

Cross Systems Youth Task Force Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2014

I. Introduction

1. Attendance

Present: Chris Blessinger, Rebecca “Becky” Buhner, Bruce Carter, Mike Commons, Mary DePrez, Cathy Graham, Nichole Hall, JauNae Hanger, Judge Charles Pratt, Angela Reid-Brown, Kate Rusher, Dan Schroeder, Tiffany Stewart, Randal Taylor, Don Travis, Michelle Woodward

Not Present: Judge Galvin, Magistrate Heather Mollo, Mary Allen, Jeff Bercovitz

2. Minutes

Approved from February 27th meeting.

II. Casey Family Programs

Guests: Judge Robin Sage & Christopher Wu with Casey Family Programs

Background- Judge Sage and Mr. Wu attended today’s meeting as part of the Judicial Engagement of Casey Family Programs. Judge Sage introduced herself as a retired Texas family district court judge 20 years. She was then a rural circuit judge for a few years, and after that started working with a judicial engagement team. Mr. Wu was with the Office of Court Administration in California and then went to Casey Family Programs. Judge Sage offered background information with regard to Jim Casey started Casey Family Programs. Judge Sage stated Casey Family Programs is not a grant making organization, provides technical assistance in child welfare cases.

Currently the Casey Program includes the following states selected for project: IN, CO, MI, WI, FL, CA, AZ, and MO.

For Indiana, three (3) proposals have been submitted to Casey Judicial Engagement through the Juvenile Justice Improvement Committee for consideration: Judges getting more information on where there are placements for foster kids when making decisions; safety mechanism of decision making; and, the crossover youth project.

An explanation was offered with regard to the crossover youth practice model. Within the model, three (3) phases of program were introduced including: working on identifying crossover youth; how two systems could communicate – juvenile & DCS offices about these youth; and follow-up on family/child to make sure they stay out of system. Also discussed was the use of one common assessment tool instead of separate instrument which would allow the family to be assessed only one time. Also, the fourth phase would then include transition and/or closing the case with legal permanency.

The model suggests three (3) committees that may need to be created: information sharing, guiding coalition, and data analysis.

An estimate was made that the entire process could take up to two years to get up and running for one or a group of jurisdictions.

The Georgetown University offers certificate programs where individuals would attend a three-day program to understand the model for crossover youth

III. Homework

A moderated discussion was held with regard to the “homework” assignment from the previous task force meetings. Discussion was held with regard to crossover and cross-system youth in response to the following questions:

What Works Well;

What Doesn't Work Well;

Legal Barriers to Communication – Real v. Perceived

How many counties break confidentiality laws?;

Which laws/practices are universally applied to benefit/detriment?

IV. Who are the Cross-System youth or the non-involved or not dually adjudicated youth?

Non-DCS juvenile justice involved kids – the invisible children that may not be involved in cross systems

The task force next considered identifying the Cross-System Youth. The following were suggested populations of youth that may fit this definition:

1. Children who have trauma, early signs of mental health diagnosis, cognitive issues
2. Highly mobile/transient children
3. Homeless children – unattached/couch surfing
4. Suspended/expelled from school
5. Children with cultural & language barriers
6. Children with special education needs
7. Victims of human trafficking
8. Children of incarcerated parent(s)

V. Overview of cross-over practice model

The Task Force next discussed an overview of the Crossover Youth Practice Model from the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform and Casey Family Programs. A discussion was held concerning the Practice Model and a concern was raised with regard to and anticipated outcome of the implementation of the model including the “reduction in the use of congregate care placements.” It was suggested that much like other programs, congregate care has its place in the continuum of services, but the theory should remain to enable the right child to get the right service for the right amount of time which should include congregate care.

VI. Next Steps: For the next Task Force Meeting

1. Read pg. 17 of the Crossover Youth Practice Model, the Practice Model Values and Principles
 - a. Are these the values we want to use?
2. Discussion next meeting will focus on the Practice Model
3. Establishment of Subcommittees
4. Review what's working across the state and who are the principle people that's making it happen

VII. Next meeting dates (on agenda)

June 26, 2014	1:00 – 3:00
August 28, 2014	1:00 – 3:00
October 30, 2014	1:00 – 3:00
December 18, 2014	1:00 – 3:00

DRAFT