Kansas Juvenile Justice Workgroup
Charge to the Workgroup

“In developing proposals for reform, the group’s priorities will be to:

• Promote public safety and hold juvenile offenders accountable
• Control taxpayer costs
• Improve outcomes for youth, families, and communities in Kansas.

The Workgroup’s recommendations will be used as the foundation for statutory, budgetary and administrative changes during the 2016 legislative session.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor Brownback</th>
<th>Senate President Wagle</th>
<th>Senate Minority Leader Hensley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Justice Nuss</td>
<td>House Speaker Merrick</td>
<td>House Minority Leader Burroughs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workgroup Process & Timeline

- **July-August**
  - Data Analysis
  - System Assessment

- **September**
  - Policy Development
  - Subgroups

- **October**
  - Subgroups
  - Policy Consensus

- **November**
  - Final Report

Stakeholder Engagement
# Stakeholder Roundtables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Intake (8/11)</td>
<td>• Court Services (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversion (8/11)</td>
<td>• JCF Staff (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Corrections (8/11)</td>
<td>• YRC Staff (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• JO and CINC youth (8/11)</td>
<td>• JO and CINC youth (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prosecutors (8/12)</td>
<td>• JDC Staff (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education (8/18)</td>
<td>• Youth Advocates (8/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Law Enforcement (8/18)</td>
<td>• Victims (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Judges (8/24, 25, 26, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Defense (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providers (8/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents/Families (TBD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kansas Juvenile Justice System Assessment Pt. 2
System assessment and data analysis sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Assessment Sources</th>
<th>Data Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews/Meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency and Court Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Juvenile Services Division, Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC)</td>
<td>▪ DCF Annual Reports, FY 2011-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Kansas Judicial Branch, Office of Judicial Administration (OJA)</td>
<td>▪ OJA Court Services Aggregate Data, FY 2004-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDADS)</td>
<td>▪ KDOC Client Level Data, FY 2004-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF)</td>
<td><strong>Surveys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Other Stakeholders: Workgroup Members, Prosecutors, Defense Attorneys, Law Enforcement, Chief Judges, and Education</td>
<td>▪ Chief Court Services Officers and Court Services Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 99 respondents from 64 counties and 23 judicial districts, including 14 Chief Court Service Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents Reviewed</strong></td>
<td>▪ Community Corrections Officers: Intensive Supervision Probation and Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ KDOC, KDADS, DCF, and OJA Documents</td>
<td>▪ 153 respondents from 83 counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Kansas Juvenile Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Kansas Code for Care of Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data analysis methodology

- Court Services data analysis based on OJA aggregate reports
  - Average length of supervision estimates based on standing population and new cases
  - Data does not distinguish CINC-NAN from CINC or JO misdemeanor from JO felony case types
- DCF data analysis based on annual reports
  - Focus on removals due to Child In Need of Care- Non Abuse and Neglect (CINC-NAN) truancy, runaway, and child behavior problem
  - Crossover youth data analysis pending
- KDOC data analysis examines ISP, Case Management, and JCF populations
  - Each section first breaks down youth trends based on the first placement on that KDOC case
  - For subsequent analyses, include all youth who have been on that form of supervision/placement during their KDOC supervision period
  - Show FY releases based on year the youth’s case was closed (not the year the youth exited that form of supervision/placement)
Juvenile Justice System Structure

Complaint through Disposition
Presentation 1

Post-Disposition Supervision
Presentation 2

KDOC Funded  DCF Funded  OJA Funded  Locally Funded
Overall Key Takeaways from Part 1

- **Decision-making:**
  - Decision-makers have some information to inform decisions but few guidelines and little specialized training
  - Opportunity for early intervention exists through intake referral to community-based services and immediate intervention programs
  - Funding is not aligned with control and accountability

- **Youth Flow:**
  - Consistent with national trends, Kansas has seen large declines in youth arrests of 52% over the past 10 years
  - Counties show wide variation in how youth flow into and through the system
  - JO filings decreased 42% while CINC filings increased 23% since 2004
  - On first disposition to KDOC, 38% of youth are placed out of home; 55% decline in youth placed out of home on first KDOC disposition since 2004
  - Declines in first disposition to ISP not as large as Case Management or JCF over the past 10 years
  - First disposition to ISP and Case Management are about 2/3 misdemeanors, while first disposition to JCF is nearly all felonies
  - For all disposition types, more than 90% of youth have 2 or fewer prior adjudications
Presentation Outline

- Youth Supervision and Costs
- Service Delivery to Kansas Youth
- Supervision of Youth in the Community
  - Court Services Supervision (JO/CINC and CINC-NAN)
  - Intensive Supervision Probation (JO)
- Removal of Youth from the Home
  - KDOC out of home standing population
  - Post-adjudication detention
  - Non-secure out of home placements:
    - Case Management (JO)
    - DCF Placement (CINC-NAN truancy, runaway and child behavior problem)
  - Juvenile Correctional Facility
Youth Supervision and Costs
Community vs. Residential Placement
Choice among CINC-NAN dispositions primarily guided by judicial discretion

* Not all counties use Court Services supervision for CINC-NAN cases
Choice among JO disposition options primarily guided by judicial discretion

*Conditions
- Community Based Program
- Counseling, education, mediation or other sessions, drug education
- Suspend or restrict driving privilege
- Charitable or community service
- Reparation or restitution
- House arrest
- Fine < $1,000
- Orders for the Family
No statutory criteria clearly define distinction between Court Services and intensive supervision probation (ISP)

The court may “place the juvenile on probation through court services or community corrections for a fixed period, subject to terms and conditions the court deems appropriate consistent with juvenile justice programs in the community”

**Court Services Probation**
- Funded by OJA
- Local oversight by Chief Court Services Officer (CCSO)
- Court Services Officer (CSO) supervises youth
- Supervise JO cases; some supervise CINC and CINC-NAN cases

**Community Corrections Probation (ISP)**
- Funded by KDOC
- Local oversight by Community Corrections Director
- Community Corrections Officer (CCO) supervises youth
- Supervise JO cases

May also provide pre-adjudication and pre-disposition supervision

KSA 38-2361:
Same types of facilities, and sometimes shared buildings, house youth on KDOC Case Management and in DCF custody.

YRCII, PRTF, Foster Care, Detention, Shelter Care
Out of home placement costs far exceed cost of community supervision

**Annual Cost Per Youth by Supervision Type, FY2014**

- Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP): $6,088.20
- WY County Pilot: $7,705.15
- MST: $8,084.75
- Case Management - Foster Care: $43,800.00
- Detention: $50,074.35
- Case Management - Out-of-Home: $88,954.15

**Cost of Court Services Probation Unknown**
More than 2/3 of KDOC Juvenile Services budget spent on out of home placements and JCF operations

KDOC Juvenile Services Budget, FY 2016

- Detention Center Grants, $850,000
- Detention Center Per Diem Payments, $2,296,000
- Out-Of-Home Placements, $23,057,000
- JCF Operations, $27,606,226
- Central Office Operations, $1,630,097
- Graduated Sanctions, $18,622,825
- Prevention, $1,761,049
- Evidenced-Based Programs, $500,000
- Title II Grants (federal), $484,100
- Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (federal), $25,000
- Title II Grants (federal), $484,100
- Evidenced-Based Programs, $500,000
- Prevention, $1,761,049
- Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (federal), $25,000
- Title II Grants (federal), $484,100
- Evidenced-Based Programs, $500,000
- Prevention, $1,761,049
Youth Supervision and Costs Key Takeaways

- **Decision-making:**
  - No statutory criteria distinguish Court Services Probation from ISP
  - Judge’s determination regarding which type of probation supervision to utilize for each youth is not guided by statute
  - The same types of non-secure facilities, and at times the same facilities, are used for CINC and JO youth placed out of home

- **Youth flow:**
  - The annual cost of case management for a youth is over 8x more than the annual cost of ISP
  - The majority of the KDOC budget is spent on out of home placements
    - Less than 1/4 is spent on community supervision

- **Other?**
Service Delivery to Youth
Access to services for Kansas youth nearly identical regardless of court involvement, type of supervision, or non-secure placement

**KDADS**
- Oversees 26 Community Mental Health Centers (CMHCs) throughout the state that provide mental health and substance abuse services
- Oversees PRTFs (Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities)
- State and Medicaid funded

**DCF**
- Family Services: connections to community resources
- Family Preservation: intensive in home therapeutic services
- State funded

**Private Providers**
- Substance abuse and mental health services
- Self-pay
- Some may accept Medicaid

*All may be accessed with or without court referral.

**Subsidized funding for some services may be dependent on court order.
The Youth Level of Services Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI) measures risk factors, criminogenic needs for JO youth.

**YLS-CMI Domains**

**Static Risk Factors**
- Prior and Current Offenses

**Dynamic Risk Factors**
- Peers
- Attitudes/Orientation
- Leisure/Recreation
- Personality/Behavior
- Substance Use
- Education
- Family

* Static risk factors: characteristics related to recidivism that cannot change

** Criminogenic needs: characteristics related to recidivism that can change
Service Delivery to Youth Key Takeaways

- **Decision-making:**
  - The YLS-CMI risk and needs assessment tool is intended to inform decisions regarding service delivery for JO youth by identifying criminogenic needs that can be addressed through services
  - Substance abuse services, mental health services, and family services can be accessed without court referrals or intervention
  - Subsidized funding for some services may be dependent on court order

- **Youth flow:**
  - Youth are referred to the same services in the community regardless of whether they are on community supervision or are in a non-secure placement through DCF custody or KDOC Case Management

- **Other?**
Post-Adjudication Community Supervision

Court Services and ISP
Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home

Supervision of Youth in the Community

Court Services
JOs and CINCs
Some statutory criteria guide decision-making by CSOs, but discretion remains broad

Probation Length
- Court sets term of supervision
- No cap on length of probation apart from age of jurisdiction
- No limit on number of extension requests or grants

Terms and Conditions
- Terms and conditions set by court order
- Assessments may be used but need not always be used

Incentives and Sanctions
- No statewide graduated incentives/sanctioning guide
- Survey: Fewer than half of CSOs reported using written guidelines to determine how to sanction youth

Modification or Termination of Probation
- Court hearing may be requested at any time to modify sentence
- Survey: CCSOs report that process for early termination is inconsistent across judicial districts
- Survey: Early termination generally not possible if financial obligations have not been fulfilled
Court Services
Surveys: Services Delivery
More than 3/4 of CSOs report that there are not enough services available to address youth needs appropriately.

There are enough services to meet the needs of youth on my Court Services probation caseload (N=85)

- Strongly disagree: 11%
- Disagree: 65%
- Agree: 23%
- Strongly agree: 1%
Nearly 3/4 of CSOs report that existing community-based services are too costly for youth to access.

The services available in the community for youth on my caseload are too costly for youth to access (N=85)

- Strongly agree: 14%
- Disagree: 25%
- Agree: 60%
- Strongly disagree: 1%

SURVEY NOTE: Chief CSOs report having no OJA funding for services. Funding from OJA is only for supervision.
60% of CSOs report long waitlists for access to existing community-based services.

The services available in the community for youth on my caseload are timely (no long waitlists) (N=85)

- Strongly agree: 1%
- Agree: 39%
- Disagree: 52%
- Strongly disagree: 8%
12% increase in CINC and CINC-NAN cases, 34% decrease in JO cases
Sedgwick, Shawnee and Wyandotte account for 86% of new CINC and CINC-NAN cases on Court Services supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties with New CINC and CINC-NAN Court Services Cases, FY 2014</th>
<th>Number of New CINC and CINC-NAN Cases FY 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38% decrease in JO, 9% decrease in CINC and CINC-NAN Court Services population

Court Services Year End Standing Population, FY 2004-2014

- JO Standing Population
- CINC and CINC-NAN Standing Population
CINC and CINC-NAN supervision 7 months longer than JO supervision on Court Services

Court Services Average Length of Supervision Estimate
FY 2004-2014

- JO ALOS Estimate
- CINC and CINC-NAN ALOS Estimate
17% of JO Court Services releases are revocations

Court Services JO Release Type
FY 2014

- Release, 2,313
- Other Revoke, 399
- Absconder, 80
- Compact Out, 14
- Revoke: doc/jja, 123
- Transfer Out, 105
Court Services Key Takeaways

- Decision-making:
  - No statutory guidance for judicial decisions on length of Court Services supervision
  - CSOs have broad discretion in supervision practices
  - Criteria for termination of supervision varies by district
  - Termination requires meeting multiple conditions and approval from multiple parties
  - Limited services available to meet the needs of Court Services youth

- Youth Flow:
  - CINC and CINC-NAN youth are supervised 7 months longer than JO youth on Court Services
  - 17% of JO youth released from Court Services supervision are revoked to ISP, detention, or KDOC custody

- Other?
Intensive Supervision Probation

- Court Services
- ISP
- JDC
- CM
- DCF Placement
- JCF

- Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home

- Supervision of Youth in the Community
Some statutory criteria and KDOC standards guide decision-making by ISP officers, but discretion remains broad.

**Length of Probation**
- Court sets term of supervision
- No cap on length of probation apart from age of jurisdiction
- No limit on number of extension requests or grants

**Terms and Conditions**
- Terms and conditions set by court order
- KDOC: Six levels of supervision based on assessment of risk and need
- KDOC: Service referral based on assessment

**Incentives and Sanctions**
- No statewide graduated incentives/sanctioning guide
- Survey: Over 1/3 of ISP officers do not use written guidelines to inform sanctioning decisions for technical violations

**Modification or Termination of Probation**
- Hearing may be requested at any time to modify sentence
- Survey: CCOs reported that early termination only possible with sign-off from either the judge, or judge and prosecutor
- Survey: CCOs reported that early termination generally not possible if financial obligations have not been fulfilled
Out of home placement down 26% in Wyandotte County since launch of MST pilot for youth on ISP

Wyandotte County launched Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) pilot in September 2013

Source: KDOC data (custody includes: JCF, Detention Facility/Other, Foster Home, Home/Relative, “JJ FC”, AWOL, PRTF, YRCII, and “Not Reported ”)
Intensive Supervision Probation

Surveys: Service Delivery
60% of ISP Officers (CCOs) report that there are not enough services available to meet youth needs

There are enough services to meet the needs of youth on my ISP caseload  
(N=96)

- Strongly agree: 7%
- Agree: 33%
- Disagree: 54%
- Strongly disagree: 6%
61% of CCOs report that existing services in the community to youth on ISP are too costly for youth to access.

The services available in the community for youth on my ISP caseload are too costly for youth to access (N=119)

- Strongly agree: 12%
- Agree: 49%
- Disagree: 34%
- Strongly disagree: 5%
More than half the CCOs report no funding for services specifically for ISP youth.

**Does your office provide funding for services (other than supervision)? (N=119)**

- Yes, we have services funded specifically for ISP: 10%
- No, we make referrals to community-based services: 54%
- We have services funded specifically for ISP AND we make referrals to community-based services: 29%
- Other: 7%
59% of CCOs report that services available in the community for youth on ISP are not timely

The services available in the community for youth on my ISP caseload are timely (no long waitlists)
(N=119)

- Disagree: 47%
- Agree: 36%
- Strongly disagree: 12%
- Strongly agree: 5%
Intensive Supervision Probation

Data
2% increase in number of youth placed on ISP first, despite decline since 2011

ISP First Placement on KDOC Disposition
FY 2004-2014 Admissions
Large increase in proportion of KDOC youth placed on ISP

Proportion of KDOC Youth Placed on ISP
FY 2004-2014 Releases
16% of youth placed on ISP were on Case Management or JCF first

First KDOC Disposition for Youth Placed on ISP
FY 2014 Releases
N=972

- ISP: 84%
- Case Management: 15%
- JCF: 1%
40% of youth placed on ISP also go out of home

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP
FY 2014 Releases
N=972

ISP Only 60%
ISP and Out of Home Placement 40%
Youth placed on ISP are 82% male, 57% white non-Hispanic

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP FY 2014 Releases
N=972

- White Non-Hispanic 57%
- White Hispanic 21%
- Black Non-Hispanic 19%
- Black Hispanic 1%
- Other 2%

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP FY 2014 Releases
N=972

- Male 82%
- Female 18%
Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed on ISP

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP
FY 2004 Releases
N=922

- Misd: 53%
- Felony: 38%
- Other: 9%

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP
FY 2014 Releases
N=972

- Misd: 65%
- Felony: 33%
- Other: 2%
For ISP, lowest proportion of youth are high on family, attitudes domains

KDOC Youth Placed on ISP
% High on YLS Domain at First Assessment
FY 2014 Releases N=972

- Offenses Domain: 12%
- Family Domain: 6%
- Education Domain: 18%
- Peer Domain: 45%
- Substance Use Domain: 38%
- Leisure Domain: 62%
- Personality Domain: 16%
- Attitudes Domain: 3%
Youth who are placed on Case Management or JCF after ISP stay on KDOC supervision more than 14 months longer than youth who are only on ISP
Youth who go out of home after ISP stay out of home 14 months on average, up 59% since 2006
ISP Key Takeaways

• Decision-making:
  – No statutory guidance for judicial decisions on length of ISP supervision
  – Limited KDOC standards guide supervision practices
  – Limited services available to meet the needs of ISP youth
  – Local ISP officers have broad discretion in supervision practices
  – Criteria for termination of supervision varies by district
  – Termination requires meeting multiple conditions and approval from multiple parties

• Youth Flow:
  – 16% of youth placed on ISP were on Case Management or JCF first
  – Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed on ISP
  – Low proportion of youth score high on family, attitudes needs
  – 40% of ISP youth also go out of home
  – Youth who go out of home after ISP average 14 months out of home, up 59% since 2006

• Other?
Violations and Revocations
Technical, New Law Violations, EJJ
Responses to violations under court or community corrections’ supervision largely discretionary

- Alleged violation may be reported to court
- Warrant may be ordered or summons issued
- Hearing set by court
- Hearing may be held or waived
- Violation may be found by court
- If violation found, terms of supervision may be extended or modified, or the court may enter any other sentence
When surveyed, CSOs and CCOs reported that factors guiding decision-making around technical violations lack uniformity.
For EJJ, an apparent violation can lead to revocation of the juvenile sentence and imposition of the adult sentence.
When surveyed, CSOs and CCOs indicated that reporting of EJJ violations is inconsistent and lacks uniform guidelines.

Professional discretion: 86% (CSO), 67% (CCO CM), 67% (CCO ISP)
Written guidelines: 67% (CSO), 48% (CCO CM), 58% (CCO ISP)
Recommendation from your supervisor: 58% (CSO), 48% (CCO CM), 43% (CCO ISP)
Recommendation from the facility: 48% (CSO), 39% (CCO CM), 47% (CCO ISP)
Court order: 39% (CSO), 34% (CCO CM), 47% (CCO ISP)
Conferencing with others who know the youth: 39% (CSO), 34% (CCO CM), 47% (CCO ISP)
Other: 19% (CSO), 17% (CCO CM), 22% (CCO ISP)
Violations and Revocations Key Takeaways

• Decision-making:
  – No structure to guide CSOs or CCOs on responses to technical violations of supervision
  – When youth’s supervision is revoked, all the original disposition options are available at resentencing
  – When an EJJ violation is alleged, burden is on youth to request a hearing after adult sentence has been imposed
  – Reporting of EJJ violations is inconsistent and lacks uniform guidelines

• Other?
Removing Youth From The Home
(Post-Adjudication)

Out of Home Standing Population, Detention, Case Management, DCF Placements, JCF
KDOC Out of Home Standing Population Data
Total KDOC out of home population down 27%

KDOC Out of Home Population – Case Management and JCF
July 1 Snapshot, 2004-2014

Out of Home Standing Population
JCF population down 38%, non-secure population down 31%, post-adjudication detention up 27%
Majority of non-secure population is in a YRC-II

Non-Secure KDOC Out of Home Population
July 1 2014

- Emergency shelter placement, 6
- Treatment placement, 8
- Foster care, 79
- Apartment OOH placement, 56
- YRC II, 357
- PRTF, 18

Out of Home Standing Population
27% decline in felony, 23% decline in misdemeanor out of home population
### Discrepancy among counties’ proportion of out of home population relative to JO dispositions or juvenile population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Counties Within KDOC Out of Home Population</th>
<th>% KDOC Out of Home Population July 1 2014</th>
<th>% JO Dispositions FY 2014*</th>
<th>% Kansas 10-17 Yr Old Population 2013**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick County</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney County</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno County</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon County</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Court Services  ISP  JDC  CM  DCF Placement  JCF

Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home

Supervision of Youth in the Community

Detention
Post-Adjudication
Detention used to sanction juvenile offenders and to detain temporarily upon violation or pending placement

**Sanctions House**

**Stage of Supervision:**
- At initial disposition, as condition of any other type of sentence
- Upon violation

**Length of Detention:**
- Up to 28 days per charge

**Temporary Placement**

**Stage of Supervision:**
- Pending JCF admission
- Prior to or between residential placements while on Case Management
- Pending detention hearing for violation and violation disposition

**Length of Detention:**
- Secretary has 5 days to take custody of child to admit after disposition but may extend if needed
- 72 hours pending detention hearing for violation
- Time until revocation disposed
Post-Adjudication Detention Data
KDOC post-adjudication detention population up 27%

KDOC Post-Adjudication Detention Population
July 1 Snapshot 2004-2014
84% of youth placed on Case Management go to detention first

First Out of Home Placement for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2014 Releases
N=678

- Detention: 84%
- Other Placement: 16%
91% of youth placed in JCF were in detention as their first out of home placement

First Out of Home Placement for KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2014 Releases
N=228

Detention 91%

Other Placement 9%
Youth on Case Management first have more detention placements than ISP or JCF youth

Number of Detention Placements by Initial KDOC Disposition Type
FY 2014 Releases

- Number of Detention Placements for Youth on ISP First
- Number of Detention Placements for Youth on Case Management First
- Number of Detention Placements for Youth in JCF First
JDC Key Takeaways

• Decision-making:
  – There is limited statutory guidance for use of JDC as a sanction
  – Detention is used pending Case Management placement or JCF admission
    • Limitation on length can be extended if placement is not readily available

• Youth flow:
  – 27% increase in KDOC post-adjudication detention population
  – Majority of youth placed on Case Management or in JCF spend time in detention as their first out of home placement

• Other?
Case Management

Supervision of Youth in the Community

Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home
KDOC funds case management, oversees provider contracts, plays minimal role in youth’s supervision or placement.

**Community Corrections Officers**
- Supervise youth on Case Management
- Coordinate placement decisions with providers

**County-Based Community Corrections Directors**
- Oversee CCOs that supervise youth on Case Management
- Coordinate with KDOC

**KDOC**
- Funds Case Management through block grants to counties
- Administers and monitors contracts for residential placement providers
- Sets standards to guide local practices
- No day-to-day presence at facilities
Some statutory criteria and KDOC standards guide decision-making by CCOs, but discretion remains broad

| **Length of Supervision** | • Judge does not set a term of days, months or years  
|                          | • Judge commits; Age of jurisdiction only limitation on length;  
|                          | • CCO decides length once committed |
| **Placements**           | • CCO makes all placement decisions with input from providers  
|                          | • If provider discharges youth from placement, CCO cannot override, and no notice required before discharge |
| **Terms and Conditions** | • Judge can order drug/alcohol treatment; All other terms/conditions advisory  
|                          | • KDOC: Six levels of supervision based on assessment of risk and needs |
| **Incentives and Sanctions** | • No uniform incentive and sanctioning guide  
|                           | • Survey: Nearly 1/3 of CCOs do not use written guidelines to inform sanctioning decisions for technical violations for youth on Case Management |
| **Permanency Planning**  | • Permanency planning required through supervision plan  
|                          | • Permanency hearings and review every 180 days |
| **Modification or Termination** | • Court hearing may be requested at any time to modify sentence  
|                               | • Survey: Most CCOs report ability to recommend early termination, but judge, and at times prosecutor, must approve |
Private providers decide which youth to accept, reject, and eject from non-secure residential placement.

- Youth accepted
- Youth ejected**
- Youth successful
- Youth rejected from placement
- Provider Discretion*

* May be limited by contract terms or KDOC standards
** No notice required before youth discharged
Case Management
Surveys: Service Delivery
YRCII Study
Nearly half (47%) of CCOs report there are not enough services available for Case Management youth.

There are enough services to meet the needs of youth on my Case Management caseload (N=73)

- Strongly agree: 7%
- Agree: 46%
- Disagree: 37%
- Strongly disagree: 10%
More than half of CCOs (55%) report that services are not available specifically for youth on Case Management.

**Does your office provide services specifically for Case Management (other than supervision)? N=73**

- Yes: 41%
- No, we make referrals to community-based services: 30%
- No, the out of home placements make referrals to community-based services: 23%
- No, services for Case Management are not provided: 2%
- Other: 4%
### Study: most YRCIIIs do not provide funding for services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
<th>% of Total Budget</th>
<th>Amount per Youth per Day</th>
<th>Average FY2014 KDOC Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average YRCII Budget Allocation for “Social Services and Counseling” (N=14)</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$883,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Budget Allocation for “Social Services and Counseling” for YRCIIIs that Provide Funding (N=6)</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>$7.19</td>
<td>$1,259,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study: a majority of youth discharged from YRCIIIs over a 12-month period remained out of home six months later

Prior Discharge Type for Youth Still in Out of Home Placement Six Months After YRCII Discharge (N=500)

- Successful Discharge: 31%
- Unsuccessful Discharge: 69%

Case Management Placements Data
44% decrease in Case Management as first placement on KDOC disposition

Case Management First Placement on KDOC Disposition
FY 2004-2014 Admissions
But increase in proportion of KDOC youth placed on Case Management

Proportion of KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management
FY 2004-2014 Releases

CASE MANAGEMENT
63% of youth placed on Case Management were placed on their first KDOC disposition

First KDOC Disposition for Youth Placed on Case Management
FY 2014 Releases
N=678

- Case Management: 63%
- ISP: 31%
- JCF: 6%
Youth placed on Case Management are 83% male, 54% white non-Hispanic.

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2014 Releases
N=678

- White Non-Hispanic: 54%
- White Hispanic: 19%
- Black Non-Hispanic: 24%
- Black Hispanic: 1%
- Other: 2%

Male: 83%
Female: 17%
Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed on Case Management

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2004 Releases
N=634
- Misd: 56%
- Felony: 37%
- Other: 7%

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2014 Releases
N=678
- Misd: 63%
- Felony: 36%
- Other: 1%
For Case Management, lowest proportion of youth are high on family, attitudes domains

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management
% High on YLS Domain at First Assessment
FY 2014 Releases N=678
25% increase in number of out of home placements for Case Management youth, now 6.2 on average.

Average Number of Out of Home Placements for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management, FY 2004-2014 Releases

CASE MANAGEMENT
52% increase in average number of long-term non-secure placements

Average Number of Long-Term Non-Secure Placements for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management, FY 2004-2014 Releases
More than 1/3 of Case Management youth have 7 or more out of home placements

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management
FY 2014 Releases N=678

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36% of Case Management youth go AWOL – up from 26% in 2006

Proportion of KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management Who Go AWOL At Least Once, FY 2006-2014 Releases
More than 100 KDOC youth are AWOL on a given day

Number of KDOC Youth Who Are AWOL
July 1 Snapshot
41% of AWOL events are more than 1 month

Breakdown of AWOL Event Time Among All KDOC AWOL Youth
FY 2014 AWOL Events N=508

- More than 1 Month: 41%
- 1 Day - 1 Week: 21%
- 1-4 Weeks: 24%
- Less than 1 Day: 14%
42% of Case Management AWOL youth end up in JCF

KDOC Youth Placed in Case Management Who Went AWOL FY 2014 Releases N=245

- JCF 42%
- Group home 54%
- PRTF 2%
- Foster care 2%
- Apartment OOH placement 1%
More than 15% of youth on Case Management had more than 1 AWOL event

KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management Who Went AWOL FY 2014 Releases

Number of Youth

Number of AWOL Events

CASE MANAGEMENT
24 month average length of total supervision for Case Management youth, up 23% since 2004

Average ISP + Custody Time for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2004-2014 Releases
14.6 month average length of stay out of home for youth placed on Case Management, stable since 2004

Average Out of Home Length of Stay for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2004-2014 Releases
5% increase in misdemeanor, 4% decline in felony length of stay for Case Management youth

Average Out of Home Length of Stay for KDOC Youth Placed on Case Management FY 2004-2014 Releases

- Felony
- Misdemeanor
Case Management Key Takeaways

- **Decision-making:**
  - KDOC funds case management and oversees provider contracts, but local community corrections officers and private providers determine youth placement outcomes.
  - Community Corrections Officers determine length of supervision for each youth.
  - Private providers have broad discretion to accept, reject and eject youth from placement.
  - No notice required before youth discharged from placement.
  - Majority of non-secure population is in YRCIIs, but study showed most YRCIIs do not provide funding for services.
  - Judge has broad discretion in resentencing upon revocation.
Case Management Key Takeaways

• Youth flow:
  – Discrepancy among counties’ proportion of out of home population relative to their proportion of JO dispositions or juvenile population
  – 63% of youth on Case Management were placed on as their first KDOC disposition
  – Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed on Case Management
  – Low proportion of youth score high on family and attitudes needs
  – Case Management youth average 14.6 months out of home; up 5% for misdemeanants, down 4% for felons
  – Overall supervision length for Case Management youth averages 24 months, up 23% since 2004
  – Case Management youth now average 6.2 out of home placements
  – 36% of Case Management youth go AWOL
    • More than 15% had multiple AWOL events; 41% of AWOL events are 1 month or longer

• Other?
DCF PLACEMENT

DCF Placements

Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home

Supervision of Youth in the Community
Certain statutory criteria and DCF rules guide decision-making by DCF for CINC-NAN custody, but discretion remains.

**Length of Supervision**
- Subject to age of jurisdiction
- DCF: subject to review by youth’s custodial case manager

**Placements**
- DCF providers make placement decisions; court may override
- DCF: All placements private; two providers oversee all placements for DCF

**Terms and Conditions**
- Court may order counseling, or drug/alcohol evaluation
- DCF: Case Plan, developed with family, outlines specific goals and is submitted to the court every 180 days
- DCF: Other than PRTF, all services provided outside of placements

**Incentives and Sanctions**
- DCF: YRCIIIs and PRTFs use behavior management plans for rules, rewards, and consequences

**Permanency Planning**
- Permanency plan must be submitted to court within 30 days, and permanency hearing required statutorily every 12 months
- DCF: Transition plan should be included in youth’s file

**Modification or Termination**
- Court may rehear the matter upon it’s discretion and terminate custody based on the case plan or permanency plan
- If juvenile offense reported, youth may be transferred to KDOC Case Management, DCF custody may be terminated
DCF Placements
Annual Report Data
More than 400 youth removed from home for truancy, running away or child behavior problem

DCF Youth Placed Out of Home for Truancy, Running Away or Child Behavior Problem, FY 2011-2015 Removals*

Truancy, running away and child behavior problem categories represent 26% of all DCF CINC-NAN removals.
### Discrepancy among counties’ proportion of truancy placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford County</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney County</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee County</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary County</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick County</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kansas Department for Children and Families, Children Placed in Out of Home Placement by Primary Reason for Removal SFY2015

**Kansas Department for Children and Families, Children in Out of Home by County-SFY15

***Annual Report of the Courts of Kansas, FY 2014, Summary of Formal Juvenile Care of Children Caseload Activity

## Discrepancy among counties’ proportion of child behavior placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick County</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford County</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno County</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kansas Department for Children and Families, Children Placed in Out of Home Placement by Primary Reason for Removal SFY2015
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***Annual Report of the Courts of Kansas, FY 2014, Summary of Formal Juvenile Care of Children Caseload Activity

DCF Placement Key Takeaways

- **Decision-making:**
  - Certain criteria guide decision-making for DCF placements
  - Judicial discretion guides whether a youth should be placed in DCF custody and when custody should be terminated, with minimal statutory criteria

- **Youth flow:**
  - More than 400 youth removed from home for truancy, running away, or child behavior problem
  - Discrepancy among counties’ proportion of truancy and child behavior problem placements
  - Youth placed out of home in DCF custody access services in the community (other than PRTF placements)

- **Other?**
Juvenile Correctional Facilities

- Court Services
- ISP
- JDC
- CM
- DCF Placement
- JCF

Supervision of Youth in the Community

Post-Adjudication Removal of Youth from Home
KDOC funds and operates JCFs, and oversees the youth committed to their facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Correctional Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Term is set by court, in accordance with JCF Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locations in Larned and Topeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision by KDOC staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training 160 hours plus 40 hours per year of OJT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capacity: Larned (152 beds), Topeka (270 beds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Release (Aftercare)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Location guided by home district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervisor guided by home district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandatory with a JCF sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Term set by court in accordance with JCF Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 Levels of supervision per KDOC standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Violation may lead to return to placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statutory criteria and KDOC Standards guide supervision decisions for youth committed to a JCF

- **Length of Supervision**
  - Time in JCF as well as time on conditional release ordered by judge in keeping with JCF Matrix guidelines

- **Placements**
  - Secretary may transfer youth among JCF facilities once JO is committed to the JCF

- **Terms and Conditions**
  - Judge can order drug/alcohol treatment. All other terms/conditions advisory
  - KDOC: Assessments used to determine service provision

- **Incentives and Sanctions**
  - Good time guided by statute and KDOC Regulations
  - KDOC: Regulations guide incentives/sanctions

- **Permanency Planning**
  - Plan to court within 30 days of sentencing, with measurable goals and timeline
  - 180 day progress reports to court, hearing every year

- **Modification of Sentence or Termination**
  - Hearing may be requested within 60 days after sentence imposed OR at any time if medical condition or exceptional progress merit reduction
Disposition of conditional release violators guided by some criteria, but judicial choice among options largely discretionary

- **Conditional Release Revoked**
  - **JCF for 3-6 mos**
    - Mandatory aftercare: 2-6 months or length of original aftercare, if longer
  - **Other Option(s):**
    - Additional conditions added to existing conditional release
    - Sanctions House: up to 28 days per charge
    - Driving privilege revoked or restricted
    - Discharge from custody; order anything else appropriate
JCF Placements
Data
71% decrease in youth with first placement to JCF
But increase in proportion of KDOC youth placed in JCF

Proportion of KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2004-2014 Releases
Only 37% of JCF youth went as first placement on that disposition

First KDOC Disposition for Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2014 Releases
N=228

- JCF First 37%
- ISP First 33%
- Case Management First 30%
Youth placed in JCF are 92% male, 46% white non-Hispanic.
Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed in JCF

KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2004 Releases
N=199
- Felony: 67%
- Misd: 30%
- Other: 3%

KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2014 Releases
N=228
- Felony: 65%
- Misd: 35%
- Other: 0%
For JCF, lowest proportion of youth are high on family, attitudes domains

KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
% High on YLS Domains at First Assessment
FY 2014 Releases N=228

- Offenses Domain: 24%
- Family Domain: 11%
- Education Domain: 22%
- Peer Domain: 59%
- Substance Use Domain: 40%
- Leisure Domain: 69%
- Personality Domain: 26%
- Attitudes Domain: 6%
41% increase in out of home placements for JCF youth, now 8.3 on average
Youth placed in JCF average 2 JCF placements

Average Number of JCF Placements for KDOC Youth Placed in JCF FY 2004-2014 Releases
Nearly 1/3 of youth placed in JCF have 10 or more total out of home placements

KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2014 Releases N=228

Number of Out of Home Placements
Youth placed in JCF stay an average of 37 months total supervision, up 64% since 2004
Youth placed in JCF stay 25 months out of home on average, up 16% since 2004

Average Out of Home Length of Stay for KDOC Youth Placed in JCF FY 2004-2014 Releases

- 2004: 21.7 months
- 2014: 25.3 months

The graph shows an increased average out-of-home length of stay from 2004 to 2014.
20% increase in misdemeanor, 18% increase in felony length of stay for JCF youth
30% increase in average time spent in JCF

Average Length of Stay in JCF for KDOC Youth Placed in JCF
FY 2004-2014 Releases
JCF Key Takeaways

• Decision-making:
  – Extensive statutory criteria and KDOC Standards guide supervision decisions for youth committed to JCF
  – KDOC has direct supervision of youth in JCF facilities
  – Statutory criteria guides judicial decision-making about conditional release violators, but still allows for discretion

• Youth flow:
  – 37% of JCF youth went as first placement on that disposition
  – Increasing proportion of misdemeanants placed in JCF
  – Low proportion of JCF youth score high on family, attitudes needs
  – Youth placed in JCF average 8.3 out of home placements; 1/3 of youth have 10 or more out of home placements
  – Youth placed in JCF stay 25 months out of home on average; 20% increase for misdemeanants, 18% increase for felons
  – 30% increase in average time spent in JCF, now 15 months

• Other?
Majority of youth on ISP first don’t go out of home after ISP, but majority of youth on Case Management and JCF first have subsequent out of home placement.

Proportion of KDOC Youth with Subsequent KDOC Out of Home Placement FY 2014 Releases:

- ISP First (N=808): 28%
- Case Management First (N=423): 73%
- JCF First (N=85): 82%
Overall Key Takeaways

• Services:
  – Youth under court or KDOC supervision most often access publicly available services that any youth may access without court intervention
  – CSOs and CCOs report limited services available to meet youths’ needs, and issues with quality and timeliness of services that are available

• Decision-making:
  – Broad discretion and little statutory criteria guide decisions around who ends up on community supervision and in non-secure out of home placements
  – Revocation decisions are at the discretion of local officers and judges, and all disposition options are available at resentencing
  – Length of supervision is at judges’ discretion, and early terminations requires multiple conditions be met and multiple parties consent
  – Placement decisions are made by individual workers in consultation with private providers
  – Unlike non-secure placement, JCF has strict statutory criteria determining which youth can be placed and how long they stay
  – KDOC has direct supervision over JCF population, but not ISP or Case Management youth
Overall Key Takeaways

- **Youth flow: Standing Population**
  - Despite large reductions in number of KDOC youth placed out of home, the standing population has not declined at the same rate
  - Fewer new admissions to Case Management and JCF, but increasing proportion of KDOC youth spend time on Case Management and JCF during their supervision term
  - Counties vary in their proportion of the KDOC and DCF out of home population, relative to proportion of dispositions or juvenile population

- **Youth flow: Youth Characteristics**
  - Low-level youth account for majority of community supervision and non-secure placement population
  - Increasing number of CINC and CINC-NAN youth on Court Services
  - Increasing proportion of misdemeanants on ISP, Case Management and JCF
  - More than 400 youth placed out of home for truancy, running away or other behavior problems
  - ISP, Case Management and JCF youth all have low proportion of youth who score high on family, attitudes needs
Overall Key Takeaways

• **Youth flow: Placement Outcomes**
  
  – Case Management and JCF youth have more placements and stay out of home longer than they did a decade ago
  
  • Case Management youth average 14.6 months out of home; JCF youth average 25 months out of home
  
  • For Case Management and JCF, increases in length of stay for misdemeanants outpacing felons’
  
  • Case Management youth average 6.2 out of home placements, JCF youth average 8.3 out of home placements
  
  • 36% of Case Management youth go AWOL
  
  • KDOC post-adjudication detention population has increased 27% while other populations have declined
  
  – Despite similarities in youth characteristics, failure is more prevalent among youth placed out of home first than it is for youth placed on ISP first

• Other?
Future Meetings

- September 9
- SUBGROUPS
- October 21
- November 17
Next Steps

• Stakeholder outreach
  – Roundtables (those remaining)
  – Individual Meetings
• Research Presentation
• Subgroup Planning