

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

Date and Time: April 5, 2019 from 8:30 am – 12:30 pm

Location: KDOC, 3rd floor
Large Conference Room
714 SW Jackson, Suite 300
Topeka, KS 66603

Committee Members in Attendance:

Kathy Armstrong, Randy Bowman, Kevin Emerson, Judge Paula Hofaker, Don Hymer, Megan Milner, Melody Pappan, Amy Raymond, Former Senator Greg Smith, Janet Waugh, Judge Delia York

Senator Carolyn McGinn and Senator Pat Pettey arrived later in the meeting to discuss Legislative Updates.

Keven Pellant from KDOC attended the entire meeting.

Roger Werholtz arrived later in the meeting.

Committee Members on the Phone:

Derrick Ploutz

Committee Members Absent:

Lara Blake Bors, Rep. Gail Finney, Max Mendoza

Criminal Justice Institute:

Jennifer Christie

Committee Support:

Karyl-Ann Roehl

Welcome and Roll Call

The meeting began at 8:38 am. Roll call was taken and the results are documented above.

Approval of Minutes from 02/04/19 Meeting

Randy motioned, and Megan seconded, the minutes be approved. Motion carried.

Georgetown University Crossover Youth Practice Model

Randy Bowman introduced the presenters from Georgetown University, Shay Bilchik and Macon Stewart, both with the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. Shay explained the presentation would be in four parts:

1. Pathways and Characteristics of Crossover Youth
2. Goals of the Research Model
3. Research Supporting the Model
4. Impact on Agency Culture

A copy of the presentation is on the KDOC website.

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

They had some challenges implementing this model in other jurisdictions:

- Information Sharing – legacy systems outdated
- Integration of the Data Systems – legacy systems did not communicate with each other
- Identification of Youth

Goals of the program are to:

- Decrease the number of youths crossing over and dually involved
- Decrease the number of out-of-home placements
- Decrease the use of congregate care
- Decrease the disproportionate representation of youth of color

Outcomes Achieved are:

- Decreased recidivism
- Decreased number of youths going to foster care
- Decreased number of juvenile justice petitions
- Decreased use of pre-adjudication detention
- Increased educational outcomes
- Increased pro-social activity
- Increased behavioral health outcomes
- Increased diversions and dismissals
- Increased home placement and reunification

As far as being an evidence-based practice, in 2018 the program earned a rating of 3, “Promising Research Evidence,” and a relevance of “High,” in the “Child/Family Well-Being” outcome category, from the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse. Technical assistance is site based, with peer-to-peer learning, and access to tools and technologies within the network to evaluate outcomes. They assist at the state level with policy development, and they assess the model fidelity.

Twenty-three states and 119 counties have engaged in use of this model. More information can be found at cjjr.georgetown.edu, phone 704-603-8059.

After the presentation ended, there was time for a few questions. Judge York asked how the program got started in Sedgwick County. They explained local officials approached Georgetown, then sent a team to the certificate program.

Randy asked what is next if we want to start working with them. First, they want to be sure we are a “good fit” by coming here to discuss the program. We would start with a cluster of counties and could even build on the work done in Sedgwick County. Getting started would involve a contract, identification of a stakeholder group, a state team, and gap analysis. Kathy asked if the stakeholder groups have been identified. They said they have a list of positions and they would work with our team to add people to the list. There are a few key individuals who should be a part of the process: local judge, juvenile director, and child welfare director.

Kathy also asked about the time and resource commitment. They said they offer “meaningful, light-touch” involvement and engagement. They help support the implementation, yet the project is not reliant on consultants. Counties must engage in information sharing too. Someone from each county involved should be assigned as the lead contact person. They are on-site every three months and we

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

would have monthly phone calls with them. The data committee works with their data team pre- and post-implementation.

KA asked what kind of hurdles were faced by data committees in other jurisdictions. The biggest issue was the data systems did not communicate. This was an issue for data matching and compatibility. Some data was collected manually. All they have worked with have been successful in overcoming these issues. We need to ask what data can be shared and what we want to do with it.

The presentation ended and we took a break. When everyone returned, we continued to discuss a partnership with Georgetown.

Randy made the motion to proceed with a contract for a practice model pilot in a couple of jurisdictions. Melody seconded the motion. Don and Amy felt they needed more information before proceeding. A site visit and talking with someone in Sedgwick County were suggested. Kathy said this model brings expertise and a framework adaptable to local processes and protocols.

Judge Hofaker wanted to know about Sedgwick County's experience working with this group. We could check with Kristen Peterman of DCF and Steve Stonehouse from Sedgwick County Department of Corrections.

Don asked if the motion included a commitment of funds. If so, how much? He feels the program model is consistent with experience and SB367, yet we need to formalize the money piece before adopting. Kathy said previously the amount mentioned was \$275,000, not including the cost of three FTEs. Maybe we could get a copy of a contract for review and possibly data agreements as well.

Amy asked if there were any issues with the Department of Administration. Randy said we were in good shape on that front; that he is to get an I-9 from Georgetown for D of A. Keven asked if the data issue would be costly. Kathy did not think so, especially if manual pulls were used. Randy thought the program urgent for families not best served right now.

Janet suggested we build a budget. Judge York would like to hear from someone in Sedgwick County who worked with this. She likes the model, yet feels we need more details. Randy would like to us to commit to moving forward with exploring the use of this model in Kansas. Judge Hofaker offered an amended motion to continue to explore entering into a contract and gather more information for our next meeting. Randy seconded the motion. The Reinvestment Subcommittee is tasked with gathering more information. Specifically, the group wants to know 1) recommendations on what jurisdictions to pilot in, 2) contract language with Georgetown University, 3) detailed costs, 4) a presentation from someone in Sedgwick County about the pros and cons of their initiative with this program.

Kathy said we must identify local stakeholder groups in counties to pilot this program in. There are past protocols to use to determine piloting information. The model is a technical assistance tool to improve protocols and processes. She would like to see a statewide approach funded by reinvestment funds. Keven said it is critical we get enough data collection for decision making and drawing generalized conclusions. We need to consider who will be the guiding leadership. If community corrections takes the lead, they will most likely go to their advisory boards for assistance because those boards know what the needs are and the strengths and weaknesses of their jurisdiction(s). They will determine the level of commitment to the model. Keven would like for us to

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

get a sample contract to review to get things started. Judge Hofaker's motion was tabled. This topic will be on the next agenda with a note that a vote will be taken.

Updates on the Reinvestment Subcommittee

Judge York reported the subcommittee is working to deploy family engagement statewide. The initial trainings are being planned. The subcommittee is looking into contracting with a provider for the new FTEs needed. There was an excellent webinar about family engagement seen by subcommittee members. It demonstrated a reduced fear in families of the juvenile justice system when families were engaged appropriately. Families felt like they were part of a team. The subcommittee is reaching out to one of those jurisdictions for more information.

Megan announced the Department of Administration approved a contract with The Parent Project. Trainings are scheduled for August/September 2019 and some dates for 2020 are being determined. Court Services and Community Corrections officers will be trained first. She has had some interest expressed by non-juvenile justice entities too.

Judge York reported a family survey has gone out to Court Services and Community Corrections officers to collect information from families about their experiences. This feedback will help create a family guide the subcommittee wants to publish for families. Focus groups will have input into the guide as well. Megan mentioned a couple of jurisdictions have made a contest out of getting the surveys completed to see which jurisdiction turns in the most surveys.

The subcommittee continues to work on processes for public presenters. The criteria for allowing these presentations is being drafted. Keven advised there is boilerplate language in community corrections and re-entry we could borrow.

Data Subcommittee Report

Amy reported this subcommittee has met a couple of times to talk about data exchange. Other than the 'End Date of Supervision,' the data needed appears to be collected by the KBI. They plan to meet with someone from the KBI to discuss this further. They are also deciding the verbiage of a data sharing MOU between KDOC, OJA and DCF. They plan to talk with the Sentencing Commission about calculating recidivism.

Don mentioned Robert Sullivan in Johnson County is heading up work on transitional aged youth (aged 18 - 24). He might be a good resource for this subcommittee.

Agency Updates

OJA

Training for Court Services staff is being planned. Training includes a YLS Refresher, an EPICS booster, and trauma-informed care. OJA logged 275 hours of CLE/CJE last year that included prosecutors, defense attorneys and judges.

OJA will start implementing a new case management system statewide on 06/03/19. They have created the system from the ground up, and all SB367 data points are covered.

DCF

Kathy reported the crossover youth report for 2018 was sent out this week. She believes there was better tracking and improved data with this report. She will provide the report to us.

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

DCF is preparing for implementation of the new Families First initiative. Federal IV-E money was shifted so it can be used for preventative services. Three community meetings with DCF have been held, with three more scheduled.

New grantee contracts are coming. DCF is working to improve information for parents and children who are moving through the child welfare system. They have adopted a program called Ice Breakers, which is being piloted now. This program brings parents together and helps improve reintegration.

Kathy said a collaborative meeting with KDOC about the Independent Living Program has been very helpful. DCF is working on implementing ESSA, the Every Student Succeeds Act, an education stability program. It has been very positive so far.

DCF data systems are antiquated, so they are working toward the development of a new child welfare system. Kathy expects the project will take five or six years.

KDHE and KDADS has been added to the work group on placements. An anti-human trafficking administrator is to be hired by DCF. DCF is also working on their Five-Year State Plan. Federal legislation drives much of child welfare and DCF is working toward compliance with that legislation. Kathy said it takes everyone working together to address these issues.

KDOC

Megan announced Juvenile Services is renewing provider contracts for FY20. Reinvestment and Regional Collaborative grants are being renewed as well. These were originally planned with a three-year term, yet collaborative grant money remains, so JS will keep the money flowing to our communities. A meeting is scheduled with Keith Bradshaw, KDOC, to talk about projections on existing contracts and grants.

JS is working with Crittendon on how our systems works, (or does not work), for girls. It is called the National Girls' Initiative. Crittendon will be here at the end of the month, looking at early decision points. A researcher from Ft. Hayes State University will join the KDOC team. Another researcher is looking at our extended juvenile jurisdiction process to compare our program to the one in Missouri.

Megan said JS is close to a contract award for ten beds in a youth residential facility.

JS has multiple data systems rolling out. The Kansas Detention Assessment Instrument (KDAI) is being deployed with vendor assistance. It should be available statewide by the end of the calendar year. The Immediate Intervention Program (IIP) database is being field tested now, and Court Services will help with that testing. The program Tracking Database tracks the hours and dosage of programming juveniles receive. The testing of this database is almost completed.

Randy said he is often asked for information about our work. Everyone had a print out of a PowerPoint presentation he uses. It has been shared with various groups. The presentation includes highlights of juvenile justice reform. For instance, we are serving more high-risk youth now, and getting the right youth into the right services. Eighty percent of youth given Notices to Appear (NTAs) show up at intake. IIP appears to be going well, with an 88.6% success rate. These youth are not getting re-arrested. We are seeing measurable reductions in risk.

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

Minutes

Legislative Updates

Sen. Pettey has been added to the Budget Committee this year. Sen. McGinn said the budget process in the House went well and there were good exchanges between members. Sen. McGinn reported the \$6 million taken from the reinvestment fund will be moved back into the fund. The legislature is not sure how to fund juvenile beds. They need to figure out how many are needed, so this has been delayed until omnibus. Mental health crisis centers are funded this session and money has been added for substance abuse treatment. Prison issues are not fully addressed yet. Three million has been earmarked to address the Hepatitis C crisis in the prisons. Public Defenders are underfunded, so that is being looked at.

There is a task force (work group) working on the federal Families First implementation. The legislature is looking in to statewide, long-term mental health beds. Parsons, Larned, and Osawatomie have old state buildings, and the use of these structures for this purpose will be studied over the summer for next year's session.

A work group is being created to gather data and study the impact of SB367 on crossover youth. This work group will be made up of mostly agency people and will have the same charge as the JJOC. She will get us more details on how this will work.

She wants information on where our committee is at in terms of the budget. If we can show evidence-based practices are moving forward, it will be easier to protect reinvestment funds. The JJOC reports to the legislature each year, and she would like to see us do a better job of taking our report to them, maybe in a hearing. Sen. Pettey said the budget will be discussed in the veto session. She asked if it was possible to use our group on a working group. Sen. McGinn needs clarifying language on what the work group will be doing to answer that.

YLS Update

For Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) an officer in Johnson County is being video taped doing a YLS assessment. Once taped and scored, she will release dates on the next IRR activities. She would like to schedule the exercises to where results are available immediately. Court Services is training on the 2.0 version, while community corrections are using the 1.0 version. While there are very few differences, but OJA and KDOC have agreed to utilize the 1.0 throughout the IRR and validation process. When the IRR activities are done, everyone will be moved to the 2.0 version.

New Business

None

Agenda for Next Meeting

Vote on the Georgetown University Crossover Youth Program Model

The meeting adjourned at 11:42am.

GS/kar