

Colorado's Three-Year Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Plan (2009-2011)



March 2010 Update

Submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

By the Colorado Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council

&

Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance

Colorado Department of Public Safety

Division of Criminal Justice

700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000

Denver, CO 80215

1-800-201-1325

303-239-4442

PROGRAM NARRATIVE

(Only those sections which are new or updated from the 2009 application are submitted herein.)

Project Abstract (new)	3
Introduction (no changes)	
Description of System-Overview (no changes)	
Colorado's Comprehensive Strategy Framework (no changes)	
Structure, Function and System Flow- Prevention through Parole/Aftercare (no changes)	
Prevention and Early Intervention	
Immediate Interventions	
Intermediate Interventions	
Institutional Confinement/Aftercare	
Direct File in Adult Criminal Court/Youthful Offender System-DOC	
Colorado's Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements (no changes)	
Plan for Providing Gender-Specific Services (new)	4
Plan for Providing Prevention and Treatment Services in Rural Areas (new)	5
Plan for Providing Needed Mental Health Services (new)	7
Plan for Compliance with the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act (updated)	9
Plan for Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Contact Core Requirement (updated)	15
Coordination of Child Abuse & Neglect and Delinquency Records (no changes)	
Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information (updated)	34
Statement of the Problem/Program Narrative- Program Descriptions (no changes)	
SMART (no changes)	
Subgrant Award Assurances (no changes)	
State Advisory Group Membership (updated)	35
Staff of the JJDP Formula Grant Program (updated)	36
Appendix A- Colorado Juvenile Justice System Flowchart (no changes)	
Compliance Monitoring Timeline 2010-2012 (new)	38
Memo Regarding Plan for Compliance Monitoring Reporting on Calendar Year (new)	48

PROJECT ABSTRACT (NEW)

The Formula Grants Program is authorized under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 2002. The purpose of this program is to support State and local delinquency prevention and intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvements. Program areas may include: Planning and administration; State Advisory Group allocation; compliance monitoring; juvenile justice issues for American Indian tribes; prevention of substance abuse by juveniles; prevention of serious and violent crimes by juveniles; prevention of juvenile gang involvement and illegal youth gang activities; prevention of delinquent acts and identification of youth at risk of delinquency; and improvement of juvenile justice system operations, policies, and procedures including establishing a system of graduated sanctions, treatment programs, and aftercare.

For the 2009-2011 Juvenile Justice Plan, Colorado's JJDP Council prioritized prevention of delinquency by focusing on the needs of high risk youth in the areas of:

- Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)
- Mental Health Services
- Substance Abuse Services

The Council also affirmed its commitment to fund Compliance Monitoring, American Indian programming at both Ute Mountain Ute and Southern Ute Indian Tribes, and strengthened its support for Juvenile Justice System Improvement including training, research and evaluation efforts.

Beginning with the FY2009 subgrant solicitation, applicants for the DMC, Mental Health and Substance Abuse program areas were eligible for up to three years of funding. Prior to receipt of second and third year funding, multi-year applicants submit an abbreviated application for review and approval. This abbreviated continuation application includes: summary of project progress, progress on goals and objectives, lessons learned, updated goals and objectives, sustainability plan and updated budgets. The remaining Program Areas prioritized by the Council are funded on a year-to-year basis.

PLAN FOR PROVIDING GENDER-SPECIFIC SERVICES (NEW)

Gender-specific services has been a Colorado priority for over 10 years and several accomplishments have been realized including development of *Guidelines for Effective Female-Specific Programming* http://dcj.state.co.us/oajja/Boards_and_Councils/Guidelines%20at%20a%20Glance%202004.pdf, that are intended to encourage professionals to look critically at how services are provided to girls in both gender-specific and mixed gender programs. As noted in previous years' plans, the JJDP Council restructured Girls E.T.C., a coalition of service providers and others who are interested in gender-specific programming for girls in the juvenile justice system so it could take a more effective and active role in promoting practices which meets the needs of girls at all levels, including prevention, early intervention and treatment.

Through a grant provided by the JJDP Council, Girls E.T.C. was integrated into the work of the Colorado Coalition for Girls (CCFG) which created a Juvenile Justice (JJ) Working Group. The CCFG is an all volunteer coalition working in the areas of research, advocacy, programs and public awareness whose mission is to create, strengthen and expand opportunities for all girls in Colorado. The work of the CCFG JJ Working Group, Chaired by Denver University Professor, Dr. Lisa Pasko, led to both original research and cataloguing and annotation of existing research. This research was then presented at the annual Colorado Conference on Girls and presented to various groups across Colorado. The work completed by the CCFG and the JJ Subcommittee went a long way toward changing perceptions about girls in the juvenile justice system and educating service providers within the juvenile justice system and other social systems about the reasons girl offenses have increased and the different experiences of girls once they are in the juvenile justice system.

In 2009, the JJDP Council commissioned an evaluation of youth characteristics and program outcomes for Formula grantees from 2005-2009. They found that over all the program and purpose areas, almost equal numbers of males and females were served and further found that gender was not predictive of whether or not the youth completed the program successfully. There was data available for 457 youth in programs under the Gender Purpose Area (all were female). All demographic variables (gender, ethnicity, and child welfare involvement) were examined for relationship to program success and there was no significant relationship found. They did find that youth in these gender programs who were attending school at intake and exit were significantly more likely to complete programs successfully than youth who were not attending school.

Although the JJDP Council is no longer funding gender-specific programming as a program area, the Council continues to focus on the needs of girls in the programs it funds. All applications, regarding of purpose area must include describe how projects will meet the gender-specific needs of the target population. The final research report will be published shortly and the JJDP Council, Denver University and the CCFG will continue to provide presentations at various venues challenging the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention system agencies to incorporate the findings into their system improvement efforts so that they can better serve the female population in Colorado.

PLAN FOR PROVIDING PREVENTION AND TREATMENT SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS (NEW)

In preparation for development of the 2009-2011 Juvenile Justice Plan, and in order to collect meaningful information directly from Colorado communities, the Division of Criminal Justice contracted with OMNI Institute on behalf of the JJDP Council to implement a web-based survey to solicit input from individuals across Colorado regarding the needs, issues and most critical areas on which to focus resources. The survey was designed to collect honest feedback on the importance of the 34 different Formula Grant program areas from a broad range of community members, juvenile justice and other systems' professionals. After two weeks of data collection, 357 responses were submitted online.

Most of the respondents lived in or represented areas that were urban (65%), one quarter (25.5%) lived in rural areas and 5% lived in frontier regions. As illustrated by the figure below, most respondents favored Early Intervention followed by Prevention to reduce juvenile delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system. The table below presents the most frequently selected categories along with the highest weighted percentages within each category by all respondents.

Prioritization of Subcategories: Top 5 Weighted % Scores

Rank	Early Intervention		Prevention		Intervention		Aftercare	
	Area	%	Area	%	Area	%	Area	%
1 st	Mental Health	11.6	Delinquency Prevention	16.6	Mental Health	17.1	Aftercare/ Reentry	25.9
2 nd	Delinquency Prevention	11.0	Child abuse/ Neglect	12.9	Substance Abuse	12.4	Mental Health	16.1
3 rd	School Programs	10.3	School Programs	12.3	Alternatives to Detention	10.2	Job Training	10.8
4 th	Alternatives to Detention	9.8	Mental Health	11.5	Juv. Justice System Improvement	7.1	Mentoring	10.1
5 th	Child abuse/ Neglect	8.4	Substance Abuse	10.3	Mentoring	6.2	Substance Abuse	8.7

Results were then analyzed separately for respondents living in urban, rural, and frontier communities. Because the size of the groups were very different with only 19 respondents representing Frontier communities, the results and group differences must be interpreted with caution.

- Both urban and rural respondents selected Early Intervention as most important followed by Prevention, however respondents representing frontier regions selected Prevention as the most important followed by Early Intervention.
- The emphasis of Early Intervention and Prevention as the top two approaches strengthened as population size decreased with Prevention and Early Intervention comprising nearly 90% of all frontier respondents' choices.
- Rural and Frontier respondents were more likely to favor Mentoring, Diversion, Rural Area Programs, American Indian Programs, Court Services, and Graduated Sanctions as program areas compared to Urban respondents.

The survey results were presented to and critically analyzed by the JJDP Council at their two-day retreat and follow-up meeting held in September and December of 2008. The Council, while looking at the survey results, also discussed what resources were already funded and/or available across the state, data regarding needs and after great deliberation, prioritized prevention of delinquency by focusing on the needs of high risk youth in the areas of disproportionate minority contact, mental health services and substance abuse services.

As seen above, the Council utilized the survey to determine Formula Grant funding priorities and truly assessed the needs across the state, looking at the potentially disparate needs for rural/frontier portions of the state versus the urban areas. Recognizing the financial limitations of Formula Grant funds and

further recognizing that adequate resources are generally much harder to develop in rural and frontier communities, the State has been diligent in accessing other resources to identify and fill gaps for these communities. Two such collaborations are noted below.

In 2000, the Colorado Legislature passed the *Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Services Act for Children and Youth* (C.R.S. 25-20.5-105-109) which established a state Prevention Services Division within the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to implement an interagency approach to the delivery of state and federally funded programs. The state interagency body for this implementing the legislative mandate is the Colorado Prevention Leadership Council (PLC), a collaborative group consisting of representatives from six state agencies, two institutions of higher education, three statewide resource organizations, and a public/private early childhood partner. The JJ Specialist and the Title V Coordinator are both members of the PLC. The work of the PLC is largely driven through development of a State Plan the purpose of which is to establish and implement goals for improving the delivery of prevention, intervention and treatment services to children and youth throughout the state. The plan, which is reviewed every two years, is required to establish standards and measurable outcomes; develop methods to target and prioritize resources throughout the state; and identify methods to foster collaboration at the local level. The statute also requires that the five state agencies that fund prevention, intervention and treatment services for children and youth work collaboratively with other public and private prevention, intervention and treatment programs in the community and with local governments, local health agencies, county departments of social services, and faith-based organizations in the community.

Colorado was awarded a federal Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) in early October of 2004. The four overlapping goals of the Colorado Prevention Partners (CPP), the name of the SPF-SIG in Colorado, are:

1. Reduce substance abuse-related problems in communities
2. Prevent the onset and reduce the progression of substance abuse, including childhood and underage drinking of alcohol
3. Build prevention capacity and infrastructure at the state and community levels
4. Develop a sustainable SPF-SIG model that is implemented through partnerships between the state and communities

As required by the federal SAMHSA Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant, communities were selected based on a data-driven needs assessment process that compared county and state level indicators of substance abuse, its prevalence, and its consequences. The overall goal of the grant is to develop and sustain the local and state prevention infrastructure needed to decrease substance abuse and its consequences in target communities.

Again, both the JJ Specialist and Title V Coordinator are members of the CPP Management Team. There have been 16 communities funded through June 2010 and of these, twelve are rural or frontier communities, one is a Native American Tribe located in southwest Colorado, and three are urban communities.

PLAN FOR PROVIDING NEEDED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (NEW)

A growing crisis in Colorado and across the country has been the influx of youth with serious mental illnesses and emotional disorders entering the juvenile justice system. A growing need for families with youth in crisis is access to services to help them cope with the youth within the home environment or, if necessary, within a community-based non-secure treatment setting. Earlier identification of mental health, substance abuse and co-occurring disorders has the potential to address youth needs before delinquent behavior presents itself. Services to determine this early need and to provide adequate treatment of mental health and other presenting needs are not available in all parts of Colorado. Youth who are not Medicaid eligible or those who do not have the adequate health insurance are often unable to access quality mental health services.

In the last several years Colorado has witnessed significant changes and improvements in the delivery of services to children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbance. Further, a system of care approach based on the work of Stroul and Friedman, 1986 has been implemented. Despite this the percent of males committed to the Division of Youth Corrections assessed as having “High-Moderate to Severe” mental health needs increased from 20.8% in 2006-07 to 21.3% in FY 2007-08. The percent of females committed to DYC assessed as having “High-Moderate to Severe” mental health needs decreased from 29.5% in FY 2006-07 to 25.0% in FY 2007-08. Conversely the females assessed with “Low Moderate/None to Slight” mental health needs increased from 70.5% in FY 2006-07 to 75.0% in FY 2007-08.

Assessed Mental Health Needs of Committed Youth¹						
	Males			Females		
	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08
High Moderate to Severe	60.2%	20.8%	21.3%	52.7%	29.5%	25.0%
Low Moderate/ None to Slight	39.8%	79.2%	78.7%	47.3%	70.5%	75.0%

¹Colorado Client Assessment Record (CCAR) used to assess mental health needs within one month of commitment. Percentages based on total CCARs given and do not include missing data. (Source: DYC Management Reference Manual, FY 2007-08.)

Concerns about the lack of mental health services for children and youth were confirmed in a survey, conducted by the Division of Criminal Justice on behalf of the JJDP Council, to solicit input from individuals across Colorado regarding the needs, issues and most critical areas on which to focus resources. The survey was designed to collect honest feedback on the importance of the 34 different Formula Grant program areas from a broad range of community members, juvenile justice and other systems’ professionals. After two weeks of data collection, 357 responses were submitted. In this survey, respondents were asked which of the four approaches (of prevention, early intervention, intervention, and aftercare) to reduce juvenile delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system were preferred. Respondents favored early intervention and prevention efforts, and furthermore mental health was one of the highest rated program areas across all four approach areas and was the most frequently selected area for funding.

The survey results were presented to and critically analyzed by the JJDP Council at their two-day retreat and follow-up meeting held in September and December of 2008, respectively. The Council, while looking at the survey results, also discussed what resources were already funded and/or available across the state, data regarding needs and after great deliberation, prioritized prevention of delinquency by focusing on the needs of high risk youth in the area of mental health.

To coordinate Colorado efforts initiated to address the needs of youth who have mental health and/or co-occurring disorders and who are involved in the juvenile justice system, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Council merged its Mental Health Committee with the Juvenile Justice Subcommittee of the Legislative Task Force to address Mental Illness in the Justice System. This committee called the *Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Work Group* has worked on many issues over the last seven-years including Juvenile Competency Legislation, HB 05-1034 that was passed in 2005. Most recently they began to discuss the many issues involved in providing a coordinated system of

services to youth in the juvenile justice system with mental health issues and the multiple issues when addressing transition services for the same population. The work group developed the following outcome to guide their work:

- Create a mechanism to provide a coordinated continuum of services and supports for youth with mental health issues at-risk of involvement or in the juvenile justice system to address gaps that occur when transitioning in and out of the juvenile justice system.

In 2007, Colorado was selected to become a “Models for Change- Juvenile Justice/Mental Health Action Network” state through a grant from the MacArthur Foundation. Through this grant Colorado is working on a systematic incorporation of a research-based mental health screening protocol within all juvenile justice agencies in Denver. This includes pilot-testing the MAYSI-2 within the Denver Juvenile Probation Department to collect information and data that will be used to develop a juvenile justice-system wide mental health screening protocol. This protocol, which will be used to train intake staff from a variety of juvenile justice agencies in Denver, will include procedures for the application of the MAYSI-2 as well as for communication and information-sharing across agencies.

In 2009-10, the MacArthur project will focus on addressing Family Involvement through the Parent Empowerment Program (PEP) Model and the JJDP Council, through use of Formula Grant funds will support development of a Family Advocacy Toolbox to 1) provide best practice and real information to people who want to become a Family Advocate; 2) provide resources to teach (beyond a training) professionals to "hear" family advocates and learn to collaborate and partner with family advocates; and 3) develop a "How to for communities wanting to implement family advocacy".

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FIRST THREE CORE REQUIREMENTS OF THE JJDP ACT (UPDATED)

A. Plan for Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO).

Trend analysis and strategy for maintaining compliance.

The following chart shows the number of violations and the rate of violations by facility type and type of violation for an eight year period beginning in 2001 and ending in 2009 (the last report submitted to OJJDP).

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Juvenile Detention Centers									
Accused Status Offenders held over 24 hours	63	22	67	4	20	11	16	18	112
Adjudicated Status Offenders	28	6	13	18	66	48	62	82	66
Adult Jails and Lockups									
Accused and Adjudicated Status Offenders held for any period of time	17	26	22	20	40	34	49	46	40
TOTAL VIOLATIONS	108	54	102	42	126	93	127	146	218
D.S.O. RATE of Compliance	9.7	4.9	8.9	3.7	11.5	7.8	10.7	12.3	18.3

Juvenile Detention Centers: Accused Status Offenders

There are 11 juvenile detention centers in Colorado. From 2001 to 2008, the number of accused status offenders held over the 24 hour reporting exception had been decreasing dramatically. In 2008, each detention center had an average of 1.6 violations. However, in 2009 the average number of violations at increased to 10.18. These types of violations are primarily caused when juveniles are placed in detention pending a detention and placement hearing and due to scheduling conflicts the detention hearings are not held within 24 hours (excluding weekends and holidays) or if juveniles are not released within 24 hours (excluding weekends and holidays) immediately following initial court appearances.

In 2009 the data reporting process for compliance monitoring changed dramatically. In previous years, the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) relied on the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC), which administers juvenile detention, to provide a printout of "questionable" holds from their Trails database. In 2009, DYC wrote a program so that the DCJ compliance monitor could query the Trails system personally thus directly producing her own reports for each juvenile detention center. These reports provided information on all juveniles admitted to detention, not just those that were "questionable", resulting in a much more accurate report. Because DYC policies and practices on detention admissions did not change in 2009, it is believed that more accurate reporting is the primary reason for the inordinate increase in violations of accused status offenders held over 24 hours.

Given the number of violations with accused status offenders held over the 24 hour reporting exception in 2009, the DCJ OAJJA Manager (JJ Specialist) and Compliance Monitor met with the DYC Leadership Team in January 2010 to discuss possible solutions to decrease these violations. Over the next several months these violations will also be discussed with the State Senate Bill 94 Advisory Board (of which the JJ Specialist is a member) and local SB 94 Coordinators who are located in each of the 22 Judicial Districts across the state. Local SB 94 Coordinators provide a gate keeping function for detention and work with the local communities in broadening the detention continuum at the local level.

Please note that these violations are in conflict with Colorado Revised Statute under Part 3 of the Children's Code, Child Abuse and Neglect (where "status offenders" are addressed), 19-3-403, "(2) A child requiring physical restraint may be placed in a juvenile detention facility operated by or under

contract with the department of human services for a period of not more than twenty-four hours, including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.”

Juvenile Detention Centers: Adjudicated Status Offenders

Since 2001 the number of adjudicated status offenders held in juvenile detention centers without benefit of a valid court order has significantly increased with a high in 2008 of 82. Since 2006 DCJ has specifically addressed these violations but unfortunately with less than stellar results. In 2006, the JJ Specialist, the Compliance Monitor and a judge from the SAG met with the State Court Administrator's Office and requested they send a memo to all Judges in the State advising them about Colorado Rule 3.8 (it mirrors the OJJDP 1996 Valid Court Order requirement regulation) and the number of violations reported to OJJDP. In 2007 the number of violations again increased and again the JJ Specialist, the Compliance Monitor and the judge from the SAG met with the State Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) and requested they mandate use of the Valid Court Order forms contained in Rule 3.8 mandatory. Although the SCAO could not mandate use of the forms, they did issue another memo encouraging use of the forms but in 2008 the violations again increased. In 2009 the violations did not increase but they were not substantially reduced either.

In addition to the above, there are several barriers to compliance. First of all, in the past data reports could only be generated once a year therefore there was no avenue for quickly responding to violations. As of September 2009, DCJ is able to generate reports from each juvenile detention center on a monthly basis.

Second, Colorado is experiencing an increase in the use of the Valid Court Order. When Colorado first began using the Valid Court Order in 1998 it was envisioned that it would be the last recourse for judges dealing with youth who simply would not follow orders of the court. Over time, more and more schools began filing truancy cases in district court. In 2008 there were 232 Valid Court Orders in Colorado, in 2009 there were 360. Each year new and untrained Judges (those who have not been trained on the use and paperwork required for the federal and State Valid Court Order) sentence status offenders to detention – without benefit of the Valid Court Order process and paperwork. In 2009, DCJ held six judicial training sessions in the districts that use the Valid Court Order. Over 100 people were trained. The purpose of the training was two-fold: 1) to train judges on the proper use and paperwork for the VCO and 2) to develop procedures for training new judges coming to the bench in those judicial districts. The results of this training should be evident in the 2010 compliance monitoring report.

During the last SAG meeting (December 2009) this compliance issue was discussed again and the DCJ OAJJA Manager suggested development of a SAG Compliance Subcommittee to focus on VCO violations and accused status offender violations. In January 2010, the DCJ OAJJA Manager and compliance monitor met with the NYC Leadership Team to discuss the violations. Additional meetings will be held with the SB 94 State Advisory Board. Local SB 94 coordinators, located in each of the 22 Judicial Districts, are the gatekeepers for juvenile detention centers and are therefore the first line of defense to prevent and/or address violations. These meetings are in addition to the chart of violations developed by the Compliance Monitor which is mailed annually to all Chief District Court Judges, the Juvenile Judges and NYC administration and juvenile detention center directors. The SAG Compliance Subcommittee will be convened after gathering more information from SB 94 State Board and local coordinators.

Please note that it is a violation of State law, C.R.S. 22-22-108, Judicial Proceedings, “After the petition is filed, the court shall notify the board and shall hold a hearing on the matter. The court shall conduct judicial review of a hearing decision pursuant to rule 106(a) (4) of the Colorado rules of civil procedure and Rule 3.8 of the Colorado Rules of Juvenile Procedures. Rule 3.8 refers to the Colorado Valid Court Order process which is identical to the OJJDP VCO process, before 2002.

Adult Jails and Lockups: Accused and Adjudicated Status Offenders

The numbers of accused and adjudicated status offenders held in adult jails and lockups rose from 17 in 2001 to 49 in 2007 and then down to 40 in 2009. There are multiple reasons for these violations. Please note that the number of violations represents less than .5% of all the juveniles held securely during the 2009 reporting year. In 2009 there were 9,110 youth held securely, of those, 40 were status offenders.

The majority of status offenders held securely in adult jails or lockups are those arrested on warrants where the original charge was a status offense. DCJ trains law enforcement during on-site visits on how to avoid this type of violation. DCJ will continue to work with law enforcement in developing non-secure areas within their facility for this type of juvenile. DCJ inspects and trains all secure facilities at a desired rate of 33.3% a year and all non-secure facilities at a desired rate of 33.3% a year. All facilities receive a green notebook entitled *Colorado's Guide for Implementing the Core Protections of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002: Safe and Appropriate Holding of Juveniles in Secure Settings and Facilities*. This notebook contains information that mirrors the federal Act and regulations. In addition, Colorado State law is comparable to the Act and regulations.

Please note that holding these youth securely is a violation of State law, C.R.S. 19-2-508(8) (a) "A juvenile who allegedly commits a status offense or is convicted of a status offense shall not be held in a secure area of a jail or lockup."

B. Plan for Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders.

Trend analysis and strategy for maintaining compliance.

The following chart shows the number of Separation violations by facility type for an eight-year period beginning in 2001 and ending in 2009.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Juvenile Detention Centers and Juvenile Correctional Facilities									
Separation Violations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Adult Jails and Lockups									
Separation Violations	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL VIOLATIONS	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Colorado continues to successfully work with adult jails and lockups in minimizing the number of separation violations in their facilities (6 violations over the last 9 years). The DCJ compliance monitor conducts on-site visits at a desired rate of 33.3% at secure law enforcement and juvenile facilities and at a desired rate of 33.3% at non-secure law enforcement facilities. During each on-site visit the facility is reviewed for sight and sound separation. A facility layout is included in each Facility File. A sight and sound separation checklist is completed, or updated, during each inspection. The separation standards are contained in *Colorado's Guide for Implementing the Core Protections of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002: Safe and Appropriate Holding of Juveniles in Secure Settings and Facilities*. Each facility receives a copy of this notebook.

After many years of zero violations, Colorado reported 24 separation violations at juvenile detentions in 2009. As noted in the 2009 Compliance Monitoring Report, this number is not an accurate reflection of the true number of violations. It represents the number of young adults who were held in juvenile detention and juvenile correctional facilities, who were sentenced to these facilities prior to their 18th birthday until their 21st birthday, who after their 18th birthday violated a State a law and were "filed on and convicted" as adult offenders and placed back in the juvenile detention or juvenile correctional facilities to fulfill their original juvenile sentence. Put another way: 24 young adults were originally sentenced to the Department of Youth Services (DYC) as a juvenile (under the age of 18) until they reached age 21 (extended age of jurisdiction in Colorado). After they turned 18, either while in a secure or non-secure DYC facility or placement, they committed a criminal offense. They were all charged with this offense and as they were over the age of 18 they were charged as adults and the cases filed in adult court. Upon conviction, these young adults were then returned to a juvenile detention or correctional facility (since they were still under the care, custody and control of DYC) until a disposition could be reached. Some young adults went into adult jails; some young adults remained in DYC custody.

Colorado's violations are not in conflict with State statute. Colorado laws allow for extended age of jurisdiction and allow DYC clients over the age of 18 to be filed on as adults and placed back in juvenile detention or correctional facilities for completion of their juvenile sentence.

The Colorado SAG has been briefed on these violations. In addition, the DCJ Director, JJ Specialist, and Compliance Monitor met with the DYC Leadership Team and advised them of the violations. An option suggested by OJJDP, to create separate facilities for the "adult inmates", does not appear to be economically feasible for the state. Separating these young adults, especially prior to conviction on the adult charge, does not appear to be a feasible option either. DCJ will keep OJJDP apprised of our talks and progress with other key stakeholders.

Collocated Facilities

Colorado has one collocated facility, the Chief Ignacio Juvenile Detention Center located in Towaoc on the Ute Mountain Ute reservation. This facility is owned and operated by BIA which allows DCJ to inspect and certify the facility annually and collect data. Per their Policies and Procedures, there is a clear designation of duties such that juvenile personnel do not work on the adult side of the facility and vice versa. Consequently, Colorado does not have a policy requiring certification of staff that works with both juveniles and adults in collocated facilities.

C. Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups.

Trend analysis and strategy for maintaining compliance.

The following chart shows the number of violations and the rate of violations by facility type for an eight-year period beginning in 2001 and ending in 2009.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Accused and Adjudicated Status Offenders held for any period of time	17	26	22	20	40	34	49	46	40
Accused delinquents held over 6 hours	14	45	17	8	15	24	20	13	12
Accused delinquents hold unrelated to processing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delinquents held over 6 hours before or after a court appearance or held unrelated to court appearance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL VIOLATIONS	31	71	39	28	55	58	69	59	52
Jail Removal RATE of Compliance	2.8	6.4	3.9	2.5	5.0	4.4	5.8	5.0	4.4

Colorado has been in compliance with Jail Removal since 1993 and continues to be in compliance with a rate of 4.4 in 2009. The number of violations represents less than .5% of the total number of youth held securely. The majority of violations are status offenders arrested on warrants. It is difficult for law enforcement to grasp that some warrants are not detainable and for that reason, training is ongoing. Due to staff turnover, new officers and low manpower we anticipate that a percentage of all arrested youth will continue to be violations. All of Colorado facilities report data. Juvenile Holding Cell logs are located next to or near the holding cells in each facility. We are confident that our data is complete and for that reason alone more violations are expected.

The DCJ compliance monitor conducts on-site visits to all secure law enforcement and juvenile detention facilities at a desired rate of 33.3% every year. Non-secure law enforcement facilities are monitored at a desired rate of 33.3% a year. During each on-site visit the compliance monitor makes sure Juvenile Holding Logs are being maintained and that these records are accurate and reflect the data needed for the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report. The compliance monitor makes sure that each facility

has a copy of *Colorado's Guide for Implementing the Core Protections of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002: Safe and Appropriate Holding of Juveniles in Secure Settings and Facilities*. This notebook contains information on Colorado Statutes and federal regulations. Facilities that report violations every year may be visited more than once a year. Training is offered during each visit, the compliance monitor is available to attend shift meetings to provide training or technical assistance. Many facilities mail or fax their Juvenile Holding Logs monthly so the compliance monitor can address violations immediately after they have occurred. The SAG is kept abreast of Colorado's compliance status through a compliance monitor report at each meeting.

Please note that holding status offender youth securely is a violation of State law, C.R.S. 19-2-508(8) (a) "A juvenile who allegedly commits a status offense or is convicted of a status offense shall not be held in a secure area of a jail or lockup."

Please note that holding delinquents over 6 hours is a violation of State law, C.R.S. 19-2-508 (4) (d) (I): "A juvenile (delinquent) may be detained in a jail, lockup, or other place used for the confinement of adult offenders only for processing for no longer than six hours and during such time shall be placed in a setting that is physically segregated by sight and sound from the adult offenders."

Rural Removal Exception

Colorado does not use the Rural Exception.

D. Plan for Compliance Monitoring for the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act.

Provide a plan describing how the state's system for compliance monitoring meets each of the following 10 elements of an adequate compliance monitoring system:

(1) Policy and Procedures.

Colorado's Compliance Policy and Procedure Manual is available on-line at; <http://dcj.state.co.us/oajja/ComplianceMonitoring/2006ComplianceManual.pdf>.

(2) Monitoring Authority.

In 2006, Colorado obtained legislative authority to monitor and collect data. Colorado Revised Statute 24-33.5-503. "Duties of Division (Division of Criminal Justice) (1) the division has the following duties: (r) to inspect secure juvenile facilities and collect data on juveniles that are held in secure juvenile facilities, jails, and lockups throughout the state." See also the Policy and Procedure Manual page 18.

(3) Monitoring Timeline.

See Pages 39-44 for Colorado's 2010-2012 Monitoring Timeline. The process used to develop the yearly timeline is contained in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 16 - 17.

(4) Violation Procedures.

Colorado's violation policy, procedure and form are contained in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 10. Please note that state Statute permits civil fines for a Sheriff or Police Chief that willfully violates Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, Jail Removal or Sight and Sound Separation. See C.R.S. 19-2-508 (II), 19-2-508 (8) (b), 25-1-310 (1) (b) and 27-10-105 (1.1) (b).

(5) Barriers and Strategies.

Colorado's policy outlining the annual process to identify barriers and strategies to address those barriers are contained in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 8. In 2009 DCJ and the SAG identified three barriers to compliance.

(6) Definition of Terms.

Colorado uses federal definitions exclusively for all monitoring activities. Please see Colorado's policy on the use of federal definitions in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 21.

(7) Identification of the Monitoring Universe.

The identification of the monitoring universe is an annual process in Colorado. It is detailed in the Colorado Policy and Procedure Manual, page 30.

(8) Classification of Monitoring Universe.

The classification of the monitoring universe is an annual process in Colorado. It is detailed in the Colorado Policy and Procedure Manual, page 37.

(9) Inspection of Facilities.

Colorado's inspection policy and process is detailed in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 41.

(10) Data Collection and Verification.

DCJ has statutory authority to collect data on all youth held securely in jails, lockups and juvenile detention or correctional facilities. DCJ annually collects Juvenile Holding Cell logs at all jails and lockups classified as being secure. There are no jails or lockups that do not comply; therefore at this point in time DCJ does not have a statistically valid procedure to project data for non-reporting facilities. No facility in Colorado "self-reports" data; it is all reviewed personally by the compliance monitor for accuracy and to determine if there are violations. All secure facilities receive an on-site inspection at least once every three years. At that time the method of collecting information on the Juvenile Holding Cell log is discussed and cases with missing information are researched. In addition, prior to counting an entry as a violation it is verified personally by the compliance monitor.

Facilities that have been classified as being non-secure are inspected once every three years to ensure they are still non-secure. If a facility is non-secure, a Non-Secure Certification Form is completed and placed in the Facility File. All non-secure facilities report holding 0 juveniles each year; which is confirmed by the compliance monitor.

No other agency, other than the DSA, which is DCJ, collects and verifies data.

OJJDP has asked DCJ to move to a calendar reporting year. See page 48 of this application regarding our plan which will allow us to begin reporting on a calendar year in 2012.

A detailed description of the data collection process and policy can be found in the Policy and Procedure Manual, page 53.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT CORE REQUIREMENT (UPDATED)

Phase I: Identification

1. Update DMC Identification Spreadsheets

Colorado's DMC spreadsheets for the State, City and County of Denver, El Paso County, Mesa County and Arapahoe County will be sent via e-mail due to difficulties accessing the webpage.

2. DMC Data Discussion

(a) Not Applicable - the data is available.

(b) Discuss the RRIs obtained, compare the updated data and data obtained in earlier years, and illustrate how the data inform/guide the state's FY 2009-2010 DMC Compliance Plan.

Colorado continues to address Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) by focusing on the arrest decision point where the data indicates the highest relative rate index (RRI). The FY 08-09 data shows a slight decline in the arrest RRI for African-American youth down from 4.47 to 4.36. For Hispanic youth the opposite occurred, where the RRI rose slightly from 2.36 to 2.40. Because we have not yet determined the causes for the high arrest rates it is not possible to make any inferences about appropriate strategies to address this issue. For this very reason, Colorado's JJDP Council (SAG) approved funding for a more thorough DMC assessment study to focus on arrest which is intended to provide the information the State needs to drive decisions related to appropriate intervention strategies. The arrest decision point area has had high RRIs for several years and although frustrating to wait another year before addressing this issue further, the importance of appropriate strategies that match the problem is vital.

The DMC plan and activities implemented in Colorado last year include addressing issues related to data and the problems that occur due to 1) Hispanic being considered an ethnicity and not a race and the impact that issue has on our arrest data; 2) issues related to the presentation and use of the data, 3) investigating promising approaches for intervening with law enforcement; 3) working with the researcher on the arrest assessment project; and 4) the biggest and possibly the most impactful intervention is the change in the focus of formula grant fund focus from intervention strategies to prevention. When data was presented to the JJCP Council related to the high RRIs at the arrest decision point coupled with information from a survey on needs across the state conducted with community level respondents, the Council decided to prioritize funding prevention strategies with the Formula Grant Funds. This was a monumental decision because the Council's priority had been on intervention for at least a decade. One desired impact of this change to prevention is that minority youth will receive appropriate services to address their problem behaviors (contributing factors) that often lead to delinquency, thus preventing them from entering the juvenile justice system.

Looking at the data in the tables below, the decision point with an alarming RRI is at the "sentenced to secure confinement" stage. The data for FY 08-09 indicate that African-American youth were two and a half times more likely to be sentenced to secure confinement and Hispanic youth were nearly five times more likely than White youth to be sentenced to secure confinement. While the RRI for African-American and Hispanic youth at this decision point has been high for a few years they had been at the alarming rates evidenced this year. The next step will be to alert the JJDP Council and the Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE), a subcommittee of the Council, of the trends and the increase in the RRI for secure confinement for discussion and planning purposes.

AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUTH					
Decision Points	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09
Arrest	3.99	7.06	6.21	4.47	4.36
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.27	.76	.89	1.29	1.32
Misdemeanor Filing	.43	.07	.09	.13	.12 (not including 2nd JD data)
Misdemeanor Adjudication	.97	** .80	.35	**1.24	** .92 (not including 2nd JD data)
<i>Felony Filing</i>	.65	.32	**1.07	.53	** .53
Felony Adjudication	1.06	**1.11	**1.12	1.04	1.03
Probation Supervision	.84	.96	1.24	1.14	1.02
Probation Sentence to Detention	1.8	**2.39	1.43	1.82	1.54
Commitment DYC	2.3	2.12	1.97	3.31	2.51

**Numbers bolded are statistically significant. The numbers not bolded (and marked with **) were not statistically significant and cannot be used to analyze or make assumptions about the RRI at that decision point. FY 04-05, FY 05-06 and FY 06-07 arrest rates were calculated based on the number of youth fingerprinted. FY 07-08, FY 08-09 arrest rates were calculated based on a formula of the ethnic and racial representation of the number of youth screened applied to the numbers of youth arrested.

HISPANIC YOUTH					
Decision Points	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09
Arrest	*2.46	*2.42	*2.02	2.36	2.40
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.11	1.12	1.34	1.17	1.11
Misdemeanor Filing	.15	.09	.16	.16	.09 (not including 2nd JD data)
Misdemeanor Adjudication	1.4	1.17	1.27	1.34	**1.09 (not including 2nd JD data)
Felony Filing	.29	.21	.30	.25	** .20
Felony Adjudication	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Probation Supervision	1.05	1.06	1.20	1.21	1.17
Probation Sentence to Detention	1.35	1.77	1.29	1.19	1.35
Commitment DYC	3.53	1.31	1.07	3.52	4.87

* In FY 04-05, FY 05-06 and FY 06-07 the State rate for Hispanic arrest data was calculated by applying a formula based on the percentage of arrests that Hispanic youth represent in jurisdictions where we have Hispanic arrest data and where a large portion of the state's youth population and Hispanic youth population reside. FY 07-08, FY 08-09 arrest rates were calculated based on a formula of the ethnic and racial representation of the number of youth screened applied to the numbers of youth arrested.

(c) Use the RRI tracking sheet to interpret and analyze the values that should drive decision-making: 1. Identify statistically significant RRIs, 2. Identify those with greatest Magnitude, 3. Greatest Volume, 4. If applicable compare RRIs to National, 5. Examining the local context for each of the RRI values in steps 1-4 which JD may be more feasible for DMC reduction activities

In Colorado the minority groups with a statistically significant over representation problem in conjunction with a significant magnitude and volume are African-American and Hispanic youth. The charts below identify the judicial districts and decision points where statistical significance, magnitude and volume are of importance. (The data used for the charts and analysis were from the Colorado-specific matrices developed by Dr. Feyerherm to match Colorado's decision points more accurately than the on-line data system built to be most uniform for use by all the states.)

FY 08-09 RRI Data for African American Youth – State and Judicial Districts					
Identification of Statistical Significance (S), Magnitude (M) and Volume (V)					
Decision Points	State	2nd JD	4th JD	18th JD	21st JD
Arrest	4.36 S, M, V (5591)	2.03 S, M, V (1,016)	2.94 S (1,220)	8.26 S, M, V (2,667)	1.10 (14)
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.32 S, V (1484)	1.03 S, V (442)	1.52 S, M (315)	1.07 S, V (468)	3.28 M (9)
Misdemeanor Filing	.12 S missing 2nd	Missing Data	.39 S	**1.10	-
Misdemeanor Adjudication	**1.92 missing 2nd	Missing Data	**1.09	**1.43	-
Felony Filing	**1.53 V (1616)	**1.53 V (378)	**1.22	**1.49 V (477)	-
Felony Adjudication	1.03 S, V (895)	**1.94 V (219)	1.06 S	1.28 S	1.15
Probation Supervision	1.02 S, V (713)	.92 S	1.04 S	.91 S	1.37
Probation Sentence Detention	1.54 S, M (67)	.81 S	1.63 S, M (6)	1.69 S, M (28)	1.31
Commitment NYC	2.51 S, M (139)	- (58)	1.38 S (26)	1.77 S, M (35)	- (2)
Number in parenthesis = Number youth; ** Not Statistically Significant					

FY 08-09 RRI Data for Hispanic Youth – State and Judicial Districts					
Identification of Statistical Significance (S), Magnitude (M) and Volume (V)					
Decision Points	State	2nd JD	4th JD	18th JD	21st JD
Arrest	2.40 S, M, V (14,741)	2.03 S, M, V (1,700)	2.46 S, M, V (1,784)	3.04 S, M, V (1,803)	1.60 S, M, V (283)
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.11 S	1.03 S, V (550)	1.0 S, V (304)	1.06 S, V (313)	1.12 S (62)
Misdemeanor Filing	.09 S missing 2nd data	Missing Data	**1.41	**1.11	**1.63
Misdemeanor Adjudication	**1.09 missing 2nd data	Missing Data	**1.17	**2.07 M (23)	1.33 S (21)
Felony Filing	**1.20	**1.46 V (544)	**1.21	.16 S	**1.66
Felony Adjudication	-	-	-	-	-
Probation Supervision	1.17 S, V (1,019)	1.08 S	**1.81	.91 S (71)	1.11 S (45)
Probation Sentence Detention	1.35 S (84)	.45 S	- (3)	**1.13	**1.08
Commitment NYC	4.87 S, M, V (268)	- (54)	2.13 S, M (17)	**4.57 M (29)	- (5)
Number in parenthesis = Number youth; ** Not Statistically Significant					

Analysis

State of Colorado

Statistically Significant

As seen in the charts above, most of the areas are statistically significant. Based on the data the areas that do not indicate any over representation are misdemeanor and felony filings or adjudications.

Greatest Magnitude (most DMC)

The decision points with the highest magnitude are Arrest and Commitment for both African-American and Hispanic youth. The data shows that the magnitude is higher at the arrest stage for African-American youth and at the commitment stage for Hispanic youth. African-American youth are more than four times likely to be arrested than White youth and a little over three times more likely to be sentenced to secure confinement while Hispanic youth are almost two and a half times more likely to be arrested but almost five times more likely to be sentenced to secure confinement.

Colorado is currently addressing the arrest decision point for both African-American and Hispanic youth through an in-depth assessment but while we have noted the high commitment rate in the past we have not yet developed a plan to address it. Information on the magnitude of the commitment issue and the trend seen this year where the RRI increased significantly for Hispanic youth being committed, this information will be presented to the Council and the CMYE. With input from both groups, a plan will be developed to begin addressing this decision point.

Greatest Volume (most people):

The greatest volume for the state is definitely seen at the arrest decision point. There were 5,591 African-American and 14,741 Hispanic youth arrested in FY 08-09. Added together they represent over half on the 38,291 total youth arrested yet only account for 29% of the youth in the general state population.

In contrast when looking at the volume of another decision point with a high magnitude, secure commitment, there are only 407 African-American and Hispanic youth. This number seems low but when talking about the most severe punishment the significance of this number takes on a higher priority as 407 youth represents 54% of all the youth committed this fiscal year. Again African-American and Hispanic youth combined only represent 29% of the state's general population. This emphasizes the state's need to begin addressing the severe over representation of minority youth in this decision point.

Compare to National

The DMC Coordinator and JJ Specialist reviewed the latest national indices available which were from 2005 for comparisons to the state's RRIs. It was determined that the information was not appropriate for comparisons with the State of Colorado data for two reasons. First, the difference in data source years and second because national statistics does not include data on Hispanic youth arrest. Colorado has a significant Hispanic population and lack of national Hispanic data would impact the other RRI calculations.

City and County of Denver (2nd Judicial District)

The Denver municipal juvenile system operates differently than the rest of the municipal systems in the state therefore municipal data from this judicial district was not available.

Statistically Significant

For the African-American youth the only areas that had values not statistically significant were felony filing and adjudication. The only non-statistically significant area for Hispanic youth was felony filing.

Greatest Magnitude

There was only one area with a large magnitude the arrest decision point and this was true for both African-American and Hispanic youth.

Greatest Volume

The arrest decision point was the only one that showed statistical significance, magnitude and volume. When looking at this area closely, the number of youth represented was 1,016 (30.5%) African American youth and 1,700 (51%) Hispanic youth totaling 2,716 of the entire 3,331 youth arrested in the 2nd judicial district. African-American youth are 16.7% of the general youth population and Hispanic youth are 51%. Even though Hispanic youth represent 51% of the youth arrested and 51% of the youth in the general population the RRI is 2.03 because the Hispanic population is the majority not the minority in the 2nd Judicial District. The DMC Coordinator will discuss this issue with OJJDP to determine what to do in this situation.

As mentioned in the state discussion even though there is not a RRI calculated for the commitment decision point it is very important to review this area because it is the most restrictive placement in the juvenile justice system. Of the youth committed to secure confinement in the 2nd Judicial District, 92% are African-American or Hispanic while African-American and Hispanic youth represent 68% of the general population. Looking further, Hispanic youth are 44% of the number of youth committed and 51% of the general youth population and African-American youth are 16.7% of the general youth population but 47.5% of the youth committed to secure detention. This is an area that should be addressed.

Compare to National

Not applicable to compare County numbers to National numbers.

El Paso County (4th Judicial District)**Statistically Significant**

For African-American youth most of the decision points have statistically significant RRIs but this is not true for Hispanic youth. If you look at the chart once you get past the pre-adjudicated detention point there are so few Hispanic youth that the RRIs are no longer statistically significant until you get to the commitment stage.

Greatest Magnitude

The greatest levels of magnitude for African-American youth in the 4th Judicial District are arrest, pre-adjudicated detention and sentenced to detention. Due to the volume at sentence to detention (6 youth) efforts will not be made to address this area. Hispanic youth in the 4th Judicial District only have an RRI with magnitude at the arrest and secure commitment decision point and because of the volume at secure commitment (17 youth) this also will not be an area for this community's focus.

Greatest Volume

There are a few areas where the volume necessitates at least a conversation. For both African-American and Hispanic youth the volume at the arrest point represents a large number of youth (3,004 youth), representing 46.6% of the arrested youth population. African-American and Hispanic youth only represent 25% of the general population in this community. There are also 315 African-American youth being held pre-adjudication in detention and they are one and a half times more likely to be held pre-adjudicated than white youth. The RRI does not show disparity for Hispanic youth at this decision point but there are 304 Hispanic youth being held pre-adjudicated detention.

Compare to National

Not applicable to compare County numbers to National numbers.

Arapahoe County (18th Judicial District)

Statistically Significant

In the 18th Judicial District most of the decision points have statistically significant RRIs for African-American youth (except misdemeanor and felony filings and misdemeanor adjudications). Hispanic youth RRIs show statistical significance for the arrest, pre-adjudicated detention, felony filing and probation decision points.

Greatest Magnitude

The greatest magnitudes for areas that also show statistical significance are African-American arrest at 8.26 which is highly alarming and the largest RRI for any of the Judicial Districts being reviewed today. Hispanic youth also have a high RRI for arrest, 3.04 representing 1,803 youth. There are a few other high RRIs but the coinciding volume is very small.

Greatest Volume

Focusing the review of volume to those areas that had a statistically significant RRI with a significant volume limits the review to the arrest decision point. African-American youth represented 2,667 of the youth arrested and Hispanic youth represented 1,803 youth arrests. In total the number of African-American and Hispanic youth arrested in the 18th Judicial District accounted for 54% of the arrests where they represent 19% of the general population.

Compare to National

Not applicable to compare County numbers to National numbers.

Mesa County (21st Judicial District)

African-American Youth: There are 173 African American youth in the 21st Judicial District with only 14 arrested in FY 08-09. The volume of African-American youth is not sufficient for looking at either statistical significance or magnitude.

Statistically Significant

The only areas in the juvenile justice system where Hispanic youth are represented at a volume that can lead to a statistically significant number is at the arrest, pre-adjudicated detention and probation supervision points.

Greatest Magnitude

For those three areas the only one that indicates a significant magnitude is arrest which indicates that Hispanic youth are over one and a half times more likely to be arrested than white youth in the 21st Judicial District.

Greatest Volume

The volume of Hispanic youth arrested is 283 youth. After this decision point the number of youth in the juvenile justice system falls drastically. Although important for this community to look at these areas compared to other judicial districts and the state the volume of youth in the juvenile justice system in the 21st Judicial District is minimal.

Compare to National

Not applicable to compare County numbers to National numbers.

Context and Readiness to Address DMC: The four communities analyzed in this section are all addressing DMC to some degree. Below is a summary of these communities' history in addressing DMC and a description of what they are doing currently.

The 2nd Judicial District participated in the original identification study in 1993 and was identified at that time as having DMC at many of the decision points. The data shows that minority youth are still over represented at various decision points across the juvenile justice system. Denver has acknowledged this and has begun to address the issue through multiple strategies. The City of

Denver was very successful in accessing formula grant funds to address DMC this funding cycle. Two prevention programs were funded (described in the evaluation section) as well as a project to assess over representation issues in Denver's child welfare system. In addition the City has embarked on efforts to address the issue and has established a Diversity and Gender Commission to examine the problem. They are currently hiring a program coordinator who will be responsible for staffing their Crime Control and Prevention Commission, collecting and analyzing DMC data (in both the adult and juvenile system) and developing appropriate strategies. The state DMC Coordinator has been involved in many of Denver's activities and will be recommended for Commission membership soon.

The 4th Judicial District also participated in the original identification study in 1993 and the data showed that they had DMC at that time as they do now. They have been recipients of formula grant funds off and on through the years. Strategies tried in the past included, general prevention programs for minority youth suspended from school and cultural diversity training for all city staff. The evaluation subsequently performed on these strategies did not show any impact on the over representation of minority youth and were no longer funded. As a result the 4th judicial district took time to evaluate their data and the needs of the community and in 2003 applied and received formula grant funds to replicate the Minority Family Advocacy Program developed by Mesa County, Colorado.

To address the over representation of minority youth being arrested in the judicial district, they applied for and were awarded formula grant funds to begin preventing minority youth from becoming delinquent. To do this they are implementing a version of the Minority Family Advocacy Program in the schools that is focused on identifying and serving youth involved in multiple systems with very high needs. They are utilizing the High-Fidelity Wrap-Around Model to serve these youth and their families. This intervention strategy was funded for three-years and will be evaluated.

The 18th Judicial District was not a participant in the original identification study conducted in Colorado. They received funding for two-years in the early 2000's to help them establish a DMC Committee but have not received any OJJDP Formula grant funds to address DMC. The DMC Committee established is still in existence and has been successful in implementing a Family Advocacy Program without formula grant funding. They were able to prioritize state funding they get as a judicial district to support this program. In recent weeks they have reached out to the DMC Coordinator for assistance in revitalizing their struggling committee. The DMC Coordinator will begin working with the 18th Judicial District DMC Committee to assess what they have done, assist them in looking at their data and developing a DMC Plan for their community. In the analysis above it is clear that they need to focus on the disparate arrests of both African-American and Hispanic youth.

The 21st Judicial District was also a participant in the original identification study of 1993. As with the others, the identification study indicated that minority youth were over represented in the 21st Judicial District's juvenile justice system. Their highest numbers were at the pre-adjudicated detention and secure commitment points. They established a DMC Committee, named the Mesa County Minority Over Representation Committee (MCMOR), developed intervention strategies to address both of overrepresentation at the two decision points. The strategy they developed is the Minority Family Advocacy Program (MFAP) that has been replicated in six other Colorado communities and is listed on OJJDP's Model Program Guide. With the implementation of this program they were able to reduce both the number of minority youth being held pre-adjudication detention and securely committed. Although there was still over representation at these two decision points it is nowhere near what it was in 1993.

The MFAP is still being implemented in the 21st Judicial District but was not successful in accessing formula grant funds for the program for the first time in ten years. Since the Council prioritized prevention and the MFAP in this judicial district has always worked with youth already involved in the juvenile justice system they were unable to make the adjustment to prevention that quickly. They are operating the program utilizing community and state funds. Their DMC Committee also struggled last year but the state DMC Coordinator was able to provide some technical assistance and help them develop a strategic plan that was both realistic and measurable. This contributed to members of the MCMOR Committee reengaging and they continue to be a strong committee.

Phase II: Assessment/Diagnosis

1. Brief Summary of DMC Assessment

Not Applicable this year.

2. Plan for Completing Assessment

In 2009 proposals were solicited and an organization was selected to conduct an assessment of the arrest decision point in Colorado's juvenile justice system. The focus of the assessment is on arrest because of the consistently high RRIs at this decision point for both African-American and Hispanic youth. A local research organization, the OMNI Institute was selected by Colorado's JJDP Council (SAG) as the successful applicant. The DMC Coordinator has been working with OMNI on the project since they were selected. The project period is October 1, 2009 through December 30, 2010.

To ensure the project is moving forward and will meet the state needs, the DMC Coordinator meets with OMNI monthly and OMNI attends quarterly meetings of the Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE), Colorado's DMC Committee, to present progress, next steps and gather input as the project moves forward. The CMYE is very engaged in the project and OMNI has had to redesign parts of the project after receiving feedback from CMYE members. Although taking the time to get input from the CMYE is extremely valuable this may end up delaying the final completion of the project by a few months. The amount of input and engagement of the CMYE was not anticipated. Below is a summary of the project, research questions, data sources and time-line.

Project Summary:

- Conduct research to provide local jurisdictions and the state recommendations on how to address the disproportionate arrest rates among African American and Hispanic/Latino youth.
- The project's major goals are to:
 - Identify best practices and promising strategies to prevent disproportionate arrests of African American and Hispanic/Latino youth.
 - Support Colorado in meeting federal DMC requirement by:
 - Identifying some potential important local contributing factors to DMC.
 - Examining state and judicial district level data on DMC.
 - Develop recommendations for local and state policy makers on arrest data collection, to enhance DMC monitoring and assessment to be presented to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council, the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice and other relevant groups.
- Two-thirds of the project will be focused on or relevant to local communities' efforts to address DMC.

Major Research Questions:

- What are the best practices and promising strategies to reduce DMC at arrest for African American and Hispanic/Latino youth?
- What geographic hotspots for DMC among African American and Hispanic/Latino youth* can be identified? What are the hotspots driving the state rate?
- What opportunities are there to examine local law enforcement data from indicated hotspots, in order to explore some of the factors that may be driving DMC at the point of arrest? Can important variations in DMC by geography, offense type and arrest location be identified?
- What data is available to examine the role of schools in contributing to disproportionate minority contact? What do the data indicate about the demographics of youth contacted, charges filed, disciplinary actions, and other relevant information?
- How have other states obtained accurate law enforcement data on Hispanics/Latinos? What are the limitations of these data and the implications for analyses?
- What does an analysis of historical juvenile justice system data indicate about the magnitude and prevalence of DMC at both the state and judicial district levels? **Subject to the validity and quality of the Hispanic RRI data.*
- Examine **historical trends** in statewide and judicial district-specific Relative Rate Index (RRI)

data (federally required reporting matrix for DMC).

- Identify **geographic hotspots driving the state DMC arrest rate**.
- With the help of local experts in two judicial districts, **examine selected community-level factors, local law enforcement information, and data** to identify opportunities to enhance understanding of factors contributing to DMC among African American and Hispanic/Latino Youth.
- Identify available data to **examine the role of schools in contributing to disproportionate minority contact**. What does this data indicate about demographics of youth contacted, charges filed, and other relevant information?
- Identify **best practices for reducing** DMC at the time of arrest.
- Examine and document **strengths and limits of the methodology** CO utilizes in populating the RRI data.

Data Sources:

- ✓ Colorado and Judicial District-specific Relative Rate Indexes (RRIs).
- ✓ Local law enforcement information and contextual data in two judicial districts.
- ✓ Local data on police contacts at schools.
- ✓ Literature on Hispanic data collection strategies and DMC reduction at the point of arrest for African American and Hispanic youth.
- ✓ Interviews with DMC experts from other states.
- ✓ Interviews with Colorado criminal justice data experts.

Time-line:

April CMYE Meeting

Discuss RRI recommendations and geographic hotspots.
Report on insights from other states' procedures.
Together, select two locales for further study.

July CMYE Meeting

Progress reports on:

Local analysis efforts & extent of available data.
Initial best practices findings.

October CMYE Meeting

Summaries of local analyses.

Develop recommendations for:

- Colorado's data collection.
- Best practices and strategies to combat DMC at the time of arrest.

December

Final Report

Phase III: Intervention

1. Progress Made in FY 2009

(a) Activities Implemented/Specific Progress Made

GOAL 1: Research and Data: Improve the data collection and analysis system in Colorado to measure disproportionate minority contact and the impact of interventions on DMC.

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve use of the OJJDP required data collection including the RRI Matrix.

ACTIVITIES

- Examine existing RRI data by Judicial Districts and identify which judicial districts are affecting the high Relative Rate Index (RRI) for African-American and Hispanic Youth arrests.

- Look at the barriers related to the collection/availability of data for the RRI spreadsheets.
- Develop a user friendly document for each Judicial District to represent their RRI data.
- Distribute the data through the local Senate Bill 94 coordinators.

FY 2009: The state (the Division of Criminal Justice, the JJDP Council and the CMYE) will focus efforts based on data-driven planning and the analysis of the arrest decision point. The DMC Coordinator will develop an announcement of funds to solicit an agency or organization to analyze the arrest decision point. This analysis at a minimum should identify which judicial districts are contributing to the high index rate for arrest, what types of crimes are involved and if there are certain locales such as schools where the arrests are occurring. The Coordinator will be involved in developing the solicitation and overseeing the agency performing the analysis. The DMC Coordinator and the JJ Specialist will focus efforts on better data for the matrix specifically related to arrest data. Because the data reported for arrest is not broken out by ethnicity the issue of not having arrest data for Hispanic youth continues to be a problem.

(a) Activities implemented: All of the FY09 activities were started. The announcement was completed and a research organization was selected to conduct the assessment of the arrest decision point. The DMC Coordinator meets with the research team monthly to ensure that the project is on target and focused on meeting the state's needs. The DMC Coordinator and JJ Specialist continue to work with an internal Division of Criminal Justice Unit, the Office of Research and Statistics, the State's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), to gather and report the RRI data annually. Since last year this is being done for all 22 judicial districts in Colorado.

(b) Activities not-implemented: N/A

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide data driven recommendations to the JJDP Council related to DMC reduction.

ACTIVITIES

- Use all available research, data and other information to develop and present recommendations to the JJDP Council. Include recommendations related to resources (money, training and technical assistance, etc).

FY 2009: The Council looks to the DMC Coordinator as the expert in this area. The Coordinator will continue to use the RRI data and any other data developed through the analyses to provide the best data driven information to the Council.

(a) Activities implemented: The FY 09 activities were completed. The DMC Coordinator presented data to the JJDP Council at their planning retreat. This was a factor when the Council made a decision to focus formula grant funds on prevention. Since the DMC data shows that the greatest level of disproportion exists at the arrest decision point focusing on preventing youth from being arrested was a sound strategy.

(b) Activities not-implemented: N/A

OBJECTIVE 3: Improve the DMC-related data by expanding it beyond what is currently collected and analyzed within the juvenile justice system.

ACTIVITIES

- Identify additional information/data available in Colorado that may be used to analyze DMC- both factors which contribute to DMC and factors which mitigate DMC.
- Use information currently collected through COKIT to inform CMYE on the impact of currently funded programs on DMC.

FY 2009: The DMC Coordinator will work with other initiatives specifically with OMNI Institute to gather and present additional data related to DMC to the JJDP Council. This will include at the minimum, geographic information for minority youth and risk and protective factor information such as poverty, school achievement, and access to opportunities. OMNI Institute is collecting this data from many state agencies and compiling it in an on-line searchable data-base ASPIRE. The Coordinator will work with OMNI so that this data can be sorted and presented to the JJDP Council in a useful way. Information from the evaluation of formula grant funded DMC programs will also be presented to the JJDP Council.

(a) Activities implemented: The findings from the evaluation of the DMC programs funded by formula grant funds were presented to the JJDP Council. The Council used these findings when setting their priorities for this three-year funding cycle.

(b) Activities not-implemented: Gathering and presenting additional data related to DMC to the JJDP Council did not occur this year. It is currently being gathered and packaged for presentation by the OMNI Institute to assist in selecting the two communities for case studies on arrest. This will be completed in April 2010 and will be presented to the Council at their June 30, 2010 meeting.

GOAL 2: Policy: Improve the juvenile justice system response to minority youth and their families

OBJECTIVE 1: Establish relationships with other statewide initiatives/systems to educate them about DMC and assist them in developing a process for tracking DMC-related data, if appropriate, encouraging them to use CMYE as a resource.

ACTIVITIES

- Establish connections and coordination efforts with other initiatives and agencies such as the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Restorative Justice Council, CO LINKS, Prevention Leadership Council, Collaborative Care Management (HB1451), Access to Recovery, SB 94, etc.

FY 2009: CMYE members and the DMC Coordinator will continue work on forming relationships with existing entities, organizations and multi-systemic initiatives which should be natural partners in addressing DMC. The goal will be to fuse efforts with others working to establish new or improved services for youth and families to assist them in meeting the needs of minority youth and their families.

(a) Activities implemented: Progress in this activity has been occurring throughout the year. The DMC Coordinator is now a member of the Minority Health Disparities Council and is serving as an expert on cultural responsiveness to the Division of Behavioral Health on a new \$11.5 million grant they received to address underage binge drinking of Latino high school students. In addition, the DMC Coordinator and JJ Specialist participated in a one-day symposium to address disparities in the child welfare system, a new initiative for the Colorado Department of Human Services. The DMC Coordinator and the coordinator of the child welfare initiative are setting up a meeting to review the work of each and develop a strategic working relationship. The DMC Coordinator has also been working with the City and County of Denver which has a Diversity and Gender Committee focused on disparities in the justice system. The DMC Coordinator also sits on the Prevention Leadership Council and CO LINKS (a statewide mental health initiative) and has been a member of the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice's DMC Committee for the last eight months.

(b) Activities not-implemented: N/A

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide DMC-related policy and practice information to the JJDP Council.

ACTIVITIES

- DMC Coordinator will keep abreast of DMC policies and practices in other states to keep both the CMYE and the JJDP Council informed.
- CMYE will make policy/practice recommendations to the JJDP Council when appropriate.

FY 2009: The DMC Coordinator will continue to participate on the DMC Coordinator calls, and take other opportunities to learn what is going on in other states related to DMC policies and practices. The Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE) along with the DMC Coordinator will continuously make recommendations about DMC issues to the JJDP Council. This will be done at the JJDP Council's quarterly meetings.

(a) Activities implemented: The DMC Coordinator participated in all the DMC Coordinator calls and passed along information from these calls to both the CMYE and JJDP Council. The CMYE provided recommendations to the JJDP Council through the DMC Coordinator.

(b) Activities not-implemented: N/A

GOAL 3: Training and Technical Assistance: Provide technical assistance to programs/communities addressing minority over representation and provide education to targeted audiences, i.e. Judges, District Attorney's, Public Defenders, other systems such as mental health and substance abuse treatment and prevention.

OBJECTIVE 1: Provide programs/communities the tools necessary to address DMC appropriately.

ACTIVITIES

- Present on Colorado's DMC efforts at juvenile justice conferences each year.
- Provide on-site technical assistance to two or more state or local programs/communities each year

FY 2009: In 2008 the DMC Coordinator gained better knowledge on where to focus training and technical assistance efforts. The Coordinator will provide training at conferences as well as provide on-site technical assistance. The Coordinator will focus on communities that previously had formula grant funds but may not have been funded in 2009 due to budget cuts. The goal of the technical assistance will be to assist them in continuing their efforts without formula grant funds.

(a) Activities implemented: The DMC Coordinator was able to provide on-site technical assistance to one community, Mesa County. Training was provided to the CMYE Members (both old and new) at the beginning of 2009 to acclimate everyone to the JJDP Act, the data and what it means, what Colorado's efforts have been and the role of CMYE in Colorado's DMC efforts. Lastly, a training to provide an overview on DMC in the juvenile justice system was provided to the Colorado Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission's DMC Committee.

(b) Activities not-implemented: Because of the economy there were not many conferences in 2009 therefore training was not provided at juvenile justice conferences this year.

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide staff support to the CMYE membership to assist in DMC planning and work.

ACTIVITIES

- DMC Coordinator will provide staff support to the CMYE as permitted under the DMC Staff support Formula subgrant.

FY 2009: The DMC Coordinator will continue to staff the CMYE (DMC Committee) and their efforts. Tasks will include meeting support such as scheduling, meeting set up, minutes, etc. The DMC Coordinator will also continue to solicit new members as deficits in membership are identified. In 2008, 12 new members were recruited and the Coordinator will make all efforts necessary to engage and retain them. The focus of the Coalition has shifted slightly from having a Coalition to support state efforts to a dual purpose of supporting communities in their local efforts as well as the Coalition supporting state efforts.

(a) Activities implemented: The DMC Coordinator provided full-staffing to the CMYE. New members were recruited including a replacement for the lost Law Enforcement representation, as well as members from two different community-based mental health agencies, Servicios De La Raza (a community-based agency serving the Hispanic population), rural representation, the state funded prevention and intervention program manager, a professor from Metro State College, and two probation officers. Most of the communities addressing DMC are participating in CMYE regularly. CMYE has become a place to exchange ideas, learn from one another and share resources instead of just being a state-driven process. Because CMYE is becoming more useful to the members participation has increased and there have been several outcomes:

- At the January 2009 meeting during the community report, three communities identified barriers they were experiencing in serving youth; other members of the Coalition were able to address all three of those barriers successfully.
- At the April 2009 meeting there was great attendance and participation. The committee identified outcomes for the DMC Action Plan (these were missing from the plan). Also at this meeting a representative of the Denver Police Department attended and committed to become a member.
- Information on a state mental health initiative meeting was sent to CMYE members and 2 members attended - one mentioned how much he learned by participating.
- At the July meeting, again great attendance with all of the new members in attendance. There was a presentation on a state funding source for juvenile prevention and intervention services that has not been typically been accessed by the minority community. Additionally, the coordinator of that program asked if she could join CMYE.
- At the October meeting there was consistent attendance. The details of the Arrest Assessment Project was presented and CMYE members provided feedback which resulted in some changes to project.

(b) Activities not-implemented: N/A

GOAL 4: Programs and Practices: Fund and support programs and intervention strategies that have been proven effective in addressing disproportionate minority contact.

OBJECTIVE 1: Assist the JJDP Council when making funding decisions for minority over representation programs to ensure they are funding effective programs to address DMC.

ACTIVITIES

- Provide information to the JJDP Council to use when reviewing applicants for Minority Over Representation programs.
- Provide technical assistance to programs so they understand the difference between a program that serves minorities and a program that is addressing DMC.
- Research programs that are proven effective in addressing DMC (Model Program Guide) to determine if they can be implemented in Colorado.

- Ensure information from data driven processes and policies and practices is presented to Council to use when making funding priorities and decisions.

FY 2009: Provide information to the JJDP Council when reviewing applications for Minority Over Representation. This will be the first year of a three-year funding cycle so decisions made this year will carry over the following two years. The Coordinator will research programs that are proven effective in addressing DMC (Model Program Guide) to determine if they can be implemented in Colorado.

(a) Activities implemented: Information was provided to the JJDP Council on effective programs to address minority over representation since the focus of the formula grant funds moved from intervention to prevention strategies. The programs that were funded for this three-year cycle to address DMC were: a program in Denver to address the education risk factor by providing alternatives to school suspensions; another program in Denver utilizing the Family Advocacy Model to serve youth with mental health issues, a high risk-factor for involvement in the juvenile justice system; a program in Lake County targeting Hispanic students in the transition years of 7th through 9th grade exhibiting risky behaviors by providing an evidence-based afterschool program focused on increasing protective factors and decreasing risk factors; and lastly a program in El Paso County utilizing the High-Fidelity Wrap-Around Model to serve the highest need youth involved in multiple systems with many delinquency risk-factors. All of these programs will be evaluated. It will take at least the three-year cycle of funding to determine the outcomes of these programs. The JJDP Council funded 8 direct-services programs of those 4 were DMC programs.

In addition to the direct service programs the JJDP Council funded a research project evaluating the existence of minority over representation in dependency/neglect proceedings in the City and County of Denver. The study's goal is to make recommendations for policy, practice and procedural changes that will make these processes more equitable for minority youth and their families.

(b) Activities not-implemented: The DMC Coordinator did not have time to review all of the new programs added to the Model Program Guide. This will be done in 2010. This information along with information from the evaluation of the newly funded programs will be used when the JJDP Council sets their priority areas in 2012.

2. DMC Reduction Plan for FY 2009- 2011 (Activities and Timelines)

GOAL 1: Research and Data: Improve the data collection and analysis system in Colorado to measure disproportionate minority contact and the impact of interventions on DMC.

OBJECTIVE 1: Improve use of the OJJDP required data collection including the RRI Matrix.

ACTIVITIES

- Examine existing RRI data by Judicial Districts and identify which judicial districts are affecting the high Relative Rate Index (RRI) for African-American and Hispanic Youth arrests.
- Look at the barriers related to the collection/availability of data for the RRI spreadsheets.
- Develop a user friendly document for each Judicial District to represent their RRI data.
- Distribute the data through the local Senate Bill 94 coordinators.

FY 2009: The state (the Division of Criminal Justice, the JJDP Council and the CMYE) will focus efforts based on data-driven planning and the analysis of the arrest decision point. The DMC Coordinator will develop an announcement of funds to solicit an agency or organization to analyze the arrest decision point. This analysis at a minimum should identify which judicial districts are contributing to the high index rate for arrest, what types of crimes are involved and if there are certain locales such as schools where the arrests

are occurring. The Coordinator will be involved in developing the solicitation and overseeing the agency performing the analysis. The DMC Coordinator and the JJ Specialist will focus efforts on better data for the matrix specifically related to arrest data. Because the data reported for arrest is not broken out by ethnicity the issue of not having arrest data for Hispanic youth continues to be a problem.

FY 2010: The DMC Coordinator will continue to work closely with the researchers conducting the Arrest Assessment Study. Time will also be spent working with the two communities selected for the in-depth case study.

FY 2011: Once the analysis is complete, the information will be used to determine effective intervention strategies based on the identified contributing factors and geographic indicators. It is anticipated that the analysis will provide more reliable arrest data by race and ethnicity allowing us to provide this information to local jurisdictions through their Senate Bill 94 efforts (Detention Continuum) and law enforcement. This year the DMC Coordinator will also focus on developing a user friendly method of presenting the RRI data to each judicial district.

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide data driven recommendations to the JJDP Council related to DMC reduction.

ACTIVITIES

- Use all available research, data and other information to develop and present recommendations to the JJDP Council. Include recommendations related to resources (money, training and technical assistance, etc).

FY 2009: The Council looks to the DMC Coordinator as the expert in this area. The Coordinator will continue to use the RRI data and any other data developed through the analyses to provide the best data driven information to the Council.

FY 2010: The Coordinator will continue to provide information related to the RRI data and other data as relevant to the JJDP Council.

FY 2011: The Coordinator will develop a presentation for the next Council strategic planning session so that the data and information derived from the DMC activities of years 2009-11 will be used to assist the Council in determining its priorities for 2012-2014.

OBJECTIVE 3: Improve the DMC-related data by expanding it beyond what is currently collected and analyzed within the juvenile justice system.

ACTIVITIES

- Identify additional information/data available in Colorado that may be used to analyze DMC- both factors which contribute to DMC and factors which mitigate DMC.
- Use information currently collected through COKIT to inform CMYE on the impact of currently funded programs on DMC.

FY 2009: Information from the evaluation of formula grant funded DMC programs will be presented to the JJDP Council.

FY 2010: The DMC Coordinator will work with other initiatives specifically with OMNI Institute to gather and present additional data related to DMC to the JJDP Council. This will include at the minimum, geographic information for minority youth and risk and protective factor information such as poverty, school achievement, and access to opportunities. OMNI Institute is collecting this data from many state agencies and compiling it in an on-line searchable data-base, ASPIRE. The Coordinator will work with OMNI so that this data can be sorted and presented to the JJDP Council in a useful way. Information from the evaluation of formula grant funded DMC programs will be presented to the JJDP Council.

FY 2011: On-going from the previous two-years and any additional information will be provided as available. This information will also be used in the development of the next three-year plan.

GOAL 2: Policy: Improve the juvenile justice system response to minority youth and their families

OBJECTIVE 1: Establish relationships with other statewide initiatives/systems to educate them about DMC and assist them in developing a process for tracking DMC-related data, if appropriate, encouraging them to use CMYE as a resource.

ACTIVITIES

- Establish connections and coordination efforts with other initiatives and agencies such as the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Restorative Justice Council, CO LINKS, Prevention Leadership Council, Collaborative Care Management (HB1451), Access to Recovery, SB 94, etc.

FY 2009: CMYE members and the DMC Coordinator will continue work on forming relationships with existing entities, organizations and multi-systemic initiatives which should be natural partners in addressing DMC. The goal will be to fuse efforts with others working to establish new or improved services for youth and families to assist them in meeting the needs of minority youth and their families.

FY 2010: The goal will be to continue to connect with others at the state and local level and to continue relationships built in 2009.

FY 2011: This work will be continuous.

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide DMC-related policy and practice information to the JJDP Council.

ACTIVITIES

- DMC Coordinator will keep abreast of DMC policies and practices in other states to keep both the CMYE and the JJDP Council informed.
- CMYE will make policy/practice recommendations to the JJDP Council when appropriate.

FY 2009: The DMC Coordinator will continue to participate on the DMC Coordinator calls, and take other opportunities to learn what is going on in other states related to DMC policies and practices. The Coalition for Minority Youth Equality along with the DMC Coordinator will continuously make recommendations about DMC issues to the JJDP Council. This will be done at the JJDP Council's quarterly meetings.

FY 2010: The DMC Coordinator will continue the work from 2009 but will also work on identifying what is occurring in Colorado to address DMC that the state may not currently be aware of and inform the CMYE and the JJDP Council.

FY 2011: This work will be continuous.

GOAL 3: Training and Technical Assistance: Provide technical assistance to programs/communities addressing minority over representation and provide education to targeted audiences, i.e. Judges, District Attorney's, Public Defenders, other systems such as mental health and substance abuse treatment and prevention.

OBJECTIVE 1: Provide programs/communities the tools necessary to address DMC appropriately.

ACTIVITIES

- Present on Colorado's DMC efforts at juvenile justice conferences each year.
- Provide on-site technical assistance to two or more state or local programs/communities each year

FY 2009: In 2008 the DMC Coordinator gained better knowledge on where to focus training and technical assistance efforts. The Coordinator will provide training at conferences as well as provide on-site technical assistance. The Coordinator will focus on communities that previously had formula grant funds but may not have been funded in 2009 due to budget cuts. The goal of the technical assistance will be to assist them in continuing their efforts without formula grant funds.

FY 2010: The Coordinator will provide technical assistance to communities with a local DMC coalition to assist them in data driven planning appropriate to their community. Technical assistance is also available to communities/programs wanting to establish a DMC response. If there are appropriate conferences held this year the DMC Coordinator will train at them as time permits.

FY 2011: Training at conferences and technical assistance to communities will continue this year.

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide staff support to the CMYE membership to assist in DMC planning and work.

ACTIVITIES

- DMC Coordinator will provide staff support to the CMYE as permitted under the DMC Staff support Formula subgrant.

FY 2009: The DMC Coordinator will continue to staff the DMC Committee and their efforts. Tasks will include meeting support such as scheduling, meeting set up, minutes, etc. The DMC Coordinator will also continue to solicit new members as deficits in membership are identified. In 2008, 12 new members were recruited and the Coordinator will make all efforts necessary to engage and retain them. The focus of the Coalition has shifted slightly from having a Coalition to support state efforts to a dual purpose of supporting communities in their local efforts as well as the Coalition supporting state efforts.

FY 2010: The Coordinator will continue to focus the CMYE meetings on meeting the needs of local community efforts to address DMC and the state's need to meet the core requirements of the JJDP Act. The members will also continue to serve as advisory on the arrest assessment project.

FY 2011: The Coordinator will continue to build the capacity of CMYE members so that they can use the knowledge they gain at CMYE meetings to better their local DMC efforts or their agencies' work.

GOAL 4: Programs and Practices: Fund and support programs and intervention strategies that have been proven effective in addressing disproportionate minority contact.

OBJECTIVE 1: Assist the JJDP Council when making funding decisions for minority over representation programs to ensure they are funding effective programs to address DMC.

ACTIVITIES

- Provide information to the JJDP Council to use when reviewing applicants for Minority Over Representation programs.
- Provide technical assistance to programs so they understand the difference between a program that serves minorities and a program that is addressing DMC.
- Research programs that are proven effective in addressing DMC (Model Program Guide) to determine if they can be implemented in Colorado.

- Ensure information from data driven processes and policies and practices is presented to Council to use when making funding priorities and decisions.

FY 2009: Provide information to the JJDP Council when reviewing applications for Minority Over Representation. This will be the first year of a three-year funding cycle so decisions made this year will carry over the following two years.

FY 2010: The Coordinator will provide technical assistance to the funded DMC programs to assure they understand the difference between a program that serves minorities and a program that is truly addressing DMC. This will be done through joint monitoring with the Formula Grant Manager. The Coordinator will research programs that are proven effective in addressing DMC (Model Program Guide) to determine if they can be implemented in Colorado.

FY 2011: The Coordinator and the JJ Specialist will ensure information from best practice research, data driven processes and policies and practices is presented to Council to use when making funding priorities and decisions.

c. Budget for Implementation of FY 2010 Plan:

- Support for DMC-specific program interventions through Formula subgrants- \$250,000 for Year 2 funding
- Support for DMC Coordinator at 50%, for CMYE support and implementation of the action plan- \$70,000
- Support Arrest Assessment Study - Youth and Stakeholder Focus Groups up to \$10,000

Phase IV: Evaluation

Performance measure information and any evaluation undertaken

The DMC Coordinator works closely with the Formula Grant Manager to ensure that the State is collecting all of the necessary performance measures along with other information that will show program success in addressing DMC. In 2007, 2008, and 2009 this information was used in a formal evaluation of Formula Grant funded programs including those to address DMC conducted by OMNI Institute.

The JJDP Council worked with OMNI Institute to evaluate all of the formula grantees from 2007, 2008 and the most recent 2009. Each year the evaluation has been cumulative, adding the data from the most current year to that from previous years to provide a larger population size and allow more conclusions to be drawn from the data. The data used for this analysis came from the performance measure data and from some additional data required of all subgrantees. Data is collected on "Intake/Exit" forms, which track characteristics of youth, their crimes and criminal histories, completion of their program, and academic performance. Until recently, OMNI had provided grantee-level summaries and frequencies of each variable collected on the forms, but had not been able to provide any analysis of relationships between factors at the aggregate level.

Grantees are expected to deliver strength-based programs with clear and focused objectives and DMC/MOR grantees are expected to address and ultimately reduce, the disproportionate contact of minority youth with the juvenile justice system by: implementing plans to assist minority youth and their families in navigating the court process, providing access to resources needed to successfully meet probation or supervision requirements, and to reduce the length of incarceration stays.

The 2009 report has not been finalized. DMC programs funded during the reporting period 2007- 2009 were required to use the Family Advocacy Model at the intervention stage (kids in the system). Between those years a total of 416 youth participated in formula grant funded DMC programs. Preliminary results of the last evaluation indicated:

Of the 416 youth served from 2007- 2009, 90.8% were Hispanic, 7.8% African-American/Black and 1% Native American. 22.1% of the youth served were required to participate. The largest number of referrals came from District Court 16.9% and most youth were in the pre-adjudicated stage 58.9% (this was the decision point targeted by the funds due to previous trend data).

Outcomes: At program intake 62.5% of youth served were actively attending school but by program exit that number had risen to 81.1%. Also at intake 44.5% of youth were receiving passing grades compared to 78.3% at exit. Of the youth participating in the formula grant funded DMC programs, 68.1% completed all court-ordered sanctions. There were exit forms for 409 of the youth served and those exit forms indicated that 84% of the youth served completed their program.

Information from the 2007 and 2008 evaluations was used to further refine the criteria for selecting programs to be funded this three-year cycle. Although, the data showed that there were several areas where DMC was being impacted by Family Advocacy Programs, the Council decided to switch the funding focus from intervention programs to prevention programs. This decision was made for several reasons, the findings from the state-wide survey indicated that prevention is a priority for communities, other juvenile justice funds exist for intervention strategies and lastly because the point of most concern is at the arrest decision point. There are two ways to intervene at the arrest decision point one is to focus on law enforcement and the other is to focus on youth and preventing them from becoming delinquent and getting arrested in the first place. The JJDP Council has decided to focus on preventing youth from becoming delinquent and four projects were funded to address prevention as it relates to DMC. Two of the four funded projects are continuing to utilize a Family Advocacy Model, one for youth with co-occurring mental health needs and the other with a high-fidelity wrap-around approach; the other two funded projects are more traditional prevention programs, one is addressing school suspensions and the other is providing after-school programming. By funding varied approaches the intent is to find out if something works better than

Phase V: Monitoring

1. Monitoring and tracking changes in DMC trends over time.

The DMC Coordinator and the JJ Specialist continue to see trend data as the best determinate of what is happening in Colorado related to DMC. These data provide information on which better decisions can be made related to Colorado's strategies. Also of great assistance in these efforts is the State's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), which assists us in collecting the RRI matrix data and providing us technical assistance on data questions as well as our partners in other parts of the juvenile justice system who can answer questions related to data anomalies.

2. Responsibility for monitoring activities.

The DMC Coordinator is responsible for monitoring activities in the DMC Plan and the data. There is a Formula Grant Manager who monitors the DMC programs funded. This year the DMC Coordinator and the Formula Grant Manager will be doing joint site-visits for these programs.

3. Timeline for current and/or future monitoring activities.

The goal is to continuously look at the data on at least an annual basis and utilize the information from monitoring activities in all of our state's DMC decision making. We know that this is a process that is continuous and simultaneous with other steps and so we will continue to monitor so that we can show areas of improvement and identify areas of need. The Arrest Assessment will provide more information for this area. The funded DMC programs will be monitored in the fall of 2010.

COLLECTING AND SHARING JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION (UPDATED)

The Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing (CCYIS) is a collaborative effort initiated by Colorado's Collaborative Management Program (CMP) State Steering Committee and Prevention Leadership Council (PLC) in 2007 in partnership with the Center for Network Development (CND), the developers of the national *Guidelines for Juvenile Information Sharing* (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2006). Colorado's Juvenile Justice Specialist is a member of the CMP State Steering Committee and the PLC as well as the Steering Committee for the CCYIS.

In early 2008, the executive directors of five state departments, the commissioner of education and the state court administrator, signed an MOU that included a commitment to work collaboratively on implementing the *Guidelines for Juvenile Information Sharing* and the formation of the Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative. In late 2008, the Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing (CCYIS) initiative became linked with the larger data sharing and data protocol initiative of the Governor's Office of Information Technology (OIT). Currently, the CCYIS is one of three major information sharing initiatives linked with the Governor's OIT and is in regular communication with the newly established Government Data Advisory Board. The CCYIS Collaborative was inaugurated in April 2009 with representatives of five state departments, county representatives, a family advocacy organization, and youth representatives. The Collaborative meets monthly and has completed the first 8 of 48 guidelines as of September 2009.

The Center for Network Development (CND), a non-profit organization in the State of Colorado, received a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) that provides funding for two pilot sites, a state level and a local level, for juvenile information sharing testing, validation and implementation. The CCYIS represents the state level site and the Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center represents the local level site. Both sites, with the assistance of CND will implement and validate the Guidelines for Juvenile Information Sharing and the new Juvenile Justice XML Data Model (JJXDM). Technical Assistance funds will be available from the OJJDP grant that will assist the Governor's OIT with training in the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). NIEM will serve as the main architecture for cross-departmental data information sharing. Currently, the CCYIS Collaborative is working on an inventory of children and youth data systems that includes templates from the Governor's Office of Information technology.

The main purpose of children and youth information sharing is to structure policy and procedures for efficient, appropriate and timely sharing of accurate information between children and youth serving agencies at the state and local levels to improve services and outcomes of children, youth and families involved in services.

The anticipated outcomes include:

- data sharing agreements between State agencies that provide access to information for policy, program, service, and resource decisions;
- access to client level information on a "need to know basis"¹ through secure methods by government and nongovernment agencies to better coordinate and determine effective services;
- improved access to information by youth and families regarding data and information that is collected about them; and
- improved health, safety and general well-being of Colorado's children, youth and families.

¹ Definition of "Need to Know": A requirement for disclosure and receipt of private information. The information needs to be directly related to the legitimate stated purpose of the disclosure and the agency need for the information in order to perform its duties and responsibilities (OJJDP, *Guidelines for Juvenile Information Sharing*, p. 33).

STATE ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERSHIP (UPDATED)

COLORADO'S JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION (JJDP) COUNCIL

The JJDP Council currently has 27 members of which ten (37%) are full-time govt. employees, 25.9% (7) are youth, and 3 admitted to prior juvenile justice jurisdiction.

	Name	Represents	FT Govt	Youth	Date of Appt	Residence
1	Dianne A. Van Voorhees, Chair	B			07/04	Denver
2	Katie Wells, Vice-Chair	C	X		12/99	Denver
3	Donia Rae Amick	B	X		05/08	Lakewood
4	Katy Avila			X	07/04	Denver
5	Bill Bane	C	X		12/99	Denver
6	Michelle Brinegar	B	X		08/08	Fort Collins
7	Steve Brittain	C			12/99	Ignacio
8	Alison Bujanovich			X	07/05	Granby
9	Susan Colling	B	X		09/01	Denver
10	Jim Covino (ex officio)	B			02/97	Englewood
11	Bob Coulson	C	X		08/08	Denver
12	Kayla Duran			X	07/05	Denver
13	Regis Groff	G, H			06/94	Denver
14	Joe Higgins	D			02/89	Grand Junction
15	Larry Hudson				07/04	Denver
16	Michelle Molinar-Dominguez			X	08/08	Denver
17	Gerry Oyen	B	X		07/04	Las Animas
18	Stan Paprocki	C	X		05/06	Denver
19	Bob Pence	G			06/92	Littleton
20	Kristin Podgurski			X	07/09	Wheatridge
21	Bonnie Saltzman	B			05/08	Denver
22	David Shakes	B	X		05/05	Colorado Springs
23	Deborah Leah Staten	C	X		05/08	Golden
24	Raiana VandenBroek			X	06/09	Arvada
25	Pam Wakefield	B			08/96	Englewood
26	Debbie Wilde	D			04/04	Glenwood Springs
27	Jeremy Wilson			X	05/05	Denver

STAFF OF THE JJDP FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM (UPDATED)

STATE PLANNING AGENCY: Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ), Colorado Department of Public Safety; (Jeanne M. Smith), Director of the Division of Criminal Justice (Authorized Official)

Office of Research and Statistics (7 FTE), BJS Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)

Office of Community Corrections (6.9 FTE), administers the state community corrections programs

Office of Victims Programs (10.92 FTE) Administers VOCA Victims Assistance and Victim Compensation funds, and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) funds

Administration, Budget, Accounting and Administrative Support (5.8 FTE)

Colorado Regional Community Policing Institute (CRCPI) (1.1 FTE)

Office of Domestic Violence and Sex Offender Management (8.25 FTE)

Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance – This office administers eight major federal and state criminal and juvenile justice funding programs. There are 12.2 FTE in OAJJA of which 2.12 FTE were charged to Formula Grant Administration from 1/1-12/31/09.

The Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance administers three grants from the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. These include the Formula or Title II Grant, Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) and the Title V or Prevention Block Grant which provide dollars to communities to assist in local efforts designed to enhance or respond to a variety of juvenile justice and delinquency issues from prevention through aftercare. The 2009-2011 funding priorities include: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders; Jail Removal; Separation of Juveniles from Adult Inmates; Native American Programming; Juvenile Justice System Improvement; and prevention of delinquency by focusing on the needs of high risk youth in the areas of Disproportionate Minority Contact, Mental Health and Substance Abuse programming. The monies are used for program development, policy design, research and other activities. In FFY 2009/10 these grant programs totaled approximately \$1.76 million. Beginning in the 2006 legislative session, the Colorado General Assembly also appropriated \$1.2 million in funding to DCJ for re-establishing the Juvenile Diversion program.

OAJJA also administers the Anti-Gang, Prisoner Reentry Initiative and Justice Assistance Grants from the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Stalking and Domestic Violence Records Improvement and National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) available through the federal Bureau of Justice Statistics; and the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program available through the National Institute of Justice.

The Formula Grant planning and administrative costs cover:

- Salaries/indirect costs for 2.12 FTE, including the juvenile justice specialist.
- Travel costs for staff for the following:
 - Attendance at national conferences such as the OJJDP-sponsored national and regional trainings
 - Attendance at the Coalition for Juvenile Justice Conferences, as appropriate
 - Other regional and local conferences related to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention
 - Subgrant monitoring and site reviews
- Supplies and operating costs to administer the federal formula grant program

OAJJA STAFF

Meg Williams
Title: Manager of OAJJA and Juvenile Justice Specialist
State Classification: GP VI
FTE: 1.0
% of salary from Formula Grant Admin= 19.5%
% of time dedicated to Juvenile Justice= 51%

Tammy Russ
Title: Lead Staff of OAJJA
State Classification: GP V
FTE: 1.0
% of salary from Formula Grant Admin= 25.5%
% of time dedicated to Juvenile Justice=50%

Yvonne Anderson
Title: Grant Monitor
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: 1
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin= 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice= 0%

Sue Bradley
Title: Administrative Assistant
State Classification: Admin Assistant II
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin= 64%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 50%

Danica Brown
Title: Program Grant Manager
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 0%

Susan Davis
Title: Compliance Monitor
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: .40
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 100%

Cindy Johnson
Title: Grant Finance Officer
State Classification: GP III
FTE: .95
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 0%

Bruce Langsdon
Title: Program Grant Manager
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 0%

Anna Maria Lopez
Title: Project Manager - DMC/Title V
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: .95
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 8.75%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 97%

Michele Lovejoy
Title: Program Grant Manager- Formula/JABG
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 28.5%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 100%

Kenya Lyons
Title: Program Grant Manager
State Classification: GP IV
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin = 0%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 0%

Deb Ristow
Title: Grant Finance Officer
State Classification: GP III
FTE: 1.0
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin= 45.75%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 97%

Kinzie Wallden
Title: Administrative Assistant
State Classification: Admin Assistant III
FTE: .90
% of Salary from Formula Grant Admin= 20%
% of Time dedicated to Juvenile Justice = 0%

Compliance Monitoring Timeline 2010-2012 (NEW)

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
Policies and Procedures	OJJDP requires each State to have a written manual describing how the State performs the compliance monitoring function.	The policies and procedures were updated in 2008 and require no further update this year.	Update the policy and procedure manual. Estimated time: 2 days Month: July 2010	The policies and procedures were updated in 2010 and require no further update this year.
Monitoring Authority	OJJDP requires each State to have authority to monitor facilities and collect data. DCJ was granted that authority with the passage of HB 06-1112. See CRS 24-33.5-503. No further action required.	No action required.	No action required.	No action required.
Monitoring Timetable	OJJDP requires each State to develop a Monitoring Timetable annually describing who will perform what compliance monitoring duty, when, and what the product will be.	Develop the Monitoring Timetable based on the previous timetable activities. Estimated Time: .50 days Month: October 2009	Develop the Monitoring Timetable based on the previous timetable activities. Estimated Time: .50 days Month: October 2010	Develop the Monitoring Timetable based on the previous timetable activities. Estimated Time: .50 days Month: October 2011
Violation Procedures	OJJDP requires each State to have written procedures on how violations of the Act are dealt with, reduced and documented.	DCJ sends a written Compliance Violation Report to the offending agency each time a violation is discovered. Violations are discovered during on-site visits or when Juvenile Holding Cell Logs are mailed or faxed in. A copy of the Compliance Violation Report is retained in the Facility File and is recorded separately for submission on the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report. Estimated Time: .20 a month Month: July - June	DCJ sends a written Compliance Violation Report to the offending agency each time a violation is discovered. Violations are discovered during on-site visits or when Juvenile Holding Cell Logs are mailed or faxed in. A copy of the Compliance Violation Report is retained in the Facility File and is recorded separately for submission on the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report. Estimated Time: .20 a month Month: July – June	DCJ sends a written Compliance Violation Report to the offending agency each time a violation is discovered. Violations are discovered during on-site visits or when Juvenile Holding Cell Logs are mailed or faxed in. A copy of the Compliance Violation Report is retained in the Facility File and is recorded separately for submission on the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report. Estimated Time: .20 a month Month: July – June
Barriers and Strategies	OJJDP requires each State to document in writing their barriers to compliance or compliance monitoring and their strategies to reducing the violations or making their	Colorado prepares the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report in the fall with a submission deadline of December 31.	Colorado prepares the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report in the fall with a submission deadline of December 31.	Colorado prepares the annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report in the fall with a submission deadline of December 31.

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
Barriers and Strategies, cont.	compliance monitoring system more efficient.	<p>The compliance monitor provides a full update on compliance status at the next scheduled meeting after December 31. At that meeting Barriers to compliance and Strategies for compliance are discussed. The barriers and strategies are included in the Council Minutes.</p> <p>The compliance monitor provides the OAJJA Manager with an annual update to the Three Year Plan in January of each year. The Three Year Plan addresses Colorado's barriers to Compliance and strategies for compliance.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .50 days Month: January</p>	<p>The compliance monitor provides a full update on compliance status at the next scheduled meeting after December 31. At that meeting Barriers to compliance and Strategies for compliance are discussed. The barriers and strategies are included in the Council Minutes.</p> <p>The compliance monitor provides the OAJJA Manager with an annual update to the Three Year Plan in January of each year. The Three Year Plan addresses Colorado's barriers to Compliance and strategies for compliance.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .50 days Month: January</p>	<p>The compliance monitor provides a full update on compliance status at the next scheduled meeting after December 31. At that meeting Barriers to compliance and Strategies for compliance are discussed. The barriers and strategies are included in the Council Minutes.</p> <p>The compliance monitor provides the OAJJA Manager with an annual update to the Three Year Plan in January of each year. The Three Year Plan addresses Colorado's barriers to Compliance and strategies for compliance.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .50 days Month: January</p>
Definitions	OJJDP requires each State to use federal definitions when monitoring and when completing the annual report.	<p>Colorado uses the federal definitions when monitoring and when completing the annual report. During the legislative session attention is paid to any bills that would change current definition of terms or current juvenile practice.</p> <p>Estimated Time: NA, performed by Meg Williams and Ann Terry Month: January – May</p>	<p>Colorado uses the federal definitions when monitoring and when completing the annual report. During the legislative session attention is paid to any bills that would change current definition of terms or current juvenile practice.</p> <p>Estimated Time: NA, performed by Meg Williams and Ann Terry Month: January – May</p>	<p>Colorado uses the federal definitions when monitoring and when completing the annual report. During the legislative session attention is paid to any bills that would change current definition of terms or current juvenile practice.</p> <p>Estimated Time: NA, performed by Meg Williams and Ann Terry Month: January – May</p>
Identification of the Monitoring Universe	The compliance monitor is required to annually update the universe of facilities that might hold juveniles pursuant to public authority. Colorado's universe is well established,	Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted, the compliance monitor contacts	Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted, the compliance monitor contacts	Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted, the compliance monitor contacts

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
	basically the yearly task is to contact the department heads or licensing agents in charge of the facilities to determine if new facilities have been added, dropped or if any licensing rules and regulations have changed.	<p>department heads and licensing agents and queries them on new facilities, dropped facilities and changes to licensing rules/regulations or state law which would impact compliance monitoring. This information is then updated in the Monitoring Universe Files and updated on the Monitoring Universe chart (that is submitted to OJJDP).</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>	<p>department heads and licensing agents and queries them on new facilities, dropped facilities and changes to licensing rules/regulations or state law which would impact compliance monitoring. This information is then updated in the Monitoring Universe Files and updated on the Monitoring Universe chart (that is submitted to OJJDP).</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>	<p>department heads and licensing agents and queries them on new facilities, dropped facilities and changes to licensing rules/regulations or state law which would impact compliance monitoring. This information is then updated in the Monitoring Universe Files and updated on the Monitoring Universe chart (that is submitted to OJJDP).</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>
Classification of the Monitoring Universe	The compliance monitor is required to annually classify all facilities identified in the previous step. This typically occurs in conjunction with the Identification process. For law enforcement facilities classification is updated during on-site visits; some departments become secure, others become non-secure. If a facility is non-secure a Non-Secure Classification is completed and signed by the Chief once every three years. They report 0 juveniles held on the OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report.	<p>Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted. Classification occurs in conjunction with Identification.</p> <p>During on-site visits to law enforcement facilities classification is confirmed. If a secure facility becomes non-secure a Non-Secure Classification Form is completed and signed by the Chief. If a non-secure facility becomes secure, they are instructed on when and how to complete the Juvenile Holding Cell log and on what constitutes a violation. A manual is left for their reference.</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>	<p>Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted. Classification occurs in conjunction with Identification.</p> <p>During on-site visits to law enforcement facilities classification is confirmed. If a secure facility becomes non-secure a Non-Secure Classification Form is completed and signed by the Chief. If a non-secure facility becomes secure, they are instructed on when and how to complete the Juvenile Holding Cell log and on what constitutes a violation. A manual is left for their reference.</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>	<p>Each year, typically in early winter after the OJJDP compliance monitoring report is submitted. Classification occurs in conjunction with Identification.</p> <p>During on-site visits to law enforcement facilities classification is confirmed. If a secure facility becomes non-secure a Non-Secure Classification Form is completed and signed by the Chief. If a non-secure facility becomes secure, they are instructed on when and how to complete the Juvenile Holding Cell log and on what constitutes a violation. A manual is left for their reference.</p> <p>Estimated Time: 2.5 days Month: December or January</p>
Inspection of Facilities	Inspections are required to perform three	OJJDP is asking that all secure law	OJJDP is asking that all secure law	OJJDP is asking that all secure law

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
	<p>functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Verify classification information; 2) Determine separation levels in all areas of the facility; 3) Determine that the data the facility is collecting is compatible with what is required for the OJJDP annual report. <p>Because I have been to all facilities in the State 20 times I am familiar with their department and have historical information documented in the Facility File that serves as a good refresher. It takes on average 1 hour per visit to a secure facility and ½ hour per visit to a non-secure facility. I can usually visit 6 facilities a day once I am in the area I am monitoring. (So that does not include travel to get to the facility).</p> <p>Number of Inspections: 2008/2009: 250 2007/2008: 211 2006/2007: 234</p>	<p>enforcement facilities be inspected once every three years. They ask that non-secure facilities be inspected once every ten years (but that seems too lax).</p> <p>One third of all secure and non-secure facilities within the State would be inspected annually. Inspections would be scheduled by Judicial District; all facilities within the slated judicial district would be inspected. Susan will schedule the visits via email.</p> <p>Year One: 1st, 9th, 10th, 11th, 15th, 16th, 18th, 112 facilities Estimated Time: 53 days Month: July - June</p>	<p>enforcement facilities be inspected once every three years. They ask that non-secure facilities be inspected once every ten years (but that seems too lax).</p> <p>One third of all secure and non-secure facilities within the State would be inspected annually. Inspections would be scheduled by Judicial District; all facilities within the slated judicial district would be inspected. Susan will schedule the visits via email.</p> <p>Year Two: 2nd, 3rd, 7th, 12th, 14th, 17th, 20th, 21st 112 facilities Estimated Time: 53 days Month: July - June</p>	<p>enforcement facilities be inspected once every three years. They ask that non-secure facilities be inspected once every ten years (but that seems too lax).</p> <p>One third of all secure and non-secure facilities within the State would be inspected annually. Inspections would be scheduled by Judicial District; all facilities within the slated judicial district would be inspected. Susan will schedule the visits via email.</p> <p>Year Three: 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 13th, 19th, 22nd 114 facilities Estimated Time: 53 days Month: July - June</p>
Data Collection and Data Verification	<p>Data must be collected from all secure facilities that held juveniles securely. This includes jails, lockups and juvenile detention and juvenile correctional facilities. Currently this is being accomplished through Juvenile Holding Cell logs at adult facilities and through TRAILS at juvenile facilities.</p> <p>One the data is collected it is entered into the annual OJJDP compliance monitoring report.</p>	<p>Twice a year email alerts will be sent asking for Juvenile Holding Cell logs to be sent either by email, hard copy or by fax. A chart will be set up showing which facilities have submitted their data. The facilities that did not submit data will be emailed again. The DCJ Adm. Asst will perform the above duties.</p> <p>Once the logs are collected Susan will review them and determine if there are any violations. If there are,</p>	<p>Twice a year email alerts will be sent asking for Juvenile Holding Cell logs to be sent either by email, hard copy or by fax. A chart will be set up showing which facilities have submitted their data. The facilities that did not submit data will be emailed again. The DCJ Adm. Asst will perform the above duties.</p> <p>Once the logs are collected Susan will review them and determine if there are any violations. If there are,</p>	<p>Twice a year email alerts will be sent asking for Juvenile Holding Cell logs to be sent either by email, hard copy or by fax. A chart will be set up showing which facilities have submitted their data. The facilities that did not submit data will be emailed again. The DCJ Adm. Asst will perform the above duties.</p> <p>Once the logs are collected Susan will review them and determine if there are any violations. If there are,</p>

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
		<p>Susan will mail a Compliance Violation Form and record the violation for entry into the yearly OJJDP report.</p> <p>Estimated Time for LE Facilities: 2.35 days Month: July – June</p> <p>Estimated Time for Juvenile Facilities: 15.5 days Month: July – June</p>	<p>Susan will mail a Compliance Violation Form and record the violation for entry into the yearly OJJDP report.</p> <p>Estimated Time for LE Facilities: 2.35 days Month: July – June</p> <p>Estimated Time for Juvenile Facilities: 15.5 days Month: July – June</p>	<p>Susan will mail a Compliance Violation Form and record the violation for entry into the yearly OJJDP report.</p> <p>Estimated Time for LE Facilities: 2.35 days Month: July – June</p> <p>Estimated Time for Juvenile Facilities: 15.5 days Month: July – June</p>
Native American Tribes	<p>Susan has served as the Tribal Liaison, due to limited time this would no longer be feasible. Since the UMU tribe is no longer receiving grant funds the facilities on the reservation are no longer subject to monitoring.</p> <p>The Southern Ute tribe and facilities will still be subject to monitoring and data collection.</p>	-	-	-
Quarterly Reports	Quarterly reports are required for this grant	<p>Quarterly Reports will be written at the end of December, March, June, with a Final Report due in September.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .25 days 4 times a year = 1 day Month: July - June</p>	<p>Quarterly Reports will be written at the end of December, March, June, with a Final Report due in September.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .25 days 4 times a year = 1 day Month: July – June</p>	<p>Quarterly Reports will be written at the end of December, March, June, with a Final Report due in September.</p> <p>Estimated Time: .25 days 4 times a year = 1 day Month: July - June</p>
Annual OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Report	Colorado’s annual report on violations is due to OJJDP on December 31. There are two parts to the report: data and a narrative.	<p>Estimated Time: 3.75 days Month: December</p>	<p>Estimated Time: 3.75 days Month: December</p>	<p>Estimated Time: 3.75days Month: December</p>
OJJDP Conference	Annual mandatory conference	2 days	2 days	2 days
	Unit Meetings Attend the unit meetings once a month for updates.	<p>Estimated Time: .5 days Month: Monthly</p>	<p>Estimated Time: .5 days Month: Monthly</p>	<p>Estimated Time: .5 days Month: Monthly</p>
	Expense Vouchers DCJ Time Sheet	<p>Estimated Time: .20 day Month: Every month</p>	<p>Estimated Time: .20 day Month: Every month</p>	<p>Estimated Time: .20 day Month: Every month</p>

Required OJJDP Compliance Monitoring Tasks	Description	2009/2010 Year One	2010/2011 Year Two	2011/2012 Year Three
	Developing a Plan for Upcoming Month and then documenting it in a Monthly Format			
	<p>End of year letters to PD's, Sheriffs, DYC and CML</p> <p>Send out end of year letters with a chart showing the number of violations and thanking facilities for their cooperation throughout the year. Send a letter to CML showing which facilities were in compliance for them to include in their newsletter.</p>	Estimated Time: 1 day October, annually	Estimated Time: 1 day October, annually	Estimated Time: 1 day October, annually
	Council Meetings	4 times a year – 1 day each	4 times a year – 1 day each	4 times a year – 1 day each
	Phone contact with facilities I am not going to be visiting	5 days yearly	5 days yearly	5 days yearly
	Misc. calls to attend to	3 days a year	3 days a year	3 days a year

Number of Facilities in the Colorado Monitoring Universe by Judicial District

Judicial District	County	Secure Sheriff	Non-Secure Sheriff	Sheriff Secure Substation	Sheriff Non-Secure Substation	Sheriff Court Holding	Secure PD	Non-Secure PD	PD Secure Substation	PD Non-Secure Substation	PD Court Holding	JDC	JCF	JAC	Total	Closed
1 st	Gilpin	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Jefferson	1	0	0	0	1	9	1	1	0	1	1 Mount View	4 Mount View, Everest, Lookout, Marler	1 Jeffco JACT	20	
Total		2				2	10	2	1		1	1	4	1	24	
2 nd	Denver	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	11	0	0	1 (Gilliam)	0	0	17	
Total		1				1	3		11			1			17	
3 rd	Huerfano	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Las Animas	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	Aguilar
Total		2				1		3							6	
4 th	El Paso	1	0	0	2 (South and Training Academy)	1	4	4	5 (C.S.)	0	0	1 (Spring Creek)	2 (Spring Creek and Zeb Pike)	0	20	
	Teller	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Total		2			2	2	7	5	5			1	2		26	
5 th	Clear Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Eagle	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
	Lake	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Summit	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2 Blue River and T.H.
Total		4				4	9							17		
6 th	Archuleta	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	La Plata	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	1 De Nier	1 De Nier	0	9	
	San Juan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Total		2	1			1	3	3				1	1		12	
7 th	Delta	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	Gunnison	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Hinsdale	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Montrose	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Ouray	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	San Miguel	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Total		4	2	1			4	10							21
8 th	Jackson	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Walden
	Larimer	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 HUB	9	
Total		2				1	5	1						1	10	

Judicial District	County	Secure Sheriff	Non-Secure Sheriff	Sheriff Secure Substation	Sheriff Non-Secure Substation	Sheriff Court Holding	Secure PD	Non-Secure PD	PD Secure Substation	PD Non-Secure Substation	PD Court Holding	JDC	JCF	JAC	Total	Closed
9 th	Garfield	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
	Pitkin	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Rio Blanco	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Total		3					4	6							13	
10 th	Pueblo	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2 Pueblo and Sol Vista		10	
Total		1			4	1	1					1	2		10	
11 th	Chaffee	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Custer	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Fremont	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Park	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Total		4				1	3	2							10	
12 th	Alamosa	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1 (SLVYSC)	0	0	4	
	Conejos	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	Costilla	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Mineral	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Saguache	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Rio Grande	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Total		5	1				3	9				1			19	
13 th	Kit Carson	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Phillips	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Logan	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Morgan	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	Sedgwick	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1 Julesberg
	Washington	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1 Akron
	Yuma	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Total		7				1	3	9							20	
14 th	Grand	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	NS T.H. too
	Moffat	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	NS T.H. too
	Routt	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Total		3				1	2	5			1				11	
15 th	Baca	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2 Campo and Pritchett
	Cheyenne	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Judicial District	County	Secure Sheriff	Non-Secure Sheriff	Sheriff Secure Substation	Sheriff Non-Secure Substation	Sheriff Court Holding	Secure PD	Non-Secure PD	PD Secure Substation	PD Non-Secure Substation	PD Court Holding	JDC	JCF	JAC	Total	Closed
	Kiowa	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	Eads inside Kiowa dept.
	Prowers	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	Holly
Total		4						6							10	
16 th	Bent	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Crowley	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Ordway
	Otero	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Total		3					4	1							8	
17 th	Adams	1	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	1 Adams	0	1 (Link)	12	
	Broomfield	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Total		1		1		1	7				2	1		1	14	
18 th	Arapahoe	1	0	0	5	1	7	2	2	0	1	1 (Marvin Foote)	2 (MarFoote S and Ridgeview NS)	1 (JAC Secure)	23	Bow Mar
	Douglas	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	1 (Lonetree)	0	0	0	0	0	7	
	Elbert	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Lincoln	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Total		4		1	5	2	10	7	3		1	1	2	1	37	
19 th	Weld	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	1 (Platte)	1 (Platte)	1	24	
Total		1					11	9				1	1	1	24	
20 th	Boulder	1	0	0	5	0	4	4	0	0	1 (Broomfield)	1 (Comm Corr)	0	0	15	
Total		1			5		4	4			1	1			15	
21 st	Mesa	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	1 Grand Mesa	1 Grand Mesa	0	9	
Total		1				1	1	4				1	1		9	
22 nd	Dolores	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Montezuma	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1 Collocated – UMU	0	0	4	
Total		2					1	1				1			5	
Total		59	4	3	16	16	90	96	20	0	4	12	13	5	337	

MEMO

TO: Meg Williams, Manager, Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance

FR: Susan Davis, Colorado Compliance Monitor

DT: February 11, 2010

RE: Plan to conform to OJJDP's request to report on a calendar year

OJJDP has requested that Colorado report data based on the calendar year (January – December) rather than on a fiscal year (July – June). Up until 2010 Colorado had to report fiscally as the Division of Youth Corrections was only able to provide data to us at the end of their fiscal year in June. Now I can pull my own reports from the DYC data base Trails, so this will no longer be an issue. Since it is understood that in order to move to a calendar year report it will require more work on my part I have developed a plan for the next two years so that by the 2012 report Colorado will be reporting as OJJDP wishes. It is understood as we move to a calendar year report all data from all months must be reported and that a minimum of 10% of all facility types must be inspected for each report period.

July 2009 – December 2009	Prepare the first half of the 2010 report. Collect and verify data from law enforcement. Collect data from juvenile detention/correctional facilities.
January 2010 – June 2010	Prepare the second half of the 2010 report. Collect and verify data from law enforcement. Collect and verify data from juvenile detention/correctional facilities.
December 2010	Submit Colorado's 2010 report.
July 2010 – December 2010	Collect and verify data from law enforcement. Collect and verify data from juvenile detention/correctional facilities. This data is for the 2010 Supplemental Report
January 2011 – June 2011	Prepare the first half of the 2011 report. Collect and verify data from law enforcement. Collect data from juvenile detention/correctional facilities.
June 2011	Submit 2010 Supplemental Report
July 2011 – December 2011	Prepare the second half of the 2011 report. Collect and verify data from law enforcement. Collect and verify data from juvenile detention/correctional facilities.
June 2012	Submit Colorado's 2011 report.