Juvenile Justice Task Force

April 21, 2011 9am-Noon 710 Kipling St., 3rd Floor Conference room, Lakewood, CO

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prev. & Control Comm. Ken Plotz, Task Force consultant

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
Don Moseley, Ralston House
Inta Morris, Department of Higher Education
Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health
Norene Simpson, Defense Attorney
Jeff McDonald, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center
Kirk Henwood, Montrose County School District
John Gomez, Director of DYC
Charlie Garcia, Juvenile Parole Board
Karen Ashby, Juvenile Court Presiding Judge
Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Chief
Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners
Susan Colling, State Court Administrators Office

STAFF

Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice Paul Herman, CCJJ Consultant Germaine Miera, Division of Criminal Justice Chrissy Adams, Division of Criminal Justice Peg Flick, Division of Criminal Justice

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

Magen Dodge, Denver Police Dept.
Carla Turner, Douglas Co. Youth Initiative
Hailey Wilmer for Steve Siegel
Kim Dvorchak, Colorado Juvenile Defender Coalition
Jennifer Bacon, Padres Unidos
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation
Anna Lopez, Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT:

Beth McCann, Representative Regis Groff, Retired State Senator Alaurice Tafoya Modi, Defense Attorney Linda Newell, Senator Don Quick, District Att. 17th Judicial District

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:		
Welcome and Introductions Regina Huerter	Regina Huerter welcomes the group and proposes the idea of possibly changing the meeting date/time to accommodate more task force members. Ken Plotz will conduct some outreach to the group and see if there's a better time for people		
Action:	to meet.		

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:

Disproportionate Minority Contact within the Juvenile System

Anna Lopez

Anna Lopez from the Division of Criminal Justice walks the group through a PowerPoint presentation and a handout regarding Disproportionate Minority Contact within the Juvenile Justice System.

Discussion Points(please see PowerPoint for more detail)

- Anna goes over her PowerPoint
- DMC is the rate of contact
- Federal core requirement that all states look at the issue of DMC in the JJ system
- There are five phases for addressing DMC in the OJJDP model Identification

Assessment

Intervention

Evaluation

Monitoring

What does Colorado's Data Look Like?

- Anna goes over a handout entitled Colorado 2011 Relative Rate Index
- Race and Ethnicity are different. There are four races but multiple ethnicities. This is a difficult area to track as many agencies don't collect ethnicity data.
- African American youth are more than 4.8% likely to get arrested in our state.
- Important to look at both over-representation AND underrepresentation in the system.
- Things to consider in data; statistical significance, magnitude, volume, comparison.
- It's hard to compare state to state as systems can be drastically different.
- It's important to note the following- 1) the calculation method involved comparing the relative volume (rate) of activity for each major stage of the juvenile justice system for minority youth with the volume of that activity for white (majority) youth and 2) the population base for the rate calculation is based on the prior decision point.
- When looking at the handout and graph there is a line titled 'Assess'. The letters in that line (S, M and V) signify Statistical Significance, Magnitude and Volume. It is important to pay attention to those areas when looking at the handout because those are important areas of focus.
- When you look at all state numbers it's really hard to digest

Action:

- It appears we can get the most traction around the DMC/MOR issue by working on SB94 and judicial district issues.
- It's easy to blame the police, law enforcement right off the bat.
- However, once you dig deeper into numbers oftentimes the DMC numbers that start to pop out are in regards to things like probation violations and failure to appear.
- You also have to go further back into the system, even before arrests, look at the communities and agencies that are contacting.
- It is critical to delve into geographic area, counties, etc. to find where and why issues start to surface.
- We really need to consider the number of kids affected to decide where we want to drill down.
- This is a very complicated issue.
- The problem with DMC data is that people often take the data and take it out of context.
- Maybe we can pull out what seems like the top ten issues from the data handout.
- When you look at origin of Overrepresentation it is often the citizens who call on a kid and Overrepresentation starts at that point.
- Let's keep in mind that DMC is not the driving factor behind this task force, but instead needs to be continually considered throughout all the facets of our work.
- We need to look at equitable systems for all kids in the JJ system.

Assessment

- Colorado is performing an assessment study focused on the arrest decision point. The methodology includes looking at state level data as well as an in-depth look at two local communities, the 18th and the 4th
- The main difference found for minority youth was them being arrested for failure to appear and failure to comply
- In the 4th most of the kids getting arrested are getting arrested during the school day (minority and white both)

Interventions

- Due to high arrest rates in the state the JJDP council has been working on programs to address DMC, prevention, system improvement projects, study of child welfare systems, etc.
- This is a local issue. Law enforcement and school districts are by county, social services, all the systems are county based systems so the issues have to be solved in communities, rather than statewide.

Discussion:			
Kim English from the Division of Criminal Justice presents a PowerPoint on the Eight Principles of Evidence-Based Practices to Reduce Recidivism			
 Discussion Points (please see PowerPoint for more detail) History of EBP goes back to the medical field In looking at the pyramid of Evidence-Based Practices, pilot studies and case studies are the first (bottom) level of evidence The next (2nd layer up) is a single study that has a pre and post design. Then there is quasi-experimental design where you can look at what's going on in one county vs. another county. Just need to understand limitations. The fourth layer includes large scale multi-site studies The next level (#5) contains systematic literature reviews Clinical trials and replications is next, but this is hard to do in the CJ world Meta-analytic reviews occupy the 7th layer—a lot of what's done in the field now draws on studies with outcomes from past research At the top is the expert panel review of research evidence 			
8 Evidence Based Principles 1. Assess -Assess each offender using validated instruments to determine risk, need and Responsivity. -Actuarial risk is the probability that offenders in a risk group will reoffendRisk assessments are also used in child welfare -This is not consistent statewide currently -In the juvenile world DYC and Probation are going to start using the same tool -When you have a tool that looks at risk AND need, you'll delude the ability of that instrument to accurately predict risk. - If there are SEPARATE instruments for risk and need that works better -Another problem with multiple instruments is that they often counter each other because they determine different pathways to risk -With the CJRA the prescreen starts out as a risk tool only. If they score out high then they go onto the needs portion. CJRA has yet to be validated in Colo. This is a risk to REOFFEND, keep in mindIt's not just how you administer the tool but what you do with the info once you get it. Anybody can administer but we need to understand what to do with it once we get dataIdentify the medium and high risk folks and focus your resources on them -Focus on the 8 Criminogenic Needs -Risk principle, try to focus on treatment oriented for high risk, use minimal intervention on low risk, don't contaminate these two populations			

Common problems with Offender Assessment

- -Don't assess offenders at all
- -Assess offenders $\mathsf{OK},$ but then the supervision process ignores important factors
- -Or assess ok but don't distinguish levels

2. **Enhance offender motivation** – all who work with the offender need to be doing this

3. Target interventions based on offender needs, risk

- -Look at risk/need and target specifically
- -Duration of programs 3 to 9 months
- -Aftercare
- -Target the factors that are changeable (can't often change history or family)
- -Responsivity means relating to clients in a positive way
- -Don't forget to engage families
- -Apply risk, apply Responsivity, adjust dosage (including meds)

4. Train staff in specific skills

- -Without competence in this area the other areas can't happen
- -Training is a difficult piece for agencies to follow-through with, especially with budgets
- -Lecturing and drive-by training doesn't work. Training 1-on-1 and with Feedback and Coaching is the best
- 5. Increase positive reinforcement. The ratio should be 4:1
- 6. Engage ongoing support in natural communities
- 7. Measure staff performance
 - -Measure both offender levels for change and staff levels as well
- 8. Measure program performance and provide feedback

Issue/Topic:

The Work Ahead – Domains identified at the Juvenile Task Force and Prioritization of the work to come

Regina Huerter/Ken Plotz

Regi engages the group in a discussion about how to take everything that came out of the retreat and move that forward into the work ahead

The smaller JV planning group took all the discussions from the retreat (areas of concern made both by the presenters and the small groups) and compiled the feedback.

The areas of concern that came out of the small groups and were generally agreed upon include the following issues-

- 1. Judicial
- 2. Education/Truancy
- 3. Cross System Coordination
- 4. Assessments and Assessment Process
- 5. System Specific Items

Action:

These five large areas of work have a sense of immediacy and need to be addressed in order to get 'unstuck'.

Discussion Points

- In looking at the Areas of Concern (above), each area has a lot more detail within it.
- Assessment for example has 17 'bucket' areas.
- Assessment is the key and gateway into understanding what we need to do with a juvenile.
- Assessment may be a large area of work we want to take on.
- Another big area is 'Judicial'

Regi asks the group if they agree that these large areas are where we want to focus our work.

Question - Where would Law Enforcement fit? Under education (truancy and SRO's) and System Specific and Assessment.

Regi asks the group if they are willing to take on 3 areas of work (from the 5 presented) and form working groups to target those areas. Each group would have members from the Task Force but add in other stakeholders as well.

How does the group feel about agreeing to address Judicial, Education/Truancy and Assessments and Assessment Processes? The group agrees. Task Force members agree preliminarily to participate on the following groups

Judicial

Norene Simpson
Judge Ashby/Chair
Ken Plotz/Co
Don Quick
A DHS rep
Another judicial voice

Education/Truancy - May 19th a.m.

Kirk Henwood Stan Paprocki Inta rep John G. rep Meg/Co-chair Regi/Co-chair Magen Dodge Judge Boatwright?

Assessments - May 19th a.m.

Jeff McDonald/Chair John Gomez Shawn Cohn Susan Colling

The group agrees to Not hold the full task force meeting in May, but instead have the small groups meet and get up and running.

Clarification Questions

- Where does mental health fit? Would that fall under the Assessments category?
- Can you delve into mental health assessment without addressing cross system coordination?
- There is a role with the police in schools, but there are a lot of other police contacts that don't fall into the 'school category'
- Keep in mind an ideal system that is not necessarily the way that it is structured currently
- Can we add DYC funding on the education group?
- On assessments, let's talk about the notion of how kids in the commitment system are assessed.
- Who is addressing JV sex offender issues? Is the SO group doing that?

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:		
Next Steps and Adjourn	The group agrees to the following- • The full task force meeting scheduled for May 19 th will be cancelled;		
Action	HOWEVER, two of the subgroups (Education & Assessment) will meet that day instead.		
	 Each subgroup will want to set criteria for which issues it wants to take up 		
	 The Education and Assessment groups will meet the morning of May 19th at 710 Kipling. 		
	 The Judicial group will find another date to meet 		
	 During the next full task force meeting let's add a JV parole board presentation (Garcia) and a community review board presentation (Shawn Cohn). 		

Meeting Schedule Jan-June 2011

May 19 th ——	9:00am - 12:00pm	710 Kipling St., 3 rd floor conference room
June 15 th	9:00am - 12:00pm	710 Kipling St., 3 rd floor conference room