**CYPM Kansas State Policy Team TA Conference Call Summary**

October 28, 2020 10:00am-12:00 pm

Conference Call Number: 1 646 558 8656 Meeting ID: 725 221 995

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Session** |
| 10:00 am | **Welcome and Introductions*** Shay Bilchik, Director Emeritus, CJJR
* Victoria Chamberlin, Program Manager CJJR
* Alexandra Miller, Program Manager, CJJR
* Macon Stewart, Deputy Director, CJJR
 |
| 10:03 am | **Review SB 367 MOU Recommendations** * Kent Reed introduced John Calvert (KSDE Safe and Secure Schools Unit) and provided a brief summary of a meeting that took place between KDSE and KDOC in which recommendations for the SB 367 MOU were proposed, including focuses related to the following:
	+ Improve services to youth in custody, with particular regard to academic accreditation
	+ Include the County Health Dept. and Community Mental Health in the MOU
	+ Increase services to school-age students earning high school diplomas in county jails and better facilitate credit transfer and credit recovery. (This is simpler in detention centers as they are equipped with education personnel; however, there is more difficulty facing youth in jails due to a lack of education staff).
* Conversation that developed from the KSDE and KDOC meeting discussion include:
	+ Youth transition back into the community/school:
		- Credit is a local option issue, and there is difficulty aligning what kids were doing in facilities with their base school when they return.
		- Karen Niemczyk expressed concern about this and recognized the benefits of standardizing the process, such as with remote video-based options, so that students can move more easily from learning environment to environment. This would not replace face to face learning so much as supplement it. Placing emphasis on the importance of social-emotional learning regardless of setting was also discussed.
		- Hina Shah recommended contacting Zachary Lawrence, Director of Roosevelt Education Center in Wellington, Kansas. Director Lawrence provided testimony during CWSTF(2018) around specialized education programs and virtual platforms.
* Where to begin:
	+ - Kent, John, and KSDE will follow up to pass these ideas down to consultants as well as make recommendations for the SB 367 MOU.
		- A new education subcommittee was established. This group will create guidance to be piloted in Montgomery, Shawnee, and/or Sedgwick Counties.
* Recommendations for the MOU from the last call included:
	+ Providing guidance or clarification to local school boards on the MOU; and
	+ Moving beyond a one-shot training and supplementing the MOU with recommendations and examples of behaviors that do and do not warrant police intervention, including developing a tiered approach to handling behaviors in schools.
* These recommendations will be shared with Megan Milner who will pass them on to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee for their November report.
 |
| 10:10 am | **Guiding Coalition Update*** Rather than have a statewide coalition, there will be six coalitions for each region (beginning first with those for Shawnee and Montgomery Counties) due to the varying needs of those communities.
 |
| 10:15 am | **Update on Engagement with Montgomery & Shawnee Counties*** CJJR and the Crossover Coordinators met with Montgomery County and have identified a local coordinator. Additionally, team members decided that they will have a joint implementation and leadership team since they are a smaller county. Montgomery also began working on their gap analysis with CJJR to identify challenges, barriers, and things that are going well. Another meeting will take place on November t12th o complete Montgomery’s assessment.
* Shawnee County will meet with CJJR to complete their gap analysis on November 9th. Ashley and Michelle met with them earlier this week to provide guidance on establishing leadership and implementation teams, and to select a local coordinator.
* There was a meeting to reengage Sedgwick County as well as to identify where their crossover processes are now, and to determine challenges and successes with those processes. The analysis was not completed during that meeting and there will be a subsequent meeting in a few weeks to complete the remainder of the assessment. This information will be used to determine what would be helpful to strengthen their practice.
* Education continuity will be an upcoming topic of discussion with the three communities. This information will be provided back to the new education subcommittee to help inform what that group will focus on.
 |
| 10:18 am | **Workgroup Updates*** Information Sharing
	+ A document complete with information sharing codes and summaries of those codes is in process. This document will serve as a guide for the counties that will inform information sharing capacities (e.g., identifying crossover cases, case assessment and planning, etc.).
* Prevention
	+ The Prevention workgroup has been identifying common challenges seen across sectors of youth- and family-serving systems, including issues related to runaways, service availability and access, communication across agencies, and youth mobility and subsequent instability within systems of care. The group is also identifying opportunities to address these challenges and is working on zeroing in on a target area or population to begin focusing the work.
 |
| 10:23 am | **Identify Challenges with Cross County Cases** – To be discussed in more detail next month* Karen Niemczyk mentioned that her school serves youth from several different counties who have social and emotional challenges. Because youth are in school in one county but live in a separate county, there is a lack of clarity over who is responsible for that youth (e.g., if a student is suicidal and needs to go to the hospital). Karen also posed the questions: What if the issue is with the parent and the school feels the student is in danger? How does DCF, law enforcement, etc. handle this? This includes students placed with their parents as well as those in foster care. Because protocols are not clear, it is difficult to determine how these situations should unfold.
* Chief Halfhill noted that there is a hospital in one county within his jurisdiction and that there is an 8-10 hour process for transporting youth to/from hospital and determining which law enforcement agency is responsible for that transportation. Most law enforcement agencies in Kansas are composed of just 6-8 officers, so when one officer is pulled away for a mental health crisis situation (for example) it drains the agency. Sheriff Merchant echoed this, and noted it would be helpful to have additional resources or other options to help with these scenarios.
	+ In the event that it is a juvenile who is in DCF state care, it is St. Francis (in Chief Halfhill’s jurisdiction) who presides over the situation so DCF is not notified – only the contractor is notified.
* Counties that have mobile response workers who can assist with mental health crisis that would not require law enforcement.
	+ Chrysann Phipps mentioned that Johnson County has something similar in place (recommended contact: Director is Robert Sullivan).
	+ Regina Scherzer noted that Wyandot County has a system where mental health counselors ride with the officers.
	+ Stacy Tidwell will contact DCF’s Director of Medicaid/Children’s Mental Health to see if they have suggestions.
	+ Hina Shah suggested: KDADS has an RFP in place for JCIC and mobile crisis units, noting that Andy Brown could provide more information.
	+ Chrysann noted that a third-party vendor handles juvenile screens instead of local mental health, which can result in long waits at the hospital.
 |
| 10:40 am | **Discussion on County-level Law Enforcement Recommendations*** This will be discussed during the December meeting.
 |
| 10:55 am  | **Next Steps*** Future Dates: Calls/meetings are held on the 4th Wednesday of the month from 10:00am-12:00pm. Subsequent dates include:

-December 9th - *\*This meeting will take the place of the November 25th and December 23rd meetings that were originally scheduled.*-January 27th *\*This schedule may be modified based on current circumstances related to COVID-19* |
| 11:00 am | **Workgroup Breakouts** (see agendas below)* Information Sharing
* Prevention
 |

**CYPM Kansas State Policy Team: Information Sharing Workgroup Summary**

October 28, 2020 11:00am-12:00pm

**Target Population**: A young person age 10 and older with any level of concurrent involvement with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, inclusive of out-of-home placements, probation, Immediate Intervention Programs (IIPs), and voluntary/preventative services (defined as Child in Need of Care (CINC) cases that are open for services such as Family Preservation, Family First, and Family Services).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Session** |
| 11:00 am | **Welcome and Introductions** |
| 11:05 am | **Review Information Sharing Guide Document & Next Level of Agency Review required*** Workgroup reviewed the current version of the outline and decided the code should be specified per each pathway a youth travels
* Upon completion of the final document a smaller compendium should be developed for CW and JJ workers. This smaller document will be user-friendlier for line staff.
 |
| 11: 40am | **Determining what’s most useful for the jurisdiction*** Judicial guidance for supporting the work
* Determining the role of judges
 |
| 11:50 am | **Goal-setting and Timeline*** What needs to occur and when to achieve each task?
 |

**CYPM Kansas State Policy Team: Prevention Workgroup Summary**

October 28, 2020 11:00am-12:00pm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Session** |
| 11:00 am | **Welcome and Introductions** |
| 11:03 am | **Review Purpose of the Workgroup** |
| 11:05 am | **Open Discussion*** Previously identified challenges:
	+ **Youth who run away**: 1) issues prior to running; 2) risk for trafficking when they run; 3) communication and collaboration between providers and agencies when youth run; 4) access to services for chronic runners upon return
	+ **Service availability**: 1) lack of trauma-responsive services; 2) lack of shared services across systems; 3) system involvement required to access services; 4) service availability and waitlists
	+ **Communication**: 1) lack of coordination among agencies and providers; 2) communication especially missing among frontline staff; 3) combatting the myth that youth must be in a system to access resources
	+ **Instability**: 1) youth who move often mistrust system/workers; 2) lack of self-worth and belonging when youth move often; 3) lack of placements for older youth results in reliance on detention
* Other challenges facing the work
	+ **Family engagement**: 1) parents often give up hope in rehabilitation and grow reluctant to welcome youth back home; 2) early intervention and involvement so that families are at the table as soon as there are any signs of trouble with the young person or at home; 3) parents do not have peers to connect with and often feel judged and discouraged by system workers; 4) Immediate Intervention could be used for any youth who comes to intake so their needs are addressed before they have multiple offenses (can be used to identify families in crisis)
	+ **Training**: 1) working with staff to recognize biases when working with youth and parents; 2) helping staff develop a trauma lens and trauma-informed approaches; 3) ongoing training for CINC and JO staff to identify and work with families who are in crisis
	+ **Education**: 1) school mobility, truancy, and suspensions and expulsions are high among systems-involved youth
* Opportunities for the work
	+ Savings from SB367 to establish a triage for youth with mental health and trauma needs (e.g., Johnson County)
	+ Training Intake staff with the Parent Project so that parents are matched with other parents for support
	+ Further develop partnerships between Intake and DCF (it is currently stronger in some counties than in others)
	+ Further incorporate school based mental health into how we support youth
 |
| 11:45 am | **Use Challenges/Opportunities to Develop a Target Population(s)**Possible options:CINC Runaways - a young person 10 and older who is referred to law enforcement for running away from their home or placementPlacement Changes - those ages 10 and older in foster care who experience a certain level of placement instability or a certain number of placement changesRelease Home - youth who are referred to Juvenile Intake and Assessment for delinquent behavior and whose parents are unwilling or unable to take that young person back into their homeNTA Challenges - youth who fail to uphold a Notice to Appear* Education (TBD: could target a component of the system or a population of young people)
* **Other suggestions?**
 |
| 11:55 am | **Wrap-up & Next Steps** |