



CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT

CITIZEN REVIEW PANELS 2021-22 FISCAL YEAR



INTRODUCTION

In 1996, an amendment to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) mandated that each state establish at least three Citizen Review Panels composed of members of the community to research a systemic issue within child welfare and make recommendations to improve related policies and practices. The Citizen Review Board (CRB), Oregon’s citizen foster care review program, has coordinated these panels since 2012.

For the 2021-22 fiscal year, CRB convened two statewide panels—one was a statewide survey of CRBs to identify areas of need within the foster system and the other focused on compliance with the federal periodic review requirement. A third statewide panel on youth who run from foster care that convened the prior fiscal year was continued.

Collectively, panels were composed of members representing CRB volunteers and staff, the Oregon Department of Human Services (ODHS), court appointed special advocates (CASA), and Oregon Foster Youth Connection (OFYC). Over the course of the fiscal year, they:

- Reviewed related laws, policies, and practices;
- Performed data collections;
- Heard from subject matter experts; and
- Developed recommendations.

The statewide survey of CRBs included all 61 boards. Most meet monthly to review cases. A handful meet every other month and one board meets quarterly. The analysis of periodic review compliance was overseen by the CRB Advisory Committee, which meets quarterly. The panel on youth who run from foster care met seven times over the 2020-21 and 2021-22 fiscal years.

The panels’ findings and recommendations were submitted to Oregon’s Child Welfare Director on May 18, 2022. Per CAPTA, DHS has six months to respond in writing whether or how they intend to incorporate the panels’ recommendations into their improvement efforts. The report and responses will also be part of DHS’ annual Title IV-B Progress and Service Report to the federal government.

A special thank you is owed to all the panel members who participated in this project. Margaret Mead, an American cultural anthropologist, once said “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”

Past Panel Locations*

2012-13 FY

Deschutes County
Lane County
Lincoln County

2014-15 FY

Douglas County
Lane County
Multnomah County

2016-17 FY

Benton County
Multnomah County
Umatilla and Morrow

2018-19 FY

Baker County
Linn County
Multnomah County

2020-21 FY

Statewide (2)
Portland Metro

2013-14 FY

Deschutes County
Lane County
Lincoln County

2015-16 FY

Douglas County
Lane County
Multnomah County

2017-18 FY

Baker County
Linn County
Multnomah County

2019-20 FY

Marion County
Multnomah County
Statewide

2021-22 FY

Statewide (3)

*DHS transferred coordination of the Panels to CRB in 2012.

CITIZEN REVIEW BOARDS

Baker County (1 board)
Benton County (1 board)
Clackamas County (3 boards)
Clatsop County (1 board)
Columbia County (2 boards)
Coos County (2 boards)
Crook/Jefferson Counties (1 board)
Curry County (1 board)
Deschutes County (2 boards)
Douglas County (4 boards)
Harney/Grant Counties (1 board)
Hood River County (1 board)
Jackson County (4 boards)
Josephine County (2 boards)
Klamath County (3 boards)
Lake County (1 board)
Lane County (9 boards)
Lincoln County (2 boards)
Linn County (2 boards)
Malheur County (1 board)
Marion County (5 boards)
Multnomah County (1 board)
Polk County (1 board)
Tillamook County (1 board)
Umatilla/Morrow Counties (2 boards)
Union/Wallowa Counties (1 board)
Wasco County (1 board)
Washington County (4 boards)
Yamhill County (1 board)

Statewide Survey of Citizen Review Boards

The Citizen Review Board (CRB), Oregon’s citizen foster care review program, has been conducting periodic reviews of children in foster care since 1985. In Oregon, CRB and the courts share responsibility for conducting these federally required reviews. CRB typically does the first and second reviews at 6 and 12 months after the child enters foster care, the court conducts a permanency hearing at 14 months that also qualifies as a periodic review, and then CRB and the court alternate every 6 months thereafter until the child leaves foster care.

CRB has 61 boards across the state and 259 citizen volunteers who serve on them. In 2021, those boards conducted 2,880 reviews involving 3,943 children and young adults in foster care.

The diverse backgrounds of CRB volunteers combined with their training and access to cases position them to offer unique insights into the state foster system. In February 2022, in preparation for a program-wide strategic planning effort, CRB asked all of its boards to identify three areas within the system that need attention. This is what they said.

Important Background Information

Diversity of CRB Volunteers

CRB volunteers are independent and bring diverse backgrounds to reviews. Oregon law (ORS 419A.092) requires CRB to recruit volunteers from groups with special knowledge or interest in child welfare. On 12/3/2021, 48% of CRB volunteers were either currently employed or retired from occupations in education, health care, social work, or law.

Oregon law also requires that, as far as practicable, members of each local CRB shall represent the various socioeconomic and ethnic groups of the area served. In 2016, CRB adopted an action item in its 5-year strategic plan to focus board member recruitment on groups that are underrepresented on boards.

Those efforts continue today and include:

- Collecting and reporting demographic information on volunteers.
- Reaching out to local Latinx, BIPOC, and LGBTQ+ contacts and groups; universities and community colleges; and Tribes.
- Creating a specialized board in Klamath County to review Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases and making efforts to recruit local tribal members.

- Reaching out to Narcotics Anonymous (NA) and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) communities to recruit professionals with lived experience.
- Meeting and strategizing with diversity, equity, and inclusion professionals.
- Encouraging CRB coordinators to interview volunteer applicants with criminal histories that do not disqualify them from serving.
- Making the volunteer experience generally more accessible by enabling volunteers to appear for reviews remotely and serve partial days if needed.

Collectively, these efforts have had positive results:

- 23% of boards have a member who identifies as an ethnicity other than Caucasian.
- 26% of boards have a member who is age 35 or younger.
- 32% of boards have a member with an annual income of less than \$35,000.

CRB does not currently collect statistics on history its volunteers have with the foster system but anecdotal reports suggest many have personally touched the system in some capacity either as a child, resource parent, adoptive parent, or parent client. Anecdotal reports also suggest representation of the LGBTQ+ community on a number of boards.

Training

To conduct high-quality reviews, CRB volunteers need a basic understanding of dependency cases, roles of the various parties, child welfare administrative rules and procedures, applicable laws and appellate decisions, services in the community, and experiences of children and families involved in the system. Over the last year and a half, CRB has partnered with ODHS and others to bring monthly online trainings to CRB staff and volunteers on a variety of topics, including:

- Oregon ICWA,
- Concurrent planning,
- African American history and culture,
- Adoption process and timelines,

- Diligent relative search,
- Effective questioning during CRB reviews,
- Children with intellectual or developmental disabilities,
- Conducting trauma-informed CRB reviews,
- Batterer's Intervention,
- ODHS Child Welfare structure and goals,
- Portland's YWCA Family Preservation Project,
- Life of a dependency case,
- Lived Experience Expert Series: A Parent's Perspective,
- Reasonable efforts to prevent removal,
- The role of CASA,
- Standards for attorneys representing children, and
- Conditions for return.

In December 2021, CRB also updated its 16-hour new volunteer orientation training with 5 additional hours of web-based homework on race, gender, domestic violence, addiction, trauma, and resilience as well as two new mock dependency cases for volunteers to practice conducting culturally responsive reviews.

Analysis of CRB Findings

CRB volunteers and staff prepare for reviews by reading through packets of case material submitted by ODHS. During reviews, further information is collected by questioning the parties in attendance. Those parties typically included the caseworker, parents, attorneys for parents and children, CASA, tribal representative (when applicable), and resource parents. Sometimes children, extended family, and service providers also appear.

Boards use the information to make a series of legal findings about services ODHS is providing to the family, progress of the parents, and appropriateness of the permanency plan. Boards also make recommendations which ORS 419A.122 states ODHS shall (1) implement as they deem appropriate and resources permit and (2) give CRB written notice within 17 days of receiving the report if they do not intend to implement them.

As stated previously, in 2021, CRBs statewide conducted 2,880 reviews involving 3,943 children and young adults in foster care. In the vast majority of cases, boards found ODHS was providing appropriate services to the family:

- For 91% of the children reviewed, boards found ODHS had ensured appropriate services were in place to safeguard the child’s safety, health, and well-being (CRB Finding #3a).
- For 92% of the children reviewed with a permanency plan of reunification, boards found ODHS had made reasonable efforts (or active efforts when applicable) to provide services to make it possible for the child to safely return home (CRB Finding #4).

About 3 years ago, in an effort to advocate for system improvements, CRB started collecting data on why boards make certain negative findings. In 2021, boards made 337 negative findings for CRB Finding #3a (see first bullet at top of this page for wording of the finding). These negative findings are rarely made for a single reason but the most common reasons were concerns about safety (32%), mental health/therapeutic support (32%), and assessments (30%) including timeliness of assessments and following their recommendations.

Also in 2021, boards made 170 negative findings for CRB Finding #4 (see second bullet at top of this page for wording of the finding). The most common reasons were lack of a current Action Agreement or Letter of Expectation (46%) and one or more services not being offered (44%).

The full CRB Findings Reports for the 2021 calendar year are included in the appendix of this report. As one would expect, the most common reasons for negative findings closely relate to the areas within the foster system that boards identified as needing attention.

Statewide Survey of CRBs

As stated previously, in preparation for a program-wide strategic planning effort, CRB asked all of its boards in February 2022 to identify three areas within

the foster system that need attention. They were challenged to develop a focus statement for each of the following categories:

- A large statewide issue affecting the foster system (not limited to those CRB can impact),
- A more specific statewide issue that CRB can meaningfully impact, and
- A local (county) issue related to CRB that needs improvement.

Boards submitted 196 focus statements that were consolidated into 21 focus areas. Below is information on the top three.

Improve Placement Safety and Stability

The largest number (38) of similar statements related to improving placement safety and stability. They identified a need for more resource homes generally and more specialized therapeutic homes specifically. They suggested incentives like higher payments for resource parents with specialized skills, assistance finding respite providers, in-home hands-on training, mentors for new resource parents, and access to a statewide network of professionals for consultation might help with recruitment and retention. They also suggested using data on the needs of children in care to target resource parent recruitment and better matching of children to resource families.

One board noted children who enter foster care in California are initially placed in group homes together with their siblings and other children where they live for a few weeks to a month while the agency makes efforts to locate a resource family that is truly appropriate to their specific needs, personalities, and culture. The children are then placed with an appropriate family, resulting in a more stable placement where siblings are more likely to remain together.

The remaining statements in this category focused on ensuring Supervision Plans are created and updated per ODHS policy; safety service providers are properly screened and monitored; and improving transitions between placements.

Improve the Quality of Case Work

The second largest number (20) of similar statements related to improving the quality of case work. They identified a need for ensuring caseworker workloads are kept at manageable levels, more stability in case assignments, better matching of caseworker strengths to family needs and dynamics, training on reasonable efforts standards, and more compliance and consistency across the state around Action Agreements, Letters of Expectation, Supervision Plans, Family Engagement Meetings, Youth Transition Planning (starting at age 14), and Benchmark Reviews.

Increase Access to Mental Health Services

The third largest number (19) of similar statements related to increasing access to mental health services, particularly for children. They identified a need to develop more and better contracts with mental health providers to ensure timely services, more flexibility to access providers outside a local Coordinated Care Organization (CCO), increase school-based counseling services, and improve timeliness of developmental/psychological evaluations for children.

Recommendations*

1. Improve placement safety and stability.
2. Improve the quality of case work.
3. Increase access to mental health services, particularly for children.

*These recommendations are obviously large, well-known, and long-standing issues. Easy to say and write on paper. Infinitely harder to do. Over the years, ODHS has addressed these issues on multiple fronts. These recommendations are not meant to minimize that good work. They are simply the top areas of need within the foster system identified by CRB volunteers in preparation for a program-wide CRB strategic planning effort.

PANEL MEMBERS

CRB Advisory Committee Members

CRB Volunteers

Kent Bailey, Baker County
Kathy Cooney, Washington County
Jennifer Doerner, Douglas County
Lee Graves, Malheur County
Jessica Lloyd-Rogers, Douglas County
Beverly Schenler, Lane County
Melinda Stephens-Bukey, Jackson County
Danny Stoddard, Coos County
Bill Wagner, Deschutes County
Jeff White, Yamhill County

CRB Staff

Angela Keffer, Field Manager and
Volunteer Resource Coordinator
Christina Jagernauth, CRB Assistant
Director
John Nichols, Field Manager
Heidi Strauch, Juvenile Court
Programs Manager
Tricia Swallow, Field Manager

PROGRESS REPORT: Analysis of Periodic Review Compliance

Federal law (42 U.S.C. 675(5)(B)) requires a periodic review of each child in foster care at least every six months. Compliance with this requirement is one of multiple factors that feed into how much federal reimbursement states receive for resource (foster) parents and services to children and families.

As stated previously, in Oregon, CRB and the courts share responsibility for conducting these reviews. Historically, they have done a good job. Meeting the periodic review requirement was listed as a “Strength” in all three federal Child and Family Services Reviews of the state child welfare system.

With that said, the COVID-19 pandemic put enormous strain on everything, including systems we assume just work. In 2021, CRB and its Advisory Committee started looking closely at potential places CRB processes for ensuring timely reviews might be breaking down. In March 2022, they started an “audit” of periodic review compliance in the 2021 calendar year.

Preliminary Results

Every evening, CRB receives a data share from ODHS on all children who have entered foster care, changed placements, or left foster care since the last data share. CRB closely tracks periodic review due dates and holds a CRB review if there is not a qualifying court hearing scheduled to occur in time. Only CRB reviews, complete judicial reviews, and permanency hearings qualify as periodic reviews.

To perform the “audit,” the Oregon Judicial Department’s case management system was queried for all foster care entries and exits from July 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021 as well as all CRB reviews, complete judicial reviews, and permanency hearings held during the same time period. Dates and event types were then consolidated into rows in ascending order for each child and the number of days between each event was calculated.

Preliminary results show 88% of the cases (7374 out of 8413) were in compliance with the periodic review requirement throughout the 2021 calendar year. It is important to note this includes 2003 cases where at least one periodic review fell in the “30-day grace period” following a review due date. This grace period is documented in the memorandum of understanding between CRB and ODHS, and is a necessity in coordinating CRB reviews with court hearings.

Sometimes review due dates pull CRB reviews into a prior month because of the board's once per month meeting schedule. If there was not a grace period, the next review due date might trigger another CRB review right before the annual permanency hearing.

The "audit" showed that 1039 cases were out of compliance with the periodic review requirement at some point during the 2021 calendar year. The big question is, why?

Trial Reunification Placements

In October 2012, CRB stopped reviewing children in trial reunification placements with their parents. The argument was that ORS 419A.106(1) only authorizes CRB to review children in substitute care and ORS 419A.004(34)(b)(C) states that substitute care does not include in-home placement. This interpretation came at a time when CRB was trying to reduce its reviews after some difficult budget reductions and staff layoffs. Since that time, staff have pointed out that the statute actually says substitute care does not include "In-home placement subject to conditions or limitations." The "trial" part of a trial reunification placement does seem to be a condition or limitation that distinguishes it from other in-home placements.

It is clear, however, that federal law continues to require periodic reviews of children in trial reunification placements and that courts can conduct them. These cases just don't have the backup of CRB to conduct the review if the court doesn't. CRB is still finishing the "audit" but it looks like trial reunification placements could be part of the story in as much as 40% of the cases that were out of compliance with the periodic review requirement.

Many CRB staff and Advisory Committee members have expressed wanting to reinstate CRB reviews of children in trial reunification placements. This partly comes from seeing overly long gaps between reviews in some children who have returned to an out-of-home placement after a trial reunification, and partly from a small number of tragedies that have occurred during trial reunification placements.

Remaining Cases

A spot check of the remaining cases appear to show a mixture of:

- Cases where scheduled permanency hearings were continued or set-over more than a month past the review due date,
- Issues with the nightly data share from ODHS,
- CRB data entry errors, and
- A court relieving CRB at times when a periodic review is due.

Plans for Next Year

CRB will continue to analyze the cases from 2021 and develop plans to address each area causing cases to fall out of compliance.

PANEL MEMBERS

Citizen Review Board

Board Members

Norma Alexander, Linn County
Cheryl Campbell, Lane County
David Davini, Lane County
Donna Fagan-Pelissier, Jackson County
Monica Gillooly, Linn County
Lee Graves, Malheur County
Sue Harbin, Klamath County
Jean Harman, Lane County
Kathryn Kennedy, Union County
Jessica Lloyd-Rogers, Douglas County
Elizabeth Peard, Jackson County
Tamara Richards, Lane County
Richard Spady, Multnomah County
Kathy Smith, Hood River County
Bill Wagner, Deschutes County

Staff

Amanda Hazen, Review Specialist
Kristina Knittel, Field Manager
Christina Jagernauth, CRB Assistant
Director

Oregon Foster Youth Connection

Madison Langan

CASA of Marion County

Shaney Starr, Executive Director

Oregon Department of Human Services

Amber McClelland, Permanency
Consultant
Matt Rasmussen, Runaway and
Homeless Youth Program
Coordinator

Statewide CAPTA Citizen Review Panel on Youth Who Run from Foster Care

The Statewide CAPTA Citizen Review Panel on Youth Who Run from Foster Care convened in the 2020-21 FY and completed its work in the 2021-22 FY. The panel included 21 members: 15 CRB volunteers and 2 staff, a representative from Oregon Foster Youth Connection (OFYC), a representative from CASA of Marion County, and 2 representatives from ODHS.

During the first meeting, panel members shared their concerns related to youth who run from foster care and what information they want to collect. Below are highlights from that discussion:

- What makes youth decide to stay (not run)?
- Why do they run? Where do they go? For how long?
- What do they experience? How often are they safe?
- What resources are available?
- How often do they stay engaged in school and/or services?
- What is being done to identify youth who might run?
- What interventions are used?
- How well are foster parents trained to recognize the signs?
- How well are current mental health resources meeting needs?
- What data is already available?
- What is the protocol when a youth runs? What is it when they're found? How often are all the steps followed?
- What types of placements are available? Is anyone tracking outcomes? What is ODHS' capacity to deal with placements that are not ideal for youth at risk of running?
- How involved are youth in developing their placement plan?
- Are LGBTQ+ youth being placed in supportive homes?
- Are the persons who must be notified within 24 hours of a run the right people? Should friends/close associates be added?

Literature Review

Child Welfare (CW) Procedures for Missing Children and Youth Adults¹

The panel reviewed CW procedures for missing children and young adults. When a child runs, the caseworker must make a report to law enforcement and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) within 24 hours. The worker must also notify parents and caregivers, court, attorneys, CASA, and tribe on the same working day the child is reported missing. After the child is missing for more than 24 hours, the caseworker must staff the case with a supervisor and continue these staffings at least once per week.

The worker must search for the child. This includes physically looking; looking on the internet; using the phone; contacting individuals close to the child; and checking with shelters, hospitals, juvenile detention, etc. The worker must assemble a team to provide guidance on how to locate the child. This team may include law enforcement, juvenile probation, NGO-nonprofit for case management beyond ODHS provided services, shelter/treatment, and district attorney. Some counties already have these teams formed and call them multidisciplinary teams (MDT).

When the child is located, the caseworker must meet with the child, arrange transportation, and determine the placement. If the worker is considering returning the child to the last placement, the worker must gather information from the child and placement separately and, if the reasons are related to the placement itself, staff the placement decision with a supervisor. If the child has a history of running and won't accept any placement selected by ODHS, the worker can consider a relative, former caregiver or other adult in the child's life. Certification requirements must be met.

The child must be seen by a medical professional within 24 hours. Also within 24 hours, the caseworker must notify those who were notified of the run that the child has been found. The worker then vacates any pick-up order or warrant, replaces needed clothing or personal items, schedules a meeting with the child's team, and takes a photo of the child.

Within 3 days of being found, the caseworker must have a face-to-face contact with the child to determine the factors that contributed to the run, the experiences when missing, and whether the child is a victim or at risk of being a victim of sex trafficking. ODHS has a [Run Debrief](#) form to assist workers. The worker then must try to address the factors that contributed to the run, which may include seeking advice from the MDT, updating the ongoing safety plan, and/or developing a Run Prevention Plan. The worker also must take steps, if needed, to resume the child's schooling.

Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) Program

Oregon's [RHY Program](#) is part of ODHS' Self-Sufficiency Program and is responsible for coordinating and

delivering services to runaway and homeless youth. With a budget of roughly \$3.1 million, RHY funds 24 grants to 13 providers across the state that offer:

- Overnight shelter services,
- Drop-in day facilities and outreach services, and
- Job development and mentoring services.

RHY has not had a budget increase since 2015.

RHY is engaged in two efforts to collect data on Oregon's homeless youth population. They are partnering with Oregon Housing & Community Services to inform the legislature of options for implementing an information system capable of tracking outcome data for homeless individuals. RHY also entered into a grant agreement with the Corporation for Supportive Housing to conduct a comprehensive statewide needs assessment and develop a 5-year roadmap for housing and support services for youth experiencing homelessness.

Homeless Youth Advisory Council

Oregon has a Homeless Youth Advisory Council (HYAC) charged with advising ODHS regarding policies and procedures that address statewide planning for the delivery of services to runaway and homeless youth and their families. In December 2019, HYAC developed a strategic action plan to build a statewide services system.

State and National Data on Homeless Youth

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) 2020 [Point-in-Time Count](#) found there were 1,314 unaccompanied homeless youth in Oregon, and 846 of them were unsheltered.

In 2017, Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago conducted a nation-wide study² on levels of homelessness amongst teens and young adults. Some of the findings from that study include:

- 1 in 10 young adults (ages 18 to 25) and 1 in 30 adolescents (ages 13 to 17) experience some form of homelessness over the course of a year.

- Certain populations—specifically, African American and Hispanic youth; young people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender; young parents; and those who have not completed high school—are statistically more likely to experience homelessness than their peers.
- Nearly one-third of youth experiencing homelessness had experiences with foster care and nearly half had been in juvenile detention, jail, or prison.

ODHS also conducted an internal data collection of foster youth on runaway status and found 37% were over the age of 18.

2020 OFYC Policy Recommendations

The [2020 OFYC Policy Recommendations](#) covered multiple areas that could impact a youth’s decision to stay in a placement including culturally sensitive placements and access to mental health services.

Subject Matter Expert Interviews

In June 2021, the workgroup interviewed four subject matter experts: 1) ODHS Permanency Consultant, 2) ODHS Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) Program Coordinator, 3) Oregon Foster Youth Connection (OFYC) representative; and 4) former Director of a youth homeless shelter. Below is a summary of those interviews.

What are some ways caseworkers can reduce risk of youth running from foster care the first time? Do these strategies change for youth who have run previously? If yes, how?

(ODHS Permanency Consultant) A child is less likely to leave (run from) foster care if their needs are being met in foster care, so part of it is understanding what those needs are. Often when youth leave, they’re either running to something or away from something. Another part is having the placements to meet their needs. The current lack of placements makes placement matching difficult. For example, I recently talked with a worker who was trying to place a teen and there were no homes for teens in that

community. It was a rural community. The teen had to be placed outside the community. Placements like this are difficult because it’s not where they’re from, it’s away from their friends, and they’re having to pick up their whole life.

Other ways of reducing risk are really using Youth Decision Meetings (YDMs) so youth have a place to bring their team together and be heard, training our workforce how to build rapport with and engage youth, giving youth the ability to have contact with their natural support system (i.e., the people who are important to them), and educating our caregivers more about collaborative problem solving and youth being part of their household. For example, not “my house my rules” but how to share the space in a way that empowers the youth and meets their needs. All these strategies apply to reducing risk of youth running for the first time as well as subsequent runs.

What are warning signs that a youth is about to run? Are there efforts underway to identify these youth and direct interventions (services) to them? If yes, what interventions?

(RHY Program Coordinator) There’s a simple answer and a more complex one. The simple answer is warning signs - changes in behavior out of the blue, sudden mood swings, dropping grades, truancy in school, starting to accumulate money and resources, and hinting at running. The more complex answer is that we often label youth as a “runner” when a lot of the other warning signs (e.g., having family issues, being isolated, changes in friends, extreme changes in habits, being depressed, anger outbursts) are a direct result of a child entering foster care.

Most young people are in foster care because of family issues. And in foster care, there are often changes in placements, feelings that they don’t know anybody, they are told what friends they can and cannot have. It is the process of entering foster care that brings many of these warning signs to light, so it’s important not to overemphasize their meaning.

Labeling a young person as a runner can be harmful. Try to imagine yourself in the young person’s shoes. Moving into a new house with complete strangers and possibly even a new school. On top of this, there are

mental health assessments, CANS screenings, therapy requirements, and family meetings. All of this is coupled with the trauma they've experienced. It's not surprising for a young person to feel they just need to get out of there.

Collaborative problem solving is one thing that has always resonated with me. It's a complex process but, when you break it down, it really comes down to "kids do well if they can." You never really know what a person is going through. When you're talking about young people's response to stress (running away, punching holes in walls, cussing at people, cutting themselves), that may be the best they can do right now. Treating the outward action won't work without going deeper – trying to get to the root of the matter that can make this youth respond better. It could be complex or it could be that the youth just wants to be heard. If we don't take the time, we're always going to be just focused on the outward response without getting to the true needs.

I believe at one point ODHS was working on identifying factors that predict runs such as multiple runs, increased number of placements, having certain diagnosis; but I'm not sure any of that has actually been implemented or is planning to be implemented. There's a fine line between predicting behavior and labeling kids as a problem. It's a big risk saying "given your upbringing and these other factors, we're going to be watching you intently."

I think some of the other work ODHS is doing on the process of working through what self-selected placements mean to young people and modifying worker responses to youth in transition is the right way to go. In the immediate, this is where the work is really taking off.

What do you wish people understood about being a youth in foster care?

(OFYC Representative) I really appreciate what has been said about the work being focused on the actual youth and their well-being because I feel our place in the system is so often overlooked. No youth in the system has asked to be put there. Their whole life has been turned around. When you're young, your parent or caregiver has a very large role in your life and when

that is messed up, everything surrounding it can get messed up too. Our responses to these situations may not be ideal but they're often natural responses to very bad situations we're put in. If we're not given correct coping mechanisms or skills or have people who listen to us, things like this happen.

Another thing that is overlooked is how much youth are trying to transform their former lives. Sometimes it's like "I miss hanging out with my friends" or "I miss doing this" all because you're in a situation you didn't ask to be put in. Why might a youth not respond in the best way? Oftentimes we're not given any other opportunities or don't know what else to do. Sometimes bad choices seem like the easiest to make and they're there. The youth may not necessarily want to be making these choices either. But, at the time, it may seem like the best option.

You used to work in a youth shelter. What would you want people to know about the youth you served?

(Former Director of a Youth Shelter) I can't emphasize enough the importance of building relationships with these youth, so they have a voice. That takes a lot of time. When youth are coming to the shelter or on the run, they're really asking where they fit into the world at this time. They know their self is better than people think. The challenge is gaining the trust necessary so they can voice their needs.

The system puts focus on outside individuals to determine what is best for the youth. The outside individuals may ask the youth about their wants and they'll get a response like "I don't know" or "I don't care." The outside individuals accept that and try to seek input from others. I feel like we're often not really listening to youth and taking the time to build the trust and rapport to hear their needs. They have a lot of needs and opinions, and a lot of time is needed to build the trust with youth to share them.

I was also a CRB member and I can't tell you how many times I heard caseworkers say the youth didn't want to come. In my experience directing the shelter, that's usually not the case. Usually they don't know the process. It hasn't been explained to them. They're not understanding the benefits of having a voice at

CRB or Court. They haven't been empowered or have the time to be empowered. They haven't been provided the advocacy to come to these sorts of things. A few times I went to CRB with some of the youth at the shelter because I was able to build rapport with them and support them.

On the ODHS side, a lot of the workers want to do social work. They want the time to build those relationships so they can do what they went to school for – to build relationships, change lives, help the community, and serve others. Unfortunately, with caseloads, they can't do that. They get burnt out, they do other things, and they're left wondering when they can get back to social work. Getting back to social work and building the relationships that get to the underlying wounds and needs of the youth would be a huge benefit.

How do caseworkers search for missing foster youth? Do certain techniques tend to work better than others? How much time should caseworkers reasonably devote to searching in the beginning? How much time should they spend on an ongoing basis?

(ODHS Permanency Consultant) Caseloads make an impact. While there are some places that have teen workers (workers with only teens on their caseload), a typical caseload can include a 6-month old where the worker is assessing safe sleep and a 16-year old who the worker is trying to keep in a placement. Really knowing your youth is important to effectively searching for your youth. One of the recommendations in our unit is to have specialized workers for teens with specialized training for working with them.

The time workers spend searching for missing youth varies. Two and a half years ago, we did a snapshot study of kids who were missing and found many workers knew where they were. But, the definition of missing is not being in a certified placement, and those youth were not wanting to be in a certified placement. This is where a self-selected environment comes in. In the last 6 months, we've provided workers a procedure for self-selected environments that fills the gap between being missing from a placement and knowing where they are and trying to

get them back into a certified placement. Since so many workers know where the kids are, if they know the youth is homeless, they're going to be searching the last place the youth went. The time spent searching also varies if it's a 13-year old missing versus an 18-year old missing who just wants to be with their friends. Workers are going to spend more time on the 13-year old because their age makes them more vulnerable.

What techniques really work in finding missing youth? Knowing the youth and their team. Knowing their friends, family, therapist so you can call them when the youth is missing. I talked to a teen worker in Portland recently who knows all the homeless camps in the area. This minimizes search time because the worker knows where to go.

Things that can be helpful is if the youth has a phone. If I could, I would provide every youth in foster care a phone so we could reach them if needed. Searching social media accounts of the youth and their friends is a good strategy as well as contacting law enforcement and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC). However, where you are at can affect how much law enforcement support you get in looking for the youth. There should be case notes reflecting the search. Our rule doesn't define how often a worker should search, but the search should be ongoing, and the worker should be actively searching for the youth at least monthly.

How much variety of placement options are available in Oregon for foster youth? Do they meet the need? If not, where are the gaps?

(RHY Program Coordinator) Placements options going up the level of involvement are:

- Foster homes. These can be with kin, family, or a stranger.
- Qualified residential treatment programs (QRTP). Historically called behavioral rehabilitation services (BRS) placements, these residential behavioral treatment settings can be site-based or foster home-based.
- Mental health placements. ODHS can't put a

youth in this type of placement without getting approval from the Oregon Health Authority. Psychiatric Residential Treatment Services (PRTS) offer short-term 24-hour support for youth. Then there are sub-acute, crisis, and acute care which is hospital-based.

There are also non-BRS placements that have the same site and family-based services but without the treatment requirements. A lot of the youth homeless shelters fall into this category. In the last few years, there has been restrictions put on the time youth can spend in non-BRS placements. I think it's like 30 consecutive days or 90 days out of a 12-month period. I think there's positives and negatives to these time restrictions. The positive is that young people were staying in these non-BRS placements way to long without getting any services or supports attached to that in a meaningful way. On the negative side, some young people who were doing well in a youth homeless shelter were forced to uproot themselves.

Homeless youth providers across the state work with a lot of youth who have run from foster care. These providers report that youth say they have more self-determination, more control over their lives, in the shelter. Youth say foster care is so focused on safety that they feel stuck. It's not right or wrong. It's just that child welfare is safety-based and a lot of work at homeless shelters are strength-based.

Do the current placement options meet the need? Capacity has been down across the board for placements. There's a need to right-size the system. Youth end up in residential or BRS homes because there just aren't foster homes available. Many young people are one step above where they should be. The gaps are in the 14+ transition age. Exploring opportunities to create programs that can mirror that homeless youth perspective as being a support to people instead of so much focus on safety. I know ODHS is already working on that. Also, within the last little bit, there's been a lot of work within the Independent Living Program (ILP) unit on different placement opportunities/housing for young people. There needs to be more housing options between foster care and living independently.

What advice might you give a caseworker or resource (foster) parent wanting to build rapport with a youth who has just returned from being on the run?

(OFYC Representative) Youth are incredibly smart and capable, and it is very obvious when a caseworker or resource parent is trying to build a relationship just to get an outcome that they want or information that they want. They need genuine. They can't have expectations beyond just creating a connection. Really work towards things that are going to help them. Help them make healthy choices. You might not be their best friend, but you can be a resource for them. The connection needs to be on the youth's terms.

What did you see as the greatest needs amongst the youth who came to the shelter? What were the barriers in getting those needs met?

(Former Director of a Youth Shelter) Besides the obvious basic needs (food, shelter, clothing), often the youth lacked a lot of soft skills compared even to peers their own age—problem solving, verbal communication, teamwork, decision making. Due to past traumas, changes in living situations, gaps in school, these were barriers. These are necessary things to belong in the community, which is the third thing they lacked.

They didn't have a strong support system with peers, family, or community. Humans need connection. A lot of the success with the shelter setting is that they were able to come together as peers. There was a sense of family, they could relate to each other, and build community. Once they had a support system, they could work on their soft skills.

Barriers are funding and time. By the time these kids start engaging with us, they've experienced so much trauma and there's only a few years until they turn 18. There isn't much time to build rapport. To help them get what they want.

How many RHY shelters are there in Oregon? Can you describe what one of them looks like inside? Do the shelters provide food, clothing, other essentials, showers, laundry facilities, etc? Can you briefly describe the other categories of RHY programs (e.g., job development/mentoring, drop in & outreach programs)?

(RHY Program Coordinator) There are three different ways homeless youth shelters are funded in Oregon. Some receive state grant funds, others are federally funded, some are locally funded, and some are funded through a combination of these sources. Altogether, there are about 15 homeless youth shelters across the state. Some of the shelters are very dorm-like in that they have individual rooms (sometimes shared with another youth) and then common spaces for the kitchen, laundry, etc. Some shelters are large houses with 8 to 10 rooms. And still others, particularly in the Portland area, have shifted to a family-based model where homeless youth are placed with host families. This variety is a good thing because one size does not fit all. All homeless youth shelters provide food, shelter, clothing, showers, and other hygiene facilities. As they are considered child caring agencies, they must be licensed by the state. Food can differ as unaccompanied youth can apply for SNAP to purchase their own food. As for clothing, there's a lot of reliance on donations or clothing closets when stipends or partnerships with clothing stores may offer better selection.

Other RHY funded programs include street outreach services where individuals go out into the community and connect with homeless young people. They provide backpacks with hygiene items, bus passes, and food. They give the young people information about drop-in centers, how to connect with school, and housing options. They try to build rapport, so when the young person is ready, they can be a resource for help. Drop-in centers do basically the same things but are site-based. Homeless youth can drop in during the day to get assistance, eat, shower, etc.

Job development/mentoring programs are designed to help young people develop the soft skills to get jobs. There are a lot of job readiness and job

placement services out there, but they tend to be geared towards people who are work ready. Many homeless young people are not work ready. They lack basic skills like how to talk to people, how to call someone back, what it means to call someone on the phone, how to act quasi-professional. The RHY job development/mentoring programs teach soft skills that bridge the gap to other job placement programs.

If you could change one thing about how ODHS serves youth who run from foster care, what would it be)?

(RHY Program Coordinator) Commitment to actively listening and supporting young people in their needs. And not just listening, but truly hearing and taking action.

(Former Director of a Youth Shelter) Getting back to the most simple of things. Building relationships with young people in a way that is meaningful so we can empower them to verbalize their wants and needs.

(ODHS Permanency Consultant) Cross-system collaboration. More or better resources for youth that work together. Developmental disability services, child welfare, the mental health system working together to meet youth needs and removing barriers for the youth. All of that necessitates really knowing the youth, which requires having the time to build a relationship with them.

(OFYC Representative) Really working with and for the youth. Prioritizing their needs. Giving them the space to vocalize their needs.

Data Collection

In August 2021, the panel conducted file reviews of 5 foster youth who were on runaway status during the month of April 2020 and were younger than 18 at the time. The panel looked at court and CRB documents including the ODHS case material submitted for proceedings.

Three of the youth ran to be with family (parents or grandparents). Three of the youth remained in contact with ODHS while they were on runaway

status and ODHS knew the location of a fourth youth even though that youth had not stayed in contact. All five youth stopped attending school and counseling while on runaway status.

A notable theme in the file reviews were ODHS caseworkers making many efforts to support the youth in what the youth wanted.

Recommendations

1. ODHS continue efforts to provide workers the time and tools necessary to build meaningful relationships with youth in foster care. These relationships are key to understanding their wants and needs and reducing risk of running. Some promising efforts the panel learned about were specialized caseworker positions with only teens on their caseload, and new child welfare procedures for youth in self-selected environments.
2. ODHS encourage workers to learn about youths' natural supports (friends, family, therapist, etc.) so workers can quickly reach out to them in an emergency. Conduct family mapping with the youth as part of the intake process and refresh the relative search when a youth runs.
3. ODHS have centralized or regional staff who offer training and consultation to branches when youth run and when they return to care. Ensure when a youth returns to care, someone experienced in talking to youth debrief the run with the youth and schedule a meeting with the child's team as soon as possible.
4. ODHS continue to work on increasing placement options for teenagers and young adults in foster care.
5. CRB work on improving its reviews of older youth in foster care, particularly those at risk of running or already on runaway status.

Citations

¹Oregon Department of Human Services, [Child Welfare Procedure Manual](#), Ch. 4, Sec. 18: Missing Children and Young Adults.

²Chapin Hall, University of Chicago, [Missed Opportunities: Youth Homelessness in America](#) (2017).

Appendix

Citizen Review Board

Findings Report (Statewide)



Time Period: 1/1/2021—12/31/2021

Reviews	
CRB reviews:	2880
Children reviewed:	3943
Average duration (in minutes):	41

Attendees	
Average attendees:	6
% with all attorneys present:	56%
% with legal assistant present for at least one attorney:	20%

Negative Findings	Count	%
Finding 1	23	2%
Finding 2	99	3%
Finding 3a	337	9%
Finding 3b	25	6%
Finding 4	170	8%
Finding 5	77	4%
Finding 6 (mother)	1274	68%
Finding 6 (father)	1285	76%
Finding 7	104	5%
Finding 8	597	15%
Finding 9	552	14%
Finding 10	65	2%

Reasons for Negative Finding 4	Count	%
Service not offered	75	44%
Referral not timely	39	23%
Delay despite timely referral	20	12%
No current Action Agreement or Letter of Expectation	79	46%
No family decision meeting	38	22%
Other	44	26%

Reasons for Negative Finding 8	Count	%
Face-to-face contacts	103	17%
Other negative finding	401	67%
Not implementing previous CRB recommendations	134	22%
Not implementing court order	34	6%
Other	65	11%

Indian Child Welfare Act	
% of children ICWA applies:	5%
% of children ICWA is pending:	4%

	Partially	Completely
At the time of the CRB review, had DHS implemented the court orders?	17%	82%
Did DHS implement the recommendations from the last CRB review?	27%	71%

Reasons for Negative Finding 3a	Count	%
Placement(s)	50	15%
Number	23	7%
Appropriateness	35	10%
Safety	107	32%
Face-to-face contacts	78	23%
Child on the run	24	7%
Family contact	33	10%
with parent(s)	21	6%
because incarcerated	4	1%
with sibling(s)	11	3%
with extended family	6	2%
Assessment(s)	102	30%
Timeliness	59	18%
Not following recs in assessment	48	14%
Mental health/therapeutic support	108	32%
Timeliness of service (excluding assessments)	74	22%
Therapist transitions	6	2%
Psychotropic medications	7	2%
Education	40	12%
Physical health	59	18%
Medical	18	5%
Dental	39	12%
Vision	19	6%
Social/extracurricular activities		
Youth transition planning (14+)	63	19%
Cultural considerations	4	1%
Other	52	15%

Background

The Citizen Review Board (CRB) is a program within the Oregon Judicial Department that reviews the cases of children in foster care. The reviews are conducted by boards composed of volunteers from the community who are appointed by the Chief Justices of the Oregon Supreme Court. Currently, there are 61 boards in 33 of Oregon's 36 counties and about 260 volunteers serving on them statewide.

During CRB reviews, boards make a series of legal findings about the services the Department of Human Services (DHS) is providing to the child and family, the progress of the parents, and the appropriateness of the permanency plan. The Findings Report is a compilation of the reasons boards are making negative findings. The statistics are calculated per child reviewed, and the calculations for percentages exclude cases in which the finding doesn't apply.

To learn more about CRB, please visit our website at www.courts.oregon.gov/programs/crb .

Legal Findings

1. Has DHS made reasonable/active efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the child from the home?
2. Has DHS made diligent efforts to place the child with a relative or person who has a caregiver relationship?
- 3a. Has DHS ensured that appropriate services are in place to safeguard the child's safety, health, and well-being?
- 3b. Has DHS taken appropriate steps to ensure that 1) the substitute care provider is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard, and 2) the child(ren) has/have regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age appropriate or developmentally appropriate activities?
4. Has DHS made reasonable/active efforts to provide services to make it possible for the child to safely return home?
5. Has DHS made reasonable efforts in accordance with the case plan to place the child in a timely manner, and to complete the steps necessary to finalize the permanent placement, including an interstate placement if appropriate?
6. Have the parents made sufficient progress to make it possible for the child to safely return home (finding made separately for each parent)?
7. Has DHS made sufficient efforts in developing the concurrent permanency plan?
8. Is DHS in compliance with the case plan and court orders?
9. Is the permanency plan the most appropriate plan for the child?
10. Is there a continuing need for placement?

Citizen Review Board

Time Period: 1/1/2021—12/31/2021



Supplemental County Findings Report: County breakdown of total negative findings for each of the ten CRB findings.

County	Children Reviewed	ICWA Eligible	ICWA Pending	Total Negative Findings											
				#1	#2	#3a	#3b	#4	#5	#6 (mother)	#6 (father)	#7	#8	#9	#10
Baker	27		7							19	16			8	
Benton	45	3								9	23			2	
Clackamas	214	8	3			9		4	4	52	55	4	28	34	
Clatsop	46	2	7			6				4	4	1	5	3	
Columbia	87	12				1				25	23	1	2	17	
Coos	106	5	6			5		3	2	21	28		11	6	4
Crook	29							2		9	7		2	5	
Curry	22					1				2	2		1	1	
Deschutes	213	4	4	11	4	14	1	27	1	114	83	16	48	32	6
Douglas	273	10	17	3	52	77	4	39	31	83	80	19	126	52	11
Harney/Grant	47	6	2			4				19	25		4	6	
Hood River	20		2							11	15			10	
Jackson	355	9	22			32	3	8	8	104	108	10	48	65	2
Jefferson	65	17				2		3		22	24		7	9	1
Josephine	93	3	1			4				15	24	1	5	17	6
Klamath	125	27	10		2	4		4		34	34	6	9	7	1
Lake	23	1	5			3		1	2	3	8		6	3	
Lane	693	25	2	1	5	43	2	8	4	164	164	9	69	57	1
Lincoln	78	7	5	3	18	28	2	18	11	17	16	11	47	11	7
Linn	156	17	2		1	1		2		63	54	2	6	25	4
Malheur	200	3	8	3		7		6		116	129		14	24	4
Marion	391	13	7		7	60	9	12	3	109	97	3	64	43	2
Multnomah	29		6		3	7		2		4	7	5	10		
Polk	80	2				5	2	9	1	30	40		12	7	1
Tillamook	21	1		1				3		3	8		3	2	
Umatilla/Morrow	234	8	19	1	2	4		10		131	131	3	23	58	9
Union/Wallowa	19									11	10			4	
Wasco	32	5								9	10		4	5	1
Washington	151	6	30		5	20	2	7	10	48	40	13	40	26	3
Yamhill	69	6	3					2		23	20		3	13	2
TOTAL	3943	200	168	23	99	337	25	170	77	1274	1285	104	597	552	65

This report is supplemental to the CRB Findings Report. It provides a county breakdown of total negative findings for each of the 10 CRB findings. Counts are per child reviewed (not per review).

The 10 CRB Findings

1. Has DHS made reasonable/active efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the child from the home?
2. Has DHS made diligent efforts to place the child with a relative or person who has a caregiver relationship?
- 3a. Has DHS ensured that appropriate services are in place to safeguard the child's safety, health, and well-being?
- 3b. Has DHS taken appropriate steps to ensure that 1) the substitute care provider is following the reasonable and prudent parent standard, and 2) the child (ren) has/have regular, ongoing opportunities to engage in age appropriate or developmentally appropriate activities?
4. Has DHS made reasonable/active efforts to provide services to make it possible for the child to safely return home?
5. Has DHS made reasonable efforts in accordance with the case plan to place the child in a timely manner, and to complete the steps necessary to finalize the permanent placement, including an interstate placement if appropriate?
6. Have the parents made sufficient progress to make it possible for the child to safely return home (finding made separately for each parent)?
7. Has DHS made sufficient efforts in developing the concurrent permanency plan?
8. Is DHS in compliance with the case plan and court orders?
9. Is the permanency plan the most appropriate plan for the child?
10. Is there a continuing need for placement?

Citizen Review Board

Time Period: 1/1/2021—12/31/2021



Supplemental Finding 3a Report: County breakdown of reasons CRBs found DHS had not ensured appropriate services were in place to safeguard children’s safety, health, and well-being.

County	Negative Findings	Reason Code																										
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA
Baker																												
Benton																												
Clackamas	9	4		4	8	3	1																					
Clatsop	6											6	6							6		6	6					
Columbia	1														1	1												1
Coos	5	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	1		4	1	2	2	3	2		1	1		3		1	
Crook																												
Curry	1											1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1						
Deschutes	14	8	6	7	8	7		2	2	1		2	2		5	4		1	7	2		2			1		7	
Douglas	77	10	7	5	24	20	5	4	4			25	7	20	13	10	2		3	2		2			26		15	
Harney/Grant	4	1	1		1	1		3	3			2	1	1		2	1	2		1						2		
Hood River																												
Jackson	32	2	2	1	4	4	1	1	1	1		9	9		16	7			9	6	1		3		1		6	
Jefferson	2				1		1																				1	
Josephine	4				3	3	3												2	1	1				1			
Klamath	4							2	2			2	2							2		2	2				2	
Lake	3				1	1									1	1				2	1	2	1					
Lane	43	11		11	5	3	2	4	1		3		14	8	8	24	22		3	8	16	6	11	2		10	3	
Lincoln	28	3	2	1	14	13	1	2	2	1		1	11	6	8	4	1			4		4			5	1	7	
Linn	1																											
Malheur	7				4	1							6	3	3	3	3											
Marion	60	6	4	1	18	10	7	7	2		6		15	11	3	23	14			5	9	6	3	2		8	1	1
Multnomah	7				4	4							1	1													4	
Polk	5	2		2	2		1	3	1			2	2		2	1	1											
Tillamook																												
Umatilla/Morrow	4				2	2						2	2		2	2				2		2			2			
Union/Wallowa																												
Wasco																												
Washington	20	2		2	5	5		2	1			4		3	8	5		1	1	4	2	3	2		6		4	
Yamhill																												
TOTAL	337	50	23	35	107	78	24	33	21	4	11	6	102	59	48	108	74	6	7	40	59	18	39	19		63	4	52

Code	Reason
A	Placement(s)
B	Number
C	Appropriateness
D	Safety
E	Face-to-face contacts
F	Child on the run
G	Family contact
H	with parent(s)
I	because incarcerated
J	with sibling(s)
K	with extended family
L	Assessment(s)
M	Timeliness
N	Not following recs in assessment
O	Mental health/therapeutic support
P	Timeliness of service (excluding assessments)
Q	Therapist transitions
R	Psychotropic medications
S	Education
T	Physical health
U	Medical
V	Dental
W	Vision
X	Social/extracurricular activities
Y	Youth transition planning (14+)
Z	Cultural considerations
AA	Other

This report is supplemental to the CRB Findings Report. It provides a county breakdown of the reasons boards across the state made negative findings for CRB Findings 3a, which asks “Has DHS ensured that appropriate services are in place to safeguard the child’s safety, health, and well-being.” A negative finding can be based on multiple reasons, and counts are per child reviewed (not per review).

Citizen Review Board

Time Period: 1/1/2021—12/31/2021



Supplemental Finding 4 Report: County breakdown of reasons CRBs found DHS had not made reasonable efforts to provide services to make it possible for the children to return home.

County	Negative Findings	Reason					
		Service not offered	Referral not timely	Delay in service despite timely referral	No current Action Agreement or Letter of Expectation	No family decision meeting	Other
Baker							
Benton							
Clackamas	4			2		2	
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos	3						
Crook	2				2	2	
Curry							
Deschutes	27	13	11	1	21	15	15
Douglas	39	18	7	3	22	5	6
Harney/Grant							
Hood River							
Jackson	8	2	1	1	1		3
Jefferson	3	3			3	3	
Josephine							
Klamath	4	4		2	2		
Lake	1	1			1		
Lane	8	2	2	3	3		2
Lincoln	18	8	6	1	6	1	8
Linn	2			1	1		
Malheur	6	3	3				
Marion	12	1	2	2	10		1
Multnomah	2						
Polk	9	5	1		4	5	5
Tillamook	3			3		3	
Umatilla/Morrow	10	9	3	1	2	2	
Union/Wallowa							
Wasco							
Washington	7	5	2				3
Yamhill	2	1	1		1		1
TOTAL	170	75	39	20	79	38	44

This report is supplemental to the CRB Findings Report. It provides a county breakdown of the reasons boards across the state made negative findings for CRB Finding 4, which asks "Has DHS made reasonable/active efforts to provide services to make it possible for the child to safely return home?." A negative finding can be based on multiple reasons, and counts are per child reviewed (not per review).

Citizen Review Board

Time Period: 1/1/2021—12/31/2021



Supplemental Finding 8 Report: County breakdown of reasons CRBs found DHS is not in compliance with the case plan and court orders.

County	Negative Findings	Reason				
		Face-to-face contacts	Other negative finding	Not implementing previous CRB recommendations	Not implementing court order	Other
Baker						
Benton						
Clackamas	28	7	11	7	1	10
Clatsop	5	2				1
Columbia	2			1		
Coos	11	1	4	3	1	1
Crook	2		2	2		
Curry	1		1			
Deschutes	48	9	26	14	3	18
Douglas	126	16	106	29	9	4
Harney/Grant	4	1	4		2	
Hood River						
Jackson	48	4	35	12	2	2
Jefferson	7		5	5		1
Josephine	5	1	4			1
Klamath	9		6			3
Lake	6	1	5	2		
Lane	69	19	48	18	2	2
Lincoln	47	8	40	16	3	
Linn	6	1	1			1
Malheur	14	1	12			1
Marion	64	18	44	5		
Multnomah	10	4	5	2		5
Polk	12		11			2
Tillamook	3		3			3
Umatilla/Morrow	23	5	17	9	3	2
Union/Wallowa						
Wasco	4					1
Washington	40	5	10	9	7	7
Yamhill	3		1		1	
TOTAL	597	103	401	134	34	65

This report is supplemental to the CRB Findings Report. It provides a county breakdown of the reasons boards across the state made negative findings for CRB Finding 8, which asks "Is DHS in compliance with the case plan and court orders?" A negative finding can be based on multiple reasons, and counts are per child reviewed (not per review).

Citizen Review Board
Oregon Judicial Department
1163 State Street
Salem, OR 97301

Phone: (503) 986-5861
Fax: (503) 986-5859
Toll Free: 1-888-530-8999
Oregon Relay Service-711
Website: www.courts.oregon.gov/crb

