

Juvenile Justice Task Force

Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

June 7, 2013 - 1:00 pm-3:00 pm

JAC Center, Lakewood, CO

Attendees:

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
 Kelly Friesen, SB94, 14th JD/Grand Co. J.J. Dept
 Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
 John Gomez, Division of Youth Corrections
 Ann Gail Meinster, 1st Judicial District Court
 Norene Simpson, Indigent Defense Counsel
 Michelle Brinegar, 8th District Attorney’s Office
 Robert Werthwen for Julie Krow, Department of Human Services
 Jeff McDonald, Jefferson County JAC
 Linda Newell, Co. State Senate
 Hal Sargent, CDAC, DA 1st JD
 Susan Colling, State Court Administrators, Probation Services
 Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
 Hollie Wilkinson for Debbie Rose, Juvenile Parole Board
 Eric Chaney for Kim Dvorchak, CJDC

Staff:

Ken Plotz, Consultant
 Anastasiya Schomaker, Division of Criminal Justice

Task Force Members Absent:

Bonnie Saltzman, JJDP Council Representative
 Beth McCann, Co. House of Representative
 Charles Garcia, Community at Large
 Karen Ashby, Denver Juvenile Court
 Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health Office
 Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners

Guests:

Lou Griffith, Juvenile Parole Board
 Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice
 Kelly Kissell, Division of Criminal Justice
 Landon Gates, COVA
 Roberta Robinette, COVA
 Claudia Zundel, CDHS

Issue/Topic:	Regi Huerter welcomed the group. Members and guests introduced themselves.
Welcome and Introductions	Regi Huerter moved the minutes to be approved as amended with the addition of Dana Wilks from the Division of Probation attending the JJTF meeting. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.
Approval of Minutes	Hal Sargent was welcomed as a new Juvenile Task Force member representing CDAC.
New Member Introduction	The group discussed the strategy for legislative changes for 2014 session: - Should we have an ad hoc legislative coordinating group? - What will be the communication strategy to various stakeholders? There should be a common message with fact sheet.
Working Group Members and Procedure Discussion	- It was suggested that the JJTF present its recommendations regarding the civil adjustment system and changes to the Children’s Code to legislature in November-December 2013 with the idea that legislation would be introduced in the 2014 session.
Issue/Topic:	<u>Jeff McDonald reported on the Assessment working group work:</u>
Reports from Working groups	The Colorado Reference Guide manual is in its final form and will not be accepting any new tools.
	The next steps for the working group will be to review the best practice tools starting

	<p>with the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) and the Child and Adolescent Service Intensity Instrument (CASII) and identify overlaps. The goal is to create a menu of best practices tools which will include when and how to use those screens appropriately.</p> <p>The group will explain how the screening and assessment tools can be used to address the Civil Adjustment process by developing protocols. When is it appropriate to screen, how to prevent the over assessing and over screening, and when to refer to civil adjustment?</p> <p><u>Susan Colling provided an update on the Services Working Group.</u></p> <p>The group discussed the different variations of an envisioned system of care and a Care management entity (system navigator).</p> <p>What are the different funding strings and how to align the different resources with difference services?</p> <p>The Children’s Code will be examined to identify services and define treatment.</p> <p>What are the essential functions envisioned in a reformed service system?</p> <p>Claudia Zundel presented on the efforts undertaken by the CDHS in Colorado Springs and provided an example of how family advocates would function.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify who is responsible for overseeing the children who doesn’t need services, especially when there is a victim question was discussed. - The CDHS is asking if there is a group already examining H.B. 1451 initiatives set up? Is H.B. 1451 fully effective? There is a separate issue of accountability. CDHS will be looking at H.B. 1451 this summer to evaluate what systems work best. Kelly Friesen encouraged separating the goals of H.B. 1451 and the goals of the agencies when the evaluation is done. - The Statutes and funding mechanisms will be discussed. - The checks and balances issue was brought up as well as the need for an entity (name of such entity has not been determined yet) that would track the children. <p><u>Jeff McDonald reported on Justice System Working Group</u></p> <p>A diagram of a civil adjustment system developed by the Working Group was presented and discussed.</p> <p>The group intends to look at Children’s Code and overlay the Children’s Code on the</p>
--	---

	<p>proposed reformed juvenile justice system. The obligations of the District Attorneys as charging authorities and the victims’ perspectives will be factored in the system. Developmental issues and misconduct will be discussed and the accountability piece will be included.</p> <p>With the reformed system, when a triggering event occurs, a formal response and an informal system response will take place. A “non-criminal track” will be developed.</p>
<p>Group discussions</p>	<p>There are similar processes currently in place for juveniles in some jurisdictions, but it is not consistent across jurisdictions and municipalities. In some jurisdictions there are programs that divert kids prior to filing, but in some others the diversion process occurs after a petition is filed. Often law enforcement officers have complete discretion on how to handle juveniles. There is no consistency across jurisdictions as to who gets diverted and who doesn’t. There are also M.O.R. concerns. It was suggested that a model should be developed for use statewide. The importance of an educational piece for police officers with the buy in from their leadership was discussed.</p> <p>What should be added to change the process significantly? The tools are already in place. As previously noted, pre-diversion, pre-filing programs are in place in some jurisdictions. There is a shortfall in the pre-diversion programs that if juveniles are in DHS custody and don’t have a family, they are excluded from pre-diversion program. There is no formal data from CDAC or formal push of handling pre-filing cases; the statute provides for pre-filing but it is at the jurisdictions’ discretion to handle it how they see it fit. It was commented that there was a trend to follow diverting processes. The diverting process already exists, but it may require a more specific and detailed education to the jurisdictions that don’t use diversion and, a better definition in the statutes.</p> <p>It was commented that appropriate legislation might be the only solution. The group discussed the possibility of a program for low-level offenders where there would be no participation from the district attorney except to set policy as part of a screening group.</p> <p>Most judicial districts are willing to participate to juvenile diversion but 13 JD lost funding. For fully funded districts, there are processes in place. In Colorado, 19 programs in 15 Judicial District are funded through OAJJA for juvenile diversion.</p> <p>It was suggested that there be a practice in place to educate and encourage judicial districts to adopt diverting processes and support those who already have a successful process in place. We need to decide who will do this. (Possible agenda item for August meeting).</p> <p>Systemic and funding go together with the data. S.B.94 is a national best practice model. A more balanced approach respecting innovation. S.B.94 is successful as coordinators are in constant info sharing mode.</p>

	<p>Other issues discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Point of no return- no DA involvement. - Should the cause of the juveniles entering the system be explored? - Repeat offenders, screening and assessment need- family advocates to be connected. - Common points in the system if we could put together the loose ends get tied up together. <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Looking at statutes and where things lay. - Better definitions on pre-file.
<p>Issue/Topic</p> <p>Membership working groups</p>	<p>Work group roster</p> <p>Any voting member of this Task Force can be a member of any committee.</p> <p>Recommendations of additional members of the working groups were discussed.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Feedback and comments from Task Force members</p>	<p>Kelly Friesen and the Task Force thanked Regi Huerter for her leadership serving as a chair and leading this group’s efforts.</p> <p>Kelly Friesen is the new chair of the Task Force.</p> <p>Next working groups’ meeting dates were announced: Assessments Work Group June 25, 9:30 am Services Work Group, June 25, 11:30 am Judicial Work Group, June 24, 10:30 all in Jeffco JAC</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next meeting</p>	<p>July 5 meeting is cancelled, but working groups will be meeting. Next meeting is on August 2 at 1:00 p.m. at the Juvenile Assessment Center. Meeting adjourned at 3:54 pm.</p>