

## **Juvenile Justice Symposium “System Resources” Workgroup**

Meeting Minutes

April 14, 2010

8:30 – 11:30 am

Commission on Children and Families—Large Conf. Room

### **Members attending in person:**

Debbie Patterson, Crook County Juvenile Department, Co-Sponsor  
Colette S. Peters, Oregon Youth Authority, Co-Sponsor  
Molly Rogers, Wasco County Juvenile Department  
Dennis Kenna, Washington County Juvenile Department  
Trish Redding, Polk County Juvenile Department  
Jeff Milligan, Juvenile Justice Consultant  
Maria Thomas, Lane County Department of Youth  
Sam Ko, Department of Education

### **Members attending by phone:**

Dave Koch, Multnomah County Juvenile Department  
Scott Taylor, Multnomah County Justice Center  
Ken Hales, Deschutes County Juvenile Justice  
Deevy Holcomb, Deschutes County Juvenile Department  
Michelle Maher, Lewis & Clark College  
Rick O’Dell, J Bar J Youth Ranch  
Hon. Merri S. Wyatt, Multnomah County Circuit Court

### **Members unable to attend:**

Marcela Mendoza, Centro LatinoAmericano  
Patricia Ramirez, Salem Keizer Public Schools  
Lory Humbert, Oregon Youth Authority  
Paul Snider, Association of Oregon Counties

### **Others in attendance:**

Helen Hoang, OYA Public Policy & Government Relations Manager  
Cherie Lingelbach, OYA JJIS Policy & Standards Coordinator  
Lynn Oliver, OYA Facilitator  
Jean Bergen, OYA Assistant to the Director

### **Items of Consideration Specific to the “System Resources” Workgroup:**

- Distribution and access of resources throughout the state.
- Wraparound service models for youth offenders with multiple service needs.
- Effective management of youth in the juvenile justice system who have mental health or substance abuse issues.
- Responses/resources for repeat and chronic offenders (property and person).
- Responses to the growing number of youth in OYA’s correctional facility.

### **Items of Consideration to be Incorporated into All Workgroups:**

- Data-driven
- County/state roles
- Gender issues
- Victims
- Disproportionality/over-representation of minority youth in the system
- Gangs
- Brain development/research (impulse control, cause-effect)

### **MEETING AGENDA**

1. Understand Background and Directive from Steering Committee
2. Come Together as a Group
3. Clarify the Deliverables
4. Identify What is Needed to Accomplish Goals
5. Outline Process to Achieve the Goal
6. Clarify Issue Statement
7. Defining Areas of Agreement/Non-Agreement
8. Closing and Next Steps

Debbie Patterson welcomed the group, and thanked everyone for their interest and involvement in this Juvenile Justice Summit Workgroup. She reminded the group that a Juvenile Justice Summit in 1994 resulted in the origination of the Oregon Youth Authority.

Helen gave a brief background and the purpose of the Juvenile Justice Summit Steering Committee and its members; in addition, she explained the differences in the four workgroups and the charge of each individual group.

Lynn Oliver explained her role as the facilitator of this workgroup. She mentioned that the workgroups will also have a meeting in each of the months of May, June, and July. The actual Summit is tentatively scheduled to be held sometime in mid-October.

Helen Hoang provided packets of printed material, which includes detailed information with regard to statistics and the overall subject of youth offenders. All members present received this packet of information; packets will be mailed to members not attending in person. Cherie Lingelbach briefly went through the information contained in each packet.

Maria Thomas asked if the information would be broken down to give details of ethnicity; Cherie responded that, yes, there are many ways to sort the data—including by ethnicity. Jeff Milligan reminded the group that, due to budget issues, there might be cuts and we need to be strategically minded and driven by assessment data and recidivism risk of youth. Colette Peters added that the majority of OYA youth in *close custody* are high-risk youth; however, with regard to DOC commits there are many more youth who are low risk, but are in OYA custody due to Measure 11 charges.

Sam Ko suggested that the group look at how much money is spent per youth from each agency/group. Dave Koch added that we need to look at whether the services for youth are meeting their criminogenic risk factors in each area. Discussion ensued. Maria Thomas added that culturally specific services need to also be looked at and addressed; Dave agreed, and reminded that we need to look at other specific areas, such as gender specific.

Jeff Milligan noted that the legislature always asks why OYA costs more than DOC to have a person in custody, and that transition services will ultimately cost more. A lot of planning has been focused on pre-commitment, but we need to also look at the community side both for OYA and juvenile departments—keeping in mind that we need to address housing, are they receiving the right interventions and resources, etc.

Scott Taylor asked if the population of DOC youth are part of this conversation. Colette said that they absolutely have to be, and that is one of the conversations OYA is having with DOC. These youth are being treated differently than OYA youth. By working with DOC, OYA is trying to improve the various treatment and transition for these youth. Cherie added that the percentage of the population in OYA close custody facilities that DOC youth represent, as well as the percentage of the resources it takes to house these youth.

Helen Hoang handed out additional information, some of which details where state and county resources are located throughout the State of Oregon. She asked for input from the group with regard to accuracy and/or additional resources that may not be listed. Dave Koch asked that the state map indicating location of various resources be sent to all county juvenile department

directors for each of their review of accuracy. Changes/updates/input should be sent to Helen Hoang.

Lynn Oliver asked what this workgroup expects to produce? Colette shared that, through a variety of conversations with many people, there was concern that trying to recreate the 1994 Summit would be an unachievable task. Instead, it was decided that the ultimate October event would be more of a “Symposium,” rather than a “Summit.” (It is tentatively set for October 12<sup>th</sup>.) Details of the Symposium are still undecided—whether it will be one day, two days, or possibly even 1½ days. Colette reminded that this is a *juvenile justice* symposium, and that everyone involved needs to assist in the planning and decision making of the ultimate details for the symposium.

Jeff Milligan reminded that the legislature will be looking at the following: Effectiveness of current services? Do the services match the assessment? Are mental health issues being addressed? Are alcohol and drug services being provided? Etc. He went on to reiterate what Dave Koch stated earlier: what services are working and actually help youth overcome criminogenic risks. Discussion ensued.

Molly Rogers asked how we actually communicate and start the dialogue as to what the resources are and how we access those resources. She noted that, at this table, a person who seems to be “missing” is a “mental health” authority person. Discussion continued as to who would might be the appropriate person to cover the mental health area.

Maria Thomas asked how we determine that the services provided and referred to youth are actually best-practices services and whether they are helping the youth?—how do we confirm that the services being delivered are working? Cherie Lingelbach explained that the CPC (Correctional Program Checklist) is a tool that assesses programs proactively—through staff and youth interviews, observations and file reviews—and it ultimately produces results that provide a measurement of a program’s expected effectiveness. Rick O’Dell said that J Bar J is scrutinized by 30 different entities, although not all are with regard to services provided—his point being that residential treatment facilities are scrutinized very closely, only second to OYA itself.

Scott Taylor asked: Where in the system should the resources fall? And so what? How do we utilize what’s available, what are the priorities, and where should they lie? Where should we focus our resources? What other factors need to be looked at? How do we look at high-risk youth—who decides what “high-risk” actually means? Discussion. Rick O’Dell added that it’s very important that we also need to look at youth behavior. Rick went on to explain that the lack of continuity and complementary services within the various areas, and how the first step needs to complement the second steps, etc. Discussion. Jeff Milligan expressed that Rick’s comments should be added as an addition bullet to this workgroup’s charge: “Complementary Services between the Systems.” Michelle Maher added that we also need to look at these youth far earlier

than them entering the juvenile justice system, as there are almost always indicators that point to the fact that they will ultimately become a youth offender. Maria Thomas added that racial and social economic issues also play a big part in this, which needs to be looked at. Discussion ensued. Dave Koch summarized that this has to do with differential involvement and differential selection and how those youth are identified.

Lynn Oliver redirected the group back to the issues of redirecting youth prior to becoming involved in the juvenile justice system, and who else might be a good addition to this workgroup? It was felt that a representative from law enforcement would be helpful. Scott Taylor asked whether, if we *were* able to identify through the Symposium characteristics of youth who will, most likely, ultimately end up in the juvenile justice system, is there something that the group can do to prevent these youth from becoming youth offenders? Molly Rogers asked that, possibly, the “Stopping the Cycle” group have a bullet added to address the younger youth population.

A discussion continued to fill in “Who’s Missing” from the workgroup of representatives that may be helpful additions. In addition, the workgroup discussed “What Will the Symposium Look Like?” and “What Will the Participants Take Away from the Symposium?” A lengthy discussion continued.

**ACTION:** The System Resources Workgroup members will develop a “map” of the resources available throughout the continuum.

Molly Rogers added that a discussion of the *effectiveness* of the various resources is another topic. Rick O’Dell added that an audit of four counties recently completed by the Secretary of State’s Office, OYA was not reviewing/making other entities accountable for JCP Basic and Diversion Funds. Discussion. Molly Rogers explained that there is not the same amount of funding now as there was ten years ago, when these programs began. Colette Peters added that the Internal Auditor is looking into those audit recommendations. Cherie Lingelbach went on to explain that, now that there is a standardized method of tracking, it will be much easier to track the various types of services provided by JCP funds.

Molly Rogers added a previous study done was “The Cost Avoidance Model,” which might be something that this workgroup may want to look at to, see if components of that overlap the resources this group is looking at. It breaks down the cost to a community when a crime is committed: costs associated with the victims, judicial process, prosecution, supervision, etc.—all of the components involved. Dave Koch went on to explain that this study looked at *chronic* offenders and all of the factors involved with a crime being committed. Discussion. Michelle Maher reminded that the group that, when budget cuts are made, frequently it will be prevention programs for the younger population that are the first to be cut.

**ACTION:** Molly Rogers and/or Dave Koch will send to Helen Hoang both the “Cost Avoidance Model” study results, as well as “The Model for Early Intervention” results. Helen will provide these to the workgroup.

Lynn Oliver recapped the process of this workgroup achieving the goals identified. Cherie Lingelbach asked everyone for their contributions to map resources and costs associated with those resources. Dave Koch suggested that the costs associated results be delayed until after budgets are finalized at the end of June.

**ACTION:** Helen Hoang and Cherie Lingelbach will send a draft to each workgroup member to supply the county general dollars for various topics, along with definitions of each topic. After members have completed this information, it should be sent to Helen Hoang.

- How much money is spent on each youth (in addition, by counties vs. state; by OYA vs. DHS, etc.)
- Total money spent per youth for:
  - Probation
  - Close Custody
  - Education
    - Special Education
    - Grants/Cost Assistance
    - Alternative Education
  - Detention
  - Shelter
  - Treatment Services

Discussion ensued as to whether the Department of Education will be able to provide actual dollars spent per youth by school district.

Dave Koch explained that we need to look at which youth do not get into placements; and, more specifically, OYA community parole/probation placements. Cherie Lingelbach replied that, from a data standpoint, this information is not in JJIS at this point. She asked if Dave has some outcome information. Dave responded that, at the probation level, the county should be working with OYA to get youth into placement and, if a youth is not getting into a specific placement, why not? He went on to explain that there should be some type of list that includes why a youth is rejected for placement. Rick O’Dell shared the types of things J Bar J looks at; oftentimes the deciding factor is based on the interview with the youth. Discussion continued. Dave concluded that he wants to ensure that staff do not stop making referrals for a youth because they think that the youth will always be rejected—and that this may, in fact, be an urban myth that this could be happening. Rick briefly explained some of the factors that are looked at when determining whether to accept or reject a youth into a residential program. Scott Taylor asked whether, when

we look at which youth *are* in community placements, we then will be able to determine which types of youth are being rejected. Cherie Lingelbach explained how this data can be gathered and shared with the workgroup. A lengthy discussion ensued as to how the residential data can be collected from counties, when the youth have never been committed to OYA's custody.

Jean Bergen read aloud to the group, Scott Taylor's earlier suggestion that the workgroup focus on: Where in the system should the resources fall? And so what? How do we utilize what's available, what are the priorities, and where should they lie? Where should we focus our resources? What other factors need to be looked at? How do we look at high-risk youth—who decides what "high-risk" actually means?

Rick O'Dell added we need to be sure to include the law in our discussions—ORS 419(C)—which details the purposes of juvenile justice in delinquency cases.

**ACTION:** The language of ORS 419(C) will be included as an addendum at the end of these meeting minutes.

**ACTION:** The group agreed that a draft issue statement is: Where in the system should the resources fall?

**NEXT MEETING:**                    **May 12, 2010**

**8:30-11:30 am**

**OYA Central Office**  
**530 Center Street NE, Suite 200**  
**Salem, Oregon 97301**

**ADDENDUM:**

**419C.001 Purposes of juvenile justice system in delinquency cases; audits.** (1) The Legislative Assembly declares that in delinquency cases, the purposes of the Oregon juvenile justice system from apprehension forward are to protect the public and reduce juvenile delinquency and to provide fair and impartial procedures for the initiation, adjudication and disposition of allegations of delinquent conduct. The system is founded on the principles of personal responsibility, accountability and reformation within the context of public safety and restitution to the victims and to the community. The system shall provide a continuum of services that emphasize prevention of further criminal activity by the use of early and certain

sanctions, reformation and rehabilitation programs and swift and decisive intervention in delinquent behavior. The system shall be open and accountable to the people of Oregon and their elected representatives.

(2)(a) Programs, policies and services shall be regularly and independently audited. Audits performed under this subsection must include program audits and performance audits, as defined in ORS 297.070. Programs, policies and services that were established before, on or after June 30, 1995, are subject to audit under this subsection.

(b) The programs, policies and services of county juvenile departments shall be subject to regular review pursuant to this subsection.

(c) The Secretary of State shall perform an audit that includes the performance of county juvenile departments.

(d) ORS 297.405 to 297.555 do not apply to an audit conducted pursuant to this subsection.

(e) Notwithstanding ORS 297.040, the costs and expenses of audits conducted under this subsection may not be charged to the county juvenile departments. The Secretary of State shall pay the costs and expenses of audits conducted under this subsection from funds available to the Secretary of State.

(3) To facilitate an audit under subsection (2) of this section:

(a) The Secretary of State may subpoena witnesses, require the production of books and papers and the rendering of reports in such manner and form as the Secretary of State requires and may do all things necessary to secure a full and thorough investigation.

(b) The custodian of information that the Secretary of State deems necessary to conduct the audit shall provide the Secretary of State or the auditor selected by the Secretary of State access to the information notwithstanding the fact that the information may be made confidential or access to the information restricted by ORS 419A.255 or another law. Information obtained by the Secretary of State or the auditor pursuant to this paragraph and made confidential by ORS 419A.255 or another law may be used by the Secretary of State, the officers and employees of the Secretary of State or the auditor solely for the purpose of performing the audit required by subsection (2) of this section and may not be used or disclosed for any other purpose. [1995 c.422 §1a; 2001 c.904 §16; 2007 c.688 §1]