

# Cross Systems Youth Task Force Meeting Minutes - February 27, 2014

## I. Introductions

Each member in attendance was introduced and later asked to identify what they believed was one important issue that needed to be addressed regarding cross-system youth.

Mary Allen (ICJI)  
Judge Steve Galvin (Monroe County)  
Bruce Carter (Wayne Twnshp. Schools – Indpls.)  
Tiffany Stewart (DCS)  
Rebecca Buhner (DMHA)  
Suzanne Draper (CASA Vanderburgh County)  
Jeff Bercovitz (IJC)  
Cmdr. James Waters (IMPD)  
Dan Schroeder (Marion County PD)  
JauNae Hanger  
Mary DePrez (JTAC)  
Cathy Graham (IARCCA)  
Kate Rusher (Allen County Court Administrator)  
Nichole Hall (Probation Bartholomew County) (appearing telephonically)  
Magistrate Heather Mollo (Bartholomew County) (EX officio) (Appearing telephonically)

Staff support:

Angela Reid-Brown  
Mike Commons

## II. Overview of Systems Issues – Judge Pratt (PowerPoint presentation)

*Identifying the problem/issue and development of mission statement:*

### 1. Key definitions:

a. **Cross Systems Youth** – Children who are neither identified nor adjudicated as delinquent or CHINS but who present with issue that require multiple system assistance or care.

a. These children could include older youths – 18 and 19 years old.

- *Issue for Task Force:* Understanding the areas of collaboration and the barriers to the coordination of services and responses for children needing assistance of or who are impacted by actions across systems. This would include, for example, children in schools who may have mental health needs that do not require DCS or Probation intervention. This area may also include homeless youth.

b. **Dual Jurisdiction Youth** – Definitions:

- a. *Dually Identified:* Currently involved in either DCS or Delinquency and have a history with the other;
- b. *Dually Involved:* Concurrent involvement (receiving services) of a child in DCS or Delinquency but not necessarily adjudicated in each area.
- c. *Dually Adjudicated* – concurrent adjudication in each system.
  - *Issue for Task Force:* development of pilot operations and pilot sites to address issues related to Dual Jurisdiction Youth.

2. Key Goals/Objectives – Discussion Points
  - a. Identify barriers in statute, regulation or practice to addressing (a) cross systems youth issues; and (b) dual jurisdiction youth issues;
  - b. Complete a policy analysis designed to increase cooperation between systems through recommendation of new practices including recommendations for system/law or regulatory reform;
  - c. Address efficiency in meeting child’s needs;
  - d. Identify areas and recommend the incorporation of restorative justice practices where appropriate.
  - e. Identify areas of service provision and recommend the incorporation of family engagement practices including Family Group Decision Making practices where appropriate; and
  - f. Develop, monitor, and report on pilot projects re: Dual Jurisdiction.

### **III. Task Force Member Thoughts - Positive Levels of Collaboration and What is Important**

1. D. Travis – Growth in DCS for cross-communication (including with DMHA with Community Mental Health Initiative (CMHI) which is currently in 82 counties), including a regular committee that discusses older youths’ individual cases, more frequent meetings with DMHA, as well as Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). JDAI is institutionalizing processes. Also seeking information from local communities’ efforts. There needs to be a system of communication and collaboration with all of the agencies involving youth in each community.
2. M. Allen – ICJI receives funding from OJJDP to maintain a Juvenile Justice Advisory Board. Used grant money to create JDAI which is in the process of expanding statewide. Also collecting disproportionate minority contact data with JTAC and the Judicial Center and working with research partners to analyze what data exists and where there are gaps, what kind of picture we see with regard to delinquency. Gathering data is essential.
3. J. Bercovitz – Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) committee is defining DMC under Indiana terms. ICJI contracted with IU to gather data on a statewide basis on DMC. Ongoing, collected by hand or through digital case management systems. Data vary from county to county based on the person entering the data.
4. Judge Galvin – gathering good data is always difficult. How a particular county handles a cross-system youth is driven by personality of the agency. Strong personalities can create a system of collaboration. Sometimes information must be shared across agencies/systems in order to better serve the child.
5. B. Carter – Wayne Township (Indianapolis) holds a Child Protective Forum where involved agencies (school townships, DCS, IMPD sex crimes investigator, probation truancy, and others) share information. School officials and probation officers inconsistently communicate with each other regarding kids within both systems. Schools and others are guilty of not placing a high enough value in cross-system communication. Homeless youth is such a critical problem. The schools deal with it when it comes to their attention but don’t actively seek that information. The problem would likely overwhelm the school system if the whole problem was uncovered.
6. D. Travis – Important to know what your agency boundaries are where it comes to information sharing.
7. T. Stewart – Communication is so important in order to help probation and DCS get together to make the best decision on how to meet the needs of the children.

8. R. Buhner – DMHA has been working on System of Care (SOC) since 2002 – wrap-around services working with children that have intensive mental health needs. Recently, SOC should be the infrastructure development with wraparound being one of the programs within the SOC. Strategic plan is being created to address children from age zero to twenty-six or twenty-seven; they are looking at the entire life-span of the child. Some counties now have local infrastructure where they have regular meetings with all of the various agencies involved. Improving the level of understanding for how a local infrastructure can be developed is critical. DMHA has had success with DCS, IARCCA, but is hoping to further develop relationships with education and probation/juvenile justice.
9. S. Draper – Educating probation officers and family case managers as to what can be communicated and shared between agencies is critical. Also, define what the data is, so that county to county data will be comparable.
10. J. Bercovitz – Years ago, there used to be a county where the judge would hold regular meetings where the cases were shared between everyone at the table and the group would work together to come up with the best recommendations for how to help the children. This became Local Coordinating Committees, which was created through a statute that was eventually repealed. This would be nearly impossible now due to confidentiality provisions. There are some statutes that exist that help communication between some law enforcement agencies. If there was a statute that specifically addressed the communications the Task Force is considering, that would help.
11. Cmdr. Waters – Great relationship with JDAI. Received training on how the youth brain works, which gives officers the chance to better understand how to relate to and interact with youth.
12. D. Schroeder – Communication can sometimes look like “informing” rather than “communicating.” CHINS caseload has exploded, delinquency caseload are holding steady. There is a problem of DCS vs. probation – who should handle this child.
13. D. Travis – When DCS and probation seek to send a youth to the other system, this is known as “case dumping.”
14. J. Hanger – Working toward public policy changes and collaboration. If this Task Force is effective, how will that impact everything else? Will the culture around children in the State of Indiana be changed? It is important to focus on prevention and diversion. Professional associations are also important to reach out to and educate them about these issues. Identify what best practices are around the country and state.
15. M. DePrez – JTAC operates a web-based digital application (INcite) to track data/information. DOC, Probation departments, and DCS can complete intake risk assessments for youth and that data is available to be analyzed. JTAC will be a repository for various sets of data discussed here. Defining data is a challenge and one that we face in these systems.
16. C. Graham – Representing the provider community – where the silos come apart. They collect and track data on many different factors.
17. K. Rusher – We must have structures in place and provide training to your staff that clearly indicates that children will be handled in a certain way. Leadership is so important.
18. Magistrate Mollo – We need a more defined protocol for knowing what each agency’s limitations and abilities are to work together.
19. N. Hall – Cross-training is important to help folks understand what occurs in other agencies.
20. Judge Pratt – Is there value to having some of us visit sites in Indiana to gather information? The budget is very small and tight.

#### **IV. Casey Family Programs**

1. Existing involvement with Commission.  
Judge Pratt – Casey Family Programs is potentially going to get involved with our Task Force.
2. What services are available to task force? Opportunities?  
They could bring the opportunity for national resource, identifying other sites with best practices, and web-connections with those sites.

#### **V. Next Steps:** Discuss with professionals within each respective system/area of responsibility to ascertain, and reduce these to writing:

1. Anecdotal information of barriers and best practices with regard to Cross Systems Youth –
  - a. Seek out perspective on how systems work well and do not work well together logistically for children having needs.
  - b. Identify possible legal barriers to communication and service: Confidentiality issues, legal and regulatory issues and fiscal barriers.
  - c. Are regulations followed or do localities override them
  - d. Which laws and practices are universally applied to the benefit or detriment of meeting a Cross System Youth's needs.
  - e. What data is available
2. Consider paradigm changes particularly as it relates to status offenders and Cross Systems Youth.
3. List what is the primary problems with cross-systems?

#### **VI. Additional items**

1. Additional Task Force members?
  - a. Former foster youth

#### **VII. Next Meeting Date** **Thursday, April 24, 1:00-3:00pm**