

North Carolina's Juvenile Reentry Reform Task Force

MEETING MINUTES MARCH 13, 2015

OPENING

The initial meeting of North Carolina's Juvenile Reentry Reform Task Force was called to order at 9:30am on March 13, 2015 at 3010 Hammond Business Place, Room 144, Raleigh, NC 27603 by Billy Lassiter, Deputy Commissioner for Juvenile Justice.

PRESENT

Task Force Members : Sonya Brown, Antonio Gardner, Dave Hardesty, Buddy Howell, Representative Pat Hurley, Anne Marie Iselin, Billy Lassiter, James Lott, Ben Matthews, Judge Marcia Morey, Mary Murray, Martin Pharr, Cindy Porterfield, Mike Rieder, Nicole Sullivan, Dale Yarborough

Other Attendees/Guests: Catherine Anderson, Venecia Carr, Duane Cogdell, Debbie Dawes, Tamara Flinchum, Megan Howell, Kim Howes, Anthony Jones, Susan Katzenelson, Diana Kees, Peggy Nicholson, Ken Perry, Garrietta Proutey, Elizabeth Seigle, Julie Singer, Jean Steinberg, Angela Taylor, Rob Thompson, Cynthia Trickel, Eric Zogry

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

N/A

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

N/A

OPEN ISSUES

First meeting, N/A.

NEW BUSINESS

At this initial meeting, all attendees were introduced and then the overall goals of the project were presented. The roles and responsibilities of the task force members were explained.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

At the next meeting, we will be having each subgroup present their progress so far on the issues and challenges related to their group and how they are working on addressing them.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm by Billy Lassiter. The next general meeting will be held on April 24, 2015, at 1201 Front St., Governor's Crime Commission First Floor Conference Room, Raleigh, NC 27603.

Minutes submitted by: Julie Singer

Approved by: _____

SUBGROUP MEETING MINUTES

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PLAN SUBGROUP

Date and time of meeting:

March 13, 2015, 12:00-12:30pm, 3010 Hammond Business Place, Room 144A

Attendees

- Dave Hardesty, Director of Juvenile Facilities, Dept. of Adult Correction & Juvenile Justice
- Kim Howes, Assistant Juvenile Defender, Office of the Juvenile Offender
- Paulette Pearce, Juvenile Court Services, Dept. of Adult Correction & Juvenile Justice
- Mike Rieder, Director, Juvenile Court Services, Dept. of Adult Correction & Juvenile Justice
- Elizabeth Seigle, Council of State Governments, National Reentry Resource Center
- Jean Steinberg, Duke University
- Eric Zogry, Office of the Juvenile Defender, Administrative Office of the Courts

Absent

- James C. “Buddy” Howell, Juvenile Justice Consultant
- The Honorable Marcia H. Morey, Chief District Court Judge of the 14th Judicial District

Summary

Introduction included a review and evaluation of the key (guiding) questions:

- Where is DACJJ (*Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice*) now in this work?
- Based on best practice (core principles), where are the short-term and long-term opportunities for change?
- What are the challenges and barriers to implementing these changes?
- What are the key tasks necessary to make these changes?
- What are the key resources and supports necessary to make these changes?
- Who will lead these change efforts?
- How will you know these changes have taken place?
- What is the timeline for addressing these changes?

Main points discussed

Q: Where is JJ I the process of developing a comprehensive service plan?

- Juvenile Court Services has already begun to develop a Comprehensive Service Plan (CSP). It is in a pilot phase with juvenile court counselors, and conversations with Facility Operations have begun. The CSP is being piloted in Districts 3, 15, 21 and 30, as well as some other districts in the central area that have specialized caseloads requiring intensive services for high risk youth.
- The CSP is based upon seven domains
 - Safety
 - Personal Accountability
 - Family Functioning
 - Health
 - Education/Vocation
 - Social Competency
 - Support Network
- The plan will begin development at intake, and continue to be developed and refined as new information is obtained, and as needs or circumstances change.

- A comprehensive service plan that is well developed in the beginning serves as a foundation to maintain the necessary services in a timely fashion in a way that remain responsive to emerging and changing needs and holds all stakeholders accountable.
- The plan will function as a case management tool to guide access to an appropriate continuum of care.
- The CSP will follow the juvenile throughout his or her involvement with Juvenile Justice, whether it be in the community or a facility
- Implement motivational interviewing with fidelity assurance procedures for court counselors prior to full roll-out of the service plan in court services.

Q: Will the court counselor always own the comprehensive plan?

R: The TEAM owns it, but the court counselor will follow the youth through to post reentry.

Clarification of court counselor role

- Coordinator, case manager, shepherd
- The level of services and the amount of court counselor time spent on cases should be commensurate with the degree of risk and need.
- Each court counselor builds a one-on-one relationship with individual youth and their families. It is beneficial to maintain that relationship while a juvenile is in a YDC (Youth Development Center).
- As staffing plans are developed, this (1:1) level of effort must be acknowledged

Q: Is there a standard case load?

R: National Standards for juvenile set 30 as an appropriate case load. There is great variability across the country concerning the role of court counselors. In North Carolina and in other jurisdiction there are a number of supervision levels. The strategy of relying solely on supervision to address the challenges of high risk and high need juveniles is not effective. Supervision is necessary, but not sufficient. The goal is to have the dosage (intensity) and duration of services coincide with the risk and needs of the juvenile. 20% of our juveniles are high risk and/or high need. Less than 3% are officially on intensive supervision. Of the approximately 30,000 complaints received for 15,000 juveniles at intake each year 13% are closed, x% are diverted and x % are referred to court.

FY 13-14 Intakes, Juveniles, Complaints

Complaint Count	Decision
19565	Approved
4159	Closed
3384	Diverted and Retained with a Contract
4498	Diverted and Retained with No Contract
765	Curtailed
5	DATA ISSUES
32376	

	Intakes	Juveniles	Complaints
60.43%	19564	15140	32376
12.85%	60.43%	46.76%	
10.45%		1.2922061	
13.89%			
2.36%			

Q: Is there a grid or structure in place to provide guidelines to determine youth to court counselor ratio?

R: The determination is left up to the chief court counselor; intensive supervision case management is used in only 2½ percent of the cases. Twenty percent of the cases are high risks/high needs.

- We are currently working to restructure our policies and procedures to support the provision of the right dosage of service to address the risk and needs of the juveniles we serve.
- A part of the training plan for Court Counselors will focus on case management skills, including wraparound services for properly serving the high risk/high need juveniles.

Q: What is the status of evaluation of services that are available? How does each county address what service(s) is available within that respective county? Is there a service matrix, or other tool available to the court counselors?

R: The court counselors are generally aware of what is available in their county. They are made aware of what services qualify as Evidence Based Programs and are encouraged to make referrals to those programs if they target the needs of their juveniles.

- Within the Community Programs Section, programs funded by JCPC funds are measured against the SPEP system and also report outcomes through the NC Allies data system. All JCPC (*Juvenile Crime Prevention Council*)-funded programs are listed for juvenile court defenders and juvenile court counselors to share.
- The Comprehensive Service Plan has standardized goals within each domain. When fully implemented, each service provider will have to report measurable outcomes that address the goals upon which the referral was made.

The youth in Youth Development Centers already feel “un-plugged”

- We must find means to get those youth more “plugged in”, especially to their court counselor. As a part of the reworking the policies and procedures for supervision will include increasing the ability of our Court Counselors to stay engaged with the youth and their families during commitment status as well as Post Release Supervision.
- We are also exploring having some of the monthly service planning meetings in the community as a means to encourage school and other community agencies to remain engaged with the juvenile, and to extent possible to continue serving the family
- Court counselors often provide transportation to the YDCs for families to visit with their sons or daughters.

Q: What factors will impact the length of stay?

A: Generally it is progress toward goals for the client. A definite term of commitment is provided for in statutes under limited circumstances and occurs very infrequently.

Q: Determinate sentencing does not exist in North Carolina, so what is the reasoning behind a six-month stay at a Youth Development Center?

R: The six-month duration is addressed in a statute, but it can be handled in a multitude of settings; the statute does not mandate the six months be confinement in a Youth Development Center.

- Treatment versus due process
- The statute has not been reviewed in 15 years
- Judges lean more toward sanctions, than toward treatment(s)
- Sometimes, there is a disconnect: we must have buy-in from all parties
- Bring prosecutors on-board on the front end of the process, so that their mindset is that of developmental versus punishment, treatment versus sanctions

Q: Is the Reentry Task Force responsible for making code-change (NCGS) recommendations?

A: We can certainly identify needed code changes that would support improving the reentry process.

TO DO: Eric Zogry will address the prosecutor concerns; prosecutors would welcome inclusion.

Suggestion: Let us consider inviting Professor Latoya B. Powell to participate in the subgroup meetings and discussions. (*Assistant Professor of Public Law and Government, UNC School of Government*)

Elizabeth Seigle shared with the subcommittee, a template which could be adapted to develop the subcommittee's process and goals (distributed to subgroup facilitators).

Discussion on hold: 90-day post-release supervision is statute (include Judge Morey and Buddy Howell in the 90-day post-release supervision discussion).

Suggestion: A family member of a youth formerly or currently in the juvenile justice system may be a useful resource to serve on one of the sub-committees.

- This suggestion can be explored. Family engagement.

Revisit the issue of juvenile court counselor training. They must be aware of all the resources available to them. Training must be:

- Formal
- Ongoing
- Focused on Strategic Goals

PDI (Pre-dispositional Investigation)

- No rules on delivery, other than the judge does not see it until the adjudication
- It is not mandated by statute
- It varies between jurisdictions

Observation regarding the pre-dispositional investigation: Juvenile Justice needs a standardized means of collection.

Template of services available, based upon Risks and Needs, and includes outcome measures and accountability.

Electronic monitoring may be a solution to the confinement issue.

Jean Steinberg referenced NIRN (National Implementation Research Network), Chapel Hill, with regard to implementing a service plan.

Q: Has Juvenile Justice developed a template of what benchmarks constitute a good service plan?

A: Yes.

Next steps and next meetings

The Comprehensive Service Plan subgroup of the Reentry Task Force agrees to meet, in person; but reserves the option of calling in for any member who is unable to participate in person.

The next subgroup meeting is scheduled.

- Date: Friday, April 10, 2015
- Time: 9:00-10:30AM
- Location: Hammond Business Place, CR 144A-144B

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT SUBGROUP

Date and time of meeting

March 13, 2015, 12:00-12:30pm, 3010 Hammond Business Place Room 203

Attendees

- Cindy Porterfield, DACJJ, Facilitator
- William Lassiter, DACJJ
- Angela Taylor, DACJJ
- Sonya Brown (DHHS)
- Antonio Gardner, Johari Family Services
- Mary Murray, Henderson County JCPC Chair
- Ken Perry, Methodist Home for Children
- Debbie Dawes, RTI

Absent

None

Summary

Cindy Porterfield gave opening remarks, and asked the subgroup members to introduce themselves. After introductions, Ms. Porterfield reviewed the discussion questions to be addressed by the subgroup:

1. What are some of the barriers to family engagement?
2. What advantages would come from DACJJ hosting a listening session? What other ways can DACJJ gather information to learn about family engagement?

3. What advantages might result from educational sessions for parents in various areas, such as juvenile rights, responsibilities, and expectations?
4. What are some strategies to effectively engage parents of deep-end juvenile justice system youth?

Ms. Porterfield opened a discussion about meeting logistics, including the structure/leadership of each meeting, meeting times, and location. Teleconference resources (1-866-434-5269, participant code 9387129, host code 7329) are available to ease the burden of travel to Raleigh. The subgroup members agreed that it would be beneficial to meet more than once per month, at least initially, and to convene meetings on the same day the Task Force meets.

Main points discussed

Subgroup members suggested expanding the group to include individuals with expertise specific to family engagement, including Sadric Bonner (UNC-Greensboro Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships), Teneisha Towe (Methodist Home for Children), Sharon Glover (Alliance Behavioral Health, Cumberland County), a representative from North Carolina Families United, and a juvenile court counselor.

Subgroup members discussed engaging families in the work of the subgroup, including family members with experience with youth development centers or hosting focus groups with families. A number of potential barriers were discussed. Some members expressed concern about the time burden to family members of participating in the subcommittee; others were sensitive to possible privacy concerns of family members. Subgroup members agreed to continue to think of families to involve in the subgroup's work.

Subgroup members also acknowledged possible barriers with respect to engaging families in the process of reentry. Some commented that even if agencies involve parents, perhaps parents do not feel involved or heard. Others noted that when working with families, agency staff may prioritize what is convenient for them rather than what is convenient for families (e.g., setting meetings during business hours rather than after work), and may use language (e.g., mental health terminology) with parents that is difficult to understand. Also noted was the need to consider how system of care dovetails with efforts to engage families so that families are not overwhelmed; it will be important for agencies to coordinate and develop a common protocol for working with youth and families.

Next subgroup meeting: April 14th, 10am to 12pm

Next steps and next meetings

The 30-minute meeting came to a close with the subgroup members agreeing to meet on April 14th from 10am to 12pm. Ms. Dawes agreed to reserve a toll-free conference line for the meeting. Given that DACJJ's proposal for implementation funds is due to OJJDP in July, Ms. Porterfield asked subgroup members to focus on the short-term goal of developing recommendations to be presented and discussed by the Task Force at its next meeting on April 24th. Subgroup members were asked to be prepared to discuss their ideas during the teleconference on April 14th.

WORKFORCE/EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES SUBGROUP

Date and time of meeting

March 13, 2015, 12:00-12:30pm, 3010 Hammond Business Place, Room 144B

Attendees

- Dr. Martin Pharr, Director of Juvenile Treatment and Intervention Services [Facilitator]
- Ms. Dale Floyd, Juvenile Health Services Manager
- Ms. Cindy Trickel, Director of Exceptional Children's Programs and Student Support Services
- Mr. Duane Cogdell, Transition Services Coordinator
- Ms. Venecia Carr, Compliance and Quality Assurance Manager [Note taker], Department of Public Safety – Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice
- Representative Pat B. Hurley, Joint Caucus Leader 2015-2016 Session Republican – District 70
- Mr. James Lott, Director, Fayetteville Workforce Development Board
- Ms. Peggy Nichols, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
- Mr. Dale Yarborough, Field Supervisor, Department of Commerce
- Mr. Will Jones, Chief of Programs, Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. – North Carolina

Absent

- Dr. Ben Matthews, Director of Safe and Healthy Schools Support, Department of Public Instruction
- Ms. Pat E. Sturdivant, Executive Director, Capital Area Workforce Development
- Ms. Kathryn P. Castellones, Bureau Chief, Department of Commerce
- Ms. Nicole Sullivan, Director of Rehabilitative Programs and Services, Department of Public Safety – Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Summary

Dr. Martin Pharr welcomed everyone to the subgroup committee and began with introductions. He noted that his current title is Director of Treatment and Intervention Services as that he manages the Juvenile Justice Education Section. Members of the subgroup introduced themselves, after which Dr. Pharr discussed the goals of education and vocational services.

Main points discussed

- Prior to the building of new facilities, there was vocational training on-site for juveniles; however, due to moving to smaller facilities the Department was unable to sustain many of its vocational training programs.
- Presently, Career and Technical Education opportunities available at Dobbs include Culinary Arts and Hospitality, Automotive Service, and Horticulture. These services are provided in partnership with Lenoir Community College.

- There is a robust CTE program consisting of an Aquaponics site at Stonewall Jackson in collaboration with a business located in Charlotte, 100 Gardens and Rowan-Cabarrus Community College, which also serves as a GED partner.
- Youth Development Center (YDC) youth returning to public schools are met with challenges. Local school systems' policies and/or procedures often require youth returning from an out-of-home placement to enroll in an alternative school. We encourage the continuation of the Child and Family Team model during the school re-entry process. This allows input from stakeholders (e.g. parents, school staff, and juvenile justice staff) concerning the most appropriate placement.
- Juvenile Detention is short-term and educational services are ongoing. In addition, the Department has short-term residential services offered by WestCare, Eckerd, and Methodist Home for Children. The community-based residential services have transition issues as well as our secure facilities.
- It is a challenge to track the educational progress of a youth once he/she has been admitted to a short-term residential service or released from a YDC. The Power School database used to monitor and track educational information is maintained externally. Therefore, once a youth is released from a YDC juvenile justice loses access to the data.
- The JJ Strategic Plan includes the expansion and re-opening of youth development centers that will not have vocational teachers and space associated with larger facilities. Strong community partnerships are needed to help provide vocational training opportunities for older youth in these centers. We need to talk about how to prepare youth for work, establish clear pathways and provide support.
- Transition issues are myriad. Transition efforts need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. There are occasions wherein it may not be in a youth's best interest to return to their local community or other extenuating circumstances may support placement in another area/community. Ensuring that these youth have opportunities for continuing education and workforce entry is essential.

Summary of Department Goals:

- Expand transition services funded by Title I
- Increase training on campuses and partnerships
- Track progress of youth released from YDC's for a minimum of 5 years
- Establish and maintain partnerships for off-site work sites and apprenticeships
- Develop strategies to access funds for stipends to incentivize and attract businesses
- Identify the activities, supports, goals, and resources necessary as these things could promote and increase the possibility for youth to become actively engaged in employment

Questions:

- 1) Does the scope of re-entry include any out-of-home placement? PRTF's?

Response:

Yes. Also, nuances of the 1998 Juvenile Reform Act gave the authority to the Department to conduct an assessment, e.g. substance abuse and PRTF's which sent youth back home on a commitment status. Chief Court Counselors and an array of support staff are in place should a youth err, then he/she can be picked up.

Next steps and next meetings

In summary, Dr. Pharr's overview established the platform for open dialogue about barriers for vocational services. He emphasized that youth released from a YDC are placed on post release supervision for a period of 3 months. A frequent condition of their post release is school enrollment and employment.

He acknowledged the weakest area for juvenile justice is re-entry and through the work of the subgroups, the Department wants to sustain the gains made thus far.

Ms. Floyd shared that health concerns are a major issue to consider when discussing youth employment. Many youth require dental treatment and vaccinations. In addition, support services are needed for caregivers to better understand why both physical and dental health is important for youth.

Dr. Pharr shared a recent publication titled "*Guiding Principles for Providing High Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings*" that captures best practices, many of which are already being implemented by the Department. He advised he would send the document to everyone to review in preparation for the next subgroup meeting.

A request was also made by Ms. Nichols to have the core questions of the group sent out along with a copy of the relevant printed materials distributed earlier to full task force committee.

Meeting options were discussed. Teleconferencing was recommended by Mr. Lott to provide those unable to attend face-to-face the opportunity to participate. The majority agreed a face-to-face meeting would work best. Members were encouraged to invite others who can give insightful thought to this enterprise to the next meeting. The subgroup agreed to hold a face-to-face meeting on the proposed date, time, and location noted below:

Date: Friday, April 17, 2015

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: Department of Public Safety – Hammond Business Place
(Conference room – TBD)

*Required

Materials: 1) “*Guiding Principles for Providing High Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings*”
2) Subgroup core questions and focus areas

DATA SUBGROUP

Date and time of meeting

March 13, 2015, 12:00-12:30pm, 3010 Hammond Business Place, Room 113

Attendees

- Megan Howell, DACJJ
- Julie Singer, DACJJ
- Anne Marie Iselin, UNC-Wilmington
- Tamara Flinchum, NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission
- Susan Katzenelson, NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission

Absent

None

Summary

This was the initial meeting of the data subgroup. Tamara and Susan agreed to join the subgroup. Some large picture goals of the subgroup were introduced along with some concerns regarding privacy, logistics, and implementation.

Main points discussed

1. **Juvenile indicators we are most worried about collecting:** Per OJJDP’s RFP, all juvenile data will need to be collected up to 5 years after they were out of juvenile justice care, but of particular concern are the measures of education and employment. North Carolina does not currently collect this information often. The subgroup discussed generally how best to collect this information as well as who should collect it – DACJJ? Research Triangle Institute (RTI)? If RTI trackers are able to find the juveniles up to 5 years out, where would this data be stored? Would we need an MOU with RTI to ensure no HIPAA or other privacy rights are violated? [Joel Rosch and Beth Gifford were mentioned in this discussion regarding the annual DPI (education) data they receive]
2. **Databases and real-time tracking:** A lofty, long-term goal is that one day NC-JOIN and OPUS can talk to each other so it is easier to track juveniles from the juvenile to adult system. We need a better way to enter data for real-time tracking so that reports to line staff can be delivered in real time. (John Matler, attorney, was mentioned in this discussion with regards to legal hurdles/guidance needed to start conceptualizing how

this would work).

3. **Definition of recidivism:** We are keeping the proposed definition in the RFP response that includes follow up periods 6, 12 and 24 months after program termination of complaint, arrest, adjudication, conviction.
4. **Risk and needs assessments:** We need to examine North Carolina's current risk and needs assessments – do they need tweaking? Should we consider other types of validated assessments that are better at documenting risks and needs? There are some concerns about the current assessments' cut off points for levels of risk and needs. Services recommended depend on these cut off points. The state should also re-evaluate risk and needs more often.

Next steps and next meetings

The data subgroup will select a time in two weeks to discuss the data subgroup tasks in more detail (this meeting has been scheduled for March 25th at 9:30am).