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1. National assessment of the current situation regarding child representation.

2. Articulation of a national consensus on the role of the lawyer for the child.

3. A QIC Best Practice Model updating the 1996 ABA Standards.

4. Six Core Skills training model implementing the Best Practice Model.

5. Implementing the Six Core Skills using a rigorous experimental design in GA and WA.

6. How lawyers accepted the model, practiced accordingly, with improvements in process and child outcomes.


8. Profile of the lawyers and the major activities that appear to correlate with good case outcomes.
Consensus
1. Entering the Child’s World
Accommodating the Child’s Wishes

- Listen - Engage with the child.
- Learn about child’s world, needs and wishes
- Counsel the child
- Advocate for child’s needs
- Accommodate the child’s stated interests.
So, Carol tells me you’re a baby.
2. Assess Child Safety

- Listen to learn:
  - threats of danger
  - child vulnerability
  - protective capacities
- Participate in all placement decisions.
- **Remove the danger, not the child.**
- Distinguish between safety plan and case plan
- Don’t equate compliance with progress.
Assessing Safety

Are there insufficient protective capacities to protect from threats to which the child is vulnerable?
Actively Evaluate Needs
3. Assess/evaluate the case

- First identify the problem.
- Facilitate an appropriate evaluation of the needs of the child and his family.
- Learn how to evaluate the evaluation.
Advance an Appropriate Case Plan
4. Advance an Appropriate Case Plan

Is it S.M.A.R.T.
- Specific
- Measureable
- Achievable
- Relevant
- Time Specific

Focus - Changes in behavior (not just compliance)
- Is it realistic?
- Does Case plan differ from safety plan?
5. Theory of the Case

Develop a theory of the case that --

✓ explains “what really happened”
✓ is consistent with the evidence
✓ is forward looking and addresses what you think should happen next.
✓ is active (drive the bus)
Develop a Theory of the Case: Where is this case going?
(Drive the bus).
Gives force and direction to your advocacy!
6. QIC Skills: Advocacy corollaries

- Identify child’s needs.
- Identify the goal.
- Emphasize problem-solving.
- Use non-adversarial approaches if possible.
- Use traditional litigation as necessary.
Related publication describing attorneys studied:

Characteristics of Attorneys Representing Children in Child Welfare Cases.
Results of this study give context for the evaluation of the *QIC-ChildRep* intervention as well as provide explanatory variables for the study of the Nature and Determinants of Child Representation Practice.

- *Most attorneys were not working in dedicated child advocacy offices. Even those working in legal aid organizations were serving a variety of clients, not just child welfare clients.*
- *For half of attorneys, percent of practice that constituted child representation was 20% or less*
- *37% of attorneys had represented 0-5 cases in the prior six months,*
- *However, the majority had been practicing child representation for at least 5 years and one quarter had been practicing for more than 10 years.*
- *The majority (67%) thought compensation was either somewhat or very inadequate.*
- *Most (64%) found their work as a child representative rewarding.*
Three related hypotheses for the study of the *QIC-ChildRep* intervention:

**First Hypothesis:** An attorney trained in and supported to practice according to the *QIC-ChildRep* model will, on average, improve fundamental child welfare outcomes for his or her clients, compared to an attorney who is not so trained and supported.

*Remember:* Inform decisions about attorney training or professional development *NOT* whether or not to provide attorneys to children. Every child in the study was represented by either a treatment or control attorney.
Hypothesized child outcomes

- More placement stability
- More kinship placements
- Reduced time in care
- Increased rate of permanency (reunification, relative, adoption exits)
- No change in repeat maltreatment
- No change in likelihood of reentry to care
Three related hypotheses for the study of the intervention:

**Second Hypothesis:** The QIC-ChildRep intervention will change the way attorneys practice to be more in line the *QIC-ChildRep* model. This change in practice will become detectable based on average behavior across a variety of cases.
Hypothesized attorney outcomes

More Frequent contact with different parties
- Children
- Immediate and extended family
- Proximate collaterals (e.g., foster parents, caseworkers, other attorneys)
- Distal collaterals (e.g., teachers, mental health providers, MDs)

More Time spent on case-related activities
- Legal case prep (e.g., develop theory of case, legal research, negotiation with parties, review of case plan / court file)
- Investigation and document review (e.g., safety assessment, record review)

Limitations:
- Self-reported
- Couldn’t directly observe quality – of interactions with child, of interactions with collaterals, quality of advocacy
Hypothesized attorney outcomes, cont.

More Frequent participation in hearings and meetings

- Mediation
- Family team meeting
- Pre-trial hearing / settlement conference
- Motion hearing

More Advocacy Activities

- Initiate Non-adversarial case resolution process
- Argue to change array of services for child and/or family

Limitations:
- Self-reported
- Couldn’t directly observe quality – of interactions with child, of interactions with collaterals, quality of advocacy
Three related hypotheses for the study of the intervention:

**Third Hypothesis:** Attorneys will have an appetite for professional development based on the *QIC-ChildRep* model, in the form of the two-day training, pod and coaching sessions.
The research design was comprehensive.

- Experiment took place in 37 jurisdictions. The evaluation was designed to measure the **average effect** of the intervention over **multiple jurisdictions**.

- Sought to include **all attorneys** practicing in each jurisdiction so that findings would pertain to the average attorney, not just attorneys who where inclined to participate.

- Research design included power analysis with required numbers of attorneys and cases to detect a moderate impact.

  - 146 attorneys in Georgia; 13 judicial districts
  - 118 attorneys in Washington; 24 judicial districts

- **Variety of local contexts**
  - Attorneys with a variety of skills
The research design was experimental.

- Random assignment of attorneys created a group of attorneys who represented *what would have happened* to the treatment group had they not received the treatment.

- Why random? Because random assignment is the best way to equally distribute things that would affect behavior across the two groups so as to *isolate treatment effect*.

- Why *random within jurisdiction*? So that *jurisdiction differences aren’t erroneously associated* with treatment or control groups.
## Timeline of Intervention and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Event</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation agreement</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of Attorney/Jurisdiction Participation</td>
<td>October 2011–</td>
<td>January 2012–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney baseline survey launch</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random assignment of attorneys</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial two-day QIC best practice model training</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second two-day QIC best practice model training</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First pod meeting and coaching session</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last pod meeting and coaching session</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney survey data collection</td>
<td>October 2013–</td>
<td>July 2012–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research of this scope takes consistent effort over time.
Almost all treatment attorneys attended two-day training.

- 5 out of 68 attorneys missed in Georgia
- 2 out of 63 attorneys missed in Washington

- With respect to two-day training, intent-to-treat design is strong.
Pods and coaching not consistently offered; mostly phone pod meetings; less structured approach.

10% to 60% of attorneys participated at every offer; median pods=3; median coaching=3

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and Children's Justice
- Pods and coaching consistently offered; in person pod meetings; structured approach.

- 60% to 85% of attorneys participated at every offer; median pods=7; median coaching=9

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and Children's Justice
With respect to coaching and pod meetings, intent-to-treat design was strong for Washington and less strong for Georgia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Skill</th>
<th>Percent of All Treatment Attorneys Discussing Skill at Least 3 Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter Child's World</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Needs</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate Effectively</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Safety</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Case Planning</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Case Theory</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still, almost half of Georgia attorneys were exposed to first four skills at least three times.

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and Children’s Justice
Second Hypothesis: Attorneys will change behavior

Georgia, treatment compared to control:
More differences than WA attorneys:
• Met with their child client more frequently
• Contacted more parties relevant to the case
• Spent more time on cases
• Engaged in more advocacy activities

Washington, treatment compared to control:
Fewer differences than GA attorneys:
• Contacted foster parents and substitute caregivers more
• Spent more time developing the theory of the case
• Made more efforts to initiate a non-adversarial case resolution process.
• Family team meetings and motion hearings were also more likely to occur

Source: Attorney, case specific surveys; response rate 86%
What do we mean by treatment attorneys doing something “more than” control attorneys? Chart below shows % of times attorneys selected different contact options for frequency of contact of foster parents during survey period.

Light grey is control. Black is treatment. Top line is cumulative number of times contacted. Light grey line is always above black line on lower end of scale: Control attorneys are more likely to select option of fewer contacts.
Example of Table from Chapin Hall Evaluation Report/Children’s Justice

Table 2. WASHINGTON. Odds Ratio (OR) of treatment effect on times attorney met in person, spoken on the phone, emailed, or texted with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Individual</th>
<th>All Surveys</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological parent or original caregiver</td>
<td>1.48 †</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other individuals related to this child (e.g., grandparent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster parent or substitute caregiver</td>
<td>1.59 *</td>
<td>1.62 **</td>
<td>1.92 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseworker(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney for this child's parent's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attorneys or legal professionals</td>
<td>1.64 †</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.22 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>1.40 †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher or other education professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** - p-value < 0.01, * - p-value < 0.05, † - p-value < 0.1.

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and Children’s Justice
Table 7. Exit status from out-of-home care by permanent and other exit types, all assignments to project attorneys. Observed through March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Type</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th></th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit to family/relative</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Permanency Exits</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Exits</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in care on 3/31/2015</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that about 50% of exits had not yet occurred when data collection concluded on March 31, 2015, so we could not measure the impact of the treatment attorneys on all of the later permanencies or later moves.

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and Children’s Justice
## Estimated Hazard Ratios of Placement with Kin and Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>H.R.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Placement with kin</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No placement move within 1 year of assignment</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Placement with kin</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No placement move within 1 year of assignment</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H.R. = Hazard ratio. For kinship analysis, hazard ratio of greater than 1 indicates greater likelihood of placement with kin. For movement analysis, hazard ratio of greater than 1 indicates greater likelihood of a stable placement (no movement). Sig = p-value

*Children represented by treatment attorneys did not experience significantly more placement with kin or significantly less placement movement within 1 year of assignment.*

Source: Chapin Hall evaluation report and and Children’s Justice
Percent Difference in Hazard of Exit to Permanence between QIC and Control Groups By State and Observation Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Entry to 3 years</th>
<th>Entry to 6 months</th>
<th>6 months to 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Black column represents statistically significant difference.*
How Multidisciplinary Practice Improves Outcomes for Children

The Flint MDT Study
Roadmap

- Project overview
- Findings
- Reasons for impacts
- Remaining challenges
The Flint MDT Study

A description and evaluation of a multidisciplinary team of lawyers and social workers collaborating to represent children in child welfare.
Project Overview

The QIC-ChildRep was also interesting in evaluating MDTs, an approach considered “best practice” within the field.

Decided to create a new MDT and study:
1) Qualitatively the process of forming these teams and
2) Quantitatively their potential effects on case outcomes.

With these data, the study identified key elements to a successful multidisciplinary collaboration.
The Flint MDT Program

Genesee County, MI contracts with a small non-profit law firm to handle all of their child representation.

The study paired the 5 lawyer-guardians ad litem with 2 social workers.

The study asked the newly-formed team to develop their own collaboration. The study gave them training in MDT methods but did not provide a structure for them to follow.
Data Collection

The study uses **qualitative data** from **observations** of meetings and interviews to describe the events, attitudes, successes, and challenges of the MDT and to evaluate the approach’s strengths and weaknesses.

The study uses **quantitative data** from **court administrative records** to measure outcome differences between the intervention and control groups.
Method: Experimental Design

Within-Subject – the attorneys served as both intervention and control subjects.

Randomized control – The randomization of cases to attorney and then to the intervention or control group produced two statistically equivalent groups of children.
Evaluation Sample

Case assignments: March 17, 2014 – October 30, 2015

409 Children from 216 Families

60% assigned to intervention and 40% to control
Finding

The MDT approach resulted in **quicker resolution of more cases.**

- MDT cases were more likely to be resolved and therefore dismissed at or prior to adjudication.

Dismissal rate for intervention group was 31% versus 11% for the control group.
Finding

The MDT was **better at preserving family connections.**

- Children represented by the MDT were more likely to be ever placed with relatives [61% versus 46%].

- Less likely to be ever placed in non-relative foster care. [46% versus 64%].

- Both mothers and fathers of children served by the MDT had fewer petitions filed to terminate their parental rights. [Mothers were 16% versus 30%, Fathers 20% versus 30%].
Reasons for Impact

Attorneys’ respect for the social work skillset.

The LGALs learned how to trust the social workers to do what was needed on their cases.
Reasons for Impact

Effective collaboration with the child welfare agency.

The social workers collaborated with the child welfare agency to build alliances and tear down barriers.
Reasons for Impact

Earlier access to assessment and services.

The social workers provided intensive advocacy early in the case, which often changed the case trajectory.
Remaining Challenge

Improve inter-professional relationships.

Differences in professional values and ethics are well-known sources of tension inherent when attorneys and social workers collaborate. The experience in this study was no different.
Remaining Challenge

Better protection of due process rights.

Individual client confidentiality needs better protecting while parties attempt to collaborate to support the whole family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MDT</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Sample</td>
<td>% of Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% with outcome</td>
<td>with outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children Randomly Assigned</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication – almost all</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed at or prior to adjud.***</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination of Parental Rights - all</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition for Mother**</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition for Father*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order for Mother</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order for Father</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency - all</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case closed after placement and reunification</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case closed after placement and discharged to guardianship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case closed after placement and adoption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child at home at case assignment</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child removed after case assignment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever removed</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever placed with relative**</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever placed in foster care**</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever placed in residential</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever placed with siblings</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .10, ** p ≤ .05, *** p ≤ .00
The court's financial team created a per child/per hearing cost estimate of $2016. These estimates include the costs of salaries (proportional to time spent on child welfare cases) of judges, clerks, records, security, and administration staff, and the facilities and supply costs. It does not include the attorney salary costs.

### Return on Investment Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional children with dismissed petitions</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of avoided post-adjudication hearings</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total saved first year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$216,784</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children prevented from rolling over into second year</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of avoided hearings from prevented rolling over</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost avoided from preventing 68 children rolling into new year</td>
<td><strong>$518,250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost avoided in current year from increase in dismissals</td>
<td><strong>$216,784</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total saved second and subsequent years</td>
<td><strong>$735,034</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment per year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$535,034</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per dollar spent per year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The full descriptive narrative of the collaborations and the evaluation results are presented in Chapter 12 of Children’s Justice.


The dataset will be available from the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect.

The return on investment analysis will be available Pott, R, The Ethical and Economic Reasons to Provide Social Work Services at the Client Level, Juvenile and Family Court Journal, forthcoming.
Zinn, A. & Orlebeke, B. (in press)
*Family Court Review.*
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How attorneys’ activities and tasks vary as function of case-, attorney-, and jurisdiction level factors.
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*Family Court Review.*

How attorneys’ activities and tasks vary as function of case-, attorney-, and jurisdiction level factors.

Drivers of child representation practice

Practice & policy prescriptions
Web-based surveys of 166 attorneys representing 745 children in WA & GA

Surveys were administered when
(a) attorneys were assigned to represent child,
(b) approximately every 6 months (until case closure)
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Surveys were administered when
(a) attorneys were assigned to represent child,
(b) approximately every 6 months (until case closure)
Web-based surveys of 166 attorneys representing 745 children in WA & GA

Frequency of contact with different parties

- Children
- Immediate and extended family
- Proximate collaterals (e.g., foster parents, caseworkers, other attorneys)
- Distal collaterals (e.g., teachers, mental health providers, MDs)

Surveys were administered when (a) attorneys were assigned to represent child, (b) approximately every 6 months (until case closure)

86% response rate
Web-based surveys of 166 attorneys representing 745 children in WA & GA

Frequency of contact with different parties
- Children
- Immediate and extended family
- Proximate collaterals (e.g., foster parents, caseworkers, other attorneys)
- Distal collaterals (e.g., teachers, mental health providers, MDs)

Time spent on case-related activities
- Legal case prep (e.g., develop theory of case, legal research, negotiation with parties, review of case plan / court file)
- Investigation and document review (e.g., safety assessment, record review)

86% response rate

Surveys were administered when
(a) attorneys were assigned to represent child,
(b) approximately every 6 months (until case closure)
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Overall variation can be attributed (i.e., parsed) to different "levels"

Differences across circuits / jurisdictions

Differences across attorneys

Differences between cases

Between 50% - 72% of overall variation attributable to differences between cases
Only a small portion (<6%) of overall variation attributable to jurisdictions.

Between 50% - 72% of overall variation attributable to differences between cases.

Overall variation can be attributed (i.e., parsed) to different "levels":
- Differences across circuits / jurisdictions
- Differences across attorneys
- Differences between cases
Overall variation can be attributed (i.e., parsed) to different "levels"

Differences across circuits / jurisdictions

Only a small portion (<6%) of overall variation attributable to jurisdictions

Substantial minority (23% - 47%) of overall variation attributable to attorneys

Between 50% - 72% of overall variation attributable to differences between cases
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Child Age
- More frequent attorney contact with children and family (4% per year) when representing older children
- Older children more communicative
- Older children have more complex legal problems

Residential Care
- Less frequent attorney contact (25%) with children and family when representing children in residential care
- Proxy for behavior
- Remoteness of facilities or other barriers to access
- Perceptions about need for, of ease of, communication

Gender
- More frequent attorney contact with all parties (between 13% and 28%) when representing females (vs. males)

Race / ethnicity
- No significant differences
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Age & Tenure

- Age: n.s.
- Tenure: < 1 year report higher rates of most activities

Representing children is "rewarding"

- CR is rewarding: higher rates of case-related activities and some types of contact
- Eager rookies
- Less efficient
- Effort motivated by attitudes
- Where efforts are (actually) rewarding, attorneys are motivated to do more
### Differences Across Attorney Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age &amp; Tenure</th>
<th>Age: n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure: &lt; 1 year</td>
<td>report higher rates of most activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representing children is "rewarding"**

- CR is rewarding: higher rates of case-related activities and some types of contact
- Eager rookies
- Less efficient
- Effort motivated by attitudes
- Where efforts are (actually) rewarding, attorneys are motivated to do more
- Lower rates -> harder work (probably not)
- B/c compensation is fixed, more effort -> lower effective per-hour rate

**Compensation is "very inadequate"**

- "Very inadequate": higher rates of case-related activities and some types of contact
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Dependency caseload size

- Higher caseloads: lower rates of case-related activities
- Burden of larger caseloads

% of practice devoted to CR

- Higher CR %: higher rates of case-related activities and (most types) of contact
- Benefits of specialization
- Committed child representatives specialize and work harder
## Differences Across Attorney Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependency caseload size</th>
<th>Higher caseloads: lower rates of case-related activities</th>
<th>Burden of larger caseloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of practice devoted to CR</td>
<td>Higher CR %: higher rates of case-related activities and (most types) of contact</td>
<td>Benefits of specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by private, non-profit</td>
<td>Higher rates of contact with children and distal collaterals</td>
<td>Committed child representatives specialize and work harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational-level resources, expectations, culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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