

Juvenile Justice Task Force

June 16, 9:00 am-12:00 pm
710 Kipling St, 3rd floor conference room, Lakewood, CO

ATTENDEES:

Group Leader

Karen Ashby, Juvenile Court Presiding Judge

JTF CHAIR

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission

Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners

Don Moseley, Ralston House

Regis Groff, Retired State Senator

Beth McCann, Representative

Linda Newell, Senator

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice

Inta Morris, Department of Higher Education

Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health

Norene Simpson, Defense Attorney

Jeff MacDonald, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center

Kirk Henwood, Montrose County School District

John Gomez, Director of DYC

Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Chief

Don Quick, District Att. 17th Judicial District

Susan Colling, State Court Administrators Office

Charles Garcia, Juvenile Parole Board

Kim Dvorchak, Colorado Juvenile Defender Coalition

Coalition Coalition

STAFF

Ken Plotz, Task Force Consultant

Anna Lopez, Division of Criminal Justice

Anastasiya Schomaker, Division of Criminal Justice

GUESTS

Brian Campbell, Denver County Court

Jennifer Bacon, Padres & Jóvenes Unidos

Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation

John Riley, Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Amber Elias, Denver Public Schools

Hailey Wilmer, Denver DA's Office

Magen Dodge, Denver Police

Lisa Polansky, Center for Juvenile Justice

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions	Regina Huerter welcomes the group. Task force members and guests introduce themselves.
Issue/Topic: Case Study, the Context of Juvenile Transformation <i>Regina Huerter/Facilitator</i> (the case study is attached)	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion</p> <p>Regina Huerter facilitated the case study discussion. Participants discussed what strikes them most in the case.</p> <p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor attendance record • Discipline • Fire • Doesn't strike me (see it every day) • Childhood trauma • Family addiction, drug effect • Systems failure- no one connected with the child • Social services not mentioned

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He will end up in prison • Not seeing many positive items • Positive- he doesn't have larger criminal record • We don't know much about the family and day treatment. Parent piece is missing. Can we maintain him at home? • Find out what the kid is interested in • Everyone threw him out of their program without trying hard • Label "conduct disorder". • We don't have a workforce that can engage with this challenging child. We have to have this skill. • Lots of times the systems within the agencies can't work together • There are gaps in the state in adolescent mental health and substance abuse issues, how do we address that gap?
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: Report of Working Group-Assessments, <i>Jeff McDonald</i></p>	<p>Assessments Work Group has had two meetings Membership has doubled in size. The work group identified two key areas to work on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Juvenile Justice Assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at the three common assessments: CJRA (Colorado Juvenile Risk Assessment Instrument), MAYSI-2 (Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument second version), SUS (Substance Use Survey) along with others. • The Assessment Work Group will review the screening manual created five years ago, explore what we know now and report to the Task Force. 2. Looking at kids in the criminal justice system. <p style="text-align: center;">Discussion</p> <p><u>Discussion points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of the work group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decide are we on the right track? ○ How do you create a balance between practicing assessment and not? ○ When assessing kids how do you not push them deeper into the system? ○ How do you run an assessment to get the kid out of the system and at the same time on the judicial side they committed an offense, what do we do with them? • 2000-2001 Orange County, CA probation study targeting high risk offenders to provide services was discussed. • How is it different from S.H.O.D.I. (Serious Habitual Offender Directed Intervention)? S.H.O.D.I. model drifted, participation from law enforcement is not 100%. • 70% kids in the system only come in once, and never come back. How do we identify those 70% of kids that shouldn't have been put into the system in the first place? • Kids are not evaluated at the municipal level. • How does a cop on the street know what is "normal" kid behavior? • As we are talking about systems, we need a model similar to PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support) • Assessment vs. intervention and response • Within assessment is it possible to tease out what is criminal and what is family manageable? What are we filling?
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We assess kids appropriately. CJRA instrument measures the criminogenic issues kids are presenting and the behavior. Modern instruments are designed to indicate what normal adolescent behavior is and what is criminogenic behavior leading to delinquency. • The concerns are whether we assess appropriately, consistently within various jurisdictions, how do we ensure fidelity and what you do with this information? • What is our charge around those indicators, with the kids that are not delinquent but need work? • Low risk kid- afraid to over assess that kid. When do we assess kids? • CJRA. Training is needed to teach people what to do with assessment information. • Why don't we use Colorado Assets, Search Institutes? We don't look at kids' strengths. • Collaboration and assessments coordination of how assessments are used is needed. We need a common assessment approach and case management and better coordination on the front end. • We have some models in Colorado that are working: Senate Bill 94 (SB94), a statewide grant initiative that provides alternatives to detention for youth, ages 10 to 17, involved in the juvenile justice system and HB 1451 regarding the Collaborative Management of Multi-Agency Services Provided to Children and Families. We can continue building upon the models that are already working. • We need consistent process in place around the state on how to roll out HB 1451. <p>The Assessment Work Group would like to keep its focus on juvenile justice assessment. The Task force agreed that review of how assessment should be used needs to be a part of the conversation.</p> <p>The Task Force agreed that the task of intervention is important, but not the focus of the assessment work group. Regina Huerter commended the work group for the work done so far.</p> <p>Next meeting of the Assessment Work Group is July 14th 9:00 am, Jeffco JAC.</p>
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: Report of Working Group- Judicial, Karen Ashby</p>	<p>Scope of Judicial Work Group is huge: How do we manage all of these complex issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short term piece- Juvenile DUI issues. An email went out to all judicial juvenile officers around the state asking what they are doing. 23 Judicial Districts are doing 16 different things. We will discuss the results at the next work group meeting. • Long term piece- start at the back end- who are these kids in DYC who were committed and who are the kids that we feel are in DYC appropriately? • We are getting some data from DYC to get a better handle on that. • How does it help us to ensure the right kids are in DYC? How do we change the system to more appropriately intervene at early stages to prevent kids from going into the DYC? • Re-adjust the system; realign the system to more appropriately
---	---

	<p>intervene at early stages to prevent kids from going into the DYC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of judicial officers, professional development part on how do you appropriately use assessments to intervene. • We need to ensure the right kids are in the right place. • There are kids in DYC that either shouldn't be there or if we have done things differently along the way, wouldn't be there— consensus from the working group. The Work Group needs to gather information on who those kids are, where they are, etc. <p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DYC is often a default for kids with mental health issues. Meeting the system's needs, not the kids needs. • We put kids to DYC as we run out of drug and substance abuse, mental health treatments. Locking up kids- we see the long term consequences. Let's develop better mental health facilities and drug and alcohol treatment facilities. • We don't have the community alternative to DYC. Communities don't have the resources. • County/state funding issues • Local policies – farther outside of metro area jurisdictions that place kids to DYC instead of other options, not just rural area, happens in metro area as well. There is no place other than DYC sometimes. • Systems failure- violation of probation was the offense for lots of DYC sentences. • Professionalism factor • Education perspective- we have obligation to provide education services. Kids don't get the support they need. • Cases of DYC kids going to Adult Community Corrections as they turn 18 • In juvenile probation, when youth turns 18, you qualify for adult probation- local policy • We need to have and look at what the data is saying. How many youth? Where? • The focus of Juvenile Justice wasn't on policies, practices, in place for child welfare system (family finding diligent search, etc.) in the past. The dynamics is changing. Family needs to be a part of the process. Dealing with the family as a whole, wasn't a common practice, there is much more focus on this now. Juvenile Parole has done a good job on that. <p>The focus identified by the Judicial work group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term- DUI • Long –term- System professionalism and; • keeping wrong kids out of DYC, by intervening early and appropriately. <p>Next meeting: June 30, 1:00 pm, 710 Kipling St, conference room #308</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Report of Working Group- Education, <i>Regina Huerter</i></p>	<p>Education Working Group discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB11-133 Concerning a Study of Disciplinary Actions Taken in Public Schools • SROs and their roles

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credits • NYC and their role • Discipline codes, practices • Transition • Special ed and mental health issues, how to get kids access to services they need • Truancy, expulsion and school practices • School attendance in general • School attendance review boards • Restorative justice • Practice some judicial districts have regarding detaining • SB11-133 task force – legislative body and this Work Group will merge to work together, not to have two separate groups <p>Three independent sub-committees formed within Education Work Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truancy • SB11- 133 (school to jail) • Transitions <p>Next meeting: June 30, 9:00 am, 710 Kipling St, conference room #308</p>
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p>	<p>Discussion</p>
<p>Procedural Discussion</p> <p>Action: Requests for data can go through Ken Plotz</p>	<p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <p><i>Procedural Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCJJ members decided that as CCJJ votes and things move forward a member of CCJJ will not oppose the legislation from CCJJ after it has been moved forward by CCJJ. If a member doesn't agree with the bill, that member will remain silent. • A Commission member will not oppose the legislation moved by CCJJ, he/she will remain silent; will not fight this bill, unless it is a legislator that needs to vote. • A task force or a work group member, and not a Commission member, can oppose the legislation, however can't affiliate themselves with CCJJ. • CCJJ is not a clearing house for legislation; it is a unique opportunity to get some really significant issues through. <p><i>Membership Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the Juvenile Task Force we define the membership for working groups (Judicial, Education, and Assessment) and suggest cutting it off. Suggested cut off time –July. • Each work group is free to decide the best way to handle work group membership. • It is not necessary to be a member of a work group to be a member of committees/sub-committees. • Work Groups will discuss the membership for their work groups and also committees/sub-committees at their next meetings. • There are lots of stakeholders, would prefer to hear all the multiple issues and for issues not to be overpowered by a certain group/voice. • If the recommendation comes out of the working group – it is already vetted and we trust the research was done, we trust the decision.

<p style="text-align: center;">Action Item: Ken Plotz will send the list of the current members of the Task Force to all</p>	<p><i>How CCJJ Makes Decisions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66 % or 2/3 demonstrates the majority for CCJJ. • Goal is to find common ground. • “ I can live with it” gives people a way out • The decisions should be coming from the evidence and “it is the right thing to do”. • At the Task Force level there should be consensus there, so we can move it to CCJJ. <p><i>Decision Making Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coming from “it is a right thing to do” perspective • Hearing and bringing up both sides of the position, even on the consensus, bringing up the caution things. • Important to have common language: Juvenile Task Force, three working groups (Education, Judicial, Assessment), committees or subcommittees <p><i>Consensus</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is pure model consensus and there are variations of it • Suggestion to use 2/3 majority instead of consensus to move forward. Use consensus when everybody agrees. • If we end up with 2/3, we want to know the level of consent and what the discussion was about. • When this Task Force pushes something to the task force to push to the commission we want to let them know whether there was a consensus or a 2/3 majority. • Clarity on majority is needed: do we take 2/3 of voting members or members present? • We need a list of members for voting Task Force members. • The Task Force decided to consider 2/3 of voting members present. • Concern: when a voting member doesn’t come to the meeting and will be voting without the participation in the meeting when the discussion occurred. • Minutes of this group are distributed and that should be enough • Members that not engaged vs. those who are-separate issue <p>Don Quick motioned that “in order to have a recommendation it would be 2/3 vote or consensus of the people present at the time of the vote. Also, members can vote by proxy”. Meg Williams and Charles Garcia seconded.</p> <p>Procedural item to add - if the group decides and you as a voting member were not present at the time; you are going with the group. Allow phone participation, sending proxy. All members voted in favor.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Next Meetings</p>	<p>No Juvenile Task Force meeting scheduled in July. August meeting – Regina will work with Ken to schedule the meeting.</p> <p><i>Next Work Group Meeting Dates:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Work Group Meeting – June 30, 9:00 am, 710 Kipling St, conference room #308 • Judicial - June 30, 1:00 pm, 710 Kipling St, conference room #308 • Assessments- July 14, 9:00 am, Jeffco JAC

Meeting ended at 11:43 am.