



CROSSOVER YOUTH PRACTICE MODEL

CENTER FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

working across systems of care georgetown university

CYPM Kansas State Policy Team TA Conference Call Summary

March 24, 2021 10:00am-12:00 pm

Conference Call Number: 1 646 558 8656 Meeting ID: 984 8710 6341

Time	Session
10:00 am	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daniel Olson is the new Crossover Coordinator for OJA.
10:03 am	<p>Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding Coalition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Crossover Coordinators are working with the pilot counties to identify individuals for their guiding coalitions. • Engagement with Pilot Counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Shawnee</i> – The assessment has been completed and a work plan is in progress. The work plan will be reviewed with the team in April. ○ <i>Montgomery</i> – The assessment has been completed and the work plan has been finalized. The group has elected to focus on Prevention and Training to begin the work. ○ <i>Sedgwick</i> – The assessment has been completed and recommendations to enhance the crossover work have been reviewed with the team thereby concluding Georgetown’s ad hoc support. The OJDA, KDOC, and DCF Crossover Coordinators will continue to provide assistance to Sedgwick and Georgetown will provide guidance as needed. • Education Subcommittee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although the group had previously entertained ideas of combining with existing education groups, the ideas did not come into fruition as other groups were not as expansive in agency representation. Instead, the Education Subcommittee will continue as its own entity but will wait to reconvene until the legislature dismisses in order to be able to respond to any changes to Senate Bill 367. As of today, there have not been any updates on SB 367. ○ When the group reconvenes, they intend to make recommendations on the SB 367 MOUs including adding mental health and the Health Department and instating a three-year renewal cycle. The workgroup will also do more exploration around cross-county cases regarding service challenges in education. Karen noted that Representative

	<p>Concannon is interested in advancing interagency collaboration and may be a resource to help advance legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The subcommittee's next meeting will take place in May or June depending on when the legislation dismisses. However, if anyone has inquiries or follow-up related to education please contact Kent Reed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Information Sharing Workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The workgroup is in the process of developing an information sharing document which outlines the CINC and JO codes that relate to information sharing and how they apply to the crossover target population. The document has been developed but is quite lengthy so the group has decided to create a summary document while maintaining the longer document for reference. This summary document will be reviewed at today's meeting. ○ The group anticipates having a finished product by the next SPT meeting and will present the document at that time. ○ The group's next steps include determining how the document can and should be utilized, such as streamlining the information for specific agencies or workers. ● Prevention Workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Prevention group is working to understand barriers to communication and interagency collaboration and is planning to create and distribute a survey to youth and families who are system(s)-involved to glean their perspectives on the issues. Upon analyzing the results of the survey, the workgroup will hold a focus group or listening session to delve further into some of the common challenges that were identified. This information will be used to inform what steps are taken to begin placating these challenges. The group's next steps will be to define the target participants for the survey, develop a dissemination strategy, and develop the survey. ○ The workgroup may use Montgomery County's efforts regarding prevention and training to inform their work. ● Presentations Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Crossover Coordinators partook in the Youth Services Collaborative presentation yesterday. ○ The Coordinators and representatives from Georgetown will present at the Best Practices in Kansas Child Welfare Law training in April.
10:20 am	Letterhead Options

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crossover Coordinators created six different letterhead options and presented them to the team for feedback. Ashley and Michelle will revise the letterhead options and present them back to the team for final selection. • Recommendations were made to include all of the agencies involved with the SPT in the side margin of the document to demonstrate the scope of cross-disciplinary investment. • It was also recommended that two letterheads should be selected: one for formal letters and one for newsletters and other outgoing documents.
10:25 am	<p>Highlighting Additional Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on record retrieval and payment research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The pilot counties were asked about how their respective agencies approach record payment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Shawnee</i> – DCF does not charge for CINC records and KVC includes DCF placement information in their records which they also do not charge for. Community Corrections prints records off for young people without charge. The Clerk’s Office charges roughly 25 cents per page for hard copies, though only certain parts of the record can be made available to those seeking their records. ▪ <i>Montgomery</i> - Intake and Court Services does not charge for records but is restrained by record release laws. The Police Department charges a few dollars per report and can only release publicly available information. ▪ One commonality is that young people cannot access their assessments only the assessment summary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OJA contracts with Multi-Health Systems to use the YLS tool and are contractually prohibited from sharing the instrument outside of those who are certified to administer it. It’s also a part of the CSO file which is protected under a Supreme Court rule. ▪ Because counties pay for computer equipment, paper, etc. there are discrepancies between what counties charge for records. ▪ According to the Kansas Open Records Act (KORA), agencies are legally able to charge a fee for accessing public records. There is no set cost for this but the fee must be “reasonable” and cannot exceed the cost of producing the records (which includes the cost of printing, staff time, use of a third-party vendor, etc.).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katie Schroeder noted that there are also fees for electronic court records, specifically for staff time, and this is because it is controlled and funded at the local level. ▪ The Kansas Attorney General recommends an hourly rate for certain positions to factor into the KORA reasonable cost clause. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other recommendations include working with the requestor to narrow the request to reduce cost and using lowest cost staff to complete the task of record retrieval. ▪ The Kansas State Historical Society makes juvenile records available if the record has been scheduled to be destroyed by the originating organization. Every agency has their own retention schedule. Individuals are still charged under the same KORA guidance. ▪ Juvenile records (which include all arrests, prosecutions, convictions, and expungements) can only be retrieved through the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) through a verified finger print process; however, there is a \$35 fee and other associated fees. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the funding implications of DCF not charging for records and how can that guide other systems? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ashley will look into how DCF is able to manage the cost of not charging youth for their records. This information can be used to inform how other systems may be able to avoid charging, as well. ○ With regard to whether the SPT can affect change on this issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amy Raymond will determine through OJA if there are other methods for a juvenile to get their publicly filed records that do not cost money (e.g., email). Additionally, Amy noted that through Odyssey a young person can enter a courthouse and pick and choose the particular documents they need to avoid requesting the entire record. ▪ Karen Niemczyk recommended proposing changes to the legislature that includes changing record charges. This aligns with the other work of the SPT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If changes are to be made statutorily, it would have to be through KORA. One way to do this is to more specifically define what “reasonable fees” implies.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kristen Powell noted that DCF has a system in which they can access records from their contracted agencies (e.g., St. Francis) this could serve as a model for KDOC with regard to pulling information and records from related agencies. This would minimize the number of agencies individuals must go through to retrieve their files.
10:40 am	<p>Brainstorm Solutions Regarding Cross-County Cases</p> <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) communication issues between Juvenile Intake and foster care providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This challenge largely ties to the inability to identify crossover youth. ○ The team discussed the need to create a systematic process to identify if someone is in foster care and who their case worker is upon admittance to JIAC. Currently, JIAC is able to call foster care admissions department 24/7 hotlines (each agency has their own hotline) in which the admissions worker looks youth up in the system and identifies who their case worker is. However, these calls are often made after hours in which case the JIAC staff member is put in touch with the on-call worker who has less information on the youth. Once notified, it is the foster care agency's responsibility to pick the youth up. This presents other issues, including communication and timelines for pick up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Because there are numerous foster care agencies, a suggestion was made to enable JIAC to cross-check with DCF to determine if a young person has an open case and, if so, with which foster care agency. ▪ Another recommendation included JIAC accessing court records to identify crossover cases. However, they do not have access to cases outside of the county. ○ The possibility of JIAC having read-only access to DCF's system was also raised. This would enable intake workers to identify which foster care agency a youth is placed with. The team was unsure if this has been attempted previously and will look into the matter. ○ Kristen recommended DCF create face sheets or contact cards for each youth and give JIAC access to that information. Dustin Browning noted this would be helpful to Probation, as well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This could also be done through the courts, although Judge Larson is doubtful that JIAC could gain access to the statewide system.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Karen suggested creating a data system that can be accessed across agencies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A meeting took place between leaders at KDOC, DCF, and OJA regarding the MyRC system used in Johnson County. However, a statewide option such as this does not seem feasible at this time particularly considering that DCF and KDOC are each currently building new systems. A flagging option may be pursued instead. ○ Ashley will ascertain what is feasible through DCF and the team will resume the conversation on the April call. <p><i>The remaining topics will be discussed at the April meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b) supervision of cross-county cases and the ability of young people to acquire services if they have DCF and juvenile justice cases open in two different counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Refer to DOC standards • c) the 5120 Notification of Move/Placement Change form and how additional stakeholders may be able to partake in its receipt • d) youth who reside on reservations and who come into custody of the state due to an offense
10:55 am	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Dates: Calls/meetings are held on the 4th Wednesday of the month from 10:00am-12:00pm. Subsequent dates include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -April 28th -May 26th
11:00 am	<p>Workgroup Breakouts (see agendas below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Sharing • Prevention

CYPM Kansas State Policy Team: Information Sharing Workgroup Summary

March 24, 2021 11:00am-12:00pm

Target Population: A young person age 10 and older with any level of concurrent involvement with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, inclusive of out-of-home placements, probation, Immediate Intervention Programs (IIPs), and voluntary/preventative services (defined as Child in Need of Care (CINC) cases that are open for services such as Family Preservation, Family First, and Family Services).

Time	Session
11:00 am	Welcome and Introductions
11:05 am	Review draft of information sharing toolkit CJJR disseminated the current synthesized version of the Information sharing guide. CJJR noted that while a considerable amount of information had been removed the document continues to be lengthy. Workgroup members agreed to review the document from their vantage point and remove any unnecessary text. These edits would be combined to create a more streamlined version that will be user-friendlier for front-line staff. Those edits are due to CJJR one week prior to the next SPT meeting.
11:40am	Determining what's most useful for the jurisdiction <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Judicial guidance for supporting the work– Determining the role of judges– Develop MOU template
11:50 am	Goal-setting and Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What needs to occur and when to achieve each task?

CYPM Kansas State Policy Team: Prevention Workgroup Summary
 March 24, 2021 11:00am-12:00pm

Time	Session
11:00 am	Welcome and Introductions
11:03 am	Review Target Focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve communication among or about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ agencies and providers ○ frontline staff ○ accessing resources
11:05 am	Develop Goals for the Target Focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous Ideas <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather feedback from youth and families with lived experience to understand their perceptions of cross-agency coordination and where gaps exist. 2. Identify effective strategies that have been or are being used to connect staff across agencies. Consider perspectives of staff, youth, and families. 3. Break down misconceptions and build rapport during COVID. 4. Develop guidance around pathways/scenarios (connect with Info Sharing group) 5. Spread awareness that youth can be connected to services without being system-involved. • Goals/tasks for #1 as it relates to youth and family perspectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determine the target audience for the survey ○ Determine a survey dissemination strategy ○ Develop a survey ○ Disseminate survey and analyze feedback ○ Use survey feedback to develop a focus group(s) ○ Conduct focus group(s) ○ Analyze feedback and establish strategies to improve communication/coordination • Ashley noted that the DCF Foster Home Program Manager and the Group Home Program Manager could assist with survey outreach. • Shirlon recommended connecting with the Regional Youth Advisory Council (RYAC) and the Kansas Youth Advisory Council (KYAC) as both would include young people ages 14+ in foster care who may also have KDOC involvement. • Kristen suggested connecting with the Progeny group in Wichita as well as the youth committee through the Kansas Advisory Group. • Shailiegh noted that the Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDAD) would also be a great resource. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ https://kdads.ks.gov/commissions/behavioral-health/services-and-programs/ylink

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashley will connect with Megan Milner regarding KJCC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Candace Bird could be a resource for connecting with KJCC, as well. • How do we connect with families or parents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Foster care providers can disseminate the survey to biological parents. ○ Community Corrections could disseminate the survey to parents of youth not in foster care but who are on probation or in a facility. Because Community Corrections are local entities, we would need to select a representative sample from across the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KDOC could ask Community Corrections entities across the state to disseminate the survey. (Michelle could likely assist with this.) ▪ KDOC-JS Program Consultant II Andrea Juarez 785-746-7510 785-260-3949 Andrea.Juarez@ks.gov • The group would also like to connect with staff and service providers to gather their perspectives on challenges. • Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include a box for youth to identify which agencies they have had involvement. Results of the survey can subsequently be analyzed based on these groups (e.g., DSS only, crossover youth, etc.). • Target population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will be the main discussion at the next call.
11:55 am	<p>Wrap-up & Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the target population • Establish and confirm the dissemination strategy with agency and organization partners • Create and disseminate the survey