

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

January 9, 2017 1:30PM-4:30PM
Colorado Department of Public Safety, 710 Kipling St., Lakewood 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
Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice (on the phone)
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department & S.B. 94, 14th Judicial District
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation
Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender
Sheri Danz, Colorado Office of Child's Representative
Anders Jacobson, CDHS, Division of Youth Corrections
Rebecca Gleason, 18th Judicial, DA's office

ABSENT

Dan Makelky, County Human Services

STAFF

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

GUESTS

Gretchen Russo, CDHS, OCYF
Ed Wensuc, DYC
Trevor Williams, CDHS, DCW
Skip Barber, CAFCA
Roger Low, OSPB

<p>Issue/Topic: 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 November 7, 2016 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Updates Mandatory Partners for S.B.91-94 and H.B.04-1451 Other Updates Action:</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein shared with the group that the Department of Human Services is currently working with legislators to bring forward legislation that would remove detention facilities as an option for 10-12 years old who have committed misdemeanor non-violent offenses. The bill will propose that SB-94 services serve this population. All misdemeanor, status and petty offenses would be eligible, excluding weapon offenses (some weapon offenses are classified as non-violent misdemeanors).</p> <p>Richard Stroker provided a brief recap of the last Task Force meeting in November.</p> <p>A list of mandatory partners based on statutes for Collaboration Management Program (CMP) – HB1451 and S.B. 94 was provided in the meeting materials. Richard engaged the group to identify the mandatory partners -- for both state oversight and local oversight -- in a crossover youth model.</p> <p><i>Should either CMP or S.B. 94 ensure the state oversight or should a new independent group be created?</i></p> <p>Considering that CMP and SB94 are already established and multi-disciplinary entities, the group decided that one of these entities should be responsible for the statewide oversight committee. The group came to a general consensus that, because S.B. 94 services are implemented in all judicial districts, S.B. 94 entities would be responsible for the state oversight of crossover youth models. It was also recommended that S.B. 94 be encouraged to collaborate with the H.B. 1451 services available in judicial districts.</p> <p>With regard to local teams, the judicial districts will make the determination regarding which group will provide oversight.</p> <p>A copy of the statutes for S.B. 94 services will be provided at the next Task Force meeting.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p>	

<p>Breakout into working groups</p> <p>Briefing from working groups</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Following the discussion of oversight groups, the Task Force broke out into two working groups (see below) and were asked to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vision 2. Current gaps in the system 3. Opportunities <p>The following describes the outcomes of the break outs.</p> <p>1. Point of Entry Working Group</p> <p>The members of this working group are Bill Kilpatrick, Mike Tessean, Kelly Friesen, Gretchen Russo, Anders Jacobson, Rebecca Gleason, and Angela Brant.</p> <p>Gretchen Russo provided a brief recap of the discussions.</p> <p>Vision: Identify, coordinate and share information Gaps: Training, education, expectations need to be established Opportunities: Build on existing processes Outcome: Unified plan, reduce length of stay in detention, have the right people around the table early on, timely info shared across systems, and fair/equitable treatment for these youth.</p> <p>The various points of entry are law enforcement, child welfare, the courts and the Juvenile Assessment Centers.</p> <p><i>Identification process</i></p> <p>Identification process would start where the youth are being screened/detained. It was later added that it would also occur at the Pre-Sentencing Investigation report (PSI).</p> <p>The role of municipal courts was acknowledged but ruled out due to the complexity of the municipal court system and the lack of representation in this Task Force.</p> <p><i>Screening team notifies</i></p> <p>Law enforcement, district attorney, SB-94 services, Human Services/Social Services, Guardian ad litem (if known), parents/guardians, Probation (if known) and the Court.</p> <p><i>Notification includes</i></p> <p>The youth has been identified as a crossover case and has either a current child welfare case or history of past involvement. Court information/detention hearing information when available. The notification should be done either via email or fax without delay. Information to be shared will be defined as sensitive and carefully handled.</p>
---	--

Detention Hearing

Court acknowledges that the youth is a crossover and encourages a least restrictive/appropriate placement.

Additional information that would be helpful to share: substance abuse, placement/treatment, placement options (can they go back?), gang involvement, family member victims, bond info, high risk victim info, running history, and probation

There will be expectations established that multi-disciplinary staffing occur within 7-14 days of screening.

The working group discussed a new warrant process and will further research this topic.

2. Assessment/Case Management/Services Working Group

The members of this working group are Robert Werthwein, Shawn Cohn, Susan Colling, Meg William, Ed Wensuc, Skip Barber, Trevor Williams, Bill Delisio and Sheri Danz.

Robert Werthwein reported for the working group.

Assessments

- Clarify purpose and use of assessment tools
- Sharing of information/assessments to ensure service coordination across multiple agencies which leads to the right service and continuum of care.
- Focus on youth and family treatment needs (before criminogenic needs).
- Congruent assessments.

Opportunities

- Family engagement/addressing family needs
 - The Division of Youth Corrections and Child Welfare already share information
 - Collaboration with CMP
 - Statewide assessment/validated instruments
 - Trauma focus
 - Youth in Conflict/Child Welfare Rule and Regulations Policies - Volume 7.201
- Program Area 4: Defined assessment for Youth in Conflict.
- Address substance abuse, mental health education, and families holistically

Case Management

- Multi-disciplinary team
- Time is allocated for MTD – Many probation officers have substantial amount of cases to supervise and may not have enough time to allocate to MTD.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dedicated staff for crossover youth. Not all county Human Services have dedicated staff for crossover - Survey to be submitted to judicial districts and counties to assess “<i>what is working and not working</i>”. - Laying out the continuum and getting buy-in across the different professions - Ensuring unified treatment planning/continuum: What is continuum across state probation and Child Welfare? Currently treatment planning could be different in another system - Identify timelines in Child Welfare and delinquency processing courts --ensuring that timelines allow time for assessments of the youths’ needs - Each judicial district should establish a system with a point of contact as a liaison between Probation and NYC. <p><i>Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Least restrictive, treatment-focused approach (per statutes) <p>The group will further discuss this topic at future meetings</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Next steps/February Agenda</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action:</p>	<p>Roger Low informed the group that the Office of State Planning and Budgeting just released a Call for Innovation soliciting ideas for a feasibility study and improved approaches for young people and their families. The description of the study can be found here.</p> <p>The survey is targeting two Colorado youth populations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child Welfare involved youth 7-12, 2. Youth post-short term secure detention, returning to their community. <p>Roger encouraged the group to pass this information along to respective networks and to submit ideas, proposals by March 21, 2017 (deadline of submission). A Call for Innovation Kick Off is organized at the Governor’s Residence on January 31, 2017.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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

February 6, 2017

1:30pm – 4:30pm

Location: 710 Kipling St., Lakewood Colorado