

Juvenile Justice Task Force

October 20, 2011 - 9:00 am-12:00 pm
JAC Center, Lakewood, CO

Attendees:

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
 Karen Ashby, Juvenile Court Presiding Judge
 Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
 Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health
 Jeff MacDonald, Jefferson County JAC
 John Gomez, Division of Youth Corrections
 Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
 Susan Colling, State Court Administrators Office
 Charles Garcia, Juvenile Parole Board
 Kim Dvorchak, Co. Juvenile Defender Coalition
 Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners
 Don Quick, 17th District Attorney's Office
 Bonnie Saltzman, JJDP Representative
 Julie Krow, Department of Human Services
 Beth McCann, House of Representative
 Michelle Brinegar, 8th District Attorney's Office

Staff

Ken Plotz, Task Force Consultant
 Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice

Task Force Members Absent:

Norene Simpson, Indigent Defense Counsel
 Linda Newell, State Senate
 Inta Morris, Department of Higher Education
 Ellen Roberts, State Senate
 Regis Groff, Retired State Senator
 Kirk Henwood, Montrose County SD RE-1J

Guests:

Anna Lopez – Division of Criminal Justice
 Jerry Adamek – FNF Association
 Ed Thomas - Colorado State Parole Board
 Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation

Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions	Regina Huerter welcomed the group. The task force members and guests introduced themselves.
Issue/Topic: Revision of the Guiding principles of the Juvenile Task Force	<p>The group proposed to change the order of the structure of the Guiding Principle document: 1. Outcome, 2. Structural, 3. Services</p> <p>1. <u>Structural</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # 1 - <i>"Citizens and decision makers should be educated on the value of investing in prevention as a means of saving money later through improved outcomes for children, and their families"</i>. <p><u>Discussions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define "Decision Maker, policy-makers and funders". - Add language on "Prevention and preventing entry into the system". - Add language to include "Early intervention".

- Change “Cost saving” to include the notion of “Effective impact and cost effective”. Improve outcome for children and families which would ultimately be cost effective. Notion of cost saving should be an outcome rather than a goal.
- Use of Colorado and other State Evidence based practice data
Julie Krow is working with the Colorado foundation to collect data related to return on investment. Research data support that early prevention generates cost saving.
- Kim Dvorchak suggested adding an item regarding the professional development of defense counsel in youth representation. The group discussed and argued that professional developments should include all professionals involved in juvenile justice.

Proposed Language: #1 – *“The general public, Public policy makers and funders should understand the value of investing in prevention and early intervention services to improve outcomes for children and families. These front end (prevention/early intervention) services should be designed to be cost effective and equitable for all youth.”*

- **#2.** *“Services are delivered through an outcome orientation that incorporates shared accountability, process, evidence-based principles, practices, and innovation”.*

Discussions:

Add a notion of collaboration and coordinated system of care - Systems should take responsibility and collaboratively work together.

- **#3.** *“Evaluation of service implementation is critical to developing a learning community and ensuring effective use of resources”.*

Discussions: Delete “developing Learning community and”

- **#4.** *“The Colorado Children’s Code should ensure that children have the appropriate structure, support, and safety to become healthy adults”.*

Discussions:

Add “Youth and families” after “children”.

This will be revised to address the notion of maintaining community safety, developing support and services to safety, permanency and child well being and ensuring best outcomes possible for the child.

- **#5.** *“Good decisions require access to information and training in the use of that information. Information should be accessed at the earliest time in the process and throughout the process”.*

Discussions:

Add “Appropriate” before “information”. Meg Williams reported the use of an Information Sharing Agreement in which the term “Appropriate” is defined. Families are often concerned about the type of information shared and the agreement addresses these concerns.

- **#6.** *“Aligned, blended, and braided funding is essential to optimal service delivery”.*

Discussions:

Replace “Aligned, blended and braided” by “Effective and coordinated”.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #8. Add an item <p><u>Discussions:</u> Proposed Language: <i>“To address and infrastructure that supports and effective and constitutional Judicial system”.</i></p> <p><u>Other discussions on Structural:</u> - Add an item relating to the collateral consequences of Juvenile Justice system. Juvenile system is not adversarial process that the adult system. - Add a Minority Overrepresentation item to Structural (duplicate #12 MOR in the Outcome).</p> <p>2. SERVICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #8 – <i>“Whenever possible Evidence-based, evidence-informed services, and best practices standards should be used to address the specific needs of children”.</i> <p><u>Discussions:</u> Remove ‘Whenever possible’ and start with Evidence-based. Add “youth and families” after “children”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #9 - –<i>“Effective, equitable, and expedited processes and service delivery ensure”:</i> <p><u>Discussions:</u> Start with “Provision of” before “effective, equitable”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Delete language starting at “regardless”. f. Change from ‘least amount’ to ‘Appropriate’ amount. Change from ‘Earliest point’ to ‘Point of System entry’ g. local/state and community (non-profit) services to be included to the juvenile system. <p>3. OUTCOME</p> <p>The group suggested moving “Outcome” as first bullet point before “Structural” and then “Services”.</p> <p><u>Discussions:</u> Add an item relating to the professional standard working with juveniles and equal to other systems.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Presentation concerning the interaction between CDHS and County Departments</p>	<p>Presentation from Julie Krow, Director, Office of Children and Youth Families.</p> <p>The vision of the CDHS is to align all systems including Child Welfare, Division of Youth Corrections or Behavior Health services and work together to adopt one system with the goal of permanency of care and uniform data reporting. There will be use of permanency round tables inviting youth, families and professionals involved to define permanency plans, treatments etc. – Data show that the Child Welfare system is not achieving permanent placement of children. Annie E. Casey, foundation is working with the State to assist with Child Welfare, Juvenile justice and fiscal reform.</p>

	<p>Ms. Krow indicated that she was a member of the Governor’s Behavioral Transformation Council and is working on the alignment of system care and proposed to present on the initiatives at a future JJTF meeting.</p> <p>There are 64 counties in the State of Colorado and each county administers own model of services. The CDHS is implementing a score system, - the Colorado Practice Model (CPM) – that will measure the performance of county services and enhance collaboration of services between counties and state.</p> <p>The CDHS is also working on reforming the Colorado Child welfare Training academy and developing a distance learning training.</p> <p><u>Discussions:</u> Regi Huerter suggested that Ms. Krow present on the values and principles so the JJTF could also align on the CDHS initiatives and work on developing a practice model.</p> <p>Meg Williams discussed the “Beyond the Control of parents” population and the issue of possible pending legislation that could result in a lack of adequate systems for this population. Julie Krow responded that she will further research on this issue.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Update on Assessment Working Group</p>	<p>Jeff MacDonald reported that the Assessment Working Group has met four times to date and added the group was lacking representation from Child Welfare services. Mr. MacDonald enumerated the multiple resources used to define risk assessments for children. These resources have now been consolidated and placed in a flash drive.</p> <p>The group continues to work on revising the Colorado Reference Guide Juvenile Screening and Assessment Instrument (JSAG) and will provide an update at the JJTF meeting in December 2011.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Update on the Prevention Workgroup of the Drug Policy Taskforce regarding Juvenile assessment centers and Diversion programs</p>	<p>Regi Huerter handed out a draft document including the recommendations from the Prevention workgroup that related to Juvenile Assessment Centers and Diversion programs.</p> <p>Ms. Huerter indicated that she will propose a collaborative work with the other CCCJJ Task Force chairs to prevent duplicated initiatives.</p> <p>The group discussed the initiatives presented by the Prevention workgroup of the Drug Policy Task Force and supported the concept of funds resulting from cost saving being invested and integrated to the work done by the Juvenile Task Force.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Next meeting</p>	<p>Next meeting is on November 17, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Juvenile Assessment Center.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 12:26 pm.</p>