



SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS PERMANENT JUDICIAL
COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

**Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for
Children, Youth and Families**

**September 14, 2012
MEETING NOTEBOOK**

The State Bar of Texas - The Texas Law Center
Hatton W. Sumners Meeting Room
1414 Colorado Street
Austin, Texas 78701

**Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families**

**September 14, 2012
Meeting Notebook**

Table of Contents

Minutes from May 4, 2012 Commission Meeting	1
Commission, Committee and Collaborative Council Member List.....	2
September 14, 2012, Report to Commission.....	3
 FY2013 Children’s Commission Staff Directed Projects – Page 4	
Minutes from August 2, 2013 CIP Committee Meeting	4
 Basic Projects	
 Training Projects	
 Data/Technology Projects	
FY2013 CIP Budget.....	5
FY2013 CIP BASIC Grant Applications.....	6
 Disability Rights Texas Legal Advocacy	
 Office of Court Administration Judicial Support	
 Texas Remote Interpreter (TRIP) Project	
 Webb County Drug Treatment Court	
FY2013 CIP TRAINING Grant Applications.....	7
 SBoT Child Abuse and Neglect Conference	
 Texas CASA	
 Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ)	
 Office of Court Administration Judicial and Coordinator Training	
FY2013 CIP DATA/TECHNOLOGY Grant Applications.....	8
 Child Protection Court Strategic Plan	
 Office of Court Administration CIP Technology Projects	
Project-Related Documents – FY2013 Staff Directed Projects.....	7
 NCJFCJ Letter	
 NACC	
 Texas Education Agency (TEA) Letter – SB 2248	

***Application pending**



Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families
Hatton W. Sumners Meeting Room
State Bar of Texas
Austin, Texas
September 14, 2012
9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting Agenda

- 9:30 Commencement / Opening Remarks – The Honorable Eva Guzman
Commission Membership Changes, Tab 2
Collaborative Council Member Changes, Tab 2
Committee Membership Changes, Tab 2
Staff Member Changes, Tab 2
- 9:45 First order of business – The Honorable Eva Guzman
1. Adopt Minutes from May 4, 2012, Tab 1
- 9:50 Commissioner Updates
- 11:00 Court Related Achievements from the Child and Family Services Review and
Completed Program Improvement Plan – Dan Capouch, DFPS
- 11:30 Break for lunch
- 12:30 DFPS Permanency Round Table Project – Jenny Hinson, DFPS
- 1:00 Report to Commission - Tina Amberboy/Commission Staff, Tab 3
- FY2013 Staff Directed Project Review Tab 3, Page 4
FY2013 CIP Budget Review, Tab 5

- 1:15 **Basic Committee Report – Hon. Bonnie Hellums, Tab 4**
- Disability Rights Texas**
 OCA – Judicial Support
 Texas Remote Interpreter Project (TRIP)
 Webb County Drug Treatment Court
- 1:30 **Training Committee Report – Hon. Camile DuBose, Tab 4**
- SBoT Child Abuse and Neglect Conference**
 Texas CASA
 Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ)
 OCA CPC Judge and Court Coordinator Training
- 1:45 **Data/Technology Committee Report – Tina Amberboy, Tab 4**
- CPC Strategic Plan**
 OCA CIP Technology Projects
- 2:00 **DFPS Update – Audrey Deckinga**
- 2:15 **Office of Court Administration – David Slayton**
- 2:30 **Jurist in Residence – John J. Specia, Robin Sage**
- 2:45 **Comments from Collaborative Council/New Business**
- 2013 Meeting Dates**
- January 11, 2013**
 May 3, 2013
 September 27, 2013

INSERT - TAB 1

MINUTES - MAY 4, 2012 CC MEETING

PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

MINUTES OF MEETING

May 4, 2012
9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Supreme Court of Texas Courtroom
Austin, Texas

ATTENDANCE

Members in attendance:

Chair, Hon. Eva Guzman, Justice, The Supreme Court of Texas, Austin
Vice-Chair, Hon. Darlene Byrne, Judge, 126th District Court, Austin
Judge Karin Bonicoro, Associate Judge, Child Protection Court of Central Texas, New Braunfels
Audrey Deckinga, Assistant Commissioner for CPS, Dept. of Family and Protective Services, Austin
Hon. Camile Glasscock DuBose, Judge, 38th District Court, Uvalde
Gabriela Fuentes, Office of the Governor
Hon Helen Giddings, Texas Representative
Hon. Bonnie Hellums, Judge, 247th District Court, Houston
Joyce M. James, Associate Deputy Commissioner, HHSC Center for Elimination of Disproportionality & Disparities
Hon. Patricia A. Macías, Judge, 388th District Court, El Paso
Hon. Michael Massengale, Justice, 1st Court of Appeals
Carolyn Rodriguez, Dir. of Texas Strategic Consulting, Casey Family Programs, Austin
Hon. Robin Sage, Judge, CPC Northeastern Texas
Hon. Cheryl Lee Shannon, Judge, 305th District Court, Dallas
Vicki Spriggs, Chief Executive Officer, Texas CASA, Inc.

Members not in attendance:

Chair-Emeritus, Hon. Harriet O’Neill, Law Office of Harriet O’Neill, Austin
Bruce Esterline, Vice President for Grants, The Meadows Foundation, Dallas
Stewart Gagnon, Partner, Fulbright and Jaworski, LLP, Houston
Dr. Octavio Martinez, Executive Director, The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, UT Austin, Austin
Selina Mireles, Attorney At Law, Laredo
Hon. Dean Rucker, Presiding Judge, 7th Region, 318th District Court, Midland
Fairy Davenport Rutland, Director, Appeals Div., Texas Health & Human Services Commission, Austin
Terry Tottenham, Of Counsel, Fulbright and Jaworski, L.L.P., Austin
G. Allan Van Fleet, Shareholder, Greenburg Traurig, LLP, Houston
Hon. Judy Warne, District Judge, 257th Family Court, Houston
Hon. Jeff Wentworth, Senator, Texas Senate, San Antonio

Staff in attendance:

Tina Amberboy, Executive Director, Children’s Commission
Ron Clark, Office of Court Administration
Simi Denson, Office of Court Administration
Tim Kennedy, TexDECK Project Manager, Office of Court Administration
Mena Ramón, Office of Court Administration

Milbrey Raney, Policy Attorney, Children's Commission
Tiffany Roper, Assistant Director, Children's Commission
David Slayton, Interim Administrative Director, Office of Court Administration
Hon. John Specia, Jurist in Residence
Kristi Taylor, Project Manager, Children's Commission
Rashonda Thomas, Grant Account Specialist, Children's Commission
Mari Aaron, Executive Assistant, Children's Commission

Collaborative Council Members in attendance:

Irene Clements, Vice President for Advocacy, Children and Family Services, Lutheran Social Services
Penny Cook, Co-Founder, The Faith Connection, Dallas
Barbara Elias-Perciful, President, Texas Loves Children, Dallas
Mike Foster, Executive Director, Neighbor to Family, Austin
Paul E. Furrh, Jr., Chief Executive Officer, Lone Star Legal Aid, Houston
Leslie Hill, Managing Attorney, Travis County Office of Child Representation, Austin
Rebecca Lightsey, Executive Director, Texas Appleseed, Austin
Diana Martinez, Director of Public Policy and Education for TexProtects, Austin
Dr. Sandeep Narang, Fellowship Director, Child Abuse and Neglect Division, Pediatrics Department, UT-San Antonio
Judy Powell, Communications Director, Parent Guidance Center, Austin
Lisa Ramirez, Women's Substance Abuse Services Coordinator, Dept. of State Health Services, Austin
Armin Steege, Vice President of Programs, Austin Children's Shelter, Austin
Kenneth Thompson, Fatherhood Program Specialist, Dept. of Family & Protective Services, Austin
Meghan Weller, Director of Public Affairs, Children's Advocacy Centers of Texas, Austin
Larry Williams, Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas

Collaborative Council Members not in attendance:

Emy Lou Baldrige, Co-Founder, Greater Texas Community Partners, Dallas
Roy Block, Executive Director, Texas Foster Family Association, San Antonio
William B. Connolly, Attorney, Connolly & Shireman, LLP, Houston
Elizabeth Cox, foster and adoptive parent, San Antonio
Kevin Cox, foster and adoptive parent, San Antonio
Susan Hopkins Craven, Executive Director, Texas Alliance for Infant Mental Health, Austin
De Shaun Ealoms, Parent Program Specialist, Dept. of Family and Protective Services, Austin
Debra Emerson, CPS Director of Permanency, Dept. of Family & Protective Services, Austin
Eileen Garcia, Executive Director, Texans Care for Children, Austin
David Halpern, Director, Promise Mentor Program, Seedling Foundation, Austin
Robert Hartman, Executive Vice President and COO, DePelchin Children's Center, Houston
Chris Hubner, Staff Attorney, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission
Shannon Ireland, Executive Director, Texas Council of Child Welfare Boards, New Braunfels
Lori Kennedy, Managing Attorney, Travis County Office of Parental Representation, Austin
Alicia Key, Deputy Attorney General for Child Support, Office of the Attorney General
Richard Lavallo, Legal Director, Disability Rights Texas (formerly Advocacy, Inc.), Austin
Stephanie Ledesma, Attorney/CWLS, Round Rock
Tracy Levins, Director, Admin. Svcs. And Community Relations, Texas Youth Commission, Austin
Madeline McClure, Executive Director, The Texas Association for the Protection of Children, Dallas
Kate McLagan, Executive Director, Texas Association of Workforce Boards, Austin
Hon. F. Scott McCown, Executive Director, Center for Public Policy Priorities, Austin
Leslie Strauch, Clinical Professor, University of Texas School of Law, Austin

Chadwick Sapenter, CEO and Founder, Little Book of Words, former foster youth, Austin
Gloria Terry, Coalition President, Texas Council on Family Violence, Austin
Arabia Vargas, Chair, Bexar County Child Welfare Board, San Antonio
Johana Scot, Executive Director, Parent Guidance Center, Austin
Janet Sharkis, Executive Director, Texas Office of Developmental Disabilities, Austin

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS, Justice Eva Guzman

Justice Guzman called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. Justice Guzman noted that this is the first full meeting of the Commission under the new format agreed to at the February meeting. She commented on the activities around the unveiling of the final report of the Education Committee that took place on May 3.

Recognition of Guests

Justice Guzman acknowledged the special guests in attendance: April McWilliams, Education Committee Member and Youth Specialist with DFPS; Hon. Rob Hofmann, CPC Judge and Co-Chair of the School Experience Sub-Committee of the Education Committee; Kathy Goodwin, Education Committee Sub-Committee member; Jean Stamp, Education Committee Sub-Committee member; Jenny Hinson, CPS Division Administrator for Permanency and Education Committee Sub-Committee member; Irene Clements, Education Committee Sub-Committee member; Mike Foster, Education Committee Sub-Committee member; Helen Gaebler, Senior Research Attorney at the William Wayne Justice Center for Public Interest Law at UT Law and Education Committee Sub-Committee member; and Casey Kennedy, Information Services-OCA and Education Committee Sub-Committee member. Ms. Kathleen McNaught, Assistant Director, ABA Center on Children and the Law and technical advisor to the Education Committee was acknowledged in absentia.

Justice Guzman introduced Andrea Sparks, Texas CASA. Ms. Sparks provided remarks about The Constellation Foundation and their program, Camp Constellation. Their inaugural camp for foster children will take place on May 4-6 at Burton, Texas.

Justice Guzman provided remarks about her recent speaker visit to Trimble Tech High School in Fort Worth. Trimble Tech has involved community resources to partner at the school to ensure student success. Trimble is a recognized high school and many of its graduates attend college and universities following graduation. Justice Guzman noted that the model involves the community along with high-level decision makers to ensure that the strategies and recommendations are supported by the community stakeholders.

Justice Guzman commented on the dedication of the Tejano Monument on the south lawn of the Texas Capitol grounds. She was invited to speak at the dedication ceremony along with Governor Perry, Lieutenant Governor Dewhurst. The monument reflects the history of Texas and the role played by Tejanos.

Commissioner Membership Changes

Justice Guzman noted that Judge Robin Sage has resigned from her position as a Commissioner for the Children's Commission and as Chair of the Basic Committee. She will now serve as a Jurist in Residence. Judge Hellums agreed to take on the duties of Chair of the Basic Committee.

Collaborative Council Membership Changes

Aaron Williams with the Alabama Coushatta Tribe has resigned. Larry Williams, a member of the

Louisiana Coushatta Tribe and a collaborative partner of the Alabama Coushatta, has agreed to serve on the Collaborative Council on behalf of the Tribe. Larry's background includes working with Mental Health and Mental Retardation and closely with CASA. We will hear from him a bit later in the program.

Committee Membership Changes

Justice Guzman noted that during the February meeting of the Commission, the Committee members were asked to consider their participation and involvement in the respective committees. Mr. Allan Van Fleet has agreed to continue on the Technology Committee. Dr. Octavio Martinez has volunteered to join this committee as well. There remains an opening for one additional Commissioner. Please contact Ms. Amberboy to discuss your interest.

Staff Member Changes

Justice Guzman announced that Ms. Milbrey Raney joined the Children's Commission as a Policy Attorney. Ms. Raney will be working closely with the Texas Center for the Judiciary on judicial training, as well as with the State Bar of Texas on development of a more robust program for attorney training. She will also work with Justice Massengale on the Trial Skills Workgroup project.

ADOPTION OF FEBRUARY 10, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

ACTION: Justice Guzman asked for a motion to adopt the meeting minutes of the February 10, 2012 meeting of the Supreme Court of Texas Children's Commission, Judge Bonicoro made a motion, Ms. James seconded. The attending members adopted the meeting minutes unanimously.

COMMISSION MEMBER UPDATES

Justice Guzman asked the Commission members to provide updates on their organizations and locales.

Hon. Cheryl Shannon, Judge, 305th District Court, Dallas, commented on two current activities in her jurisdiction. The CASA review program model will be underway soon. Dallas was one of five counties selected. She reported the Esteem Court, a girls court in Dallas. The court is for cross-over youth, who are those youth who are primarily involved in the juvenile justice system but also in CPS cases. The intent of the program is to move the young women up and provide guidance to allow them to become contributing members of the community.

Hon. Robin Sage, Judge, Northeast Texas Child Protection Court, updated the members on events that were presented by the CASA of Longview and East Texas. At one of these, a car was given away. The other event emphasized volunteer recruitment and drew over 300 participants. The growth of the program in East Texas continues.

Carolyn Rodriguez, Dir. of Texas Strategic Consulting, Casey Family Programs, reported on the activities of Casey Family Programs. Fully executed state agreements are finalized with the Health and Human Services Commission and the Department of Family and Protective Services. The scope of Casey Family Programs work has expanded as a result of these agreements. Casey is engaged with the Center for the Elimination of Disproportionality and Disparities around varied disproportionality efforts. They see an outgrowth of the work in the spread to other systems. Casey continues to meet the challenge of this work and weave leadership development and event sponsorship into the vision of the organization. Casey continues to support CPS in the statewide rollout of the Permanency Round Table

events. The Round Tables are highly structured, internal procedure around the staffing of CPS cases. Input of stakeholders around the planning is a component. The program began in Houston. The first round of permanency values training has been completed and will be followed by a series of staffing. There are 18 Casey staff who have been trained in the model. The final report of the Education Committee will be shared nationally at the Casey Board of Trustees meeting that will take place later this month. Anne Heiligenstein is leading the effort to publicize the report at the Casey offices in Washington. Their Board is interested in education outcomes and the relationship to permanency.

Audrey Deckinga, Assistant Commissioner for CPS, Dept. of Family & Protective Services, Austin, reported that the Department has successfully completed the Program Improvement Plan for the Child and Family Services review one year ahead of the federal deadline. The PIP components addressed and improved the numbers, percentages and quality of face to face monthly contact with children and support quality case work. She noted that this was accomplished during the period when caseloads in conservatorship have been high and speaks to the quality of the direct delivery staff. She also acknowledged the assistance of the community partners in helping the Department to achieve the CFSR completion. Round Three is on the horizon. Ms. Deckinga provided information on media coverage of the rapid response efforts in Travis County. As normal practice around the state, the Department regional directors review data and review completion of case loads and other data points that substantiate quality casework. In some cases, a regional director will determine that a county is in need of additional help and will deploy staff from other counties to assist in the workload in order to ensure child safety. When the determination is that assistance is needed from another region, other regional directors support the request. The situation in Travis County was that the number of investigations open longer than 60 days required the assistance of staff from other regions in order to complete pending investigations. The rapid response was completed on April 30. At present, a rapid response is underway in Midland Odessa, with completion anticipated by the end of this month. The impact of the availability of oil field employment has resulted in the shortage of interested applicants in Midland Odessa. Ms. Deckinga added comments on the Permanency Values Training. There were over 120 people who attended the training in Houston and included CASA, judges, community partners and staff from every region in the state. Ms. Jenny Hinson was one of the trainers and noted high enthusiasm of the participants. The effort consists of several layers. The training is for CPS as well as partners and stakeholders, including judges, AALs, CASA and contractors. The Department will also implement internal Permanency Round Tables for the staff to provide the opportunity to brainstorm on how to get children and youth to permanency as well as serve as support to staff. This team approach will provide a skill and knowledge building opportunity for caseworkers and supervisors. The intent is for improvement of reports, affidavits and permanency plans that go to the judges. Ms. Deckinga provided an update on Foster Care Redesign. Two contracts will be awarded this June. She noted that the program is a community based model and the emphasis will be to engage the community in ownership of outcomes for the children, youth and families in the system.

Justice Guzman acknowledged the arrival of Mr. Sam Greer and noted his work as an Education Committee sub-committee member.

Gabriele Fuentes, Appointments Manager, Office of the Governor, commented that Commissioner Robert Scott announced his retirement from the Texas Education Agency this week. He will depart TEA in July. The appointments office will be working on identifying his successor over the next few months.

Joyce James, Associate Deputy Executive Commissioner, Center for the Elimination of Disproportionality and Disparities, reported on the work underway by the CEDD. Expansion of the

model across Health and Human Services agencies is well underway as well as other systems. Ms. James recently had the opportunity to present to Juvenile Justice Judges Advisory Committee and is developing a response to impact the results noted in the 'Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Related to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement', which was released in July of 2011, Ms. James will also present on the work of the CEDD in Judge Naranjo's court and address invited members of the judiciary and others who work in her court. Information on Undoing Racism workshops will be included in her presentation. Ms. James is working with Judge Meca Walker in Houston to plan and provide technical assistance and support for an Undoing Racism workshop on August 10-11. Judge Walker is conferring with Judge Hellums to finalize the participant list. The Commission and the Texas Center for the Judiciary will sponsor the workshop. The CEDD is moving ahead with plans for the first major conference. The focus will be on health disparities. Through the work of the CEDD, an improved understanding of the relationship of what occurs in systems and the subsequent health impacts has resulted. She cited as an example the review of educational outcomes for youth in foster care. In addition, the information contained in the 'Breaking Schools' Rules' report notes the impact that disciplinary referrals have on the dropout rate for children and their involvement in the juvenile justice system. The long term trajectory noted by the CEDD is that when a child does not successfully complete their education, there is a direct impact on their access to employment, housing options, access to services and resources, access to health insurance and ultimately life long health outcomes. Stakeholders in healthcare, education, juvenile justice, child welfare and related areas will be invited to the conference. At the upcoming Interagency Council Meeting on May 31, the researchers behind the 'Breaking Schools' Rules' will present. The CEDD will deliver a report to the legislature in December of 2012 that will examine disproportionality as it relates to racial groups, child welfare and juvenile justice as well as mental health services. A draft report will be submitted to the Interagency Council members this month. The transfer of disproportionality and disparity specialists from DFPS to the CEDD is complete. These staff possess the history, knowledge and foundation of how to perform this work. The position of the CEDD is that any work that they can introduce to other systems (mental health, substance abuse, education, and various other systems) should be based on the model used in CPS. This will serve to enhance and improve outcomes for children, youth and families in child welfare. The Center continues to host town hall meetings across the state. Advisory committees are in place and through their partnership with Casey Family Programs, the Center continues to host Undoing Racism workshops. Invitations to all the activities and trainings mentioned above are open to members of the Commission.

Judge Byrne inquired about involvement in the adult criminal justice system and whether there has been spread of the Center's work within. When criminal court judges can attend implicit bias training, there are positive outcomes for child welfare.

Ms. James noted that the Center has initiated outreach to some criminal court judges who have expressed interest in the dialogue. She would like to develop higher level connections to the criminal justice system. She attended a meeting with Dr. King Davis and his staff. Dr. Davis directs the new institute at the University of Texas. A brief will be published soon on research conducted in criminal justice. The intent is for the Center to develop the relationship with Dr. Davis to open dialog with others in the system.

Ms. James related an example of how the Center is working to establish connections by relating the CEDD's concern about the rate of HIV infection for youth between ages 11-17. She believes it is critical to develop the understanding of people in the community. Examination of attitudes and assumptions about the reason for the elevated HIV infection rate among African American youth. While in attendance at a housing meeting in Austin, figures on where people who reside in Section 8 housing

were presented by race. The results indicated that people of color are concentrated along the east Austin corridor. White people who reside in Section 8 housing have more diverse geographic options for housing. HHSC research indicates that when populations are concentrated in communities where there is a lack of access to resources, there is a higher infection incidence compared to populations who have the opportunity to reside in more varied geographic locations. There is a need to consider this information in terms of the impact that identified changes in systems would have on outcomes for vulnerable populations that are served.

Judge Byrne suggested that with regard to developing higher level connections in the criminal justice system, contact with the Court of Criminal Appeals should occur. Currently, the Texas Juvenile Justice Commission is dealing with some serious issues, but once resolved, their leadership would be good contacts. Ms. James noted that Sherri Townsend is a member of the CEDD Interagency Council. Ms. James will follow up with the criminal court justices.

Justice Guzman offered the assistance of the Commission with facilitation for this effort.

Hon. Camile Glasscock DuBose, Judge, 38th District Court, Uvalde, reported on events in her jurisdiction that include activity around Child Abuse Prevention month. Judge DuBose commented about the video conferencing equipment grant and noted that details on the grant application will be addressed later in the meeting, but emphasized that many of the children who are in Uvalde and Medina Counties are in placements that are a significant distance away. A former foster child from her court recently contacted Judge DuBose and shared that she is doing well in the military and is continuing her education. She thanked the judge for the opportunity she had to come into court and talk during her case. Judge DuBose reminded the Commissioners to keep in mind the long term impact and value that access to the court has on children who appear. Judge DuBose noted that she is on the District Court bench now and is having experience with the Commissioners Court and County Auditors in her jurisdiction. She reported that last year's budget in Uvalde County for CPS attorney fees was nearly one-half of the amount budgeted for indigent defense. She acknowledged the dilemma that she faces with regard to this because she is aware of the need for competent and well trained attorneys who demonstrate their commitment to child welfare representation, however, for counties with a small tax base, it is difficult for the counties to make up those funds. There is ongoing discussion on how to determine a solution that will satisfy those on each side of the issue. Judge DuBose requested input and guidance from the Commissioners in attendance on an approach.

Judge Byrne commented that Judge Clark in east Texas contracts with attorneys and could advise on that strategy. Ms. Amberboy commented that the Children's Commission has a Legal Representation Workgroup that is currently working on various methods and models of representation. One of the methods that the LRS Workgroup has discussed is the Managed Assigned Counsel (MAC) model. This model is being used in a small scale in indigent criminal defense. The workgroup has discussed if the model could be used in CPS cases. Regional Public Defender or a Public Defender Office has been discussed. The meeting notebook contains an update on the work of the Legal Representation Workgroup. Ms. Amberboy will provide additional information to Judge DuBose following the next meeting of the LRS Workgroup on May 15. Judge DuBose expressed interest in potentially piloting a MAC model in a CPS context.

Justice Guzman noted that there has been substantial current discussion on ways that the Family Law Section can respond to the lack of resources for indigent pro se individuals in family courts. The Family Law Section has indicated a willingness to enhance their involvement. This community of children may be introduced into that discussion so that there may be opportunities around the state

for pro bono representation. Judge Hellums commented that the Advanced Family Law Conference will take place in Houston this year and this will be a forum for someone to present on the issue. Ms. Amberboy will coordinate with Judge Rucker to bring the topic to the Family Law Section at the Houston Conference.

Hon. Bonnie Hellums, Judge, 247th District Court, Houston, noted that she is a member of the AIDS Foundation Houston Board and will follow up with Ms. James to provide referrals for education programs. Judge Hellums updated the members on the findings on brain trauma and the National Football League. The findings are applicable to the results of abuse perpetrated on some of our foster children. Judge Hellums reported on the Drug Court and Infant Toddler Court. These courts have been merged and are doing well. They have recently received federal funds through OJJDP grant and are allocating some of these funds with CPS to bring in staff to provide parent coaching and other efforts. This is enhancing the benefit of the funding streams. She believes that the efforts are improving the quality of parenting by providing positive roles models to parents, particularly those whose parents were involved in the child welfare system. The lawyers who are involved in her drug court have contributed cleaning supplies that the parent coaches then provide to the parents and educate them on basic home upkeep. Judge Hellums acknowledged the leadership and efforts of the Education Committee and the final report. Judge Hellums noted that she will now succeed Judge Sage as the Chair of the Basic Committee. In addition, she is continuing her work with the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Disorder (FASD) program.

Judge Specia commented on Judge DuBose's earlier comments with regard to bringing children to court. He noted that he has had the opportunity to speak to former child clients who have emphasized the importance of having the ability to talk directly to their judge. This is a critical point when talking to other judges about reasons for bringing these children to court. There is a long term impact on the child when they have access to their judge on a regular basis.

Judge Hellums commented on the importance of building a relationship of trust with the child. Justice Guzman noted that judges have the opportunity to demonstrate the level of interest in these children that will lead to positive outcomes in education and their later life.

Hon Helen Giddings, Texas Representative, District 109, acknowledged the expertise, awareness and dedication of the Commission members with regard to the interconnection of all the issues she has heard discussed at the Commission meetings. She noted that successful outcomes for Texas children depend on the issues under discussion here today. Aspirationally, she would like to see the attitudes, awareness and knowledge embodied by the members dispersed throughout the communities in the state. Representative Giddings noted Ms. James comments with regard to the proposed relationship that will be built with the UT Institute of Clinical Studies. Representative Giddings served a key role in the structure of the Institute and will follow the results of the work that comes out of the relationship with the CEDD. She acknowledged the need for the kind of work supported by the Children's Commission. Representative Giddings authored the legislation during the 82nd session that asked school administrators to refrain from the use of Class C misdemeanors for students in grade six and under. The data is yet to be reviewed concerning this change.

Hon. Darlene Byrne, Judge, 126th District Court, Austin, commented on the Capitol campaign kickoff by CASA of Travis County. Their goal is to increase the percentage of court-involved youth that have a CASA from 81% to 100%. There are currently 1,100 court involved youth in Travis County. Judge Byrne noted that the Judicial Summit that was presented by the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe was beneficial and the involvement of the Tribe on the Collaborative Council is very welcome. Judge Byrne

commented that Commissioner Howard Baldwin recently attended her court for a half-day observation. She reiterated that her court is open to guests. Legislators, staff, judges and commissioners as well as other interested parties are encouraged to observe and share their feedback about the proceedings. Judge Byrne encouraged everyone to consider membership in the NCJFCJ and attend the annual conference this summer. Judge Bryne acknowledged the earlier remarks of Judge DuBose, Judge Hellums and Judge Specia about children in court and the urgency of the issue. The National Council has issued a resolution about support of the practice at a national level. She updated the members on the current initiatives in her model court that include an education initiative, that is chaired by Ms. Helen Gaebler and Ms. Lori Duke. The initiative will weave in elements and guidance from the leadership of the Education Committee and will include use of CASAs as the Educational Advocate in court. A letter will go out soon to Mel Waxler, General Counsel for Austin Independent School District regarding the specifics of the CASAs role. This initiative will roll out in September. On May 15, the court ordered services initiative will commence. Judge Byrne sees the statute as flexible and she utilizes it in her drug court. When a drug issue is not the issue, the observation was made that there is not a statutory structure for the court ordered services statute, unlike for TMC and PMC review. The hypothesis is to overlay a court structure that is somewhat like a drug court structure. Special scheduling orders are in place, as well as special court reports that will be used. The early parent attorney appointment model, originally used in 2009, will be reinstated as well. This means that as soon as the law suit is filed, everyone named in the law suit will receive an interim attorney whose sole role is to determine how to locate their client and confirm whether or not the client(s) qualify for a court appointed lawyer. If the client is located and qualifies, prior to the first hearing, their attorney is in place. The results obtained when the model was piloted in 2009 showed that early attorney appointment resulted in a higher percentage of the children being with family and parents while the case proceeded and the case was resolved earlier. In addition, 99% of the people involved qualified for the court appointed attorney. Approximately 2.5 hours in attorneys fees were spent per parent to secure those results. Judge Byrne plans to complete a cost-benefit analysis to support a change in the legislation to update the statute to provide for a presumption of indigence on the part of the parent. There will be a fiscal impact and is likely to be perceived by the county governments as an unfunded mandate from the state, but the data is likely to show that the method will enable earlier closing of cases, fewer jury trials, and fewer mediations. This will provide evidence of saving of foster care IV-E funds at a federal level as well as attorneys fees at the local level. Judge Massengale commented that judicial resources will be saved as well because there will be decreased need to litigate the question of indigency. Judge Byrne will provide follow up on the initiative to the Commission once adequate data has been collected and assessed. She also commented on the status of the Crossover Youth Practice Model and the spread that is underway throughout the state.

Hon. Michael Massengale, Justice, 1st Court of Appeals, reported on the status of the Trial Skills Workgroup. The intent of the workgroup is to put together a NITA-style training module on trial skills that would be made available to appointed counsel who represent parents and children in CPS cases. There are two working groups. The focus for one of these is curriculum design and their work is informed by numerous examples. Decisions on length of the conference and type of faculty to include are under consideration. The group is working to determine the target audience and the type of skills to deliver to the audience. The second group is working on written materials that would be part of the process. A model trial notebook that attorneys could have that would serve as a guide to their practice is being considered. Additionally, information on forms for commonly filed documents, checklists and outlines, all designed to provide solid guidance on what a model representation would look like, are being considered. There have been several meetings via conference call and in person over the last few months. Following the discussion phase, the groups are now moving into the deliverable phase. During next week's meeting, one of the preliminary tasks is to define a case model that participants

will use so that when the training programs are implemented there will be materials that can be used for a mock direct examination of a fact witness, a cross examination of a caseworker or expert witness, etc. The group is considering whether or not to acquire an existing model, retain services of a professional who can prepare a customized model or to prepare one collaboratively with workgroup members. Identification of trainers is under consideration as well as scheduling of the training. Progress is continuing on the written materials. The group has narrowed down the content and drafting will be underway soon. The group will also consider the best method for dissemination of the materials once completed. Justice Massengale reported on the Harris County judges and noted that there has been progress and discussions that resulted from the Round Table meeting that took place in addition to follow up to the Harris County Child Protection Collaborative meeting report. The report provides concrete suggestions for areas for improvement in Harris County and can be accessed on the Children's Commission website. In January, a meeting took place and was well attended by the Harris County Family Court District Judges, Associate Judges and administrators of the Harris County courts. The participants reviewed the report and acknowledged the need to take action on the recommendations within. The meeting served to re-inform the judges about the report and about the Children's Commissions interest in the steps that will be forthcoming to follow up on the recommendations. At a meeting that was held in March, there was robust discussion around what other stakeholder involvement the judges would like to see. Stakeholder input will inform how some of the processes can be improved. The next meeting is set for next week and the agenda will include substantive discussion about some of the problems cited in the report. Justice Massengale acknowledged the efforts of Judge Specia who has served as a resource for the judges. His efforts reinforce the interest of the Children's Commission in seeing action toward improvement in the system. In addition, Judge Hellums and Judge (Judy?) Warne have spent their time to move the effort forward. The Administrative Judge for the Harris County Family Court, Judge David Farr, has assumed a leadership role and has helped to communicate the importance of the issue and encourage the involvement of the judges. Justice Massengale shared that restoration is now complete of the 1910 Harris County Courthouse. The building is across the street from the Family Law Center in Houston and he offered the facility as a conference site for Commissioners who would like to utilize it.

Justice Guzman commented that Professor Peter Hoffman at the University Houston held a NITA-style training in Child Abuse and Neglect for attorneys. Although he is no longer at U of H, he would be a good resource for existing material for the Trial Skills Workgroup.

Judge Karin Bonicoro, Associate Judge, Child Protection Court of Central Texas, New Braunfels, provided an update on her jurisdiction. There is a court systems workgroup who meet every 3 months and is composed of community partners who work on issues that they identify that relate to the foster youth population. Two youth specialists from the Department of Family and Protective Services who are themselves former foster youth, were delegated the project to develop video modules for PAL refresher training. The module topics include information on how to open a bank account, how to obtain an apartment lease, how to use the public transportation system, etc. The video modules can be accessed from the web for current foster youth or foster alumni. The members of the workgroup are highly responsive to any resource needs around projects of this type. One of the court systems workgroup sub-groups is based in Comal County and they recently conducted a job fair for foster youth that focused on how to interview, how to dress for an interview, resume writing, completing an employment application, as well as other relevant issues. Eighteen youth from Comal County participated. Judge Bonicoro noted that she has counties in both Region 7 and 8. As a member of the Commission's Psychotropic Medications Workgroup, she is working on issues around these medications in the foster youth population. Recently an informed consent training was held for all the caseworkers, supervisors and program directors in Region 7 and 8 to familiarize them with the

psychotropic medication utilization parameters (PMUR). In addition, a review of the steps for informed consent was provided. Ms. Kristi Taylor attended one of the training sessions. Judge Bonicoro provided the training materials that were used and she noted that these tools can be utilized by the workgroup to address the issue of informed consent on a wider level. A separate training was provided for CASA volunteers and their supervisors to familiarize them with the informed consent process. Judge Bonicoro noted that there is not an expectation for CASA volunteers to be the medical consenters, but since information about the medications prescribed to the children are gathered in the court reports, the CASAs should have awareness of the guidelines and dosages and use the information to bring issues to the attention of the court when appropriate. Judge Bonicoro noted that in the CPCMS system there is the capability to track medications and get warning flags when an issue arises. An i-phone application has been developed that will allow consenters to get feedback about prescribed medications. Judge Bonicoro commented on Dr. Mark Chasnoff's recent presentation to the Commission and tied back to Ms. James comments with regard to the impact of systems. Dr. Chasnoff looked at the relationship between the number of placement changes and the increase in behavioral problems and mental health issues and educational issues. He postulates that placement change is the single largest factor that impacts educational, mental health and behavioral outcomes for children in care. She believes that this evidence supports proposals for earlier attorney appointments and placement with family and relatives. Judge Bonicoro commented on the attorney fees issue. She has observed a 20% increase in her caseload in the past few months, which will result in increased attorneys fees. She has been approached by one county auditor with regard to the cost to the county of the increased fees. Judge Bonicoro acknowledged the work of Disability Rights Texas. In her court, their services are sought when there are special education issues with a child and an Admission, Review, Dismissal (ARD) or Individualized Education Program (IEP) is needed. The expertise and working knowledge of the Disability Rights Texas legal staff are vital when working with school districts who possess limited resources.

Judge Byrne commented that beginning next year, Michael Nash is the incoming president for NCJFCJ and plans to establish a national ad hoc committee on psychotropic medications. Members who are interested in joining this national committee can obtain Judge Nash's contact information from Judge Byrne. Judge Byrne acknowledged the foundational work already completed in Texas that could be beneficial on a national level.

BREAK: Justice Guzman recessed the meeting at 10:58 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 11:15 a.m.

Justice Guzman announced a change to the agenda in order for Mr. Larry Williams from the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe to deliver comments to the Commission.

Prior to Mr. Williams comments, Judge Hellums shared an update on an upcoming event in Houston, 'Viva Laws Vegas' on June 13-16. Judge Meca Walker and some appellate court judges will entertain during the event which benefits the Houston Bar Association. HBA then uses the proceeds to help sustain the drug court in the criminal courts as well as Judge Hellums' drug court.

Mr. Williams expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to be part of the Collaborative Council. He invited all members to visit the Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Nation. Mr. Williams noted that the tribe's involvement with the Children's Commission is a step toward the ongoing development of a government to government relationship. The tribe is a sovereign nation with its own judicial system, and law enforcement. Within the past two year, the tribal court system was established. The lower courts are Peacemaker Courts. There is a civil court system as well as criminal and appellate courts. Mr. Williams commended Judge Byrne for her effort and participation and the growing involvement of

the Commission. The 2nd Annual Tribal Judicial Symposium was recently held in Livingston and brought together tribal judges as well as federal judges. The Indian nations of the United States are moving forward with efforts to build collaborative relationships with their respective state governments. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe and the State of Texas was signed nearly 2 years ago. This document formalized the relationship between the tribal government and Child Protective Services. The terms of the MOU dictate that once a report of abuse is made, the state worker must have the authorization of the tribe before coming onto the reservation to begin the investigation. Mr. Williams stated that this is necessary to acknowledge and coordinate with the cultural systems of the tribe. Nearly 95% of the tribal cases reach resolution through the peacemaker system. The Alabama-Coushatta model court was selected as one of four Indian Nations model courts throughout the United States. During the Judicial Symposium in April, the tribe executed an additional MOU with the State of Texas that will address work with the Title IV-E program. The tribe has begun to implement their own foster care and adoptions through the tribal court system. Adherence to the state guidelines includes incorporation of tribal customs, such as use of the 'basket' during proceedings. Only the individual holding the basket is permitted to speak per tribal custom. Efforts are underway on the third MOU with the Texas Department of Health. This document will address mental health issues. Mr. Williams discussed the Adam Walsh Indian County act. The initial statute passed in 2006 established the requirement for serious sexual offenders to register and regularly provide information on their whereabouts. However, recognized Indian tribes may delegate the functions of the law to the state(s) in which the tribal land is located. The tribe is working on a project that will train tribal members on how to carry out the requirements of the law. A third tribal judicial symposium will be held in 2013 and Mr. Williams encouraged all in attendance to attend and observe tribal court proceedings.

Justice Guzman acknowledged Mr. Williams report and emphasized that the Commission supports the effort to collaborate with the tribe and to mutually learn how to better serve our communities.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

Hon. Patricia Macías, Judge, 388th District Court, El Paso, provided a report to the members about the activities that have lead to the completion of the final report of the Education Committee. The report is a result of work begun in 2010 and today marks the implementation stage of the efforts. Judge Macías noted that the context of the delivery of the report is important to emphasize and provided the historical context. In 2005 the Pew Commission recommendations reviewed various aspects of court and finance reform. High level judicial leadership was one of the recommendations put forth and stressed the importance of this leadership to achieve true court reform for children in foster care. Following the completion of the Pew Commission's work, a judicial summit took place in Minnesota and was attended by a Texas team lead by Chief Justice Jefferson and Chair Emeritus Harriet O'Neill. The group returned to Texas with the charge to create state plans. The creation of the Children's Commission was an outgrowth of the Minnesota summit. Following the formation of the Children's Commission, a judicial summit was held in Austin. At the conclusion of the summit in October 2009, participants received the charge to review the issue of education and children in foster care and respond with the development of a state plan. The members of the Texas judicial leadership included Chair Emeritus O'Neill, Judge Byrne and Judge Specia and the group began work on how to fulfill the charge. In May of 2010, the group decided to form the Education Committee to review the educational issues and obstacles that children in foster care face. Chair Emeritus O'Neill recruited Judge Macías to chair the committee. The committee membership included high level representatives from the education systems, child protective services, CASA and other judicial colleagues. The committee held its inaugural meeting in September 2010. The meeting structure guided committee members in their discussion about the obstacles that foster children encounter in the education

system. The work of the committee benefitted from the expertise of Dr. Debbie Staub, Casey Family Programs and Kathy McNaught with the ABA Center on Children and the Law. The ABA Blueprint on reforms for children in foster care informed the Texas work. The work of the committee benefited as well from the support of Justice Guzman. Judge Macías expressed her confidence in the impact that the report and the recommendations contained within will have on the children of Texas both presently and in the future. Judge Macías acknowledged the contributions of Mr. Carl Reynolds, Ms. Audrey Deckinga, Mr. Jim Crow, Ms. Joy Baskin and Ms. Lori Duke in elevating the work pre-publication through presentations at both the state and national level. Judge Macías commented on the press conference and report reception held yesterday. Media coverage has appeared today in Houston and Austin. In addition publication of Justice Guzman's editorial has occurred in Amarillo, El Paso, Lubbock, Corpus Christi, San Antonio, Austin, Houston, with Dallas expected to publish it soon. Judge Macías fully anticipates that justices in other states will work to replicate this effort. She noted that the Supreme Court of Texas and the Children's Commission has taken a major role in support of the final report. The report is distinguished from efforts in other states by the support demonstrated through the allocation of staff time and resources. Along with Judge Shannon, Judge Macías provided technical advisory services and guided the contributions of the members of the sub-committees. The level of information exchange that occurred between the members of the sub-committees provided a prototype model for other states who undertake these issues. The final report reflects the comprehensive content that was collaboratively vetted and refined to produce the user friendly document that was released yesterday. Future discussion and dissemination of the report will be framed in terms of the concept that education is a lifeline for foster children and will enable them to benefit from the options it provides that include the opportunity to achieve economic stability, build a place in their community, and ultimately have a multi-generational impact.

Judge Macías turned the presentation over to Judge Shannon, who reviewed the statistics that pertain to children in foster care and education. The powerpoint presentation that contains the comprehensive overview of the statistics and relevance of the final report can be obtained on request to Ms. Roper. Judge Shannon summarized the data that indicates the many obstacles faced by foster children in the school system. The position of the Education Committee is that these obstacles are not insurmountable. She stressed the collective responsibility of the education, child welfare and judicial systems to ensure that foster youth have educational success.

Judge Macías provided additional comments on the definition of report. The report is a blueprint to inform statewide discussion and address the educational transformation for children in foster care from pre-school to post-secondary. The process leading to the publication of the report can also be replicated and customized for rural to large jurisdictions. Judge Macías read a statement by Dr. Staub acknowledging the collaborative work of the Education Committee and the consideration of best practices and programs from other states. National presentations have taken place on the Texas work and interest continues to grow.

Ms. Roper commented that the national office of Casey Family Programs have indicated their interest in an instrument that can be shared with other states who are interested in the work done in Texas.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that Casey Family Programs will disseminate a document that will publicize the final report.

Ms. Roper commented on the proposed dissemination plan envisioned over the next 12 months for the report. Implementation of the recommendations contained in the final report require ongoing involvement of stakeholders in the courts, schools and CPS. Members of the Education Committee

agreed to reconvene annually to obtain information on the progress of the implementation. Members will publicize the report at venues within their respective agencies and organizations. An implementation task force will be assembled to ensure that each discipline follows up on their agreed to responsibilities. The Children's Commission will continue to staff the Texas TRIO Grant effort. This grant will conclude in February 2013. The Commission will continue to raise awareness around the state among court education child welfare stakeholders. A summit on education and foster youth will be planned with consultation from the Texas Center for the Judiciary.

Justice Guzman opened the floor to input from the Commissioners.

Judge Macías reminded the Commissioners that they are asked to discuss the report and utilize opportunities to raise awareness in multiple contexts.

Judge Byrne recalled Dr. Chasnoff's presentation and the information provided that noted multiple placements and multiple school settings is a significant element that compromises outcomes and success for our youth. She urged the Commission to embrace this issue and carry it forward. For judges, simply doing one thing differently in the jurisdiction can result in a significant impact. She acknowledged the creative work done by Representative Giddings and Lori Duke in Travis County.

Judge Specia suggested building on current collaboratives. At present he is involved in Bexar County with a collaborative effort between CPS and health care services on behavioral health issues with the Bexar County schools. He will share the final report with the school superintendents. Judge Specia will share information with Dr. Rodney Beard at the Region XX Education Service Center. Dr. Beard has an interest in foster youth. Judge Specia will investigate speaking opportunities at a Bexar County Council of Superintendents meeting. Judges can exercise their role as conveners to assemble superintendents or their designees and high level CPS staff to meet and discuss the report. He will distribute a copy of the final report to all superintendents with a cover letter from him requesting an opportunity for discussion.

Ms. Rodriguez commented on plans to elevate visibility of the report to the Casey Family Programs Board members. The emphasis will be on the connection between education and permanency and how certain recommendations contained in the report relate.

Justice Guzman noted that the changes proposed by the final report recommendations include small scale changes all the way up to legislative changes. The Texas Center for the Judiciary seeks topics for judicial education. Informing judges about the benefits of their involvement in the education issues of foster children should be a priority.

Ms. Deckinga noted that the collaborative process utilized in the production of the final report has raised awareness of opportunities. As an example, she commented that Head Start contact the Department seeking their support for an ACYF grant application. The Department is involved with the work of the Texas TRIO grant as well. The work that the department is doing on Foster Care Redesign, with the emphasis on keeping children in placements that are close to their homes, will have a positive effect on the child's educational stability. Effort is underway to determine how to expand the geomapping system to coordinate services with removal sites.

Ms. James acknowledged the work leading to the publication of the final report. She commented that as the impact is examined, it is vital to track data on which children are experiencing improvements and which are not. The tendency is to believe that when improvement is demonstrated, the improvement

affects everyone. She cited figures obtained on infant mortality. The US Department of Human Services set a figure of 6% infant mortality for states. Texas has attained this figure and therefore the assumption is that Texas is doing well on the issue of infant mortality. However, when the data is assessed through the lens of disproportionality, the figures on infant mortality in Texas for African American women are 11%.

Justice Guzman concurred.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that the Commissions' Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup should review the report in the context of their work.

Ms. Deckinga noted that the Department have data by race and ethnicity. The Department's data does not match TEA's data and that is an ongoing issue.

Judge Macías and Judge Shannon acknowledged the support of the Commission to conduct the work. An award was presented to Ms. Roper by Judge Macías in acknowledgement of her outstanding effort on behalf of the Education Committee.

Justice Guzman commented that during the reception for the release of the Education Committee's final report at the State Bar of Texas yesterday, the Children's Commission awarded Judge Macías the first judicial leadership award in recognition of her service to the Committee. Justice Guzman also acknowledged the outstanding efforts of Ms. Roper over the 18 months of work leading up to the publication of the Education Committee final report.

Ms. Roper shared a letter from a young man in foster care that depicted the challenges of children in the child welfare system.

VOTING MATTERS

In order to accommodate schedules for members, issues that require a vote were addressed.

Ms. Amberboy provided a brief summary on the Judicial Symposium held by the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe. During Peacemaker Battises' visit to the Commission last November, support of the symposium was discussed. In the interim, the tribe applied for a grant in the amount of \$3,000.00 from the Children's Commission. Ms. Amberboy asked the Commission to ratify the award of \$3,000.00 from the CIP Basic funds to the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe for reimbursement of travel expenses for speakers who participated in the Judicial Symposium.

ACTION: Justice Guzman asked for a motion to ratify the request to award \$3,000.00 to the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas for reimbursement of travel expenses for speakers who participated in the Judicial Symposium held in April 2012 in Livingston, Texas. Judge Hellums made a motion to approve the request to award the \$3,000.00 and Judge DuBose seconded. Judge Byrne asked to abstain because she served as one of the speakers at the Judicial Symposium. Prior to the vote, Ms. Amberboy commented that there were only twelve voting members were in attendance. A review of members in attendance included Justice Guzman, Judge Bonicoro, Audrey Deckinga, Judge DuBose, Gabrielle Fuentes, Rep. Giddings, Judge Hellums, Joyce James, Judge Macías, Justice Massengale, Carolyn Rodriguez, Judge Shannon and Judge Sage. Judge Byrne agreed to vote in order for there to be quorum. The members approved the award of \$3,000.00 to the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas.

Ms. Amberboy provided information to the Commission about the grant application submitted by Uvalde and Medina counties. The funds will be used to bring the equipment to those jurisdictions to allow use of video conferencing for attorneys and clients involved in child protection cases. Uvalde and Medina counties have applied for a grant from the CIP Technology funds in the amount of \$44,000.00. Judge DuBose augmented her comments from earlier in the meeting and explained that the video conferencing system will allow children placed outside of the counties to utilize a device (laptop or ipad) to conference in to the proceeding, meet with their judge and any others involved in the case and participate electronically. She noted that nearly 80% of the placements for children in Uvalde and Medina counties are in other counties. The costs to the counties to transport these children back for hearings is prohibitive. Justice Guzman commented on the importance of providing the opportunity to the child to have a voice during the proceedings. Justice Guzman asked for a motion to ratify the request to award \$44,000.00 for the Regional Videoconference System for Child Protection Litigants. Judge Byrne made a motion to approve the request to award the \$44,000.00 and Judge Hellums seconded. The members approved the award of \$44,000.00 to Uvalde and Medina counties; however, Judge DuBose abstained. Upon review of these minutes, this matter was one vote short of quorum. The matter will be brought before a full quorum of the Commission on September 14, 2012 for a vote to support the expenditure.

Ms. Amberboy provided an explanation to the Commission about a discussion held during the February 10, 2012 meeting of the Children's Commission that pertained to the hiring of CIP technology staff to work for Mr. Casey Kennedy. Since the disbursement of CIP funds for FY 2012 were delayed, in August of 2011 contingency plans were approved and interim grants were awarded to applicants, including OCA. Following the August interim awards, discussions occurred with OCA and the plan to hire OCA staff and the terminate contract employee model was finalized. This will result in a savings to the CIP budget of over \$160,000.00 overall when compared to the contract employee budget from last August. During the February 2012 meeting, a vote to ratify an amended award for the funds in addition to the interim funds to OCA did not take place. Ms. Amberboy needs a motion and a second to ratify the amended award statement for OCA for the full FY2012 grant funds in the amount of \$439,533.00. The details of the amended award were contained in the meeting notebook for the February 10, 2012 Commission meeting and will be provided upon request to Ms. Amberboy. Justice Guzman asked for a motion to ratify the amended award to OCA in the amount of \$439,533.00. Judge Macías made a motion to approve the amended award and Judge Hellums seconded. The members voted to ratify the award.

RECESS FOR LUNCH: Justice Guzman recessed the meeting at 12:26 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:33 p.m.

Justice Guzman noted that Ms. Vicki Springs has joined the meeting.

REPORT TO THE COMMISSION, Ms. Tina Amberboy, Executive Director

Ms. Amberboy opened her report to the members of the Children's Commission with the update that the CIP funds were disbursed several days prior to this meeting. CIP has streamlined the application process that will be used for the next 5 years. Ms. Amberboy recalled for members that there was discussion at the February meeting of the Commission as to changing the location of the meetings from the Supreme Court Courtroom to the State Bar of Texas. Presently, the State Bar building does not support webcast capability. Justice Guzman noted that the State Bar will begin webcasting arguments of the Supreme Court and there is the possibility that once that process is in place the Children's Commission meetings may use the Hatton W. Sumners meeting room at the Texas Law Center for meetings.

Ms. Amberboy provided information on the projects of the Basic Committee. Detail of the Basic Committee projects are described in detail in the committee report contained in the meeting notebook.

Ms. Amberboy highlighted the Legal Representation Workgroup. The next in person meeting of the workgroup will be held on May 15 at the State Bar of Texas. Ms. Amberboy invited any interested members to attend the meeting. The workgroup has continued to review the types of representation models used in Texas, as well as standards and training requirements for attorneys involved in child welfare cases. In addition, there has been discussion on how judges and stakeholders can ensure that quality representation is occurring. Differing representation models have been discussed and the workgroup does not believe that the Commission should support any one model over another. The emphasis should be for jurisdictions to retain the discretion to use the model that is best for them. The workgroup will be supportive of different models and help jurisdictions with financial support, when feasible and with planning to implement pilot programs. Travis County uses a public defender model that has proven to be useful and successful. Judge DuBose commented earlier on the Managed Assigned Counsel model. Mr. Slayton commented that this model is used by the criminal system in Lubbock. A proposal from the workgroup is for jurisdictions to contract with a local Bar section to implement the model. The workgroup has some statutory work to do to clarify for counties that they can engage in those types of contractual relationships. Judge Rucker is presently working on this component. The workgroup has agreed on the importance of establishing standards that exceed those currently in statute. The thinking is to develop standards that will be similar to those of the ABA and NACC, but will provide specific Texas emphasis. With regard compensation, the workgroup is looking at encouraging and supporting documentation that will explain specific information for attorneys on how they will be paid, what the payment will be for, improving transparency of the appointment process with regard to qualifications and setting up a grievance process to allow issues on fairness of representation to be addressed. The issue of training has been discussed by the workgroup. The statute at present provides for minimum training and the group acknowledges that training cannot be statutorily required. In some counties, there are no attorneys who will take these appointments. Establishing training requirements would be unworkable for the judges in these counties unless the requirements can be waived at the judges' discretion. There is continuing debate among the workgroup members as to whether there should be a minimum greater than three hours. The solution that has been discussed is to encourage jurisdictions to have more than three hours. The Commission will support jurisdictions with their training needs. The State Bar has made available an online video training on parent representation. A video will be taped later this month on representation of children. Long term plans are underway to develop an online library of no-cost training that will focus on more specific topics, including ICWA, immigration issues, etc.

Ms. Amberboy noted that there are several recent activities around the Psychoactive Medications Workgroup and she turned the floor over to Ms. Kristi Taylor to provide the update.

Ms. Taylor noted that the issue of psychoactive medications is important to the foster care population. The workgroup membership includes advocates at CASA, judges, STAR Health representatives and others. Discussions are focused on what can be done a present. The workgroup is aware that there have been some unfavorable media reports about Texas. Currently, parameters are in place and have been supported as a correction to overuse of psychoactive medications among the foster child population in the past. The workgroup has focused on nomenclature and clarification of dosage issues. The group is requesting that judges look carefully at cases where there are psychoactive medications involved. A Round Table will take place that will provide an opportunity for participants to conduct an in-depth review of forms and processes. Judge Bonicoro has conducted a review of the parameters and

is familiar with the training specifications for medical consenters. She is using a customized form to have the medical conserter notify her when a medication change has occurred that identifies when the child's drug regimen appears to be outside of the parameters. Judge Bonicoro has shared the forms with STAR Health and is seeking to collaborate to determine an effective procedure. The Round Table will be an opportunity for all concerned advocates, doctors, judges and stakeholders to meet and establish a level of trust of the existing system. Ms. Eilers has shared that the judicial medication information pilot project that was initiated in January 2012 for a select group of judges will be expanded for all judges. The hotline format allows judges to submit factual questions about psychoactive medications and whether or not dosages are appropriate for a child's weight, etc. There is a need to clarify for judges details about the decision process. Conversations are taking place between the foster parent and the child's psychologist, but in some cases, documentation of these conversations are not making their way back to court for the judges review. Dr. Rogers has contacted staff at Rutgers University and work is underway on an independent review (of the parameters?).

Judge Hellums raised a concern about HIPPA and revealing medical information through the hotline program. Ms. Taylor commented that inquiries are not identified by name.

Justice Guzman asked if the workgroup has conducted specific discussion about the impact of HIPPA regulations on the work underway. She wants the discussion to take place and will expect a report to the Commission at the next meeting in September.

Judge Bonicoro commented that at present, the designated conserter is the person usually requesting the information. It only comes to her attention if the dosage is outside of the guidelines. It was set up with the intention that the psychiatrist would explain the reason for going outside of the guidelines, so that when the issue comes to court, the information is available. When the information is unavailable to her in court, she requests a review.

Judge Hellums wanted to know how the HIPPA regulations are being addressed in the process. Judge Sage commented that the managing conservator of the child holds the right to the information. This is included in the informed consent process.

Ms. Taylor acknowledged Judge Hellums' point and stated that this is an area of discomfort. When these processes begin, the issue of sharing personal information arises. The group will discuss all of these concerns and develop a process that can be supported.

Judge Hellums noted that in open court, this type of information can be sent from the stand and the information could be quite damaging to some of the people appearing in her court.

Judge Bonicoro commented on the CPCMS system and its requirement that the child's weight be entered simultaneously with the entry of a medication. She can refer to the child's history during court and note any weight change. This can be a prompt to inquire about any possible side effects that may be resulting from the medication(s).

Justice Guzman acknowledged the arrival of David Slayton to the meeting.

Ms. Amberboy provided comments on the status of the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM). Mr. Shay Bilchik, Director, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, made a presentation on the model at the April 2011 meeting of the Children's Commission. The model addresses dually-managed youth who cross between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and are provided integrated case

management services. The model is in place in Travis County and there are plans to spread the model to five additional Texas counties: Dallas, Bexar, Tarrant, El Paso and McLennan. Teams from these five counties held their initial meeting in Austin on May 2. Mr. Bilchik has requested support from the Children's Commission for meeting facilitation as the efforts to spread the model in Texas continue. Ms. Amberboy anticipates the total amount to be between \$3,000-\$5,000 over the next 8-12 months. Ms. Amberboy asked the Commission members to consider support to go forward with support of the expansion of the CYPM. She will report to the Commission at the September 2012 meeting and provide details on the status of the expansion.

Judge Byrne stated that Travis County has been working with Mr. Bilchik for about 3 years. In its initial stages, the model emphasized removing barriers between DFPS and the Juvenile Probation Department and unified case planning for children who were simultaneously involved in each system. Extensive planning has led to the implementation of a crossover docket. A detailed protocol sheet was developed and addresses the issues of notice to parties and weaving in of the statutory timelines for CPS as well as responsibility for the budgetary work on services. Initial outcomes appear promising. Utilization of the model is reducing the number of hearings that the affected families must attend. Since the juvenile and CPS dockets are in two separate courthouses in Travis County, the issue of transportation for the youth is resolved, as well as the need for the CPS worker to appear at each hearing. Mr. Bilchik has produced national data on the model and presented at Georgetown University. The goal is for implementation of the model statewide to enable jurisdictions to share information and benefit from knowledge gained. Presently, Colorado, Ohio and Florida are utilizing the model statewide. Judge Byrne commented that there is a model that has been utilized in Los Angeles County that might be adaptable for use in the Texas specialty courts. Judge Byrne is in favor of the Commission providing support for the Texas efforts to spread the model.

This concluded the Basic Committee update.

Judge DuBose provided additional comments on the projects underway by the Training Committee. There will be video taping of training for children's attorneys at the State Bar of Texas later this month. When completed, the training will be made available online. Scholarship application information for attorneys will be posted soon for the National Association of Counsel for Children (NACC) conference. Scholarships will also be provided for the Child Abuse and Neglect track at the Advanced Family Law course. Planning is moving forward with Texas Appleseed for the Permanency Summit. The summit will replace Beyond the Bench and is scheduled for October 8-9 in Rockwall, Texas. On June 4-6, the Child Welfare Judicial Conference (NCJFCJ) will be held in San Antonio, Texas. Ms. Amberboy added that the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges will hold its 75th Annual Conference on July 15-18 in New Orleans, Louisiana. In previous years, the Commission has provided memberships for the Children's Commission commissioners in NCJFCJ. Any commissioners who are interested in becoming NCJFCJ members are eligible to have the annual membership fee reimbursed by the Children's Commission. In addition, any members who wish to attend the conference may attend. If TCJ is unable to cover the cost of the conference, the Children's Commission will reimburse for travel expenses. Judge DuBose noted that TCJ has a prerequisite for eligibility for conference scholarships and that is attendance at the Child Welfare Judicial Conference. Justice Guzman encouraged commissioners to consider becoming NCJFCJ members.

This concluded the Training Committee update.

Ms. Amberboy provided an update on the projects underway by the Technology Committee and highlighted the progress to date on timely notice to families and stakeholders involved with child

welfare cases. This matter was addressed in response to issues identified in the report that followed the Notice and Engagement Round Table held in Austin in 2010. OCA staff have met with technical advisory staff at DFPS and reviewed the daily data feed procedures involved with the Department's IMPACT system. Evaluation is underway on how to activate additional data fields from IMPACT to allow OCA to develop a tool that will provide information on hearing schedules. Issues around confidentiality have been reviewed. Ms. Amberboy reported that the Bench Book was migrated to the OCA website. Staff are working with Lexus on authentication issues. A JIR will be forthcoming to provide judges with access information. A requirement of the CIP grant involves measurement of data on the elements of the toolkit that address timeliness to first hearing, permanency hearing and subsequent permanency hearings, time to filing a petition for termination, time to terminating rights and time to permanency. Time to permanency presents the most significant challenge among these. OCA is assisting with development of a procedure to gather data from courts other than the child protection courts. Progress updates on this project will be provided at upcoming Commission meetings.

Justice Guzman opened the floor to Mr. David Slayton. Mr. Slayton provided some remarks on his background. He has moved to Austin from Lubbock to join the OCA. He has extensive experience with the work of the Texas courts and court administration.

Justice Guzman acknowledged that the involvement of OCA with the Commission has been an integral part of the success of the projects and work.

JURIST IN RESIDENCE, Hon. John Specia, Hon. Robin Sage

Judge Specia commented on the work underway with the Houston judges. The next meeting of the group will take place on May 9. The Appleseed study and review of permanency issues and recommendations will be on the agenda. Judge Specia has taken over two small counties, Wilson and Karnes. He requested a STAR Health medication review and was pleased with the thoroughness of the report and the peer-to-peer summary input. Judge Specia is working on the psychotropic medications issues as well.

Judge Sage is looking forward to her beginning her role as Jurist in Residence. She will work on JIR projects a couple of days each month in addition to her duties as assigned judge for the CPC Northeastern Texas Foster Care Docket.

Justice Guzman opened the floor to Ms. Audrey Deckinga. Ms. Deckinga provided an update on the Children's Rights lawsuit. The Fifth District Circuit Court issued an opinion on the lawsuit. The original lawsuit was filed on the basis on nine children. The judge in Corpus certified a class of 12,000. The Department appealed to the Fifth District Circuit Court and at the end of March 2012 the court issued its ruling which de-certified the class. The class is again comprised of only nine children. Depositions and discovery is ongoing for these nine. The Department is waiting to learn if the lawsuit will proceed with the nine children or if there will be sub-classes. The ruling marks the first time for this type of result in the twenty-two states that Children's Rights has brought suit. Ms. Deckinga will provide additional updates on this matter at future meetings of the Commission.

Ms. Deckinga reported on the ongoing work with regard to trauma informed care. The emphasis is on sound therapeutic interventions. Ms. Taylor and Mr. Casey Kennedy are involved in the workgroup that is addressing the issues of restraints and seclusion. The workgroup is close to creating subgroups that will address assessments and training. The goal is to infuse the trauma informed perspective into the entire child welfare system. Some members of the Department staff have attended trauma

informed training at De Pelchin and a training will be offered this June at TCU. The Department efforts are guided by a strategic plan that is close to approval.

Justice Guzman opened the floor to Ms. Vicki Spriggs of Texas CASA. Ms. Spriggs provided information to the Commission members on the Permanency Toolkit. The publication was funded by the Children's Commission and Casey Family Programs. The toolkit is available online the Texas CASA website. The toolkit is designed for youth who will exit the foster care system and is a resource for adolescent children as well.

Justice Guzman inquired about the distribution plan for the toolkit. Ms. Spriggs commented that there is an internal plan within Texas CASA to distribute the document. Judge Bonicoro noted that there are numerous websites that foster youth alumni frequently access, including Youth Alumni in America as well as the resource website maintained by the Department. Justice Guzman commented that some of the local bar associations can assist as well when made aware of such a need.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that the regional Youth Leadership Councils are a source for dissemination of this type of information.

Ms. Spriggs provided an update on a staff training video, funded by the Children's Commission. The video will be completed by July 2012. The video will be a resource for staff and volunteers and provides an overview of how a child enters the foster care system and the experience of going through the court system from three unique case perspectives. Judge Macías and Judge Hofmann are featured in the video. Ms. Spriggs will present the video at the September meeting of the Commission.

COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL REPORT

Justice Guzman acknowledged the members of the Collaborative Council in attendance and opened the floor to comments.

Penny Cook, Co-Founder, The Faith Connection, Austin commented on children in courts and acknowledged that the judges present today welcome and encourage children in their courtrooms. She noted that owing to various factors, this is not always the case in Texas courtrooms. Ms. Cook asked that judges encourage their peers to consider the importance of the issue and the impact on affected children. She also reiterated the importance of the judge expressing acknowledgement to foster parents for their efforts on behalf of the children they have. Justice Guzman proposed a panel discussion on the issue at the CPS Judges Conference to provide this perspective to judges.

Diana Martinez, Director of Public Policy and Education, TexProtects, Austin commented that the Child Protection Round Table has developed their budget agenda for the 83rd Legislative session and presented it to DFPS last week. Commissioner Baldwin and Assistant CPS Commissioner Deckinga as well as others provided feedback on priorities. The group will reassemble as committees and review the budget ideas. Ms. Martinez will prepare a status report and present at the September Commission meeting.

Irene Clements, President, Texas Foster Family Association, Austin noted that May is National Foster Care month. There are various activities throughout the state this month to recognize these families. She stressed the importance of expressing appreciation to foster families for their work and acknowledged Ms. Cook's comments regarding acknowledgement by judges for these families. Ms. Clements noted that Judge Specia always acknowledges foster parents who appear in his court.

Ms. Clements noted that the Final Report of the Education Committee is now on Facebook and has been linked. She offered to add any resource information to the Texas Foster Family Association webpage and distribute through their listserv.

She noted that there are some courtrooms in the State that do not allow foster parents or the foster children in court. There is a need for improvement for access to courts, particularly in our rural counties.

Justice Guzman noted that there have been issues with regard to custody proceedings and including children in the courtroom. There is a need to differentiate for judges between these proceedings and those that involve foster youth.

Judge Hellums noted that in the instance where there are contentious parents in regular cases, she prevents children from being present in her courtroom.

Judy Powell, Communications Director, Parent Guidance Center, Austin noted that there are closed courtrooms in the country as well as in Texas. She supports judicial discretion but expressed the concern that courtrooms that are closed to the public prevents checks on judicial accountability and process and has civil liberty implications.

Barbara Elias-Perciful, President, Texas Lawyers for Children, Dallas reported that the Texas Senate Intergovernmental Relations Committee held a hearing in Dallas on runaways and homelessness. Ms. Elias-Perciful provided testimony on the relationship between child abuse and homelessness. There are two significant budget cuts that will affect the Department that came out of the 82nd Legislative session. These issues were addressed in policy papers from the Center for Public Policy Priorities. The first concerns the budget cut to statewide intake. The 4% cut affects 17 positions and will increase hold time on the hotline by 2 minutes and the estimate is that 85,000 calls on the child abuse hotline will be abandoned because of the increased wait time. The second issue that funding for case growth was not provided. The CPPP report noted that based on the results of the 2010 census, Texas has had over one-half of the child population growth in the entire United States over the past 10 years. During the last 10 years, the child population in the US has grown to 1.8 million. Nearly 1 million has been in Texas. Any reversal of these cuts will require significant public outcry. Those in the field are aware of the issues, but information about the needs of our systems has not been adequately provided to members of the public. It will be vital to inform the 83rd Legislature that these relatively small cuts to the Department's budget will have significant impact on children.

Ms. Elias-Perciful reminded members that although the online resource and communication center for judges and attorneys will continue to support all projects of the Children's Commission. She has met with Ms. Sparks and will distribute CASA's Permanency Toolkit to the judges and attorneys who are registered on the TLC system.

COMMENTS/NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business brought forth for consideration.

NEXT MEETING

Justice Guzman noted that the next meeting of the Commission is scheduled on September 14, 2012. She reminded Commissioners that the total number of annual meetings is reduced from 4 to 3 with the expectation that Commission members will commit to attend the scheduled meetings in their entirety.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

INSERT - TAB 2

MEMBER LIST

CHILDREN'S COMMISSION MEMBERS

Hon. Eva Guzman, Chair
 Hon. Harriet O'Neill, Chair Emeritus
 Hon. Darlene Byrne, Vice Chair
 Hon. Karin Bonicoro
 Audrey Deckinga
 Hon. Camile G. DuBose
 Bruce Esterline
 Gabriela Fuentes
 Stewart W. Gagnon

Hon. Helen Giddings
 Hon. Bonnie Crane Hellums
 Joyce M. James
 Hon. Patricia A. Macías
 Dr. Octavio Martinez
 Hon. Michael Massengale
 Selina Mireles
 Carolyne Rodriguez
 Hon. Dean Rucker

Fairy Davenport Rutland
 Hon. Cheryl Lee Shannon
 Vicki Spriggs
 Terry Tottenham
 G. Allan Van Fleet
 Hon. Judy Warne
 Hon. Jeff Wentworth

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

EXECUTIVE

Hon. Eva Guzman,
Chair
 Hon. Harriett O'Neill,
Chair Emeritus
 Hon. Darlene Byrne
Vice Chair
 Audrey Deckinga
 Hon. Bonnie Crane Hellums
 Hon. Camile G. DuBose
 Hon. Dean Rucker
 Hon. Patricia A. Macías

BASIC PROJECTS

Hon. Bonnie Crane Hellums *Chair*
 Gabriela 'Gaby' Fuentes
 Colleen McCall
 Carolyne Rodriguez
 Hon. Peter Sakai
 Judge Virginia Schnarr
 Hon. Cheryl Lee Shannon
 Hon. Olen Underwood
 Hon. Doug Warne
Staff: Tina Amberboy
Kristi Taylor

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

Vicki Spriggs *Chair*
 Dan Capouch
 Jason Hassay
 Hon. Gilford Jones
 Octavio Martinez
 Robert Nolen
 D.J. Tessier
 G. Allan Van Fleet
 Bryan Wilson
Staff: Tina Amberboy

OCA Advisory
Darrell Childers
Ronald Clark
Simi Denson
Casey Kennedy
Tim Kennedy

TRAINING PROJECTS

Hon. Camile G. DuBose *Chair*
 Cathy Cockerham
 Barbara Elias-Perciful
 Alice Emerson
 Debra Emerson
 Hon. Richard Garcia
 Tracy Harting
 Joyce M. James
 Hon. Lamar McCorkle
 Sandeep Narang, J.D., M.D.
 Shaneka Odom
 Pam Parker
 Fairy Davenport Rutland
 Randy Sarosdy
 Hon. Ellen Smith
Staff: Milbrey Raney

COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS

Emy Lou Baldridge
 Roy Block
 Irene Clements
 William B. Connolly
 Penny Cook
 Elizabeth Cox
 Kevin Cox
 Susan Hopkins Craven
 De Shaun Ealoms
 Barbara Elias-Perciful
 Debra Emerson
 Mike Foster
 Natalie Furdek
 Paul E. Furrh, Jr.
 Eileen Garcia
 Helen Gaebler
 David Halpern
 Julie Harris-Lawrence
 Robert Hartman
 Leslie Hill
 Chris Hubner
 Shannon Ireland
 Lori Kennedy
 Alicia Key

Richard Lavallo
 Stephanie Ledesma
 Tracy Levins
 Rebecca Lightsey
 Madeline McClure
 Kate McLagan
 Hon. F. Scott McCown, ret.
 Diana Martinez
 Sandeep Narang
 Judy Powell
 Chadwick Sapenter
 Johana Scot

Janet Sharkis
 Jeanne Stamp
 Armin Steege
 Leslie Strauch
 Gloria Terry
 Kenneth Thompson
 Arabia Vargas
 Meghan Weller
 Larry Williams

STAFF

Tina Amberboy, Executive Director
 Tiffany Roper, Assistant Director
 Milbrey Raney, Staff Attorney
 Kristi Taylor, Program Manager
 Teri Moran, Communications Manager
 Rashonda Thomas, Grants & Finance Specialist
 Leigh Mathews, Intern
 Mari Aaron, Executive Assistant
 Hon. Robin Sage, Jurist in Residence
Office of Court Administration
 Hon. John Specia (ret.), Jurist in Residence
Office of Court Administration

INSERT - TAB 3

REPORT TO THE COMMISSION-SEPTEMBER 14, 2012



SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS PERMANENT JUDICIAL
COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for
Children, Youth and Families

Commission Meeting

September 14, 2012

Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families
Report for Commission Meeting, September 14, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP CHANGES, **TAB 2**

STAFF CHANGES, **TAB 2**

MINUTES FROM AUGUST 2012 CIP COMMITTEE MEETINGS, **TAB 4**

PLACEHOLDER FOR FINAL BUDGET, **TAB 5**

BASIC GRANT – Applications **TAB 6**

Disability Rights Texas Legal Advocacy

Office of Court Administration Judicial Support

Texas Remote Interpreter Project (TRIP)

Webb County Drug Treatment Court

TRAINING – Applications **TAB 7**

SBoT Child Abuse and Neglect Conference

Texas CASA

Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ)

Office of Court Administration Judicial and Coordinator Training

DATA / INFORMATION – Applications **TAB 8**

Child Protection Court Strategic Plan

Office of Court Administration CIP Technology Projects

STAFF DIRECTED – Project Descriptions TAB 3

1. AAL Manual
2. AAL Training
3. Annual Reports to ACF and Supreme Court
4. Attorney Scholarships (AFL, NACC, ABA, TDCAA)
5. Bench Book
6. CEDD Interagency Council
7. Conference Planning (TCJ, SBOT, Others)
8. Continuous Quality Improvement Efforts
9. Crossover Youth Practice Model Replication
10. Education Committee: Blueprint Implementation Plan
11. Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup/Tribal Initiatives
12. Judicial Technical Assistance (Harris County)
13. Jurist in Residence
14. Juvenile Justice Committee of the Supreme Court Judicial Council
15. Legal Representation Reform
16. Mediation
17. Notice & Engagement Improvements
18. Permanency Initiatives
19. Policy / Legislative (83rd Session)
20. Psychotropic Medications / Trauma Informed Care
21. Round Table Meetings / Reports
22. Texas TRIO Grant (Education)
23. Title IV-E Court Order Project
24. Trial Skills Training and Products
25. Website Maintenance

BASIC GRANT PROJECTS:

1. DISABILITY RIGHTS TEXAS LEGAL ADVOCACY PROJECT

See Grant Application, TAB 6

Amount Requested: \$100,000.00

2. OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION JUDICIAL SUPPORT

See Grant Application, TAB 6

Amount Requested: \$20,520.00

3. TEXAS REMOTE INTERPRETER PROJECT (TRIP)

See Grant Application, TAB 6

Amount Requested: \$37,599.00

4. Webb County Drug Court

See Grant Application, TAB 6

Amount Requested: \$57,099.00

TRAINING GRANT PROJECTS:

1. SBOT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CONFERENCE

The State Bar of Texas Child Abuse and Neglect Committee plans to hold a multi-disciplinary conference in October, 2012 in Houston. Funding for this project was included in the FY 2012 budget approved by the committee, but the conference date was rescheduled to avoid conflicting with another training event. **Agenda is under TAB 7 ___**

Amount Requested: \$25,000.00

2. TEXAS CASA

See Grant Application, TAB 7

Amount Requested: \$162,984.00

3. TEXAS CENTER FOR THE JUDICIARY (TCJ)

See Grant Application, TAB 7

Amount Requested: \$595,924.00

4. OCA CHILD PROTECTION COURT JUDICIAL AND COURT COORDINATOR TRAINING

See Grant Application, Tab 7

Amount Requested: \$15,000.00

DATA GRANT PROJECTS:

1. STRATEGIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT FOR CHILD PROTECTION COURTS

See Grant Application, TAB 8

Amount Requested: \$46,597.00

2. CIP TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

See Grant Application, TAB 8

Amount Requested: \$370,623.00

STAFF DIRECTED PROJECTS:

1. AAL Manual

The Attorney Manual, *The Abuse and Neglect Case: A Practitioner's Guide*, was written in Spring 2009 as part of a grant agreement with the National Association of Counsel for Children (NACC) to provide multiple attorney training conferences across Texas. The manual is available online on the Commission's website and was made available in print form to attorneys who attended the 2009 NACC trainings in Texas. Commission staff is currently in the process of updating the manual and making improvements to enhance its usefulness to practitioners. The updated manual will contain a substantive overview of the law, as well as practice tips, trial advocacy best practices, and curriculum from the statewide attorney training developed by child welfare experts. The funding associated with updating and maintaining the AAL manual is included in the Commission overhead. Printing expenses, if any, will be covered by the Commission's FY2013 operating budget.

2. AAL Training

In FY2012, Commission helped develop two training courses on representing parents and children in CPS cases designed to assist attorneys in meeting the statutorily required minimum three hours of continuing legal education (CLE) training to be eligible for appointment as an attorney ad litem in CPS cases. Both courses were filmed at the State Bar's studio, in November 2011 and May 2012. Attorneys who represent children, parents, or the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) in CPS cases can take either or both courses free of charge.

Commission Staff continues to collaborate with the State Bar of Texas to create a larger, ongoing, online video library. One initiative that is being discussed is the creation of a CPS Mentor Series focused on CPS issues, including trial skills for attorneys. While the State Bar of Texas already offers "mini CLEs" in their "Ten Minute Mentor" series, Staff at the Commission and at the State Bar are considering pursuing a modified, separate CPS-focused series of 15 minute and/or hour-long trainings in order to ensure that there is easily available and affordable CLE in the area of child protection law. The Commission might be able to subsidize

this new mentor series, which can be customized to address current and developing child protection issues and trial skills training as needed.

These CLE sessions will be taped as live webinars and will offer full CLE credit to attorneys. Currently, there is very little online CLE available on child protection issues in CPS cases, and what CLE exists is very difficult to locate and usually embedded within the larger family law CLE library.

The creation of a CPS-focused series would involve designating a new category of online CLE topic area for child protection issues to make the CLE easier to locate online.

Two CLEs have already been taped at the SBoT and will be available shortly. These are in the areas of advocating on educational issues for older youth in CPS cases, and issues involving representing the teen parent in a CPS case. Other possible future topics include the following:

Youth Aging Out issues (extended foster care; extended jurisdiction; and benefits available to older youth)

Preserving error and appeals issues in CPS cases.

Discovery in CPS cases (this could be a series)

Jury selection series (jury demand, jury charge, voir dire)

SIJS/ immigration issues

Pretrial matters

Mediation in CPS cases

Upon completion of a taping, a JIR letter will be circulated so that judges can let the appointed and Department's attorneys know that the CLE is available.

3. Annual Reports to ACF and Supreme Court

Commission Staff is responsible for submitting a Court Improvement Program Report to the Administration for Children and Families by December 31 each year, and an annual report of the Commission's activities and projects to the Supreme Court by March 31 each year. The cost associated with producing both annual reports is included in the Commission overhead and there is no separate funding

line item for this project other than printing. Printing services are purchased from the State via House Printing. Printing costs are included in the Commission FY2013 operating budget under the printing line item..

4. Attorney Scholarships (NACC, AFL, ABA, TDCAA, DFPS)

In FY2012, the Commission approved using \$50,000 for scholarships to send Texas attorneys to training conferences related to child abuse and neglect cases. Although the conferences for which attorneys scholarships will be available in FY 2013 have not been wholly identified, they will likely include:

- **NACC Child Welfare Law Conference** – The NACC annual conference offers nationally known expert speakers on multi-disciplinary topics related to legal representation in child abuse and neglect cases. Commission scholarships usually cover registration for the conference, and may cover preconference sessions on various topics such as Red Book training for NACC Child Welfare Law Certification. Commission staff works with NACC to develop the grant award statement, which describes the purpose of the program, NACC's deliverables and a training evaluation component. Staff also verifies and approves attorney applicants by confirming their good standing with the State Bar, and verifying with a sponsoring judge that they accept appointments to represent children, parents or DFPS. In 2012, the Commission provided \$400 registration scholarships to send 17 Texas attorneys to NACC's annual conference in Chicago.
- **Scholarships for Child Abuse and Neglect Track at Advanced Family Law (AFL)** – The AFL conference offers a day-long Child Abuse and Neglect training each year at the annual State Bar of Texas Advanced Family Law Conference. Commission scholarships cover the \$100 registration fee for the one-day session, or for subsequent video replays of the training. In 2011, the Commission funded 100 registration scholarships and 118 scholarships in 2012. Commission staff works with the State Bar of Texas to negotiate an interagency agreement each year, And as with all scholarships, staff verifies and approves attorney applicants by confirming their good standing with the State Bar, and verifies with a sponsoring judge that the attorneys accept appointments to represent children, parents, or DFPS.

- **American Bar Association Center for Children and the Law Parent Attorney Conference and Child Law Conference** scheduled for July 2013 in Washington DC – The conferences bring together experienced child and parent attorneys, foster alumni, parents, judges, child welfare agency representatives, and other key stakeholders to receive not only substantive training, but also tips for returning to their home states to work on ways to improve the quality of legal representation for children and parents.
- The Commission has provided scholarships for attorneys to attend Texas District and County Attorney Association’s Crimes Against Children conference, and may do so again in FY2013.
- The Commission has in the past entered into a grant agreement with DFPS to provide scholarship funds specifically for DFPS Regional Attorneys, may do so again in FY2013.

Recommended budget: \$50,000.00 to cover registration fees for conferences and, if appropriate, travel. The staff time associated with supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

5. Bench Book (Child Protection Law Judicial Bench Book)

The Bench Book is available in a printed version and online to judges who hear CPS cases. Commission staff maintains the bench book by updating the statutory content after each legislative session and by adding and updating topical reference material. In FY2013, the bench book will be edited by Judge Robin Sage, Jurist in Residence for the Office of Court Administration, for accuracy and usability. Other activities include support from OCA in importing the Word version of the bench book into the software that gives the bench book its functionality online. The project will provide free access to Lexis-Nexis for one more year, but staff will develop a strategy to move all statutory and case law links to free online statutory services, such as Texas Legislature Online, and discontinue the Lexis-Nexis contract in FY2013.

Recommended budget: \$10,000.00 to cover the Lexis-Nexis contract only. The Jurist in Resident's expenses to review and edit the bench book will be paid for from the JIR fund, which is a separate budget item. Commission staff supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead, and printing is covered by the Commission FY2013 operating budget.

6. CEDD Interagency Council

The Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) established the Interagency Council on Addressing Disproportionality and Disparities (Council) pursuant to Senate Bill (S.B.) 501, 82nd Legislature, Regular Session, 2011. The purpose of the Council is to “examine issues and make recommendations relating to the disproportionality of children who are members of a racial or ethnic minority group in the juvenile justice, child welfare, health, and mental health systems and the disproportionality of the delivery of certain services in the education system.”

The Council conducted its first meeting on November 30, 2011. Subsequent quarterly meetings took place on February 28, 2012; May 31, 2012; August 30, 2012; and one is scheduled for October 8, 2012. Additionally, the Council is directed to submit report by December 1, 2012; to the lieutenant governor, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the legislature containing the council's findings and recommendations, including a recommendation as to whether to continue the council.

The Commission supports the work of the Center for the Elimination of Disproportionality and Disparities by serving on the statutorily created Interagency Council. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

7. Conference and Event Planning (TCJ, SBOT, Others)

Commission Staff collaborates with the Texas Center for the Judiciary, State Bar of Texas, Texas Appleseed, Casey Family Programs, and DFPS to plan large and small conferences for judges, attorneys, and other child welfare advocates and stakeholders. Agendas for these conferences are often created in response to requests from stakeholders about their need for training and education on child abuse and neglect issues, including the topics of safety, permanency, and well-being. Commission staff supporting this effort is included in the Commission overhead.

8. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)

A new condition for receiving federal CIP funds is to incorporate continuous quality improvement throughout CIP-funded projects. This will be achieved through implementation of the new strategic plan, which includes strategies for collecting,

assessing and analyzing data on the state's practices, laws, and policies to improve court functioning, build capacity and reform systems. Elements of CQI include identifying:

- Intended outcomes or goals of projects and activities undertaken to achieve the goal,
- Changes expected to occur as a result of the activity,
- The data that will be used to measure changes,
- Who will receive feedback or reports of what the data says and what changes are indicated
- How issues will be addressed and monitoring going forward.

Staff has already begun implementing this ongoing requirement by creating training evaluations for attorneys who receive scholarships from the Commission. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

9. Crossover Youth Practice Model Replication

The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) at Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute has been involved with Travis County in implementing its Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) since 2010. Casey Family Programs and the CJJR began spreading the CYPM to other counties in Texas in 2012. The CYPM is built around a core set of principles and is designed specifically to improve outcomes for “crossover youth” (youth involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems) by creating greater efficiencies and levels of effectiveness through the collaborative efforts of these two systems. Work in 2012 and 2013 will expand to five additional counties (Bexar, Tarrant, Dallas, El Paso, and McLennan). CJJR will convene several gatherings of key stakeholders from each county to develop practices and policies for the CYM model and then begin implementation.

The Children’s Commission has been invited to participate in the CYPM expansion by serving in an advisory role, hosting the CYPM meetings held in Austin throughout the year, and bringing specific attorney ad litem training to the CYPM Counties through the Commission’s project that provides legal representation for dually managed youth. The next CYPM meeting is scheduled for September 6, 2012 in Austin. And, a Webinar entitled Resources and Procedures for Representing Crossover Youth with Disabilities will be taped through the State Bar and made available online and free of

charge to any attorney representing a party in a CPS case. Ian Spechler with Disability Rights, TX will provide the training.

Recommended budget: \$2,500.00 for meeting hosting / facilitation. Commission staff time supporting this project is project is included in Commission overhead.

10. Education Committee: Blueprint Implementation Plan

The Education Committee held its final meeting in April 2012 to conclude its work and discuss its final report, The Texas Blueprint: Transforming Education Outcomes for Children and Youth in Foster Care. The final report, submitted to the Children’s Commission and the Supreme Court of Texas at a reception held May 3, 2012, represented collaborative discussion and problem-solving of over 100 court, child welfare, and education stakeholders over a 19-month period. In total, the Education Committee and its subcommittees and workgroups met more than 50 times. Although the Education Committee officially met its charge with the submission of its final report, members agreed to continue future collaboration. Next steps for the committee include:

- Hold annual meeting of Education Committee to continue collaboration
- Create a task force to periodically meet to develop an implementation plan and assess progress of implementation
- Support a statewide, multi-disciplinary education and foster youth summit, tentatively scheduled for February 2013
- Raise awareness among court, education, and child welfare stakeholders both in Texas and nationally through presentations and written materials
- Assist in the creation of tools, resources, and training

Commission staff is working on a development plan for the Implementation Task Force, which should kick off in Fall 2012 and planning for the Education and Foster Youth Summit, which is scheduled February 19-20, 2013 in Austin, and staff will continue to work with its education and other partners to further awareness of the Education Committee’s Texas Blueprint and the unique educational needs of children and youth in foster care.

Recommended budget is \$15,000.00 to support meeting facilitation, hosting, and travel for Education Committee and Implementation Task Force

members and any printing costs. Commission staff time supporting the Education Committee, Implementation Task Force and documents and reports produced is included in the Commission overhead.

11. Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup/Tribal Collaboration

The Children's Commission has been committed to continuing the dialogue surrounding racial disproportionality and disparate outcomes for children of color. These courageous conversations will help develop new mutually respectful relationships between child welfare courts and the African American communities, as well as the Hispanic, and Native American communities. Building understanding allows us all to shed light on unconscious bias that may be affecting how decisions are made.

In late 2010, the Children's Commission created the Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup to raise awareness and understanding among judges and key stakeholders about racial disproportionality by: (i) developing and promoting judicial and attorney training applying tools designed to reduce institutional racism and bias; (ii) identifying and providing technical assistance regarding statewide and for jurisdiction-specific disproportionality data; and (iii) connecting judges with expert trainers for community-based workshops if they wish to expand the training into their communities and for local partners.

Child welfare judges have been actively engaged in understanding and undoing racism. At the first three Annual Implicit Bias Conferences, judges heard from national speakers about the latest discoveries in brain science and how cultural bias affects decision making. Several judges were so moved by the Implicit Bias training that they brought similar workshops into their courts and communities. Judge Meca Walker is hosting an Undoing Racism Workshop in August 2012 to bring together many Harris County child welfare stakeholders who appear in her court for a two and a half day workshop exploring institutional racism and how systems affect individuals.

Native American children are also disproportionately over-represented in the child protection system. A review of national child welfare data indicates that across the United States, Native American children are overrepresented in foster care at a rate of 2.2 times their rate in the general population. Disproportionate representation of Native American children is also seen in Texas and demands further investigation.

The Children's Commission has worked to develop collaborative relationships with Texas' three federally recognized tribal nations. In April 2012, a small group that included the Commission Executive Director and the DFPS Assistant Commissioner for Child Protective Services visited the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas for a signing ceremony honoring the first Tribal IV-E Agreement in Texas. This historic event was preceded by a 1-1/2-day Judicial Symposium called "Strengthening and Healing our Families and Community Through State-Tribal Collaboration." The symposium included Alabama-Coushatta Tribal judges, state court and county court judges, caseworkers, attorneys, experts from domestic violence advocacy groups and many other stakeholders. Austin District Judge Darlene Byrne spoke on the first day of the symposium about her work with the tribe in creating the first tribal model court in Texas. The Commission staff came away from the symposium with many new connections as well as concrete ideas for working with the three federally recognized tribes in Texas, and would like consider inviting a tribal judge or leader to serve as a Commissioner.

Also, Commission staff traveled to El Paso to the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo reservation to meet with representatives of the three federally-recognized tribes, state leaders in child welfare, and experts in racial disproportionality. National experts introduced the idea of historical trauma, and how the past informs our current challenges. Commission staff has been connecting with members of the Alabama-Coushatta, Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and the Kickapoo tribes to gain a better understanding of how state courts and tribal courts can work together for Texas' vulnerable children and families.

The Commission will continue to work with the Texas Center for the Judiciary to plan the annual Implicit Bias conference, and will continue to host meetings of the JDW to continue education efforts aimed at the judicial and legal system.

Recommended budget: \$15,000.00 for meeting and travel expense for the workgroup members or local training at the request of a judge who hears child protection cases. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

12. Harris County Judicial Technical Assistance (JTA)

In December 2011, Justice Guzman asked Harris County District Judges Judy Warne, Bonnie Hellums, David Farr, and Michael Schneider for their help in leading efforts to implement more effective processes and protocols to help produce better outcomes for children and families served by the Harris County child protection system. Eight Harris County district judges and seven associate judges met on January 13, 2012 and again in March and May 2012 to discuss how the juvenile and family judges can work together to address some of the legal and child welfare system barriers that are contributing to the delays in foster youth exiting the system. Children's Commissioner Justice Michael Massengale, and Senior District Judge John Specia, ret., are serving as advisors to the group and the Children's Commission has conveyed its availability to assist when and where needed. Any travel or meeting expense required to support the JTA in Harris County will be covered by the Commission's FY2013 operating budget. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

13. Jurist in Residence

The Jurist in Residence project was created to foster judicial leadership and promote greater expertise among child protection judges. The Commission's first JIR, Judge John Specia, has been instrumental in advancing judicial education and community collaboration across the state. OCA added a second JIR position in 2012 to assist the Commission's court improvement efforts. As part of the JIR program, the Commission publishes JIR newsletters that provide practical information to judges who hear CPS cases and tools to help them do a better job. In FY2012, the Commission published JIR newsletters on free online training for parent attorneys, CPS staff realignment after the 82nd Legislative Session, new appellate rules applicable to parental termination cases, DFPS subpoena policy, training scholarship announcements, court hearing practices and court costs, and OCA's Spanish interpreter program for CPS cases. In October, the Commission will attend a meeting Bryan Samuels, Commission for the Administration of Children and Families in Dallas to discuss court practices affecting Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, and Questioning (LGBTQ) foster youth. JIR, Robin Sage, will attend the meeting and advise on the project.

Recommended budget is \$50,000.00 to cover conference registration fees, travel, OCA's salary and overhead expense to administer the program. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

14. Juvenile Justice Committee (JJC) of the Supreme Court Judicial Council

The JJC was formed in FY2012 and charged with assessing the impact of school discipline and school-based policing on referrals to the municipal, justice, and juvenile courts and identifying judicial policies or initiatives that: 1) work to reduce referrals without having a negative impact on school safety; 2) limit recidivism; and 3) preserve judicial resources for students who are in need of this type of intervention. The Commission's Executive Director serves as an advisor to the JJC which meets quarterly. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

15. Legal Representation Reform

The Legal Representation Study Workgroup was formed by the Commission in early 2011 to develop plans for implementing the recommendations from the LRS Report, issued in December 2010. There are two main areas of focus – the administration and the quality of legal representation in child protection cases. Several in-person and conference calls were conducted in FY2012, and the workgroup will continue to meet and confer in FY2013.

The subcommittees examining the administration of legal representation have been charged with making recommendations and suggestions for remedies and reforms about how legal representation systems and processes are administered by counties and judges. The Standards / Quality Assurance / Training Subcommittees have been charged with making recommendations regarding qualifications and training, as well as accountability within the judicial system, to help ensure parties are receiving high-quality legal representation.

Statutory changes on the horizon for FY2013 may include clarification that counties may establish a Public Defender (PD) or Managed Assigned Counsel (MAC) office or contract with a legal-aid office or local bar section for legal representation, and counties may establish special

prosecution units within the county or a region of the state. Also, statutory changes may include affecting the timing of appointment for parent attorneys and additional duties on DFPS and the judge to advise parents that they are entitled to a court appointed attorney if they are indigent and opposed to the suit for termination or conservatorship. There may also be legislation filed aimed at explicitly limiting the duties of attorneys ad litem who are appointed to represent alleged fathers and parents cited by publication.

The LRS workgroup will work on how compensation can be reformed at a statewide level through state-provided funding or another source, rather than the current system which pays attorneys solely from county funds. Another cost-saving idea is to examine whether counties should be required to publish a clear list of expenses that are reimbursable.

LRS workgroup members will continue to work on the issue of building and implementing a statewide information and bill tracking system to track, report, and analyze attorney time spent on cases and dollars paid by the county.

The LRS workgroup believes that attorney standards would help ensure high-quality representation. Further discussion is warranted before defining standards and deciding who will draft them, and what level of support from LRS workgroup and Commission members the effort will require. There may be legislation filed to increase the minimum number of legal education hours required to qualify for court appointments in child protection cases, as well as creating an ongoing, annual legal education requirement.

Funding associated with the Legal Representation Workgroup includes travel and meeting expenses. The Commission budgeted \$5,000.00 for FY2012, but that was exceeded by \$877.00 as of July 31, 2012.

Recommended budget is \$15,000.00 for LRS meeting and travel expense in FY2013. Commission staff time supporting Legal Representation Workgroup, monitoring legislation stemming from the LRS work, and any implementation plans identified in FY2013 is included in the Commission overhead.

16. Mediation

In 2012, a national workgroup, in conjunction with the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts, issued Child Protection Mediation Guidelines. The workgroup included Cynthia Bryant, Clinical Professor at the University of Texas School of Law. Ms. Bryant is currently working with one Texas County to analyze data collected regarding child protection mediations over a three-year period. Commission staff would like to establish a workgroup on child protection mediation and begin convening meetings. Part of the workgroup's responsibilities would be to establish guiding principles for using mediation in Texas child welfare cases, and to establish practical goals for the growth and improvement of mediation practices. The workgroup will consider developing a mediation guidebook for judges, attorneys, and other stakeholders and education or training modules or events. In addition to working with UT in analyzing Travis County data, the workgroup may identify other counties, or other resources from which to collect and analyze data.

Recommended budget is \$25,000.00 to cover meeting expense, travel, and possibly a grant to UT for an intern or student to analyze data collected for the project. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in Commission overhead.

17. Notice & Engagement Improvements

In FY2013, the Commission staff will revisit many of the legal and judicial directives issued in its Notice and Engagement Report from 2011. The directives included a training module for judges to cover:

- Procedures for monitoring compliance with service and notice requirements and enforcing noncompliance
- Issuing a standing order allowing notice to be accomplished via email with a read receipt requested unless not feasible
- Continuing to emphasize the importance of timely service and notice and its impact on timely case resolution and permanency for the child
- Addressing attitudes and misconceptions regarding the involvement of alleged fathers, relatives, caregivers, and youth, and emphasize the importance (and statutory requirements) of their involvement throughout the case
- Supporting education and practices to ensure parents, youth and other participants understand their rights and feel welcomed and empowered to participate in the case

- Discussing how to increase the involvement of parents and family members earlier in the process and inform parents of the right to legal counsel.

Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

18. Permanency Initiatives

Texas Appleseed completed its study of Texas children in the state's Permanent Managing Conservatorship and published its final report in November 2010. Since that time, Appleseed, DFPS, Casey Family Programs, CPPP, CASA, and the Children's Commission have been working on how best to implement the report's comprehensive recommendations. Texas Appleseed recently completed a cost analysis on the current cost of hearings in multiple jurisdictions to better estimate the expenses associated with a benchmark hearing process and a survey of several courts to evaluate the quality of their PMC hearings. Most recently, the Children's Commission has been working with Appleseed on holding a Permanency Summit on October 8-9 in Rockwall, Texas, that would be structured similar to Beyond the Bench Conferences. Plans to date include inviting up to 25 judges who will bring a team of up to eight people including the judge, the judge's associate judge, a prosecutor, CPS caseworker and supervisor, child and parent attorneys, and a CASA representative.

The Commission staff support required to manage this permanency project and any directives that develop from the October Summit is included in Commission overhead.

Other permanency initiatives Commission staff will work on in 2013 include the NCJFCJ's Legal Orphans project, which is aimed at helping courts recognize the plight of legal orphans (defined as a child whose parents' rights have been terminated and the child has no legal connection to a family). The NCJFCJ has developed a resolution on this matter, and believes that because courts have the authority over and responsibility for children in foster care related to the child's safety, permanency, and well-being, the court has the duty and authority to provide ongoing oversight on every dependency case, including meeting ASFA timelines and requirements. Much more frequent review and vigilant oversight judicial practice is recommended.

A project goal will be to work with courts and DFPS to identify the case name and number of every child whose parental rights have been terminated and who remain under the court's jurisdiction and in the custody or under the supervision of the agency. Using this information, the judge can focus on the specific children who are legal orphans, tailoring questions and requesting information related to achieving permanency for each child and the court system can track success in reducing the jurisdiction's number of legal orphans and supporting better outcomes for children leaving foster care.

The project will also support courts that want to develop and maintain an ongoing collaborative relationship with DFPS and share information regarding all children in the custody or under the supervision of the agency and under the court's jurisdiction. The NCJFCJ Committee will also encourage states to use the best practices outlined in the *RESOURCE GUIDELINES: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse & Neglect Cases* and *ADOPTION AND PERMANENCY GUIDELINES: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases* along with the visionary framework of the Key Principles for Permanency Planning for Children.

In late 2011, DFPS initiated Permanency Round Tables (PRTs) in partnership with Casey Family Programs. Permanency Roundtables are an internal case consultation process designed to facilitate discussions regarding permanency. It is a multi-pronged approach for improving permanency outcomes for children and youth in DFPS conservatorship. The primary goal of permanency roundtables is to convene a meeting of DFPS permanency experts to discuss a child's permanency goal, previous permanency efforts in order to develop a child specific permanency action plan designed to exit a child to a family. If an exit to family cannot be achieved, then the development of a child specific action plan designed to develop and improve lifelong connections to caring adults and/or family members. Another goal of permanency roundtables is to further develop clinical skills and enhance staff knowledge around permanency and permanency planning. During the roundtables, participating staff have the opportunity to explore permanency strategies previously explored and/or to consider new strategies as well as observe case presentations, to learn more about agency policies and practices, and to receive guidance regarding permanency planning. An additional goal is the identification of barriers to permanency that can be overcome

through staff development, policy clarification and/or development, and stakeholder involvement.

The roundtable key players include a Permanency Practitioner who facilitates the roundtable and tracks the action plan, a Permanency Consultant whose role is to focus exclusively on permanency for the youth, a Master Practitioner who is the agency policy and practice expert, a scribe who captures the discussion on the permanency action plan, the youth's case manager and supervisor. The case selection criteria include:: children and youth in the permanent managing conservatorship of DFPS with priority given to children and youth who have been in care the longest, who are not in their intended to be permanent placements, who are a member of a sibling group, and/or are children and youth of color.

Commission staff time supporting Permanency Initiatives will be on an "as needed basis" and is included in Commission overhead.

19. Policy / Legislative (83rd Session)

The Commission works primarily on legislative matters that affect Title V of the Texas Family Code and, upon legislative request, provides resource testimony and written comments geared toward assessing a proposed issue's impact on judicial administration of child-protection cases. Testimony is developed based on the experience of the Children's Commission staff and contributions of various trial and appellate judges who hear child protection cases. Written testimony and comments and oral resource testimony from the Children's Commission are not advisory opinions of the Supreme Court of Texas or any other court. Resource papers and testimony are not rulings on specific cases or legal issues, but are solely intended to address the improvement of the law, the legal system, and the administration of justice.

Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

20. Psychotropic Medications/Trauma Informed Care Workgroup

The use of psychotropic medications by children is an issue confronting parents, other caregivers, and health care professionals across the country. Foster children, in particular, have complex needs. Foster children often reside in areas of the state where mental health professionals such as child psychiatrists are not readily

available. Similarly, caregivers and health providers may be faced with critical situations that require immediate decisions about the care to be delivered. For these and other reasons, treatment parameters, called Psychotropic Medication Utilization Parameters (Parameters) were created in 2005 to encourage the appropriate use of psychotropic medications in foster children. The Parameters have been considered successful, leading to a significant reduction (31%) in the overall use of psychotropic medications and decreases in the use of multiple medications for the same purpose. However, some judges and stakeholders continued to encounter lingering cases where the Parameters have not provided enough of a safety net or the system was not responsive enough for these children.

After receiving feedback regarding concerns about psychoactive medications, the Children's Commission formed the Psychoactive Medication Workgroup (PMW), which has sought to improve practices and communication, gain a better understanding of the Parameter review process, and identify possible gaps and solutions in this system. In early July 2012, the Commission co-hosted a Round Table meeting on Judicial Practices in the Oversight of Psychoactive Medications and Texas Children in Foster Care. The Round Table brought together judges, child psychiatrists, STAR Health and DFPS leadership, as well as other subject matter experts, for an all-day discussion of how judges handling CPS cases can exercise informed and appropriate oversight of the medications being prescribed to the children in their courts.

At the Round Table, the participants discussed the independent evaluation of Texas' Parameters from national experts at Rutgers University, which recommended increased comprehensive psychosocial assessments and treatments, non-pharmacologic alternatives, and improved monitoring of children on such medications. Several participants expressed a desire to see more emphasis on non-medication alternatives, with trauma-informed, recovery-based policies to ensure these alternatives are being considered. The Round Table recommendations are being developed, and will likely include efforts aimed at three main areas: Medical / Informed Consent, Judicial Review, and the Psychotropic Medication Utilization Parameters (PMUR). The report will suggest ways to improve training tools, increase awareness and education of all stakeholders to improve participation in medical appointments, heighten judicial awareness and education to improve accountability during hearings, and the development of tools and

practices to help consider and eliminate non-pharmacological interventions before resorting to the use of psychoactive medications.

Because Trauma-informed care is such a significant part of best practices in prescribing psychoactive medications, the PMW will work closely with the Trauma-Informed Care (TIC) Workgroup, which was asked in 2011 to study the use of physical restraints and other emergency behavioral interventions. Researching the use of restraints led to broader goals of better outcomes for children in foster care by introducing trauma-informed practices into the Commission's judicial and attorney education.

The TIC Workgroup has developed a new chapter for the Child Protection Judges' Bench Book and plans to develop more materials for judicial and attorney education. While the TIC Workgroup has been on hold as DFPS has been developing its strategic plan to integrate trauma-informed care into child protective services, representatives from the TIC Workgroup have participated in strategic planning sessions with DFPS to begin the work of making the entire Texas child welfare system more aware of and responsive to the effects of trauma on child development and mental health.

Recommended budget is \$15,000.00 to pay for meeting, travel, and printing related to the workgroups. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

21. Round Table Meetings / Reports

Commission Round Table meetings are held once or twice each fiscal year to discuss issues that affect the child welfare system by bringing together subject matter experts, judicial and executive branch leaders and key policy-makers. The goal of the Round Table Series is to advance ideas that result in sound executive agency policy, carefully planned legislation, and improved judicial handling of child protection cases. In FY2012, the Commission held Round Tables to discuss budget constraints on DFPS' ability to provide services in CPS cases and on the use of psychoactive medication use for children in foster care.

Recommended budget is \$15,000 for travel for at least one to two RT meetings in FY2013. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead. The fees for Round Table

facilitation are included in the TCJ Judicial and Administrative Assistance line item.

22. Texas TRIO Grant (Education)

In October 2011, the Texas Education Agency, in partnership with DFPS and the Children's Commission, received a 17-month grant to support collaboration between education, child welfare, and the courts in Texas. As part of this grant, a state-level team will work with stakeholders in Harris County, including the Houston Independent School District, to implement some of the strategies identified in the Education Committee's Texas Blueprint. Additionally, the state-level team will develop training materials and other resources for education, court, and child welfare stakeholders. Commission staff will contribute to these materials by focusing on tools of use to judges and attorneys. Commission staff will work closely with its partners at TEA and DFPS, including holding weekly calls and monthly meetings to further ongoing collaboration.

Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission's overhead.

23. Title IV-E Court Order Project

The purposes of the Title IV-E foster care eligibility review are (1) to determine whether the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services title IV-E foster care program is in compliance with the eligibility requirements as outlined in 45 CFR §1356.71 and §472 of the Social Security Act (the Act); and (2) to validate the basis of the State's financial claims to ensure that appropriate payments were made on behalf of eligible children.

Although not officially a requirement for which the state is audited, clarity and specificity of court orders is an element of each audit. Since 2000, the Children's Bureau has noted problems with our court orders in that they do not reflect child and family specificity, noting that best practice standards require court orders to "definitively articulate" that the court has made a child-specific determination regarding "reasonable efforts" or "contrary to the welfare" rulings. Suggestions for improving practice in this area include training court personnel who prepare individual court orders for judges' signatures on the methods and importance of child specificity. Some courts utilize template orders that include optional language such as "have/have not" or "did/did not." Also, although it is not

required for IV-E, including language in the court order that the facts upon which the “contrary to the welfare” and “reasonable efforts” determinations are based, would significantly improve the quality of the court order.

The Commission will participate in efforts to improve child and family specificity in court orders, will ensure this subject is included on the CPS Judge Conference agenda, and will develop a Jurist in Residence letter that will be distributed to judges in the state hearing child protection cases.

Commission staff time supporting this project is included in the Commission overhead.

24. Trial Skills Training and Products

The Training Committee approved FY 2012 funding for this project at the July 2011 joint committee meeting. A workgroup, led by Justice Michael Massengale of the 1st Court of Appeals in Houston, has met several times since August 2011. The workgroup identified the need to develop curriculum for statewide, basic hands-on trial skills training as well as the need to identify and develop trial skills related resources, including a trial notebook for attorneys who represent parents and children.

Currently, the workgroup is focusing on developing four tangible products which will be helpful at all stages of pretrial and trial preparation, for use by parents’ attorneys, attorneys ad litem, and attorneys representing the Department. These products include a form bank, checklists, outlines, and a “Grab & Go” Toolkit.

Additionally, the workgroup is in the process of determining if a sample case scenario can be created, from which a hands-on training workshop can be designed with Texas-specific law, policy, and terminology. (Staff are working on a grant application for a written case scenario, and locating and providing helpful, existing materials to the writer on Texas law and practice.) This very practical training would be taught by an experienced, core Texas faculty. These trainers would present the case scenario and related litigation exercises across the state to attorneys for parents, children, and the Department, along with a local faculty member who could provide information about local practices and local rules in that

particular jurisdiction. After an initial pilot, this hands-on trial skills training would be presented in each appellate jurisdiction around the State, over a period of up to four years. Commission staff anticipates that the pilot project will be rolled out in FY2013.

The workgroup will hold periodic meetings during FY 2012, with a plan to disseminate a robust trial skills training following the pilot in FY 2013. Commission staff anticipates that the resource materials mentioned above will be developed by the workgroup and disseminated in FY 2013.

Recommended budget is \$40,000.00 for meeting expenses, printing, training events, and travel. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in Commission overhead.

25. Website Maintenance

Commission staff maintains the Children's Commission website and in 2012 will establish an Education Committee website and a Psych Meds / Trauma Informed Care webpage where committee materials, resources, and helpful links will be available to users. The Commission staff will develop the website as a primary source for current Commission-related events and projects. Commission staff time supporting this project is included in Commission overhead.

INSERT - TAB 4

MINUTES - AUG 2 CIP COMMITTEES MEETING

**The Supreme Court of Texas
Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families**

**Basic, Training, and Data/Technology Committee Meeting Minutes
August 2, 2012**

**Location: Children's Advocacy Centers of Texas, Inc.
Bldg. A
Austin, TX 78757**

I. Call to Order

This meeting was held at 10:00 a.m. on August 2, 2012, at the Children's Advocacy Centers, Inc., Bldg. A, in Austin, Texas. The Basic, Training and Data/Technology Committees met in joint session. Ms. Amberboy called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

II. Meeting Overview

Ms. Amberboy noted that the annual joint meeting of the CIP grant committees provides an opportunity to share information on all CIP projects for upcoming FY2013 and allows review and discussion. Members provided introductions; Ms. Milbrey Raney described her legal background prior to joining the Commission. Ms. Amberboy noted that Ms. Spriggs is the most recent addition to the Children's Commission. The Commission is working at both the state and national levels to identify a tribal representative to invite to join the Commission.

III. Minutes from the April 2012 Committee Meetings

Ms. Amberboy noted that the meeting minutes for the Basic, Training and Technology Committees were adopted by the Commission at the May 4, 2012 meeting.

IV. Use of CIP Funding

Ms. Amberboy reported that the efficient use of CIP funding has been a topic of discussion with Justice Guzman and among the members of the Commission. Ms. Amberboy provided oversight in procedural changes to the way in which the three CIP grants are administered. There are now procedures in place that reflect improved process efficiency for the accounting of the Basic, Training and Data funds. The changes are a result of the review of the evolution and growth of activities and projects since the Commission's inception in 2007.

Beginning in FY2013, the operating expenses of the Children's Commission will be charged to the Basic Grant. Previously, these expenses were tracked and paid with 1/3 coming from each of the three CIP grants. This will necessitate moving projects that were designated as Basic Grant projects into the remaining two grants that are more appropriate for the grant activities. The Texas CASA project will move from Basic to Training, since volunteer and staff training activities are the predominant use of the CIP funds.

The detail budget information is described fully in the budget report provided in the meeting notebook. The budget will be presented for approval to the Children's Commission at its upcoming meeting on September 14, 2012.

Ms. Amberboy commented that the change will not impact the grant reporting procedure to the federal government. Briefly, the grant reporting to the federal government requires submission of quarterly forms and at the end of the year, a form is submitted that verifies that no funds lapsed and all funds were expended with the timeframe specified and that sufficient match was collected. An explanation on the twenty-five percent match was provided. The Commission acquires match in

excess of the federal requirement because of Staff and Commission members' activities of the training grant each year.

V. CIP Grant Committee Business

A roll call for the three Committees was taken to determine quorum. Pending the arrivals of Judge Hellums and Judge Sakai, the Basic Committee did not have quorum.

Ms. Amberboy proposed a change to the order of the agenda since there was quorum for the Training Committee and moved presentation and discussion of the FY2013 projects of the Training Committee to this point in the meeting.

a. CIP Grant Training Committee Business

Judge Richard Garcia served as proxy for Judge DuBose at this meeting. Judge Garcia led discussion on the applications and expenditures for FY2013 CIP training grant projects.

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS TRAINING

Members Attending

Members Not Attending

Name	Name
The Honorable Richard Garcia, Acting Chair Ms. Cathy Cockerham, Member Ms. Barbara Elias-Perciful, Member Ms. Alice Emerson, Member Ms. Debra Emerson, Member Dr. Sandeep Narang Member Ms. Pam Parker, Member Mr. Randy Sarosdy, Member	The Honorable Camile DuBose, Chair Ms. Tracy Harting, Member Ms. Joyce James, Member The Honorable Lamar McCorkle, Member Ms. Shaneka Odom, Member Ms. Fairy Davenport Rutland, Member The Honorable Ellen Smith, Member
Staff	
Ms. Tina Amberboy Ms. Tiffany Roper Ms. Kristi Taylor Ms. Milbrey Raney Ms. Rashonda Thomas Ms. Teri Moran	
Ms. Mari Aaron	

1. State Bar of Texas Child Abuse and Neglect Committee - Child Abuse and Neglect Conference

Ms. Amberboy provided an update on the work of the Committee and the planning that has been underway for over a year on the Child Welfare Conference. The conference agenda will include a variety of topics and will target attorneys. The agenda is being prepared and will be provided by Ms. Carol Hurley. The proposed dates for the conference are October 18-19, 2012. This committee has approved the budget expenditure for the conference in prior meetings, but because of scheduling conflicts with other conferences and events the date has been deferred. The committee is asked to consider deferring the expenditure of \$25,000.00 for the Child Abuse and Neglect Conference to the FY2013 budget. Ms. Elias-Perciful noted that there will be separate tracks for both parent and child attorneys as well as attorneys with the Department.

Discussion: In response to a question from Judge Garcia with regard to the availability of the separate child and parent tracks to attorneys who represent both client populations, Ms.

Amberboy noted that once the agenda is finalized and conference detail is provided by the State Bar of Texas Child Abuse and Neglect Committee, the information will be provided to the Training Committee for input. Ms. Amberboy and Ms. Raney will confer with Ms. Hurley. Ms. Debra Emerson mentioned that a Parent Panel might be an informative presentation at this conference.

Ms. Amberboy noted the arrivals of Judge Hellums and Judge Sakai as well as Mr. Casey Kennedy.

ACTION: Judge Garcia asked for a motion to vote to approve deferring the previously approved funds for the State Bar of Texas Child Abuse and Neglect Conference in the amount of \$25,000.00 to FY2013. Judge Jones made a motion to approve the request to defer the funding to FY2013 and Dr. Sandeep Narang seconded. Members of the Training Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

2. Texas CASA

Ms. Cathy Cockerham provided an update on the projects for Texas CASA. Texas CASA has received ongoing CIP funding from the Commission and utilized the funds to develop Training of Trainers projects. Each year, Texas CASA strives to bring more volunteers into the program to increase advocacy services to children. The projects that will be funded are 1) Training of Facilitators (TOF); 2) the Core Advocacy Skills Training (CAST); 3) Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training and 4) Leveraging of Statewide CASA/CPS MOU. The detail information on each component is described fully in the Texas CASA FY2013 CIP Grant Application provided in the meeting notebook. Ms. Cockerham also commented that CIP funding has allowed development of resources for children in residential treatment centers (RTCs). One, a manual, provides information on advocacy for a child in RTC. The most recent resource, the Permanency Toolkit, provides information for advocacy for older youth.

Discussion: Judge Garcia, Judge Sakai and Judge Hellums brought forth some of the service issues related to court orders for conservatorship to get a child enrolled in school, obtain medical care, etc., associated with CPS cases. Judge Sakai acknowledged that this is a separate issue that warrants additional strategic consideration. Ms. Amberboy inquired about the outcome of an effort from a previous legislative session to develop a 'self-help' form (a child safety placement form) or order that could be used for CPS cases. She asked if the issue is something that the Department can help address. The possibility of Texas Lawyers for Children bringing together a pool of pro bono attorneys to draft order to assist in COS cases was discussed. Judge Garcia commented that in Bexar County the court has worked with legal aid to get the child safety plan delivered to free legal services in order for them to represent, but the high rate of case numbers are an obstacle. Judge Garcia also expressed concern that resources would be strained if CASAs were to be appointed at the COS stage of CPS cases. Ms. Alice Emerson offered that a regional representative from the Department would work with CASA to determine which cases might be appropriate for CASA involvement. Ms. Cockerham clarified that a CASA could not become involved with a family unless a legal case was filed. Ms. Cockerham also agreed that CASA would need to be very clear about the agreements with the Department on COS case involvement and that CASA volunteers would get specific training on COS cases. Ms. Cockerham noted that the intention is to open a dialogue in regional areas to determine what is possible and to clarify Texas CASA's objectives.

ACTION: Judge Garcia asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$162,984.00 for Texas CASA. Ms. Elias-Perciful made a motion to approve the request and Ms. Debra Emerson seconded. Members of the Training Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

3. Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ)

Mr. Randy Sarosdy reported on the proposed activities for the FY2013 grant year. The center will conduct four conferences, plan 1 additional conference and administer the scholarships for NCJFCJ conferences. The detail information on the multi-disciplinary training activities and specific information on the programs are described fully in the Texas Center for the Judiciary FY2013 CIP Grant Application provided in the meeting notebook. Mr. Sarosdy noted that there will be an increased focus on training in child protection cases for new judges next June. Separate tracks will be planned for urban judges.

Discussion: Judge Sakai expressed his support for the Implicit Bias training and encouraged participation by anyone who has yet to attend the 4 trainings to date. Ms. Amberboy noted that discussion has taken place to include the Implicit Bias training in the College for New Judges. Mr. Sarosdy commented that those discussions are continuing. The class for new judges for 2013 is anticipated to be approximately 130 judges. Ms. Amberboy commented that it is time to consider an Implicit Bias Summit to involve a multi-disciplinary audience. Ms. Rodriguez commented that the youth and parent voices at this conference were most informative, and that Casey would like to broaden the variety of speakers who present at these conferences.

Judge Sakai commented on the coordination necessary to plan the numerous conferences. The curriculum committee must focus on coordination and timing for conference planning.

ACTION: Judge Garcia asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$595,924.00 for Texas Center for the Judiciary. Ms. Spriggs made a motion and Judge Hellums seconded and members of the Training Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request; however Mr. Sarosdy asked to be recorded as abstained for this vote.

4. OCA Child Protection Court Judge and Court Coordinator Training

Ms. Amberboy reported on the proposed FY2013 activities. Each year a concurrent training is conducted for CPC judges and their court coordinators in or near Austin. The funds requested will be used to help facilitate attendance of court coordinators. Mr. Casey Kennedy noted that the role of the court coordinator is to facilitate the flow of case paperwork between the clerk's office and judges. Ms. Amberboy noted that coordinators use the CPCMS and there is a significant amount of training necessary for proficient use of the system. The amount requested for FY2013 is near one-half the total requested in prior years.

ACTION: Judge Garcia asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$15,000.00 for the OCA Child Protection Court Judge and Court Coordinator training. Ms. Alice Emerson made a motion and Judge Shannon seconded and members of the Training Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

Conclusion of the Review of the CIP Training Committee Projects for FY2013.
The members of the CIP Training Committee completed review of the projects.

Mr. Van Fleet agreed to remain on the conference line while members took a short break.

Break – 11:09 a.m.

Reconvened at 11:27 a.m.

b. CIP Grant Data/Technology Committee Business

Tina Amberboy led discussion on the projects of the Data/Technology Committee. She noted that although the position of chair for the Data/Technology Committee is vacant at this time, the advisory staff are willing to provide the necessary information about the work of the Committee to the person who accepts the role.

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS-DATA/TECHNOLOGY

Members Attending	Members Not Attending
Name	Name
{Undesignated}, Chair Mr. Dan Capouch, Member The Honorable Gilford Jones, Member Mr. Robert Nolen, Member Ms. Vicki Spriggs Mr. G. Allan Van Fleet, Member (teleconference)	Mr. Jason Hassay, Member Dr. Octavio Martinez Ms. D.J. Tessier, Member Mr. Bryan Wilson, Member
OCA Technical Advisory Staff (non-voting)	
Mr. Ronald Clark	Mr. Darrell Childers
Ms. Simi Denson	
Mr. Casey Kennedy	
Mr. Tim Kennedy	

1. Child Protection Court (CPC) Strategic Plan

Ms. Amberboy commented that over the past several months, the Commission staff has held discussions with OCA, the General Counsel and some of the presiding judges about the structure of the Child Protection Courts and the variances in populations these courts serve. It is appropriate at this time to assess if the program is operating in the manner that was intended at the beginning and to plan for future activity. During FY2013, Ms. Simi Denson is the staff designee who will conduct a project that will review the cluster courts and look at current practices and outcome data. The characteristics of the counties served will be reviewed as well. Development of a strategic plan informed by this information will address the future of the cluster courts and guide any proposed changes or improvements. In addition to this project, OCA will ask the upcoming legislature to approve three additional courts. If successful in securing funds for these courts, Ms. Denson will develop a plan for allocation of funding.

Ms. Amberboy gave the floor to Ms. Denson, who provided brief additional detail on the project activities. She noted that because of her experience with OCA, she possesses expertise in working on legal technology. She will serve as the attorney contact with OCA staff.

Discussion: Judge Gil Jones expressed his support of the proposed activities.

ACTION: Ms. Amberboy asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$46,597.00 for the Child Protection Courts Support and Strategy project. Mr. Dan Capouch made a motion and Judge Garcia seconded and members of the Data/Technology Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

2. OCA CIP Technology Projects

Ms. Amberboy provided a review of the Project Improvement Plan (PIP) technology projects managed by OCA on behalf of the Children’s Commission. The efforts of the three full-time staff include development, maintenance, and enhancements for the Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS). New activities planned for FY2013 include development of a

method for judges to remotely access their calendars on CPCMS without having to be in the application. There are plans to update the training and marketing videos to encourage use of the system by other counties.

Ms. Amberboy gave the floor to Mr. Casey Kennedy for comments. He noted that in the past, CPCMS was restricted to the counties that were supported by OCA, but now there have been improvements to the system that will allow use by other counties that are outside the OCA cluster courts. Three of these counties are currently using the system – Karnes, Atascosa and Wilson. The system is a cost-effective and efficient resource. Mr. Ron Clark commented on the expanded role based security feature. Comments have been collected from judges and other users on future use of CPCMS. There are system maintenance issues that involve data clean up and response to outstanding system tickets associate with changes made during the last legislative session as well as any system updates resulting from changes to the psychotropic medications parameters. Future requested enhancements have been designated as special projects. These include a request from several judges for access of the system calendar from their cell phone. The role based security enhancement is currently the highest priority item and is a response to comments from several larger courts to open the system to bailiffs and attorneys as well as judges and court coordinators. This would help with docket preparations, for example, in cases where the client is incarcerated and will require transport to court. Mr. Casey Kennedy commented that during his observations in Judge Bonicoro’s court, he noted that giving caseworkers access to CPCMS and providing the ability for them to upload their reports directly into the system would allow viewing by the court coordinator and easy forwarding to the judge. This is a process efficiency matter that removes the step of having to email the report to the court, download the report from email and open the system to attach the report. Mr. Clark noted that assessment of the technical limits of the system are underway as well as assessment of business requirements. He noted that the developer who is now on staff is a webmaster and will be providing help with the webpages related to CPCMS. Ms. Amberboy commented on the webpage for notice and engagement and attorney assignment billing. In 2011, the Commission held a Round Table on issues around Notice and Engagement that, in addition to other problems, identified issues with caregivers and foster parents receiving consistent notice of hearings. Discussion is ongoing with the Department on the possibility of developing a tool to electronically generate notice that would be driven by the hearing date. Judge Garcia commented that in Bexar County, attorneys have opted to obtain email notice. Ms. Amberboy noted that as long as the information is non-confidential, family members or caregivers could subscribe to get notices that pertain to the child’s case. Mr. Casey Kennedy provided the example of alter notifications from airlines when there is a change to the flight itinerary. Judge Sakai commented on the long term implications of migrating to a paperless/e-filing system. There is a history of too many technical hurdles to overcome in the CPS system. Mr. Clark noted that CPCMS is designed for the cluster courts. A significant amount of CPS data resides in the IMPACT system. Mr. Casey Kennedy commented that the technology is ahead of where the policy and rules are. OCA will continue to work with the Supreme Court and the rules advisory committee. Judge Sakai is concerned that the solution will be piecemeal because of funding constraints. Ms. Amberboy commented that the technology exists as well as the will to reach a workable solution. As Foster Care Redesign moves forward and work is undertaken in the catchment areas, some resources will have to be put in place and may provide opportunity for changes in how cases are handled in the catchment areas. She noted that the Department will have to comply with the Family Code regarding issues of notice. Judge Garcia commented about a notification used by EMS following September 11, 2001 that provides real-time information on availability of hospital beds. A similar technology could be used with regard to placement team issues. Judge Sakai commented that he wants to see more efficient use of the existing technology. Judge Jones noted the issue of the lack of uniform data standards and the impediment to progress in solutions to these issues. Ms. Amberboy noted

that these ideas are a result of comments received from judges and other stakeholders. She moved on to discussion of the design of a web-based system for counties to use to track attorney assignments and billing to enable collection of data on the number of attorneys who represent parties in CPS cases and the dollar-spend figures at the county level. This is a result of feedback from the Legal Representation Study workgroup and is in the discussion stage at this time. On the timeliness and permanency measures, during FY2013 a process of assessment of these measures must be determined. The data elements are in the IMPACT system. Over the next year, in order to comply with a requirement of our CIP funding, the Commission will work with the Department to develop a plan on a data extract schedule and how to track and report the data. The committee will receive regular updates on the progress of this project.

Ms. Roper reported on the Education Website. One of the recommendations from the final report of the Education Committee was to establish a website dedicated to educational issues and foster youth. The website will also provide relevant information on the court and child welfare systems. OCA staff is collaborating with the development of the website. Eventually, there will be linkage from the Department website as well CASA's. The anticipated rollout date is fall of 2012.

Ms. Amberboy noted that OCA will work with the Children's Commission to develop enhanced business process efficiencies with regard to management of stakeholder and contact data.

Ms. Amberboy invited Mr. Tim Kennedy to provide an update to the Committees on the Video Conferencing project. He reported on the successes and provided an example of Judge Michael Schneider's Court in Houston. Recently, Judge Schneider heard eleven cases that involved children located in five separate RTC facilities. OCA is working to expand the database of RTC facilities which have video conference links available. Hearings began last week in Dallas in the 304th District Court. Feedback has been positive. OCA will distribute post-hearing survey instruments to determine the areas for improvements around the actual technology as well as the process and procedures in working with the courts and the CPS staff. Mr. Kennedy commended the support provided on the project by the CPS staff in the Dallas region. Beginning next week, the 305th District Court will begin placement hearings. There are ten cases scheduled that involve children placed in seven separate RTC facilities. Mr. Kennedy is working with the Bexar County Children's Court and the Travis County Juvenile Court to schedule placement hearings that will utilize the video conferencing equipment. As the RTC facilities are contacted and resources are distributed to them and the video links are established, Mr. Kennedy is compiling a master directory, which will be provided to courts so that the judges are aware of the availability of these resources. Additional webcams have been requested in order to involve additional RTCs. Mr. Casey Kennedy commented that the initial impetus for this project was to increase the engagement of children in their hearings. The project has leveraged existing equipment in the urban court settings. OCAs support at the RTCs enables remote access by children to their hearings without requiring physical transport to the court. Ms. Amberboy noted that while facilitation of child participation in the hearing process is a primary goal of this project, the opportunity to share the video conferencing equipment with organizations such as CASA and the Department is feasible. The initial pilot activities for the project identified that the rural locales cannot support quality hearing experience. Bandwidth is a significant restricting issue in the rural counties of the state, but is anticipated to be resolved over time.

Discussion: It was noted that the SKYPE interface is not utilized for this purpose. Mr. Casey Kennedy noted that the interface used is a secure 'bridge' that resides at OCA. This allows encryption of communication exchanges between the RTC, OCA and the court. A SKYPE

interface is not secure. Ms. Amberboy noted that plans for future phases of the project include acquisition of software that will allow use of handheld devices such as android phones, iPads, etc., for use with video conferencing. Ms. Alice Emerson inquired whether the system could be utilized for family therapy. Ms. Amberboy commented that this matter is open to consideration. The current emphasis is getting children to court. OCAs assessment of the system's capacity will be ongoing, and implementation of enhanced usage will be incremental. Mr. Tim Kennedy commented that the capability exists to upgrade the unit to quadruple the port capacity that is currently being utilized.

ACTION: Ms. Amberboy asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$371,223.00 for the OCA CIP Technology Project. Ms. Vicki Spriggs made a motion and Mr. Robert Nolan seconded and members of the Data/Technology Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

Conclusion of the Review of the CIP Data/Technology Committee Projects for FY2013.
The members of the CIP Data/Technology Committee completed review of the projects.

Mr. Van Fleet concluded his participation in the meeting.

c. CIP Grant Basic Committee Business

Ms. Amberboy proposed that the business of the Basic Committee be undertaken prior to the lunch break and members agreed. Judge Hellums led the Committee in consideration of FY2013 Basic projects.

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS-BASIC

Members Attending	Members Not Attending
Name The Honorable Bonnie Hellums, Chair Ms. Gabriela 'Gaby' Fuentes, Member Ms. Colleen McCall, Member Ms. Carolyne Rodriguez, Member The Honorable Peter Sakai, Member The Honorable Cheryl Lee Shannon, Member	Name The Honorable Virginia Schnarr, Member The Honorable Olen Underwood, Member The Honorable Doug Warne, Member
Staff	
Ms. Tina Amberboy Ms. Tiffany Roper Ms. Kristi Taylor Ms. Milbrey Raney Ms. Rashonda Thomas Ms. Teri Moran Ms. Mari Aaron	
Guest	
Ms. Meghan Weller, CACTX Ms. Heidi Penix, TCJ	

1. Disability Rights Texas (DRT) - (formerly Advocacy, Inc.)

Ms. Amberboy provided an overview of the project. It began approximately three years ago to provide attorney resources to courts hearing CPS cases. The attorneys provided representation for dually-managed youth with cases in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Representation for youth in state supported living centers was also provided. Over time, the project has expanded somewhat and judges now appoint DRT attorneys for at-risk youth. The project has been received positive feedback from judges. Approximately 100 young people are served annually by this project and data is maintained which demonstrates positive outcomes for the youth clients.

Discussion: Judge Garcia acknowledged the efforts of the project in working with youth to secure placements that successfully reintegrate them into their communities as well as making available resources that prepare them for independent living and the opportunity for education services.

Ms. Amberboy commented that in addition to services for youth, Mr. Spechler provides presentations and trainings in various jurisdictions throughout the state. She noted that later in the meeting, there will be information provided on the Travis County Crossover Youth Practice Model of joint case management and the introduction of the model in other Texas counties. Highlights of the project are described more fully in the detailed document in the meeting notebook.

DRT is seeking \$100,000.00 in funding from the Children's Commission. The total project cost is \$250,000.00, with supplemental funding provided by the Meadows Foundation and other sources. Preparation is underway to prepare a request for an appropriation from the 83rd Legislature to ensure future funding and sustainability for the project due to its well documented success.

ACTION: Judge Hellums asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$100,000.00 for the Disability Rights Texas Project. Judge Sakai made a motion and Ms. Rodriguez seconded and members of the Basic Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

2. OCA Judicial Support - Aircards

Ms. Amberboy provided a summary of the project activities. The Child Protection Court judges travel to various contiguous counties to hear cases and often must go to remote, rural jurisdictions. In order to access the case management system from their laptops, aircards are needed to enable internet connectivity is needed. The requested funds cover the cost of aircards and technological support.

ACTION: Judge Hellums asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$20,520.00 for the OCA Judicial Support – Aircards funding. Ms. Spriggs made a motion and Judge Garcia seconded and members of the Basic Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

3. Texas Remote Interpreter Project (TRIP)

Ms. Simi Denson reported on the project. OCA has an interpreter who is available to provide interpretation services to hearings of the Child Protection Courts. The project is in its initial stages and efforts to expand utilization throughout the state are underway.

ACTION: Judge Hellums asked for a motion to vote to approve the request for FY2013 funding in the amount of \$37,599.00 for the Texas Remote Interpreter Project (TRIP) funding. Ms. Rodriguez made a motion and Ms. Fuentes seconded and members of the Basic Committee in attendance (listed above) voted to approve the request.

Break – 12:21 p.m. - Lunch

VI. Update on Staff Directed Projects

Children's Commission staff provided an update to the members on the staff directed projects overseen by the Basic, Training and Data/Technology Committees. These staff directed projects are:

Attorney Ad Litem (AAL) Manual Update	Juvenile Justice Committee of Supreme Court Judicial Council
Attorney Ad Litem (AAL) Training	Legal Representation Reform
Annual Reports to ACF and the Supreme Court of Texas	Mediation
Attorney Scholarships (AFL, NACC, ABA, TDCAA)	Notice and Engagement Improvements
Bench Book	Permanency Initiatives
CEDD Interagency Council	Policy / Legislative (83 rd Session of the Texas Legislature)
Conference Planning (TCJ, SBOT, Others)	Psychotropic Medications / Trauma Informed Care
Continuous Quality Improvement Efforts	Round Table Meetings / Reports
Crossover Youth Practice Model Replication	Texas TRIO Grant (Education)
Education Committee: Texas Blueprint Implementation Plan	Title IV-E Court Order Project
Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup/Tribal Initiatives	Trial Skills Training and Products
Judicial Technical Assistance (Harris County)	Website Maintenance
Jurist in Residence	

Staff reported on status of each of the staff directed projects. Information on each project is described fully in the summary report provided in the meeting notebook.

VII. New Business

Ms. Amberboy noted that there are two items for consideration.

a. NCJFCJ Membership

Ms. Amberboy asked Judge Sakai to provide detail on this matter. Judge Sakai noted that he serves on the NCJFCJ Board. The Children's Commission has an ongoing relationship with NCJFCJ. He acknowledges past Texas members of the NCJFCJ board, Judge Jim Farris and Judge Patricia Macías. Texas has taken a leadership role in the NCJFCJ. In order to sustain membership of the Texas judges in the NCJFCJ, Judge Sakai has proposed that the use of CIP funds for judicial memberships be considered. Judge Darlene Byrne is the current NCJFCJ board secretary. There has been good participation by Texas judges in the child welfare training opportunities provided by NCJFCJ. There is an ongoing relationship with the Texas Center for the Judiciary to send judges by scholarship (provided by the Children's Commission) to the NCJFCJ Conference. Ms. Amberboy commented that use of CIP funds are permissible for payment of membership in the NCJFCJ. It is a practice used by other states. She supports offering the payment of NCJFCJ members to judges who sit on the Children's Commission and those who serve on the Commission's various Committees. In addition, a review will be done to determine which judges who have attended the Child Welfare Conference over the past few years as well as the possibility of offering a one-year one membership for those CPC Judges. Judge Sakai noted that payment of membership will include a commitment to participate in the national conference meetings as well as the Child Welfare Conference meetings. Ms. Amberboy noted that NCJFCJ frequently invites Texas judges to advise and participate on issues that will spread nationally.

Discussion: Ms. Elias-Perciful commented that NCJFCJ is a worthwhile organization. The scholarships provided by the Committee are a good way to ensure participation in relevant training opportunities. Judge Sakai noted that Ms. Mari Kay Bickett, formerly of TCJ, is now the Chief Executive Office of NCJFCJ and supports ongoing collaboration with Texas judges. Ms. Amberboy commented that the Children's Commission staff will conduct research to determine the total number of judges to target for the membership opportunity and the related budget. This information will be presented at the September 14, 2012 Children's Commission meeting for consideration and approval. Ms. Spriggs inquired as to whether there will be a set number of memberships offered. Ms. Amberboy noted that the initial estimate has identified approximately thirty judges who have participated in past child welfare trainings. Individual membership cost is approximately \$200.00 per year. Ms. Spriggs and Ms. Elias-Perciful commented that the offer for the CIP to pay for membership must be conditional on attendance at child welfare training offered by NCJFCJ. Ms. Amberboy agreed that payment of expenses for attendance at the national meeting would be contingent on attendance and participation at the CPS Judges Conference. Additional discussion on the order of payment and requirements for attendance took place. Ms. Amberboy will provide follow up information to the members via email.

b. NACC Certification

Ms. Amberboy reported on new developments that pertain to the NACC Certification issue. This issue has been discussed in detail in the Training Committee. The certification is a child welfare law certification that is not based on Texas law. It is based predominantly on federal law. Attorneys who obtain the certification benefit in becoming more qualified in child welfare cases. Improvement to the quality of the legal process that benefits children, families, and the community is a result. There are Texas attorneys who seek this certification. The associated costs are an application fee as well as a fee to sit for the exam. The Children's Commission has a good relationship with NACC. NACC has asked if CIP could fund some of the costs associated with attorneys to sit for the certification exam. Ms. Amberboy proposed that the issue be revisited at this time to determine if there is a way for CIP to pay for Texas attorneys who wish to sit for the certification exam. Attorneys will be responsible to pay the application fee. Once vetted by NACC to sit for the exam, these attorneys may submit an application to the Children's Commission for the exam fee. The exam fee is approximately \$350.00. One of the issues that has come up around the funding for this certification is the desire for a Texas specialization through the Texas Board of Legal Specialization. Efforts to achieve this long-term objective are ongoing. The two issues are not mutually exclusive. The opportunity to obtain the NACC Certification will provide a higher level of education to interested attorneys, and it is currently available. Achieving the Texas child welfare law specialization is a long-term proposition and Ms. Amberboy encourages the support of the Children's Commission toward that goal as well.

Discussion: No motion or vote is required at this time. Ms. Amberboy noted that there are approximately twenty-three Texas attorneys who are eligible to sit for the NACC exam in the next 12-18 months, and nine more who are trying to become eligible. She will determine the cost per exam and provide the estimated expenditure total to members of the committee. Judge Jones inquired if there is clarity on how the attorneys who obtain the certification will benefit the purposes of the committee/Commission. Ms. Amberboy responded that the exam requirements are strenuous. A considerable amount of training and experience in the courtroom is necessary to successfully attain the certification. Judge Hellums commented that the attorneys who hold the certification and have appeared in her court are highly proficient. Ms. Elias-Perciful noted her objections to the use of the CIP Training Committee funds for the exam because it doesn't include Texas law and practice issues. There is another cost involved in the NACC national certification, and that is attendance at the NACC's Red Book training. There is a course fee associated with that training. She believes it is more fitting for CIP funds

to be used to pay for attorneys to attend the Red Book training, then if they want to pay for the exam, those attorneys should do so themselves because doing so is comparable to payment of the state bar license dues. Payment for the training would give attorneys the information and higher level skills and knowledge that Judge Hellums just acknowledged. Ms. Elias-Perciful inquired if Commission funding for the NACC exam fee would be a benefit to the NACC rather than to the Texas attorney. Forthcoming Texas Board Certification in Child Welfare Law and related training would be focused on what is needed by the Texas attorney to practice in our state. Ms. Amberboy noted that attorneys who apply to take the NACC Certification will get the NACC Red Book training provided to them by NACC is their applications are approved and they are deemed eligible to sit for the NACC certification exam. Ms. Elias-Perciful perceives the training as providing attorneys with the skill and knowledge while the exam only provides the credential. In her opinion, a better use of the Commission funds is to pay for the training versus the cost of taking the exam. Mr. Sarosdy noted that the acts of studying for and taking a certification exam elevates the attorney's practice to a higher level. Ms. Amberboy noted that in this case, if the CIP funds were used to pay for the attorney to take the training and then they decided not to take the certification exam, funds will have been expended for the training with no resulting certification. Ms. Amberboy will provide additional information to the committee members about the details of the NACC certification. Ms. Alice Emerson commented that she attended the training and did not get a significant benefit. Ms. Elias-Perciful noted that her initial objection to payment for the NACC Certification was due to her understanding that it would be to the exclusion of obtaining a Texas specialization. Since both specializations are now on the table, she will withdraw her objection to the funding for the NACC Certification. This issue will be included on the agenda for the September 14, 2012 Children's Commission meeting.

VIII. 2013 Meeting Calendar

The 2013 meeting dates for the Children's Commission are:

January 11, 2013, Friday 9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Supreme Court of Texas Courtroom

May 3, 2013, Friday 9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

State Bar of Texas – The Texas Law Center – Hatton W. Sumners Meeting Room

September 27, 2013, Friday 9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

State Bar of Texas – The Texas Law Center – Hatton W. Sumners Meeting Room

IX. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

INSERT - TAB 5

FY2013 CIP BUDGET

Children's Commission Budget Report FY 2012 and Projected Budget for FY 2013

Operating Budget	FY2012 Actual	FY2013 Projected
Award Amount	\$ 1,883,101	\$ 1,883,101
Carry-forward	\$ 1,205,016	\$ 1,131,801
Total Budget	\$ 3,088,117	\$ 3,014,902
Obligated Amount	\$ 2,253,344	\$ 2,298,847
Unobligated Amount	\$ 834,773	\$ 716,055

Budget and Expenditure Summary

	Budget Obligated FY 2012	Total Expenses To date FY 2012	Est. Expenses Sept. FY 2012	Balance	Budget Projected FY 2013
BASIC					
Overhead Expenses					
Salaries	\$ 425,000	\$ 374,239	\$ 36,679	\$ 14,082	\$ 452,000
Payroll Taxes/Retirement/Health & Ben	\$ 102,000	\$ 62,942	\$ 22,624	\$ 16,434	\$ 104,000
Staff Travel	\$ 25,000	\$ 22,953	\$ 2,000	\$ 47	\$ 30,000
SC Administrative Fee	\$ 18,000	\$ 27,696	\$ 2,066	\$ (11,762)	\$ 18,000
Commission Operating Budget	\$ 50,000	\$ 38,512	\$ 7,380	\$ 4,108	\$ 45,500
Travel	\$ -	\$ 16,285	\$ 4,000	-	\$ 15,000
Training	\$ -	\$ 45	-	-	\$ 1,000
Registration fees	\$ -	\$ 2,640	-	-	\$ 3,000
Membership dues	\$ -	\$ 1,240	-	-	\$ 8,000
Subscriptions	\$ -	\$ 300	-	-	\$ 500
Meeting/Conference room rent	\$ -	\$ 2,332	\$ 2,000	-	\$ 5,000
Audio/Visual rental	\$ -	\$ 1,724	-	-	\$ 1,000
Printing	\$ -	\$ 7,874	\$ 650	-	\$ 3,000
Audio/Conference Service	\$ -	\$ 3,014	\$ 280	-	\$ 3,000
Cleaning Service	\$ -	\$ 1,395	\$ 450	-	\$ 2,000
Supplies	\$ -	\$ 4,303	-	-	\$ 4,000
	\$ 620,000	\$ 526,342	\$ 70,749	\$ 22,909	\$ 649,500
Staff Directed Projects					
Publication Reprints (TRLA)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ 12,000
Bench Book	\$ 20,000	\$ 9,569	-	\$ 10,431	\$ 10,000
RoundTable	\$ 15,000	-	-	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Education Committee	\$ 25,000	\$ 19,242	-	\$ 5,758	\$ 15,000
Crossover Youth Practice Model	\$ -	-	-	-	\$ 2,500
Legal Representation Study	\$ 5,000	\$ 6,019	-	\$ (1,019)	\$ 15,000
Psych Meds WG/Trauma Informed	\$ -	\$ 3,030	-	\$ (3,030)	\$ 15,000
	\$ 65,000	\$ 37,860	-	\$ 27,140	\$ 84,500
Grants					
201-11-0000 *Lubbock Transition Ctr	\$ 27,890	\$ 24,580	\$ 3,310	\$ (0)	\$ -
201-12-0001 Texas CASA	\$ 246,301	\$ 146,377	\$ 50,000	\$ 49,924	\$ -
201-12-0002-2 OCA - CPS Judge Support (Tech Budg)	\$ 19,980	\$ 14,162	\$ 5,818	-	\$ 20,520
201-09-00022 Judge In Residence	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,419	\$ 6,500	\$ 20,081	\$ 50,000
201-11-00040 Webb County	\$ 16,905	\$ 7,180	\$ 9,725	-	\$ -
201-12-00042 Uvalde County	\$ 44,000	-	\$ 44,000	-	\$ -
201-12-00044 *OCA Shared Solutions Summit	\$ 5,000	-	\$ 5,000	-	\$ -
201-12-00043 OCA Spanish Interpreter	\$ 33,840	\$ 22,598	\$ 11,242	\$ 0	\$ 37,599
201-11-0033 DRT/Legal Rep	\$ 54,370	\$ 54,370	-	\$ (0)	\$ 100,000
	\$ 498,286	\$ 292,686	\$ 135,595	\$ 70,005	\$ 208,119
DATA					
201-12-0002-1 OCA - CIP Technology Proj	\$ 439,533	\$ 224,951	\$ 200,000	\$ 14,582	\$ 371,223
CPC Attorney/Strategic Planning	\$ -	-	-	-	\$ 46,597
	\$ 439,533	\$ 224,951	\$ 200,000	\$ 14,582	\$ 417,820
TRAINING					
Staff Directed Projects					
CPS Mediation	\$ 25,000	\$ -	-	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
JDW / Tribal Initiative	\$ 25,000	-	\$ 18,500	\$ 6,500	\$ 15,000
Trial Skills	\$ 40,000	-	-	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
	\$ 90,000	-	\$ 18,500	\$ 71,500	\$ 80,000
Grants					
201-12-00035 Attorney Scholarships	\$ -	-	-	-	\$ 50,000
-00037 TDFPS	\$ -	-	-	-	-
-00038 AFL	\$ 10,000	-	\$ 2,200	\$ 7,800	-
-00046 ABA	\$ 50,000	-	-	\$ 50,000	-
NACC	\$ 8,000	-	\$ 8,000	-	-
TDCAA	\$ -	-	-	-	-
SBOT Conference	\$ 25,000	-	-	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
NACC Exam Fee	\$ -	-	-	-	\$ 10,000
201-12-0001 Texas CASA	\$ -	-	-	-	\$ 162,984
201-12-0002-3 OCA -Judge Training & Coord.	\$ 30,000	\$ 3,168	\$ 26,832	-	\$ 15,000
201-12-0007 Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ)	\$ 417,526	\$ 309,433	\$ 100,000	\$ 8,093	\$ 595,924
	\$ 540,526	\$ 312,601	\$ 137,032	\$ 90,893	\$ 858,908
TOTAL	\$ 2,253,344	\$ 1,394,440	\$ 561,876	\$ 297,028	\$ 2,298,847

*Not funded in FY2013

INSERT - TAB 6

FY2013 CIP BASIC GRANT APPLICATIONS

BASIC GRANT-TAB 6

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION - DISABILITY RIGHTS TEXAS



SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS PERMANENT JUDICIAL
COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

Justice Eva Guzman, Chair

Tina Amberboy, Executive Director

FY2013 Grant Application
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Grant Fund Category Requested: New Continued: October 2012-September 2013

Applicant: Disability Rights Texas			
Authorized Official Name:	Richard LaVallo		
Title:	Legal Director		
Organization:	Disability Rights Texas (formerly Advocacy, Inc.)		
Address:	7800 Shoal Creek Blvd, 171-E		
	Austin, TX 78757-1024		
Phone:	(512) 454-4816		
Fax:	(512) 323-0902		
E-mail:	rlavallo@drtx.org		
Financial Officer Name	Nick Ahmad	Financial Officer Title	Chief Financial Officer
Program Director Name	Richard LaVallo	Program Director Title	Legal Director

Requestor is designated as a(n):

- State Agency
 Non-Profit Organization
 Unit of Local Government
 Educational Institution
 Other (describe): _____

Program Type Requested: Basic Program Data Training

Program Title: The Legal Advocacy for Dually Managed Children Project (LADMCP).

1. Program Issue or Problem:

Overview

Children in foster care are among the most disadvantaged youth in the State of Texas. Within this population there is an especially disadvantaged subgroup of youth with disabilities who have left their homes because of abuse or neglect only to end up in state institutions. Unfortunately, these same institutions have come under national scrutiny due to rampant abuse and neglect,

insufficient medical and mental health care, and inadequate educational services. These institutions include the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD) facilities, where media reported systemic sexual and physical abuse in 2007.

Despite the state's special legal duty to the children in its care who are unlikely to have an effective advocate, many fall through the cracks because Texas' youth-serving systems do not communicate with one another at even a basic level.

When no legal advocate is appointed who understands a youth's unique needs and who has the ability to engage in effective cross-system advocacy, the problems are exacerbated. In Texas, children in the permanent managing conservatorship of the foster care system are not required to have a lawyer. Those that do have a lawyer often have a lawyer not familiar with the unique advocacy that can benefit children with disabilities who are dually managed. This proposal requests continuance of a project which began in January 2010 with grant funding from The Meadows Foundation, and The Rees Jones Foundation. In 2010, The Meadows Foundation, The Rees Jones Foundation and The Commission generously supported the expansion of the project, which allowed us to add a third lawyer to the project and to build our capacity to serve youth who were not in a State Supported Living Center (SSLC) or TJJD facility but were at risk of placement in one of those institutions. In 2011, one of the three attorneys on this project was funded by a special fellowship from the Skadden Fellowship Foundation.

By the end of 2011, the project had provided legal advocacy to 140 children with disabilities in the managing conservatorship of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) who were also court-committed, or who are at risk of being court-committed, to the TJJD or State Supported Living Center (SSLC) systems. Sixty-nine of these youth were originally confined in high-security TJJD facilities or in SSLCs, and 71 were at risk of confinement in either or both categories of institution.

LADMCP has achieved many results for those youth, including improved health, treatment, education, placement and transition planning for successful adulthood. As a result of this project, youth have been able to access a variety of services that can offer long-term success in the community including assistance in locating and maintaining employment and schooling-- key factors that prevent recidivism among juvenile offenders. Our clients with intellectual disabilities are far more likely to receive Home and Community-Based Services, a Medicaid waiver program that enables them to remain connected to and involved in their communities, through the provision of community-based long term services and supports. Dually managed youth served by this grant also experience increased engagement and self-sufficiency.

By the end of 2011, the project had also provided presentations and trainings to over 1,100 attorneys, judges, caseworkers, volunteer advocates and others, both in and out of state, to foster systemic change in the agencies we work with in their treatment of dually managed youth and in their interagency coordination and planning. The trainings were designed to address at least one area of the law affecting the rights of foster children with disabilities. The overall goal of such training was to enhance the knowledge and advocacy skills of participants so that they could improve the lives of foster youth with disabilities. We provided specific training in the area of special education, mental health and transition planning. We also addressed a variety of information particularly relevant to this population, including topics such as seclusion and

restraint, transition planning, and the importance of ensuring that an effective surrogate parent is appointed to protect the special education rights of youth in foster care.

Our systemic victories affect many vulnerable youth beyond those we represent. Administrative complaints about the poor quality of special education services have resulted in required changes in the way school districts educate youth in adult correctional facilities and hospitals, and in one major urban district's implementation of federal law relative to identifying and training persons fulfilling the role of 'parent' for foster children. These victories increase the quality of special education services making these foster youth more likely to remain in the community.

Significant systemic problems remain including timely and appropriate community placement, the ability for youth to access and participate in legal proceedings that determine their services and placements, almost total lack of consistent trauma-sensitive treatment, lack of or poor constructive programming for youth in TJJD facilities, lack of available specialized treatment such as anger management training, sex offender treatment; mental health services; and substance abuse treatment.

Problems Facing Children with Disabilities in Foster Care

When family reunification is not possible and adoption does not immediately appear to be an option, children in foster care are placed under the permanent managing conservatorship (PMC) of the department. Most of the children in PMC spend years in the foster care system. The average length of time for children in long-term foster care is nearly four years. More than 80 percent of the children who have been in foster care for more than two years will end up "aging out" (i.e., turning 18) of foster care.

The average length of time in care for the children who age out or are otherwise emancipated is more than five years. During those five years, these children are placed, on average, in more than eight different foster care facilities. Often these facilities include psychiatric hospitals and residential treatment centers. The clients we serve tend to have far more than eight placements. SSLC and TJJD facilities are usually the completion of a pattern of movement from one restrictive facility to the next. They are facilities of last resort.

While conducting its study on Improving Outcomes for Children Living in PMC, Texas Appleseed found the following problems for long-term foster children:

- They move from school to school, often without the support they need.
- Their disabilities may not be diagnosed or the needed special education services may not be provided consistently.
- They may fall behind educationally because credits from a school at one placement do not transfer to a school at another placement.
- They may not receive adequate and appropriate medical treatment. They may be either overmedicated or under-medicated.
- As the children age out, they may not be aware of or ready to take advantage of services available to them. Later, if they want to utilize those services, the children may be unable to access them.
- They may have issues with DFPS related to visiting with their siblings or needing residential treatment.

One of the reasons these problems exist is that children in PMC often receive less intervention from the courts than children in temporary managing conservatorship. Unfortunately, that reduction in court intervention comes at a time when more supervision is needed. Once a child or youth is placed in PMC, it is common practice for courts to dismiss both the attorney ad litem and CASA volunteer. At the same time, court oversight decreases, as the Texas Family Code requires courts to hold hearings only every six months after PMC is granted as opposed to every four months before it is granted. In the vast majority of cases, youth in foster care who end up being placed in TJJD or SSLC environments are already in the PMC of DFPS. In a great number of cases, they do not have attorneys or advocates and also do not attend their permanency hearings. If they do have attorneys, those attorneys often are not familiar with disability-related issues or the systems with which the children come into contact.

Some improvements in overall quality of the TJJD system have been achieved recently. Still, foster youth with disabilities remain the most likely to remain in the TJJD system, as they are often unsuccessful in maneuvering through program levels in which youth are expected to “earn their way up” to release, and they do not have effective advocates to ensure their well being in the system or to advocate for more appropriate services. And, as recent developments have shown, problems still exist in TJJD despite the efforts at reform.¹

Another problem facing foster youth placed in TJJD is that many times DFPS does not play as large a role in a child’s life once that child is in TJJD. When youth arrive in TJJD, they arrive with a minimum length of stay. When that minimum is over, a review panel meets to determine whether the youth is prepared for a return to the community. A large part of a review panel’s decision to release a youth from TJJD is based on the potential ability of the youth’s new placement to keep the youth from reoffending. Often, DFPS will not actively seek a placement or work in concert with TJJD to develop an appropriate placement and plan. Without a system of support to work toward creating a viable new placement, review panels often deny a youth’s release.

Additionally, youth can receive what is called an “early transfer.” This occurs when a youth is sent to adult prison due to failure to complete his or her program at TJJD. With no advocates requesting additional services and DFPS often neglecting the youth’s needs, foster youth with disabilities sometimes are frustrated by their inability to receive accommodations in their programs. Combined with the difficulty youth with mental health disabilities or with intellectual disabilities can have in meeting the behavioral requirements to be released, foster youth with disabilities often can go directly from the state juvenile prison system to the adult prison system without ever having a chance to live in the community.

A Texas Criminal Justice Coalition video was created with the assistance of the TJJD ombudsman to put a face to the problem of children with mental health issues who are living in TJJD facilities. One can see from the video that youth are not receiving the mental health supports they desperately need. This video features Richard LaVallo, who serves as DRTx’s

¹ See “Security, Safety Issues Go Beyond Giddings, Ombudsman Says,” AUSTIN AMERICAN STATESMAN, May 3, 2012, available at <http://www.statesman.com/news/texas-politics/security-safety-issues-go-beyond-giddings-ombudsman-says-2339262.html>.

legal director, as well as individual children. To watch the video, go to <http://vimeo.com/3969231>.

2. Program Objective:

This project offers legal advocacy to youth with disabilities in the managing conservatorship of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) who also have been court-committed, or who are at risk of being court-committed, to the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD), formerly the Texas Youth Commission and to transition those youth into safe community placements with needed health, educational and vocational services.

DRTx seeks funding to continue specialized attorney ad litem advocacy for 125 foster youth for a twelve (12) month period, to ensure that their safety, health and educational needs are met in the least restrictive placement. The long-term goal of the representation is to provide the children with an opportunity to transition back into a community, family based placement with supports sufficient to give the children the chance to live independently and pursue their goals, thereby improving life outcomes for the youth served by the program.

We currently serve as attorney ad litem for a number of dually managed youth who are placed at a SSLC, and we will continue to provide legal representation to those youth. However, because of increasing demand and limited resources, any new cases we are assigned in 2012 will only serve youth with disabilities who are dually managed in the foster care system and the juvenile justice system, who are placed in TJJD facilities or are at risk of placement. As resources allow, our DRTx attorneys and advocates who are on our State Supported Living Center Issue Team, will represent dually managed youth from SSLCs.

The objectives for this project originated with the Commission, which relies on the advice of a Collaborative Council, on which Richard LaVallo, legal director of DRTx serves. The Commission has identified improved legal advocacy and judicial education as two of its primary strategies. As part of its effort to improve and reform legal advocacy, the Commission formed a work group to examine whether the needs of incarcerated foster youth were being adequately and appropriately met by the child protection and juvenile justice systems. The work group recognized that skilled ad litem representation of children in foster care by attorneys who understand disability-related issues and the multiple systems of involvement for those currently placed in institutional settings could greatly improve outcomes for the affected youth. The Commission's work group also recognized the unique position of DRTx to meet these needs.

The project goals are:

Goal 1: Ensure that living and treatment conditions are safe and appropriate, thereby improving the youth's safety and well-being.

Goal 2: Ensure that health and mental health services are adequate and appropriate to ensure health, as well as to ensure treatment when needed, thereby improving the youth's well-being.

Goal 3: Ensure that students who receive special education services receive a free appropriate public education, which includes having appropriate and individualized educational goals and receiving the instruction, supports and services that are required to make meaningful progress on

these goals, including personal goals related to transitioning to secondary educational or post-high school employment which can help improve a sense of well-being, and promote permanency for the child once placed back into a community.

Goal 4: Ensure that youth approaching release to community placement, receive wrap-around transition planning to ensure that placement is likely to be successful, which would promote permanency for the youth. Our target is to maintain community placements for at least 80 percent of DRTx clients within six months of the date those placements begin.

Goal 5: Provide training to 200 attorneys, judges and service providers on issues related to the population being served.

3. Continuation Activities for 2012-2013

The project employs two full-time staff attorneys and an attorney fellow supported by the Skadden Foundation. All three attorneys travel two days a week on average, visiting the youth they represent in each facility regularly. The attorneys meet with the youth, review medical records, speak to doctors and institutional staff, and provide zealous advocacy in the Family Court System through representation at placement review hearings, which are held at least every six months, and other hearings that are held to address other specific issues. The attorneys also help the youth participate in their own hearings. Most youth who are institutionalized had never enjoyed such an opportunity before our involvement.

In addition, the project attorneys represent these particularly vulnerable and deserving youth on issues related to abuse, neglect, safety, access to appropriate health care and special education. We routinely file TJJD grievances when there is suspicion of abuse or neglect. We also maintain cordial relationships with the superintendents and upper management of the facilities where we work and with those in TJJD's central office. We frequently bring issues to their attention and follow through to ensure those issues are addressed. We also represent youth at special education meetings, at team meetings in facilities and before the release/review panels when youth are eligible to leave the facilities. DRTx is uniquely qualified to offer those services, and they are often left unaddressed in the current system.

Systemic Goals

This project will continue to address numerous systemic problems impacting large numbers of children who are dually managed in both the foster care and TJJD systems. We regularly communicate with agency leaders from DFPS, TJJD and the Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) to address these issues, which include the following:

Placement Problems:

- Release/review panels hold it against foster children that do not have an identified placement to go to upon release from TJJD. However, DFPS generally does not search for placements until they are certain of a date on which the client will be leaving TJJD.
- When a child is transferred from TJJD, a TJJD halfway house, or a foster care placement to county jail, absolutely nothing is set up for them. First, children have no access to the money in their canteen. Since they are still under TJJD custody in a halfway house or a TJJD facility, they cannot make that money available in county jail. This means that the children have no access to extra food and, in many county jails, portions are quite

meager. Second, in many counties, there are no educational services provided to youth who are incarcerated in county jail. The local school district has a responsibility to provide special education services to youth in the county jail, but county jails often are resistant to allowing school personnel in their facilities.

- For girls, there are no mental health halfway house to provide transition into community placement.

Legal Issues:

- Very few youth in DFPS care who are placed in TJJD facilities have ever had the option of attending their court hearings in person or through phone or video conferencing. A vast majority, if not all, are very interested in doing so.
- TJJD case workers are not communicating with CPS case workers and are not providing reports to courts or parties in foster care cases.

Lack of Services:

- There is a lack of consistent trauma-sensitive treatment for young men and women with very significant trauma in their histories.
- There is a lack of constructive programming for youth in TJJD facilities after school hours. The idle time, when ordinarily youth are expected to sit quietly at their desks, can lead to behavior problems. This is exacerbated in some cases when youth are not even provided potential reading materials for this time.
- Many foster youth in TJJD do not receive sufficient specialized treatment; anger management training, including sex offender treatment; mental health services; and substance abuse treatment. This is particularly true when they have more than one treatment need.
- Few foster children in TJJD facilities have access to DFPS's Preparation for Adult Living Program, which leads to important benefits for youth after they reach age 18.
- Some youth do not feel safe in TJJD from other youth and do not trust that staff or safety plans can keep them safe.

4. Method of Evaluation:

DRTx will evaluate each client on the following criteria to determine whether there was a deficiency at the time DRTx became involved and what type of progress was made due to our advocacy. We help ensure:

1. That living and treatment conditions are safe and appropriate, thereby improving the youth's safety and well-being while incarcerated;
2. That health and mental health services are adequate and appropriate, thereby improving the youth's well-being;
3. That the student receives a free appropriate public education, which includes ensuring the youth has appropriate and individualized educational goals and receives the instruction, supports and services needed to make meaningful progress on those goals, including personal goals related to transitioning to secondary educational or post-high school employment, and ensuring permanency for the child once he or she is placed back into a community; and

4. That when approaching release to community placement, wrap-around transition planning is appropriate to ensure placement is likely to be successful, which again would promote permanency for the youth.

Furthermore, DRTx will evaluate its ability to obtain successful, community-based placements for each youth. For youth in TJJD facilities, DRTx's goal is to obtain community placement at the first opportunity that its clients are eligible for release in concert with DFPS, the agency with responsibility for placement upon release. DRTx will advocate appropriate and individualized community-based supports to make the placement work and will measure one year after its representation to determine if the youth has successfully maintained that community placement. The goal is to maintain community placements for at least 80 percent of DRTx clients within six months of the date those placements begin.

DRTx also will keep track of the numbers of attorneys and judges it trains on issues related to the population being served and maintain the goal of training at least 200 attorneys, judges and service providers. We also have a goal during this grant period, as part of our effort to train 200 attorneys, judges, and service providers, of providing training for the Commission's new crossover model court initiative. There are five counties that are in the process of adopting the model court—El Paso, McLennan, Dallas, Tarrant, and Bexar. The goal of the program is for each county to adopt unique practices for working with youth involved in both the justice system and the foster care system. We will offer training to lawyers, judges, and social service providers from each of the participating counties on the unique challenges involved in working with youth with disabilities who are involved in both the DFPS system and the justice system.

We are also looking at unique ways to receive client input. Two graduate students from the University of Texas LBJ School of Public Affairs and University of Texas School of Law have worked under the supervision of Professor Michele Deitch to develop meaningful tools to improve evaluation of this project and have developed a Youth Satisfaction Survey, Judicial Survey and Training Survey to further improve the data collected about the project's success. These surveys will be used over the next grant year.

In addition, we have conferred with the Casey Family Programs and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at the Georgetown University Public Policy Institute (CJJR) to review their Crossover Youth Practice Model. We will determine which values and outcome measures can be applied in this project recognizing that the youth we represent cross over the child welfare, juvenile justice and disability service systems. We will review our current data collection protocol to determine what other information can be collected to demonstrate the types of outcomes experienced by the youth in this project.

5. Future Funding:

We believe that we have constructed a legal service model that produces positive outcomes for the youth we represent and that it has potential to be replicated. DRTx's ultimate goal is to make this project a permanent program with a minimum annual budget of \$250,000. We have been fortunate to secure financial support and guidance from three key partners: State Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families; The Rees Jones Foundation and The Meadows Foundation. In addition, federal funds from our Protection and Advocacy for

Persons with Mental Illness program have been utilized in this project and funding from the Skadden Foundation has provided support for an attorney who works on this project.

The Rees Jones Foundation has awarded \$40,000 for an eleven month period (July 2012- May 2013). A request was submitted to The Meadows Foundation in February 2012 and is pending.

6. Budget Narrative (Include information on match):

A summary of project expenses is provided in Chart 1.

Chart 1: Budget

Dollar amount requested: The proposed grant period is for twelve (12) months beginning September 2012 and concluding August 2013. The requested amount is \$100,000.

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a.	Personnel	155,150	76,840		78,310
b.	Fringe Benefits	46,790	23,160		23,810
c.	Travel	40,000			40,000
d.	Equipment	1,620			1,620
e.	Supplies				
f.	Contractual				
g.	Construction				
h.	Other				
i.	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$243,740	\$100,000		\$143,740
j.	Indirect Charges	0	0		0
k.	Totals	\$243,740	\$100,000		\$143,740

Budget Narrative

The total 12 month project cost is \$243,740. The request to the Texas Supreme Court Children’s Commission is \$100,000. We anticipate that the current shortfall of \$46,757 will be funded by The Meadows Foundation or the Dept of Human Services (Protection and Advocacy for Individual with Mental Illness funding).

Revenue

Financial support of this project has come from three key partners and a fellowship grant over the past two years: State Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families; The Rees Jones Foundation; The Meadows Foundation; and the Skadden Foundation.

We are applying for continuation funding from all three partners for 2012. During January 2012, a funding request was submitted to the State Supreme Court Children’s Commission for \$50,000 to cover project costs from March – September 2012. This application for additional funding will cover the period of September 2012 – August 2013. The projected revenue from the Children’s Commission is listed as \$100,000 for a twelve month period in the budget above.

A funding request to The Rees-Jones Foundation was submitted February 2012 in the amount of \$75,000 for a 12 month period. We received a grant award of \$40,000 for an eleven month period (July 2012- May 2013).

The request to Meadows Foundation is for \$75,000 for a 12 month period. We are awaiting their decision.

The Skadden Foundation provides \$56,983 annually to fund a fellowship attorney to work with youth in this project. Our Skadden Fellow is funded through August 2013.

Expenditures

This project includes salaries and benefits for three full-time attorneys, travel, supplies and miscellaneous expenses.

Annual attorney salary cost for three full time attorneys is \$155,150.

Annual fringe benefits for three full time attorneys is \$46,970. Fringe benefits include social security and medicare tax, health and life insurance, dental insurance, long term care insurance, attorney liability insurance, long-term disability insurance and DRTx contribution to retirement plan.

Travel expenses are significant, because the facilities where the children live and the courts that hear their cases are scattered throughout the state and are mainly in rural areas. All project attorneys travel approximately 500 miles/week for 52 weeks per year. The projected cost of \$40,000 estimated for travel is based on actual travel costs in the prior year.

Other expenses include cell phone stipends to staff, request for client records or unrelated expenses of cases that are not anticipated as being a significant or predictable part of the budget.

While DRTx does not have any cash to support an in-kind contribution, the agency is providing the in-kind contribution of office space and supervision of the project staff by the agency's Legal Director.

Requested Grant Period: The Grant becomes effective October 1, 2012 and ends September 30, 2013, unless terminated or otherwise modified.

Amount Requested: \$100,000

Applicant must initial each of the following:

msf Applicant understands that CIP grants awarded to a governmental entity are governed by OMB Circular A-87 and that CIP grants awarded to a non profit organization are governed by OMB Circular A-110.

Msf Applicant understands that CIP funds expended must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program for which funding is sought.

Msf Applicant understands that CIP funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and must be supported by appropriate documentation.

msf Applicant understands that funding is subject to approval by the Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families.

Msf Applicant understands that funding must involve meaningful and on-going collaboration of local or statewide stakeholders.

BASIC GRANT-TAB 6

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION - OCA JUDICIAL SUPPORT

FY2013 Grant Application
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Grant Fund Category Requested: New Continued

Applicant			
Authorized Official Name:	David Slayton		
Title:	Administrative Director		
Organization:	Office of Court Administration		
Address:	205 W. 14 th St., Suite 600		
	Austin, TX 78701-1614		
Phone:	512.463.1625		
Fax:	512.463.1648		
E-mail:	David.slayton@txcourts.gov		
Financial Officer Name	Glenna Rhea Bowman	Financial Officer Title	Chief Financial Officer
Program Director Name	Marilyn Galloway	Program Director Title	Legal Programs Manager

Requestor is designated as a(n):

State Agency Non-Profit Organization

Unit of Local Government Educational Institution

Other (describe): _____

Program Type Requested: Basic Program Data Training

Program Title: OCA/CIP Partnership

1. Program Issue or Problem:

Access to the Child Protection Court Case Management System (CPCMS), a web-based case management system used by the Child Protection Courts, is an essential part of the courts operation. CPCMS allows the judges and their staff to maintain their dockets and calendars and enter data necessary for running accurate reports regarding the courts' activities. Many of the child protection courts serve areas with limited internet access. In some instances, they are unable to access CPCMS while on the bench. Wireless data cards will enable the

judges and their staff to have access to their court calendars and case information, and enter accurate data in a timely manner.

2. Program Objective:

Provide data telecommunication services to child protection court judges and staff to maintain their dockets and case information. Wireless or 'air' cards are absolutely essential for the court to access the web-based case management system data.

3. Activities:

Wireless data cards will be provided to all judges and court staff to access the web-based case management system that provides updated docket and case information.

4. Method of Evaluation:

OCA will monitor the courts access activities to ensure the courts are routinely entering data into the case management system.

5. Future Funding:

Wireless data cards are absolutely essential for the courts to access the web-based case management system data so that they may maintain their dockets and enter crucial data for performance measures. Making the courts more efficient and providing a method for them to compile data for the evaluation of their activities/performance will result in improved outcomes for the children who are served by the courts.

6. Budget Narrative (Include information on match):

Supplies – 38 aircards @ \$45 per month x 12 months = \$20,520.

In Kind match will be accrued by monitoring the staff time entering data into the case management system. The formula is:

Number of hearings* x 5 minutes per hearing to enter data / 60 minutes = hours spent entering data

Hours spent entering data x average hourly wage of court coordinator = In-Kind Match

Example: 6827 x 5 min = 34,135 minutes
34,135 / 60 min. = 568 hours

568 hours x 17.84 = \$10,133.12

*Supported by hearings report run from CPCMS

Budget

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a	Personnel				
b	Fringe Benefits				
c	Travel				
d	Equipment				
e	Supplies	\$20,520	\$20,520		
f.	Contractual				
g	Construction				
h	Other	\$6772			\$6772
i	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$27,292	\$20,520		\$6772
j	Indirect Charges				
k	Totals	\$27,292	\$20,520		\$6772

Requested Grant Period: The Grant becomes effective 10/01/12, and ends 09/31/13 unless terminated or otherwise modified.

Amount Requested: \$20,520

Applicant must initial each of the following:

_____ Applicant understands that CIP grants awarded to a governmental entity are governed by OMB Circular A-87 and that CIP grants awarded to a non profit organization are governed by OMB Circular A-110.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds expended must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program for which funding is sought.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and must be supported by appropriate documentation.

_____ Applicant understands that funding is subject to approval by the Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families.

_____ Applicant understands that funding must involve meaningful and on-going collaboration of local or statewide stakeholders.

BASIC GRANT-TAB 6

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -TEXAS REMOTE INTERPRETER (TRIP) PROJECT

FY2013 Grant Application
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Grant Fund Category Requested: New Continued

Applicant			
Authorized Official Name:	David Slayton		
Title:	Administrative Director		
Organization:	Texas Office of Court Administration		
Address:	205 W. 14 th St., Suite 600		
	Austin, Texas 78701-1614		
Phone:	(512) 463-1625		
Fax:	(512) 463-1648		
E-mail:	dslayton@txcourts.gov		
Financial Officer Name	Glenna Rhea Bowman	Financial Officer Title	Chief Financial Officer
Program Director Name	Marilyn Galloway	Program Director Title	Legal Programs Manager

Requestor is designated as a(n):

- State Agency Non-Profit Organization
 Unit of Local Government Educational Institution
 Other (describe): _____

Program Type Requested: Basic Program Data Training

Program Title: Child Protection Courts Court Interpreter Program

1. Program Issue/Objective:

The object of this program is to continue the remote site interpretation center that was originally set up to provide licensed Spanish court interpreters for child protection court hearings held by the Office of Court Administration's (OCA) child protection courts. The project was modeled on OCA's Texas Remote Interpretation Project (TRIP), which provides licensed court interpretation services in family violence cases.

The project was originally designed to address the lack of ready and reliable access to licensed court interpreters in the counties served by OCA's child protection courts. Prior to the implementation of this project, the child protection courts had to rely on ad hoc "interpreters" who did not have specialized training or other interpretation skills.

Use of an unlicensed person to interpret in a court hearing, particularly in child protection hearings that often involve complex legal and medical issues, is problematic at best. Licensed court interpreters undergo rigorous testing and pass both oral and written exams before receiving a license. They must adhere to written standards of ethics and practice and can be disciplined for violations of these standards. Use of a licensed court interpreter is always preferable to reliance on an ad hoc interpreter.

The proposed project will provide interpretation services to eligible courts by telecommunications (video-conferencing, voice over internet protocol, or by speaker-phone) with interpreters located at an office at the OCA. On-line scheduling programs will be used to automate the scheduling process. The use of telecommunications technology (videoconferencing, voice over internet protocol, or duplex speaker telephone) allows the court to communicate with a licensed court interpreter with minimal expense and effort. The court administrator can view the interpreter's schedule on-line and schedule services using the on-line program. Because the interpreter does not have to spend time traveling to the court or waiting for the case to be called, the interpreter can provide more of the highest quality interpretation service at minimal cost. This project will help reduce costs and improve access to courts for children, litigants, and witnesses in child protection cases.

Implementation:

The original grant provided interpreter services for OCA's child protection courts with a possible expansion to serve additional courts if the interpreter had excess capacity. At the end of the first four months of the original project's implementation it was determined that the court interpreter had the capacity to expand his services to cover additional courts. Effective June 11, 2012, the project was expanded to courts that hear child protection cases in counties with fewer than 500 children in the legal responsibility of the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS). OCA anticipates that the interpreter may have the ability to provide services to additional jurisdictions during the term of the proposed project. OCA will work with the Children's Commission to plan the expansion of the project to other jurisdictions.

In April of 2013, OCA and the Children's Commission will review the utilization of the project's services and determine whether the project is effective and if its utilization rate supports continued funding.

2. Activities: The project would fund:

1. The salary of a licensed Spanish court interpreter who would work 20 hours per week;
2. Purchasing necessary services (videoconferencing, telephone line, scheduling program);
3. Training of the interpreter in child protection issues; and
4. Travel related to providing technical assistance to the participating courts.

3. Method of Evaluation: The project will be evaluated by:

1. Collecting data on usage for hearings (dates of service, length of session);
2. Evaluating sub-projects that provide benefits to the courts outside the hearing or proceeding (e.g. compilation of an on-line Spanish-English glossary for child protection cases);
3. Determining the cost per service and utilization rates;

4. Tracking the disposition rates for periods before and after the project starts to determine how reliable access to an interpreter affects the timely resolution of a case;
5. Distributing a survey to DFPS caseworkers, the attorney(s) representing DFPS, the parents in the case and their counsel and CASA volunteers assigned to the case. The survey will be provided in hard copy from the bench or by mail and also be available on-line. The survey will gather information regarding the respondents' perceptions about the development of the evidence and information provided at the hearing with the use of the certified interpreter versus hearings in which they have participated where a certified interpreter was not provided; and
6. Distribute a survey to the judges who use the service to gather information regarding the judges' perception of the quality and development of the evidence and information provided at the hearing when a certified court interpreter is used versus when one is not, the judges' overall impression of the effect of the certified interpreter's services on the quality and length of the hearing and whether the availability of a certified court interpreter funded through this project made it possible for the judge to schedule the hearing more promptly than if the interpreter had not been available.

Data tracking can be done with a combination of online programs (that is, the videoconferencing and online scheduling services can capture some of the information) and, in the case of OCA child protection court associate judges, the existing CPCMS (that is, having the judges or their staff enter data into the system when an interpreter is used).

4. Budget Narrative:

A. Personnel

Position	Number of FTEs	Computation	Cost
Interpreter II	.5	\$4,666 x 12 months x .5 FTE	\$27,996.00
Total Personnel Cost:			\$27,996.00

One part-time interpreter will perform Spanish-English interpretation, over the phone or internet, for parties in child protection cases. The interpreter must be a Licensed Court Interpreter with the State of Texas.

B. Fringe Benefits

Position	Computation	Cost
Interpreter II	\$27,996 (personnel cost) x 28%	\$7,838.88
Total Fringe Benefits:		\$7,838.88

The additional personnel costs associated with the part-time Interpreter II position is 28 percent of the salary for fringe benefits.

C. Travel

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Cost
Training and technical assistance	TBD	Tuition + Airfare + Car + Rental + Per Diem	\$750.00
Total Travel Cost:			\$750.00

Over the grant period the interpreter will be sent to one approved training program concerning child protection issues. The training will increase the interpreter’s knowledge about child protection issues and may help fulfill continuing education requirements for licensure of interpreters. The interpreter may also visit child protection courts that need technical assistance regarding the use and implementation of the remote interpreter services for the court.

D. Contracts

Item	Computation	Cost
Phone service	\$20.00 per month x 12 months	\$240.00
Online calendar system	\$49 per month x 12 months	\$588.00
Online videoconferencing service	\$100 per 12 months	\$1,200.00
Total Contracts:		\$2,028 x .50=\$1,014.00

The interpreter will require one phone line. The online scheduling and online videoconferencing services will allow efficient and secure services with minimal administrative costs.

OCA’s TRIP has excess capacity in phone service, calendaring system and videoconferencing services. Funds provided under this grant will pay for half of the costs of these services that are currently being paid for with OCA’s TRIP funds

In-Kind match will be accrued by OCA headquarters and Child Protection Courts Program staff as they participate (i.e., plan, test, supervise, account, and report) in the project. Timesheets documenting the In-Kind effort will be collected during the course of the project.

E. Budget

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a	Personnel	\$27,996.00	\$27,996.00		
b	Fringe Benefits	\$7,838.88	\$7,838.88		
c	Travel	\$750.00	\$750.00		
d	Equipment	0	0		

e	Supplies	0	0		
f.	Contractual	\$1,014.00	\$1,014.00		
g	Construction	0	0		
h	Other	0	0		
i	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$37,598.88	\$37,598.88		
j	Indirect Charges	0	0		
k	Totals	\$50,131.84	\$37,598.88		\$12,532.96

Requested Grant Period: The requested grant period is from October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 unless terminated, extended or otherwise modified.

Amount Requested: \$37,598.88

Applicant must initial each of the following:

_____ Applicant understands that CIP grants awarded to a governmental entity are governed by OMB Circular A-87 and that CIP grants awarded to a non profit organization are governed by OMB Circular A-110.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds expended must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program for which funding is sought.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and must be supported by appropriate documentation.

_____ Applicant understands that funding is subject to approval by the Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families.

_____ Applicant understands that funding must involve meaningful and on-going collaboration of local or statewide stakeholders.

INSERT - TAB 7

FY2013 CIP TRAINING GRANT APPLICATIONS

TRAINING GRANT-TAB 7

SBoT CAN Conference

TOPICAL AGENDA INCLUDED BEHIND THIS SHEET

Placeholder – Application Omitted

Keynote Speakers: Howard Baldwin, Justice Eva Guzman (tentatively confirmed)

Plenary Sessions

Foster Youth Panel

The Intersection between Domestic Violence and Child Abuse

FASD in the Foster Care Courts

Case Law Update

Track for Children's Attorneys

Psychotropic Medications

Infant Toddler Mental Health

Child Well-Being as the Path to Permanence: Trauma Informed Advocacy (Ethics)

Aging Out/Return to Care

Track for Parent's Attorneys

Parental Drug Addiction

After "Gates": CPS Policy

The Ultimate Trial Notebook

Track for Attorneys Representing DFPS

Advanced Skills Training: Trial Tips, Tricks, and Techniques

()Specific topics identified as critical

Speakers include:

Connie Almeida

Barbara Elias Perciful

Diana Martinez, J. D., TexProtects

Quita Russell, Office of the Gregg County District Attorney

Michael Schulman, J.D., DFPS

Aaron Setliff, Texas Council Against Family Violence

Carole Hurley, J.D.

TRAINING GRANT-TAB 7

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -TEXAS CASA

**FY2013 Court Improvement Project
Application for FY2013 Funds**

Grantee Name: Texas CASA
Program Title: Advocacy Training and Multidisciplinary Collaboration
Grant Period: October 1, 2012– September 30, 2013
FY2013Amount: \$ 162,984
Grant: Court Improvement Project Program
Requests for Reimbursement: Due no later than 90 days after expense incurred

Program Issue

Texas, like many other states in the nation, continues to contend with systems which do not achieve goals related to the safety, well-being and permanency of children in its child protection system. Dismal results on many indicators of the most recent Child and Family Services Review point to grave concerns for children. The most recent May 2012 Texas Appleseed report finds that the under-resourced and problem plagued foster care system in Texas is particularly negligent of the needs of children in permanent managing conservatorship (PMC).

Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) partners with dependency courts, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), attorneys who represent children and families, the education system, the mental health system, the medical system and other pertinent stakeholders to ensure safety, well-being and permanency for the 22,000 children in DFPS custody served by CASA advocates. In FY 2011, there were another 24,000 children in the legal system without a CASA advocate.

CASA seeks better outcomes for all children and strives for a CASA volunteer for every child. We seek to strengthen collaboration with courts, DFPS, attorneys ad litem and other stakeholders through multidisciplinary training on critical advocacy topics. We also seek to strengthen quality advocacy through effective training and retention of CASA volunteers. This will be achieved through:

- **Increased collaboration, knowledge and understanding of critical issues affecting children.** Achieved through multidisciplinary training on relevant advocacy topics including the impact of trauma on children and families, barriers to mental health, medical, and educational services for children living in congregate care, and effective advocacy for children and families in Court Ordered Services cases.
- **Providing effective, best interests GAL and volunteer advocacy to children in the child protection system.** Achieved through core training for CASA staff on the legal

and child protection systems in Texas, and key strategies for the supervision and retention of volunteer advocates and training for CASA staff on the effective facilitation of training for new volunteers.

Therefore, Texas CASA respectfully requests CIP funding for the following projects:

Activities and Deliverables

1. **Training of Facilitators** A two-day training, TOF is designed to teach CASA staff to effectively facilitate pre-service training for new volunteers. TOF training incorporates adult-learning methods, new technology and instruction on screening of volunteers during training. Approximately 30 CASA staff will attend this training.

In addition to the two-day, traditional TOF training, National CASA has developed a *Flex Learning Volunteer Training* curriculum that gives CASA/GAL programs a flexible option in pre-service training for volunteers. The curriculum is a blended approach training that combines in-person and online delivery of information. Texas CASA will present a one-day training on the logistics of using this new pre-service training option including best practices for monitoring online discussions and facilitating classroom case studies as well as application of adult learning principles to e-learning. Approximately 40 CASA staff will attend this training.

National CASA staff will assist Texas CASA staff in the facilitation of both trainings. Texas CASA staff: Program Operations Director, Program Training Specialist, Program Operations Specialist, and Meeting and Events Planner.

Measurable Goals and Outcomes: Improved quality volunteer pre-service training, resulting in well-trained volunteers prepared to provide high quality advocacy to children, and improved volunteer retention/satisfaction.

TOF Key Learning Objectives

1. Summarize core curriculum chapters;
2. Develop practical applications for Adult Learning Principles;
3. Identify new skills for effective facilitation, including use of online curriculum;
4. Describe the impact of quality pre-service training on volunteer advocacy and; permanency outcomes.

Data collected/reported:

1. Attendee satisfaction survey delivered via hard-copy format following training with goal of 100% response and overall course rating of satisfied or better by 90% of participants.

2. Pre- and post-training assessments of key learning objectives (above), designed to measure increases in subject matter knowledge, delivered via online survey instrument with goal of 65% response for both assessments.
3. Personal contact with attendee supervisor prior to and following training regarding participation, summary of post-test scoring and recommendations for continued subject matter education and/or skill development as appropriate, with goal of 100% response.
4. Online assessment with attendee and attendee supervisor following attendee delivery of two pre-service trainings designed to identify changes in practice related to learning objectives and satisfaction surveys as completed by new volunteers trained. Goal of 65% response.

Impact to local courts and communities: Well-trained advocates appointed by the court as guardians ad litem or volunteer advocates contribute to positive outcomes for children and provide much needed attention to children within the overburdened court and child protection systems.

Describe any ongoing collaboration that will occur as part of the project: Quality pre-service training for new volunteers reinforces the important role CASA advocates play in promoting collaboration among CPS, attorneys ad litem and others in working toward best interests.

This training will also encourage local CASA programs to invite judges, attorneys ad litem, CPS staff, attorneys for parents, service providers and other stakeholders in the child protection system to participate in pre-service training for volunteers. This provides additional opportunities for collaboration with these stakeholders and systems.

2. **Core Advocacy Skills Training (CAST)** A “blended learning” curriculum with one eight (8) hour workshop and a six (6)hour interactive online e-learning module. The online training, a product of the FY 2012 partnership between Texas CASA and CIP,takes each learner through the child protection system in Texas, explaining the roles of all those in the system and covering pertinent sections of the Texas Family Code. Previously delivered only in a classroom setting, the online learning allows local CASA programs to provide this foundational training as part of pre-service training for volunteers, and with companion resources as continuing education for both staff and volunteers. As part of CAST offered through Texas CASA, the online learning cuts down on both time and travel expense related to this core training.

The volunteer management section of CAST, vital to training CASA staff in the skills needed to effectively supervise and coach volunteer advocates, is more group and process oriented and will continue to take place at an in-person session.

Texas CASA staff: Program Operations Director, Program Training Specialist, Program Operations Specialist, and Meeting and Events Planner.

Measurable Goals and Outcomes: Staff with increased knowledge and skills in achieving timely permanency, child well-being and promoting quality advocacy through volunteers. CASA volunteers with increased knowledge and skills in achieving timely permanency and ensuring child well-being.

CAST Online Key Learning Objectives

1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of hearings and the statutorily defined; timeframes for the court process in dependency cases;
2. Identify pertinent sections of the Texas Family Code;
3. Describe the roles of CPS, the Attorney *ad Litem*, and other professionals involved in a SAPCR;
4. Explain CASA's role, activity and opportunities for advocacy throughout a case.

CAST Classroom Key Learning Objectives

1. Identify ways to build a volunteer-centered organizational culture;
2. Describe methods for identifying and communicating with different personality types;
3. List key principles in volunteer supervision;
4. Explain the supervisor's role in volunteer development.

Data collected/reported:

Online Learning:

1. Participant satisfaction survey delivered via online survey instrument prior to in-person training with goal of 100% response and overall course rating of satisfied or better by 90% of participants.
2. Indicators of online course completion and demonstration of knowledge and understanding of key learning objectives are built in to the training modules. Texas CASA will obtain individual and aggregate data based on participants enrolled in CAST with goal of 100% response.
3. Personal contact with attendee supervisor within 21 days following training to provide feedback regarding participation, summary of online learning indicators and recommendations for continued subject matter education and/or skill development as appropriate, with goal of 100% response.
4. Online assessment with attendee and attendee supervisor 6 months following training to identify changes in practice related to learning objectives. Goal of 65% response.

Classroom Training:

1. Participant satisfaction survey delivered via hardcopy format following training with goal of 100% response and overall course rating of satisfied or better by 90% of participants.
2. Pre- and post-training assessments of key learning objectives, designed to measure increases in subject matter knowledge, delivered via hardcopy format at the beginning and end of training, with goal of 100% response and post-training aggregate scores which demonstrate improvement of 30% or higher.
3. Personal contact with attendee supervisor within 21 days following training to provide feedback regarding participation, summary of post-test scoring and recommendations for continued subject matter education and/or skill development as appropriate, with goal of 100% response.
4. Online assessment with attendee and attendee supervisor 6 months following training to identify changes in practice related to learning objectives. Goal of 65% response.

Impact to local courts and communities: CAST provides foundational advocacy training for CASA staff and volunteers that results in improved outcomes for children. Stronger and more comprehensive permanency recommendations and explanations supporting these recommendations in CASA court reports will assist judges with better decision making for children. Improved collaboration between CASA, CPS, AAL and parent attorneys due to greater systems understanding.

Describe any ongoing collaboration that will occur as part of the project: CAST is designed to promote case collaboration through enhanced understanding of the child protection system by CASA staff and volunteers, enabling opportunities for shared information, concerns and strategies for achieving timely permanency and addressing child well-being (better placements, more services, appropriate services, and an increased likelihood of the child's participation in court review hearings/youth court reports). CASA programs are also encouraged to share the online portion of CAST with local stakeholders.

3. **Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training** Texas CASA will host six (6), two-day regional trainings across the state to an audience of CASA program staff and volunteers, regional CPS staff, attorneys for children and parents, child placing agency staff and other regional stakeholders as identified (attendance at each training anticipated to average 60 persons). These comprehensive trainings are designed to strengthen multidisciplinary collaborative partnerships by providing relevant training related to positive outcomes for children in the following areas:

- Facilitating trauma-based education for families and relatives

- Mental health, medical and educational advocacy for children living in congregate care facilities
- Advocating for children in cases where legal custody remains with parents or caregivers while specific services are ordered by the court
- Leveraging the revised statewide CASA/CPS Memorandum of Understanding

In addition to the scheduled training, participants will have the opportunity to network during two lunches and in the evenings. Combined attendance for all trainings is estimated at 300-360 persons. As the trainings are being offered regionally, Texas CASA will have the opportunity to tailor trainings to the specific needs of each area.

Texas CASA respectfully requests CIP funding support for a portion of the total project cost, including the development and presentation of 8 hours of training, lodging, meals and meeting expenses for one night and training materials. We are seeking additional support from other funders to complete the project budget.

1. Facilitating Trauma-Based Education with Families

Texas CASA will present a four-hour, introductory training on the role advocates and workers play in bridging the information gap around trauma-informed care, specifically trauma-based parenting. Based on the innovative and research-based model of working with vulnerable children and their families developed at the Institute of Child Development at TCU, participants will be introduced to Empowering, Connecting and Correcting Principles as part of the Trust-Based Parenting: Creating Lasting Changes in Your Child's Behavior curriculum.

Participants will learn how this intervention model can be introduced to parents, kinship providers, adoptive parents, foster parents and other caregivers. They will learn how to serve as encouragers as adults learn trauma-based parenting strategies and practical problem solving skills, remaining sensitive to the changes these new approaches may represent.

In conjunction with this training, Texas CASA will produce a Parent/Caregiver Guide to Trauma-Based Parenting Resources. This resource can be used by a variety of organizations in their work with children and families and will be provided at no cost to organizations or families. Texas CASA will also provide each participating organization with a copy of the four-hour instructional DVD Trust-Based Parenting: Creating Lasting Changes in Your Child's Behavior to use in ongoing training of advocates and other stakeholders.

2. Special Advocacy Needs of Children Living in Congregate Care

Utilizing updated portions of a comprehensive curriculum developed to train CASA staff and volunteers on the special advocacy needs of children living in residential centers or long-term care, combined with resources from the recently released Texas CASA Permanency for Youth Toolkit, Texas CASA will present a four-hour training on specific mental health,

medical and educational needs of children in RTCs, resources and tools to identify service deficits and opportunities and strategies for effective advocacy.

Participants will engage in interactive learning activities designed to help CASA and CPS work together to ensure that children receive appropriate care and services within residential treatment centers, including:

- psychiatric care, counseling and medication management, including the importance of psychotropic medication parameters, psychotropic medication utilization review and non-pharmacological interventions
- necessary medical services, routine health care and culturally sensitive personal care
- quality education tailored to specific learning needs and prior educational performance

Participants will each receive a copy of the Permanency for Youth Toolkit and Advocating for Youth in Residential Treatment Centers Manual.

3. Advocacy in Court Ordered Services Cases

As allegations, investigations, and substantiated findings of abuse or neglect continue to increase, judges across the state have become mindful of the option of Court Ordered Services (COS) for cases in which a likelihood of reasonable amelioration of risk factors to the safety and well-being of children exists within the family, or when parents choose to place their children temporarily with a relative.

While CASA programs have not traditionally been appointed to cases where CPS is not granted legal custody, more judges are asking their local CASA programs to accept assignment to these non-custody cases as another layer of monitoring and advocacy for at risk children. As more programs accept COS appointments, there is a need for CASA staff and volunteers to be trained in the unique aspects of these cases, including a greater level of family and in home involvement and family-centered advocacy.

The Travis County Model Court began a pilot project working COS cases in the spring of 2012. The goals of CASA appointment in Travis County COS cases included:

- Expediting resolution of COS cases, improving judicial oversight and management
- Implementing predictable processes and timeframes of hearings in COS cases
- Reducing the number of cases which transition from COS to TMC
- Securing better outcomes for children and families

Texas CASA will enlist judges across the state who currently appoint CASA to COS cases as well as programs serving in this role to assist in the development of training content and template resources related to appointment, roles and responsibilities and court reports. The training will provide a foundation for programs seeking to serve children through this emerging model of court practice.

4. Leveraging Statewide CASA/CPS MOU

Texas CASA, in conjunction with DFPS, began working in 2012 to revise the MOU that addresses the working relationship between CASA and CPS. The statewide MOU has always been used as a starting point for local offices to create their own MOUs, tailored to regional needs and practices.

The newest version of the statewide MOU will address changes that have occurred within the Legislature during the past two sessions related to the rights and responsibilities of both parties, as well as other changes designed to enhance the professional working relationships between CASA and CPS across the state. A final, signed MOU is anticipated in early 2013. Texas CASA will work with regional CPS directors to provide facilitated, team-based reviews and discussions around the new MOU at each of the regional trainings.

Using the CASA/CPS MOU as a basis for developing further collaboration, participants will be encouraged to use this as a model for developing additional working agreements with other stakeholders, including:

- mental health providers
- parent, kinship and foster care organizations
- child placing agencies and RTCs
- attorneys ad litem

Texas CASA staff: Program Operations Director, Director of Public Policy and Outreach, Program Operations Manager, Program Training Specialist, Senior Program Services Specialist, Program Operations Specialist, and Meeting and Events Planner.

Measurable Goals and Outcomes: The goal of the Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training project is to provide professional training which enhances the individual advocacy knowledge and skill level of participants, as well as strengthens the working relationships between local CASA programs and local CPS offices, attorneys ad litem, and other local and regional stakeholders in pursuit of better outcomes for child victims of abuse and neglect.

Key Learning Objectives of Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training:

1. Facilitating Trauma-Based Education with Families

- a. Explore the impact of trauma on children and families;
- b. Identify principles for parenting trauma impacted children;
- c. Describe parenting methodology proven effective with child victims that will create lasting changes in the child's behavior;
- d. Implement a strategy in each local CASA program to support and encourage parents regarding attachment with their child.

2. Special Advocacy Needs of Children Living in Congregate Care

- a. Identify specific mental health, medical and educational needs of children in congregate care;
- b. Use available tools and resources to assess individual treatment plans and practice;
- c. Advocate effectively across systems to ensure appropriate services are provided.

3. Advocacy in Court Ordered Services Cases

- a. Develop broad understanding, including the legal definition of Court Ordered Services (COS) cases and identify differences from TMC cases;
- b. Identify appropriate avenues of advocacy within COS/FBSS cases including enhanced family engagement and support;
- c. Engage with local judges regarding practice and policies related to CASA/GAL appointment in COS cases;
- d. Identify ways CASA can bolster efforts through advocacy and effective work within families in COS cases to divert children from coming into care.

4. Leveraging Statewide CASA/CPS MOU

- a. Identify changes and revisions from previous MOU;
- b. Identify and address limitations and deficits in current collaborative practice;
- c. Develop plan for creating enhanced working agreements between local stakeholders.

Data collected/reported:

1. Participants will complete an evaluation measuring training satisfaction and achievement of learning objectives (above), as well as relevance and application via online survey instrument, with goal of 75% response, with an overall course rating of satisfied or better by 90% of participants.
2. Texas CASA will administer 6-month post-training follow-up evaluations, eliciting specific indicators of practice change related to training, use of resources as well as anecdotal positive outcomes impact, with a goal of 65% response.

Impact to local courts and communities: The trainings will enhance the knowledge and skill level of court advocates and other system participants, contributing to better outcomes for children. As participants gain better understanding of the research, data and evidence-based practices related to the impact of trauma on children and families and special needs of children in congregate care, they bring this understanding into their work with children, including court advocacy. As courts and communities continue to address the impact of foster care, participants will understand the criticality of advocacy in cases where the court orders services and appoints CASA/GALs without legal custody awarded to CPS. Positive working relationships between CASA, CPS and other agencies contribute to quality court advocacy.

Describe any ongoing collaboration that will occur as part of the project: The trainings will bring together a multidisciplinary audience to strengthen knowledge and understanding

and inform practice around critical advocacy areas. Participants will be encouraged to host follow-up trainings with staff, CASA volunteers and other regional stakeholders (judges, attorneys ad litem, foster parent organizations, child placing agencies) with the resources provided.

Texas CASA will consult with judges, attorneys, CPS, Casey Family Services and other content experts in developing curriculum and planning training presentations.

Budget Narrative (describes in narrative form how the money will be spent)

Personnel/Fringe:

Salary and fringe costs of the CIP Grant are allocated to the activities listed above, according to time spent on each activity.

Travel:

Travel and lodging for the Program Operations Director, Director of Public Policy and Outreach, Program Operations Manager, Program Operations and Training Specialist, and the Event Planner for trainings, allocated by participation at each activity.

Supplies

Supplies include supporting DVDs, toolkits, manuals, other materials and printing for all training events.

Contractual

Contractual costs include meeting fees and lodging for participants at the following trainings: Training of Facilitators, Core Advocacy Skills Training, and Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training. Speaker fees and associated costs for Multidisciplinary Advocacy Training.

- A. Personnel (applicant must submit a job description for each person who will be paid with CIP funds and time keeping records must be submitted for reimbursement)
- B. Fringe (includes payroll taxes, retirement and health benefits)
- C. Travel (all travel receipts will be required for reimbursement)
- D. Equipment (all receipts for equipment will be required for reimbursement)
- E. Supplies (all receipts for supplies will be required for reimbursement)
- F. Contractual (evidence of contracts, rates paid to speakers and other contracts may be required for reimbursement)
- G. Construction (not applicable)
- H. Other

Budget detail for full FY2013 Grant

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
A	Personnel	\$104,077	\$71,982	\$32,095	
B	Fringe Benefits	25,635	18,012	7,623	
C	Travel	8,350	2,450	5,900	
D	Equipment	0	0	0	
E	Supplies	24,010	14,510	9,500	
F	Contractual	96,504	56,030	40,474	
G	Construction	0	0	0	
H	Other	0	0	0	
I	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$258,576	\$162,984	\$95,592	
J	Indirect Charges	0	0	0	
K	Totals	\$258,576	\$162,984	\$95,592	

TRAINING GRANT-TAB 7

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -TEXAS CENTER FOR THE JUDICIARY (TCJ)

**FY2013 Court Improvement Project
Grant Application**

Grantee Name: Texas Center for the Judiciary
Program Title: Judicial Education for Child Protection
Grant Period: October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013
FY2013 Request: \$595,924
Grant: Court Improvement Project Program

AWARD ACTIVITIES

Grant Fund Category Requested: New Continued

INTRODUCTION

The Texas Center for the Judiciary (Texas Center) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that provides specialized judicial education and training opportunities for active, retired and former Texas appellate, district and county court at law judges, as well as associate judges and court personnel. The Texas Center is designated by the Court of Criminal Appeals as the official registrar of continuing judicial education.

The mission of the Texas Center, *Judicial Excellence Through Education*, is exemplified by providing strong leadership in education and training so that a qualified and knowledgeable judiciary and staff may administer justice with fairness, efficiency and integrity.

I. PROGRAM ISSUE

The Texas court system has been described as one of the most complex in the United States. The system consists of both trial courts and appellate courts. The trial courts are broken down into the county courts and the district courts. These can be further divided into justice of the peace courts and municipal courts. There is no uniform jurisdiction among the courts at each level but rather one must refer to the individual statute that established each court in order to determine jurisdiction. In some areas, district courts have jurisdiction over child welfare cases, in other areas, statute has given the county court at law jurisdiction over these cases, and in many areas, there is concurrent jurisdiction between the county court at law and the district court. In urban areas, district courts have been created that have specialized family law dockets. Texas also has 17 specialized Child Protection Courts covering 130 rural counties with judges who have a sole focus on these cases.

Child welfare cases differ from typical legal cases and require time, effort and experience for judges to be able to understand how each specific hearing should work in order to be able to achieve safety, permanency and well-being for the children involved. Because of the range of judicial experience, expertise, and understanding of the various issues involved in child welfare cases and because of the vital role judges play in determining positive outcomes for children, youth and families, the Texas Center for the Judiciary will endeavor to ensure that all new and experienced judges in the state receive the necessary information about how to handle child protection litigation. The Texas Center will work with the Supreme Court Commission for

Children, Youth and Families to identify the basic information that less experienced judges need as well as specialized information to help more veteran judges hone particular skills. Additionally, the Texas Center will work with the Commission to promote collaboration between the judiciary and other stakeholders involved in child welfare to ensure engagement, dialogue and shared practices between groups.

II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The Texas Center's proposed training activities include the following:

1. Texas Permanency Summit – The Texas Center, in collaboration with Texas Appleseed and the Commission, will hold a multi-disciplinary team training to facilitate collaboration and dialogue between the courts and child welfare professionals in order to improve permanency outcomes for children in the child welfare system.
2. Child Welfare Judicial Conference – This conference will target judges throughout the state who hear cases involving child welfare. In addition to general sessions, the conference will include a specialized session for CPC judges, a session for new or less-experienced judges on the basics of child protection cases as well as tracks for urban and rural judges
3. Education Summit – The Texas Center will work with the Commission and selected members of the Commission's Education Committee to plan and hold an Education Summit in FY2013. The Summit will encourage collaboration between the education, child welfare, and the court systems to improve education outcomes for youth in foster care.
4. Implicit Bias Conference – The Texas Center will work with the Commission's Judicial Disproportionality Workgroup to plan and hold the fourth Implicit Bias training for Texas judges. This conference will explore the science behind automatic biases and the implications for the court system and the disproportionate representation of children of color in child welfare.
5. Trauma-Informed Care/Psychotropic Medication Summit – The Center will work with the Commission and Casey Family Programs to plan a multidisciplinary Summit on trauma-informed care/psychotropic medication and foster youth. The conference will occur in the fall of FY2014 and a planning committee will be established and begin to meet during FY2013.
6. National Conferences – The Texas Center will process and facilitate Texas judges' attendance at conferences sponsored by national training organizations. These conferences will give Texas judges a broader perspective on the current issues faced in their own court rooms as well as give them a chance for collaboration with a different set of peers. Concurrently, the positive practices being applied in Texas can be brought to a national setting.

7. Judicial Technical and Administrative Assistance – The Texas Center will make funds available for data collection and analysis, training development, and additional administrative/technical assistance as needed throughout the year.

A. III. Outputs / Deliverables

The Texas Center will deliver the following training events which will train over ____ judges, pursuant to the 2012 grant agreement:

- Plan and implement one Texas Permanency Summit;
- Plan and implement one Child Welfare Judicial Conference ;
- Plan and implement one Education Summit;
- Plan and implement one Implicit Bias Conference;
- Plan one Psychotropic Medication Summit to be held in fall of 2014
- Provide scholarships and travel for 30 judges and other stakeholders to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges' 75th Annual Conference, July, 2013 in Seattle;
- Provide scholarships and travel for judges to attend national or out-of-state education opportunities for judges and/or other stakeholders to attend programs which further promote the Commission's goals and strategies;
- Provide fiscal and technical assistance to the Children's Commission via the Judicial Technical and Administrative Assistance Program

The following sections provide an explanation of each program's specific objectives along with a detailed narrative of each program.

1. Texas Permanency Summit

The Texas Permanency Summit will take place on October 8-10, 2012. The intention of this Summit is to encourage judicial leadership in restoring a sense of urgency as well as maintaining momentum in helping the more than 30,000 children in the care of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services quickly find permanent homes. As a recently released analysis of Texas courts by Texas Appleseed shows, there is a clear correlation between courts' consistent implementation of best practices and better outcomes for children. However, while judges have a great deal of influence, they work within the broader system of child welfare. In order for systemic change to occur, more disciplines must be included in the conversation.

The Permanency Summit will include judicially-led, multidisciplinary teams from jurisdictions across the state. In addition to judges, teams will consist of CPS staff, prosecuting attorneys, CASA supervisors, and child and parent attorneys. The conference will feature presentations by judges and other professionals, moderated panel discussions, and facilitated small group discussions intended to provide insight on best practices that fit each jurisdiction. The conference will also help jurisdictions to identify common concerns, create plans to improve current processes, and explore solutions that will lead to more timely permanency for children and youth in care.

The Texas Center plans to involve more than 200 participants and faculty in the Summit.

2. Child Welfare Judges Conference

The Child Welfare Judges Conference will target judges throughout the state who are involved in hearing cases that directly affect the lives of children and their families. In Texas, more than 350 judges have jurisdiction to hear child protection cases across 254 counties that have incredible diversity – from geography to resources to language. With Texas’ highly fragmented court system, it becomes vitally important to bring together the judges who hear child welfare cases to discuss best practices and share common solutions.

The Child Welfare Judicial Conference will have several new components this year. The conference will include training specifically for the 17 Child Protection Court (CPC) judges. Also, in order to be more responsive to the diverse needs of the judges involved in child welfare, the Texas Center will have a pre-conference session dedicated to providing training on some of the central legal practices and concepts unique to child protection cases. This session will target new and newly assigned judges and may include NCJFCJ Child Abuse and Neglect Institute (CANI) curriculum, materials, and/or faculty. In addition to general sessions, the conference will feature breakout sessions for rural and urban judges.

The Texas Center will work the Commission to develop planning committees for the conference sessions in order to get specific input from the judges on curriculum that will best suit their needs. Planning committees will also include other relevant stakeholders as needed.

This conference will not only provide necessary education but also foster candid discussion to allow participants to share their experiences with other judges who hear similar cases and promote the generation of common solutions.

3. Education Summit

Children and youth in foster care face a number of educational challenges, including multiple residences and school changes, appointments such as court appearances or other case-related appointments that must be attended during school, and previous school instability. These obstacles can, for large number of foster youth, lead to poor education outcomes. Multiple studies have found that less than 60% of youth in foster care finish high school before leaving care and only about 3% of youth obtain a bachelor’s degree within a few years of emancipation (Northwest Alumni Study). The Commission’s Education Committee recognized the importance of this issue for youth in Texas and brought together more than 100 multidisciplinary stakeholders over a two-year period to develop best practices to encourage school stability and positive outcomes for foster youth.

The Education Summit will target representatives from education, child welfare and court systems to focus on the importance of school stability for youth in the foster care system and on specific practices that can be implemented to improve the likelihood of educational success for children in care. The Texas Center will work with the Commission, members of the Commission’s Education Committee, and other identified stakeholders to create the curriculum. The training will be presented over 1.5 days in February, 2013 and intends to include between 100-125 participants.

4. Disproportionality: Implicit Bias in Judicial Decision-Making Conference

African American children in Texas are disproportionately represented in the child welfare system and receive disparate services. Relative to the number of children of each race/ethnicity investigated for abuse/neglect, African American children in Texas are more likely than Anglo children to be removed from their homes and are more likely to be removed from their homes instead of receiving Family Preservation Services.

The Implicit Bias Conference will present participants with scientific information on neuroscience and how persistent and pervasive implicit racial attitudes can affect decision making. The conference will also explore current issues surrounding implicit racial bias and the law. Judges who participate in the Implicit Bias in Judicial Decision-Making training will be better equipped to ensure their jurisdiction's ability to effectively analyze barriers, challenges, and opportunities to reducing this problem. Better trained judges can then work to reduce disproportionate representation and disparate treatment of children and families of color in the child welfare system.

This conference will be held in spring of 2013 and will include roughly 35 participants. The Texas Center will continue to work with the Commission's Judicial Disproportionality Working Group to develop curriculum and learning objectives.

5. Trauma-Informed Care and Psychotropic Medication Summit

Children entering the foster care system have often been exposed to violence, neglect, poverty, substance abuse, inadequate health care, and other factors that negatively impact their social and emotional development. These children often display mental and behavioral health problems that lead to treatment with psychotropic medications. Children and youth in the foster care system are often prescribed psychotropic medications 2.7 to 4.5 times more than children who are not in foster care (US GAO Report, 2011). This Summit will address the efforts that Texas has undertaken in the past six years to address the overutilization of psychotropic medications in foster care. One of the key measures has been the promotion and integration of the use of trauma-informed care. The Summit will also address the impact of trauma on children in foster care and give participants a better understanding of effective, evidence-based practices to support healing.

The Texas Center will work with the Commission and Casey Family Programs to plan a multidisciplinary conference on this topic that will take place in October of 2013.

6. Conferences sponsored by national organizations or other states

By attending conferences sponsored by national organizations or other states, Texas judges and other stakeholders have opportunities to take advantage of both learning about ideas and innovations from colleagues from around the country as well as sharing Texas' successes in handling cases involving child abuse and neglect.

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) Annual Conference, which will occur in July 2013 in Seattle, has always been a particular beneficial event for members of the Texas judiciary and we intend to send up to 30 judges to participate in this event.

Additionally, the Texas Center will work with the Commission to identify other trainings that will be relevant and worthwhile for Texas judges.

The Texas Center has provided scholarship opportunities for Texas judges to attend national programs for almost a decade and we have developed a streamlined process for managing conference announcements, scholarship applications, reimbursements and conference evaluation and follow-up.

6. Judicial Technical Assistance and Speaker/Trainer Development

The Texas Center will provide judicial technical assistance (JTA) to address moving children to permanency. JTA consists of assistance from many sources, including the Jurist in Residence, OCA, CPPP, and perhaps other entities to help courts, jurisdictions or counties analyze data related to foster care and child protection, provide subject matter expertise (beyond data analysis) on judicial practice or other court-related issues, to convene meetings, or hold round tables, and may include associated expenses. The Texas Center will also make funds available to judges to help develop and hold local training or support projects that promote training concerning pertinent child welfare issues.

B. Outcomes

The Texas Center's proposed programs are designed to achieve the following general outcomes which are applicable to items 1-5:

- Train judges who hear child protection cases in order to improve the timeliness and quality of court hearing;s
- Assist judges who attend the training to satisfy continuing education requirements;¹
- Provide judges and multidisciplinary stakeholders with information about best practices to improve permanency in their jurisdictions;
- Provide judges and multidisciplinary stakeholders with information on trauma and trauma-informed services and how to incorporate these services into court practices;
- Provide judges with training on disproportionality and race in the child welfare
- Provide judges and multidisciplinary stakeholders with information and training to improve education outcomes for children and youth in foster care.
- Assist with the implementation of new practices based on learning at a training event.

The grant deliverables will lead to the following outcomes:

1. The jurisdictions and stakeholders trained at the Permanency Summit will demonstrate improved understanding of best practices for youth permanency and, following the conference, will implement at least one new practice learned.

¹ Tex. Gov't Code 22.110, Judicial Instruction Related to Family Violence, Sexual Assault, and Child Abuse, requires "each district judge, judge of a statutory county court, associate judge appointed under Chapter 54 of this code or Chapter 201, Family Code, master, referee, and magistrate to complete at least eight hours of training within the judge's first term of office of the judicial officer's first four years of service." Each judge and judicial officer must "complete an additional three hours of training during each additional term in office or four years of service." Additionally, the Texas Center is a licensed provider of continuing education units for social workers.

2. Increase in knowledge on relevant issues following participation in Child Welfare Judicial Conference. Participants will also be able to discuss behavior change and adoption and implementation of practice change based on training.
3. Participants in Implicit Bias Conference will demonstrate increased understanding of implicit bias and the role of the court system in disproportionality in child welfare. Participants will be able to discuss behavior changes implemented following the training.
4. Cross-training with multi-disciplinary stakeholders will lead to increased collaboration and information sharing in participating jurisdictions.
5. Participants in Education Summit will demonstrate increased knowledge on issues and best practices for education stability for youth in care. Participants will adopt at least one practice or behavior change due to training.

C. Data

Method of Evaluation

The Texas Center will build into its training programs an ongoing evaluative and improvement process to ensure quality instruction, training effectiveness, and hold itself accountable to stakeholders. The Texas Center will strengthen its method of evaluation by conducting a thorough pre-training needs assessment; developing specific, measurable learning objectives; using learning objectives to identify critical course content; and measuring the effectiveness of the training through participants' satisfaction, learning acquisition, behavioral changes, as well as longer term impacts to the safety, permanency, and well-being of children and families.

As an initial step in the program planning process, the Texas Center will conduct a thorough needs assessment. The needs assessment will occur through planning committees comprised of chosen representatives of the disciplines to be trained. The planning committees will offer their input on what topics and issues should be priorities for the conferences. If additional information regarding training needs is required, Texas Center staff will prepare questionnaires for judges and stakeholders relevant to curriculum development.

Prior to each training, staff will carefully assess and establish the learning objectives for each training session and create instruments to evaluate the achievement of the learning objectives. There will be pre- and post-training tests in order to gauge levels of knowledge and understanding of a topic before a session or conference and after a session or conference. These tests will allow the Texas Center to know whether participants in a training learned what was intended and to what extent knowledge was increased.

In general, survey instruments will also collect information to measure participants' reactions, including participants' perceptions of the training content, trainer/instructor performance, satisfaction with course materials, etc., and intended behavior changes. Each session will have its own unique evaluation instrument tailored according to the session learning objectives and reflective of the specific content of the course material.

To ascertain more in-depth evaluative data to help guide the direction of future training opportunities, the Texas Center will conduct interviews with selected participants or focus groups at intervals following the training. The post-training discussions will be an avenue to collect additional information regarding the trainings' relevance and how it might be improved to increase its usefulness to the audience's day-to-day activities, how the training resulted in practice or behavior changes, what additional resources might be necessary before participants can implement changes, and what additional training would be beneficial to improve outcomes for children and families. If focus groups are not possible, the Texas Center will distribute questionnaires to participants at selected intervals following trainings in order to ascertain the extent to which participants have applied the learning and changed their behavior. These interactions with training participants will be ongoing in order to assess training effectiveness.

Finally, the Texas Center will work with the Commission and other stakeholders to collect data and quantifiable performance measures around aspects such as rate to permanency, rates of reunification, assignment of CASAs, percentage of cases in which youth participate in hearings, etc. Data will be measured specific to jurisdictions where judges and stakeholders participate in trainings.

The Texas Center will also continue to collect and report on the following outputs measures:

- Number of Continuing Judicial Education hours offered;
- Number of Family Violence hours offered; and
- Number of judges trained.

III. IMPACT TO LOCAL COURTS AND COMMUNITIES

A. Ongoing collaboration

The Texas Center will collaborate with a broad range of stakeholders during all stages of program planning and implementation. Because of the nature of the CIP training programs, the development of the curriculum for each of the conferences requires input from representatives from a variety of disciplines and organizations involved in child welfare.

In the planning process for the Permanency Summit, the Texas Center worked with Texas Appleseed, DFPS, Casey Family Programs, Texas CASA, as well as judicial representatives.

The Implicit Bias Conference was developed by the Judicial Disproportionality Working Group, established by the Commission and made up of judges, as well as cross-system representatives. This Working Group met repeatedly to discuss the content and curriculum of the Implicit Bias Conference and brought together multiple viewpoints and ideas to create an innovative and successful program.

The Child Welfare Summit program will require several months of intensive planning and will include a number of separate planning committees due to its numerous elements. The Texas Center plans to collaborate with the Commission, the Office of Court Administration, NCJFCJ, DFPS, as well as a number of representatives from the judiciary.

The Education Summit will be a collaborative effort between the Texas Center, members of the Commission's Education Committee, and key stakeholders within the education community.

The planning process for the Psychotropic Medication Summit will include collaboration with Casey Family Programs as well as DFPS and other system stakeholders.

B. Match

Judges and other professionals will donate their professional time as attendees to the above projects. Attendees will receive their usual salary from their employer while attending. If employer did not pay attendee's salary while participating, then applicant would have to pay attendee's salary. Per agreement, TCJ is not required to match technical assistance funds.

**Texas Center for the Judiciary CIP Training Grant
FY2013**

Project Budget:

Summary

	Texas Center CIP Grant				
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a	Personnel	\$102,650.00	\$102,650.00		
b	Fringe	\$28,742.00	\$28,742.00		
c	Travel	\$306,752.00	\$306,752.00		
d	Equipment				
e	Supplies	\$85,900.00	\$85,900.00		
f	Contractual	\$24,000.00	\$24,000.00		
g	Construction				
h	Other	\$268,372.00	\$47,880.00		\$220,492.00
i	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$816,416.00	\$595,924.00		
j	Indirect Charges				
k	Totals	\$816,416.00	\$595,924.00		

1. Budget Narrative -

Salaries:

Program Director (40%) and part-time Program Assistant (100%) manage the everyday activities related to the training program. The job duties related to these positions include: (1) Working with appropriate committees and partners to plan innovative and relevant program curriculum; (2) facilitating collaboration as necessary to steer the program; (3) facilitating all aspects of conference planning including identifying, corresponding and confirming faculty; collecting and assimilating course materials; drafting course descriptions and designing program schedules; developing marketing materials; working with hotel and conference staff to ensure conference room set-up, meals and audio-visual needs; (4) developing and implementing appropriate evaluation instruments and learning objectives; and (5) completing other assignments as needed to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the program. The Program Administrator (10%) will assist with curriculum planning and conference coordination as needed.

The Executive Director (10%) directs the efforts of the Texas Center for the Judiciary to ensure fulfillment of its mission statement and achievement of all CIP grant funded objectives. The Executive Director is responsible for overall operations, general staff supervision, budget management, planning and organization of judicial education.

The Associate Director (10%) negotiates all conference contracts and oversees site logistics for all Texas Center programs and meetings, including those funded by the CIP grant. The Associate Director serves as liaison for the Texas Center and Judicial Section Boards of Directors and all committees and assists in office management and administrative duties assigned by the Executive Director.

The Registrar (10%) maintains the database of all Continuing Judicial Education and Family Violence records for judges as well as continuing legal education for court support personnel. This position further supports CIP grant funded programs and activities by registering and confirming all conference participants as well as managing CJE hours for participants.

The Financial Officer (6%) handles most daily financial duties of TCJ in compliance with current grant rules and conditions. This includes setting up and maintaining controls and records of materials, human resources, and financial transactions. Further supporting all CIP grant funded activities, this position also uses QuickBooks Accounting, Excel, and Access database programs for accounting and record keeping.

The Conference Coordinator (15%) works with the Associate Director to plan and organize every aspect of the Texas Center's judicial conferences, meetings, seminars, and specially funded projects, including all CIP grant-funded activities.

The Financial Associate (20%) assists in the organization of documents and recording of transactions which enables the preparation of a monthly request for reimbursement.

Total = \$102,650

Fringe Benefits:

The fringe benefits are set at a rate of 28% of total salaries. These include health, life, and disability insurance. Fringe benefits also include FICA, retirement benefits, and worker's compensation insurance. Total = \$28,742

Travel:

Travel expenses have been budgeted in accordance with the current per diem rates approved by the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. The expenses outlined in the budget are necessary to provide for participants, faculty and staff to attend the Permanency Summit (200 participants), Child Welfare Judges Conference (115 participants), Implicit Bias Conference (35 participants), Education Summit (125 participants), NCJFCJ Annual Conference, and additional training events to be determined (estimated at 5 scholarships). Faculty, staff and participants will be reimbursed for hotel, meals, and mileage costs, or in some cases flights, as appropriate.

Budgeted travel is based on costs from previous years including estimated number of attendees. Lodging costs are based on the estimated number of nights participants will be required to stay in order to fully participate in a program as well as the predicted number of participants. Meals are based on the per diem rate (adjusted to take travel days and conference provided meals into consideration), the estimated numbers of days of training

and the predicted number of participants. Flights, mileage, parking and taxi costs are based on estimates considering current reimbursement rates and past conference expenditures.

Travel also includes breakfasts, lunches, and breaks provided at conferences. Breaks are estimated to cost between \$5-9 per participant (depending on service provided), breakfasts typically cost between \$14-\$18 per participant and lunch costs range between \$21-\$25. These charges also include the cost of hotel conference room usage for breaks, meals, and all conference presentations.

Total = \$366,252.

Supplies:

Supplies include both basic office supplies for the Texas Center as well as conference specific supplies including pens, notebook paper, binders/folders, name badges, labels, etc. Other expenses include brochure design and conference related printing expenses, mailing and shipping expenses, and conference A/V expenses. Conference booklets, faculty packets, registration table supplies, name badges, etc. are all shipped to the site in advance of the conference.

Total all supplies = \$26,400

Contractual:

For some of the training events, the Texas Center will pay negotiated speaker's fees to engage particular nationally known experts and professionals to instruct in their areas of knowledge. Total = \$24,000

Other:

This category includes those all of those conference/event expenses and operating/administrative items that cannot be specifically categorized as office or conference supplies.

1. Rent/Utilities are to provide office space for the program personnel and charges are allocated to the grant based on a full-time equivalency/square footage basis. Total = \$18,000(allocation 9.8%)
2. Communications costs for program staff include office telephone and internet services. The phone and internet costs are allocated to the program on a full-time equivalency basis. Total = \$1,800 (allocation 9.8%)
3. IT Services are for server hosting and maintenance, website support, and other computer technical support issues that may arise. Total = \$5,000(allocation 9.8%)

4. Insurance is charged for general liability insurance for the Texas Center. Total = \$1,080 (allocation 9.8%)
5. Audit expenses are for the costs related to an annual single audit for the Texas Center. Total = \$7,000 (audit is shared equally between the CJA, TxDot and CIP grants)
6. Judicial technical and administrative assistance costs are expenses related to technical assistance, data analysis, and administrative assistance, as needed. Total = \$15,000

Total: \$47,880

Non-federal Match

The Texas Center will use the participants contributed time as match. Judicial salary calculation is based on an average annual salary of \$125,000.00. Based on a standard 2080 hours per year, a judge makes approximately 60.10 per hour.

Salary information for non-judicial participants will be self-reported and certified at the time of the program.

Texas Center accounting staff will collect match forms from program participants throughout the year and track all match in a database.

CATEGORIES	Total Program
Personnel	\$102,650.00
Fringe	\$28,742.00
Travel	\$366,252.50
Equipment	
Supplies	\$26,400.00
Contractual	\$24,000.00
Construction	
Other	\$47,880.00
Total Direct	\$595,924.50
Totals	\$595,924.50
Match	\$220,492.07
Total Project	\$816,416.57

Operating

Salaries

Executive Director	\$	12,500	
Associate Director	\$	9,000	
Program Director	\$	27,200	
Program Assistant	\$	20,000	
Registrar	\$	5,000	
Financial Officer	\$	5,100	
Program Administrator	\$	7,600	
Conference Coordinator	\$	8,250	
Financial Associate	\$	8,000	
	\$	102,650	SALARY

Fringe

Executive Director	\$	3,500	
Associate Director	\$	2,520	
Program Director	\$	7,616	
Program Administrator	\$	5,600	
Registrar	\$	1,400	
Financial Officer	\$	1,428	
Publications Coordinator	\$	2,128	
Conference Coordinator	\$	2,310	
Financial Associate	\$	2,240	
	\$	28,742	FRINGE

Admin and Operating

Rent	\$	18,000	OTHER
IT Expenses	\$	5,000	OTHER
Office/Conference Supplies	\$	5,400	SUPPLIES
Telephone/Internet	\$	1,800	OTHER
Insurance	\$	1,080	OTHER
Audit	\$	7,000	OTHER
Judicial Technical and Administrative Assistance	\$	15,000	OTHER

\$ **53,280**

Total All Operating \$ **184,672**

Child Welfare Judges

Conference Expenses

Event Expense

Contractual (speaker fees)	7,500.00
shipping, brochures, printing	2,500.00
A/V	2,500.00
Total Event Exp.	12,500.00

Faculty Travel Expense

F Airfare	2,250.00
F Car Rental	-
F Lodging	1,428.00
F Meals	1,704.00
F Mileage	555.00
F Other	
F Parking/Tolls	
F Taxi	400.00
Total Faculty Travel Expense	6,337.00

Participant Travel Expense

Conference rooms, Onsite meals, breaks	15,500.00
P Airfare	5,000.00
P Lodging	28,560.00
P Meals	20,412.50
P Mileage	6,105.00
P Other	
P Parking/Tolls	441.00
P Reg. Fees Exp.	-
P Taxi / Shuttle	800.00
Total Participant Travel Expense	76,818.50

Staff Travel

S Airfare	-
S Car Rental / Taxi	-
S Lodging	952.00
S Meals	887.50
S Mileage	555.00
S Other	-
Reg. Fees	
S Parking/Tolls	-
Total Staff Travel	2,394.50

Total Expenses **98,050.00**

Permanency Summit

Planning Meeting	
Travel	-
Meals	-
Lodging	-
Total Planning Exp.	-
Conference Expenses	
Event Expense	
Contractual (speaker fees)	2,500.00
shipping, brochures, printing	3,000.00
A/V	2,500.00
Total Event Exp.	8,000.00
Faculty Travel Expense	
F Airfare	1,800.00
F Car Rental	
F Lodging	1,440.00
F Meals	1,420.00
F Mileage	555.00
F Other	
F Parking/Tolls	128.00
F Taxi	240.00
Total Faculty Travel Expense	5,583.00
Participant Travel Expense	
Conference rooms, Onsite meals, breaks	24,000.00
P Airfare	5,000.00
P Lodging	55,200.00
P Meals	27,000.00
P Mileage	11,100.00
P Other	
P Parking/Tolls	
P Reg. Fees Exp.	-
P Taxi / Shuttle	1,200.00
Total Participant Travel Expense	123,500.00
Staff Travel	
S Airfare	-
S Car Rental / Taxi	-
S Lodging	1,440.00
S Meals	675.00
S Mileage	888.00
S Other	-
Reg. Fees	
S Parking/Tolls	-
Total Staff Travel	3,003.00
Total Expenses	140,086.00

Implicit Bias

Conference Expenses

Event Expense

Contractual (speaker fees)	11,000.00
shipping, brochures, printing	1,500.00
A/V	2,500.00
Total Event Exp.	15,000.00

Faculty Travel Expense

F Airfare	2,700.00
F Car Rental	-
F Lodging	1,150.00
F Meals	710.00
F Mileage	444.00
F Other	
F Parking/Tolls	
F Taxi	480.00
Total Faculty Travel Expense	5,484.00

Participant Travel Expense (35 participants)

Conference Rooms, Onsite	
meals, breaks	7,500.00
P Airfare	1,000.00
P Lodging	5,175.00
P Meals	3,727.50
P Mileage	3,330.00
P Other	
P Parking/Tolls	
P Reg. Fees Exp.	-
P Taxi / Shuttle	280.00
Total Participant Travel Expense	21,012.50

Staff Travel

S Airfare	-
S Car Rental / Taxi	-
S Lodging	230.00
S Meals	200.00
S Mileage	-
S Other	-
Reg. Fees	
S Parking/Tolls	
Total Staff Travel	430.00

Total Expenses **41,926.50**

Education Summit

Conference Expenses

Event Expense

Contractual (speaker fees)	3,000.00
shipping, brochures, printing	1,500.00
AV	2,500.00
Total Event Exp.	7,000.00

Faculty Travel Expense

F Airfare	900.00
F Car Rental	-
F Lodging	600.00
F Meals	992.00
F Mileage	666.00
F Other	-
F Parking/Tolls	-
F Taxi	140.00
Total Faculty Travel Expense	3,298.00

Participant Travel Expense

Conference rooms, onsite meals, breaks	12,500.00
P Airfare	-
P Lodging	9,520.00
P Meals	12,625.00
P Mileage	5,550.00
P Other	-
P Parking/Tolls	750.00
P Reg. Fees Exp.	
P Taxi / Shuttle	
Total Participant Travel Expense	40,945.00

Staff Travel

S Airfare	
S Car Rental / Taxi	
S Lodging	238.00
S Meals	248.00
S Mileage	-
S Other	-
Reg. Fees	
S Parking/Tolls	50.00
Total Staff Travel	536.00

Total Expenses 51,779.00

NCJFCJ - Seattle

Conference Expenses

Event Expense

Contractual (speaker fees)

shipping, brochures, MCLE

A/V, onsite meals, breaks 2,500.00

IT Prof Services

Total Event Exp. 2,500.00

Faculty Travel Expense

F Airfare -

F Car Rental -

F Lodging -

F Meals -

F Mileage -

F Other -

F Parking/Tolls -

F Taxi -

Total Faculty Travel Expense -

Participant Travel Expense

P Airfare 13,500.00

P Lodging 20,250.00

P Meals 6,390.00

P Mileage -

P Other -

P Parking/Tolls 900.00

P Reg. Fees Exp. 17,250.00

P Taxi / Shuttle 2,400.00

Total Participant 60,690.00

Staff Travel

S Airfare 900.00

S Car Rental / Taxi 80.00

S Lodging 1,500.00

S Meals 426.00

S Mileage -

S Other -

Reg. Fees 1,150.00

S Parking/Tolls -

Total Staff 2 4,056.00

Total Expenses 67,246.00

National Trainings

Conference Expenses

Event Expense

Contractual (speaker fees)
shipping, brochures, MCLE
A/V, onsite meals, breaks
IT Prof Services

Total Event Exp. -

Faculty Travel Expense

F Airfare -
F Car Rental -
F Lodging -
F Meals -
F Mileage -
F Other -
F Parking/Tolls -
F Taxi -

Total Faculty Travel Expense -

Participant Travel Expense

P Airfare 2,250.00
P Lodging 2,250.00
P Meals 1,065.00
P Mileage -
P Other -
P Parking/Tolls 150.00
P Reg. Fees Exp. 2,875.00
P Taxi / Shuttle 400.00

Total Participant 8,990.00

Staff Travel

S Airfare
S Car Rental / Taxi
S Lodging
S Meals
S Mileage -
S Other -
Reg. Fees
S Parking/Tolls -

Total Staff 2 -

Total Expenses 8,990.00

Psychotropic Medication Summit

Planning Meeting		
	Travel	2,000.00
	Meals	600.00
	Lodging	575.00
Total Planning Exp.		3,175.00
Conference Expenses		
Event Expense		
	Contractual (speaker fees)	
	shipping, brochures, MCLE	
	Onsite meals, breaks	
	A/V	
Total Event Exp.		-
Faculty Travel Expense		
	F Airfare	
	F Car Rental	
	F Lodging	
	F Meals	
	F Mileage	
	F Other	
	F Parking/Tolls	
	F Taxi	
Total Faculty Travel Expense		-
Participant Travel Expense		
	P Airfare	
	P Lodging	
	P Meals	
	P Mileage	
	P Other	
	P Parking/Tolls	
	P Reg. Fees Exp.	-
	P Taxi / Shuttle	
Total Participant Travel Expense		-
Staff Travel		
	S Airfare	-
	S Car Rental / Taxi	-
	S Lodging	
	S Meals	
	S Mileage	
	S Other	-
	Reg. Fees	
	S Parking/Tolls	-
Total Staff Travel		-
Total Expenses		3,175.00

TRAINING GRANT-TAB 7

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -OCA JUDICIAL AND COORDINATOR TRAINING

program budget. It also allows some of them to attend other specific training that might not be possible on the program budget.

2. Program Objective:Child Protection Court Training

- Improve the knowledge, skills and abilities of child protection court judges and staff to facilitate consistent decisions for safety, permanency and well-being of children brought before them.

3. Activities:Child Protection Court Training

- OCA will provide a training session in conjunction with the Texas Center for the Judiciary to target issues specific for approximately 37 judges and staff involved in child protection cases.
- OCA and judges will identify specialized child abuse and neglect training opportunities for judges and staff to attend.
- Child Protection judges and staff will attend the conferences, seminars, meetings and workshops that target issues specific to child projection.

4. Method of Evaluation:

Attendees to the OCA training session will complete a survey at the end of the training to identify the value of the training.

- 5. Future Funding:** The annual training has become an event the judges and their staff anticipate and on which they rely. With the prospect of budget cuts ever-looming in an unstable economy, OCA will continue to rely on this grant as long as it is available to train its child protection associate judges and staff.

Budget Narrative (Include information on match):

Travel - Expense for associate judges and OCA staff to register for conference and training events (\$12,500). Although the OCA training in FY 2013 will be held in conjunction with the Texas Center for the Judiciary's Child Welfare Judicial Conference, we are requesting funds to cover travel for OCA staff who are court coordinators and court reporters and who cannot be reimbursed through the Texas Center. These funds are also used to pay for other CP training opportunities for judges and staff throughout the year.

Contractual – Facility costs/Speaker Cost\$2,500. Although the OCA training in FY 2013 will be held in conjunction with the Texas Center's Child Welfare Judicial Conference, we would like to request some funds to help cover facility costs as necessary, as well as to provide speakers specifically relevant for OCA staff who are court coordinators and court reporters during the conference.

In-Kind match will be accrued by OCA and stakeholder staff as they participate (i.e., plan, design, develop, test, supervise, account, and report) on the project. Timesheets documenting the In-Kind effort will be collected during the course of the project. The formula is:

Number of CPC associate judges and coordinators in attendance at annual training x respective starting hourly wages x CLE hours = In-Kind Match

Example: [12 associate judges x \$46.04/hour] + [17 court coordinators x \$ 19.34] x 9 accredited hours = \$7931.34

Budget

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a	Personnel				
b	Fringe Benefits				
c	Travel	\$12,500	\$12,500		
d	Equipment				
e	Supplies				
f.	Contractual	\$2,500	\$2,500		
g	Construction				
h	Other	\$4,950			\$4,950
i	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$19,950	\$15,000		\$4,950
j	Indirect Charges	0	0	0	0
k	Totals	\$19,950	\$15,000		\$4,950

Requested Grant Period: The Grant becomes effective 10/01/12, and ends 09/31/13 unless terminated or otherwise modified.

Amount Requested: \$15,000

Applicant must initial each of the following:

_____ Applicant understands that CIP grants awarded to a governmental entity are governed by OMB Circular A-87 and that CIP grants awarded to a non profit organization are governed by OMB Circular A-110.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds expended must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program for which funding is sought.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and must be supported by appropriate documentation.

_____ Applicant understands that funding is subject to approval by the Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families.

_____ Applicant understands that funding must involve meaningful and on-going collaboration of local or statewide stakeholders.

TRAINING GRANT-TAB 7

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION

NACC GRANT REQUEST FOR TRIAL SKILLS CASE SCENARIO

Comment [m1]: CONFIRM W/ TA IF INCLUDING IN NB; EXPENDITURE OF \$40K will be voted on

INSERT - TAB 8

FY2013 CIP DATA/TECHNOLOGY GRANT APPLICATIONS

DATA/TECHNOLOGY GRANT-TAB 8

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -CHILD PROTECTION COURT STRATEGIC PLAN



SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS PERMANENT JUDICIAL
COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

Justice Eva Guzman, Chair

Tina Amberboy, Executive Director

FY2013 Grant Application
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Grant Fund Category Requested: New Continued

Applicant:			
Authorized Official Name:	David Slayton		
Title:	Administrative Director		
Organization:	Office of Court Administration		
Address:	205 W. 14 th Street, Suite 600		
	Austin, TX 78701-1614		
Phone:	512-463-1625		
Fax:	512-463-1648		
E-mail:	dslayton@txcourts.gov		
Financial Officer Name	Glenna Rhea Bowman	Financial Officer Title	Chief Financial Officer
Program Director Name	Mena Ramón	Program Director Title	General Counsel

Requestor is designated as a(n):

State Agency Non-Profit Organization

Unit of Local Government Educational Institution

Other (describe): _____

Program Type Requested: Basic Program Data Training

Program Title: Child Protection Courts Support and Strategy

1. Program Issue or Problem:

- Although the Child Protection Courts (CPCs) have been in existence for over 15 years, the Office of Court Administration has not had the opportunity to assess whether the needs of and benefits to the original CPC counties are different today and whether existing resources should be restructured to more effectively meet current needs.
- OCA does not know what the budget of the CPCs will be in the next biennium. In order to smoothly transition into the new fiscal framework, several short-term implementation plans need to be developed.
- The existing CPCs require legal and technical support to continue serving their current caseloads.
- Statewide child welfare-related technology projects require an attorney with related experience to help implement them effectively and efficiently. The CPC Attorney has developed that experience through work with CPCMS and could be utilized for other projects.

2. Program Objective:

- Develop a three to five year strategic plan to most effectively use the CPC structure in Texas or recommend changes to the structure, as appropriate. In developing the strategic plan, child welfare data and outcomes should be examined as well as the practices utilized in the 120 counties that currently participate. Whether the current model should be modified will also be reviewed.
- Develop short-term plans to allow immediate implementation of new CPC courts funded by the 83rd Legislature. OCA has requested 3 additional courts in its Legislative Appropriation Request. The plan should address implementation of the three possible funding scenarios (funding provided for one, two or three courts).
- Develop contingency plans for how to address increased caseloads if no additional CPC courts are funded by the 83rd Legislature.
- Continue responding to support requests from the CPCs.
- Serve as a resource for statewide child protection technology-driven projects.

3. Activities:

- Develop a method and a plan to collect caseload and practice information from participating counties and CPCs, document the information and provide a report to OCA and the Children's Commission within a timeframe mutually agreed upon by OCA Technology Staff, OCA General Counsel and the Children's Commission.
- Convene and staff an advisory group including CPC judges and staff, Children's Commission staff, Presiding Judges, and other interested parties that will assist in directing the CPC strategic plan development.
- Draft and circulate for comments both long- and short-term strategic plans.
- Finalize and publish strategic plans.
- Document the frequency and nature of CPC support requests and response provided. Support statewide technology projects on an as-needed basis. Provide monthly

reports of activity to Children’s Commission Executive Director and consult monthly with Children’s Commission Executive Director regarding the status of pending technology projects and the implementation of new technology projects.

4. **Method of Evaluation:** Published strategic plans for the CPCs and data/research/surveys developed and collected during the development of the strategic plans.
5. **Future Funding:** Unless the program receives a legislative appropriation to fund the CPC Attorney position, OCA will continue to apply for CIP funds to fund the program.
6. **Budget Narrative** (Include information on match): The budget includes the cost of half of an existing fulltime attorney position. The other half of the CPC Attorney position is anticipated to be funded by a Children’s Justice Act grant. The activities funded by that grant are complementary to the goals of this program.

Budget

Texas CIP Grant		Requested			
		Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
a	Personnel	\$38,210.00	\$38,210.00		
b	Fringe Benefits	\$8,387.00	\$8,387.00		
c	Travel				
d	Equipment				
e	Supplies		0		
f.	Contractual				
g	Construction				
h	Other				
i	Total Direct Charges (sum a-h)	\$46,597.00	\$46,597.00		
j	Indirect Charges				
k	Totals	\$62,129.33	\$46,597.00		\$15,532.33

Requested Grant Period: The Grant becomes effective 10/1/2012, and ends 9/30/2013 unless terminated or otherwise modified.

Amount Requested: \$46,597.00

Applicant must initial each of the following:

_____ Applicant understands that CIP grants awarded to a governmental entity are governed by OMB Circular A-87 and that CIP grants awarded to a non profit organization are governed by OMB Circular A-110.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds expended must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program for which funding is sought.

_____ Applicant understands that CIP funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and must be supported by appropriate documentation.

_____ Applicant understands that funding is subject to approval by the Supreme Court Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families.

_____ Applicant understands that funding must involve meaningful and on-going collaboration of local or statewide stakeholders.

DATA/TECHNOLOGY GRANT-TAB 8

FY2013 CIP GRANT APPLICATION -OCA CIP TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

CIP GRANT: BASIC

TRAINING

DATA

Strategic Category: Capacity Building

X Court Function Improvement

X Systemic Reform

Project Name / Brief Description: *CIP Technology Staff*

The program provides three full-time staff to plan, develop, and implement technology projects designed to improve child protection court processes and outcomes. By having a dedicated staff, the Texas CIP will efficiently and quickly move from concept to realization for various projects requiring technological expertise.

Staff will consist of a Project Manager, Business Analyst/Project Lead and a Programmer.

Business Analyst/Project Lead

- Architects and designs optimum solutions to complete technology-related projects assigned by the Children’s Commission
- Keeps apprised of the business processes in use by the OCA child protection courts
- Manages the day-to-day operations with regards to existing CIP technology systems including the management of operational support and system enhancements
- Provides project management to CIP technology projects requiring programming services, ensuring that priorities and projected timelines are met

Programmer

- Codes web-based programs as designed by the CIP technology Business Analyst/Project Lead
- Analyzes existing code to increase system efficiency and speed
- Ensures that system security is in place and functioning correctly
- Updates the system as needed as court operations change

Manager

- Prepares reports for the technology committee, the commission, federal partners and others related to the technology projects currently underway
- Prepares and monitors the CIP technology project budget
- Provides proactive updates to the commission, technology committee and OCA management regarding CIP technology projects
- Manages CIP technology projects not requiring programming service

Technology project priorities will be established by the Children's Commission and reviewed regularly. The currently planned projects for FY13 include:

- Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)
 - Daily Operations
 - Enhancements
 - Export Court Docket Calendar
 - Expanded Roles Based Security
 - Training/Marketing Videos (online)
- Web page for Notice and Engagement
- Attorney Assignment and Billing System
- Toolkit Timeliness and Permanency Measures
- Commission Stakeholder and Contact Management System
- Commission Education and Foster Care Website
- Video Conferencing for Child Protection Hearings – Phase II

Need (issue driving the activity (the why) and the data source that supports or justifies the project):

Technology is a crucial part of developing innovative solutions to CIP programs and initiatives. When a new web-based program is envisioned or enhancements to an existing program are proposed, the Business Analyst and Developer work collaboratively to design and implement the work. In the past, CIP has relied on contract staff to perform these services. Having a dedicated staff will both increase efficiency, as workers are able to fluidly adapt to changing needs and priorities, and significantly decrease cost. CIP will be able to create more high-quality programs at a lower cost and in a way that is more responsive to its audience.

Outcome (what was achieved: the law, a process, a practice, or a policy was changed, knowledge or skills were gained, attitudes or behaviors were modified, capacity or conditions were expanded) (CQI Element):

Technology projects will be completed on time and according to the specifications set forth by the Children's Commission. These projects will allow robust data collection and information sharing, ultimately leading to efficient court operations and more positive outcomes for youth and families.

Measurable Objective (the intended results – capable of being measured along the way to evaluate whether or what the result will be)(CQI Element):

Level of Effort Accuracy – each project will be given an estimate as to the level of effort required to complete the project. The Project Manager will report the accuracy of the estimates of the Business Analyst and the Programmer. Number of Projects Completed – the Project Manager will measure the number of projects assigned along with the number of projects completed. A project is complete once the approved scope of the project has been met.

Number of CPCMS Enhancements Completed – the Project Manager will measure the number of CPCMS enhancements (measured by ticket quantity) completed each Fiscal Year.

Number of CPCMS Operation Activities Completed in a timely manner – the Project Manager will measure the number of CPCMS daily operational activities (such as the provisioning of a new court or user, running data reports, or other normal Information Technology related care needed to ensure successful system operation)

Anticipated Outputs and Results (units of service provided, number of people served or trained, goods / services produced, e.g., book, curriculum, legislation, MOU)

Level of Effort Accuracy – anticipated accurate estimations within 20% of actual effort. For example, a project anticipated to take 10 weeks to complete should take between 8 and 12 weeks.

Number of Projects Completed – anticipated completion of at least three significant projects in FY 13. The target number of completed projects will vary with the size and complexity of the projects identified by the Commission. Additionally, shifts in project priorities may cause the number of projects completed to be lower than anticipated.

Number of CPCMS Operation Activities Completed in a timely manner – anticipated completion of CPCMS operational activities within 40 business hours of identification 100% of the time.

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI): ensures proceedings related to child abuse and neglect promote due process of law; timely, thorough and complete court hearings; and high quality legal representation to parents, children and title IV-B/IV-E agencies, both in and out of court, in an ongoing fashion

The technology grant will support other Texas CIP projects that directly improve due promotion of due process, timeliness, and quality of legal representation by providing technological support as well as a means of collecting and analyzing data.

Collaborative Partners:

The technology grant will continue existing collaborations with the Texas Conference of Urban Counties, the Department of Family and Protective Services, the Office of Court Administration’s Child (OCA) Protection Courts, as well as the other committees of the Children’s Commission in order to provide for the efficient data collection and analysis to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the child protection courts across Texas.

Matrix

Activities	Timeframe <i>can be specific or "ongoing"</i>	Target Improvement <i>specific change intended</i>	Data Source for Evaluation (CQI Element) <i>What data will be used to measure the change/who will evaluate</i>	Feedback (CQI Element) <i>stakeholders with whom data will be shared to solicit feedback</i>
Provide dedicated data and technology staff to the CIP Program.	Ongoing	Time and cost efficient delivery of technology projects intended to improve child protection court processes and outcomes in Texas.	The Project Manager will track the project team's accuracy of effort estimations as well as the number of projects completed.	The Office of Court Administration (OCA) will share project outcomes with the Children's Commission, DFPS, and other interested child welfare stakeholders on a regular basis.
Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)	Ongoing	Daily Operations	Operation Activities Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisioning of a new court or user. • Running data queries / reports. • Tracking other normal care activities to ensure a successful system operation. • Timeliness of completion of operational activities / response. Project Manager will evaluate with additional review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCA management team. • Child Protection Court Advisory Group. • Children's Commission
Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)	FY2013	Enhancements (data, functional, and reporting).	Development Activities Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of enhancements completed (measured by request/ticket quantity) • Level of Effort Accuracy – anticipated accuracy of estimations within 20% of actual effort. Project Manager will evaluate with additional review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCA management team • Child Protection Court Advisory Group • Children's Commission
Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)	FY2013 (Scheduled)	Calendar Export – Develop and implement court docket calendar export in a standard format.	Survey of CPCMS Users: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of users synchronizing docket calendar information onto their personal devices (blackberries, iPhones). • Number of users synchronizing docket calendar information between applications (case management systems). Project Manager will evaluate with additional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCA management team • Child Protection Court Advisory Group • County/District Court staff & IT staff partnering with OCA. • Children's Commission

			review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.	
Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)	FY2013 (Scheduled)	Role Based Security - Implement security to allow individual courts to determine what user roles exist and the appropriate permissions (none/read/write) for that role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined user roles anticipated to increase from 4 to 12 roles based on user requirements analysis. Adoption and utilization of CPCMS by independent county courts and district courts. <p>Project Manager will evaluate with additional review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OCA management team. Child Protection Court Advisory Group. County/District Court staff & IT staff partnering with OCA Children's Commission
Child Protection Case Management System (CPCMS)	FY2013 (Scheduled)	Training/Marketing Videos (online)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing video modules will be revised and updated, and new modules will be produced to cover functional enhancements implemented during the prior 12-18 months. Video modules will be accessible through a public web page and access will be monitored and tabulated. <p>Project Manager will evaluate with additional review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OCA management team Child Protection Court Advisory Group Children's Commission
Video Conferencing for Child Protection Hearings - Phase II	FY2013 (Scheduled)	Phase II of pilot project to use Internet based video conferencing technology to enable children involved in child abuse and neglect cases to participate in the court hearing dealing with the child's placement outside of their home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the number of courts participating in phase II of this project. Increase the number of children participating (remotely) in their placement and permanency hearings. Increase the number of group homes or residential treatment centers (RTC) participating in phase II of this project. Track the number of hearings conducted by each participating court. <p>Project Manager will evaluate with additional review and oversight from OCA mgmt. team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OCA management team Texas Department of Family & Protective Services (DFPS) Children's Commission
Web page for Notice and Engagement	FY2013 Planned	Design and develop a web page for Notice and Engagement of parties involved in child protection cases.	Unavailable at this time. Project is tentatively planned.	

Attorney Assignment and Billing System	FY2013 Planned	Confirm functional requirements, then design and develop a new system for tracking attorney assignments for children and respondents, and track the billing for those services.	Unavailable at this time. Project is tentatively planned.	
Timeliness and Permanency Measures	FY2013 Planned	Confirm functional requirements, then design and develop a new system for collection and analysis of the timeliness measures from the NCSC/ABA Toolkit and as mandated by the Court Improvement Program.	Project is tentatively planned. Data from the following Performance Measures is anticipated to be used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure 4A – Time to Permanent Placement. • Measure 4G – Time to First Permanency Hearing. • Measure 4H – Time to Termination of Parental Rights Petition (filing). • Measure 4I – Time to Termination of Parental Rights • Measure 4X – Time to all Subsequent Permanency Hearings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCA management team • Child Protection Court Advisory Group • Children’s Commission
Commission Education and Foster Care Website	FY2013 Planned	Confirm functional requirements, then design and develop a new website to support the Commission education subcommittee with resources to aide in the participation and success of the education of foster care children.	Unavailable at this time. Project is tentatively planned.	
Commission Stakeholder and Contact Management System	FY2013 Planned	Confirm functional requirements, then design and develop a new system to support the Commission staff in managing their extensive and complicated system of contacts, the contact’s membership on committees, the contact’s assigned tasks, and committee notes.	Unavailable at this time. Project is tentatively planned.	

CIP Technology Budget

FFY 2013

Category	Requested			
	Total Program	Amount of CIP Funds Requested	Cash Match	In-Kind Match
Personnel	\$ 246,846	\$ 235,616		\$ 11,230
Fringe Benefits	\$ 75,189	\$ 71,769		\$ 3,421
Travel	\$ 7,362	\$ 7,362		\$ -
Equipment	\$ -	\$ -		
Supplies	\$ 56,414	\$ 56,414		\$ -
Contractual	\$ 62	\$ 62		\$ -
Other	\$ 109,089	\$ -		\$ 109,089
Total Direct	\$ 494,963	\$ 371,223		\$ 123,740

CIP Technology Budget - Line Item Detail

FFY2013

Travel	
Conferences	\$ 3,047
Travel to support courts on-site	\$ 4,315
TOTAL Travel/Training	\$ 7,362

Supplies	
Paper/Toner/Copier	\$ 600
Software Support - TOAD Data Modeler	\$ 100
Software Support - MadCap Flare - maint. 1 license	\$ 550
Telerik RadControls for ASP.NET AJAX - maint. 1 license	\$ 499
Adobe Creative Suite - CS6 - upgrade - 1 license	\$ 375
Visual Studio Design Ultimate - upgrade - 1 license	\$ 1,644
Entrust Security Certificate - 1	\$ 400
SQL Server 2008 Std. - 2 CPU licenses - new licenses	\$ 8,308
Win Server Std. - maint. - 2 blade licenses	\$ 235
SQL Server CAL - 41	\$ 403
Win Server CAL - 41	\$ 168
Exchange CAL - 41	\$ 403
System Center - 41	\$ 235
Office - 42 notebook licences	\$ 3,237
Windows Business - 42 notebook licenses	\$ 1,515
Sophos - 42 notebook licenses	\$ 840
Adobe Captivate upgrade	\$ 237
Prezi Pro - Presentation - 2 licenses	\$ 318
Igloo Collaborative Service - 50 users	\$ 5,100
Go To Meeting Webinar Services	\$ 900
Century Link Telephone Conference Services	\$ 600
Cisco WebEx Subscription	\$ 1,800
Hardware Support - ClearSea video conferencing server	\$ 11,632
Aircard - annual use fee	\$ 480
Postage / Shipping	\$ 1,120
Phones / Long Distance Charges	\$ 1,284
Misc. Supplies	\$ 800
Staff Training	\$ 1,200
iPad	\$ 1,100
120 Web Cameras	\$ 9,600
PMI certification - annual fee - Ron Clark	\$ 129
Court Coordinator Mobile Cart	\$ 600
TOTAL Supplies	\$ 56,414

CIP Technology Project List

FFY2013

Project	Priority	Tech?
CPCMS - Daily Operations		Y
CPCMS - Enhancements		Y
CPCMS - Calendar Export		Y
CPCMS - Role Based Security		Y
CPCMS - Training Materials and Marketing, including Demo Site		Y
CIP Web - Notice and Engagement of Children/Families		Y
Attorney Billing System		Y
CIP Website conversion to Content Management		Y
Toolkit Timeliness & Permanency Measures		Y
Commission Stakeholder & Contact Management System		Y
Commission Education & Foster Care Website		Y
Video Conferencing for Child Protection Hearings		Y
		N

INFORMATION DOCUMENTS-TAB 9
FY2013 STAFF DIRECTED PROJECTS

INFORMATION DOCUMENT-TAB 9

FY2013 STAFF DIRECTED PROJECT INFORMATION

NCJFCJ Membership Offer Letter

LETTER BEHIND THIS SHEET

Placeholder



SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS PERMANENT JUDICIAL
COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

Justice Eva Guzman, Chair

Tina Amberboy, Executive Director

September 4, 2012

Dear Colleague:

Since its inception, the Supreme Court of Texas Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families (the Children's Commission) has partnered with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) in several endeavors. The NCJFCJ is one of the oldest and largest judicial membership organizations nationally and it offers cutting-edge training, initiatives, and materials for courts handling child abuse and neglect cases, as well as matters involving family law, juvenile, and domestic violence issues.

Over the years, some of Texas' finest and most committed judges have been or are actively involved with the NCJFCJ, including John Specia from San Antonio and the late Jim Farris from Beaumont, both pioneers in Texas and nationally for their work with child welfare cases. Judge Patricia Macias, El Paso, served as the NCJFCJ's President in 2008. Austin District Judge Darlene Byrne currently serves as the NCJFCJ secretary, and as the lead judge for the NCJFCJ Child Dependency Model Court in Travis County. San Antonio District Judge Peter Sakai is currently in his second year of service on the board of directors. Every year, the Children's Commission supports scholarships for Texas judges to attend the NCJFCJ's judicial conferences, including its annual conference held each summer. The NCJFCJ supports Texas training by offering national judicial and other experts at training events held in Texas.

Because the relationship between the NCJFCJ and Texas is of great interest to the Children's Commission and the judicial leaders mentioned in this letter, we would like to support your membership in the NCJFCJ. The NCJFCJ is offering a one-year membership, which will be paid for by Court Improvement Program funding and the Texas Children's Commission. Your commitment would be to actively support the mission of the Children's Commission and the NCJFCJ to develop judicial leadership among Texas judges hearing child protection cases and to attend judicial education events sponsored by the Children's Commission and the NCJFCJ including the Annual CPS Judges Conference, the Annual Implicit Bias Conference, and the Annual NCJFCJ Conference. Please contact me at tina.amberboy@txcourts.gov or by calling 512-463-9352, if you are interested in this opportunity.

Sincerely,

Tina Amberboy
Executive Director

INFORMATION DOCUMENT-TAB 9

FY2013 STAFF DIRECTED PROJECT INFORMATION

TEA_SB2248

LETTER BEHIND THIS SHEET

Placeholder

August 22, 2012

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

Re: Importance of Maintaining Educational Stability for Children and Youth in the Foster Care System¹

There are approximately 16,000 children under the umbrella of foster care attending Texas public schools. Children in foster care face a number of challenges that impact their ability to be successful in the school environment. Children in foster care move from home to home and school to school more frequently than other children for a number of reasons; usually those reasons involve the need to ensure the child resides in the safest and most appropriate home environment that meets the child's needs. Some children and youth may reside in multiple placements and may ultimately attend many different schools over the course of their time in foster care. Consequently, children in foster care frequently lose course credit, repeat courses they have already taken, are placed in inappropriate classes or grade levels, and cannot participate in extracurricular activities. Delays in transferring school records result in serious disruptions in learning and special education services.

Research shows poor education outcomes for youth in foster care. From aggregate data provided by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) from its Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) concluded that many students in foster care struggle to achieve minimum educational outcomes and establish educational stability. The following DFPS conclusions mirror the national research on education outcomes for children and youth in foster care conducted by the Casey Family Programs. (www.casey.org):

- Children and youth in foster care are likely to lack basic foundation skills in core subjects.
- 51% of the students in foster care graduate from high school compared to 79% of students in the general population. (PEIMS 2010-2011)
- Students in foster care are almost three times more likely (31%) to receive special education services compared to students in the general population (10%). (PEIMS 2010-2011)
- Students in foster care are much more likely to be disciplined in school for fighting and "persistent misconduct" than students in the general population and are more likely to receive out-of-school suspension. (PEIMS 2010-2011)

¹Foster or substitute care means the placement of a child who is in the conservatorship of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services or an authorized agency in care outside the child's home. The term includes foster care, institutional care, adoption, placement with a relative of the child, or commitment to the Texas Youth Commission. *See* Fam. Code § 263.001.

Federal Law

The federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, Public Law 110-351, requires state child welfare agencies to work with their state and local education systems to support initiatives to improve educational outcomes for children in foster care. On August 25, 2011, the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued a joint letter to all Chief State School Officers and State Child Welfare Directors (<http://nrcpfc.org/nrc-wu/mainview.asp?ID=165>) informing them of provisions in the federal law that require local education agencies and child welfare agencies to coordinate to ensure that children in foster care maintain "education stability."

As outlined in the letter, the law specifically requires that at the time of a child's initial placement in foster care, the child welfare agency (DFPS) must coordinate with local education agencies to ensure that children remain in their current school (unless doing so poses a safety risk for the child or is otherwise not in the child's best interests), thereby keeping them connected with teachers, other family members including siblings, and friends, and helping them continue to progress in their school work.

State Law

Section 25.007 of the Texas Education Code requires TEA to assist the transition from one school to another of students in foster care by:

- ensuring that school records for a student in foster care are transferred to the student's new school not later than the 14th day after the date the student begins enrollment at the school;
- developing systems to ease transition of a student in foster care during the first two weeks of enrollment at a new school;
- developing procedures for awarding credit for course work, including electives, completed by a student in foster care while enrolled at another school;
- promoting practices that facilitate access by a student in foster care to extracurricular programs, summer programs, credit transfer services, electronic courses provided under the Texas Virtual School Network, and after-school tutoring programs at nominal or no cost;
- establishing procedures to lessen the adverse impact of the movement of a student in foster care to a new school;
- entering into a memorandum of understanding with DFPS regarding the exchange of information as appropriate to facilitate the transition of students in foster care from one school to another;
- encouraging school districts and open-enrollment charter schools to provide services for a student in foster care in transition when applying for admission to post-secondary study and when seeking sources of funding for postsecondary study requiring school districts, campuses, and open-enrollment charter schools to accept a referral for special education services made for a student in foster care by a school previously attended by the student; and
- providing other assistance as identified by TEA.

Memorandum of Understanding

Pursuant to section 25.007(b)(6) of the Texas Education Code, TEA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with DFPS that requires the exchange of information to facilitate the transition of students in foster care from one school to another and includes

provisions to support the additional requirements of section 25.007 aimed at easing the disruption caused by educational placement moves by children in foster care.

TEA offers school districts technical assistance in their efforts to ensure that student records are transferred in a timely manner, and provides school district superintendents and principals with a periodic report of all requests for records in the Texas Records Exchange System (TREx) that have not been fulfilled within ten business days.²

Further, the MOU directs TEA and DFPS to jointly develop and distribute information to school districts regarding the challenges facing children and youth in foster care, and the importance of employing strategies that will help maintain or improve educational outcomes and stability for these youth.

New statute: Liaison with state child protective services required (House Bill 826)

Section 33.904 of the Texas Education Code requires each school district to appoint (by December 1, 2011) at least one employee to act as a liaison officer to facilitate the enrollment in or transfer to a public school of a child in the district who is in the conservatorship of the state.

In the 2011 – 2012 school year, TEA received a competitive federal demonstration grant from the Administration for Children and Families to build capacity at TEA to assist school districts with program information and support for the newly designated liaisons, commonly called school district foster care liaisons. The grant is a collaborative initiative between the Children’s Commission of the Texas Supreme Court, DFPS, and TEA. In the 2012 - 2013 school year, designated school district foster care liaisons will benefit from optional TEA training and support for this new school district liaison role including: an online foster care resource guide, a Webinar series, email support, a dedicated webpage, a collaborative space on Project Share, and a temporary foster care program specialist at TEA. These resources are currently under development in the TEA Division of Federal and State Education Policy.

Important Action Item: There are three (3) important ways for school district foster care liaisons to connect with TEA at the start of the school year. Please forward this information to the designated liaison(s).

- 1) Please complete this form to provide district contact information for the liaison registry:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/fostercareliaison>
- 2) The designated email address to the TEA program office is:
fostercareliaison@tea.state.tx.us
- 3) To join the listserv: Go to <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/list>, select “Foster Care Education” from the pull-down list, then click the button “join” and follow the on-screen instructions.

Attendance, Admission, Enrollment Records and Tuition

On August 2, 2012, TEA distributed an annual *To The Administrator Addressed* letter that summarized several important Texas statutes relating to attendance, public school admission,

²Although section 25.007 of the Texas Education Code states that school records for students in foster care must be transferred to the student’s new school not later than the 14th day after the date the student begins enrollment at the school, section 25.002 of the Texas Education Code provides that school records must be furnished not later than the 10th working day after the date a request for the information is received.

enrollment records, and tuition. This August 2, 2012, document specifically addresses the enrollment of children in foster care in Section II. ADMISSION and Section III. ENROLLMENT RECORDS.

Strategies to Assist with Education Stability

- School superintendents should identify the school district foster care liaison for students in foster care and notify the Child Protective Services (CPS) Regional Education Specialist at the local DFPS office of that person's name and contact information. Administrators should utilize the local DFPS staff and CPS Regional Education Specialists³ for school-related issues and for training opportunities on topics such as recognizing and preventing child abuse, and the effects of trauma-informed care on students in foster care. A map identifying the DFPS geographic regions and contact information for DFPS staff can be found at: http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/contact_us/map.asp
- Pursuant to section 7.010 of the Texas Education Code, each school district and open-enrollment charter school must utilize the Texas Records Exchange (TREx) to electronically request and transfer student transcripts, including information concerning a student's course or grade completion, teachers of record, assessment instrument results, receipt of special education services (including placement in a special education program and the individualized education program developed), and personal graduation plan as described by section 28.0212 of the Texas Education Code. Prompt record transfer will enable students to complete grade and course requirements and improve the students' opportunity to participate in the school's credit recovery program rather than repeating an entire course.
- Schools should encourage eligible students to take advantage of the Texas Virtual School Network to take courses, including courses not offered at the local public school, toward requirements for high school graduation. Administrators and educators should identify and remove barriers for students in foster care to participate in extracurricular activities, enrichment and summer school programs, as well as sports activities.

With these strategies in mind, please note that TEA and DFPS appreciate your work to ensure that children in foster care maintain education stability and improve educational outcomes.

Sincerely,

R. Todd Webster
Chief Deputy Commissioner

³CPS Regional Education Specialists serve as DFPS resources and provide educational support to children and youth in foster care.