

Appendix A: Children’s Court Initiative Performance Measures

Safety: Children are safe from abuse and neglect, and maintained in their own home whenever possible.

Goal	Indicators	Data Source ¹
S1. Court properly determines if continued placement in the home is contrary to the welfare whenever the child is removed from home. ²	a. Percentage of written orders authorizing removal that include the “contrary to the welfare” finding.	FR
	b. Percentage of written orders authorizing removal that include a sufficiently detailed, ³ child-specific “contrary to the welfare” finding.	FR
	c. Whether the court makes a sufficiently detailed “contrary to the welfare” finding orally on the record.	CO, FG
S2. Court properly determines whether reasonable efforts were made to prevent removal.	a. Percentage of written orders authorizing removal that include the “reasonable efforts to prevent removal” finding.	FR
	b. Percentage of written orders authorizing removal that include a sufficiently detailed, child-specific “reasonable efforts to prevent removal” finding.	FR
	c. Whether the court makes a sufficiently detailed “reasonable efforts to prevent removal” finding orally on the record.	CO, FG
S3. Children do not experience subsequent abuse or neglect.	a. Percentage of children who experience repeat maltreatment in accordance with the national standard.	WiSACWIS

¹ FR=court file review, CO=court observation, S=surveys and/or pre-visit worksheet, FG=focus groups, WiSACWIS=Wisconsin Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems, CCAP=Consolidated Court Automation Programs

² Wisconsin statutes **also** require the contrary to the welfare finding and reasonable efforts to prevent removal finding at the dispositional hearing, even if the child was removed an earlier hearing. While this is not included as a performance measure, the report will note practices inconsistent with statute.

³ “Detailed, child-specific” means the finding cannot be merely a reference to state or federal law and it must include relevant facts specific to the child.

Permanency: Children have permanence and stability in their living situation.

Goal	Indicators	Data Source
P1. Evaluations of the permanency plan are held timely and in accordance with statutory and federal rule requirements.	a. Percentage of cases where the permanency plan is reviewed within 6 months of removal.	FR, FG, agency file
	b. Percentage of cases where the permanency plan is reviewed a minimum of two times within 12 months of removal where at least one of the reviews was heard by the court.	FR, FG
	c. Percentage of cases where the permanency plan review summaries are filed timely.	FR
P2. Court properly determines whether reasonable efforts were made to achieve the goal(s) of the permanency plan.	a. Percentage of written orders that include the “reasonable efforts to achieve the goal of the permanency plan” finding.	FR
	b. Percentage of written orders that include a sufficiently detailed, child-specific “reasonable efforts to achieve goal of the permanency plan” finding.	FR
	c. Whether the court makes a sufficiently detailed “reasonable efforts” to achieve goal of permanency plan finding orally on the record.	CO, FG
P3. Children achieve timely permanence.	a. Percentage of children who re-enter out of home care after being returned home in accordance with the national standard.	WiSACWIS
	b. Percentage of children achieving reunification in accordance with the national standard.	WiSACWIS
	c. Percentage of children achieving adoption in accordance with the national standard.	WiSACWIS

Due Process: Proceedings are conducted in a fair, thorough manner with effective judicial oversight.

Goal	Indicators	Data Source
D1. Due process is provided to all parties through timely notice, hearings, and decisions.	a. Whether parents and caregivers are given the opportunity to be heard in court.	CO, FG
	b. Percentage of cases in which notice of the hearing is given in writing or orally to parents, guardian, caregiver, and tribe (if applicable) for designated hearings. ⁴	FR
D2. Changes of placement occur with proper notice and in accordance with statutory requirements.	a. Percentage of changes of placement that occur with notice or a hearing to the court.	FR, FG
	b. Percentage of changes of placement that have an associated written order.	FR
	c. Percentage of non-emergency changes of placement where the placement is not changed until a hearing or 10 days after the notice of change of placement is sent to the court.	FR
	d. Percentage of emergency changes of placement where a hearing was held or notice of the change of placement was sent within 48 hours of the change.	FR
	e. Percentage of children who had no more than two placement settings.	WiSACWIS
D3. Parties are timely represented by counsel or GAL.	a. Percentage of children who have a GAL or adversary counsel present at the first hearing.	FR, CO, FG, CCAP
	b. Attendance of the GAL/adversary counsel at key hearings.	FR, CO, FG
	c. Court procedure for monitoring required GAL training.	S, FG
	d. Court procedure for appointing counsel for parents in CHIPS cases.	S, FG
D4. The number of judicial officers presiding over a child's case is kept at a minimum.	a. Percentage of cases where one, two, and three or more judicial officers preside over the hearings in a child's case. ⁵	FR, FG, CCAP

⁴ Procedures used for providing notice will also be examined, using focus groups.

⁵ Procedures a county employs for assigning cases, including intake and judicial rotation, will also be examined using a pre-visit worksheet and focus groups.

Timeliness: Children’s permanence and stability are met through timely proceedings and decision-making.

Goal	Indicators	Data Source
T1. Orders are prepared properly, signed, and distributed shortly after hearings are completed.	a. Percentage of orders filed within 30 days.	FR, FG
	b. Procedure for distributing court orders.	CO, FG
	c. Percentage of orders from designated hearings that use current, standard circuit court forms. ⁶	FR
T2. Cases are heard and completed consistent with statutory requirements, without unnecessary delay.	a. Length of time between filing of the CHIPS petition and CHIPS disposition.	FR, CCAP
	b. Length of time between filing of the TPR petition and the TPR disposition.	FR, CCAP
	c. Whether there are unnecessary delays or continuances in CHIPS and TPR cases.	CO, S, FG
	d. Length of time between filing of the agency court report and the CHIPS disposition hearing.	FR, S, FG

Indian Child Welfare Act: When applicable, proceedings are conducted in accordance with ICWA.

Goal	Indicators	Data Source
II. Provisions of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) are followed when the case is subject to ICWA.	a. Percentage of cases where the “active efforts” finding was made either orally or in writing	FR, FG
	b. Percentage of cases where a “serious emotional or physical damage to the child” finding was made and supported by qualified expert witness testimony.	FR, FG
	c. Percentage of cases where the first notice in the case sent to the tribe via registered mail with return receipt requested.	FR, FG
	d. Percentage of voluntary TPR cases where parent’s consent was in writing with a judge’s certificate that the terms and consequences fully explained and understood.	FR, CCAP

⁶ Procedures for providing parties with copies of the written orders will also be examined, using file review, focus groups, and court observation.