

# REIMBURSEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

## OF THE JJOC

### Minutes

October 19, 2018 at 9:00 am

KDOC Small Conference Room

#### Members Present:

Judge Delia York, Max Mendoza, Megan Milner, Melody Pappan

#### Members via Phone:

Lara Blake Bors, Greg Smith

#### Members Absent:

Kathy Armstrong, Kevin Emerson

#### Visitors:

Mike Fonkert from Kansas Appleseed

#### Committee Support:

Jennifer Christie, CJI

Karyl-Ann Roehl

The meeting began at 9:07 am. Attendance was taken and the results are shown above.

#### **Statutory Language Concerning Reinvestment**

Everyone present had a copy of the SB367 language regarding reinvestment. Judge York read section (7) A-C, noting KDOC is the agency allowed to spend the money.

#### **Review of Funds Available**

Megan Milner reported there is about \$17 million in the reinvestment fund for FY18, \$14 million of which has been encumbered/allocated for collaborative grants and reinvestment grants, as well as state contracts such as FFT, YAP, and sex offender treatment. Megan will follow up and provide a concise and clear break down of the balance in the Evidence-Based Programs Fund to help guide the group's discussion on where to direct resources. Megan provided the group with a handout showing the reinvestment grant awards. If the grantee was awarded funds last year, their grant was renewed for this year. There was \$3.6 million in reinvestment grants, serving 3,258 youth.

#### **How to Make Good Decisions**

Judge York would like to know what has been done with the money so far and what the outcomes of these programs are. We need more information than the number of youth served. Megan said the outcomes being monitored are: 1) Whether or not the youth remained in the home, and if not, where he/she was placed; 2) educational and employment status; 3) re-arrest; 4) and for FFT youth, whether or not the youth returned to intake for another incident. FFT reports are going out to providers and the judicial districts each month.

Each judicial district sets their outcome goals and we ask them to use the same outcomes as the contracted providers. Judge York has not seen this data. Melody said Judge York should get a JCAB report each quarter. Maybe we need to educate administrative contacts about sharing those reports. Megan is thinking about technical assistance to JCABS on how to do their annual reports. Much of what she receives is unhelpful because no research is done and the people writing the report are unaware of programs in their area. How can we provide assistance on how to do this report? Some JCABS did OK on their reports, yet Megan would like to explore other ways we can identify their programming needs.

It has been Judge York's experience with her JCAB (WY) that they really do not know what is going on with juvenile offenders. They fail to understand the importance of the JCAB report. Often, JCAB attendance is poor, and a quorum cannot be reached. She has attended Johnson county JCAB meetings and seen the same thing. Court Services supervises most of the offenders in her area, and she sees money being spent on training and administration in lieu of programs. She supports educating JCABS and trying to re-energize JCAB efforts. She feels we need to know 1) where the money is, and 2) how it has been historically spent.

JCAB reports are not as meaningful as they could be. Melody agreed the JCAB wants the AC to write the report telling them what they want.

Melody said the KAG is using Title II funding in a community initiative to help districts with community planning. They have contracted with KU to work with three judicial districts (Garden City area, Wyandotte County and the 15/17/23<sup>rd</sup>) to complete a comprehensive plan in the implementation of SB367. The contractor will likely send out a survey to get feedback from stakeholders.

Lara reported at the last JCAB meeting in her area they discussed Clinical Associates (CA). They feel CA is not providing the services they are supposed to provide, and youth are being sent to other providers for evaluation. Contractually, CA will not evaluate a youth pre-adjudication unless paid a fee. If the youth is age 18 or older, CA charges a fee and bills Medicaid. Medicaid denies the claim, and they then go ahead with the contract. They will do pre-adjudication assessments when paid for separately. Lara said the main complaint is youth are not getting the services. Judge York suggested we talk to Court Services about antidotal information not being reported. Talking to the lead people may help.

KASCO would have been a good opportunity to address these kinds of issues. Their group sessions are already scheduled. KCCA is another meeting we may be able to get on the agenda for. The next KDOC AC meeting is in December. There are probably many organizations we could ask about being on their agenda. Jen asked how these discussions could be turned in to data. She suggested data on the YLS scores by judicial district to see what needs are. This would be a good look at what is going on in the state.

Megan provided a handout listing what programs JCABS say they need. Common needs are services for parents, mentoring, and more services for youth on IIP (like FFT). Parent engagement is a huge issue. Melody said family engagement is bigger than just programming; it addresses the "us vs, them" mentality of our culture. She believes family engagement needs to start at arrest and continue through to discharge. She would like to see parents treated as part of the solution, instead of being treated as part of the problem. Judge York agreed saying we want to keep youth in the community, and keep the community safe, and it is hard to get "village" participation.

Megan said this topic is good for our reinvestment discussion and asked if we should go to family members of justice-involved youth for input. Melody would like to see a family engagement coordinator in each judicial district and/or county. She wants to see the state create a family engagement model and mirror it in each judicial district. Judge York would like to create something modified toward needs. We need to think outside of the box. She suggested getting education and training on family engagement. Confidentiality may be a hurdle and we would need people to run the program.

Jen said she hears the group saying a family engagement program is needed and could be something we invest in. Is this a program this group wants to recommend?

Max has had great success with youth who participate in Strengthening Families programming. His group had to think outside of the box to find ways to keep parents committed to his Strengthening Families program. They use incentive gift cards, and have drawings at each meeting at the end of the night. This has helped with attendance. They also did a family photo night which was very popular, and a movie night basket full of board games, popcorn, and a movie. Grocery cards also work. Jennifer said motivation is a responsibility factor.

Transportation and child care are other issues facing families, and are often used as excuses for not participating. Melody uses retired officers to provide transportation.

### **Scope/Specificity of Recommendations**

Judge York wants to see this group put together a scope of work with specific recommendations about programs. She wants to see us drill down on what is needed. She feels being specific and focused is better than generalization. She envisions a comprehensive plan that goes three years out. Melody wants us to find out where the gaps are (such as mentoring) and address them. The entire group agrees.

KDOC's Mentoring for Success may be a model for the community. This program has a very good mentor retention rate.

Jennifer asked if it is feasible to call each judicial district's court services and community corrections staff to talk to them about what is needed. Mike said he has done this with about half of the judicial districts. He has obtained some insightful input.

Megan distributed a handout showing what programs the judicial districts currently have. We have not provided the JJOC with copies of the reports. This is good information to share statewide. It allows people to put their heads together and network. They may even take the JCAB report more seriously if they knew it was going to be made public.

Judge York would like to see us look at the efficacy of substance abuse programming. This is a huge risk factor for youth. Many youth are surrounded by substance abuse in their homes. We could potentially redirect resources to other systems serving youth. Substance abuse is certainly related to family engagement.

Jennifer said everything talked about today is part of wraparound services. Wraparound services is what Max's organization is doing. He believes it is good to have all at the table to help the family get what they need. We need to give them more than a phone number to call. We need to break down roadblocks. Behavior is symptomatic of what is going on in the home.

Some funds are going to the three crisis centers, yet we want to prevent the need for crisis centers and keep the youth in the home. We should talk about our recommendations this way to the legislature, not just corrections.

Megan said there are four districts using the High Fidelity wraparound case management model. It is an intense model and fidelity is very important. They go through a vendor using reinvestment grant money. A care coordinator oversees implementation. These districts are sending us monthly progress reports. To date, we have only minimal information as these have not operated long enough for youth to have completed the program. This program teaches families how to find resources and create their own self-support network.

Creation of advocacy groups and a fund coordinator position may be an outcome of family engagement implementation. Max has a parent on the Heartland 180 Board who might be willing to talk to us. There are also national advocacy groups who are ready to help us implement family engagement services.

### **Timeline / Preliminary Recommendations**

This group believes we can put general information into the Annual Report about the direction we are headed so far. The group also believes we can report at the next JJOC meeting about what we are considering.

### **Next steps and Assignments:**

1. Talk with other stakeholders who may be interested in family engagement implementation. K-A will put together a list of organizations and agencies, and will try to find out when their meetings are.
2. Collate ways to explore family advocacy; that is, examine ways we can talk to stakeholders.
3. Flush out what family engagement looks like. Melody will start something for us.
4. Put together a concise plan for the allocation of reinvestment funds for family engagement. Megan will work on that.
5. Mike is willing to provide the feedback he has received doing his “haves and needs” survey of court services and community corrections personnel. He will summarize the information he has so far to share with us.
6. Jennifer will research investing in wraparound service models.
7. We need to figure out how to get family input. Mike and Max may know parents of justice-involved youth who would be willing to speak to us.

The next Reinvestment Subcommittee meeting is Monday, October 29, 2018, at 1:00 pm, at the Judicial Center in the Fatzer Courtroom on the third floor.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

/kar