

Juvenile Justice Task Force

February 16, 2012 - 9:00 am-12:00 pm
JAC Center, Lakewood, CO

Attendees:

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
 Jeff MacDonald, Jefferson County JAC
 Charles Garcia, Juvenile Parole Board
 Bonnie Saltzman, JJDP Representative
 Norene Simpson, Indigent Defense Counsel
 Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
 Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners
 John Gomez, Division of Youth Corrections
 Kim Dvorchak, Co. Juvenile Defender Coalition
 Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
 Karen Ashby, Juvenile Court Presiding Judge
 Don Quick, 17th District Attorney's Office

Task Force Members Absent:

Linda Newell, State Senate
 Inta Morris, Department of Higher Education
 Regis Groff, Retired State Senator
 Beth McCann, House of Representative
 Kirk Henwood, Montrose County SD RE-1J
 Julie Krow, Department of Human Services
 Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health
 Susan Colling, State Court Administrators Office
 Michelle Brinegar, 8th District Attorney's Office

Guests:

Alison Boyd, 1st JD, Victim Witness Assistance Unit
 Jesse Hansen, Division of Criminal Justice, SOMB

Staff:

Ken Plotz, Consultant
 Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice

Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions	Regina Huerter welcomed the group. Judge Ashby moved for the approval of last month's minutes. Meg Williams seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.
Issue/Topic: Guiding Principles	The group finalized the Guiding Principles and decided to remove the "Outcomes" piece as included in "Structural" and "Services" pieces.
Issue/Topic: Juvenile Justice Jurisdiction	Ken Plotz presented a PowerPoint presentation on "Looking at the Big Picture: Juvenile Justice Jurisdiction". Discussions: There is disparity among jurisdictions in the way juvenile cases are handled (e.g. by county court or juvenile court) but there are a number of statutory reforms that emphasize the coordination and cooperation across court systems. Under the current system, the jurisdiction decision is often matter of best practice in that particular jurisdiction. The group agreed that an alignment between state court and municipal court systems is needed to address the disparity of practices. Assessment of youth. Should all youth be assessed? Should some assessments be handled at the

	<p>school level? Is there potential for broader use of deferred judgment and sentence?</p> <p>Diversion cannot be utilized in municipal court systems as the statute is written but youth in probation often include youth who should be in diversion. Is there an opportunity to create a different system?</p> <p>Ken Plotz suggested a system with minimum standards for municipal courts.</p> <p>Don Quick suggested including best practice recommendations and statutory changes.</p> <p>Kim Dvorchak reiterated that a comprehensive review of the Children’s Code should be undertaken before any possible changes.</p> <p>Regi Huerter concluded that the Guiding Principles should be used as a guideline for the review of the juvenile system.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: The Juvenile Sex Offender</p>	<p>The Juvenile Sex Offender: Do we want to address this issue and what is it that we want to address?</p> <p>Noreene Simpson presented the group with 2 cases (anecdotes) of children required to register as sex offenders and engaged the group into revising the issue. These cases illustrated the collateral consequences of such adjudication. Such consequences can last a lifetime and affect the ability to get into schools and get certain jobs.</p> <p>Bonnie Saltzman indicated that there is a bill in this current legislative session that proposes addressing juvenile sex misbehavior through schools’ discipline policy.</p> <p>Kim Dvorchak agreed that this group should take on the juvenile sex offender issue considering the difficulty for children to be removed from the sex offender registry and the lack of representation. Kim added that rules should apply for appropriate age.</p> <p>The group commented that there should be a recognition that treatments work differently between adults and juveniles.</p> <p>Jesse Hansen mentioned that the Office of Sex Offender Management proposed to provide staffing and research data should this group decide to undertake this issue. Jesse added that the SOMB is currently working on reviewing the juvenile standards to be completed by December 2012 as legislatively mandated.</p> <p>Allison Boyd mentioned that the SOMB has developed several standards specific for juveniles and that differed diversions are widely used. Allison indicated that 18-25 years old remained a high risk population.</p> <p>Judge Ashby reminded that, once juvenile sex offenders are assessed and evaluated, a recommendation is made to the court on whether or not a juvenile should register. Is there court discretion?</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Discussion of our priorities</p>	<p>Regi Huerter explained that the CCJJ will sunset in 2013 and with that in mind, Regi engaged a discussion on the priorities of this Task Force.</p> <p>The Education and Truancy working group will have several pieces as well as the Professionalism</p>

	<p>working group.</p> <p>Discussed priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of diversion to keep children out of juvenile justice systems. - Juvenile Justice System design. - Consistency among systems and resources – Realigning the systems. - Review of the children’s code - To determine diversion: when to assess, decision of intervention, decision of filing, who should have discretion? - Focus on structural changes - #5 of the Guiding Principles: Defining when is earliest time, who should access information, when should assessment occur, when should continuum start? Focus on divert. - Juvenile escape <p>Is Juvenile sex offender issue is too big in the timeframe?</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Legislative update and information session</p>	<p>Hand out of the legislative bills in this current legislative session and group discussions on the following bills:</p> <p>SB12-036 Parental Consent for Collection of Information from Students in Schools</p> <p>SB12-028 - Aggravated Juvenile Offenders</p> <p>SB12-046 Disciplinary Measures in Public Schools</p> <p>SB12-099: Expand Access Juvenile Model Facility. The group commented the model and concern of child welfare placed in detention settings. Bonnie Saltzman responded that some amendments to this bill are being discussed which would define the population of this facility to include only boys 14 years old and over, D&N and adjudicated cases.</p> <p>HB12 - 1271 Concerning Charging of Juveniles by Direct File</p> <p>HB12 -1139 Concerning Pretrial detention for direct file youth</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next meeting</p>	<p>Next meeting is on March 15, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. at the Juvenile Assessment Center.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 12pm.</p>