislation and there are a number of courts who feel they cannot use the State Court Administrator forms because they do not follow exactly the language in the statutes.

Stephen mentioned that another layer of complexity needs to be addressed. It may not even be enough to have uniform statewide forms, it may be necessary for a workgroup to look at compliance with federal mandates under the Brady Act, under VAWA, etc. There may need to be another whole layer of conformity that will need to be looked at, no matter how politically unpalatable, in 36 different counties. This is a very complex and important issue.

Judge Selander and Bill Howe both expressed concern that any language set forth in a form from the State Court Administrator's office would be a mandate that would prevent a judge from making interlineations in orders to accommodate the circumstances. It may be an unintended consequence to restrict the court, and it may be appropriate to change the proposed legislation now to allow the court to modify forms as appropriate to the case. BeaLisa stated that by making the legislation too broad we may end up with 36 counties still producing their own forms. Stephen stated that he believes there is an essential line between using promulgated uniform forms from the State Court Administrator's office and allowing judicial officers to have case-specific discretion in their rulings. BeaLisa will draft language setting forth this concern and forward it to the State Court Administrator.

BeaLisa stated that there have been inferences that the SCA and the Chief Justice will be looking to the SFLAC to develop these forms. BeaLisa stated the SFLAC will be needing a Forms Committee to address this legislation if it passes. Judge Brownhill mentioned "Project Passport", which allows for the face page of all protective orders in the United States to be the same. Several years ago, Oregon decided not to participate in this project, however, if the SFLAC will be revising FAPA forms then we should revisit this concept.

LC692: came out of the Bar's Standing Committee on Family Law Legislation – would make judgment remedies regarding renewal and expiration of judgments consistent for both the money award portion and the body of the judgment. The rest of the concept is basically cleaning up language at the request of legislative counsel.

In Section 3 ORS107.093 – in the 2003 legislative session the automatic statutory restraining order was implemented. There was confusion in the practitioner community as to whether that could be enforced by contempt. Clarification is stated on page 4, paragraph 6, that violation is subject to remedial sanctions.

In Section 5 – it adds discretion for judges to award reasonable attorneys fees and costs in modifications of FAPA orders.

LC691: Task Force convened at the request of the 2005 legislature that wanted clarification of the reinstatement of the spousal support statute ORS 107.136. This concept clarifies that there is judicial discretion to reinstate spousal support.

Bill and Stephen have concerns about the language in the draft.

- When citation is included in the ORS language, it leaves room for possible difficulties: 1) if petitioners only reference the section, then you cannot tell from the document if their full intentions are addressed in the document; 2) petitioners may clearly state what their intentions are and it is very obvious what their intentions are, but if they do not reference the section, the document is inoperative.
- Under #5 of the recommendation, the word "benefits" leaves room for ambiguity. Stephen would prefer that word changed to "application".

Bealisa suggested that she fax a copy of the actual LC to Stephen and Bill for further review and comments.

If the SFLAC has any questions or concerns about any of the legislative concepts discussed above, please contact BeaLisa.

Because the State Court Administrator is looking to the SFLAC to review proposed legislation and provide feedback or concerns, the SFLAC decided that it would be beneficial to re-instate the Legislative Subcommittee. Judge Leggett agreed to Chair this subcommittee and members will be Bill Howe, Hon. Robert Selander, Robin Selig, and BeaLisa Sydlik. LC 691 will probably be introduced in the judiciary committee on December 13, 2006. Judge Leggett requested an electronic copy of the LC.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Annual Family Law Conference: The next conference will be in April 2008. Because of the success of the 2006 Family Law Conference, SFLAC decided to hold the Family Law Conference immediately before the Circuit Court Judges Association meeting in the spring of 2008. Judge Selander will check to see if a location has been selected for the Circuit Court Judges Association meeting and report back at the March SFLAC meeting. Initial planning for a facility should begin shortly after that. It was suggested that "Research and Data" be placed on the conference agenda.

Domestic Violence Subcommittee: The subcommittee has met once since the last SFLAC meeting and will meet again next week. The big news is that the DV webpage is now up and running. Thanks to the workgroup of the DV subcommittee who did the bulk of the work, BeaLisa Sydlik and Linda Scher. Also, thanks to Stephen Adams who raised the issue of information for respondents. Everyone is very pleased with the end product. Robin was asked to please convey the SFLAC's thanks to the subcommittee for their efforts in producing a first rate website.

Follow up to the Fire Arms Summit: At the last SFLAC meeting it was decided that the DV subcommittee be involved, to some extent, with the follow up from that summit. A meeting is scheduled for 12-15-06 and Judge Brownhill, BeaLisa, Robin and a number of other people will attend. Hardy Myers is convening the meeting and Robin is looking forward to reviewing what was learned at the summit, giving people background information, then developing an action plan for Oregon.

Confidentiality Brochure: Robin and BeaLisa are working on updating the confidentiality brochure that was developed by the DV subcommittee several years ago. The main goal is to incorporate information about the Address Confidentiality Program that will be starting up January 1, 2007. In the course of reviewing the brochure, Robin will be looking at simplifying language to make the brochure more comprehensible.

VAWA Grant Technical Assistance Manual: the subcommittee intends to provide feedback on the manual that Karen is preparing. Once the draft is completed she will be giving it to the DV subcommittee for their review. The five judges who attended the Santa Fe program will also be reviewing the manual.

Parenting Plan Outreach Workgroup (PPOW): No report.

Court/Child Support Agency Child Support Coordination: Because Judge McKnight was not present, Butch Castor was asked to give a report. Butch mentioned that the subcommittee spent time reviewing the 2000 paper by Judge McKnight that created the subcommittee. They reviewed the issues that the subcommittee could work on, looked at what has been accomplished to date, and identified what still needed attention.

They reviewed the handbook (Judicial Benchguide on Child Support) starting with the table of contents. They had an example of a national judicial child support task force strategic plan and the subcommittee questioned whether they should also have a plan that would outline the direction the Committee's work should take. There was much discussion on the work involved in developing a plan, and if the subcommittee wanted to take the time to develop a plan. The subcommittee agreed to revisit this issue in March.

In January the Division of Child Support and the OJD ITD will meet to see how and where interfacing with the new OJD case management system will work.

Self-Represented Legal Services Subcommittee: Report delayed until the arrival of Judge McKnight.

Judge Leggert stated that Marion County started a new program. The Marion County Circuit Court will require parents to attend an orientation session a week or two after a response is filed in domestic relations matters involving children. They have a referee, who provides the orientation. Cases involving self represented litigants on both sides will be assigned to the Family Law Referee (unless there are difficult issues which warrant a judge assignment) who will work closely with facilitators. All family law self-represented litigants will have one place to go rather than many.

Cases with children under three years old are now on a fast-track. The local FLAC has been working to develop new processes to allow courts to handle cases more efficiently and expeditiously. Judge Leggert offered to invite the pro-tem judge to attend the next SFLAC meeting to report on this new process. Judge Brownhill stated that the Marion County FLAC will be present at the September 2007 SFLAC meeting in Salem, and we hope to learn more about local practices at that time.

Toward the end of today's meeting, in the absence of Judge McKnight, BeaLisa reported that the subcommittee decided there was a need to develop a strategic plan. There are some projects the subcommittee is currently working on, for example, judge protocols, and finalizing the guide for developing attorney assistance programs, but the long term vision is unclear.

The subcommittee is going to contact stakeholders (17 identified) who have interactions with self represented litigants and ask a series of standard, consistent questions to help identify what the problems are, and what the barriers are, then bring that information to the in-person meeting in March. The subcommittee will then review the information and work to develop a report to bring to the SFLAC, the Chief Justice and State Court Administrator at the September meeting.

Stephen Adams asked if the subcommittee has looked to other states for reports on this issue, rather than starting from the beginning. Maria mentioned that she sent reports from Maryland and Florida to the chair, vice-chair and BeaLisa. BeaLisa stated that most states in the last five years have completed work along these lines, however, Oregon needs to hear from their own stakeholders. Bill suggested looking to work done

in other states and countries (i.e., Australia) since this is a world wide issue, not unique to Oregon.

Judge McKnight was able to attend the end of this meeting, and stated that she firmly believes that in order to have Oregon buy-in, you have to involve the stakeholders from the beginning. The Oregon style is to get the investment in the solution by the early contact with the stakeholders for identification of the problems and barriers. Judge McKnight recognizes the value of previous work, however, she believes that if you are to move an agenda in Oregon, it would be a mistake to produce a document from a group that has not attempted to make contact with the stakeholders. Stephen suggested that Judge McKnight take the best of the published reports and adapt it as a structural document, and then take it to the stakeholders for their input. Judge McKnight agreed that her plan included this step.

Subcommittee on Subcommittees: Stephen reported that this subcommittee was charged with addressing how to promote the effectiveness of the SFLAC in general and the essential work of the subcommittees in particular. By addressing a very specific issue that will have a proposed motion today, the SFLAC will acknowledge that judicial officers need to have support, in the form of pro-tem judges, in order to continue their extremely valuable and effective work on this Committee and its subcommittees, as well as for the new Chief Justice Task Force on Judicial Support for Pro Bono.

In order to enable experienced judicial officers to help the SFLAC fulfill the essential mandates from the statute and from OSCA, the SFLAC strongly urges the Chief Justice and the State Court Administrator to consider and act upon the following motion:

The Chief Justice and State Court Administrator support judicial efforts to participate as chairs or members of the following committees, subcommittees and task force, by facilitating the provision of pro-tem judges to cover bench duties that would allow judges time to actively participate in essential and valuable committee work:

1. Statewide Family Law Advisory Committee
2. Statewide Family Law Advisory Committee Subcommittees
3. Statewide Family Law Advisory Committee Forms Drafting Subcommittee
4. Chief Justice Task Force on Judicial Support for Pro Bono

Stephen Adams made the motion, and the Honorable Robert Selander seconded. The Committee passed the motion unanimously. The SFLAC Chair and Co-Chair will make an appointment with the Chief Justice and State Court Administrator to discuss this recommendation.

Discussion continued involving difficulties of developing a pool and using pro-tem judges, for example, rural areas working with the constitutional provision that states you cannot be a pro tem judge and also serve in other ways, i.e., being a member of city council.

The original charge of the subcommittee on subcommittees was to look at resource staffing issue for the various subcommittees since it was not possible for the current staff person to complete the staffing work for all subcommittees, and still perform the necessary duties of her position as Family Law Staff Counsel. After conversations with the Deputy State Court Administrator and several members of the SFLAC, the following persons were identified and charged with staffing the following subcommittees:

- Erin Ruff will staff the Task Force on Alternative Methods of Resolving Family Law Matters;
- Maria Hinton will staff the Parenting Plan Outreach Workgroup, the Annual Family Law Conference subcommittee and the Self Represented Legal Services subcommittee;
- Karen Olson will staff the Domestic Violence subcommittee;
- Bealisa will staff the Court/Child Support Agency Child Support Coordination subcommittee.

A motion was presented by Stephen Adams that the SFLAC Chair write a letter to the State Court Administrator expressing the appreciation of the SFLAC for the support and resources dedicated to the continuation of the essential work of the subcommittees. Motion was seconded by Judge Leggett and the Committee passed the motion unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS: Judicial involvement/ethics and pro bono issues:

Formation of Chief Justice's Task Force: Bealisa reported that this comes out of the white paper that was reviewed by the SFLAC at the April meeting that was held in conjunction with the Family Law Conference. This paper was a compilation of the research on what other states were doing and what they found to be successful in increasing the number of attorneys that would provide pro bono services. The number one element was judicial involvement. The recommendation that has been developing in conjunction with the Bar's Pro Bono Committee is that the Chief Justice be approached for appointment of a Task Force to address whether the judicial cannons need to be changed, what kind of work needs to be done to clarify that judges can do things like write letters to attorneys asking them to volunteer for their local attorney assistance program, or engage in other kinds of measures.

The Chief Justice supports this task force and Judge McKnight and Bealisa have been working on a work plan, however, the effort is currently not moving forward because Judge McKnight would be chairing this task force, and she cannot commit the time unless she can be provided pro-tem coverage. The SFLAC supported this issue back at the April meeting and asked to be updated on its development. Bealisa asked the SFLAC to add this Task Force to the list of committees previously mentioned in the motion to the Chief Justice requesting support of pro-tem judges. Stephen made a motion that this Task Force be included in Judge Brownhill's and Bill Howe's meeting with the Chief Justice. Judge Leggett seconded the motion. The Committee passed the motion unanimously.

Stephen Adams clarified that the Task Force would, once started, take up the task to work on the issue of judicial ethics regarding pro bono efforts, relieving the SFLAC's Self Represented Legal Services subcommittee of this charge.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dr. Nancy Thoennes was unable to attend the meeting, however, Ernie provided the SFLAC with the Executive Summary from her report (*Integrated Approaches to Manage Multi-Case Families in the Justice System* from the Center for Policy Research, August 2006).

Ernie stated that the information is very recent and he is not prepared to make any remarks other than he found the information very positive. It is difficult to make very strong conclusions because we do not have a group we can use as a comparison.

Counties involved in this study are Maricopa County, Arizona, Deschutes County, Oregon and Jackson County, Oregon, and include 406 unified family court cases. There is some evidence that with the unified family court model, there are better orders entered that are not conflicting. However, you could not make a strong argument either way that more judicial monitoring meant better outcomes.

This report reflects the ability to identify best practices that seem to have good results with less conflicting orders. However, with the unified family court, you also need a good community response system in place that can match up with the judicial orders. How services are administered at the executive and non-profit levels will directly affect the success of families.

Jim Adams stated that preliminary research clearly indicates that the unified family court concept is less adversarial, and one of the most rewarding aspects of this research is that it clearly demonstrates a statistically strong increase in reunification. This research does a good job of identifying best practices, and Dr. Rivera's research gives good insight in that this model can reduce criminal activities, both at the juvenile and adult level, as well as family violence including domestic violence. This report emphasizes the need for continued, high level, research that can now start addressing the "whys" of these results.

OJD IT has agreed to re-write the OTCMS that will simplify input of data, allow for service agencies to input their own data into this system, and allow for the extracting of useful data that will support further research.

CJ Re-appointment order and new SFLAC member: Judge Brownhill stated that there was conflicting information on the last SFLAC appointment order from the Chief Justice, and in order to clarify appointment dates, a new appointment order has been drafted for the Chief Justice's consideration. The new order would re-appoint existing SFLAC members to a two-year term starting January 1, 2007 and ending December 30, 2008. The new order would appoint William "Butch" Caster to the Committee for a two

year term, also starting January 1, 2007 and ending December 30, 2008. The new order will adjust Lauren Mac Neill's term to end December 30, 2008.

Judge Brownhill asked the Committee if all agreed to the re-appointments. The Committee unanimously agreed to the re-appointments.

Maria will send the drafted order to the Chief Justice for his consideration and signature.

Discussion and definition of "family court": BeaLisa recommended at the last meeting that the SFLAC have a discussion of the definition of "family court" and what specifically it is that the SFLAC should address.

Bill Howe stated that it is unclear if a definition of "family court" exists. Unified family court is the logo for the one family, one judge model, however, there are many variations of this model. Consideration has been given to family law cases that include children, and these cases are different than cases that do not involve children. They are looked at differently at every stage of the process. When the term "family court" is used, this does not include the need to have a courthouse facilitator or parent education program or any other particular component.

Stephen Adams asked for clarification of the task brought before the SFLAC. BeaLisa stated that ORS 3.430 Family Court Advocate Programs is now called the Family Court Coordinator in most counties. Courts are struggling with the issue that they need a Family Court Coordinator that will coordinate the services (parent education, mediation, visitation, parental access, etc.), but that doesn't fit with what the statute says.

This position has evolved into many forms. Deschutes county had decided to call this position an "advocate". However, it is still evolving to coordination, treatment court specialist, etc. They still see the position as an advocate for the family.

It was suggested that the language in the statute may need to be more broad. As the statute reads, it is necessary for a court to submit written application to the Chief Justice to either establish or abolish a "family court department".

BeaLisa stated that there seems to be a lot of emphases placed on drug and treatment courts (resources, staff and priorities). The concern is that the mission of the SFLAC may be becoming defused in the family court arena. There are resources available that specifically address drug and treatment court issues, so clarification would be helpful as to the SFLAC's purpose in these areas as opposed to family courts. There seems to be little discussion around the great need for parent coordination services for high conflict families.

Judge Selander and Jim Adams both stated that separation of issues would not be beneficial to services offered to families. The issues are all intertwined, and drug and treatment issues need to be addressed along with the parent coordination services in high conflict families, in order to provide the best possible services for both the parent(s) and the children. The ideal would be to address all the issues at the same time with full

effort. BeaLisa reiterated that if family court is all these things, there isn't a voice for the various family court services that she has stated, (mediation, supervised visitation, parent education, etc.).

Ernie restated the issue and mentioned that by blending the issues, the family courts are not getting resources and are falling lower on the priority list. BeaLisa asked, to what extent is it the responsibility of the SFLAC to elevate the image, definition and needs of the family court.

BeaLisa mentioned that Oregon has totally backtracked and lost the concept and impetus behind unbundled legal services. This was one of the major sources of information and investigation that the family law commission and family law task force worked on.

Stephen Adams stated that it is very important for the SFLAC to define its mission statement based on the statutory authorization that created this Committee; "we need to find a way to define our core, yet not forgo our responsibility to say that core has connections out to other things (concentric circles)".

Judge Selander stated that SFLAC needs to supply the legislature with evidence-based practices that show the positive effects of family courts in our schools, juvenile departments, and adult departments, and that family courts are important!

BeaLisa suggested looking at the strategic plan and redefining our mission and goals. Judge Brownhill agreed that it is very important to go back to the strategic plan and modify it if necessary. Elder Abuse and Elder Law is the first item on the strategic plan and Ernie mentioned that the SFLAC should have a representative on the new Chief Justice's Task Force on Protected Persons Proceedings. Ernie made a motion that Bill Howe be recommended to serve on this Committee and Stephen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Judge Brownhill, on behalf of the SFLAC, will write a letter to the Chief Justice recommending that Bill Howe serve on this Task Force.

BeaLisa suggested that as the Committee reviews the strategic plan, the members prioritize the different tasks. For example, because of the great need for unbundled legal services for self represented litigants, this item should be above the ADR Task Force.

The topic of another retreat was discussed. BeaLisa mentioned that there are funds in the Family Law account and a request could be made to the State Court Administrator for approval to use funds from this account to support a SFLAC retreat in May of 2007.

Retreats in the past have been Friday, all day, and Saturday till noon. The retreat will be placed on the March agenda. Stephen suggested Wallowa county as the place for the retreat and will look into finding a facility that would work. Stephen also stated that if Wallowa county is too far away, then another location should be discussed at the

March meeting. Maria will do some preliminary research to see if the facilitator from the last retreat is available.

Contempt Form: The State Court Administrator sees the family law forms creation as the responsibility of the SFLAC. BeaLisa reported that when the statewide forms were initially created, the OJD Forms Committee played an active part. Since then it has proven exceeding hard to have the involvement of the OJD Forms Committee. Therefore, BeaLisa requests that the SFLAC consider the need for having a SFLAC Forms subcommittee. BeaLisa also requests immediate input on whether there should be contempt forms on the website.

The family law facilitators raised the fact that they have a tremendous need for people to be able to enforce their judgments. A deliberate policy decision was made to not include areas of child support or custody or parenting time in the forms, but limited to areas that could require remedial sanctions. Other avenues are available to address child support and custody or parenting time. This summer, BeaLisa and Sarah Davis, law clerk, developed Packet #19 (contempt packet) and this has raised issues with family law practitioners and several judges. The issue is that some judges feel contempt issues are too complex for self-represented litigants and the forms may set them up for failure, however, some judges and facilitators feel that self-represented litigants must have some way to at least get them into the courthouse. BeaLisa asks the SFLAC to consider this issue of contempt forms on the website.

Bill Howe stated that there will always be disagreement as to whether forms should be on the website, however, he made the motion that the contempt packet should be made available to self represented litigants and made the motion to leave the forms on the website. Linda Scher agreed that some issues should have the advice of an attorney, however, many self represented litigants are not going to get that advice, and making it more difficult for them to access the court will not change that fact. Stephen seconded the motion to leave the forms on the website. Judge Brownhill, Judge Leggett and Judge Selander will look at the comments and consider making improvements to the forms; facilitators will monitor responses. Motion passed unanimously.

FUTURE MEETING DATES:

Friday, March 2, 2007	12:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Multnomah County Juvenile Justice Center
Friday, June 1, 2007	12:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Multnomah County Juvenile Justice Center
Friday, Sept. 7, 2007	12:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. (CJ/SCA Annual Meeting - Salem)
Friday, Dec. 7, 2007	12:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Multnomah County Juvenile Justice Center