

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

06/27/19 Minutes

Date and Time: June 27, 2019 from 1:00 – 5:00 pm

Location: Judicial Center, Third Floor
Fatzer Courtroom
301 SW 10th St.
Topeka, KS 66603

Committee Members in Attendance:

Lara Blake Bors, Hope Cooper, Shanelle Dupree, Rep. Gail Finney, Judge Paula Hofaker, Donald Hymer, Sen. Carolyn McGinn, Max Mendoza, Megan Milner, Jeanette Owens, Melody Pappan, Sen. Pat Pettey, Derrick Ploutz, Amy Raymond, Greg Smith, Janet Waugh, Judge Delia York

Committee Member Designees:

Chris Mechler for Kevin Emerson, Randy Bowman for Jeff Zmuda

Criminal Justice Institute:

Jennifer Christie

Committee Support:

Karyl-Ann Roehl

Roll Call and Welcome of New Members

Greg Smith called the meeting to order and the roll call was taken. Results of roll call are shown above. New members were introduced and changes noted. New member, Jeanette Owens, the Governor's appointee, is the Director of Children & Family Services of DCCCA in Lawrence, Kansas. New Member, Hope Cooper is Deputy Secretary of Juvenile and Adult Community-Based Services at KDOC. Previously Deputy Secretary of Community Corrections, Hope now oversees the Juvenile Services division of KDOC as well. Randy Bowman is KDOC's Director of Public Affairs. He attends today as designee of the new Acting Secretary of Corrections, Jefferey Zmuda, who arrives July 1, 2019.

Approval of Minutes

Megan Milner moved, and Derrick Ploutz seconded, the minutes of the last meeting be approved. Motion carried.

Sedgwick County's Presentation on the Georgetown Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)

Kristen Peterman, Lanora Franck, and Vickie McArthur gave a presentation about the implementation of CYPM in Sedgwick County. Georgetown University was the technical assistance on the project and stepped in to help when the implementation team hit roadblocks. The implementation team had intensive training, which included a lot of conversation about language and its meaning. They explained there is a collective of people all over the country doing this work and they were able to learn from each other along the way. They always worked as a team. The consultants were very good at understanding juvenile justice and child welfare, and they were always available.

They emphasized opening relationships with all involved groups. Building internal infrastructure is important and should be funded as dedicated staff/unit. The team avoided directly addressing crime. Instead, they looked for strengths and supports among agencies. Intake assessments were loaded to a shared portal. These assessments addressed family information, parent/child functioning, mental health issues, risk of reoffending, and danger to community indicators. They will have outcome data to share with us soon.

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

06/27/19 Minutes

They said the less siloed they are, there is an ideal way to serve youth at every point of the process. Youth were no longer referred to as “your kid” or “my kid”. And interventions differed between low, medium and high-risk offenders. They believe they were successful because they worked together intentionally and provided needed programs. Judge York asked if there were unavailable services that may have had an impact. They replied cognitive behavioral groups for low risk youth was lacking.

The JIAC screening and assessment process serves to formulate ideas on how to handle the case. To clarify, Don asked if it is correct to say they started with youth already in the system, and over nine years, moved to family preservation to keep the youth in their homes. This is correct. JO/CINC staffing was set up at the beginning and is still in place. They used multi-disciplinary teams prior to Georgetown’s involvement, and these teams were not as collaborative as the process became after working with Georgetown. With shared beliefs and goals, now everyone comes together to serve the youth and their families.

At first, the processes seemed unsuccessful for youth in the deep end of the system because of difficulties in finding stable placements. The population was very mobile. Their definition of ‘success’ changed over time as they worked through these types of issues. They learned youth with severe mental health and behavioral issues lacked caring committed adults in their lives.

At this point, our guests answered a couple of questions and concluded their presentation. The committee took a break.

Reinvestment Subcommittee Plan for Funds Discussion & DCF Reinvestment Letter Discussion

The group was given a copy of the Reinvestment Subcommittee’s proposed plan for reinvestment funds. Judge York reminded everyone SB367 says we will implement evidence-based programs for use by intake and assessment services, and we will provide training on evidence-based practices for juvenile justice staff, including cognitive behavioral therapies, substance abuse treatment, sex offender therapy and other services addressing juvenile risk and needs. That said, we looked at the table listing the programs the Reinvestment Subcommittee is proposing. This list is divided into three sections: Programs Currently Funded, Upcoming programs we have already decided to invest in, and a list of programs we are Exploring or gathering more information on to consider.

The Reinvestment Subcommittee would like to pilot the Crossover Youth Practice Model in three counties. The \$246,000 is for the pilot.

The MAYSI-2 Screening Tool we are already using, yet the database requires more development to store the data. The \$12,000 is to cover that cost.

We are sending out an RFP to contract with a provider for implementing family engagement services and a family guide to juvenile justice processes. The plan is to employ family engagement specialists at the local level. The \$200,000 is to get this started, and more money will be needed later on. Megan has been in contact with other states and agencies about this piece.

In step with the implementation of family engagement services, we are holding Parent Engagement Training sessions for all juvenile justice stakeholders statewide so they learn how to engage with families.

Before moving on to talk about the programs being explored, Shanelle reviewed the list of programs DCF would like to implement using reinvestment funds. This list was attached to a letter to Greg

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

06/27/19 Minutes

Smith dated 06/21/19 from the Secretary of DCF. (This list is available on the KDOC website.)

There are eight programs on the list:

1. Intensive In-Home Family Preservation Services
2. Community-Based Mentoring Services with Big Brothers & Big Sisters
3. Crisis intervention beds
4. Training costs for Family Functional Therapy (FFT)
5. Behavioral Intervention Services from FosterAdoptConnect
6. Augmenting funds to family first prevention grants to overlapping evidence-based programs
7. Family Finding Practice Approach implementation
8. Curriculum for specialized foster homes

Shanelle explained there is an increasing number of older youth coming into foster care with behavioral problems, and foster parents are ill-equipped to handle these needs. She supports the DCF Secretary's request for use of reinvestment funds to address these needs. Randy has been attending various workgroups discussing these issues and has found it very hard to determine exactly what the youth needs are. Rep. Finney said crisis beds being unavailable is a big problem for law enforcement and Derrick agreed. Officers can access beds for a youth's mental health needs, yet not all situations require mental health beds. Youth do not screen into facilities. Don said we would need a lesser definition, and even then, there is a lot of work ahead to get these beds to where they are useful.

DCF would like substance abuse services for families, not just the person using the drugs. Substance abuse touches everyone in the family, so all family members affected should have access to treatment. Jennifer agreed we want to open substance abuse treatment to parents and family members.

The FosterAdoptConnect is emerging as an evidence-based program but is not there yet. Shanelle is working to get some data about that program.

All agreed we have shared needs with DCF and this group is open to discussing the possibilities. Each of the eight items listed needs to be thoroughly discussed before funds can be committed to them.

At this point, the group returned to the Reinvestment Subcommittee plan's Exploring category. Juvenile Services has talked with Microsoft about their Youth Offender System. This product has been designed for juvenile justice agencies and has the capability of interfacing with other agencies. Randy said it started in Illinois and is structured like MS Office. It includes several components. Hope said it also includes data analytics. The \$2 million listed is for per user license fees. The actual project implementation costs are yet to be determined.

Sen. Pettey brought information to the meeting about the Attachment Bio-Behavioral Catch-Up (ABC) Program. This program teaches young parents who have experienced adversity how to interact and nurture their child, ages 0-2. It is a ten-week intensive service done in the home. This program may be one for juvenile offenders who are parents, and it may help in stopping the cycle of youth following their parents into the criminal justice system. It is evidence-based and has lowered foster care numbers where implemented. There are five sites in Kansas currently piloting this program. KU is doing evaluations of the program. The Reinvestment Subcommittee will find out more information about this program.

Judge York reported the subcommittee continues to work on an RFP for allowing the public to present programs for funding to the JJOC. Reinvestment funds are earmarked for implementing

Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

06/27/19 Minutes

recommendations coming out of the assessment being done by the National Juvenile Defender Center. It will be about eighteen months before this is out. Mentoring of some kind and family preservation services are being explored too.

Jennifer has been talking with the KBI about data support through KSCJIS and/or the Sentencing Commission. The Kansas Sentencing Commission is able analyze data and they are doing this for adult corrections. Jennifer and Amy are trying to figure out a way to include juvenile justice data for analysis, so have earmarked \$150,000 to get this started. Jennifer is fairly certain this is allowed by statute. Judge York remarked if our decisions are going to be informed by data, this approach goes along with that goal.

Jennifer said the total annual revenue of reinvestment funds is \$17 million with \$30 million currently in the bank. We believe this revenue stream is sustainable for about fifteen years. The starred (*) programs in the Exploring portion of the table are our first priority.

Sen McGinn advised to fold these recommendations into KDOC's budget requests to be ready in August. Jennifer asked the JJOC to confirm this is the way they want to proceed. Sen. Pettey suggested items with no price tag by August be scratched. Megan asked what the best way is for handling the Girl's Initiative and the Juvenile Defenders projects, and Sen. McGinn replied money amounts are needed to budget for them. Sen. Pettey said we can talk about those with money amounts and leave the rest for next year. Max made a motion to approve expenditures on the Currently Funded programs, the Upcoming programs, and the following Exploring programs: mental health services, substance abuse counseling for families, open-ended cognitive behavioral programming, Justice System Navigator, Microsoft Youth Offender product, and data support through KSCJIS and the Sentencing Commission. Melody seconded the motion. The motion passed.

This is a starting point and we can add to the list at our next meeting. The ABC program will go with the JCAB line item. The Reinvestment Subcommittee will work to nail down some money amounts for some of these programs. Max said some of these require more review. Amy wants us to make sure we are within the statutory language of SB367, as we may need to ask the legislature to open the language of the statute to fit some of these recommendations.

New Business

None.

Agenda for the Next Meeting

Don would like for us to talk more about the RFP for public input at our next meeting. Chris made the motion to adjourn, and Lara seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting adjourned a 3:43pm.

/kar