

2012 Governor's Summit on reducing disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system



**Taking action for justice and fairness
through commitment, collaboration,
data and accountability**

**November 1-2, 2012
Spirit Mountain Conference Center
Grand Ronde, Oregon**

Table of contents

Introduction	1
Background and context	3
Work group recommendations	5
Youth Summit	5
School Discipline Impact on DMC	6
Law Enforcement Arrests and Referrals	10
Referrals to Detention and Services	12
Petitions, Courts, Adjudication	14
Multi-System Approaches to Reduce Disparities and Improve Outcomes for Crossover Youth	16
Youth Re-Entry into the Community	19
Conclusion	23
Recommended strategies in brief	26
References and resources	30

Introduction

*"None of us can fail to recognize either the problem we are here to address, or the threat it poses to our future. We can all agree that when any child becomes involved in criminal activity, that is one child too many. We can also agree that the disproportionate number of minority youth who drift – or who are driven – into lives of crime reflects an unfortunate and unacceptable racial imbalance that we can no longer afford to tolerate. As long as young people of color are over-represented among our children at risk; as long as they disproportionately fail in school; as long as they are disproportionately present at every stage of the juvenile justice process – from arrest through incarceration – then **we have not come far enough.**"*

– Governor John Kitzhaber, November 18, 2008, DMC Summit

Four years after Governor Kitzhaber spoke those words, a cross section of Oregon's juvenile justice stakeholders and a few experts from across the United States gathered in Grand Ronde, Oregon, to again address the issue of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system. The 2012 Governor's Summit participants took seriously its title: *"Taking Action to Reduce DMC through Commitment, Collaboration, Data, and Accountability."*

Several features distinguished this summit from those of the past: First, the agenda focused on a reliable method for generating data on DMC at both the state and county levels, based on the nationally recognized work of Portland State University Professor Dr. William Feyerherm and built on Oregon's excellent Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Second, participants made an explicit commitment to action and accountability for achieving measurable progress.

Representing geographical areas across the state, 279 participants attended the two-day Summit. Participants included judges, attorneys, and representatives from juvenile and adult corrections, county juvenile departments, education, law enforcement, child welfare, mental and behavioral health, boards, commissions, tribal governments, faith community, community members, social services, businesses, parents, and youth.

The agenda included a range of general sessions that set the foundation for substantive work groups addressing seven focus areas:

- The impact of school discipline on DMC;
- Law enforcement arrests and referrals;

- Referrals to detention and services;
- Petitions, courts, and adjudication;
- Multi-system approaches to reduce disparities and improve outcomes for crossover youth;
- Youth re-entry into the community; and
- A youth summit.

Over two days each work group identified focus areas and developed strategies and action steps to address them, with the overarching goal of making concrete progress on reducing DMC. The purpose of this summary report is to bring together recommendations of the work sessions into a single set of strategies for action and achievement of results.

Background and context

In 1997 Governor John Kitzhaber called the first Summit on Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the Juvenile Justice System. In the 15 years since then, Oregon has held 11 additional Summits to address the issue. Although progress has been made and documented over the years, the problem of DMC has persisted. To raise the stakes for solving the issue, the 2012 Summit established a specific framework – commitment, collaboration, data, and accountability. Within that structure, the Summit set out to renew commitment to actions and solutions, ensure collaboration by bringing all partners together, build on the firm foundation now established with data, and hold ourselves accountable for achieving the results envisioned by the Summit recommendations. The general sessions at the Summit were designed to establish that foundation.

Summit Planning Committee Co-Chairs Lonnie Jackson (Oregon Youth Authority Office of Minority Services Administrator) and Anya Sekino (Youth Development Council Juvenile Crime Prevention Manager) welcomed participants. Liani Reeves (Governor Kitzhaber's Chief Legal Counsel) opened the Summit on behalf of the Governor, and Toby McClary (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal Council Secretary) led the traditional tribal opening.

Governor Kitzhaber's message was delivered by Frank Garcia (Director, Diversity and Inclusion / Affirmative Action). Dr. Rudy Crew (Oregon Education Investment Board Chief Executive Officer) gave opening remarks that emphasized the inextricable connection between educational achievement and success in staying out of the juvenile justice system. The community context was highlighted by the Antoine Kennedy, who spoke from the perspective of a young adult who had successfully navigated the juvenile justice system, and in a tribute to Rob Ingram, whose death in November 2011 ended his outstanding work as director of Portland's Office of Youth Violence Prevention.

The two general session presenters echoed two of the key themes of the Summit – the importance of data and the value of collaboration. Dr. William Feyerherm, Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Portland State University, who is a primary architect of the Relative Rate Index (RRI), a nationally recognized measure of DMC at key juvenile justice decision points, discussed the importance of using data for decision-making. John Tuell, Co-Director of the MacArthur Foundation Models for Change: Systems

Reform in Juvenile Justice Initiative at the Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps, addressed collaboration with child welfare as an essential step toward reducing DMC.

Dr. Feyerherm has applied the RRI to nine decision points in juvenile justice at both state and county levels:

- Juvenile arrests
- Juvenile referrals received by juvenile departments,
- Juvenile referrals diverted,
- Juvenile referrals involving secure detention,
- Juvenile referrals petitioned (charges filed),
- Juvenile referrals resulting in delinquent findings,
- Juvenile referrals resulting in probation placements,
- Juvenile referrals resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and
- Juvenile cases transferred to adult court.

In presenting key findings of his research, Dr. Feyerherm indicated that “the principal areas of DMC are in the referrals of African American and Native American youth into the juvenile justice system, as well as higher rates of detention....” In studying crossover youth coming from child welfare into juvenile justice, Dr. Feyerherm found that “(b)oth (African American and Native American) youth have significantly higher ratios of founded child welfare cases. Findings of injury, threat of harm, neglect, and mental injury are higher among these court-referred youth.” (Dr. William Feyerherm, *DMC in Oregon Juvenile Justice Systems: Identification and Assessment Report 2012.*)

John Tuell underscored the findings that childhood abuse is associated with increased risk of crime and violence. He presented a Strategic Planning Framework and Crossover Youth Practice Model to provide guidance in addressing the issue.

Following these presentations, seven work groups were charged with identifying issues and creating action plans around the Summit’s key themes – the use of data, collaboration, commitment, and accountability. The work groups’ efforts formed the core of the Summit's work. Near the close of the two days, Oregon First Lady Cylvia Hayes reminded participants of the importance of the task through the stories of her path as a young person and the success of four young people she honored as the 2012 Youth Award Winners.

Work group recommendations

Youth Summit

Facilitator: Jordan Thierry, Black Fatherhood Project Director

Approximate number of participants: 25

Strategy One: Provide training and education to professionals working with youth.

Actions:

- Provide better training for professionals working with youth. Develop improvement plans for employees; focus on good listening skills, reasoning ability, flexibility.
- Provide education about culture and local minorities to authority figures who come into contact with youth.

Strategy Two: Provide educational opportunities aimed at keeping minorities in school to graduation.

Actions:

- Increase funding to provide more teachers as a way to provide one-on-one contact with students and meet the needs of youth who need help.
- Offer classes in life skills, coping skills, substance abuse, and other social-emotional support.
- Offer career-driven courses in high schools.
- Provide supports to help youth graduate by increasing funds for tutors and teachers to work with individual youth and small groups of students. (Some schools are losing advisory and study classes. More than 50 percent of seniors at North Salem High School are not graduating due to the state writing test. Those who feel they are unlikely to graduate are probably going to drop out or go into alternative schools or programs. Leaving school results in more spare time to get into trouble. Providing advisory supports to youth promotes bonding, confidence, and hope.)

Strategy Three: Expand connections between schools and communities.

Actions:

- Provide cultural liaisons in Oregon middle schools and high schools to connect youth with culturally specific resources. Many Native American youth are unaware of the resources available to them and some African American students express the feeling that they do not have a positive community in which to engage. Additionally, some non-English speakers struggle with language barriers and multicultural students feel lost in the mix.
- Place culturally competent mentors in schools to work with minority students.
- Offer opportunities to learn job skills, pursue adult education, and transition to independent living.
- Provide safe retreats where youth can express emotions in after-school programs or community groups.
- Connect youth with parenting classes for teen moms and dads and with single teen parent community support groups.
- Provide after-school and in-school activities such as sports, mentors, elective classes, after-school programs, community recreation and other activities (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs). These opportunities are known to reduce crime; research shows that most youth crime happens between 3:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

School Discipline Impact on DMC

Facilitators: Michael Mahoney, Oregon Department of Education Safe and Healthy Schools Coordinator; Simon Gonsoulin, Director of the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At Risk; and John Hall, for Memphis City Schools, Tennessee, Department of School Security Coordinator

Approximate number of participants: 55

Strategy One: Address institutional racism in education.

Actions:

- Examine existing policies, practices, and procedures to counter institutional racism.
- Design, assess, write, and respond to policies needed, and to create direction for Oregon learners and implement a fully integrated pre-school through higher

education (P-20) structure.

- Provide training and education to address institutional racism.
- Develop and offer training (e.g., *Beyond Diversity*) to address historical and institutional racism and its impact on teaching and learning to Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Education Investment Board, Oregon School Boards Association, and Teacher Standards and Practice Commission.
- Align policies, practices, and procedures to counter institutional racism, following an analysis of school policies and practices.
- Promote transparency and include all stakeholders and representatives of the education community in design and development of policies and a plan to identify barriers. The plan should not be a one race developed plan and should include staff and youth of color.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include feedback on training, policy analysis, self-assessments, language changes to policies, and changes in practices.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include an education framework for a streamlined leadership and governance system; a teaching workforce in Oregon schools that reflects the ratio of student body diversity; statewide increased knowledge about institutional racism and cultural competency across multi-agency and community stakeholders about its impact on teaching and learning; a culturally responsive public education system (P-20); and an increase in policies that reflect reduced historical/institutional racism as it pertains to internal school discipline that impacts DMC.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include student performance and achievement data, Systems Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I) Data, discipline disproportionality rate, surveys, and focus groups.

Strategy Two: Overcome philosophical barriers and cultural and educational expectations of multiple stakeholders that impact or interfere with successful outcomes for youth traditionally over-represented in exclusionary discipline and/or referral to the juvenile justice system.

Actions:

- Create outreach to inform, motivate, and engage the public and involve parents and students in policy making.

- Promote and actively encourage cross-agency training.
- Develop clear policy statements communicated frequently across agencies (vision/mission/purpose that demonstrates collaboration and common ground).
- Invite and encourage all stakeholders to the table to ensure their goals and concerns are heard when performing cross-agency work.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the emergence of cross-agency collaborative efforts and initiatives; training feedback and self-assessments conducted by agencies on related summits, meetings, and work groups addressing the issue of DMC; and sharing of resources, both human (personnel) and fiscal across agencies.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include reduction in proportion of students falling through the gaps that currently exist in child-serving agencies; reduced disproportionality in discipline data; reduced number of students, particularly youth of color, entering the juvenile justice system; reduced number of youth of color involved in more restrictive discipline measures (suspension, alternative school placement, expulsion); increased parent involvement in schools, including proportionate numbers of parents of students of color; and increased use of the “State Department of Education's Discipline Data Tool” to inform discipline-related decisions in local school districts.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include student performance and achievement data; graduation rates in accord with 40/40/20 – 40 percent of students receiving four-year degrees, 40 percent receiving two-year degrees, and 20 percent receiving high school diplomas; attendance, truancy, and dropout rates; Discipline Data (Oregon Education Data Explorer Tool); and graduation rates.

Strategy Three: Overcome racial, cultural, and economic biases impacting discipline decisions as well as instructional expectations.

Actions:

- Design and Implement high-impact, outcome-based, cost-effective initiatives supported by an outcome-based state budget aligned to initiatives.
- Promote collaboration between higher education teacher preparation programs and school districts to self-assess adherence to the Oregon Minority Teacher Act.
- Provide training and education on racial, cultural, and economic biases that impact discipline-related decisions for school staff, administrators, school boards,

and school resource officers.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include feedback and training regarding evidence-based practices; instructional strategies related to students' personalized learning needs; and districts' self-assessment on adherence to the Oregon Minority Teacher Act.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include return on investment, including all students meeting or exceeding the third grade reading benchmark by the end of third grade; increased student engagement, achievement, and graduation; decreased exclusionary discipline rates, particularly with students of color; an effective and culturally responsive teaching workforce that reflects the ratio of student body diversity; and an increase in the hiring of teachers that better reflects the culture and race of youth who attend local schools.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include statewide formative and summative assessments, the 2013-15 Oregon State Budget, exclusionary discipline rates, hiring records, and the annual Minority Teachers Act Report.

Strategy Four: Address positive school-wide discipline, social-emotional learning, school climate, and mental health needs of students.

Actions:

- Design and implement school-wide positive discipline methods.
- Develop a consortium with the University of Oregon, NW-PBIS network, and ODE to identify and implement culturally responsive positive behavior supports.
- Build and implement a social-emotional learning network.
- Conduct school climate surveys and collect self-perception data.
- Conduct student engagement surveys.
- Consider the development and implementation of a student mentoring program, restorative justice practices, and other inclusive methodologies.
- Establish a cross-agency committee comprised of state and local agencies engaged in collaborative efforts and initiatives to identify Oregon schools operating successful alternatives to suspensions and expulsions.
- Provide staff development on social-emotional learning and school climate.
- Contract with providers/experts to assist with social-emotional learning and school climate, with one message for the state moving forward in these areas.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include school-wide training and self-assessment on positive school discipline methods; feedback on training and outcomes of school climate surveys published statewide and locally; and common language, procedures, and practices on culturally responsive positive behavior supports.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include a sustained system to support school-wide positive behavior discipline methods implemented with fidelity; inclusion of social-emotional learning curricula; effective use of behavior intervention plans to address individual student needs; reduced discipline referrals and exclusionary discipline rates, particularly regarding disproportionality in discipline data; school climate improvement plans; fewer youth disengaged in school due to exclusionary discipline methods, and higher student engagement; an increase in the number of school programs operating successful alternatives to suspension and expulsion; and fewer youth placed out of school and referred to the juvenile justice system.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include the School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), survey results, and Functional Behavior Assessment Data (Education Data Explorer); a discipline data tool and discipline incidence data collection tool; suspension and expulsion rates; district office discipline referral (ODR) rates; annual dropout and graduation rates; and focus group notes.

Law Enforcement Arrests and Referrals

Facilitators: Lindsey Draper, Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance Disproportionate Minority Contact Coordinator; Chief Ronald J. Louie (Ret.), MA, MPA, teacher, consultant, and former Chief of Police, Hillsboro, Oregon; and Commander John Schmerber, Hillsboro, Oregon, Police Department, Special Operations and Youth Services Division

Approximate number of participants: 25

Strategy One: Create improved relationships between law enforcement agencies and the public, including minority communities.

Actions:

- Identify community stakeholders.
- Institute presentations by law enforcement in the community.
- Develop and implement pre and post surveys.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of presentations made and number of community members reached, and survey results.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include improved community views of the role of law enforcement.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include surveys and evaluations completed, and record of presentations made.

Strategy Two: Use school resource officers in ways that divert minority youth from the juvenile justice system.**Actions:**

- Prepare school resource officers to participate effectively on interdisciplinary school safety teams (threat assessment teams).
- Identify diversion from arrest opportunities, particularly for minority youth.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include changes in the proportion of youth diverted.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include a reduction in number of minority youth arrested while successfully resolving cases.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include school and law enforcement records and Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) data.

Strategy Three: Provide training to officers in fair and impartial policing and working with minority youth.

Actions:

- Identify training content.
- Integrate the training into officer training protocols.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of officers participating in training.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include improved relationships and communication with youth.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include law enforcement agency training records.

Strategy Four: Develop recruiting and hiring strategies directed toward hiring officers who reflect community demographics.**Actions:**

- Understand the demographics of the local community.
- Develop recruiting and hiring strategies that will be effective.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of qualified applications received in response to the strategies.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include the hiring and promotion of minority officers.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include police department human resources records.

Referrals to Detention and Services

Facilitators: Sonya Littledeer-Evans, Senior Juvenile Justice Officer, Jefferson County, Oregon Department of Community Justice; Jeff Milligan, Consultant for the Central and Eastern Oregon Juvenile Justice Consortium; and Troy Fuller, Detention Manager for

Linn and Benton Counties, Oregon

Approximate number of participants: 10

Strategy One: Develop a detention screening/assessment tool for each jurisdiction.

Actions:

- Collect research findings and models of effective detention screening and assessment tools.
- Develop tools for the local needs of each jurisdiction, and with consideration of the reason for detention (new law violations or technical probation violations).
- Implement the tools in local jurisdictions and in JJIS.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of jurisdictions using an objective tool, the proportion of detention decisions made using an objective tool, and the number of Detention Risk Assessment Instruments in JJIS.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include unbiased detention admissions to detention, reduced DMC at the detention decision point, and consistency in decision making.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS).

Strategy Two: Build understanding and capacity in the use of detention reports in the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS).

Actions:

- Create an understanding of JJIS detention reports, particularly the Relative Rate Index regarding minority admissions to detention.
- Provide training to all counties on the JJIS detention reports.
- Sponsor awareness campaigns throughout the juvenile justice system and in local communities.
- Produce meaningful reports, review them regularly with leaders , and share them across jurisdictions.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of staff trained, number of counties trained, and report use in the JJIS database.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include counties have local data to focus on, counties understand local data and know how to use it, and data are reliable and accurate.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and county training records.

Strategy Three: Develop community alternatives to detention.**Actions:**

- Analyze local community alternatives to detention.
- Invest in opportunities for alternative resources.
- Provide grant writing assistance to fund alternatives.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include the number of detention alternatives available and measurement of the use of detention alternatives.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include reduction of DMC in detention, increased alternatives to detention, and increased use of appropriate detention alternatives.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and Detention Risk Assessment Instrument data.

Petitions, Courts, Adjudication

Facilitators: Dr. William Feyerherm, Portland State University Criminology and Criminal Justice Professor and Youth Development Council Member; Craig Prins, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission Executive Director; and Gary Sims, Oregon Department of Corrections Assistant Director of Human Resources

Approximate number of participants: 30

Strategy One: Review and modify the law on Measure 11 and waiver to adult court.

Actions:

- Consider repeal or modification of Measure 11 for juveniles.
- Consider removing second degree crimes from the Measure 11 list.
- Review the law regarding the second look. Consider allowing a second look for all juveniles in the adult system through Measure 11 or waiver, and consider prohibiting the waiver of the right to second look by a juvenile.
- Modify the law to require that cases be heard in juvenile court, when a Measure 11 offense is reduced to a non-Measure offense.
- Explore using the Relative Rate Index at additional decision points and for conducting detailed analysis on crime types and other criteria to improve understanding of how to affect decisions that have an impact on DMC.
- Develop an assessment tool that incorporates multiple criteria beyond the nature of the offense to make decisions about transfer to adult court.
- Promote collaboration among police, district attorneys, courts, and other stakeholders.
- Provide a means for broad community representation that includes minorities in decisions on public policy such as sentencing.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include a Measure 11 bill submitted by 2015 and adoption of an assessment tool.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include reduction in the Relative Rate Index (RRI) for waiver to adult court.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS).

Strategy Two: Develop resources that promote equity in decisions and increase options short of the formal court process.

Actions:

- Map current resources by state and county, and identify gaps. Consider equity of

access to resources in urban and rural areas, and in parts of both urban and rural areas where minorities live.

- Seek funding to expand community-based services where gaps exist.
- Provide technical assistance to enhance evidence-based practices.
- Develop standards and accountability for culturally competent services by juvenile justice system providers and contractors.
- Provide technical assistance on applying standards of cultural competency.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include commitment by government to funding by 2015, cultural competency standards for services adopted by 2015, mapping of resources across state and in counties completed, and standardized program evaluation implemented.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include establishment of a resource baseline; reductions in petitions, filings, and confinement of minority youth; and state funding tied to outcomes.

Data:

Data sources for process measures and outcomes include the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and Oregon Department of Administrative Services data.

Multi-System Approaches to Reduce Disparities and Improve Outcomes for Crossover Youth

Facilitators: Dr. Brad Richardson – Research Director, University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Center for Family Centered Care; The Honorable Nan Waller, Presiding Judge, Multnomah County, Oregon Circuit Court; Abbey Stamp, LCSW, Juvenile Court Improvement Coordinator, Multnomah County, Oregon Juvenile Services Division; and Jason Walling, Child Welfare Manager, District 3, Marion County, Oregon

Approximate number of participants: 30

Strategy One: Establish leadership mandate and a climate for culture change at the state and local levels.

Actions:

- Engage in courageous conversations across the state and in local communities.
- Increase the use of objective, validated tools for decision making throughout systems.
- Governor and state department leaders set forth the initiative.
- Educate local and statewide leaders about the Crossover Youth Model.
- Develop commitment at the local level to implement the model.
- Set the vision of the community for the outcomes of the model.
- Educate community leaders about the need and the model.
- Develop a social marketing campaign that supports recognition of DMC.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include completion of a readiness assessment of each community regarding leadership's understanding and ability; the necessary partners and departments at the table to support a coordinated approach; each community has developed a joint plan and established outcomes desired through implementation; and the State DMC Planning Committee implements a system of recognition for communities that show substantial improvement in disproportionate representation in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include community and agency leaders commit to the implementation of the Crossover Youth Model; policies and procedures are established to support the desired outcomes for Crossover Youth; a Governor's directive to support the Crossover Youth Model and the reduction of DMC is published and includes implementation strategies; and a system of recognition or incentives is in place for communities making substantial progress in reducing DMC in child welfare and juvenile justice

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), OR-Kids (the child welfare information system), educational databases, and Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) Screening measurements.

Strategy Two: Establish systems in local jurisdictions to implement the crossover youth model in accord with the best interests of the child.

Actions:

- Establish joint meetings between agencies that result in case plans based on multi-system collaboration.
- Require accountability for follow-through based on the plan.
- Engage children, youth, and families meaningfully in the planning process.
- Engage all systems in practical trauma-informed care training and implement trauma-informed principles.
- Actively engage all systems (attorneys, CASA , education, mental health, alcohol and drug treatment, etc.) and supports (mentors, kith and kin, coaches, neighbors) to enhance quality planning for children and families.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include delivery of identified services (with follow-through); use of trauma-informed assessment tools; completion of training for placement resources and providers; modification of contracts to prevent children from being discharged from treatment programs based on behavior, including due diligence and emphasizing program acceptance; and systems in place at the local level to identify children who have dual contact or involvement.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include, in alignment with federal Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) Well Being Measurements, children are at home with healthy attachments, progressing in school toward a diploma, safe, and not committing crimes; a reduced number (proportion) of out-of-home placements; increased placement stability; discharge from placements pursuant to due process rights; and children are identified at the earliest point in terms of crossover or the potential of crossing over.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), OR-Kids (the child welfare information system), educational databases, and Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) Screening measurements.

Strategy Three: Develop collaborative systems to decrease the “silo effect” of agencies acting independently.**Actions:**

- Develop a common language.
- Share cross-system data that is reflective of children and youth served.

- Engage judges in each jurisdiction to convene a multi-system group regarding crossover youth.
- Seek federal waivers that allow blending of funds to support the needs of children and youth.
- Create local agreements on the use of locally controlled funding streams and resources.
- Use collaborative problem-solving, even if a youth is not yet involved in the juvenile justice system, through the use of local committees and staffings.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include conducting and sharing joint assessments; data agreements in place; systems to support data sharing in place; training is offered regarding information sharing between systems; and systems exist to support information sharing that promotes timely decisions and positive outcomes.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include Memoranda of Understanding between agencies regarding values, vision, and clarity about who does what; data sharing groups and agreements in place in each county; collaborative plans for children and families cover mandates of all systems involved (or a new document if each agency has its own mandates); multi-system meetings convene to dispel misunderstandings and myths about different systems; Quality Assurance and Continuous Quality Improvement processes follow up on established agreements; decreased deeper system penetration for youth of color; and members of the child's team have information in a timely way that supports decisions and outcomes in the best interest of the child.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), OR-Kids (the child welfare information system), educational databases, Child and Adolescent Needs, and Strengths (CANS) Screening measurements.

Youth Re-Entry into the Community

Facilitators: Faith V. Love, Oregon Youth Authority Parole/Probation Supervisor, Youth Re-entry Project Supervisor, Juvenile Justice Specialist for Wraparound Oregon; and Paul Solomon, Executive Director, Sponsors, Inc., and Partnership for Safety and Justice Board Chair

Approximate number of participants: 60

Strategy One: Develop a range of educational, vocational, and employment opportunities at each stage of re-entry into the community.

Actions:

- Create more educational opportunities inside facilities – programs that reach beyond basic education, take advantage of holding learning activities in living units, emphasize career planning, computer/technology-based learning, computer literacy, and arts, all based on the principle that re-entry planning starts on the day of entry into a facility.
- Develop a statewide tutoring program aimed at increasing diplomas and GEDs through support to youth both inside facilities and after release to the community.
- Engage businesses and the community in developing internships and employment opportunities.
- Create pathways to support enrollment in post-secondary education, community internships, and employment for long term re-entry success.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include specific educational programs developed inside facilities, tutoring programs in place, and specific business and community groups engaged.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include increased proportion of youth admitted to regular school classes at the time of release, increased proportion of youth enrolled in post-secondary education and/or employed, and long-term reduction in re-offending.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include school district records and follow-up data on youth in transition.

Strategy Two: Establish means to ensure health coverage for youth upon re-entry.

Actions:

- Develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Human Services to provide medical coverage for youth upon re-entry.

- Ensure that medical coverage is integrated into aftercare plans.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include development and implementation of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Human Services addressing medical coverage.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include increased proportion of youth with medical coverage at the time of release.

Data:

Data sources for the process measures and outcomes include Oregon Health Authority records and aftercare plans.

Strategy Three: Develop policies, procedures, and practices inside facilities that build community connections and support systems.

Actions:

- Ensure that visiting policies regarding families, volunteers, and mentors promote connections to the community throughout a youth's stay in a facility.
- Review policies and programs within facilities to ensure that they foster community connections.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include policies reviewed to include the elements described.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include policies that foster community connections.

Strategy Four: Ensure that a comprehensive aftercare plan is developed for each youth.

Actions:

- Ensure that youth under the supervision of both the Oregon Youth Authority and Department of Corrections receive comparable aftercare support.
- Identify a single person to be in charge of the aftercare plan to ensure a coordinated approach.

- Use a release check list to ensure that the elements of successful re-entry are addressed.

Strategy Five: Develop a comprehensive support system for youth that assists with immediate and long-term re-entry success.

Actions:

- Develop a support system that includes relevant professional staff (parole officers, counselors) as well as family, significant others, mentors, and members of the faith community.
- Take steps to ensure that appropriate housing options are in place at the time of release.
- Connect youth with pro-social activities and recreational opportunities in the community.
- Ensure that community supports are culturally specific and incorporate strong support from community cultural groups.
- Engage non-profits and small businesses in the support network.
- Inform and engage the community about transitioning youth.

Process measures:

Recommended process measures include clear policies on aftercare planning in place and existence of comprehensive aftercare plans for youth.

Outcomes:

Desired outcomes include increased success in immediate and long-term re-entry.

Data:

Data sources include Oregon Youth Authority and Oregon Department of Corrections records.

Conclusion

Participants in the November 1-2, 2012, Governor's Summit on Disproportionate Minority Contact in Juvenile Justice resolutely set out to forge action plans that will produce measurable and lasting results. Seven work groups focused on key aspects of systems that touch youth and families in our communities – schools, police, detention, courts, child welfare, correctional facilities, and the perspective of youth themselves. These systems are complex and interconnected. Making a difference requires authentic collaboration and grappling with issues across systems. The work groups recommended 24 strategies and a set of actions associated with accomplishing each strategy.

Success is defined as a change in the Relative Rate Index at decision points in the juvenile justice system and reduction in disparities where found. Success relies on right decisions about and positive relationships with minority youth in schools, police agencies, courts, and the rest of the identified systems. It depends on an array of resources and supports, both the formal services of government and communities, and the informal networks of family, friends, mentors, and role models. Success also builds on opportunities in sports, recreation, and the arts. Education is central at every level – academic, vocational, and social-emotional.

Furthermore, the policies that guide our institutions are decisive in creating a climate for change – how school discipline is administered, whether visiting protocols in juvenile facilities maintain and build community connections, and the effectiveness of interventions with abused children. Policies in these arenas have far-reaching effects. What the policies are is important; how we arrive at them is equally important. Do we engage minority communities in the earliest stages of policy development and hear their voices on how well those policies serve the community?

These are the themes that emerged at the Summit. Some strategies and actions are specific, anchored to a time frame, and easily tracked. Some are more general and have missing elements – they do not specify who is responsible, set time frames for completing them, show how we will know when they are accomplished, or identify who will track them and report on progress. The challenge is take advantage of what is in place and at the same time acknowledge what is missing so that we can make it whole.

Components in place include:

- An excellent data source in the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and a

sophisticated methodology for analyzing data through the Relative Risk Index (RRI) developed by Dr. Feyerherm, both of which continue to grow in precision and offer capacity for increasingly fine-grained analysis;

- Highly developed conceptual frameworks – the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform work on re-entry and crossover youth practice model, and the framework and models presented by John Tuell;
- Leaders and professionals with demonstrated commitment to solutions, from the highest levels of state government to those representing a broad range of disciplines at the Summit and those who have committed years of effort toward achieving tangible results in local projects addressing DMC in Oregon;
- A history of collaboration, represented among Summit participants and in local communities;
- Proven assessment tools such as the Oregon Juvenile Crime Prevention Assessment, the Oregon Youth Authority's Risk/Needs Assessment, and the OYA Recidivism Risk Assessment (ORRA), which identify well known and documented risk factors; and
- Research findings pointing in the direction of strength-based approaches and the Positive Youth Development model, which emphasizes certain goals in working effectively with youth:
 - Youth LEARNING and DOING:
 - Developing new skills and competencies,
 - Actively using new skills,
 - Taking on new roles and responsibilities,
 - Developing self-efficacy and personal confidence, and
 - Youth ATTACHING/BELONGING:
 - Becoming an active member of pro-social groups,
 - Developing and enjoying the sense of belonging, and
 - Placing high value on service to others and being part of a larger community.

The Positive Youth Development framework offers direction on how to proceed. The Oregon Youth Authority already is applying the model and exploring it as a framework for evaluating outcomes. Positive Youth Development offers core elements in keeping with Summit recommendations in its assertion that even the most disadvantaged youth can develop positively if connected to the right environment and experiences – educational and vocational opportunities, life skills, family and community supports, positive role models, relationships, and connection to the larger community.

The strategies from the 2012 Summit are consistent with these elements and establish

a foundation. They are less clear on who is responsible, what the time lines are, and how we can track progress. But a blueprint that can be refined over time is now in place, and we can build on it. We do not have to start over. The task of more sharply defining the strategies and actions reported here might be approached in any of several ways – review by staff from key partner agencies, or reconvening the Summit facilitators, or in the work of the Youth Development Council. The strategies and actions can be refined to incorporate the concrete elements that will strengthen accountability. They also can be reviewed through the lens of sound practice and fiscal feasibility to create a pathway toward making genuine progress.

The recommended strategies in brief

Youth Summit

Strategy One:

Provide training and education to professionals working with youth.

Strategy Two:

Provide educational opportunities aimed at keeping minorities in school to graduation.

Strategy Three:

Expand connections between schools and communities.

School Discipline Impact on DMC

Strategy One:

Address institutional racism in education.

Strategy Two:

Overcome philosophical barriers and cultural and educational expectations of multiple stakeholders that impact or interfere with successful outcomes for youth traditionally over-represented in exclusionary discipline and/or referral to the juvenile justice system.

Strategy Three:

Overcome racial, cultural, and economic biases impacting discipline decisions as well as instructional expectations.

Strategy Four:

Address positive school-wide discipline, social-emotional learning, school climate, and mental health needs of students.

Law Enforcement Arrests and Referrals

Strategy One:

Create improved relationships between law enforcement agencies and the public, including minority communities.

Strategy Two:

Use school resource officers in ways that divert minority youth from the juvenile justice system.

Strategy Three:

Provide training to officers in fair and impartial policing and working with minority youth.

Strategy Four:

Develop recruiting and hiring strategies directed toward hiring officers who reflect community demographics.

Referrals to Detention and Services

Strategy One:

Develop a detention screening tool for each jurisdiction.

Strategy Two:

Build understanding and capacity in the use of detention reports in the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS).

Strategy Three:

Develop community alternatives to detention.

Petitions, Courts, Adjudication

Strategy One:

Review/modify the law on Measure 11 and waiver to adult court.

Strategy Two:

Develop resources that promote equity in decisions and increase options short of the formal court process.

Multi-System Approaches to Reduce Disparities and Improve Outcomes for Crossover Youth

Strategy One:

Establish a leadership mandate and a climate for culture change at the state and local levels.

Strategy Two:

Establish systems in local jurisdictions to implement the crossover youth model in accord with the best interests of the child.

Strategy Three:

Develop collaborative systems to decrease the “silo effect” of agencies acting independently.

Youth Re-Entry into the Community

Strategy One:

Develop a range of educational, vocational, and employment opportunities at each stage of re-entry into the community.

Strategy Two:

Establish means to ensure health coverage for youth upon re-entry.

Strategy Three:

Develop policies, procedures, and practices inside facilities that build community connections and support systems.

Strategy Four:

Ensure that a comprehensive aftercare plan is developed for each youth.

Strategy Five:

Develop a comprehensive support system for youth that assists with immediate and long-term re-entry success.

References and resources

Bilchik, Shay. *Five Emerging Practices in Juvenile Reentry*. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University Public Policy Institute.

Butts, Jeffrey A., Gordon Bazemore, and Meroe, Aundra Saa Meroe (April 2010). *Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Juvenile Justice.

Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University.
Models for Change: System Reform in Juvenile Justice Initiative—Crossover Youth Practice Model
www.cjrr.georgetown.edu

Feyerherm, William. *Disproportionate Minority Contact in Oregon's Juvenile Justice Systems: Identification and Assessment Report 2012*.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (July 2009). *Disproportionate Minority Contact Technical Assistance Manual*. Fourth Edition. Washington, DC: OJJDP,

<http://www.oregon.gov/oya/dmcs Summit/2012/resources.htm>

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/dmc/>

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/dmcbestpractices/>

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/reentry.aspx?continuum=reentry>

<http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/dmcr/index.shtml>