

Webinar Series

Court and Child Welfare Data Exchange: Better Information for Improved Outcomes

May 28, 2020

Presenters: **Scott Trowbridge**, Child Welfare Specialist, Administration for Children and Families

Alicia Davis, Principal Court Management Consultant, National Center for State Courts and Center of Capacity Building for Courts

Cindy Bricker, Court Improvement Program Director, Washington

Matt Orme, Senior Research Associate, Administrative Office of the Courts, Washington

Tammy Cordova, Data and Reporting Administrator, Department of Children, Youth and Families, Washington

Judge Jerry Bruce, Court Improvement Program Manager, Georgia

Wendy Wilson, CCWIS Project Manager, Georgia

Phil Breitenbucher, Webinar Facilitator, ICF

Phil Breitenbucher: Good Morning, good afternoon everyone. We are excited that you're able to join us today. We will begin this webinar in just a few minutes, but we're glad you've joined us today. Okay, welcome to this webinar with the Child Welfare Information Technology Systems Managers and Staff Webinar series. This webinar is presented by the US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau. Today's webinar, titled "Court and Child Welfare Data Exchange: Better Information for Improved Outcomes," will feature our Court Improvement Program as well as the Capacity Building Center for Courts. We will also have panelists representing the state of Georgia and the state of Washington.

So, welcome all of you and good morning or good afternoon, wherever you're joining us from. Today's presenters will be Scott Trowbridge who is the Child Welfare Specialist with the Court Improvement Program at Administration for Children and Families. Alicia Davis, who is a Principal Court Management Consultant at the National Center for State Courts and the Center of Capacity Building for Courts. It will also feature Cindy Bricker who is the Court Improvement Program Director from Washington and Matt Orme who is a Senior Research Associate at the Administrative

Office of the Courts and Tammy Cordova, who is a Data and Reporting Administrator at the Department of Children, Youth and Families in Washington State. It will also feature our panelists from Georgia - Judge Jerry Bruce who is the Court Improvement Program Manager, as well as Wendy Wilson who is the CCWIS Project Manager. And, I am your webinar facilitator, my name is Phil Breitenbucher and we're glad you have joined us.

We really encourage participation today and there's multiple ways in which you can participate in today's webinar. One is that we will periodically pause and take questions and answers and try to provide questions and answers as we go through this segment. You can also submit your questions and comments via the chat function or, again, we can open up the lines, you can use the "raise your hand" feature and we can unmute your line that way. Questions can be addressed to an individual, to a panelist or just general discussion. After the webinar, you may also email questions to your federal analyst or to ccwis.questions@acf.hhs.gov. So, we do want to encourage active engagement and participation in our discussion today.

Broadly, we're going to start with an overview of the Court Improvement Program - we'll have a national perspective there from Scott. Then, we're going to have a discussion on opportunities for collaboration through data sharing presented by Alicia Davis. And then our panelists will discuss opportunities to build relationships as a foundation for data and information exchange, building information exchange models, and public-facing data dashboards. We'll conclude today with some final thoughts and a wrap up. Alright, we're going to move now into our first speaker, so I'm glad to present to you Scott. Scott, take it away.

Scott Trowbridge:

Hello all, we wanted to start with an overview of the state Court Improvement Program, or I will say CIP most of the time. This may be review for some of you but even there, I hope that by outlining what CIPs are charged to do, you can be thinking of areas where you may have similar data needs, uses, insights and above all, ideas for opportunities to work together.

So, the CIP was established as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993 - that will be on the quiz later - and that act, overall, provided funds to states and tribes for child maltreatment prevention and response. For the CIP part, the highest court in each jurisdiction is eligible for those funds and most of these are called - and within the administrative offices of the courts in the most places called - state Supreme Court.

So, the CIP is granted in three parts - basic, training, and data. And basic

is broadly court improvement for child welfare. The other parts are, generally and broadly, what you'd guess from being called training and data. Currently, every state, D.C., Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands have these grants. And, I'll just say state to save time, if you can excuse that simplification. Next slide, please.

Overview of the Court Improvement Program - so, I'm going to go over the purposes and the practice orientation. So, the reason I hope this is useful, again, is for you to be able to think about ways that CCWIS and CIP could be working together. So, here are the broad purposes of the CIP from the regs and program instructions, as I summarize them. CIP is focused on certain outcomes - on safety, permanency, well-being, and due process. CIP is focused on certain domains or spheres or disciplines, for lack of a word perhaps better than that, those domains of the legal community- judges, lawyers, and court staff. And, legal processes, including those involving others like case workers and their interactions with the court, for example. There are two required projects - a joint project with the child welfare agency and a hearing quality project - and, next year, I anticipate there will be a required legal representation project. And, maybe not on purpose, but there is a requirement in significant projects to and ideally in all efforts to some reasonable extent to operate the CIP under a continuous quality improvement framework. So, in the next slide I'll explain what we mean by that.

The continuous quality improvement - CQI for short - is a mouthful of words for something that's simple to understand, hard to do and practice in big, complex systems. It's a change management model, a cyclical conception that goes from one, identifying and assessing needs, two developing a theory of change - or really more properly a hypothesis of the chain of causation that will get you from your intended initial systemic change to your desired outcomes. Phase three is developing, fleshing out the intervention that will make that change. Part four is planning, preparing and implementing that intervention. And five, evaluating whether you really did the intervention faithfully - you might call it fidelity - and checking on both short- and long-term outcomes.

So, the reason I go into this one in more detail is because I would assert that - and CIPs hear this from us, too - that every step of the cycle benefits from data and data expertise. I think in phase one - identifying and assessing needs - and in phase five - evaluation - there's a more intuitive importance of looking at the data involving data experts. But, what I'd assert is that there's a lot of intervention, design, implementation, and planning in between that the experts on the state data could provide insight to or benefit from being a part of. So, you know, aside from the topical focus of the CIPs, I would think about, you know, where in the

cycle are you being, taking advantage of opportunities there and are CIPs taking opportunities there to work with you.

So, in a lot of cases we see the court data or insights that could be shared with you and better understand, you know, why you are seeing what you're seeing in data and we also see the other way of examples of court partnerships improving data quality, for example, around IV-E findings.

So, those - next slide, please - those are in a nutshell the broad topical purposes and process approach of the state CIPs. For a little more detail - we won't take too long on this - but, we do gather and aggregate national data on the CIP work annually and - next slide, please, sorry - and so, we gather national data on the CIP work and there's some additional snapshots of what they were working on from last year's info. Almost all of them are working on a data project - which is, may not be CCWIS data, of course, it could be manual, it could be, you know, collecting court hearing data. You also see timeliness/permanency there, which is surely something you are also looking at. Engagement of parties is a good one to focus on because that's an area crucially often the courts and agencies both have just part of the puzzle in their data sets. There are more that didn't make the top categories and we could, you know - if you're interested in this type of thing - we could make that national report available to you, if you like, that this comes from. Next slide, please.

So, further breaking out the data projects, you'll see that the largest percentage of these are agency data sharing efforts and second is case management systems. I would say - and one of the things I was focusing on when the idea of this webinar was proposed is - I think a lot of the data sharing projects are not as automated as I would like. On the other hand, comparing 10-12 years ago when I first started working with CIPs, the amount of sharing of any type - including, you know, manual, it's, like sharing at meetings - it's up a lot. So, I'd also note that a lot of the sharing projects might not be child welfare agency and courts, they could be with education or juvenile justice, for example. That's some other breakdowns for the data initiatives. And, capacity building needs and, another thing - yeah, back to that next slide, please.

So, we asked what areas they needed assistance with globally and number one was data collection and analysis. In the top five was data visualization and reporting. So, I imagine that many of you have skills in those areas that would be most welcome if you could take on a shared venture with CIPs. Next slide.

So, what are the possibilities? I hope it's helpful for you to understand

what CIPs are charged to do. You'll hear some examples of where, in my opinion, they are great benefits to the courts and agency and of course the children and families from collaboration around and including data. So, I encourage you to think about where you might see a bridge - whether it's topical or some process where you could work with a CIP. As you know, as you probably know the CFR does promote the bi-directional data exchange between CCWIS and the courts and without calling out CCWIS specifically, there is, you know, direction to CIPs in their program instruction to reach out to the agency about data and of course, you know, that's part of the data grant and part of the joint project potentially in a lot of states.

So, if you have specific questions, reach out to your assigned federal analyst, they can reach out to us if anything was needed on, you know, getting things rolling or introductions made, et cetera. It's better to ask and we'll see how we can be helpful. So, for more depth on the parameters of getting started and making data exchange work, I'm gonna turn it over to Alicia Davis - who when Phil and Nicole proposed this topic to me was one of the first persons I thought of. So, I've had the pleasure of working with her for, I think a dozen years and on a lot of the topics above that I just went through quickly, she could say a lot about her background, but I'll say quickly that she speaks at least four languages fluently - legalese, data, English and Spanish. So, take it away, Davis.

Alicia Davis:

So, thank you so much, Scott. Yeah, we go back a long time. And, I really appreciate the opportunity to take part of this panel. As Scott knows, I am a very enthusiastic - sometimes unknowingly so - supporter of data exchange between CCWIS and CIP and the reason that I am is because my experience is that it has been the vehicle to springboard collaboration. And, as Scott was saying, you know, partnerships really improve data quality and I would say that also, you know, that data quality improves the partnerships.

So, as Scott mentioned, you know, I've been with the Capacity Building Center for six years and I'm the Region 2 Liaison and I've been involved in a number of joint projects of the types that Scott was just referencing. Like the CFSR and PIP workshops that really count on data sharing, taking a look at, you know, the information that is at the hands of CCWIS and courts systems and requires the type of collaboration that Scott was talking about. So, you know, I've been at the National Center for State Courts for about 10 years working on a lot of different national data sharing projects. But, before that, I served as the Court Improvement Director for Colorado and the Director for CIP in Utah before that and those of you familiar with those states know that they are states that are really invested in CCWIS and court data exchange and data sharing and

as a result of that, I would say that those jurisdictions have accomplished some pretty great outcomes for youths, some pretty great attention for the children and families that they're serving. So, next slide.

Just as an example of my former days in Colorado, we were very proud of the Family Justice Information System that was an information sharing effort between the Colorado Department of Human Services and the courts. That kind of ugly thing that you see there is the Wheel of FAMJIS - it was one of the ways that we tried to fun it up when we would do joint trainings to ensure that on the CCWIS side and on the court side that everybody was entering the right codes. And those were all the codes that you can see represented on the wheel there in order to improve data quality and, you know, be able to get better information out of it.

In terms of the next slide, court-agency data exchange - Scott, I think you had something to say about this. Scott may be muted. So, I think the point here is that automated court systems have, you know, obviously, they have a lot of information about the rights of the parties, emergency hearing dates, you know, the dates of all different reviews and hearings. There are, you know, obviously a lot of, it can be very helpful because the court documents may or may not have the most current address of the parties, so that's obviously information that can be helpful to share. Information about the attorneys that are assigned to the case, the, you know, of course the different elements of the permanency dates according to the courts - we know that sometimes that doesn't always necessarily square up with what the agency has on record and that becomes a whole conversation between the courts and the agency and can be really helpful in terms of, you know, determining what the, what each party's respective data definitions are and sort of generating a conversation about what permanency really means. And then, as we'll be hearing from some of the jurisdictions that are represented on the panel today, by squaring up those definitions, really, you know, engaging in a shared focus on those, on permanency and other outcomes. Next slide.

So, in saying all of this, I recognize as, you know, as represented in this cartoon here, where the one guy is saying "sometimes I think that collaboration would work better without you". And I know that that is often the experience and so, we just want to recognize that, that what we're talking about is not, it's not easy, it can require some effort - especially if you've had turnover in your jurisdiction. Maybe, you know, there was a court leader that you were working really well with and then that person left or they've taken on a new assignment. It can be difficult to start all over again to get the buy-in and the vision for what can be accomplished through this. And, you know, and I've heard stories and, you know, and I hate to hear these stories of just, of people reaching out to courts and

hearing that, you know, that this aspect of court functioning represents a percentage of what the court does. We all certainly recognize the importance of it. But, the thing that I would again say is that, you know, sometimes it requires a lot of effort, but in terms of the benefits, once you do get to that place of shared vision, it can really reach some tremendous benefit.

And, on the next slide, again, kind of harkening back to what Scott was saying, if you had talked to - I've been, you know, I've been working with Court Improvement Programs for over 15 years now, and I, you know, I was a parents' attorney before that. You know, it's just a different environment now than it was 10, you know, five, 10, 15 years ago, whereas it used to be really interesting to be involved in agency data discussions because they were very robust and then, you know, the court discussions were sometimes less-so. You know, as Scott showed in the slides, that's really changing and people are actively seeking assistance in how to collect and then interpret and use the data that they were getting.

So, in the next slide, as a final kind of note, I hope that maybe this has crossed your desks at some point - and if it has, I would like to hear if it's been of use at all - it's a document that I got to collaborate on just talking about some of the elements of data sharing, it gives a couple of examples of memoranda of understanding between CCWIS and courts. So, on the next slide with regards to the Capacity Building Center for Courts - as Scott will tell you and has mentioned - each state has a liaison, as I mentioned, I'm in Region 2, but there's a liaison for every single region and these are people that are really steeped in CQI and in trying to support communications and partnership between the agency and the courts. Scott?

Scott Trowbridge:

Yeah, I think, I mean that's a good highlight, but, just to know that there's this other technical assistance provider there and, you know, most of these folks are attorneys, have attorney backgrounds and have a lot of child welfare specialization but in a lot of cases, they're brought on because they have additional expertise in other areas. As such, they might cross over regional lines depending on the subject matter. Like, Alicia, for example, she is a Regional Liaison, but she also worked on that technical guide she mentioned and could be brought in for data-related consultation as needed. And, reaching out to your assigned analyst is one way to connect there. I think we also have our contact information in there, as well. Aside from the newest liaisons that are just starting, they've all worked extensively with CIPs and child welfare agencies, so, they'd be good resources also for, you know, the type of introductions and just understanding some about the states and where they're at with

different things. So, either from that or subject matter expertise or workgroup facilitation, it's probably easier just to share with us what the need is than for me to list all the ways they could be helpful in your states. So, I'd just offer that as a resource that is potentially there for you. Alright, next, that's our contact information - I assume this presentation is going out to everybody - and now I believe we're turning it back to Phil.

Phil Breitenbucher: Yeah, thank you so much. And we're gonna move to a period of questions. We know that there was a question or a request that the URL be made available that was on the slide deck, we can, maybe Alicia can put that in the chat box, but you can also email Alicia there at adavis@ncsc.org and she'd be happy to share it with you that way. Nicole, do we have any other questions at this time?

Nicole Fuller: Phil, give me one second, the chat line just went off. No, sir, we do not have any, we do not have any other questions right now. Thank you, sir.

Phil Breitenbucher: Yes, thanks, Nicole. And I see, Alicia, you have posted that link, as well, there. Go ahead and feel free to download that toolkit, it's an excellent resource. And again, thank you very much Scott, Alicia, we really appreciate that introduction of the Court Improvement Program. Let's now, we're gonna shift into part two with our state panelist discussions and we're gonna start with our folks from Washington, again, which is - and I'll let them introduce themselves as they speak. And I'll turn it first over to Tammy.

Tammy Cordova: Next slide, please. Thank you! And, my name is Tammy Cordova and I'm the Data and Reporting Administrator for the Department of Children, Youth and Families, which is the child welfare agency in Washington State. I'm responsible for agency reporting and data sharing. My team works closely with our CCWIS team and our court data partners. Today, I'm going to briefly tell you the story of how our child welfare agency started working with the courts to share data. Next slide.

First, I wanna give you some context about how the child welfare system and the court system intersect in Washington state. So, Washington is a state-administered child welfare system with six regions and 51 field offices. The map you can see on the screen shows the six regions in different colors, very different sizes depending on east and west of the state. And the smaller borders reflect the 39 counties in Washington. Tribal lands are shown in the teal color and some tribes have their own tribal court. Our dependency courts are situated in the counties and our child welfare offices do not always align exactly with counties. In urban areas, we have multiple offices in large counties and our rural offices often cover multiple counties. We have a decentralized, county-based

court system, which prevents some challenges in terms of sharing data, as each court may function very differently.

However, we're very fortunate to have state-wide court leadership through the Administrative Office of the Courts, which we call AOC. Our other two panelists from Washington work for AOC and you'll get to hear about the work that they're doing. You are going to hear the term dependency or dependent child during this presentation - in Washington, this term is used to indicate a child who is placed into the placement and care authority of the child welfare agency by the court, so that that's clear. Next slide.

In 2007, a state law required AOC in consultation with our child welfare agency and the attorney general's office to compile an annual report that provided information about dependent children whose cases did not meet statutory guidelines for achieving permanency. As we looked at that, it quickly became clear the child welfare agency had data that we needed to share with the courts in order to understand permanency outcomes at the broader system level. We executed a data share agreement and shared the child welfare data so it could be merged with court data to tell the broader story of the child welfare system and the very first report established the shared ownership for improvement outcomes by the courts, child welfare agencies, attorneys, parents, and service providers. And, we went along that route for four years and then in 2011, the AOC's Center for Court Research - which was responsible for the report - hired Matt Orme, who you will hear from next.

Matt had worked with data in our child welfare system for 20 years, both in our research shop and for me in our data shop. Because Matt understood the child welfare data, he was able to make use of the merge data that we already had and produce additional useful content much quicker. And, as you all know, the 2016 CCWIS rules added the requirement of three new interfaces to electronic child welfare systems - one being the court interface, which will complement Washington's already existing requirement to share data between child welfare programs and the courts. Data sharing is often the biggest hurdle to establishing new electronic interfaces and Washington has already successfully navigated that hurdle, so we feel like that's a big step forward for us. We still have some technological challenges that need to be worked through in order to develop the interface between our CCWIS system and the court system, which Matt will touch on in his presentation.

The 2007 state law served as an opportunity because we were mandated to produce an annual report, however, we've leveraged that mandate to do much more, which we'll show you in just a couple minutes. Next slide.

So, we have learned some lessons over the last 13 years and the first is to develop repeatable processes. Our current process for exchanging and merging the data is very dependent on Matt's knowledge of child welfare data, so we're excited as we move forward to automate this exchange through our CCWIS process and we know this will streamline our data exchange process, making it much more efficient, economical, and effective. It will allow the courts and the child welfare agency to focus more of our efforts on using the data. In addition, which we don't have now, bringing the court data back into our CCWIS system will reduce caseworker data entry workload and lag time and allow caseworkers to focus on improved outcomes for children and families.

Another lesson we learned is that it is very important to develop documentation that translates terms and field names between systems, quite honestly, we have to admit that we didn't take the time to do that and I still have to call Matt occasionally and ask what some fields mean in the merge data because the terms are quite different between the court and the child welfare system. Having two primary agencies reach agreement about how best to share the data and make use of it was not always painless. It was made easier by Matt's knowledge of both systems, however, we were doing it for four years before Matt was hired by the courts just in case any of you were thinking you need to go hire someone from the court system in order to do this. It is possible and it really is worth it. We expect the use of the data to continue to evolve from what it is today in supporting improved practice. It provides a common framework where child welfare workers, attorneys, and judges can all look at the same information and work together toward improved outcomes. Our last presenter today is going to share some examples of the collaborative and constructive work being done in Washington because we have this merge data. But now, I'm going to turn this over to Matt Orme, who's the Senior Research Associate from AOC's Center for Court Research and he's going to tell you about the data products we've developed using the merged data and there you go, Matt, thanks.

Matt Orme:

Thanks, Tammy. And thank you, Phil and all for inviting Washington to participate in today's presentation. I'm gonna quickly cover how our current data exchange process works and then share a few of our data products that support Washington in using better information for improved outcomes. Next slide, please.

So, a little bit about our current data exchange process. First, removal and placement data are extracted from the DCYF Famlink data system. This data is then used to match back to Washington's Superior Court Management Information System or what we call SCOMIS. Once matching has been identified indicating that a person with the same

name, gender, birthdate was associated with both systems, a complex date/time routine is done to associate the best fit Famlink placement to the SCOMIS court case. This is necessary as a child could have many placements over time, as well as many court cases. Once the child has been matched on a court case and a placement, then the necessary Famlink data is merged to the court record for analysis and reporting. Next slide, please.

So, here are just some simple screenshots from our Dependency Timeliness Report that we do annually or what we call the DTR. So, in the upper left is a representation of what's in the middle of our report - this is illustrating the Washington State Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program, which Cindy's gonna talk about. As you move across the top, there are sections related to case volumes and filing trends for populations, et cetera. And then, we have big sections related to what we call our timeliness measures or timeliness indicators - this one is for fact finding where time from dependency petition to adjudication. Lower left, we have lots of breakouts related to placement discharge types, events, time to those events, dismissals, et cetera. And, then in the back of our report is a complete county-based section where we have lots of breakouts per our 39 counties - this happens to be for Pierce, illustrating a couple sections related to their performance indicators or timeliness indicators, outcomes, demographics, their filings, re-entries into the systems, et cetera. Next slide, please.

So, our public facing dependency dashboard - we used Tableau in creating this - it contains monthly and quarterly aggregate displays for all of our timeliness measures indicators for all our counties, as well as a previous year's rollup for comparative measures and a previous year rollup for all the measures broken out by race and ethnicity. So, again, these are just some simple little screenshots from the website, the public website. On the left-hand side, a simple little county map. When you're online, you can hover over or select any of those counties, all of their permanency indicators come up, timeliness indicators, filing indicators. Down the center, you can kind of see - as much as we could fit on the screenshot - the measures per county. On the right-hand side are some simple examples of some maps related to demographics across the state and again, dependency filings and rates per county. Next slide, please.

So, our internal Interactive Dependency Timeliness Reporting system or what we call the IDTR contains everything the DTR does, plus more in an interactive setting. It's a web-based application housed securely on our internal court server and this reporting tool allows users to view data on timeliness and court processing for the state, their county, or any other county. And these screenshots, upper left, are showing federal approach

for the termination of parental rights within 15 months. You can see in the blue box, you can filter for any county in the state gender, race, ethnicity; it is broken down over time for compliance and non-compliance. A user can come in and if they want to drill into things that look like have either stalled or are non-compliant, double-clicking on any of those numbers will pull up the raw case filing information so we can do data lookups, data clean ups, continue quality improvement, QA stuff around the table with system actors.

To the right of that is another example of kind of what we call stock and flow or Mark Courtney and Fred Wilson out in Chapin Hall would call. So you get your dependencies flowing, dismissals flowing out, active cases during a year on the purple line, filter for any county per population - this is a really great, quick way to indicate pressures throughout the system during different parts of the case time. Below that, we offer a lot more sections based on outcomes and time to those events.

And then the internal IDTR also has its own dependency dashboard, so the user can come in and select whatever timeliness indicators they want per state, FJCIP or comparison up to five counties. This is great for folks that want to come in, get some quick data over time, print it out, take it to a judicial meeting or a systems meeting. So, as Tammy mentioned, we still have some IT challenges that need to be addressed in developing the interface between the FamLink system and the courts. Washington courts recently implemented a new statewide odyssey case management system, however, two of the 39 jurisdictions - one being the largest county in the state - chose to either remain or transition to a non-odyssey system. So, it goes without saying that defining consistent data structures, elements, as well as outlining the data mapping, extracting for state-wide reporting continues to be a struggle. However, the agency is committed in finding solutions as we look for with the CCWIS and designing interfaces for better information and improved outcomes for children and families here in Washington State. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Cindy Bricker, who's the Director of CIP for Washington.

Cindy Bricker:

Hello, I'm Cindy Bricker thank you, Matt. And, I am the Court Improvement Director with Washington State working for Administrative Office of the Courts. And, as Scott mentioned in the intro, CIP is about continuous quality improvement. And data is such an important part that a third of the grant funding that we get is specific to data collection and use. Washington CIP uses our data grant to pay for a senior research associate position with the Washington State Center for Court Research, which is Matt Orme, who you just heard from.

We also used CIP funding to contract with the agency's research and

data analysis division to examine court process timelines and its relationship with permanency related outcomes. Out of that, there were three key findings from that analysis that determined one, dependency cases in compliance with statutory guidelines had significantly shorter durations; and two significant differences exist in the duration of dependency cases across courts; and three, racial and ethnic disparities in dependency lane exist in nearly all courts for cases longer than one year. That let us know that the timelines that we were tracking, just as Matt showed you, really do make a difference.

Matt showed you the different data products that we have available and besides the individual users of the court child welfare data - including state legislators - there are two CIP groups that use the data to help direct their work. The first is the Innovative Dependency Court Collaborative, which is a statewide, multidisciplinary group that's co-chaired by myself and the director of the child welfare programs division. This taskforce is required by the CIP grant. The group uses data to see where things are going well and to find out what these jurisdictions are doing differently and look for ways to grow that success. As Tammy mentioned, we are a decentralized court system, so each court does things a little bit differently in each county. We also use the data to look for areas that are struggling in order to offer resources to assist jurisdictions to improve their system, thereby improving outcomes for children and for families. Next slide, please.

I also oversee the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program and that program is state funded and it's in 10 out of our 39 counties. And each of those 10 courts hire a coordinator that regularly reviews the court child welfare data and shares with local stakeholder groups - similar to the IDCC but done at the local level. Data shows that these programs perform better than the statewide average. FJCIP courts provide semi-annual reports that include dependency data for their individual jurisdictions, trends that they're noticing, and solutions they're planning to implement to resolve identified areas needing improvement. Information from these reports are used in the annual FJCIP report to the legislature. The FJCIP coordinators also participate in monthly online meetings, where they share ideas. And using the CQI process that Scott talked about, several of these successful, innovative programs have moved to statewide implementation. Next slide.

Data is an integral part of systems change and without it, how are we gonna know what we are doing truly makes a difference in the lives of children and families we serve? Here's our contact information and we're happy to answer questions when it comes to that time. Thank you for your time today.

Phil Breitenbucher: Thank you very much and there are a couple questions that have come in, but thank you, Tammy, Matt and Cindy very much. We're just gonna go ahead now and move to our Georgia panelists. So, I'm very delighted to present to you Judge Jerry Bruce.

Judge Jerry Bruce: Thanks very much, glad to be here. As you might have noted, I'm a former juvenile court judge and before I was a juvenile court judge in the State of Georgia, I was an attorney for the child welfare agency and so, I've had a lot of different exposure to different aspects of juvenile court practice in Georgia and I'm bringing that, sort of, practical knowledge of the courtroom into the, my role as the Court Improvement Program Director for the state. One of the most important things that, one of the most important tools I had available to me really as a judge - I wasn't always aware of these options when I was an attorney for the state but really became aware of them, unfortunately only after I got on the bench - was sort of robust approach to data that Georgia takes.

Georgia is also a very decentralized system, if you can go to the next slide, you can see that, first off, Georgia has more counties than any state besides Texas and we're much smaller than Texas. So, we are about as Balkanized that a state that's not in the Balkans can probably be. We have 159 counties, fortunately, we have a state-administered child welfare system - if it were county-administered, it would be utter chaos. We have a very decentralized court system, so data, overarching data can be hard to come by.

And, fortunately, the CIP program did two things - and I completely neglected to ask to include a slide about the first part. One is aggregate data about our child welfare system that's very useful for our court improvement system program, for our - we also have a court improvement initiative that has about 15 or 16 jurisdictions in it who are committed to implementing best practices and we are very driven by looking at specific outcome data, aggregate outcome data in those jurisdictions and also in any other jurisdictions that ask us to come and talk about those. So, Georgia is one of only about 12 states that completely shares openly all of its aggregate child welfare data that is reported to the federal government. We do this in cooperation with a program that's operated out of North Carolina, the University of North Carolina, called Fostering Court Improvement.org - you can look that up, fosteringcourtimprovement.org, you can see the states that share their data.

Twelve states share their data with no protection whatsoever because it is all aggregate data, Georgia is one of those. Anybody with a web browser can pull up aggregate data on Georgia's child welfare outcomes and

measures - anything from the number of children we take into care in any given county, in any given region of the state, you can look it up by jurisdiction, by county, and by administrative regions in the state. You can find out how many children go into care, for how long they stay there, whether they're brought in as part of a sibling group or not, when they're discharged, what type of placements they're in, how long it takes for termination of parental rights. There is hundreds of measures that every state is required to report to the federal government.

As I said, as part of our partnership with our child welfare agency more than 15 years ago, our CIP helped to broker an agreement to share that data completely publicly and so, it's available to anybody and we use that data. I have access not only to the front-facing data, but to the raw data behind that - and use that to build charts and graphs to assist our courts and other stakeholders in doing their jobs. So, aggregate data is very important for what we do in our work in Georgia.

But, also, case-specific data is very hard to come by. We have this highly decentralized court system, we have no statewide requirement that our juvenile courts use any particular type of data system. We have juvenile courts who use manila folders and yellow pieces of paper with a pen to take all of their notes and they have records that are also just paper records. We have a lot of courts that digitize their records but they don't really share them. I was the judge in a four-county circuit up in the far right-hand corner of Georgia, very rural circuit that was cut in half by the Appalachian Trail and the mountains that are associated with that and it was very difficult to carry files around from one county to another.

So, we had developed - if you go to the next slide - something called the Court Process Reporting System. And this is for case-specific data. So, this is the result of a very innovative data sharing agreement between our judicial branch and our executive branch. The data sharing agreement itself is over 15 years old, but the court process reporting system has evolved enormously over the course of that 15 years. What it does essentially, is it takes all relevant data for every child in foster care and makes it available immediately - it's updated daily - to all of the stakeholders who deal with that child's case. So, if I'm a judge in a multi-county circuit and I'm doing a judicial review because of timeframes on a case from county A while I'm sitting in county B, I don't need to have that child's court file, which is going to have a lot of things that are probably extraneous to the decisions I have to make. Instead, I can pull that child up on CPRS and I can see everything that's in our state CCWIS system, which is called SHINES regarding that child's foster care stay. We'll go a little bit more into that in detail in just a little bit.

So, also, this is the same thing as well, if I'm an attorney I can pull up my child's information and see exactly what's going on, if I'm an attorney for a parent, I can go in and see exactly what's going on with this case. We all know that case managers are difficult to get to and to communicate with sometimes between court dates - I don't have to get the case manager on the telephone, I can get updated information by pulling up the child's case on CPRS and seeing what's going on with it. So, if you can go to the next slide, we'll look at a little bit of the type of information that's included there if you pull them up.

You can do searches by the child's name, by the relative, or caregiver that's from whom that child was initially removed by the current case manager. You can highlight your own cases out of the raw data about children so that you have a window with your own cases so that you can go quickly to those. You can look at the case plans in detail about this issue. You can find out what people are associated with the case, where the child's placed, the child's placement history and you can look at court orders and other documents regarding that child. We also have a data sharing agreement with the Department of Education in Georgia that allows us to have educational data for the child and we also have, we also have a data sharing agreement with the Department of Juvenile Justice so if we have children who are dually involved, we can pull up all of their accurate Department of Juvenile Justice information.

Sorry, I was accidentally muted there for a second. So, it's a large amount of information that's available about every child who is in foster care and it's updated daily. Could you skip to slide 40 really quickly, the next slide and then we'll come back to slide 39. We have a lot of jurisdictions in which CASAs upload their GRA reports to CPRS in advance of the hearings so they're available there. We've worked with our Georgia CASAs to build out the CPRS CASA reporting capability, they've made a more robust court report form that the CASAs can get online and fill out on CPRS so that once it's reviewed by their supervising staff, it's immediately published to everybody who has access to CPRS on the case, which is all of the parties represented in those cases.

We can also run reports on cases that have been recently updated. There's a large amount of case-specific information in CPRS so you can have a report run to just show which cases have been recently updated. You can pull up a huge - we have about 12,000 kids in care at the moment - so, you can pull up an entire report of all the children in care, recently updated documents, written transitional living plan reports. All kinds of specific reports and we often create ad hoc, custom reports for other people, as well, for different jurisdictions as they ask for those. Can we go back to 39, slide 39?

We also have an e-filing process that's available in CPRS that allows - the attorneys for the agency in Georgia are called Special Assistance Attorney General, unfortunately it's SAAGs - so, if I'm a SAAG and in a case and I prepare an order - which is, that's the party who most frequently prepares court orders in cases - they upload those to the court process reporting system after showing those to all the parties and being aware that there's no other changes to be made. The court, when the court logs into CPRS they see that there are documents requiring the court's attention, the court can review those court orders and either flag them and send them back of editing further or can sign those and if the judge e-signs them, then they immediately go to the clerk who then can e-file them and they're available immediately to everybody in that party.

Then, that night, they go back to our state CCWIS system so they're available to the state, as well. We've had a large issue over the past several years with IV-E reimbursements because of court order availability and this is helping to address that. So, recently as of this past year, an agreement with our attorney general's office who sort of runs the SAAG program and with our child welfare agency so that all of the SAAGs in the state are required - if they're not e-filing, the court's not e-filing - they're required to upload copies of every single court order as soon as it's stamped and filed to CPRS every day. So, we expect to really make some strides on court order availability because the agency should have all of those court orders relatively up to date. So, it's a large amount of information that can be seen by the parties in the case and it's two-way communication between CPRS, between the state's CCWIS system and the local court system. So, I think that takes us to slide 41.

So, I pointed out the two-way courts, that most of the information that's already on this and the benefits of having this two-way communication, so I think that pretty much takes care of slide 41. So, we've got Q&A, you can see it's a large amount of information Georgia shares both its metadata, its large aggregate data and makes available to the parties and the individuals and the courts a lot of detail of microdata about every child in foster care. So, I see a question, is it okay for me just to look at the question and answer it, Phil?

Phil Breitenbucher: Yeah, sure, if you see one for you, go ahead.

Judge Jerry Bruce: I just see one that says, "Is data sharing between the courts and SACWIS in Georgia at the data elements level or is it simply a pdf or other copy of the order itself?" It is a data elements level. I mean, now when a court order is uploaded, our state law requires documents that are uploaded to state systems for security purposes to pdfs, so the court orders themselves are pdfs, but when you're looking at the elements of a child's

case plan or you're trying to find out where the child's currently placed or look at educational data, then you're looking at data elements displayed on the screen which change as they're updated in the CCWIS system or as they're updated from the court's side.

Phil Breitenbucher: Thank you. One question for Washington, you had mentioned that - I think this was Cindy - mentioned that I think there was 11 projects locally, that started locally now moved to statewide - are there any examples of that, that you might be able to share with us?

Cindy Bricker: Sure, yeah. We've had several projects that have gone statewide. I don't know if it's 11, but several.

Phil Breitenbucher: Okay. I might have heard 11, you said several, thank you.

Cindy Bricker: That's alright. So, one of the examples would be our Finding Fathers Project which is, the Finding Father Project provides courts with reliable, fast, low-cost DNA testing for alleged fathers in dependency cases. And, we had a pilot project where five courts, juvenile courts in Washington State were provided these low-cost testing, so the CIP program paid for the testing to happen, to see if it would make a difference in timeliness. And, so, we measured - using information that Matt tracks - the difference in the median waiting time between the filing of dependency petition and then the DNA results prior to the pilot and then during the pilot by each court. And, it was a significant amount of change. For instance, Pierce County went from 388 days to 71 days just by having this project available. So, then, Pierce County, because it was so successful there and the way that they did it where they were actually swabbing in the court these alleged fathers. I think that may change now that we've got this COVID stuff going on, but...

Anyway, they were able to track from the date petition filed, when the order was entered, when the sample was collected, when they got the results back and then back again. And, it's a significant amount of savings if they're able to figure out who the father is at the beginning of the case versus waiting until later because then they have to file legal advertisements and those are expensive. So, we were then able to go to legislature to get funding to cover statewide implementation for this, which really, it's only \$66,000 per year, it's not very much money and if you look at just the legal advertisements for the 1,200 cases that we expect in a year's time statewide, that's like \$480,000 just in the legal costs for that. Not to mention time saved by attorneys and social workers who are trying to figure things out. So, that was just one of the projects.

Phil Breitenbucher: Great, thank you so much for sharing that. I wanted to just go back to the

Georgia team and open it up for Wendy, if you wanted to comment from the CCWIS perspective on the partnership there in Georgia.

Wendy Wilson:

Thank you. I did want to - while Judge Bruce has done a really great job talking about or speaking to you about the exchange that exists between the courts and the state CCWIS system - I did want to highlight that there are several benefits to the data exchange. One, the ready access to key case information from reason for removal to permanency plan, to caretaker relative information, we send the diligent search, education, health, our visitation plan. And, as he had mentioned our written transitional living plan - and that's specific to our youth who are 14 years of age and older. The, all case information, case plan information is available to our citizen panel review, court clerk, CASA judges and as Judge Bruce had mentioned, our attorneys - both parent and child attorneys.

For us, one of the key benefits is it improves our IV-E outcomes and he mentioned that, as well. You know, when we do our IV-E determinations and redeterminations, our revenue maximization team have ready access to the court orders without having to request them from case managers or, you know, it prevents delays with us waiting for them to be transmitted, you know, through mail. So, we have ready access to our court orders and ensuring that the court order language is there that's needed for IV-E.

The other part, which I think is equally important - this would be my third benefit when it comes to the data sharing between the courts and CCWIS - is increased efficiency. It reduces the amount of time that case managers have to spend actually requesting orders, actual hard copies, they are now readily available. It gives them an opportunity to really focus on children and families. And, I also think it's a cost savings on both the court and the child welfare agency side. You know, I remember the days of having to make copies of court orders, I mean case plans and making sure that we get signatures on multiple copies and so, we no longer have to do that, it's a lot more efficient for us.

And lastly, it allows for us to securely share client information. So, any time we remove paper and actual hardcopy or, you know transitioning from one person to another, it allows us to be able to do that in a more secure manner with sharing the data. So, those are some of the notable benefits for what I think are, you know, for data sharing between our courts and CCWIS. And, I don't know if, I don't recall, but you know, we share more than 600 data elements between the three interfaces that exist between the courts and child welfare. And so, to Jerry's point, we share quite a bit of data between the two entities.

Phil Breitenbucher: That's amazing, thank you, Wendy, for sharing that. Great. Let me just - we got a couple questions here. It looks like there's a question that's come in and I think this question is for Jerry, for Georgia's team. Are you considering implementing a master data management or an MDM solution between the child welfare and court systems and if so, which specific solution are you considering using? Thanks. That may also be for Washington.

Judge Jerry Bruce: I know in Georgia we're not currently considering anything beyond CPRS, which all courts already have access to and which gives them access to all the information they want. It's free, I forgot to say that we developed this pretty much from scratch using contractors, like two contractors who run it. We didn't go to a software company. So, the code is actually owned by the State of Georgia, it's open source - it's not like posted online - but, it's free, we'll share it with anybody. We just had a call yesterday with some tribal CIPs about the possibilities of using the underlying code in CPRS system, as well. So, we don't have any plans right now to move off of CPRS or use any other type of software. We just sort of build out CPRS as we need to.

Phil Breitenbucher: Awesome, thank you. Tammy, or anybody from Washington, do you want to address that?

Tammy Cordova: What I can say about that is that I am not actually part of our CCWIS development team and so, they would actually need to respond to that later. But, I'm guessing that kind of thing would be considered as we plan toward building out an interface. But, we're still at those early stages.

Phil Breitenbucher: Okay. Thank you, Tammy. Great. Let me just check here. Looks like this question's come in - is there data sharing between the courts and SACWIS in Georgia - I think we might have answered this - at the data elements level or is it simply- yes, I'm sorry, Judge, you did answer that one. Here's a new one. Were NIEM data models used for any of the exchanges? And Alicia is, wanted to jump in here

Alicia Davis: Yeah, I know that that was true in Colorado - I'm not sure about Utah, though.

Phil Breitenbucher: Okay. Great, thank you, Alicia. Alright, that's all the questions that I am seeing at this point. Unless any of you are seeing others. Okay, alright.

Nicole Fuller: Phil, this is Nicole, there was one other question from Mr. Fred North. And, I think this question was to the Washington team. I want to be sure that we don't miss it. His question was are you considering implementing a master data management MDM solution between the child welfare and

courts system and if so, which specific software solution are you considering using? Thank you.

Phil Breitenbucher: Yeah, thanks, Nicole. Actually, Tammy did respond and let us know that that would have to be answered by the CCWIS team, the CCWIS project manager and it's probably something they're considering at this time as they're in the early stages of their CCWIS rollout. So.

Nicole Fuller: Perfect. Thank you, I just wanted to be sure we didn't. Thank you.

Phil Breitenbucher: Yes, thank you and I appreciate that. I do want to make sure that we do address all questions. There was another question that came in around the materials being available and this presentation is being recorded today. It will be posted on the ACF/CB/DSS website and should be available between two and four weeks after we make it 508 compliant. Okay. Alright, I think that's about it on questions for now. Continue to ask us, continue to respond with questions or share questions. You can email us those if you have questions after this. Just a few final thoughts - and these are some things that we kind of heard from our presenters and our panelists today.

We'd encourage you if you haven't yet engaged in a partnership with the court to not think of it as a huge project and it has to be everything all at once. It's important just to get started. You heard from Judge Jerry Bruce that they started a partnership 15 years ago and they're building out to where they are not, but it takes baby steps. You clearly heard the importance of relationships. It's often said that technology isn't the challenge, actually, it's really the trust and the relationships that's a larger challenge. We heard that collaboration is sometimes hard, but it's worth it - especially when we're able to really use data, like you heard from Washington and how they're driving decision-making because of the availability of information and we heard that from Georgia. And the ability to make direct decisions about cases for children and families because they have the availability of the data.

There's an opportunity here - I think we heard that from Scott - in terms of the CIPs, this is a priority area for them and so again, build those relationships, there's a clear opportunity. And, we heard this from Alicia, too - be clear about the outcomes you're seeking to develop those shared outcomes. What you mutually need together is important.

And I think that the last two final thoughts is that in collaboration, language really matters and being clear. Washington did a great job highlighting that this is one of their lessons learned is that what you call certain things in one agency or discipline might be different in another and

so, be clear on terms. So, language is important.

And last one, we can see from this that better outcomes can occur with this information exchange and those outcomes can be in the cases of children and families and it can additionally as a revenue that we can increase, which again, helps us to serve more children and families.

I want to turn to my panelists before I do wrap up to see if there are any final thoughts from you all, we have just a couple minutes if you had a final thought that you'd like to share before we close out today. Okay. Not hearing any. We'll go ahead with wrap up today. Thank you again for attending this webinar. We have an upcoming June webinar that will be on CCWIS program and technology integrations. So, please look for that save the date and registration link. Again, we thank you all for attending and we thank you for the work you're doing on behalf of children and families. And with that, we will conclude today's webinar.

END