

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

March 6, 2017 1:30PM-4:30PM
Colorado Department of Public Safety, 710 Kipling St., Lakewood CO

ATTENDEES:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

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
Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender
Rebecca Gleason, 18th Judicial, DA's office
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation
Sheri Danz, Office of Child Representative

ABSENT

Robert Werthwein, CDHS, Office of Children, Youth and Families
Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
Dan Makelky, County Human Services
Anders Jacobson, CDHS, Division of Youth Corrections

STAFF

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

GUESTS

Gretchen Russo, CDHS, OCYF
Shelly Sack, 18th JD, Douglas County Probation
Adam Zarrin, Governor's Office
Skip Barber, CAFCA
Roger Lowe, OSPB

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions Approval of minutes</p>	<p>Richard Stroker welcomed the group and informed them that he would be filling in for task force chair Robert Werthwein who was unable to attend the meeting.</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 February 6, 2017 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Updates</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Gretchen Russo informed the group that the bill discussed at previous meeting and regarding the detention of 10-12 years old has been introduced to the Legislature and will have its first hearing tomorrow, March 7. A copy of the draft was forwarded to the members of this Task Force and can be found here.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Broad Framework Recommendations</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Richard proposed a timeline for the work of the Continuity of Care Task Force to develop recommendations and present to Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice for a vote by July 2017.</p> <p>The goals for today’s meeting are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To review the framework document that was prepared based on the work of the two working groups (below in Blue ink). Corrections discussed during the Task Force meeting are shown in Red. 2. To agree on the number of recommendations. 3. To form working groups to begin drafting language for the recommendations <p>1. Review of the Framework document</p> <p>Vision:</p> <p>Judicial Districts through their Juvenile Service Planning Committees are responsible for developing and implementing a plan involving all counties in their districts to address supervision and management of youth involved in Child Welfare and criminal justice agencies.</p> <p>The plans developed by Judicial Districts shall contain essential components outlined as follows: Early identification of dually-involved youth, timely information sharing across systems, unified coordinated plan of services across multiple agencies, clear structure/expectations defined so all parties are working towards a common goal, highlight the focus on youth and family</p>

treatment needs.

Outcomes:

Early identification of crossover youth

Least restrictive placement based on the needs of the child, issues presented and public safety considerations.

Reduce length of stay in detention

Coordinated plan which may incentivize engagement for youth and family.

Plan that maximizes resources

Information sharing between judicial districts

Elements to consider:

- Judicial districts & counties: Chief Judge to coordinate between counties as there may be multiple plans within a Judicial District.

- Identify similar goals for SB94 & counties and probation & counties

- Clarify and define what early identification of dually-involved youth means

- Develop a form or guide for the framework

- Judicial districts are encouraged to establish MOUs:

- o List of information that will be shared and all relevant case history (court information/detention hearing, substance abuse, placement/treatment, placement options, gang involvement, family member victims, bond info, high risk victim info, running history, probation etc.).
- o Define sensitive information and how it will be handled/shared. Ensure consideration of protective orders and clarify information that youth can or cannot share at staff meetings (varies by districts).

Framework:

Points of entry: law enforcement, Juvenile Assessment centers/Juvenile Service centers, SB94, detention facilities, courts, probation, child welfare, diversion.

Identification process: Identify that youth as a crossover who is currently involved in the juvenile justice system and has current involvement or history with Child Welfare, Probation or DYC.

Notification: If known Screening team notifies by phone, email or fax and without delay: Law enforcement, district attorney, SB-94 services, human services/social services, guardian ad litem (if known), parents/guardians, probation (if known) and court.

	<p><i>Detention Hearing</i> Court acknowledges that the youth is a crossover and encourages a least restrictive/appropriate placement.</p> <p><i>Multi-Disciplinary Staffing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To occur within 7-14 days of screening identification which may occur at the following stages of the system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o law enforcement contact/Charge/JACs/JAS/SB94/Diversion o Detention (mandatory MDT: often time, youth are in detention awaiting for placement and not necessary for safety reasons) o Probation o Commitment (to establish clear timeline and permanency before release) o Parole - Identify lead (first in case?) and coordinate responsibilities between parties. Agree on shared ownership. - Establish timeline of responsibilities - Assessments completed by appropriate agencies and shared at the Multi-Disciplinary Team meeting. - Develop a unified case management plan/one case plan; coordinated plan to address needs of youth/family in least restrictive approach. Written/oral plan presented to court. - Hold regular MDT follow-up meetings - All referrals sent to the MDT to make recommendations (currently referrals are sent from agency to agency). <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>It was suggested to include more specific language about the use of Juvenile Service Planning Committees (JSCP) that would ensure that communities have complete discretion to decide whether S.B. 94 or H.B. 1451 or both are the most appropriate in their jurisdictions. The local communities should be reminded of the role of JSPPCs and their statutory responsibilities to address the critical needs of youth which will include the crossover youth population.</p> <p>A third recommendation may be discussed at future meetings to identify resources (funding, training, etc.) and incentivize the implementation of this framework.</p> <p><i>Would these recommendations involve a legislative change?</i> The group agreed that a crossover youth plan could be referenced in the Local Juvenile Services Planning Committee statutes and the framework, coordination</p>
--	---

	<p>of resources added as an attachment to the plan.</p> <p>In “elements to consider,” it is important to add language regarding communication/information across judicial districts. A youth may have a case with Child Welfare in one judicial district and commit an offense in another. Coordination of information across districts is critical to ensure continuum of care.</p> <p>The group discussed at length the definition of crossover youth and whether it includes “reversed” crossover youth and agreed to define the language of “<i>current involvement</i>.” A youth could be identified as crossover when in the juvenile justice system and with current or history of involvement with Child Welfare, Probation or NYC.</p> <p>There should be flexibility for jurisdictions to decide what works for their community, what services can actually be implemented as well as ensuring information sharing, coordination of assessments/case plans.</p> <p>2. Recommendations</p> <p>Richard Stroker suggested that two initial recommendations seem to be coming forward from this Task Force and a third recommendation to be discussed later and relating to resources (funding, training etc.).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation #1: Structure, oversight, local plans/Control/Coordination A working group was formed and included Susan Colling, Rebecca Gleason, Kelly Friesen and Meg Williams. The goal of this working group is to identify statute(s) that would be impacted and start drafting language. 2. Recommendation #2: Critical elements of local models A working group was formed and included Bill Delisio, Sheri Danz, Mike Tessean, Angela Brant, Shawn Cohn, Shelly Sack and Skip Barber. This group is to outline the objectives, changes and identify if these changes would be legislative or policy. 3. Recommendation #3: Resources This recommendation will be discussed at future meetings and will involve the identification of resources in terms of funding and training. <p>When the Task Force adjourned, the participants broke into two working groups.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next steps/April Agenda</p>	<p>At the next meeting in April, 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>Richard Stroker 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 3:30 pm</p>
---	---

Next Meeting

April 10, 2017 1:30pm – 4:30pm Location: 710 Kipling St., Lakewood Colorado