

Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Minutes

July 11, 2016, 1:30PM-4:30PM
690 Kipling, 1st floor conference room, Lakewood

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Robert Werthwein, CDHS, Office of Children, Youth and Families

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department & S.B. 94, 14th Judicial District

Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice

Susan Colling, State Court Administrators' Office, Probation Services

Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department

Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation

Charles Parkins, CDHS, Division of Youth Corrections

Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender

Rebecca Gleason, 18th Judicial, DA's office

Sheri Danz, Colorado Office of Child's Representative (phone)

Bill Delisio, Colorado Judicial Branch, Family Law Program (phone)

ABSENT

Mike Tessean, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center

Dan Makelky, County Human Services

STAFF

Richard Stroker/CCJJ consultant

Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice

Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

GUESTS

Skip Barber, CAFCA

Gretchen Russo, Colorado Department of Human Services

Joe Thome, Division of Youth Corrections

Edward Wensuc, Division of Youth Corrections

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein, Chair of the Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force, welcomed the group and thanked members and guests for attending.</p> <p>The members of the Task Force and guests introduced themselves.</p> <p>Robert reviewed the agenda and noted the minutes from the June meeting captured the areas of interest that were discussed and also the conversations about what was still left to be addressed in this second meeting. Meg Williams added that she appreciated the detail in the minutes and offered one correction, which is that she is the Vice Chair of the Juvenile Parole Board and not the Chair. A motion and a second were made to approve the minutes. All voted in favor.</p> <p>Robert expressed that after reading the June minutes he wanted to make sure his personal interest in crossover youth didn't come across as too prescriptive. He also reminded the group that the Governor's letter to the Commission called for unity in addressing issues surrounding youth.</p> <p>Robert introduced Richard Stroker, the new consultant for the Commission. Richard explained that he read the minutes from the June meeting and summarized eight interest areas identified by task force members, as follows:</p> <p><u>Areas/Issues mentioned</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective models/approaches regarding cross-over youth • Information sharing/I.T. systems • Use of assessments/sharing/overlap • Build on good work; "Right services/right time/right place" • Mental health considerations • Use/duration of detention • Parent accountability • Collateral consequences <p>Richard added that hopefully by the end of today's presentations the group can agree on some particular subgroups in the hopes of getting momentum to move forward.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Review of Key Themes from June meeting Definition of dual-status/crossover youth population</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Robert said he wanted to spend some time at the top of this meeting further discussing the definition of dual status youth.</p> <p>Kim English directed task force members to a handout in their packets from the Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps that describes dual status youth as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dually-identified youth: youth who are currently involved with the juvenile justice system and have a history in the child welfare system but no current involvement. 2. Dually-involved youth: youth who have concurrent involvement (diversionary, formal, or a combination of the two) with both the child

	<p>welfare and juvenile justice systems.</p> <p>3. Dually-adjudicated youth: youth who are concurrently adjudicated in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems (i.e. both dependent and delinquent).</p> <p>Robert added that in Colorado crossover youth can be involved in 3 different systems: child welfare, probation, and/or youth corrections.</p> <p>The question was raised about why so many adolescents are in congregate care. One answer is that children with maltreatment histories and dependency and neglect (D&N) issues end up delinquent, and therefore become dually involved. The issue of dually-identified is a bigger hill to climb than the other definitions.</p> <p>Richard offered that this group could start by looking at dually-involved youth and then expand the focus later. Robert said he agreed but that the group should not ignore dually-identified. Shawn Cohn noted that in Denver, every child with a Pre-sentence Investigation Report (PSIR) is checked to see if they ever had any involvement in child welfare, so they can flag the case so probation officers are aware of possible unresolved trauma.</p> <p>Kelly Friesen shared that in small districts diversion youth usually have history of social services involvement. She said if there is any hope of stopping penetration into the juvenile justice system, there needs to be identification of where the child first starts to fail.</p> <p>Robert summarized that the group seems to agree on the definition of dually-identified. But when it comes to identifying themes for the group the term 'dual-status' youth is better and wider at this point in the work. The group is also in agreement that the system in Colorado is not efficient. The group agreed that for the purposes of this work the definition for Dual Status incorporates dually identified and dually involved.</p> <p><i>Dual Status definition: Dual status incorporates dually-identified and dually-involved.</i></p> <p>Richard reiterated that he is new to the group and was not in attendance at the first meeting. However, he shared that after reading the June minutes, the request from the Governor and the minutes from the CCJJ retreat, he came away with a theme regarding the study topics for this task force. He asked the group if he could articulate this theme for them and get some feedback from task force members. He added that it was important for groups to identify a unifying mission so they can have a sense of progress and can determine whether they are reaching their objective.</p> <p>Richard described the overarching theme for the group as follows: <i>The effective use of information, resources and approaches amongst several agencies in order to better achieve desired outcomes for dual status youth.</i></p> <p>Robert replied that this description of an overarching theme fits for him. Meg</p>
--	--

	<p>replied that the verbiage 'dual status' works better for her than using 'dually-involved', which makes it seem there are two groups involved with kids, while some of the kids may not be involved at the same time.</p> <p>The group agreed that this is a good direction to consider moving toward.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Presentation: Profile of youth in Diversion</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Meg Williams walked the group through a presentation about youth in Diversion.</p> <p>The full PowerPoint presentation can be found at: http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-07-11-Youth_Diversion.pdf</p> <p>Some discussion points from the presentation are outlined below.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Diversion was established in the 1980s and serves a broad range of youth. • Diversion of a youth can take place either at the pre-filing level or post-adjudication level. • Diversion can happen at pre-filing when law enforcement stops a youth and makes a decision NOT to forward the case to a district attorney. It can also happen when law enforcement sends the case to a district attorney and the DA determines not to file. • Decisions by law enforcement vary greatly and differ jurisdiction to jurisdiction. • Diversion can also happen post-adjudication AFTER a DA decides to file. • With pre-adjudication diversion a wide variety of youth are actually served. Some places are more willing to take juveniles with more background and history. • Originally there was 20 years of solid diversion funding, but the funding stream was decimated in 2002/03. • In 2007 programs received half of the funding back and funding currently stands at \$1.2M. • In 2015, \$360,000 in marijuana tax funding was also made available. • Funding distribution for diversion programs occurs through a competitive grant process. • Approximately 2200 youth are served every year in programs funded by DCJ. • Over ¾ of the youth committed misdemeanors or petty offenses, the remainder committed felonies. • The youth are 15 years old, on average. • 65% male, 55% while, just under 1/3 are Hispanic/Latino. • There were under-representation issues to begin with, but those numbers all stemmed from one particular jurisdiction. The under-representation issue is being worked on now. • 84% of youth are exiting diversion successfully. • 14% recidivate within one year.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all programs use the same assessment tool, and even if they do they may not be using the tool in the same way or correctly. • The biggest area with opportunities to improve outcomes is via educational programs. • As for recidivism, males are more likely than females to recidivate and youth with prior police contact. • Meg noted that there is no data on youth NOT getting into diversion programs. • There are better relationships in certain jurisdictions with Juvenile Assessment Centers. JACS typically house more services. • At the end of the presentation task force members discussed various assessment processes.
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Presentation: Profile of youth on Probation</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Susan Colling offered a presentation to the group about youth on Probation.</p> <p>The full PowerPoint presentation can be found at: http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-07-11-Youth_Probation.pdf</p> <p>Some discussion points from the presentation are outlined below.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado's Probation Statement of Common Ground states that Probation is committed to public safety, victim and community reparation through offender accountability, skill and competency development and services to the communities of Colorado. • Probation is responsible for PSIRs, Community Supervision, DUI evaluations and Victim Services. • PSIRs can be waived and this varies jurisdiction to jurisdiction. PSIRs are NOT supposed to be waived on sex offenders, but it may happen occasionally. • There are a small number of PSIs are being done across the state. • PSIRs provide a lot of background information when they are performed. • The PSI is used to inform the court when making a sentencing decision. • PSIRs are often not performed because it is assumed the youth is going to get probation and that the PO will gather background information. • Both Denver and Public Defenders find a lot of value in the PSIRs and they will extend the sentencing date in order to get one done. • The issue is that there are not enough probation officers to write the PSIRs for juveniles. The focus is on adult PSIRs. • Robert asked if the lack of juvenile PSIRs could be an issue this group wants to highlight or work on. • Many states will not waive the PSIR since there are so many benefits but youth are often overly assessed. • When the PSIR isn't performed, the probation officer will have to gather background information, which takes significant time. • By the time a youth is adjudicated, he/she has often been overly

	<p>assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roughly 7% of (850) POs supervise juveniles. • Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation (JISP) was originally designed to be short term. • Youth often fail JISP because they are either overly supervised, or they receive JISP too late in the process and their criminality is already established. They could have more intense mental health issues or other factors. • Sometimes a youth may need something more than the surveillance model of JISP. • There has been a big decrease in caseloads across the JV justice system. • The number of adult probation cases has been pretty stable. • Assessments used across probation include CJRA, SUS, MAYSI-2, JSOAP-II. • Recidivism (new filing) one year out is at 13.7 %. • Bill Kilpatrick asked if this group is tasked with looking at just state youth or municipal youth too. He suggested that this group should look at all youth. • One of the big problems at the municipal level is the lack of data. • We do not know what decisions are being made about the juveniles at all these other placements. Data systems not talking. • There is always the problem of getting a youth too late to do the right intervention. • The system needs to ensure juveniles get the right intervention before hitting the adult system. With the absence of data sharing, police do not know the background of the youth, particularly those from other jurisdictions. • Information systems do not talk.
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Presentation: Profile of youth in DYC</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Edward Wensuc 's presentation to the group about youth in the Division of Youth Corrections.</p> <p>The full PowerPoint presentation can be found at: http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-07-11-Youth_DYC.pdf</p> <p>Some discussion points from the presentation are outlined below.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The difference between committed youth and youth on probation is that legal custody of the youth is transferred to human services when the child is in DYC. • DYC works with youth ages 10-20, for acts committed prior to a youth's 18th birthday. Ages 10-12 only for very specific sentences including class 1, 2 or 3 felonies. • There are two types of sentences – the majority of sentences are determinate (non-mandatory) which is for a period up to 24 months. Special sentences (mandatory) are for aggravated crimes, violent and

	<p>repeat offenders and high profile cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DA will make a determination of filing for the case. • Client management includes-commitment, assessment, residential care, community residential, and parole before discharge. • Ed explained the DYC commitment timeline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -assessment happens in the first 30 days -first placement is in 45 days • Some of the services lacking include the ability to evaluate medication. • As for client management, the case manager becomes the parole officer at the end of a youth's residential stay. There is an overarching commitment to this kind of continuum. DYC wants to ensure they walk the youth from assessment to being on parole. • Services provided include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Mentoring -Functional Family Therapy (FFT) -Multi-systematic therapy -Aggression Replacement Training -Restorative Justice activities -Outpatient Drug and Alcohol services -Job skills training -Independent Living Support • Juvenile arrests are going down as well as the number of SB94 screens. • New DYC admissions are down. • Average daily population is down. • Currently only 1.2% of the juvenile population gets detained. • Detention numbers have also gone down. • Commitment ADP (average daily population) trends have seen a remarkable decline. • As in the rest of the nation there are huge declines in juvenile detention numbers. • Most recommitments occur on parole. • There are fewer committed youth but seriousness of offense has increased. Recommits have gone up as well. • Youth are coming in with multiple issues including severe mental health, substance abuse and alcohol issues. • As for offense type, a majority of kids are involved in person crimes as opposed to property crimes. • There is no mental health diagnosis capability in the TRAILS system – so mental health numbers could be underrepresented. • There is an over-representation of females in diversion. • As for female offender trends, there is a big decrease in ADP. • Parole projections are also down. • Risk usually goes down during commitment in all domain areas, but goes back up a bit after parole. • Recidivism rates are comparable to the rest of the nation. About half recidivate in three years. Recidivism is measured as new adjudication. After three years about half are re-adjudicated. • Youth generally discharged around 19 years old. • Fewer juveniles needing community based services, larger number
--	--

	needing secure care in DHS.
--	-----------------------------

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Presentation: Profile of youth in Child Welfare</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein provided the following information about youth in Child Welfare. He distributed a handout entitled Colorado Child Welfare Data for Federal FY 2015.</p> <p>The document can be found at: http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-07-11-ChildWelfare-Data.pdf</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 160,846 hotline calls in the past fiscal/calendar year. • 88,695 referrals • 32,703 assessments • 4913 new removals • Robert provided numbers on children/youth in out of home placements broken down by multiple categories (see handout). • Robert also provided numbers on all permanency goals for youth placed out of the home broken down by multiple categories (see handout). • He added that his office will start tracking juveniles by judicial district and counties. TRAILS (the DHS data system) is not deciphering that data now. • There is no data on the number of county custody youth in detention. • Residential Treatment Center is better alternative to detention. • Robert explained that his office is looking at Ridgeview as a model to replicate. • TRAILS has many gaps and is not a great system. • Child Welfare is moving to a web-based system which will be able to communicate with other data systems as they come up. • Counties have arrangements on local levels to share data, but this is challenging at the state level. • There are 850 youth in residential, and only about 15% are traditional child protection cases. • 67 percent are youth in conflict beyond control of the parent. • Juveniles have to have Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to receive services. There is also a six month delay in SSI. • As far as multiple disciplinary wrap-around approaches, teams that overlap are more successful. • Robert added that his office is trying to figure out data collection for collaborative management. • Detention utilization is an area for improvement. Youth in detention are more likely to have mental health issues.

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next Steps</p>	<p>Richard Stroker engaged the group to discuss next steps and narrow the scope of work.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claudia Zundel from CAIMH will be presenting at the August meeting on a Study of Youth with high behavioral health needs in Colorado by COACT. • Broad areas have been discussed today and it was suggested breaking up into working groups that will gather information and examine these areas and report back to the Task Force. • Richard outlined three potential broad areas of focus as follows: <p>INFORMATION SHARING OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunities to share information /how do we share now and what can we do differently. What would be helpful at different points? <p>COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENT AND CASE PLANNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are lots of assessment and case planning used, but it's not collaboratively done. <p>EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS ACROSS AGENCIES / EFFECTIVE DETENTION USE FOR HIGH UTILIZERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at issues around the interventions themselves. Need to focus on 'high utilizers' or other approaches. Other intervention strategies to help us reach better results. • Richard asked the group if they would be willing to discuss these topics at the next meeting in August. He explained that the group will need to have some structure to advance the work on specific topic areas. • Meg mentioned that the CCJJ currently has a Data Sharing Task Force working on data sharing issues, but it will not be dealing specifically with child welfare. • It was noted that it was unfortunate the JAC representative wasn't in attendance today as the Task Force determined the need of more discussions around the JACs. Robert informed that Mike Tessean will be in attendance in the August meeting and someone from one of the JACs should present. • Robert asked everyone to submit the list of assessments that they use before next meeting. Joe Thome volunteered to gather the information. • The assessment used for juveniles is CJRA but the question is what do you do after you do the assessment and where do you find the services. • More services are need around drug and alcohol. • Does this Task Force need a judicial representative? The group agreed but proposed to wait until the group has defined areas of work and possibly reach out to retired judges. • Gretchen offered to reach out to new JV judges on rotation.
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Adjourn</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Robert Werthwein thanked the group for coming. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.</p>
---	---

Action:	
----------------	--

Next Meeting

August 8, 2016

1:30pm – 4:30pm

700 Kipling St., 4th floor Training Room