Welcome & Introductions

Highlighting Top Issues

- Transition from JJ for foster youth - Discussion postponed allowing for Kristen Powell to be present and provide input.
- Examples of district provider challenges
  The discussion continued regarding the challenge of youth not being picked up promptly following their juvenile intake/assessment. Solutions discussed during last month’s meeting were reviewed for prioritization based on feasibility.
    - The first solution discussed was developing a standard of practice specifically around communication that can be enacted across the state.
      - Standards of practice for communication are in place across the state; however, the practice does not work when it comes to placing older and more difficult to place youth during non-traditional business hours, e.g., late afternoon, evening, and into the early morning hours. The team turned their focus towards exploring options to provide safe and supportive environments for youth to wait for placement following their intake/assessment during non-traditional business hours, bearing in mind not only the difficulty for CMP’s in picking up a youth across the state at a late hour but also the disruption it can cause a young person who may be sleeping. The team is aiming to minimize transience and discomfort for youth and maximize safety for staff.
      - Safety practices for youth and transport staff were discussed; safety concerns could be
        - Potentially combative youth
        - Transport driver is the opposite-gender of the youth and difficulty with identifying a second person to accompany the CMP at a late hour
        - Driving long distances especially during non-traditional business hours
      - Vicki advised that foster care contractors have safety protocols in place with options such as transporting in pairs or using a secure transport company when there are concerns.
      - Assistance with transporting youth from law enforcement was also discussed. While this may be an option in some jurisdictions, John Calvert stated that in his experience most law enforcement agencies will not provide transportation for youth due to concerns around liability – especially when it comes to crossing jurisdictional boundaries. Brady Burge suggested the group take a look at the CINC code when making any decisions, as it will dictate what LEO can and cannot do.
• Hope identified that there is a lack of understanding between the two systems around processes and practices. This causes continued contention and misconceptions regarding timeframes, expectations, and responsibilities. She suggested that cross-systems training is provided.

• One suggestion was to allow youth to remain in an intake center, potentially overnight, as opposed to being shuffled to and from various offices until a more permanent placement can be located. It was noted that not all juvenile intake/assessment locations have a physical office where youth can wait for placement. For those communities that have an actual intake/assessment center, the team would like to explore if this is an option.

• The Statewide Coordinators will invite the staff from 2 JIAC agencies, Johnson and Douglas counties, who have physical locations, to discuss protocols and the feasibility for youth to remain at their JIAC location while placement is sought.

• The two main challenges the team is looking to address are: 1. Who is responsible for youth at various times throughout the process? and 2. What are the protocols that can be put in place regarding time of when youth comes to intake? The team will look to Johnson and Douglas Counties as examples for how to potentially model the guidance they develop.

  o The second solution discussed was the need for increasing respite beds to provide immediate placement while longer-term placement options are being explored. Some communities currently have respite families who provide placement for 3 – 5 days.

  • Foster care providers continually work to increase capacity. Nina mentioned Safe Families, which are individuals who volunteer to provide a safe environment to youth temporarily. Katie provided information on the Protective Homes through Care Portal. There are currently 10 of these homes which are used for short-term PPC placements. They are not licensed but are required to complete training and have background checks. Katie suggested that these homes may be respite options for youth at a JIAC waiting for placement.

  • While there may be homes willing to provide respite, intake staff may not be aware of them. The team discussed methods of providing intake staff with information regarding these homes such as developing lists.

  • Linda Bass suggested expanding the filters for respite homes in CareMatch so the Foster Care Case Management Providers are aware of the parameters of the willing respite homes (e.g.,
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willingness to accept older youth). Unlicensed respite homes are not in CareMatch, but Melinda Kline suggested Foster Care Case Management Providers may be able to share resources.

- John suggested that a way to increase capacity could be through engaging educators and inviting them to become emergency respite homes. The process to have these homes approved is fairly quick, since these families are only required to undergo background checks. Using educators as respite homes would allow youth to be placed with a familiar, safe, supportive adult and remain in their home community and school. Karen added that educators should be cognizant of boundaries when providing respite for youth who may be one of their students.

- Stacy suggested that a follow-up conversation be held with DCF, DOC, KSDE, and OJA to develop a draft memo in support of educators becoming emergency respite homes. John stated that it may not be appropriate to develop a state-level memo; however, he is open to doing something informally on a regional level. John and Karen will work on developing communication for the schools. During next month’s meeting, a plan for dissemination will be discussed.

- Updates on record retrieval costs
  - Amy was not available to provide an update on any additional information she may have discovered.
  - Ashley and Stacy stated that some DCF staff have the task of record retrieval built into their positions, but these staff are located across the state. Stacy also stated that she is unaware if smaller districts have staff assigned to this task.
  - For ideas on ways to mitigate costs, when jurisdictions do not have positions and/or resources Stacy asked if Georgetown staff would provide examples from other states.
  - The discussion turned to the possibility of addressing this issue and instituting a cap on records costs, through Kansas Open Records Act (KORA). While this is a challenging, complicated process that would require legislative change the team is urged to take on this challenge.
  - Karen suggested inviting legislators to attend an SPT meeting to hear the concerns around this issue. To prepare for a discussion with legislators the following steps were proposed and agreed to.
    - During the July or August meeting, the team will conduct a line-by-line review and make suggestions for changing or revising the wording of the law.
Stacy suggested that the Supreme Court Task Force on Permanency, of which Kristen has just been appointed and Judge Larson chairs, be used to gain momentum.

Judge Larson advised that he would lead a discussion with the task force during the July or August meeting.

Legislators will be invited to an upcoming meeting once the team has solidified their recommendations for changes to KORA.

Update on family representation on the team
- Karen connected with Tara Minor who has agreed to participate on the team. The Statewide Coordinators have provided Tara with information and will schedule a time to further discuss roles, responsibilities, and compensation.

Data Sharing MOU
- This item was not on this month’s agenda; however, it will become a standing discussion item. This conversation began in July of 2020, when DCF, DOC, OJA, and a few other key members discussed how data sharing occurred across the state, successes, pitfalls and how to move forward. The conversation took place again in October at which time OJA’s legal was reviewing the MOU.
  - Hope updated the team and stated that Amy had accepted the changes and the MOU is being routed for signatures.

Updates
- Guiding Coalition (this update is included in the updates on Engagement with Pilot Counties)
- Engagement with Pilot Counties
  - Shawnee County had two meetings this month. One meeting was of a short-term workgroup to plan for the focus groups. The group discussed the goals for conducting the focus groups and reviewed potential questions with plans to facilitate the group this summer. Following the focus group, CJJR will compile information and develop a report which will provide direction for incorporating what is learned. During the whole team meeting, the team brainstormed a list of organizations and individuals to invite for participation in the Guiding Coalition. The breakout workgroup Information Sharing/Protocols met. The workgroup is awaiting information sharing guidance from the SPT Workgroup, until then the focus will be on developing protocols. The group began describing the process that currently takes place when a young person who is involved with foster care is arrested or receives a citation. During this discussion, the team focused on communication processes between JIAC and KVC to identify gaps and brainstorm ideas for improvement. One discussion point was that while JIAC has reporting time-frames,
there are no response time-frame requirements for KVC or DCF. One gap identified was that if a youth goes from JIAC to the JDC, information regarding the youth’s involvement with DCF may be unknown unless it is self-reported or otherwise known. This can cause a lag time in response from KVC, especially on weekends. Canan advised that JIAC has 24/7 access to the court computer – secure portal and would be able to supplement information provided to the JDC, which can then be communicated to KVC. The group will begin to map out what this communication would look like.

- The inventory workgroup discussed how best to collect information regarding services and resources that are currently available or that can be made available to crossover youth and their families. The workgroup suggested attending JCAB meetings to take note of grants and/or funding opportunities that are brought up during these meetings. DCF, DOC, KVC, and Community Corrections each have a list of programs and resources that they will bring to the next meeting so the workgroup can identify crossover-specific programs/resources, cross-reference for overlapping programs/resources, and identify gaps in programs/resources. The workgroup identified known gaps in resources, including a lack of housing resources for young people being released from juvenile placement.

- Montgomery County met earlier this month and continued focus group planning. The team has identified 21 youth who will be invited to participate by next month. Incentives are being purchased for crossover and justice-involved youth from the county’s JCAB grant. DCF is developing plans to provide incentives for youth involved in the child welfare system only. The plan is for CJJR staff to facilitate the multiple focus groups of 7 youth via Zoom in August. These sessions will be facilitated without the observation of stakeholders to promote open communication. Outreach to organizations/individuals to participate in the Guiding Coalition has begun. Only 2 of the 4 members of the Prevention Workgroup were in attendance, and the members of the Training Workgroup requested additional time to prepare for a review of their agency’s orientation training which will be used as a started point to develop 101 training sessions.

- Sedgwick County met and completed a review of assessment tools utilized to determine if any of the same information is collected by different tools. During the next meeting, they will discuss 101 training.

  - Education Subcommittee – (no new updates)
  - Information Sharing Workgroup (due to lack of time workgroup breakouts were postponed until next month)
Macon was unable to attend; however, Alex stated that the information-sharing guidance draft is finished. The next step for the group is to identify individuals from each agency to review and approve the documents.

- Prevention Workgroup (due to lack of time workgroup breakouts were postponed until next month)
  - The draft survey of questions has been developed by CJJR and is ready for review by the Prevention Workgroup. Will be reviewed at the July or August meeting.

- Presentations Opportunities
  - July 26th – Statewide Confabulation -Family Well-being System
  - October 14th – KS Assoc. of Court Service Officers Conference

Brainstorm Solutions on Cross-County Cases (due to lack of time these items were not discussed.

- a) communication issues between Juvenile Intake and foster care providers
- b) supervision of cross-county cases and the ability of young people to acquire services if they have DCF and juvenile justice cases open in two different counties (Refer to DOC Standards)
- c) the 5120 Notification of Move/Placement Change form and how additional stakeholders may be able to partake in its receipt
- d) youth who reside on reservations and who come into the custody of the state due to an offense

Ongoing Discussion
- SPT year-end goals: 1) Crossover service information portal; 2) Celebration of crossover youth; 3) Review policies that impact crossover youth; 4) Roadmap for post-Georgetown engagement

Future Meeting Dates
- Calls/meetings are held on the 4th Wednesday of the month from 10:00 am-12:00 pm. Subsequent dates include:
  - July 28th. The Statewide Coordinators will facilitate this meeting. Georgetown staff will be facilitating the Janet Reno Forum, A Better Path Forward: Restructuring Systems to Support Crossover Youth. All are invited to register for attendance.
  - August 25th