

The Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs
Two Constitution Square – 145 N Street NE – Washington, DC 20002

June 22, 2015 Meeting
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The June 22, 2015, meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Council) was hosted by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

U.S. Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch, Council Chair, and OJJDP Administrator Robert L. Listenbee, Council Vice-Chair, presided over the meeting which focused on a study completed by the Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center, titled “[Closer to Home: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms](#).” This unique study of justice-involved Texas youth draws on an unprecedented dataset of 1.3 million individual case records spanning eight years. It reveals that children experience better outcomes when they receive targeted, appropriate community-based services. Young people incarcerated in state-run facilities are 21 percent more likely to be rearrested, than children with very similar profiles who remain under closer-to-home, community-based supervision and services. When they do reoffend, youth released from state correctional facilities are three times more likely to commit a felony than youth close to home.

The CSG Justice Center led an expert panel discussion on the national and state ramifications of reducing these out-of-home placements for children involved in the juvenile justice system. Council members and practitioners offered their experiences and concerns about resources and tools, cultural shifts, provider issues, and prevention/reentry activities needed to engage justice-involved children and their families, and to carry the work forward.

Two new Council subcommittees were formally announced: Youth and Family Engagement, and Mentoring. Subcommittee members, co-chairs, and meeting schedules will be identified and communicated soon.

Attending her first Council meeting, Attorney General Lynch praised Administrator Listenbee’s leadership of the Department and his tireless passion for the welfare of the nation’s youth. She also recognized the extraordinary accomplishments of the Council in the last four decades and pledged the Department’s dedication and her personal commitment to this work. The Attorney General reiterated her inspiration for the commitment of such dedicated professional colleagues and shared her enthusiasm for a future that offers hope and change for the nation’s youth, who are the key to a better America.

Opening Remarks and Introductions

Robin Delany-Shabazz, *Designated Federal Official (DFO), Coordinating Council, Director, Concentration of Federal Efforts, and Associate Administrator, State and Community Development Division (OJJDP)*, called the meeting to order. She welcomed attendees, including those participating via webcast, with special acknowledgement to U.S. Attorney General (AG) Loretta E. Lynch and OJJDP Administrator Robert L. Listenbee. The webcast recording, meeting notes, and other presentation materials and handouts, will be posted on the Coordinating Council website at <http://www.juvenilecouncil.gov/> within 90 days of the meeting. Oral testimony or comments from the general public were not accepted at the meeting. Members of the general public were advised they may submit written comments directly to Ms. Delany-Shabazz via her contact information in the Federal Register notice announcing this meeting. [NOTE: As of the publication of these meeting notes, Jeff Slowikowski, Senior Policy Advisor, OJJDP, is acting DFO of the Coordinating Council and written comments can still be sent to jeff.slowikowski@usdoj.gov]

Robert L. Listenbee, *Administrator, OJJDP, Vice Chair, Coordinating Council*, thanked Ms. Delany-Shabazz and expressed his honor to welcome the Council's new Chair, Loretta E. Lynch. Presiding over her first Council meeting, and on the job less than two months, AG Lynch has already spoken eloquently and passionately on juvenile justice reforms and her commitment to protect the nation's children. As the former U.S. Attorney for New York's Eastern District, she successfully fought on behalf of child victims of human trafficking, and has vowed to continue that work at the national level.

Loretta E. Lynch, *U.S. Attorney General (AG), DOJ, Chair, Coordinating Council*, shared her gratitude for being able to attend the meeting and complimented Administrator Listenbee for his leadership of the Department and his obvious regard for the welfare of the nation's youth. She further acknowledged the support of Assistant AG Karol Mason, Principal Deputy AG Beth McGarry, White House Domestic Policy Council Deputy Assistant Roy Austin, and everyone working tirelessly on the leading issue of the day – juvenile justice.

AG Lynch recognized the extraordinary accomplishments of the Coordinating Council in the last four decades on behalf of the nation's youth, to focus federal efforts on preventing youth violence and victimization and keeping young people on the right path. She pledged the Department's dedication—and her personal commitment—to find the best intervention strategies. Pleased to see that the Council's focus was on research and understanding programmatic impacts, she asserted that systems must be responsive to the emerging research and information on best practices, if children are to avoid the juvenile justice system and experience better outcomes. The AG highlighted some wonderful results from collaborations yet reminded everyone that multi-layered problems require multi-layered solutions and that there are promising signs of progress. Juvenile violent crime has reached its lowest level in over three decades and the national juvenile confinement rate declined by nearly half between 1997 and 2013. AG Lynch anticipates that everyone—driven by commitment and passion—will continue contributing their best efforts to generate the massive energy needed to change lives and strengthen communities.

Administrator Listenbee thanked AG Lynch for her comments and invited guests and Council members, including those attending via webcast, to introduce themselves.

- Judge Adele Grubbs/Cobb County, GA
- Judge Gordon Martin/MA
- Judge Trina Thompson/Alameda County, CA
- Lisa Lauxman/DA
- Mary Lou Leary/ONDCP
- Ronn Nozoe/ED

Opening Remarks and Introductions

- Karen Morgan/DOD
- Richard Morris/DOL
- Rachel Frier/DHS
- Pamela Rodriguez/TASC, Inc.
- Michael Thompson/CSG-JC
- Susan Burke/Juvenile Justice Services, UT
- John Tilley/House of Representatives, KY
- Randy Turner/Tarrant County, TX
- Jennifer Hojaiban/CNCS
- Lark Huang/HHS
- Charles Homer/HHS
- Kevin Washburn/DOI
- Ron Ashford/HUD
- Judge Deborah Schumacher/2nd Judicial District Court, NV
- R. Dwayne Betts/CYJ
- Roy Austin/White House

The Administrator outlined his three top OJJDP priorities:

1. Address the core protections outlined in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (de-institutionalization of status offenders, removal of juveniles from adult jails, sight and sound separation between juveniles and adults in confinement, and addressing disproportionate minority contact).
2. Reform the juvenile justice system to better meet the needs of youth, families, and communities.
3. Reduce youth out-of-home placements (the focus of this meeting).

When youth enter the system, only those who pose a bona fide threat to public safety should be confined. Otherwise, most youth have better outcomes when they receive appropriate community-based services. Dramatic strides to reduce residential placements have been achieved, including those for status offenses, without compromising public safety.

Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms*

Michael Thompson, Director, Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center, congratulated AG Lynch on inheriting a fantastic juvenile justice team and edified Administrator Listenbee as an expert practitioner and tireless advocate for at-risk youth. Director Thompson presented a study completed by the CSG Justice Center titled [*Closer to Home: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms*](#), opening with background information about efforts to reduce the number of Texas youth in secure confinement.

In 2007, Texas took steps to ensure status offenders were no longer incarcerated. In 2009, investments were made in different community-based programs. In 2011 and 2013, further reductions were achieved through additional steps. However, Texas youth released from secure facilities experienced high rearrest rates – 75 and 85 percent over a three- and five-year period, respectively – triggering an eagerness to better understand the impact of the 2007 reforms. The state achieved reductions in youth confinements with support from OJJDP, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trusts; and with expertise from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; and through partnerships with the Texas Juvenile Justice Department and the Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University.

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home*:
An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms**

Mr. Thompson highlighted several aspects of the study which was unique in its scope, encompassing the review of millions of records that spanned multiple databases. The 2007 reforms were credited with dramatic declines in the number of justice-supervised youth (e.g., from 5,000 confined youth in 2007 to approximately 1,000-1,200 today). While the racial compositions revealed an overall proportionate decline, there was no significant change in disproportionate minority confinements. Placing more youth under community supervision did not result in an increase in crime and youth released from state-run secure facilities were 21 percent more likely to be rearrested and three times more likely to commit a felony when recidivating, compared to those supervised “closer to home.” The study examined 254 Texas counties, painstakingly controlling for all variables to ensure an apples-to-apples comparison. A discouraging finding was the fact that rearrest rates did not improve and were comparable for all interventions, even though Texas closed eight facilities and increased spending on community-based supervision and treatment reforms by 98 percent. Nevertheless, Texas should be credited for taking a hard look at the study’s results. Key observations and takeaways for Texas include:

1. The state reduced the number of youth incarcerated in state facilities without compromising safety.
2. Youth supervised closer to home experienced lower rearrest rates than similar youth released from state-run secure facilities.
3. The state reinvested some of the hundreds of millions saved from the closure of the state-run secure facilities back into community-based supervision and services.
4. Best-practice gaps have rendered Texas unable to realize the full potential of its investment in community-based services; recidivism rates have still not improved overall.

Nevertheless, Texas continues to move forward and act on these results. In January 2015, the Texas Supreme Court convened state leaders, including panelist Chief Randy Turner, and introduced legislation that was recently enacted [[Texas SB 1630](#)], limiting youth confinements to state secure facilities, pushing even more youth into the community, and creating a new division within the state’s Department of Juvenile Justice to provide quality assurance, accountability, and other technical assistance to counties across the state. Key takeaways for the U.S. Department of Justice include:

1. Help states, territories, jurisdictions, counties, etc. take a hard look at the impact of enacted reforms.
2. Minimize the incarceration of youth in state correctional facilities.
3. Improve outcomes for youth under community-based supervision and identify the specific impacts.

Mr. Thompson introduced his panelists. [More detailed biographies are available on the Council’s website at <http://www.juvenilecouncil.gov/meetings.html>]

Randy Turner, *Director/Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Tarrant County Juvenile Services, Texas*, indicated this was the first study of its kind completed in Texas and he cited the importance of the access to data which allowed the examination of such critical issues. Tarrant County, Texas had one of the largest differential between the expected versus the actual rearrest and recidivism

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home:*
*An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms***

rates, surprising everyone involved, yet Chief Turner emphasized that this is more than numbers: the focus is to change the daily lives of young people and their families.

Susan Burke, *Director, Juvenile Justice Services, Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Utah*, underscored the importance of the study to inform and strengthen the community work. Five years ago in Utah, 1 in 12 youth by age 18 would have spent time in a locked detention center. Today that number is 1 in 18 and, while efforts continue, she cautioned that reduction is only half of the story: more youth are being placed into community programs closer to home but the desired outcomes still elude them.

John Tilley, *Representative, Kentucky House of Representatives*, acknowledged that Kentucky has a similarly sad story of high incarceration rates for status offenders and others committing crimes. For two years, Kentucky also worked with some of the same organizations that supported the CSG Justice Center report; the state could not have passed recent reformative legislation without those organizational supports. An oversight council was established to bring every agency and stakeholder together to aid in the difficult task of implementation.

AG Lynch thanked everyone for the overall report summary and the candid revelations on the efforts in Texas, Utah, and Kentucky. An interesting observation about the Texas study is the first-time extensive aggregation of data. Acknowledging the undesirable recidivism rates, the massive data collection allows for progress based upon real versus anecdotal information, and the key factor is that community supervision still produces better results. The question is how to translate that model into larger gains for other juveniles and what was discovered when peeling back the numbers. **Chief Turner** stated that in 2007, they became interested in diverting youth in the system on the front end. Now they have data for Tarrant County dating back to 2009 so they can trace youth from the juvenile into the adult system, including rearrest rates for years 2012-2013, and they are sharing that data with providers. **Director Burke** added that changes in organizational structure—a fundamental cultural shift—must embrace the youth developmental approach and should never try to emulate the adult system or focus on punishment. Programs are often designed to work with the most challenging youth populations, keeping them within the programs as long as possible, rather than working with low-risk adolescents who are most amenable to those programs. Utah and other states are now changing contracts to create incentives for shorter times and better outcomes.

AG Lynch sought suggestions on how the Federal Government can help with prevention and reentry efforts, especially for high-risk youth. **Chief Turner** explained that Texas passed legislation to improve their approach to truancy, helped fund some prevention models, and provided staff for a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program for two major school districts. Additionally, they are working to connect elementary children and families with the right resources. The Federal Government can help with research opportunities and guidance on implementing this type of data. **Rep. Tilley** responded to an inquiry about Kentucky's challenges to obtain data remarking that 20 percent of states do not even measure recidivism rates, posing a huge challenge to track these outcomes. The cultural shift is huge but Kentucky left a great deal of local control in the legislation to drive funds down to local levels within set parameters and this compromise seems to work fairly well. There is inadequate recidivism data for youth and this is quite unacceptable. States are suffering from pension liabilities and huge costs in healthcare and

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home*:
*An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms***

corrections, with no money left to spend on IT, new systems, and personnel to address these problems, so federal assistance is put to tremendous use.

AG Lynch commented on Kentucky's positive adult reentry programs and inquired about adult system practices that might be translated to juvenile programs. **Rep. Tilley** explained that his state was overwhelmed with the numbers, spending \$0.97 of each \$1.00 on incarceration but only \$0.03 on supervision. The greatest return on investment, for both public safety and the lives of these most troubled children and their families, comes from intensive community supervision for prevention or reentry.

AG Lynch asked panelists to share about family-involvement components of their juvenile justice programs, especially engagement in prevention and reentry activities. **Director Thompson** applauded OJJDP efforts to focus research on the integration and coordination of disciplines needed for multi-system youth. **Director Burke** explained Utah's core mission and top priority is to change young lives, support families, and keep communities safe. A child's first contact with the juvenile justice system results in diversion (no detention) to Utah's Juvenile Receiving Centers and its Youth Services Programs. A full assessment is conducted on the youth and the family to discuss the issues and resources needed. Youth directly involved in state custody or under probation supervision are involved in a child and family team meeting; nothing is done without their involvement and the research supports improved outcomes as a result.

AG Lynch reiterated the driving message that this is an integrated, cohesive, and holistic approach to the juvenile as a community member, with significant family involvement and preventive processes. While the recidivism data may be disappointing in one sense, the report still informs and encourages the Department and its partners to focus on successful community programs, because reducing the number of juveniles in confinement is a win for everyone. She was enthusiastic about future engagement with the group.

Administrator Listenbee conveyed his appreciation for the presence of the AG and his pleasure in working with Mr. Thompson, his staff, and member state representatives during the last four years on three critical youth justice issues: school discipline, reentry, and out-of-home placement. The CSG Justice Center always delivers thoughtful and thorough analysis and the Administrator appreciates the research-to-practice model they implement.

Roy Austin, *Deputy Assistant, White House Domestic Policy Council*, inquired if the study numbers reflect the fact that 17-year-olds are moved directly to the adult court, as opposed to the vast majority of states which wait until age 18. This is a critical issue because nine states treat 16- and 17-year-olds as adults. **Director Thompson** replied that the Texas reforms included the termination of jurisdiction for a number of youth who were in secure confinement. Previously defined at age 21, the age was shortened to 19 in Texas for detention, allowing youth to be pushed back into their communities. However, several states continue to treat 16-year-olds as adults. **Chief Turner** commented that their legislation to address 17-year-olds as juveniles did not pass. The research does not address that particular aspect of the system but he believes it is becoming a more prevalent concern and anticipates an increased focus during the next session.

Director Burke, in response to Mr. Austin's inquiry about tools, stated that some jurisdictions are completely lacking validated risk assessment tools and the challenge is to ascertain if the tools or the results are being used appropriately but those who do have them. This is an opportunity for

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home:*
*An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms***

the Justice Department to assist states in developing better ways to utilize state-of-the-art tools. **Director Thompson** found the Texas data fascinating as they examined how children were assigned to approximately 250 programs: all but three programs mixed youth with different risk levels, often resulting in inappropriate assignment to the same programs. There was an increased surge for low-risk youth but not for those with a high risk.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

Administrator Listenbee invited the panelists, Council members, and practitioners to share their thoughts, concerns, experiences, and suggestions to reduce out-of-home placements. Their comments were primarily related to the use of collaborative resources/tools, cultural shifts needed, provider issues, and critical prevention/reentry activities. [The majority of those comments have been aggregated and reproduced in the Appendix at the end of these notes.]

Judge Gordon Martin, Jr., retired, Massachusetts Trial Court, acknowledged the inadequate development of the adolescent brain, and that juveniles must be kept out of the adult courts.

Judge Adele Grubbs, Superior Court of Cobb County, Georgia, agreed with the need for mandatory reentry programs and cited the relative lack of tools, education, or programs for these youth.

Laurie Garduque, Ph.D., Program Director, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (MacArthur Foundation) found it noteworthy that this study is comparable with other research that highlights the outcomes from treating juveniles as juveniles, rather than as adults, and felt the Texas results were very promising. She highlighted the Crossroads to Desistance study in the works by the MacArthur Foundation and OJJDP, which follows first-time juvenile offenders who committed offenses with a 40-60 percent chance of being entirely diverted from the juvenile justice system. The findings suggest that youth perform better when they are informally processed in the areas of school engagement, mental health and substance abuse problems, peer relations, etc., in contrast to those who are formally processed. Dr. Garduque also underscored the importance of offering training, guidance, workforce development, and training and technical assistance for standardized risk assessment tools.

Pamela Rodriguez, President, TASC, Inc., added that the same quality assurance and workforce training investments made in probation departments must also be addressed with community providers, even during times of budget cuts, and a key factor of success is the investment in IT and the retention of trained personnel. Often waiting an entire year to get a data request through the criminal history agency, she was encouraged to see data pulled from multiple systems in the study. **Director Thompson** reiterated that such a huge study is extremely time and resource intensive, requiring data resource infrastructure that can handle matching the data against the rest of the state, a capability very few states can maintain. The study spanned 2-3 years and required substantial money—and political leadership with the moxie—to drive it forward and surmount barriers.

Mary Lou Leary, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, OJP, asked how the reform efforts impacted the distressingly low numbers of youth actually receiving substance abuse treatments or interventions, compared with the numbers of those identified who actually needed services. Mr. Thompson indicated a lower risk youth was more likely to be placed into a substance abuse treatment program even if there was no stated definitive need for such treatment; moreover, treatment may be funded but not delivered to the appropriate youth, or treatment may not be

Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home*: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms

provided in ways the evidence says works. **Chief Turner** has observed significant diversity in treatment and supervision but recognizes it needs to be a priority.

Larke Huang, Ph.D., Senior Advisor on Children and Youth, Office of the Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), inquired about outcomes, information on children with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse issues, and gender issues. **Director Burke** shared that screening and assessment occur at the very front end in their receiving and servicing centers but acknowledged that they fall short of sharing that information with other community providers. Utah is moving toward a System of Care process and received SAMHSA funding to integrate all services needed in a holistic approach, because youth involved in the juvenile justice system creates a crisis for the entire family. **Rep. Tilly** indicated his entire county has embraced caregiver trauma-informed training – and youth resilience and healthy adolescent development – by school, private, mental health care systems through a collaborative process. **Director Thompson** stated it would be a game changer for health and human service agencies to begin addressing subsequent outcomes for youth; how treatments are prioritized based on risk levels; what additional treatments are incorporated into the program; etc. Typically each system funds its own services and is primarily concerned with the number of service units it delivered, so it would be very interesting for the agencies represented to discuss how the different funding streams share some outcome measures.

Judge Trina Thompson, Immediate Past Presiding Judge, Alameda County Superior Court, California, communicated that the issues of context, cultural diversity, and location are shifting the cultural paradigm. Her experience is that engaged youth consistently enjoy greater outcomes on every level. One challenge is the lack of Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) that people could review for guidance to collaborate access ethical lines, especially since everyone is competing for the same funding. **Chief Turner** admired the collaborative spirit found within various countywide initiatives and referred to the trauma-informed care practices taking place in multiple agencies across his county. He recalled a deadly shooting incident in the Dallas-Fort Worth area where the Ft. Worth mayor made a commitment to prevent that from happening again. Fifteen to twenty years later, they continue to build on that culture. **Director Burke** added that change requires advocates who are committed to make the necessary infrastructure changes and to confront federal and state laws that prohibit the sharing of information. Utah passed legislation and created an MOU between the state's department of education and its juvenile justice system that allows information sharing to help youth in custody transition back to their home school. When a school district protests that certain information cannot be shared, they are presented with a copy of the MOU for review by their attorneys.

Administrator Listenbee asked for suggestions on organizing at the federal level to provide better resources to the states for such a massive reform effort.

Richard Morris, Senior Advisor, Office of Youth Services, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), shared that the development of solicitations provides an opportunity for his department to gather additional information (e.g., rearrest rates, levels of offense, etc.). DOL recently made several awards focused on the juvenile and adult justice populations and he believes more can be done to engage young people in seeking the outcomes that make the most sense. **The Administrator** reiterated the panelists' comments about the need for workforce readiness and collaborative efforts and **Chief Turner** recalled the receipt

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home*:
*An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms***

of several grants through local communities with DOL that has helped to address the educational and career-readiness needs of youth. **Director Burke** agreed that DOL has done a great job with the Workforce Investment Act [now superseded by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act enacted July 22, 2014]. She reminded everyone that youth still remain confined and that nearly 100 percent of them will return to their respective communities; so she would like to see some of those job-training programs expanded/delivered in some of their facilities and communities to benefit those populations. **Director Thompson** agreed that the priority for elected officials in urban or rural communities in tough times is to improve employment outcomes for disconnected youth; however, the research does not show which program models have been effective. He suggested that the Labor and Justice Departments jointly fund the development of models that would imbue confidence for the subsequent research base. **Rep. Tilley** conveyed the staggering statistic that 70 million Americans (many who continue to cycle in and out of the justice system) have some sort of criminal record and efforts to connect those individuals to employment is critical. His home state has 30+ licensing restrictions, often lacking uniformity, against convicted felons: incredulously, a convicted felon may practice medicine or law in Kentucky but cannot cut your hair! **Mr. Morris** referenced several multi-million dollar awards from the Labor Department: \$12M to fund a job challenge component directly associated with the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program; and \$10M for 20 communities to implement one-stop “behind the fence” career centers where, prior to release, individuals can explore their work opportunities post-release. Face Forward grants continue to promote diversion and records sealing/expungement to mitigate the collateral consequences of having a juvenile justice record and as prerequisites for reentry.

Administrator Listenbee inquired about educational opportunities for young people in facilities and for those in transition, as well as the challenges of recruiting young people into the Defense Department, in light of their juvenile justice records. **Norris Dickard**, *Senior Advisor, Healthy Students Group, U.S. Department of Education (ED)*, stated his group operates programs offering resources for correctional education in juvenile justice facilities. They monitor six states and have very robust data on pre- and post-test educational outcomes that states can utilize to monitor their local facilities which serve longer-term students. **Karen Morgan**, *Assistant to the Defense Deputy Undersecretary, Military, Community and Family Policy, Office of Children and Youth, U.S. Department of Defense (DOD)*, replied that DOD deploys a strong background check process. The Closer to Home study has great resources DOD can use, especially the assessment tools. Fair and accurate use of those tools by trained individuals is essential for consistent measurements; otherwise different results with the same tools can lock individuals into the system. DOD would be interested in the community support process to improve assistance to incarcerated individuals and their families. **Chief Turner** lives near a military base that accommodates tens of thousands of his constituents at any one time and he encouraged continued efforts by DOD. Youth often lose the opportunity to serve because of their records, sometimes due to misdemeanors committed at age 18 or 19; or they suffer such tragic circumstances during their service that they cannot get employment as veterans upon returning home.

Deborah Schumacher, *District Court Judge, Second Judicial District Court, Nevada*, questioned why interventions have not worked for children supervised in the community. In many states, funds may not be available for these purposes, raising concerns about the level of substance abuse and behavioral health services being provided through Medicaid funding streams. From a provider

**Discussion – National and State Ramifications of *Closer to Home*:
*An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms***

perspective, resources necessary to deliver evidence-based practices with positive impact do not always come through the states, resulting in potential quality and quantity barriers, and Judge Schumacher felt it is critical to examine Medicaid coverages as a possible basis for the barriers. **Director Thompson** confirmed this was examined in the study. Obviously, youth participation in a treatment program may need to be coupled with other services that could impact behavior. Moreover, states have varying thresholds for Medicaid qualification rendering it more difficult to ascertain exactly which services are reimbursable under Medicaid.

Chief Turner added that many private providers can draw down the Medicaid dollars for those youth which makes additional resources available. His state legislature provided additional county resources so they can provide more effective services at the local level. **Dr. Huang** responded that Medicaid offers comprehensive benefits often exceeding many insurance plans; however, many community-based organizations—especially those in the substance abuse arena for youth—are still becoming Medicaid-eligible. Youth must be diagnosed for Medicaid eligibility and her agency can work with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on this. Acknowledging the concerns about screening, assessment, and upfront diversion, she proposed joining with DOJ on this task. SAMHSA is funding more at the state level rather than community-based organizations, for youth with mental health and addiction issues, but states are indicating difficulty getting their juvenile justice partners to the table. Dr. Huang suggested bringing the Closer to Home study to those grant programs.

Mr. Morris reminded the Council that many young people face termination of their Medicaid benefits, not just suspension, when they find themselves in secure confinement. Care must be taken to ensure these youth remain eligible. **Charles Homer**, *Deputy Assistant Secretary, Human Services Policy, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*, is working closely with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to soon clarify the rules around eligibility for Medicaid during those out-of-home placements.

Judge Gordon Martin ended the Council discussion with expressions of gratitude for the support and encouragement of AG Lynch.

Council Member Announcements

Administrator Listenbee appreciated everyone's contributions to the discussion and was pleased to announce the formation of two new Council subcommittees, which will have co-chairs from both OJJDP and the Council.

Family and Youth Engagement Subcommittee: Cindy Pappas, *Senior Policy Advisor, OJJDP*, will co-chair this subcommittee which fulfills a recommendation from parents of justice-involved youth to support achievement of OJJDP priorities. It also helps other Council member agencies inform their work through direct engagement with justice-involved youth and their families.

Mentoring: Scott Pestridge, *Senior Policy Advisor, OJJDP*, will staff this subcommittee with the President's My Brother's Keeper (MBK) workgroup and also serve as the MBK liaison. This subcommittee fulfills one of the deliverables of the MBK initiative. Both subcommittees will engage staff and practitioner members and will periodically report progress to the Council. OJJDP staff will soon contact Council agencies and practitioner members to identify remaining co-chairs, subcommittee members, and meeting schedules.

Council Member Announcements

Ron Ashford, *Director, HOPE VI Community and Supportive Services, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)*, informed the Council that there was a federal mentoring council some eight years ago. Led by Maria-Lana Queen, the MBK Subcommittee documented 20 agencies with mentoring components in their programs. They reconvened to research best practices and to engage the mentoring organizations. HUD received second chance money for expungement of records for public housing residents (or those who would have been residents but for their convictions).

Lisa Lauxman, *Director, Youth Development, Coordinator, National Children, Youth and Families at Risk, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), U.S. Department of Agriculture*, briefly mentioned the Food and Nutrition Service which is targeting tribal and rural areas and seeking to increase teen participation, and she referred attendees to information provided in the meeting packet. NIFA has community-based partners through the Cooperative Extension System, tied to the land-grant universities, providing opportunities for positive youth and family engagement strategies for those seeking community-based partners. On the food sustainability side, there is always a need for more beginning farmers/ranchers and suggested this as a potential diversion or reentry opportunity.

Jennifer Hojaiban, *Policy Advisor, Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS)*, announced that applications submitted to AmeriCorps¹ by the May 31 deadline are being reviewed and awards will be announced at the end of the summer.

Norris Dickard, *Senior Advisor, Healthy Students Group, ED*, continues to spread the word on the Correctional Education Guidance Package – a joint undertaking by ED and DOJ, aimed at helping states and local agencies strengthen the quality of education services provided to America's estimated 60,000+ young people in confinement every day. They recently presented an expert panel to discuss trends, challenges, and opportunities in correctional education.

SAMHSA submitted written announcements which may be viewed on the Council's website.

Closing Remarks and Meeting Adjournment

Administrator Robert L. Listenbee thanked everyone for a meeting that was highly engaging and informative and conveyed his appreciation to the Coordinating Council and those who traveled long distances. He reiterated that resource materials will be posted on the Council's website at <http://www.juvenilecouncil.gov/> and encouraged everyone to share collaborative ideas that will draw attention to the various constituencies and the multitude of available resources on juvenile justice reentry.

In closing, the Administrator shared his gratitude to his OJP, OJJDP colleagues who helped plan this meeting, with special recognition of Kathi Grasso, former Designated Federal Official for the Council, who helped planned the meeting and with whom he had the pleasure of working for a number of years.

Meeting was adjourned: 12:10 p.m.

¹ AmeriCorps is a partnership between OJJDP and CNCS intended to engage youth, who have been disconnected from school or work, with service and mentorship opportunities.

APPENDIX

Closer-to-Home Takeaways

RESOURCES/TOOLS

1. Reduce confinements and reinvest funds back into community-based support.
2. Research is crucial; more than just addressing numbers, it facilitates change in the daily lives of young people and their families.
3. Implementation is more difficult without agency resources and youth must be tracked into adulthood to determine success or failure. The Texas study used significant resources; the breadth and depth of such a study cannot be accomplished without state resources.
4. Drive money down to the local levels within set parameters.
5. More funding is needed to help connect youth, families, and schools with the appropriate resources to keep children in school.
6. Improve employment outcomes: Labor and Justice Departments might fund research to better identify which program models have been most effective.
7. Tools:
 - Proper tools are essential to determine if a youth is a low- or high-risk offender, and guidance on the use of those tools is needed to better inform decision-making.
 - IT support is needed for new systems and tools. States suffer from exponentially increased costs for health, corrections, pensions, etc. with insufficient funds left for technology or for the personnel required for implementation and maintenance. Federal assistance is put to tremendous use to keep the train moving down the track.
 - The federal government can assist in identifying state-of-the-art tools to improve the practice, focused on inter-reliability, training, and appropriate use for consistent results.
 - Licenses must be maintained for these assessment tools, requiring training and funds.
8. Data collection using real versus anecdotal information allows for progress but requires a robust infrastructure/funding support and the ability to match data against the rest of the state.

CULTURE SHIFTS

1. The political will and leadership to drive change is crucial. Bring champions willing to confront federal and state laws that prohibit sharing of information to make infrastructure changes.
2. Major paradigm shifts in culture and organizational structure are needed to redirect resources. It is a slow process and must include measurements for performance, effectiveness, quality, etc.
3. Embrace the core principles because they address the priorities and system changes needed to reduce all youth involvement in the juvenile justice system.
4. There is too much emphasis on corrections and not enough on youth developmental approaches.
5. Address the gaps between what works versus the implementation barriers.
6. Stop trying to emulate the adult correctional system.
7. Contracts should offer incentives to reduce confinements for better outcomes.
8. Without tracking children into adulthood, accurate measurements of outcomes are impossible.
9. Do not just focus on recidivism, which is a long-term measure of outcomes. Also recognize the short-term gains in education, mental health and substance abuse treatments, employment, etc., that can be provided to help young people achieve while they are still developing.
10. Consider the data collection progress needed for education, health, employment, etc.

APPENDIX

Closer-to-Home Takeaways

PROVIDERS

1. More collaboration is needed between agencies and local community providers; it is a huge challenge to track outcomes and a federal role may be needed.
2. Put providers on notice to change how they do business; request more data and accountability.
3. Share data with providers and ask them what needs to be done differently.
4. Need more intensive community services.
5. Quickly replace staff when there is turnover.
6. Embrace trauma-informed caregiver training.
7. Review Medicaid coverages/barriers and clarify eligibility. Many youth are facing termination of their Medicaid benefits. Screening, assessment, and diversion are big issues.

PREVENTION, REENTRY, FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

1. OJJDP can bring research to bear which highlights the best-practice, holistic integration of various approaches—especially for multi-system youth—to address child and family services, mental health, workforce, law enforcement, juvenile justice courts, etc.
2. Establish youth and family team meetings where youth and family are totally involved, with a voice and full ownership for the outcomes.
3. Diversion helps to do more with less. Funds saved from reduced incarcerations can be poured back into community-based resources.
4. Continue an aggressive spotlight on expungement and other collateral consequences of having a juvenile justice record.
5. Establish receiving centers, conduct full assessments, and provide 24x7 services through mental health authorities to keep youth out of residential care.
6. Find a balance between benefits to the youth versus safety for victims and communities.
7. Share educational information to help youth transition back to their home school. Develop and bring MOUs to school districts and request reviews by their attorneys.
8. Federal government can help with research opportunities and inform how to implement the data around the country.
9. States might consider changes to legislation regarding better management of truancy.
10. Need better data at the youth level, including educational outcomes.
11. Recidivism is one measure of success but short-term outcomes for youth related to health, education, employment, etc. must also be measured, because youth are still achieving a sense of identity, development, and judgment.
12. Need a consistent standard for the age individuals are still considered juveniles, allowing them to be pushed back into the community. Currently, the research does not address that aspect of the system but hopefully that focus will become more prevalent.
13. Agriculture Department's National Institute of Food and Agriculture has community-based partners through cooperatives and always needs more beginning farmers/ranchers; this could be a diversion or reentry opportunity.