

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

November 7, 2016, 11:00AM-4:30PM  
Arapahoe Sheriff's Office, 13101 E. Broncos Parkway, Centennial CO

**ATTENDEES:**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Robert Werthwein, CDHS, Office of Children, Youth and Families  
Susan Colling, State Court Administrators' Office, Division of Probation Services  
Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department  
Bill Delisio, Colorado Judicial Branch, Family Law Program  
Mike Tessean, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center, S.B. 94  
Dan Makelky, County Human Services  
Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice  
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department & S.B. 94, 14<sup>th</sup> Judicial District  
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation  
Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender  
Sheri Danz, Colorado Office of Child's Representative

**ABSENT**

Rebecca Gleason, 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial, DA's office

**STAFF**

Richard Stroker/CCJJ consultant  
Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice  
Laurence Lucero/Division of Criminal Justice

**GUESTS**

Gretchen Russo, CDHS, OCYF	Shelly Sack, 18 <sup>th</sup> JD, Douglas County Probation
Ed Wensuc, DYC	Joe Kellerby, Mesa County Human Services
Glen Chambers, Grand County Human Services	Roger Low, OSPB
Kyle Ragland, Weld County Human Services	Anders Jacobson, DYC
Amanda Pearson, retired Judge in Saguache County	Skip Barber, CAFCA
Trevor Williams, CDHS, DCW	Keah Beeftu, OCR
Kacey Brackney, 18 <sup>th</sup> DA's office for Rebecca Gleason	

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b> Welcome and Introductions Approval of minutes</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein welcomed the group and thanked members and guests for attending.</p> <p>The members of the Task Force and guests introduced themselves.</p> <p>A motion and a second were made to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2016 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b> Overarching goals</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p>Robert Werthwein explained that the purpose of this extended meeting is to agree on the goals of this Task Force and narrow the focus of the work.</p> <p>Robert thanked the group for the feedback received to the questions that were sent in October to Task Force members and stakeholders. The questions were about what should be considered essential elements and obstacles of a crossover youth model.</p> <p>The answers have been organized into categories and a handout of the responses was included in the meeting materials (see links: <a href="#">elements</a> and <a href="#">barriers</a>).</p> <p>Richard Stroker provided a brief recap of the group’s discussions since June 2016.</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> The effective use of information, resources and approaches to achieve desired outcomes with crossover youth.</p> <p><b>Definition of the crossover youth:</b> The dually identified or involved youth in child welfare, probation or DYC systems.</p> <p><b>What:</b> A system to improve collaboration, communication across agencies, develop complementary approaches and make the best use of options and resources.</p> <p><b>Child:</b> Identify and address areas of concern, stabilize/promote positive change, reduce likelihood of further or deeper penetration into systems.</p> <p>Richard proposed structuring the discussion into seven topics.</p> <p><b>Develop and propose a cross-over youth model:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oversight/system coordination</li> <li>2. Role of Law enforcement, court, prosecution</li> <li>3. Assessment</li> <li>4. Case management – supervision</li> <li>5. Community services</li> </ol>

	<p>6. Info systems 7. Staffing</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p>The different systems involved often have overarching goals which are sometimes contradictory to other systems. In order to better serve this population and ensure better outcomes for the youth, it is important to understand the overarching goals of each system (Child Welfare, Probation and Youth Corrections) and identify common ground. For example, with regards to placement decision, Child Welfare is encouraged to reduce the use of congregate care and because NYC is not considered as an out-of-home placement, the youth often end up in NYC when an out-of-home community placement might be a more appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Essential Elements of an “Ideal” crossover youth model</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p><b>1. Oversight/System Coordination</b></p> <p>The group discussed and agreed on the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judicial Framework:</b> Each district would be responsible for ensuring that a crossover youth plan is in place in each of the counties in the judicial district (similar to truancy bill). The Chief Judge would sign the plan.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Districts would have the discretion to use existing models or create a new process.</li> <li>○ Cross-county/districts. It should be acknowledged that some counties within the same judicial district have very different practices.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Multi-disciplinary Team (MDT):</b> Provides oversight/structure in each judicial district. Could be already in place in districts (such as Juvenile Service Planning Committees (JSPC) or Collaborative Management Partners (CMP)). If non-existent, the district or county would have to develop one.</li> <li>• <b>Mandatory/required/desired MDT members:</b> The group heard from guests attending the meeting about the structures that have been implemented in their jurisdictions and the various partners involved to address crossover youth (see section: County Perspectives).</li> </ul> <p>In order to determine the required minimum representation of the oversight team, the group decided to consult S.B. 91-94 (C.R.S. 19-2-212) and H.B. 04-1451 (C.R.S. 24-1.9-102) <i>Concerning the Collaborative Management of Multi-Agency Services Provided to Children.</i></p>

- Requirement of Teams – MOUs

**DISCUSSION**

Counties have existing structures such as [Juvenile Services Planning Committees \(JSPC\)](#) or [Collaborative Management Partners \(CMP\)](#).

*[Collaborative Management Partners \(CMP\)](#): In 2004, the Colorado General Assembly passed House Bill 04-1451 to establish collaborative management programs at the county level that would improve outcomes for children, youth, and families involved with multiple agencies. Partners in local Collaborative Management Programs include county departments of human/social services, local judicial districts, health departments, school districts, community mental health centers and behavioral health organizations, parent or family advocacy groups, and community agencies.*

*[Juvenile Services Planning Committees](#): Funded by the Colorado Department of Human Services/Division of Youth Corrections, Senate Bill 94 is a statewide grant initiative that provides alternatives to detention for youth, ages 10 to 17, involved in the juvenile justice system. Each SB94 program (implemented in each of the State’s 22 JDs) has **Juvenile Services Planning Committees (JSPC)**. Local Judicial Districts are responsible for the screening of all youth referred to secure detention and for an assessment of risk. Senate Bill 94 programs provide an array of services based upon each Judicial District’s unique Juvenile Services Plan.*

One critical component is the coordination with other judicial districts to ensure continuity of care as youth move across districts and counties.

The majority of youth on probation are referred to the Department of Human Services (DHS) for treatment and services and very few have open dependency and neglect cases. It was suggested that the definition of crossover youth should include youth with prior dependency and neglect case.

*[Sentencing--Community Accountability Program \(C.R.S. 19-2-914\)](#). The court has the discretion to sentence a juvenile to participate in the community accountability program. Such a sentence is a condition of probation for higher risk juveniles who would have otherwise been sentenced to detention, out-of-home placement or committed to DYC. The sentence is conditioned on the availability of space in the community accountability program and on a determination by the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) that the juvenile’s participation in the program is appropriate.*

The group discussed the penetration of youth into the system and mentioned a

	<p><a href="#">study</a> (see link) recently released.</p> <p>The group also discussed the need to clarify which population would be served in this framework. The dependency and neglect (D&amp;N) child who has committed a delinquent act and presents as high risk and high need or the youth who has been arrested and could become crossover kid?</p> <p>The group decided to <b>Parking Lot</b> this topic (see at the end of these minutes) for future discussion.</p> <p>Robert Werthwein stated that he believes that the population would be any youth and family served by the County Human Services even if there is no criminal justice involvement or a formal D&amp;N case.</p> <p>It should be acknowledged that developing a crossover process would require significant effort and commitment, especially in those counties with very small number of crossover youth.</p> <p>The group discussed that the Chief Judge should sign the framework plan and the following representatives should be considered as partners in the development of the plan and process: judicial officer or designee, law enforcement, district attorney, probation, DHS, NYC, pretrial services, schools, Juvenile Assessment Centers, defense bar, behavioral health service providers, youth advisory, family advocate, guardian ad litem, victim/restorative community justice groups.</p> <p><b>2. Principles of Framework - Role of Law Enforcement, Court, Prosecution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charging Decisions – Screening/Assessment Law enforcement officers often make decision whether to charge the juvenile often without much information about the youth. All youth should be screened/assessed to assist with decision making.</li> <li>• Juvenile Assessment Centers Whenever available in districts, the Juvenile Assessment Centers have been valuable resources to officers. Use of resources or screens.</li> <li>• Training and information to law enforcement officers</li> <li>• Information Sharing</li> <li>• Diversion</li> <li>• Transition from emergency services</li> <li>• Policy team</li> <li>• Implementation team</li> </ul>
--	--

- Case team
- Crisis mobilization services
- Use of resources

**DISCUSSION**

When a child is beyond the control of parents, it is not uncommon, because of the lack of information, the officer ends up charging the juvenile. Chief Kilpatrick suggested that an ideal process would be to have a JAC representative respond to calls with law enforcement officers or have the ability to take the juveniles to assessment centers.

The framework should include the utilization of mobilization crisis centers (or crisis stabilization) and the inclusion of law enforcement first responders in the treatment planning to identify youth who are dually involved as well as frequent flyers.

There is a successful model in Colorado Springs that seems effective addressing frequent flyers. Colorado Springs Police Department, Fire Department and mental health clinicians respond jointly to calls. The program partnered with mental health centers.

Several years ago, Jefferson County had a program called Family/Adolescent Team and, when families would call for help, responders would take the juvenile to a crisis mobilization center. The program was funded by Jefferson County Human Services.

Every district should have a JAC or designated point of contact/substitute so law enforcement officers can quickly identify a dually involved youth.

Robert Werthwein suggested including in the Task Force recommendations that judicial districts should have a plan to address the 10-12 years old in detention, dually involved youth, the frequent flyers through treatment planning, the utilization of mobilization crisis, the use of charging centers and the sharing of information across systems.

A working group called “Point of Entry” was formed to discuss the broad elements to be part of this framework. The members of the working group are Kelly Friesen, Mike Tessean, Gretchen Russo, Anders Jacobson, Chief Kilpatrick and Dan Makelky.

**3. Principles of Framework – Assessment**

- Assessments shared across systems/amongst partners and agreed upon.
- Appropriate assessments for youth in conflict, trauma, substance abuse and services needed.
- What kind of assessments are in place. What is driving the assessment process? Should be a method to identify adequate assessments?
- Strengthen/streamline assessment across.
- Most assessments look at risk for reoffending but should also include other outcomes for the juveniles.
- Role of pre-sentencing investigation (PSI) in case planning. Collateral information from PSI.
- Standardized interpretation of assessments. What do assessments tell us?
- Amenability to treatment. How to use treatment information?
- Assess to address. Social history should be included.

**DISCUSSION:**

Robert Werthwein suggested discussing the role of assessments in the pre-sentence investigation phase and case planning.

At Denver Probation services, multiple assessments are used to prepare the initial case plan. PSIs are conducted for about 96% of the juveniles on probation and are considered valuable tools for the probation officers to work the case much quicker compared to gathering all collaborative information from various sources. The PSIs also include information on whether there has been prior involvement with DHS which helps identify crossover youth at pre-sentencing.

Many jurisdictions choose not to use PSIs; they are routinely waived.

It was believed that there are too many assessments used by different systems. Several years ago when the Child Mental Health Treatment Act was created, it was agreed that mental health centers should assess all the youth referred under the act. The assessments are performed by mental health centers as independent entities and should be part of the discussions in this group.

*What roles do assessments and treatment planning play in sentencing?*

Every judicial district has to do the Colorado Juvenile Risk Assessment (CJRA) which is included in the recommendations submitted to the judicial officer.

In Denver, probation officers would provide the assessments and PSIs to the supervisor probation officer for recommendations of services, type of probation, type of courts and programs.

**4. Principles of Framework – On-Going Case Management/Supervision**

- Information sharing
- Reassess over time
- Ongoing multi-disciplinary team
- Right time, right placement. Least restrictive setting required per federal and state statute
- Succession planning for the team

**DISCUSSION:**

Judicial districts should have a plan to reconvene and reassess the youth who are not doing well in the placement.

In many jurisdictions, there is a frequent rotation of lawyers and there should be a plan to ensure that the information regarding the case planning/treatment is relayed appropriately to the next team.

**5. Principles of Framework - Services**

- Evidence based effectiveness
- Fidelity to model – Adequate dosage to allow services to be effective
- Timeliness of services
- Method for early termination of treatment
- Develop service treatment plan with the potential of multiple players but at the same time reduce multi-system involvement for the same family
- Services to family
- Colorado PEAK – Assessing for eligibility for a variety of basic needs (see



<https://coloradopeak.secure.force.com/>)

- Blending resources and funding to ensure continuity of services across systems for the youth and family

**DISCUSSION:**

It is important to identify the family needs and coordinate services for the family in order to prevent siblings of the youth involved in the criminal justice system from entering the system.

There should be a process across systems to ensure that families with a dually involved youth are assessed for eligibility to PEAK. PEAK is an online service for Colorado residents to screen and apply for medical, funds, cash and childcare assistance program.

Many youth are sent to detention because they are in need assessment, treatment, and stabilization. The biggest need of services for the youth on probation in Denver is the short term residential drug and alcohol treatment. It would be very valuable to create a program that would also serve both populations, and serve as a diversion from NYC.

**6. Principles of Framework - Other elements**

- Permanency
- Homelessness prevention

**DISCUSSION:**

The issue of youth committed in NYC and in need of permanency was discussed and the requirement for courts and social services to establish a permanent home in a specific time frame when parent rights have been terminated or when they are giving up their parent caregiving rights.

There also should be consideration for the juveniles who return home to the same environment when an out-of-home placement might be more appropriate.

Richard Stroker suggested treating the topics “**Info Systems**” and “**Staff**” as barriers to discuss at future meetings.

A working group called “Assessment/Case Management/Services” will begin to draft recommendations for the Task Force to consider. The members of this working group are Robert Werthwein, Trevor Williams, Shawn Cohn, Skip Barber, Susan Colling, Meg Williams, Ed Wensuc. Dan Makelky will delegate someone of his team to participate to the work of this working group.

	<p><b>PARKING LOT:</b></p> <p>Delinquency Only crossover and True Child Welfare</p> <p>Creation of a Statewide Oversight Team to provide support to jurisdictions</p> <p>Bench Card for Judicial Districts.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>County perspectives</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p>Robert Werthwein asked participants to discuss the structures/models and mandatory partnerships existing in their jurisdictions.</p> <p>Joe Kellerby from Mesa County Human Services explained that his county partnered with Georgetown University’s crossover youth efforts about a year ago. The crossover partners are essentially the same as the Collaborative Management Partners and include representatives from DYC, probation, mental health services, the Office of the Public Defender, prosecution, and the school district. The population served has been identified as a youth currently involved with Child Welfare and who then commits a delinquent act. There are two types of judicial systems in the 21<sup>st</sup> Judicial District: Judicial officers dealing with dependency and neglect cases and magistrates for delinquency cases. The efforts are placed on establishing policies for information sharing, using common assessments around S.B. 94, and sharing case plans with probation to prevent duplicating efforts with families. Joe Kellerby commented that the use of CMHTA (Child Mental Health Treatment Act) doesn’t get enough attention and agreed that some delinquency issues could be handled in treatment centers. The limited resources on the western slope are a significant issue and youth are being moved to the front range to get services. Because of few resources, youth end up in congregate care sometimes more than 250 miles away from their home. The county started to collect data in June 2016 so there is not a good understanding on the number of youth involved in the CYMP. No funding for additional staffing was allocated for the implementation of this model and existing staff have taken on the extra workload to implement the model and collect data. It is a challenge to implement a whole cross-system model with existing staff and without the ability to hire new staff.</p> <p>The multi-disciplinary team is a steering committee and Mesa County uses an Individualized Services and Support Team (ISST) to make recommendations for youths and families.</p> <p>Shelly Sack indicated that in the 18<sup>th</sup> JD, the mandatory partners are part of the HB 04-1451 collaborative management efforts. MOUs are included in the process and the Chief Judge signs the plan.</p> <p>Shelly Sacks mentioned that Arapahoe County is piloting components of a crossover model and collaborating with the Juvenile Assessment Center, probation, S.B. 94 and county attorneys. The current focus is having DHS voluntarily involved without a court order. A MDT is in place to help guide the youth and family as they navigate through services. Services are funded through DHS. Youth come through probation, S.B.94, and juvenile assessment centers. This process is still in its infancy stage.</p> <p>Shawn Cohn mentioned that Denver started with Georgetown University and</p>

	<p>then proceeded with a separate group. Everything is now falling under H.B. 04-1451. There is multi-disciplinary team with all entities represented. When a youth picks up a charge in Denver and has a case in another county, the other county MTD is contacted.</p> <p>Mike Tessean described a program in the 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District (Jefferson and Gilpin Counties) targeting younger children with DHS involvement. A MDT is in place and includes pretrial services, diversion, probation, the Jefferson Center for Mental Health, DHS, GAL, schools, district attorneys and a coordinator who helps families navigate different systems.</p> <p>Gretchen Russo commented that the implementation of a crossover youth model may be challenging in some districts due to the size of the population.</p> <p>Judge Amanda Pearson discussed the implementation of the crossover youth model in the 12<sup>th</sup> Judicial District which includes Georgetown. Probation partnered with the social service agencies in two counties to develop a plan to be implemented in the five counties in the judicial district. The plan was submitted to the Chief Judge for approval.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Next Steps December Agenda</p>	<p>A list will be established of mandatory partners based on statutes for the CMP and S.B.94.</p> <p>Two working groups were created:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Point of Entry Bill, Mike, Kelly, Gretchen, Dan, Anders</li> <li>2. Assessment/Case Management/Services Robert, Trevor, Shawn, Skip, Susan, Meg, Ed, Dan’s appointee. Due to scheduling issues in December, it is anticipated that this working group will not have enough time to meet and produce recommendations before the next Task Force meeting.</li> </ol> <p>The meeting scheduled on December 5 is cancelled. Next meeting is on January 9, 2017 at 710 Kipling St., Lakewood CO.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Public Comments Adjourn</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein thanked the Task Force members and guests for their participation and asked if there were any public comments. Seeing none, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm</p>

**Next Meeting**

January 9, 2017

1:30pm – 4:30pm

Location: 710 Kipling St., Lakewood Colorado