



FINAL REPORT
of the
JOINT INTERIM TASK FORCE ON
JUVENILE COURT DEPENDENCY PROCEEDINGS
December 3, 2014

Staff:

Bill Taylor, Judiciary Counsel
Channa Newell, Judiciary Counsel
Mike Reiley, Judiciary Office Coordinator

Members:

Non-Legislative Members:
Hon. Patricia A. Sullivan, Chair
Hon. Valeri L. Love
Hon. Elizabeth Welch
Nancy Cozine
Lois Day
Lori Fellows
Lene Garrett
Leola McKenzie
Angela Sherbo
Megan Shultz
Joanne Southey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW & PROCESS	3
IMPEDIMENTS TO TIMELY PERMANENCY.....	5
CURRENT INITIATIVES TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENTS	9
STAKEHOLDER COMMITMENTS FOR IMPROVING THE JUVENILE DEPENDENCY SYSTEM	11
LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.....	12
CONCLUSION.....	13
Appendix 1-Stakeholder Commitments for Improving the Juvenile Dependency System.....	14
Appendix 2- LC 2058, Foster Care Reduction Through Effective Representation in Juvenile Court Proceedings.....	17

OVERVIEW & PROCESS

The 2013 Oregon Legislative Assembly passed House Bill 3363 (Chapter 439, (2013 Laws)) establishing the 11-member Work Group on Juvenile Court Dependency Proceedings (Work Group). Modeled after similar county level multidisciplinary groups, the Work Group included:

- Two judges representing the Oregon Judicial Department (OJD)
- The Director of the OJD's Juvenile Court Programs representing the Citizen Review Board (CRB)
- Two CASA Directors representing CASA Volunteer Programs
- One Senior Judge representing the Public Defense Services Commission
- The Director of Oregon's Child Welfare Program, and
- Four attorneys with expertise in juvenile court dependency proceedings:
 - One representing the Department of Justice
 - One representing the Oregon District Attorneys Association
 - Two with expertise representing parents and children in juvenile court dependency proceedings.

The Legislative Assembly charged the Work Group with reviewing the juvenile dependency system. The Work Group was directed to report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees no later than January 15, 2015.

The Work Group was charged with undertaking an analysis of current conditions and making recommendations for improvement. Specifically, the group was to identify impediments to:

- A. The timely resolution of jurisdictional petitions in juvenile court dependency proceedings.
- B. The assessment of the bases for dependency jurisdiction.
- C. The development and implementation of case plans for the reunification of families that include services and other assistance that are appropriate and accessible to parents.
- D. The assessment of the adequacy of case plans.
- E. The identification and implementation of specific, understandable and realistic conditions for the return of a child placed in substitute care to the physical custody of the child's parent.

- F. The timely development and implementation of permanent plans, including reunification of the family, that take into account the policies of the State of Oregon expressed in ORS 419B.090 and the concept of “reasonable time” as defined in ORS 419A.004.

Once the impediments were identified the Work Group was asked to:

1. Identify the specific actions each entity represented by the work group members can take under existing law and within current budgetary restraints to remove or mitigate the identified impediments, and develop a plan to put those actions into practice and to measure the effectiveness of those actions.
2. Identify changes to existing law that could be made to assist in removing or mitigating one or more of the identified impediments that would not require the investment and support of additional state funds.
3. Identify changes to existing law that would be essential to remove or mitigate one or more of the identified impediments that would require the investment and support of additional state funds.

At the national, state, and local level it is widely recognized that juvenile court, child welfare and community stakeholder systems are inter-related and that changes in one entity will affect the effectiveness of all related systems. There are a number of county level multidisciplinary groups that regularly convene to engage in a process that strives to improve permanency outcomes for children and families involved in dependency proceedings. For example:

1. Juvenile Court Improvement or Model Court Teams
2. Safe and Equitable Foster Care Reduction Teams
3. Zero to Three Teams
4. Child Welfare Advisory Committees
5. Family Law Advisory Committees
6. Citizen Review Panels

Although counties come together in unique ways, these groups are similar in that they meet regularly to identify changes they can make to improve court and systemic performance and outcomes for children and families and to evaluate their progress through the use of data. Participants enter into these processes knowing

that changes will affect the way each agency interacts with the rest of the juvenile court community.

The charge of the Work Group, and the inclusion of stakeholder representatives from all entities in the child welfare system, allowed the Work Group to identify and examine issues that are common across jurisdictions. The Work Group met seven times, heard from twenty-two witnesses, conducted research, and analyzed information. Because of time constraints and the broad charge to the group, the group focused on two of the three charges, charge number 1 and charge number 3.

First, consistent with charge number 1, the Work Group addressed changes each of the represented groups could commit to making within the current statutory scheme and within current budgetary restraints. That document, entitled “Stakeholder Commitments for Improving the Juvenile Dependency System”, is included as [Appendix 1](#).

Second, consistent with charge number 3, the group addressed improvements that would require additional resources. General agreement was reached in that improvement for children and families involved in the juvenile system would come largely from improved representation of all parties (necessitating lower caseloads, greater oversight and additional training for attorneys and CASAs) and a judiciary with sufficient time and resources to give these cases the attention and priority they deserve. The Work Group’s proposal is memorialized in a legislative counsel draft of a bill requiring funding for the implementation of a pilot program to reduce the length of time children spend in foster care through effective representation. In addition to appropriating funds to improve representation of the parties, the bill appropriates funds to the judicial department to add judicial and staff resources. The draft, LC 2058, is included as [Appendix 2](#).

IMPEDIMENTS TO TIMELY PERMANENCY

Temporary, short-term foster care is an essential element of a comprehensive child welfare program. There will always be a need for a temporary means of ensuring children's safety when working with families to address issues that are compromising their children's safety.

The effectiveness of foster care diminishes over time. The longer children remain in foster care, the less effective foster care is in meeting children's needs. In order to maximize children's success in safely navigating childhood, we must identify the

strategies with the greatest promise of reducing the length of time children spend in a foster care setting and supporting safe environments that promote safety and permanency.

An initial task of the Work Group was to identify obstacles to timely permanency for children within the juvenile dependency system. Work Group members pinpointed many challenges to achieving permanency. Some of these challenges are broad systemic issues which may be beyond the ability of a single state to rectify and are beyond the charge of this group. For example, significant permanency delays occur due to delays in obtaining home studies when an out of state placement is sought.¹

But other obstacles are less expansive and more easily addressed through process changes, additional resources, or both. These impediments fall into three broad categories: lack or delay of services for parents and children, lack of system resources, and lack of adequate education and training.

Lack or Delay of Services for Parents and Children

A consistent barrier to permanency is the unavailability (or delayed availability) of services which serve as a predicate to permanency. Work Group members noted that service quality and availability varies greatly by geographical location and that the lack of adequate services is pervasive in rural areas of our state. Mothers and fathers are often required to engage in mental health and/or drug and alcohol treatment programs. In the past several years, where austerity has severely limited treatment resources, parents have endured lengthy wait times and limited availability of services. Limited availability of services for children also contributes to delays.

When children are in foster care, visitation with parents is essential to promoting timely reunification and, in addition, regular visitation is

¹ The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC), originally drafted in 1960 and enacted by all States, established procedures for ensuring the safety and stability of placements across State lines for children in foster care or adoption. The home study process, a preplacement assessment of the safety and stability of a prospective foster or adoptive family, is often seen as a major barrier to timely placement. Sankaran, *Foster Kids in Limbo: The Effects of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children on the Permanency of Children in Foster Care, A Report to the Annie E. Casey Foundation*, University of Michigan Law School (2012).

correlated with an increased likelihood of lasting reunification.² However, in many cases, both the quality and quantity of visits between parents and children is less than ideal. Parents and children consistently receive limited visitation time in an environment akin to a child welfare office. In addition, transportation challenges, particularly in rural areas of the state, contribute significantly to limited visitation.

Lack of System Resources

A consensus among Work Group members was that a lack of resources within the systems represented by the group's members has a substantial impact on timely permanency. Group members identified many barriers which result from underfunded public defense, judicial, and child welfare systems.

Public defenders strain to meet the demands of challenging clients under an often oppressive caseload.³ As a result, attorneys for parents and children struggle to engage their clients during the critical front end of dependency cases. In some counties, lawyers for parents and children are not present at the initial shelter care hearing which creates missed opportunities for advocacy and problem solving. High caseloads also contribute to scheduling delays. When lawyers have too many clients, they have limited time for client meetings and court appearances. Cases are often delayed by months when a contested hearing or trial needs to be set and the parent's or child's lawyer does not have available time.

Limited judicial officer availability also causes delay in timely case resolution. The number of judicial officers available varies significantly from county to county. In addition, due to docketing limitations, cases awaiting trial can be delayed for months. In many counties, one judge is assigned to the family's case. The effectiveness of a consistent judicial officer is well-established and the one-judge-one-family model is a best practice. Additional judicial officers available to hear juvenile dependency matters would ease the scheduling challenges which lead to delays.

² Weintraub, *Information Packet Parent-Child Visiting*, National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning at the Hunter College School of Social Work (April 2008).

³ According to Work Group members, in most counties, lawyers representing children and parents have well over 100 cases at any given time. Because there can be multiple children in each case, for lawyers representing children, there can be many more clients than cases.

Overstretched child welfare staff has a direct impact on permanency timeliness. There are a number of activities which must occur for a child to move into permanency including supporting effective visitation, evaluation of relatives for establishing relationships, and supporting the child in the placement. Due to staffing levels which are at about two-thirds of need⁴, these tasks are not completed as rapidly as they could be, thus resulting in delayed permanency.

The lack of consistent legal representation of DHS Child Welfare in court is another contributing factor to permanency delays. DHS caseworkers often appear in court without legal counsel. There is inconsistency among the counties on the role of the district attorney's office in these cases and in terms of the type and frequency of appearances by an assistant attorney general. Issues occur when cases are delayed due to DHS caseworkers being unable to adequately address their legal position or present their case.

Lack of Adequate Education and Training

As a result of insufficient education and training, the professionals working to serve parents and children within the juvenile dependency system inadvertently cause harmful delays. For example, the workgroup identified educational and procedural deficits which cause delays at the beginning of a case: attorneys for parents, children and the state have an inconsistent understanding of the bases for juvenile court jurisdiction and, at times child welfare staff struggle to provide timely discovery to the parties in the case. In addition, there are varying practices within DHS child welfare regarding developing service plans and action agreements for parents.

Another contributing factor is philosophical differences regarding the role of foster care and the value of permanency. Some judges, CASAs, attorneys, and DHS staff believe remaining in foster care to take advantage of program access is of higher importance than moving to a higher legal level of permanency. Others disagree. Further education and discussion among system participants is needed in the hopes of reaching a greater consensus on this and other philosophical issues.

⁴ Kelley-Siel and Waybrant, *DHS Child Welfare Programs Phase 1 Budget Presentation*, Oregon Department of Human Services, <http://www.oregon.gov/dhs/aboutdhs/dhsbudget/budget20132015/cw-phase1presentation.pdf> (March 18 and 19, 2013).

CURRENT INITIATIVES TO ADDRESS IMPEDIMENTS

Several projects and programs are already underway to address barriers to timely permanency. But most are agency or organization-specific and targeted toward a particular outcome. A comprehensive, multi-system initiative, driven and managed in a collaborative fashion, has yet to be implemented.

Parent Child Representation Program (Office of Public Defense Services)

PCRCP is a pilot program modeled on the highly successful Washington State Parent Representation Program which, over the past 14 years, has been shown to dramatically increase the speed at which children achieve permanency. According to a 2011 study, the PRP resulted in an 11 percent higher reunification rate and an over 80 percent increase in the adoption or guardianship rate.⁵ The focus of the PCRCP is on providing high quality representation, including caseload limits, additional oversight and training requirements, and multidisciplinary collaboration, which in turn promotes positive outcomes for parents and children. Repeated studies indicate that when parents are represented by attorneys with reasonable caseloads, the attorneys spend more time with parents and, as a result, both parents and children have better experiences with the child welfare system.⁶

Child Welfare Program (Department of Human Services Child Welfare)

There are several efforts underway in child welfare that will positively impact permanency for children:

1. Comprehensive retraining of line supervisors in the elements and application of the Oregon Safety Model, increasing the consistency of the practice of the Model including Conditions for Return.
2. Hiring of additional casework staff allocated by the 2013-15 legislature bringing staffing to approximately 85% of need as identified by the child welfare workload model.

⁵ Courtney, Hook & Orme, "Evaluation of the impact of enhanced parental legal representation on the timing of permanency outcomes," *Partners for Our Children* (Discussion Paper Vol. 1(1)) (2011).

⁶ Laver, "Improving Representation for Parents in the Child-Welfare System," *American Bar Association Children's Rights Litigation* (October 2013).

3. Implementation of Permanency Roundtables, a comprehensive staffing designed to support workers efforts to identify and achieve a more timely permanent plan for children in foster care two years or longer.
4. Continued collaboration with Casey Family Programs focused on the equitable reduction of the number of children experiencing foster care with an emphasis on the use of metrics to drive interventions to specific outcomes.
5. Implementation of Strengthening, Preserving and Reunifying Families Programs (SPRF): Statewide implementation of SPRF programs, strengthening the service array in every county in Oregon to be more responsive to the challenges facing families in keeping their children safe at home.

Juvenile Court Workload Study (Oregon Judicial Department)

The Oregon Judicial Department is contracting with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to conduct workload assessments of juvenile court judges and staff. Juvenile court practice has grown increasingly more complex over time. Since the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) was passed in 1974, there have been over 30 pieces of federal legislation impacting juvenile court work. This workload study is an important first step to ensuring that our trial courts have adequate time on the docket and sufficient staff resources so judges can do the work well.

This workload study, which will be the first judicial workload study in Oregon since 2000, will measure the work that juvenile courts are able to do with the resources they currently have available. Additionally the study will include discussion and review of best practices and an assessment of the time and resources necessary to reach a baseline level of quality for juvenile dependency hearings. The study will be completed by the end of July, 2015.

Statewide Survey of Visitation Practices for Children in Foster Care (Citizen Review Board (CRB))

The Lane County CRB CAPTA Panel completed a comprehensive DHS visitation policy review and a survey of over 200 Lane County cases. They found that the policy is very sound yet its implementation is uneven. Cases were assessed based on the initial safety threat and very few had updated safety assessments and step downs in visitation. As we all know, adequate, quality visitation is one of the indicators of successful reunification. The

CRB has taken on the task of exploring the effectiveness of visitation policy implementation across the state as the CRB believe this can really go a long way to speed reunification, a goal we all seek. CRB staff will compile the results and provide DHS with a written briefing detailing the outcomes of the inquiry.

STAKEHOLDER COMMITMENTS FOR IMPROVING THE JUVENILE DEPENDENCY SYSTEM

After reviewing the substantial number of obstacles to timely permanency for children, the Work Group reached consensus that, although many contributing factors are broad systemic issues, substantial gains could be made by focusing on improving legal representation for the parties and refining the court process.

Consistent with the Work Group's first charge, to address changes which could be made within the current statutory scheme and within current budgetary restraints, each represented Work Group entity developed commitments to improve the juvenile dependency system. These commitments range in scope and scale; however, each obligation addresses and attempts to reduce or remove an obstacle to timely permanency for children.

The stakeholder commitments, as documented in [Appendix 1](#), fit into three categories: process improvement, education and training, and oversight and standards. Within each category, the represented entity's commitment(s) to avoiding unnecessary delays are listed individually. Process improvements are primarily focused on collaboration and efficiency initiatives which will alleviate system bottlenecks. Education and training commitments will ensure practitioners have the tools needed to navigate the complex juvenile dependency system with an eye toward ensuring children obtain the permanency and stability that is desperately needed. Oversight and standards serve to ensure consistency of practice.

The Work Group members expressed a continued ongoing commitment to the county level collaborative efforts discussed earlier. Work Group members will provide encouragement and support for their county level representatives to implement the Stakeholder Commitments for Improving the Juvenile Dependency

System at the local level. The OJD and DHS are committed to the ongoing sharing of county level data related to timeliness of court proceedings, timeliness of permanency, reduction of APPLAs, and exits from foster care, and to ensuring that discussions of this data and current improvement efforts occur in a setting that includes all stakeholders. This commitment reflects the group's conclusion that continued improvement requires collaborative local level efforts. The practice changes contemplated within the Stakeholder Commitments for Improving the Juvenile Dependency System, combined with the current initiatives to address impediments to permanency, will help Oregon achieve goals of timely permanency, safety, and well-being for our foster children.

DHS recently launched their public child welfare data reporting website. (https://rom.socwel.ku.edu/oregon_Public/MyHome.aspx) This website has a list of reports that provides the trends and county comparisons on various child welfare outcome reports. This on-line reporting tool provides local multidisciplinary teams with data to assess their progress along with a better understanding of local level successes and challenges.

LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT

The third Work Group charge required the group to identify changes to existing law which would reduce impediments to timely permanency and require the investment and support of additional state funds. Because the Work Group uniformly agrees that improving outcomes for children and families in the dependency system is inexorably linked with high-quality legal representation and an adequately-resourced judiciary, the group proposes a pilot program to create an environment wherein the court and attorneys are able to function optimally to ensure children do not spend additional time in foster care due to systemic barriers to permanency.

The pilot program proposal, memorialized in LC 2058 and included as [Appendix 2](#), would provide for comprehensive, multi-system reform and collaboration which, as a result, would reduce the amount of time children spend in foster care and accelerate permanency for children.

CONCLUSION

Over the past year, the Work Group on Juvenile Court Dependency Proceedings struggled with the enormous challenge of identifying barriers to permanency and determining which barriers could be alleviated through practice improvement. However, upon further examination, it became clear that each participating Work Group entity could make some progress simply by committing to enhance and improve their role within the dependency system. And, in order to effect more substantial improvement for children and families involved in the juvenile system, improved legal representation for all parties and a judiciary with sufficient time and resources is needed to give parents and children the attention and priority that they deserve.

Appendix 1-Stakeholder Commitments for Improving the Juvenile Dependency System

PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Courts

- Schedule shelter hearings at a time that allows attorneys to be appointed and appear at the shelter hearing.
- Review adequacy of visitation plan - for parent & child and child & sibling(s) if not placed together.
- Address DHS referral of parents to pre-adjudication services with attorney approval.
- In counties where multiple judges handle juvenile cases, establish guidelines for judges to retain cases once they hear them.
- Coordinate and set hearings so there is a review every 90 days by either the court or CRB.

Citizen Review Board

- Review adequacy of visitation plan - for parent & child and child & sibling(s) if not placed together.
- Emphasize concurrent planning.
- Recommend expedited permanency hearings only when appropriate.

Attorneys for Children and Parents

- Practice in accordance with the Oregon State Bar standards of representation for parents and children in dependency proceedings.
- Work with local courts and juvenile justice stakeholders to create specialized juvenile dockets and implement systems that eliminate delays.

State's Attorneys

- Develop and be familiar with standards for proper legal service on parents.
- Ensure effective legal service in each case.
- Work with local courts and juvenile justice stakeholders to create specialized juvenile dockets and implement systems that eliminate delays.

Department of Human Services

- Clearly state the Conditions for Return (the department's expectations for changes in behavior that parent(s) need make to resolve the safety issues challenging the family).
- Monitor and periodically update the visitation plan for parents as well as siblings.
- Provide timely notification to the court of a requested change in case plan and a requested hearing if required.
- Provide discovery to parties as soon as practicable following the filing of a petition and continue to provide discovery on a predictable and functional schedule with consideration of the import of the documents to the case.

Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)

- Monitor status of relative search, CANS assessment, CRB recommendations and Protective Capacity Assessment to insure timely resolution of case.
- Ensure youth 14+ have been referred to ILP services, participated in permanency roundtables or family finding processes.
- Document home visits, school visits, client contact and observations of parent and/or sibling visits.
- Ensure DHS case plan/permanency plan has been identified and is being implemented.
- Emphasize appropriate visitation for family preservation.

OVERSIGHT AND STANDARDS

Courts & CRB

- Courts and CRB to be trained on effecting compliance by all attorneys with standards and expectations.

Attorneys for Children and Parents

- Work with attorneys to ensure they are aware of updated standards of representation in juvenile dependency cases for attorneys representing parents and children, which were adopted by the Board of Governors in June 2014.
- Adoption of maximum caseload standards.
- OPDS oversight on performance by practitioners through contracting, complaint resolution and reviews of non-routine expense requests.

State's Attorneys

- DOJ provides oversight of AAGs representing DHS in dependency cases through caseload reviews, complaint resolution and manager follow-up with model court leaders. DA offices to provide oversight of DDA handling juvenile work with regular meetings, complaint resolution and discussions with model court leaders.
- Development and adoption of performance and practice standards for attorneys representing the state and DHS.
- Adoption of maximum caseload standards for DDAs and AAGs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Courts & CRB

- Ensure all new judges get Basic Juvenile Court 101 training at OJD New Judge School.
- JCIP continue to sponsor and support judicial officer and multidisciplinary educational programs.

Attorneys for Children and Parents

- Continue to develop multi-disciplinary collaborative training and education including all parties and system participants such as the Juvenile Law Training Academy.
- Ensure the availability of regular and ongoing training related to juvenile law practice.
- Develop webinars and other remote-access training for practitioners in rural or remote areas.
- Regularly disseminate information to practitioners regarding available training related to juvenile law practice.

State's Attorneys

- Ensure regular and on-going training specific to juvenile law practice.
- DA offices to provide in-house training for attorneys handling juvenile dependency work. Regional exchanges should be considered for smaller communities.
- ODAA and DOJ attorney training on legal sufficiency for dependency petitions and need for rational relationship between allegations of parental conduct and services ordered.
- Attendance (in person or by webcast) at CLEs relevant to juvenile law practice including the annual Juvenile Law Training Academy CLE.

Department of Human Services

- Training in court processes and how to present as a witness
- Diligent relative search and absent parent search.

Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)

- Consistent availability of relevant quality statewide training.
- Collaborative training offered with multi-party participation.
- Additional training focus on:
 - Effective use of party status
 - Conditions of return
 - Jurisdictional basis vs. required services
 - Reasonable time for the child.

Appendix 2- LC 2058, Foster Care Reduction Through Effective Representation in Juvenile Court Proceedings

LC 2058
2015 Regular Session
11/18/14 (BLS/ps)

D R A F T

SUMMARY

Directs Judicial Department, Public Defense Services Commission, Department of Human Services and Department of Justice to collaborate to establish pilot programs in four to six Oregon counties to reduce foster care use through effective representation in juvenile dependency proceedings.

Appropriates moneys to Judicial Department, Public Defense Services Commission, Department of Human Services and Housing and Community Services Department for purpose of implementing pilot programs.

Sunsets pilot programs on June 30, 2021.

Declares emergency, effective on passage.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

1
2 Relating to pilot programs to improve juvenile dependency system; and de-
3 claring an emergency.

4 **Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:**

5 **SECTION 1. The Legislative Assembly finds that:**

6 (1) Every child has the right to be raised in a permanent, safe and
7 stable home.

8 (2) Foster care is a temporary service that can be both necessary
9 and effective. However, the effectiveness of foster care declines sub-
10 stantially as the length of stay in foster care increases.

11 (3) Evidence-based research shows that high-quality legal represen-
12 tation improves outcomes for children and families, in that children
13 are more likely to remain safely in the home, spend less time in foster
14 care and achieve permanency more quickly.

15 (4) Safely reducing the use of foster care is both cost-effective and
16 in the best interests of Oregon's children.

NOTE: Matter in boldfaced type in an amended section is new; matter [italic and bracketed] is existing law to be omitted.
New sections are in boldfaced type.

1 (5) The Department of Human Services requires additional legal
2 resources to fully comply with Oregon's juvenile dependency laws.

3 (6) The Judicial Department requires additional judicial resources
4 and staff to be trained for and dedicated to juvenile court.

5 (7) The Public Defense Services Commission requires additional re-
6 sources in order to reduce attorney caseloads and provide adequate
7 high-quality legal representation to parents and children.

8 (8) The implementation of pilot programs as set forth in section 2
9 of this 2015 Act will inform the Legislative Assembly and stakeholders
10 of the prospect for success of implementation of similar programs
11 throughout this state.

12 SECTION 2. (1) The Judicial Department, the Public Defense Ser-
13 vices Commission, the Department of Human Services and the De-
14 partment of Justice shall collaborate to create and implement pilot
15 programs to reduce foster care through effective representation in ju-
16 venile dependency proceedings in a minimum of four and a maximum
17 of six counties in this state, including Linn and Yamhill Counties.

18 (2) The purposes of the pilot programs implemented under sub-
19 section (1) of this section include, but are not limited to:

20 (a) Improving the quality of legal representation for parents and
21 children by reducing attorney caseloads, providing adequate compen-
22 sation, ensuring additional oversight and providing multidisciplinary
23 support and training;

24 (b) Increasing resources to enable the State of Oregon and the De-
25 partment of Human Services to be adequately represented in juvenile
26 dependency proceedings;

27 (c) Increasing judicial resources and staff in the Judicial Depart-
28 ment in order to adjudicate dependency cases more expeditiously;

29 (d) Increasing resources to CASA Volunteer Programs as defined in
30 ORS 458.580 to provide court appointed special advocates an opportu-
31 nity for legal consultation when needed; and

[2]

1 (e) Measuring outcomes to determine if the use of foster care has
2 declined as a result of implementation of the pilot programs.

3 (3) The pilot programs shall be implemented as follows:

4 (a) The Public Defense Services Commission shall contract with
5 attorneys to represent children and parents in the counties where the
6 pilot programs are implemented and shall adopt standards and train-
7 ing for the attorneys.

8 (b) The Department of Justice shall employ attorneys to represent
9 the Department of Human Services in juvenile dependency proceedings
10 and shall establish standards and training for attorneys that provide
11 the representation.

12 (c) The Public Defense Services Commission, in consultation with
13 and with the support of the Judicial Department, the Department of
14 Human Services and the Department of Justice, shall select and con-
15 tract with an independent evaluator to evaluate each pilot program.

16 (4) The Judicial Department, the Public Defense Services Commis-
17 sion, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Jus-
18 tice shall collaborate to submit a report on the status of the pilot
19 programs to the interim or regular committees of the Legislative As-
20 sembly with subject matter jurisdiction over the judiciary on or before
21 the date of the convening of each odd-numbered year regular session
22 of the Legislative Assembly as specified in ORS 171.010.

23 (5) The Judicial Department, the Public Defense Services Commis-
24 sion, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Jus-
25 tice shall collaborate to adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this
26 section.

27 SECTION 3. In addition to and not in lieu of any other appropri-
28 ation, there is appropriated to the Judicial Department, for the
29 biennium beginning July 1, 2015, out of the General Fund, the amount
30 of \$_____ for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 2
31 of this 2015 Act.

1 **SECTION 4.** In addition to and not in lieu of any other appropri-
2 ation, there is appropriated to the Public Defense Services Commis-
3 sion, for the biennium beginning July 1, 2015, out of the General Fund,
4 the amount of \$_____ for the purposes of carrying out the provisions
5 of section 2 of this 2015 Act.

6 **SECTION 5.** In addition to and not in lieu of any other appropri-
7 ation, there is appropriated to the Department of Human Services, for
8 the biennium beginning July 1, 2015, out of the General Fund, the
9 amount of \$_____ for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of
10 section 2 of this 2015 Act.

11 **SECTION 6.** In addition to and not in lieu of any other appropri-
12 ation, there is appropriated to the Housing and Community Services
13 Department, for the biennium beginning July 1, 2015, out of the Gen-
14 eral Fund, the amount of \$_____ to be deposited into the Court Ap-
15 pointed Special Advocate Fund created in ORS 458.584 for the purposes
16 of carrying out the provisions of section 2 (2)(d) of this 2015 Act.

17 **SECTION 7.** Sections 1 and 2 of this 2015 Act are repealed on June
18 30, 2021.

19 **SECTION 8.** This 2015 Act being necessary for the immediate pres-
20 ervation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is de-
21 clared to exist, and this 2015 Act takes effect on its passage.

22
