

**Juvenile Justice Reform Committee (JJRC)**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**October 22, 2019**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room**  
**710 Kipling St, Lakewood CO 80215**

**Committee Members Attending:** Carl Blake, Bob Booth, Allison Boyd, Kirsta Britton, Shawn Cohn, Stacie Colling, Sheri Danz, Hon. Beth Elliot-Dumler, Sarah Ericson, Anders Jacobson, Sen. Pete Lee, Elise Logemann, Dan Makelky, Rep. Hugh McKean, Lanie Meyers, Jenifer Morgen, Tariq Sheikh, Elaina Schively, Sara Strufing, Joe Thome, Hon. Doug Walker, Tobin Wright, Adam Zarrin

**Staff:** Kelly Abbott, Gina Vincent, Yaël Coley-Greene, Kate Ferebee, Anna Lopez

**Guests:** Tom Harbaugh, Hannah Hayes, Ersaleen Hope, Debbie Oldenettel, Shelley Siman, Erin Crites

**Procedure – How Decisions Are Made:** In-line with how other committee's make decisions, an initial recommendation is made to the full committee, discussion and questions are heard and then all the information from the discussion goes back out to stakeholder's and at the following month's meeting the workgroup comes back with a finalized recommendation.

### **Division Updates**

#### Update from Risk Assessment Implementation Committees (Shawn Cohn):

Probation formed a working group to address the implementation of YLS, the tool selected as the Risk and Needs Assessment tool for the probation population. They have met a couple of times to talk about the implementation of the YLS/CMI. The group is looking at how they can implement the assessment across the state, as well as, what entry point should be used for and who should do the administration of the tool for youth prior to sentencing or disposition. The working group consists of Shawn Cohn, Tom Harbaugh (from judicial, co-chair), a mixture of both rural and urban probation officers, a probation supervisor, as well as magistrate Denmark. The group is recommending to the Reform Committee that the tool be utilized predisposition for all youth that are in the court system. The JJRC acknowledged all the work that has gone into this plan and based on the input from this conversation with the larger JJRC asked the workgroup to take all the information and the recommendation back to their stakeholders again and come back to the JJRC's November meeting with a plan for what the implementation of the YLS will look like for the youth to be assessed; including who should do the assessment (at this time the recommendation is for probation to administer it), when, how often, who will use the information and in what situations. No vote was held for this decision.

Gina will take this consideration into her next conversation: not only kids that are on pre-trial, out of the detention but using the screening tool for children sitting in detention. When planning for release, they can address some of those hyperkinetic needs to ensure the right services are being put into place for release.

There was additional information from Judicial was presented by Tom Harbaugh who is Judicial's lead on SB 19-108 implementation. Tom mentioned the number of tools and their pricing structures reflected the total number of uses or an unlimited license that allows them to utilize the YLS/CMI know that they have additional packages of assessments given a robust catalog. Judicial is looking at funding for implementation costs from multiple places. The fees include an upfront fee of \$30,000, and then there is a licensing structure. That leads to an annual cost to utilize the YLS and those payment structures are unique, based on how they want to structure, those assessments. They can have a pay to play system or pay for each individual assessment, the more assessments they use, the less cost per assessment. There is also an unlimited option, which is \$50,000 annually. The information was provided to the governor's office in direct response to Judicial's Director reaching out and asking if they were going to assist with implementation, as well as staffing.

#### Update from Risk Assessment Implementation Committees (Carl Blake):

DYS formed an implementation committee within DYS to look at implementing the youth assessment-screening instrument. The committee consists of a variety of individuals in terms of DYS, including representatives from the region, region directors, client managers, supervisor's client managers, and assessment specialist. For them, they will be replacing the CJRA with the YASI. During their assessment process they identified that the YASI was the best fit for their needs. They then took a cursory look at their policies around reassessments at different key decision points. A placeholder has been established for once the initial round of training with more of their administrative supervisory staff. They will then have a focus group to relook at their policies once people know more about the YASI.

The information received from the YASI may be more beneficial than what they currently receive. DYS has also been in contact with a couple of other states that have implemented the YASI. Currently, Carl is trying to get in touch with people from California and Illinois, California uses the version of the YASI that will be used here (the California version) because it was based on a juvenile justice correctional population. Wisconsin also recently implemented the YASI, but both Wisconsin and Illinois are using the kind of more generic version of the YASI, which is more consistently used, but it doesn't give you the same information that the California version because it's based on a residential population within a correctional component.

A big part of their implementation has been securing funding. They received a quote from Orbis, the only company available because they own the instrument and are the sole entity for distribution and training.

DYS sent their policies to Gina to look at and provide feedback on how what is already in policy relates to the CJRA and what may be necessary to change as they move toward adopting the YASI.

Update from Diversion Working Group: Formula Funding and Risk Screening Tool (Kate Ferebee):

The Diversion Work Group members include Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council members, key stakeholders, and diversion program managers. The work group has met a few times. There are two focus areas right now for the work group. One is the screening tool, and the second is the formula for distributing the juvenile diversion funding to all 22 judicial districts for this fiscal year and in the future. Gina gave the work group an initial look at the YLS/CMI, screening version of the Ohio Youth Assessment System, and Arizona risk and needs assessment. The group is going to talk to their own agencies to get some more feedback and then bring that information to the work group. Programs may pilot one or two of the tools so there will be more information for the JJRC to base a final decision.

For the discussion on a formula Nancy A. with CSG presented a few spreadsheets to the work group and presented a couple of options. Those options are based on population, a weighting for poverty a weighting for geography. The next steps on the formula discussion for future funding are for the work group to have another discussion and come up with a recommendation. That recommendation will go to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council (they are the decision making body for the formula selection). The next JJDP Council meeting is on November 15. The next Diversion Work Group meeting is October 31.

The Executive Committee of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council already made a decision for this year's current funding. The decision is to fund the seven judicial districts that do not receive DCJ funding currently via a formula based on population with a weight for poverty and weight for square mileage. There will be a base of \$60,000 and a cap of \$250,000. The remainder of the funds will fund the current programs based on their original requests (grant fund requests) and approvals of those requests via the JJDP Council. The JJDP Council will also be presented with a scenario where some of the funds would be utilized to develop a diversion database to be used by all diversion programs to meet the requirements of SB 19-0108.

Someone asked staff to create a map indicating who is making what decisions and when those decisions will be made so the JJRC can appropriately give input but also appropriately prepare stakeholders for decisions.

Update from Outcome Measures Working Group (Dr. Erin Crites):

Dr. Crites is currently one of the two co-chairs for the Outcomes Work Group along with Laurie. The work group has had one meeting where they figured out which direction they are headed. They discussed the kind of outcome measures that are commonly collected amongst DYS, diversion, and probation programs for youth. Moving forward CSG is going to pull together all of the reports that are produced on an annual basis, look for some commonalities within those data points. By doing that they are hoping they can see where they might already have crossover. Then they will

look at what additional measure, they might want to add. Additionally, they are looking to find out which other service providers might be interested in being involved on this work group. The next meeting will be held in December.

Update from DYS and Judicial on SB19-108 Implementation and Alignment (Anders Jacobson):

The update from DYS, focused on the JD SAG screening instrument for detention. They are going to survey people for help with informing the committee. As a reminder, a new screening instrument must be in place by January of 2021. Dr. Vincent has been helping them around what needs to look be included and other available instruments across the country. They are really wanting to get the YASI up and running as well their treatment service delivery model to marry those two before implementing another new process.

Next Steps (Joe Thome):

There being no other business, the **meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.**