

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

February 6, 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 Delisio, Colorado Judicial Branch, Family Law Program
Mike Tessean, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center, S.B. 94
Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department & S.B. 94, 14th Judicial District (on the phone)
Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender
Linda Weinerman for Sheri Danz, Colorado Office of Child's Representative
Anders Jacobson, CDHS, Division of Youth Corrections
Rebecca Gleason, 18th Judicial, DA's office
Dan Makelky, County Human Services

ABSENT

Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation

STAFF

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

GUESTS

Gretchen Russo, CDHS, OCYF
Trevor Williams, CDHS, DCW
Shelly Sack, 18th JD, Douglas County Probation
Adam Zarrin, Governor's Office

<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 January 9, 2017 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: S.B. 91-94 Review of discussions and overarching goals</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Copies of the Colorado Revised Statutes <i>19-2-212 Statewide Advisory Board</i> and <i>19-2-211 Juvenile Services Planning Committee</i> were included in the meeting materials.</p> <p>Richard Stroker provided a brief recap of the last Task Force meeting in January.</p> <p>Robert Werthwein reiterated that the final recommendations from this Task Force should not only define minimum standards of a model framework but also include the expectations that Judicial Districts have established processes addressing the crossover youth population.</p> <p>Richard Stroker proposed organizing the discussions of the Task Force to first define a model framework and then discuss how to formulate these expectations.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Breakout into working groups Briefing from working groups Action:</p>	<p>The Task Force then broke out into two working groups and continued the work started at the meeting in January.</p> <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 were Mike Tessean, Kelly Friesen, Gretchen Russo, Anders Jacobson, Rebecca Gleason, Angela Brant, and Dan Makelky.</p> <p>Gretchen Russo reported for this working group.</p> <p><i>The working group discussed the following elements to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Judicial districts & counties: There should be some coordination between counties as there may be multiple plans within a Judicial District (for example, Douglas and Arapahoe counties are in the same Judicial District but have adopted different models). The Chief Judge of each Judicial District would be responsible to ensure models are in place and coordination between counties.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify similar goals for SB94/Counties and Probation/Counties - Agree on shared ownership - Get copies of MOUs – Address protective orders - Clarify the starting point - Develop a form or guide for the framework <p><i>Topics:</i></p> <p>Identify: Youth who has current involvement or history with Child Welfare at any of the following stages of the system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Juvenile Assessment Centers/Juvenile Service Centers - Detention (when screened for detention) - Court hearing - Probation <p>Notify (without delay): Youth identified as crossover, court info</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How: By phone, email, fax - Who: Police Department, District Attorney, S.B. 94 Coordinators, Department of Human Services, Guardian Ad Litem (if known), Parent/Guardian, Probation Officer (if known), Court. <p>Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Info sharing: Each jurisdiction has to determine (in MOUs) which information is shared and how – protective orders; define what information a youth can and cannot share at staff meetings. Create a list of information that can be shared and all relevant history. - Clear structure to be defined when developing framework and ensure all parties are working towards a common goal. - Hold meeting/staffing within 14 days of notification. <p>Outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written/oral plan presented to court - Coordinated plan to address needs of youth/family using least restrictive approach
--	---

	<p>2. Assessment/Case Management/Services Working Group</p> <p>The members of this working group were Robert Werthwein, Susan Colling, Meg Williams, Trevor Williams, Bill Delisio, Linda Weinerman and Shelli Sacks.</p> <p>Robert Werthwein reported for this working group.</p> <p>Assessments: Completed by appropriate agencies and shared at the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) before treatment decision.</p> <p>Case Management/Multi-Disciplinary Team meetings (MDT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify lead and coordinate responsibilities between parties - Timeline of responsibilities - Develop a unified case management plan/one case plan - Hold regular follow-up team meetings - All referrals sent to the MDT to make recommendations (currently referrals are sent from agency to agency) - Incentivize youth to see trajectory of placement <p><i>When:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Law enforcement contact (if and when known) - Detention – MDT mandatory: Often times, youth are in detention awaiting placement and custody is not necessary for safety reasons - Probation: For example, when a crossover youth is on probation and struggling, the MDT convenes - Commitment: MDT convenes long before release and ensures that permanency is established with clear timeline - Parole – To be discussed further
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>General Concepts Next steps/March Agenda</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>The Task Force discussed the broad concept of merging responsibilities from S.B. 94 and H.B. 1451 into one single body to address the dually involved youth. The Task Force will decide at future meetings whether to give this idea further consideration.</p> <p>At the next meeting in March, the Task Force will consolidate the discussions of the two working groups into one broad framework.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</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 4:15 pm</p>

Next Meeting

