

CYPM Kansas State Policy Team TA Conference Call Summary

September 23, 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	SB 367 MOU
10:03 am	The Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee has been discussing items currently in the MOU (dictated by Sec. 58 of SB367), gaps in the MOU, and the training that is currently required within SB 367. JJOC has been putting together recommendations for the annual report that will go to the governor and legislature. The SPT discussed several areas of improvement for the MOU, including: Variation in compliance. Compliance to the MOU has differed across the state depending on the judge and county attorney. Some opposition to the MOU is due to the interpretation that the MOU indicates criminal behavior should not be reported or addressed. The language of the MOU needs to be clarified to dissolve this misunderstanding. Ambiguity on timing of MOU updates. SB 367 currently does not clarify how often the MOUs should be revisited. Schools signed 3 years ago, and there has been turnover at the local level that may affect institutional memory of the MOU and how closely the MOU is adhered to. Minimal training. The training statute requires that the superintendent or designee of the superintendent attends a training for best practices for kids in juvenile justice. This training occurred in conjunction with law enforcement and personnel. The training was one-time with no stipulation in the MOU for regularly scheduled trainings or for follow-up accountability to the training. This training is available online and has been shared via email by Kent Reed. Irregular accountability. There is an annual report to the DOC and OJA that summarizes compliance to and content of each MOU. This report was submitted to JJOC by a Board of Education member the first year the MOUs were signed,
	but no reports have been submitted since. o Each Board of Education annually compiles and sends to the State Board of Education the types and frequency of criminal acts, and arrests and referrals to
	juvenile intake services. These are disaggregated by location (on school property, off school property) and by race and gender. The report is to be included under the quality performance accreditation system.

Kent indicated that the education accreditation system has changed since the instatement of the MOUs three years ago. o Role of SROs and law enforcement in schools. Smaller communities allow for closer relationships between schools and law enforcement. Schools in jurisdictions where law enforcement are more flexible in their approach can reach out to law enforcement for guidance situations without committing to formal police intervention. This approach allows for consideration of typical adolescent behaviors without criminalizing the youth. To address some of the issues identified above, the team proposed: Reach out to the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB) and work with them to provide guidance or clarification to local school boards. Supplement the MOU with recommendations and clear examples of behaviors that warrant police intervention. Develop a tiered approach to handling behavior that delineates which behaviors are best dealt with by the school, and which behaviors require police intervention. Communities will be asked to create their own tiered approach based off the examples provided in the MOU supplement. Parties involved should include the school, law enforcement, prosecuting attorneys, and an independent party who could provide community insight. This approach requires empowerment of schools and administrators to make decisions to handle behavior within the school. Schools must feel equipped to handle behaviors without calling law enforcement. The SPT identified this as a potential opening to incorporate restorative justice practices. Members of the State Policy Team are encouraged to consider recommendations for improving the MOU (e.g. moving beyond training, accountability, role of SROs and law enforcement in schools) to be presented to the JJOC. Send recommendations to CJJR by October 12th. CJJR will compile recommendations and share with Megan for JJOC's review. o JJOC's report with recommendations is due by November 30th. Finalization of the report will be done by mid-November. **Guiding Coalition Update** The team agreed to put together a Guiding Coalition to help spread the word of CYPM work in Kansas, to provide recommendations for services and supports, and to offer

10:30 am

10:48 am

- available resources to the State Policy Team. The Guiding Coalition will also add an additional layer of accountability to the work.
- Members of State Policy Team are encouraged to submit recommendations for the guiding coalition to Ashley and Michelle.

Update on Engagement with Montgomery & Shawnee Counties

CJJR provided a CYPM orientation to Montgomery and Shawnee Counties on September 21st.

The next meetings with Shawnee and Montgomery Counties are being scheduled by Doodle Poll and will occur late October or early November. In preparation for the next meeting, the counties were asked to acquire aggregate crossover youth data specific to each county that includes race, ethnicity, and gender; create Leadership and Implementation Teams that reflect the crossover population and are inclusive of professionals across systems, agencies, and organizations; and develop a plan to engage youth and families in the crossover work. 10:53 am **Update on Engagement Opportunities** To date, the members of the State Policy Team and CJJR have presented on the CYPM and Kansas' CYPM efforts at the following events: Children's Alliance Foster Care Collaborative: August 20, 2020 Joint Citizen Review Panel: August 28, 2020 Foster Care Oversight Committee: September 22, 2020 Shay Bilchik, Megan Milner, and Steve Stonehouse from Sedgwick County presented on the State Policy Team and provided the Kansas CYPM flyer to the Foster Care Oversight Committee The committee members were very engaged and interested in this work, and they will likely want an update in the future. The group was curious regarding the data that currently exists and outcomes that can be achieved. This committee may provide advocacy for the State Policy Team and could be helpful in breaking down barriers and addressing challenges that the SPT encounters in the CYPM work. CJJR will put together a report of challenges experienced and lessons learned from Sedgwick County in anticipation of the need for advocacy from the committee. The report will include expected opportunities and likely challenges within the pilot There was interest in the use of respite beds to prevent disruption to foster care placement, or when guardians, parents, and/or youth need a break The Governor's Conference has been cancelled. CJJR is working with Ashley and Michelle on a CYPM update to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee's annual report. 10:55 am **Next Steps** SPT to provide recommendations for the Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee to the CJJR team by October 12th Provide recommendations to the guiding coalition to Michelle and Ashley. Future Dates: Calls/meetings are held on the 4th Wednesday of the month from 10:00am-12:00pm. Subsequent dates include: -October 28th at 10am -December 9th1 - *This meeting will take the place of the November 25th and December 23rd meetings that were originally scheduled.

11:00 am Workgroup Break	outs (see agendas below)
Information	n Sharing
 Prevention 	

Upcoming Topics:
* Progress on cross-county case planning

CYPM Kansas State Policy Team: Information Sharing Workgroup Summary September 23, 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 Outline & Provide Feedback
	 CJJR presented an outline that listed each of the relevant codes and a brief descriptor. The workgroup discussed the utility of including the key decision points that the CY case management process will create and stating the applicable code that supports information sharing. CJJR will have the next draft of the document prepared for review at the October meeting.
11: 35am	Determining what's most useful for the jurisdiction-not addressed due to
	lack of participation
	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

September 23, 2020 11:00am-12:00pm

SPT 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 Purpose of the Workgroup
11:10 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 Service availability: 1) lack of trauma-responsive services; 2)
	lack of shared services across systems; 3) system
	involvement required to access services
	Communication: 1) lack of coordination among agencies and providers; 2) communication especially missing among frontline staff
	 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:
	 Lack of capacity and long wait lists to access services. The pervasive myth that kids must enter the system to be able to tap into resources. Additionally, the idea that kids will be able to access all the resources they need once they do enter the system.
	 Challenges with youth who are chronic runners and the struggle to get them into services as soon as they return. One way to ameliorate this issue could be to have a set clinician who facilitates this quick access. Challenges associated with youth who have mental health
	needs and/or trauma related behaviors. Johnson County is using money from the state saved through SB 367 to assist with triage for youth with mental health needs/trauma related behaviors. If the state also contributes funding for triage, this could open up to the state and provide an opportunity for
	cross agency work.
	Opportunities for the work

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 placement Placement Changes - those ages 10 and older in foster care who experience a certain level of placement instability or a certain number of placement
	 changes Release 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 home
	NTA Challenges - youth who fail to uphold a Notice to Appear Thursday (TRD) could to got a component of the system or a population of
	 Education (TBD: could target a component of the system or a population of young people)
	Other suggestions?
11:55 am	Wrap-up & Next Steps