Tanya Keys, Deputy Secretary of DCF, attended the meeting to discuss the 06/21/19 letter from DCF requesting use of reinvestment funds. She began by saying DCF is seeing an increase in the number of older youths they serve. Foster home providers are ill-equipped to handle these youth. Two proviso work groups are meeting to discuss issues surrounding this change. The first group is reviewing the characteristics of older youth and what services they need. The second group is taking an in-depth look at the conduct problems of these at-risk youth and how it relates to their foster care placement. It is possible their needs may intersect with youth involved in the juvenile justice system. DCF’s goal is to prevent entry into the foster care system, and their letter to us includes ideas about evidence-based programs in which our agencies have common interests.

A table in the letter lists eight service areas DCF would like to discuss. The first one is intensive in-home family preservation services, proposed to serve 100 families with youth age 15 and older facing crisis or juvenile offender allegations and at risk of entry into foster care. They estimate these services would average $4,667.00 per family, for $466,700.00 per year.

The second item listed is to strengthen relationships with Big Brothers & Big Sisters (BB&BS) to leverage mentoring services they provide. They have multiple hubs statewide. They estimate 200 youth per year with a $1,500.00 mentoring match, for a total of $300,000.00 per year.

Crisis intervention beds for youth ages 14 and older is the third item. These youth are facing behavioral crisis or allegations of juvenile offender behavior and are at risk of entry into foster care.

Listed as a fourth item, DCF would like to see capacity for FFT services built up statewide. The total cost is estimated at $793,272.00.

The fifth item, Behavioral Intervention Services through FosterAdoptConnect, is an emerging program currently serving families in Wyandotte and Johnson Counties with youth age 15 and over facing crisis or juvenile offender allegations and who are at risk of entry into foster care. This program works one-on-one with families up to fifteen hours a week for thirty weeks. Preliminary information from Johnson County shows increased stability in academics and success in keeping youth out of foster care. Working with forty youth per year would cost about $882,000.00 annually.
The sixth item would match federal Family First Prevention Grant money dollar-for-dollar to provide evidence-based programs to youth aged 15 and over facing crisis or juvenile offender allegations putting them at risk of foster care. The estimated cost is $500,000.00 a year.

The seventh item is a family engagement approach with four foster care grantees to identify and locate families willing to support youth age 15 in care. This money would be for training and collaboration costs. Those costs are not yet known.

The last item is a curriculum for specialized foster care homes or relative homes. DCF wants to investigate the ideas and practice models available to use.

Tanya sees opportunities to prevent adjudication of youth using these programs and serve youth already in foster care who have not been served before. She would like insights and what would align with the definitions already in place. These could be prioritized to determine how to best serve families.

Judge York asked about the available data; that is, is there data? Who collects it? Who reports it? Tanya said, in the case of the program currently piloted in Johnson County, there is data available from Missouri covering 4-5 years we could ask for. This program has been effective at preserving adoptive placements.

Jennifer said she is not sure we can fund these due to the statute language restricting us to evidence-based programs, intake and assessments, and training only. Tanya said they are available and willing to work on this together with us. Megan sees ways to partner within the statute in some ways, such as family engagement training and services for all who touch the juvenile justice system. We need an opportunity to unpack each of these in order to find ways to partner. We will also need to put some thought into what the legislative intent was behind the bill.

Today at the JJOC meeting, we will recommend our committee investigates the items in this list to see what makes sense to fund under SB367. There may be a couple things we can look at right away, such as FFT expansion. We will pursue expanding FFT to a broader group to include dually involved youth.

Shanelle asked about looking at crisis intervention beds soon. Youth go through intake, then are sent home with no cooling off period. Sometimes, parents will not let them come home, and there is nowhere for the youth to go. Judge York noted “crisis” beds are for those youth at risk of harming themselves or others. Even with this qualification, it is very hard to find them a PRTF bed. Melody said what Shanelle is describing is less “crisis” and more “respite”-type arrangements. The crisis center RFP is out with no award yet, so we do not know how the $13 million for them will be spent.

BB & BS is an already evidenced-based program and IIP youth may be eligible for those services under statute. Megan said BB & BS historically is unable to address the criminogenic needs of these youth. We would want a program doing work specific to our population. Max agreed. He used to refer youth to them and found they are unable to handle youth with major issues. They want youth who are already starting to turn around.
Judge York asked about expanding YAP. DCF did not sign with YAP because it did not meet their needs. Mike said DCF wanted the YAP to find youth and they are not in that type of business. Megan was not sure we could expand there.

Mike said there is a demand for youth mentoring. Megan agreed, saying she sees this request often in JCAB reports. She noted a new person has been hired at KJCC who is to expand a mentoring program out into the communities. Jennifer asked if these mentors could serve crossover youth.

Family preservation services are evidence-based. We would have to define the services, who can be involved, where referrals would come from, etc. Shanelle reported a family preservation RFP is going out some. Max feels FFT is more involved with the family. Shanelle agreed, saying family preservation resembles case management.

The committee is supportive of partnering in these efforts. Today, we will tell the JJOC we are interested in pursuing these with their approval. We may find they dovetail with the crossover model. Jennifer said we could ask Georgetown to look these over and address each one.

This committee agreed with Jennifer's plan as written. If appropriations are not reduced, the $17 million per year is accurate. We believe this plan creates a well-rounded system to keep youth out of the juvenile justice system.

Melody made the motion we move forward with taking this plan to the JJOC and Max seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Jennifer reported on her discussions with the directors of counties we wanted to pilot the crossover model. We settled on Shawnee County and Montgomery County, with Wyandotte County as an alternate. The relationships across agencies was a major factor in choosing these pilot counties. Megan made the motion to pilot in Shawnee County (3rd JD) and Montgomery County (14th JD) with Wyandotte (29th JD) as the alternate. Max seconded the motion and it passed.

Megan continues to work on the family engagement RFP.

Jennifer has been looking for some sample substance abuse RFPs that include family services with no luck. Megan said we may have one in KDOC on the adult side and she will check this out.

Megan is sending out the requests for JCAB reports soon and directors have been advised of the changes.

Leah Haake has accepted a project manager position in Juvenile Services. She will be working to get our initiatives up and going and will also provide JCAB support.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35am.