



**OHIO**

**CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION**

65 SOUTH FRONT STREET • 5TH FLOOR • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-3431 • TELEPHONE: 614.387.9305 • FAX: 614.387.9309

## **Juvenile Justice Committee**

**November 16, 2017**

### **Agenda**

- I. Call to Order and Approval of October 18, 2017 Meeting Notes**
  
- II. Old Business**
  - A. Juvenile Probation – Project Proposal from RFK**
  - B. Best Practices Document – redistributed for review**
  
- III. New Business**
  - A. JDAI Conference Update**
  - B. Criminal Sentencing Commission staffing update**
  
- VI. Pending Legislation**
  
- V. Adjourn**

---

**Next meeting: Full Commission – December 14, 2017 at the Riffe Center**

**Juvenile Justice Committee – January 18, 2017 10:00a, Room 281**



## Juvenile Justice Committee

October 18, 2017

### Meeting Notes

Before the larger committee meeting, the smaller workgroup on probation met to discuss the contracting with RFK. Members present included Paul Dobson, Kathy Hamm, Jill Beeler, Shawn Welch, Erin Davies, Lisa Hickman and Sara Andrews.

Paul opened the meeting to discuss the recommendation on the RFK project. Cost of \$60,000.00 – for three counties. The question is, is this funding well-spent on probation or should we consider other options for fiscal resources? The group discussed that probation has never been evaluated, researched. RFK can give suggestions on what data will be helpful. Three counties through RFK may give us insight to improvement for probation practices and those generalizations can be useful, applicable for the rest of the state.

The group generally agreed that a three county study will help define best practices and there need to be commitment from the Commission, Court or someone to implement the recommendations statewide. The group discussed the possibility and practicality of partnership for funding and implementation strategy. The group then discussed asking RFK for a project proposal specific for Ohio. And, created the following to-do list:

To do:

- Ask RFK for an Ohio specific proposal for three, four and five counties, including cost (Sara)
- Redistribute best practices in probation done by Katie (Sara)
- Casey foundation opinion of RFK (Erin)
- Talk with Summit county about RFK (Shawn)

The larger committee then convened. Those present included Paul Dobson, Kathy Hamm, Jill Beeler, Shawn Welch, Erin Davies, Harvey Reed, Brooke Burns, Marta Mudri, Justin Stanek, Teresa Lampl, Lisa Hickman and Sara Andrews.

#### I. Call to Order

Paul called the meeting to order at 1:05p and told the group he appreciated people coming to a meeting on a Wednesday. He is completing his term as President of the OPAA.

#### II. Approval of August 17, 2017 Meeting Notes

Director Reed moved to approve the meeting notes with no additions/corrections. The motion was seconded by Teresa and the group unanimously approved the same.

### **III. Old Business**

#### **A. Juvenile Probation**

Paul discussed the current status of the RFK proposal – noting at the Full Commission meeting his report did not include the RFK update as previously agreed upon by this committee. Small workgroup met just prior to this meeting to reevaluate project.

Sara reviewed small workgroup meeting. Cost sharing option and stakeholder engagement are key focuses. Assignments due back before November meeting. If other agencies aren't interested in supporting fiscally, probably not a generalized interest to move forward. We can approach sentencing commission with a set percentage, dollar amount willing to contribute and if we can't get commitment for remaining dollars, we don't move forward.

The group then revisited other topics of discussion regarding the probation topic:

- Probation officer training presentations and learned not on the same level as the adult system.
- Approval/advancement the driver's license suspension revision
- VCO provision for status offenses may not be an RFK assessment topic. But, it is an issue currently with violations of the interstate compact and is a huge issue that should be addressed at some point.

#### **B. Juvenile Justice Data Project**

Erin discussed a proposal for statewide platform for data collection, noting a cost estimate of \$2m. Erin will invite a presenter on the topic to attend the January meeting.

Case Western Reserve University may be able to assist with our data wish list – and, they will be invited to the January meeting.

The group agreed that, at the January meeting, it should determine if a juvenile specific data collection committee should be convened.

### **VI. Future work and Priorities**

Future work and priorities were not discussed. However, Erin raised the topic of the committee's response and review of pending legislation. She suggested that current legislation should be agenda item for meetings – the group can then discuss the list of bills and share the discussion points/impact analysis with the full Commission for consideration. The group agreed to add discussion of pending legislation to future meeting agendas.

### **V. Adjourn**

With no further business, Paul adjourned the meeting.

JUVENILE JUSTICE BILLS CURRENTLY PENDING

<b>Bill:</b>	<b>Sponsor(s):</b>	<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
<b>SB 63</b> Confinement Credit	Thomas	Sen Judiciary	The bill changes the definition of "confined" to include locked and secure facilities as well as community corrections facilities (not necessarily locked and secure) The bill clarifies that a juvenile court retains jurisdiction to correct any error in calculating confinement credit	Referred to committee
<b>SB 64</b> Mandatory Bindovers	Thomas	Sen Judiciary	The bill eliminates mandatory bindover for juveniles; discretionary bindover, which requires an amenability hearing, is not altered	1 <sup>st</sup> hearing – 9/19/17
<b>SB 67</b> Violent Offender Registry	Gardner	Sen Judiciary	The bill authorizes BCII to maintain a registry of offenders who have committed 5 specified crimes The bill allows for lifetime registration with a minimum of 10 years of registering	3 <sup>rd</sup> hearing – 6/13/17
<b>SB 196</b> Bullying	Williams, Brown	Sen Judiciary	The bill creates the offense of aggravated bullying as a third-degree misdemeanor The definition, which applies only to public school students, requires knowingly causing emotional harm or knowingly causing someone to believe that emotional or physical harm will occur	1 <sup>st</sup> hearing – 10/3/17
<b>SB 197</b> Bullying	Williams, Brown	Sen Ed	The bill requires a tiered disciplinary procedure for	

JUVENILE JUSTICE BILLS CURRENTLY PENDING

			harassment, intimidation, or bullying in school The bill creates the offense of aggravated bullying as a third-degree misdemeanor	
<b>HB 318</b> School Resource Officers	Patterson, LaTourette	House Ed	The bill permits a school resource officer to make arrests, conduct searches and seizures, carry a firearm, and exercise other police powers	1 <sup>st</sup> hearing – 10/10/17
<b>HB 355</b> Sexting	Rezabek	House Crim Justice	The bill defines the crime of sexting as specific to images on electronic devices The bill requires that all courts utilize a diversion program for first-time sexting offenders who are younger than age 21	Introduced
<b>HB 360</b> Bullying and Hazing	Greenspan	House Ed	The bill outlines expulsion policies for acts of bullying, harassment, intimidation The bill requires community service for students expelled for bullying The bill requires a municipal court to develop community service plans for juveniles (the sub-bill removes this language and leaves this responsibility with the school)	First hearing – 10/24/17
<b>HB 394</b> Juvenile Omnibus	Rezabek	House Crim Justice	The bill: eliminates mandatory bindover; changes the process for discretionary bindover to include an interlocutory appeal and 14-day stay; changes calculation of confinement credit; changes	Introduced

## JUVENILE JUSTICE BILLS CURRENTLY PENDING

		how financial sanctions are ordered; and provides special parole eligibility for certain offenders serving life or indeterminate terms for a crime (other than agg murder) committed when a youth	
--	--	---	--



**OHIO**  
CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION

65 SOUTH FRONT STREET • 5TH FLOOR • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-3431 • TELEPHONE: 614.387.9305 • FAX: 614.387.9309

**SUBJECT: Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission review and analysis of ???**

**DATE:**

---

<b>BILL NUMBER:</b>	<b>TITLE:</b>
<b>SPONSOR(S):</b>	<b>COMMITTEE:</b>
	<b>STATUS:</b>

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION:**

---

**DESCRIPTION OF PROHIBITED ACT - MENS REA, ACTUS REA:**

---

**IS THERE EXISTING STATUTE OR LANGUAGE RELEVANT TO THE ISSUE?**

---

**CHANGE IN PENALTY:**

---

**GENERAL IMPACT:**

---

**VICTIM IMPACT:**

---

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT:**

---

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

---

**1 SUMMARY AND IMPACT ANALYSIS HB??? 11-03-2017| Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission**

\*The Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission is comprised of 31 members appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio and the Governor, ORC 181.21. The Commission’s mission and vision are to enhance justice and ensure fair sentencing in the State of Ohio. Commission Members represent organizations, associations and agencies with an interest in further advancing sound, well-rounded criminal justice policy. The Commission uses a consensus decision-making process when considering new proposals, advancing recommendations and in conducting its business. Commission Members’ opinions on a particular bill may not reflect the position of the organizations, associations or agencies they represent and are not intended to substitute consultation with the respective member organization, association or agency.



---

**RELEVANT SUPREME COURT OF OHIO DECISION(S), IF APPLICABLE:**

---

**HISTORICAL RESOURCES, IF AVAILABLE:**

---

**NOTES:**

---

DRAFT

---

**2 SUMMARY AND IMPACT ANALYSIS HB??? 11-03-2017| Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission**

\*The Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission is comprised of 31 members appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio and the Governor, ORC 181.21. The Commission’s mission and vision are to enhance justice and ensure fair sentencing in the State of Ohio. Commission Members represent organizations, associations and agencies with an interest in further advancing sound, well-rounded criminal justice policy. The Commission uses a consensus decision-making process when considering new proposals, advancing recommendations and in conducting its business. Commission Members’ opinions on a particular bill may not reflect the position of the organizations, associations or agencies they represent and are not intended to substitute consultation with the respective member organization, association or agency.





**Criminal Sentencing Commission  
Juvenile Justice Committee  
Supreme Court of Ohio**

*Proposal for:*

**A Probation System Review  
*for Selected Jurisdictions in the State of Ohio***

November 2017

*Presented by the:*

**Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice *led by the RFK  
Children's Action Corps***

## INTRODUCTION *and* BACKGROUND

In a continuing effort to enhance policy, practice and service provision for the youth and families involved with the juvenile justice and probation system in the state of Ohio, a comprehensive probation system review is proposed. Through the framework set out herein, and with leadership of relevant interested juvenile justice system stakeholders in selected participant local jurisdictions, the proposed analytic probation system evaluation will include a review and examination of policy, practice and service provision designed to inform immediate opportunities for system enhancement, improvement and reform.

The specific design of the proposed review is guided by three publications from the RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. These include the original *Probation Review Guidebook*, *Probation System Review Guidebook, 2nd edition*, and the newly released *Developmental Reform in Juvenile Justice: Translating the Science of Adolescent Development to Sustainable Best Practice*. The work has also been informed by the system review experiences in fifteen states and twenty three local jurisdictions since 2005.

However, the specific implementation of the review will also be informed and best accomplished in preparatory discussions with the probation and juvenile justice system leadership personnel in the selected jurisdictions, and among the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission, Supreme Court of Ohio regarding the most critical issues that confront their probation departments and juvenile justice system. From these discussions the statement of work proposed herein will initially:

- describe the jurisdiction(s) in which the review is to occur (census data, prevalence and characteristics of system involved youth)
- indicate the impetus for the review,
- describe the project scope (including the timeframe for completion and the resources to be used in the review),
- identify the goals and objectives from the perspective of each jurisdiction's leadership, and
- outline the issues and set them into a framework of elements for review, examination and analysis.

Further, the probation system review will enable the construct of a long term plan for comprehensive probation system improvement and judicial partnership within the selected jurisdictions and across the state of Ohio that is organized within these primary elements:

- effective programmatic and fiscal system practices
- effective and efficient court and probation management performance
- improved recognition of the neuroscience of adolescent development and adoption of the principles and hallmarks of a developmental approach aligned with practices that are proven to improve youth outcomes,
- implementation of enhanced prevention and early intervention, and inter-agency approaches for youth and families
- improved utilization of evidence based probation supervision and juvenile justice system practices and intervention services, and

- policies, procedures and/or legislative changes that are necessary to support systemic change in jurisdictions across the state of Ohio.

The probation system review will result in a report of findings and recommendations for each participant jurisdiction and an Executive Summary report for the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission, Supreme Court of Ohio that will highlight opportunities to enhance statewide system practice and performance that is consistent with recognized best practice standards and improved access to evidence based services that improve youth and family outcomes for those involved in the probation and juvenile justice system. Additionally, the technical assistance will provide initial support in the infrastructure development and best-practice approaches to ensure effective implementation and sustainability of the endorsed recommendations in each participant jurisdiction.

## **THE APPROACH**

The RFK National Resource Center utilizes a core team of two expert consultants, with periodic reliance on longstanding partnerships with the National Youth Screening and Assessment Partners, LLC and the National Juvenile Defender Center to enhance the review and analysis and to execute the methodologies detailed in subsequent sections of this proposal. The teaming permits a more thorough consideration and perspective on the information received and the opportunity to occasionally conduct multiple methodologies simultaneously during the on-site work, the latter of which is a key to efficient yet thorough delivery of the Probation System Review elements. The engagement of agency/organizational leadership, court, probation, and other relevant practitioners and stakeholders is essential to informed, meaningful and transparent exchange of information. It is this array of system actors that permit the development of findings and recommendations that truly capitalize on local expertise and seize viable opportunities for reform. This collaborative approach ensures objectivity while increasing the likelihood that the participating probation departments in the selected jurisdictions in Ohio, the juvenile court, and other relevant and critical youth serving partners will actively implement plan recommendations.

In the best practice methodology, juvenile probation combines monitoring and oversight for compliance with the court-ordered conditions and targeted responses to priority areas of youth and family behaviors that promote positive behavior change. In this approach, juvenile probation serves to ameliorate the risk for re-offending, thereby improving public safety, while simultaneously increasing the chances that youth will develop improved cognitive behavioral skills and abilities that will interrupt their trajectory into adult criminality.

Over the past 20 years the juvenile justice field has developed the capacity to conduct cost-benefit analyses that reflect the fiscal benefit of juvenile probation versus the costly and often ineffective residential and correctional alternatives that represented far too much of the juvenile justice system landscape during that period. We have learned from practice and research that when juvenile probation is applied to youth with moderate and high risks for re-offending, in the right dosage through a collaborative approach that prioritizes addressing the youth's priority criminogenic factors that desirable youth outcomes and community safety are best achieved.

So how do we make full use of this valuable resource known as juvenile probation? The first thing is to be aware of what works – which is clear and unequivocal. Recent publications that have synthesized the “what works” literature include:

*Four Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Youth Outcomes* (Council of State Governments, 2014)

*Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach* (National Research Council, 2013)

*Developmental Reform in Juvenile Justice: Translating the Science of Adolescent Development to Sustainable Best Practice* (RFK National Resource Center, 2017)

It is clear the most effective approach includes a commitment to the use of structured decision-making instruments that inform professional judgement at key decision points (e.g., risks-needs-responsivity tools), a continuum of graduated levels of supervision and responses to behavioral transgressions, monitoring that is integrated with effective behavior change service interventions and programs, an effective system of departmental management and supervision practices, and effective quality assurance for system performance and youth outcomes.

We also know that youth show up in the juvenile justice system with high rates of trauma exposure and active trauma symptoms. The research reflects that more than 80% of youth in juvenile justice settings are exposed to more than one traumatic experience. Those events can have significant impact on the mental health, physical health, and behavior and responsiveness of youth with whom probation practitioners work. Given this prevalence, implementing the use of validated screening instruments for active trauma symptoms and providing the appropriate care and interventions is yet another best probation practice that contributes to the desired pathway to success.

Additionally, a juvenile justice system committed to family involvement and engagement ensures that there are flexible and authentic opportunities for families to partner in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the case plan for the probation involved youth. The research, derived from practical experiences in juvenile probation, has increasingly reflected that institutionalizing these practices helps to realize improved desistance of delinquent behavior.

Finally, effective probation departments and juvenile justice systems must define with clarity their mission, goals and accountability measures. Effective departmental management practice commits to collect, manage, and report relevant data routinely. This practice leads to continuous opportunities to assess youth outcomes and system performance. Fortunately, several state and local jurisdictions have embraced this obligation and demonstrated that neither technological nor procedural challenges can prevent this requirement from being met.

Through this holistic framework and that which is embraced and used by the RFK National Resource Center and its RFK Probation System Review, a juvenile probation and juvenile justice system may realize the highest likelihood to operate in an effective and efficient manner resulting in the achievement of its goals, objectives and outcomes. We believe that the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission leadership and the current environment for reform in Ohio is consistent with the principles articulated within the RFK National Resource Center's approach and proposal herein and provides the foundation for the strong partnership that is necessary to make this endeavor a success.

The RFK National Resource Center will therefore employ an interactive consultation approach designed to assist and support, not to supplant, the authority, talents, current initiatives and work or actions of leaders within each selected jurisdiction and the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice

Sentencing Commission. This initiative will be accomplished with the guidance, active involvement and support of three primary core groups:

1. **A Leadership or Executive Committee from the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission** which would be comprised of those members identified by the Juvenile Justice Committee leadership and may include personnel with expertise in:

- Ohio probation leadership
- Policy development and standards of practice
- Law, executive orders, case law
- Data collection, management and reporting
- Quality assurance / Continuous quality improvement

This group would possess the expertise and authority to oversee and manage key decisions and activities potentially impacting reform at the state level and in support of opportunities in the selected jurisdictions during the life of the project. The RFK National Resource Center consultant team would schedule quarterly conference calls with this group to keep them apprised of the progress in each site-based review; solicit updates on relevant policy, legislative and/or practice matters impacting the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission; and provide a six month written memorandum inclusive of a summary of preliminary observations from each participant jurisdiction. Additionally, the consultant team will report in-person at a subsequent Juvenile Justice Committee meeting (but no later than the eight month time period of the project) in Columbus to ensure a full opportunity to discuss and explore all of the issues that are or potentially may impact the construct of the recommendations and the corresponding implementation and sustainability plan for each jurisdiction and the Juvenile Justice Committee.

2. **A Probation System Review Team (PSRT) in each Participant Jurisdiction** which would include leadership personnel from a broad-based representation of youth-serving agencies and organizations within each selected jurisdiction that would possess the expertise and authority to oversee and manage key decisions and activities potentially impacting reform during the life of the project. The key members of this group may include:

- County Juvenile Justice Services agency leadership and/or designees
- Court / Judiciary
- Probation / Case Worker representation
- Law Enforcement
- Behavioral Health
- Education
- Political representatives (legislators, other local elected officials)
- Legal representation (prosecutor, public defender, advocacy attorney's)
- Juvenile Justice Committee member representation

The site-based PSRT will meet to create a unified vision of the project goals that commits to support the activities necessary to achieve the desired project outcomes specifically for each selected jurisdiction consistent with the mission, vision, goals and objectives of that site's probation and juvenile justice system. At the outset of the project, the RFK National Resource Center consultant

team will work with the project leadership team to examine the most advantageous among a variety of methodologies proven to be effective in past evaluations. The PSRT in each jurisdiction will meet at regular intervals during the project period to develop and finalize the collaborative work plan, to determine the composition of relevant and necessary standing or ad hoc subcommittees, to discuss relevant expectations and parameters of the examination and analysis, and to set any other necessary directions for the joint project work. Each site-based PSRT will routinely review progress and project deliverables, and plan and oversee the activities of any standing and/or ad hoc subcommittee groups. The PSRT will have final decision-making authority regarding the work of the collaboration within each jurisdiction.

3. **A set of standing or ad hoc subcommittees, comprised of jurisdictional professionals and practitioners** that possess subject matter expertise in areas that may include data collection, current agency practice, available resources, policy and legal issues. The RFK National Resource Center consultant team will routinely work on-site and through conference calls and electronic messaging to provide tools and resources that will enable examination and analysis of the key areas identified in the framework of the project by these standing or ad hoc committees.

## **METHODOLOGIES**

Through on-site consultation, utilizing a range of methodologies successfully developed over a decade of work in the field, and previously referenced off-site communications, the RFK National Resource Center will assist the PSRT and Sub-Committees in each selected jurisdiction in moving through sequenced phases of activity that will yield desired project outcomes. The available analytical methodologies include:

### **Routine Meetings with Project Leadership /Executive Committee (PSRT)**

This method includes regular meetings with the Leadership/Executive Committee (PSRT) to discuss and assess the progress of the evaluation, their expectations, and to offer dynamic current suggestions to address many of the preliminary observations and findings as the evaluation progresses. This methodology permits opportunities for remedial actions without waiting for the final report to be completed.

### **Document Review**

An effective review will include the collection and review of various practice manuals, statistical reports, program descriptions and reports, and court and probation practice forms. This documentation will be specific to the state of Ohio and each participant jurisdiction, highlighting mission, vision, strategies, policies and procedures of relevant departments and agencies.

### **Process Mapping**

A critical component of this process evaluation, recognizing the importance of quantitative and qualitative data to inform the process, is the conduct of a process mapping exercise with a select group of leadership and practitioner stakeholders to analyze interfaces, handoffs, bottlenecks, and other case flow issues in the processing of juvenile justice system cases. This includes an analytic discussion of what information is available at various decision making points. This mapping process is often supplemented with a meeting of outside agencies to gain their perspectives on interagency work processes.

### **Key Stakeholder Interviews**

The RFK National Resource Center consultant team may conduct interviews with key system stakeholders within and from outside of each participant jurisdiction's probation and court system to solicit their expertise regarding the current process and practice and determine their views about the efficiencies and challenges of operation of the probation, juvenile court and juvenile justice system. A specifically designed questionnaire will be used to conduct the interviews.

### **Employee Survey**

An electronic, confidential survey of employees (new or existing) may be used to further gather opinions about current actual practice and efficiencies and challenges. The survey may utilize both closed-ended and open-ended questions that would be developed by the consultants in concert with the project leadership committee.

### **Project Management Team Conference Calls**

Routine conference calls will be held with a subset of the PSRT to ensure efficient and effective planning of specific evaluation activities, logistics planning to ensure efficient management of time for all involved stakeholders, and consideration of alterations to planned activities, as necessary.

### **Group Interviews**

These interviews may be conducted with any of the following stakeholder groups:

- Juvenile Justice Services youth-serving leadership personnel
- Court Judiciary
- Probation Officers
- Outside Agencies (e.g., contract service providers, educators, pro-social community organizations)
- Behavioral Health Providers
- Attorneys (e.g., defense, prosecution, private)

These meetings permit a qualitative understanding from these disciplines of their experiences and interactions in the key work and decision-making processes.

### **Discussion / Focus Groups**

The conduct of discussion/focus groups with consumer and/or client groups permits an enriched understanding of system responses from a valuable perspective often overlooked in this kind of analysis. The focus group discussions will be guided by a set of prescriptive questions. Potential groups include families and youth, among others uniquely identified by the participant PSRT.

### **Best Practice Analysis**

This methodology involves an analysis of decision making processes, a review of data, an examination of case management and assignment to and oversight of treatment resources and programs. A review of a department's screening and assessment process is instrumental within this methodology.

### **Risk Screening Tool & Risk-Needs Assessment – Implementation & Quality Assurance**

Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) is a case management approach that, if implemented well, can lead to better outcomes for individuals involved in the justice system. The RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice in collaboration with Gina Vincent, Ph.D., of the National Youth Screening and

Assessment Partners, LLC, developed checklists and an accompanying inquiry protocol to assist probation departments and juvenile justice agencies in their review and evaluation of the quality of their implementation practices and quality assurance methods in relation to their risk assessment and RNR tools.

### **Performance Measures and Outcomes Development**

This methodology supports an increased awareness of how worker performance (practice and adherence to prescribed practices) is related to the desired sought outcomes for the client population. The method permits a clearer identification of the best practices for stakeholders that are directly connected to desired outcomes and may form the basis for restructuring system and worker performance evaluation that will ultimately drive improved system and worker practices.

It is believed this frame of activities that support a “360 degree probation system evaluation” of the jurisdictions’ probation and associated juvenile justice system practices will result in findings that will yield opportunities for an improved system that is characterized by:

- Policy and program development that emphasizes prevention and early intervention
- Use of reliable data and data analysis practices to inform decision-making
- Reliance on evidence-based system, treatment intervention and program practices
- Effective screening and assessment methodologies
- Interagency agreements that support improved collaboration for access to services and efficient practices that contribute to “swift justice”
- Statutory and other policy frameworks that support systemic change.

During the initial on-site meeting in each jurisdiction, the RFK National Resource Center consultant team will facilitate a discussion with project leadership to develop an efficient work plan for employment of selected evaluation methodologies that will permit an effective compilation of desired analysis and findings. To accomplish the goals of this project, this proposal puts forth a project period covering twelve months. During this period, the RFK National Resource Center consultant team will conduct four on-site consultation visits (duration of one day each in each selected jurisdiction). Each jurisdictional site visit will include a meeting with the PSRT and permit the execution of scheduled meetings and methodologies with ad hoc or subcommittee groups. Off-site consultation will include monthly conference calls with project leadership and necessary stakeholders and be an important part of the review activities that will ensure depth of analysis and cost efficiency. Electronic mailing lists will also permit an ongoing exchange of resources, dialog and problem-solving interactions.

Additionally, the RFK National Resource Center consultant team will provide an on-site progress report to the Juvenile Justice Committee at approximately the eight month period of the project. The meeting will be designed to provide the Committee observations and preliminary findings. The meeting will be coordinated around a regularly scheduled site visit and Juvenile Justice Committee meeting.

The review and analysis site visits will occur during the initial ten months of the project period and will allow a period of one-two months for the RFK National Resource Center to prepare and submit a final report of recommendations and findings to the PSRT. A final site visit (½ day in each site and ½ day before the Juvenile Justice Committee – two days total) is included to present the report to the leadership in each participant jurisdiction as described in the section below.



## CONCLUSION & DELIVERABLES

The RFK National Resource Center consultant team will provide a final report of findings and recommendations that will address the:

- (1) Assessment of current available individual and aggregate data to inform prevalence, demographics and characteristics, risks and needs, trends, trajectories, and outcomes for juvenile justice youth in each selected jurisdiction and more broadly for the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission representation,
- (2) Assessment of probation system process and performance in the areas of management policy, court practices, structured and validated screening and assessment tools, key decision points and case worker decision-making; and identification of strengths and opportunities in these domains that enable best practice approaches to be implemented,
- (3) Analysis of case management and flow within the delinquency court, as well as its linkages with the relevant organizations with which it interfaces (e.g. child protection, education, behavioral health) as cases move through the system,
- (4) Ability to identify sought system practices and client outcome measures that drive evidence-based system and case worker performance, and
- (5) Ability to identify and access effective community-based resources that match identified service needs through the use of validated screening and assessment tools and methodologies.

The RFK National Resource Center will work with each local PSRT to convene a meeting in each site to discuss the background details and potential implications of the key findings and recommendations. Additionally, at the conclusion of the project period the RFK National Resource Center consultant team will prepare a written Executive Summary capturing the findings from the analysis in each site and include recommendations for implementation of priority areas of reform for the Juvenile Justice Committee (and the criminal Justice Sentencing Commission if requested). The RFK National Resource Center will work the Juvenile Justice Committee to participate in a meeting in Columbus to discuss the background details and potential implications of the key findings and recommendations that support maximizing statewide impact where practicable and desirable.

The RFK National Resource Center is committed to using the principles and research of implementation science to support the development of the infrastructure, methods, and activities that enable effective implementation of the endorsed Probation System Review recommendations. This approach provides the best opportunity for systemic change and for long-term sustainability of the revised policies, procedures, and practices in each selected jurisdiction and in partnership with the Juvenile Justice Committee of the Ohio Criminal Justice Sentencing Commission.

## **BUDGET NARRATIVE**

### **Three Site Probation System Review Project**

The budget calculation on the following pages is constructed to reflect on- and off-site time required for the team of consultants to conduct the articulated activities in each designated time period. The total cost for preparation, mobilization, and planning and each site visit reflected in the budget chart is “fully loaded.” “Fully loaded” is defined as inclusive of all on- and off-site consultation, travel, administrative costs (calculated at 9% of consultation costs), and report writing. The budget contemplates the submission of invoices at the conclusion of each scheduled site visit with an assurance that forecasted activities and methodologies have been conducted during that invoice period. The assurance is offered by the signature on the invoice by the appropriate and authorized RFK National Resource Center staff.

The travel costs include airfare, lodging, ground transportation (car rental and parking), meals, and incidentals incurred during the site-based visits related to the assignment.

The RFK National Resource Center Administrative costs include mailing, printing and fiscal management for the project.

The total costs for a multi-site project involving three jurisdictions are calculated at \$22,000/site. With the addition of one day in Columbus to meet with the Juvenile Justice Committee, the total cost for a three-site Probation System Review in the state of Ohio is \$69,000.

### **Four or Five Site Probation System Review Project**

The RFK National Resource Center proposes to offer a discount of 17.5% for each additional site (\$3,850 subtracted from \$22,000 = \$18,150). Therefore, to conduct a four site Probation System Review in the state of Ohio, the total project costs are \$87,150. To conduct a five site Probation System Review in the state of Ohio, the total project costs are \$105,300. The work would be conducted within the same total project timeline of 12 months.

## **BUDGET - Probation System Review (Three, Four and Five Sites)**

Activity	Project Time Period	Cost of Activity
<b>Consultation - 2 Consultants (TBD)</b>		
Preparation, Mobilization, Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparatory conference calls and exchange of informational / instructional materials</li> <li>• Conference calls to discuss selection process for participant jurisdictions</li> <li>• RFK NRC consultant facilitation for development of agenda and construct of site-based teams and working groups</li> <li>• Review of all received input and materials</li> </ul>	Initial date of contractual agreement - date of 1 <sup>st</sup> site visit (TBD – potential February 2018)  Project period: 0 - 2 months	\$4,500.00
Conduct of Site Visit #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparatory conference calls and exchange of informational / instructional materials</li> <li>• RFK NRC consultant facilitation of site visits in three separate jurisdictions</li> <li>• Initial convening of PSRT (local sites)</li> <li>• Construct of necessary ad hoc working groups</li> <li>• Initial meeting w/selected probation management and line staff (initiate Process Mapping)</li> <li>• Review, examination and analysis of all received input and materials</li> </ul>	April 2018          Project period: 2 - 4 months	\$12,500.00
Conduct of Site Visit #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparatory conference calls and exchange of informational / instructional materials</li> <li>• RFK NRC consultant facilitation of site visits in three separate jurisdictions</li> <li>• Convene participant site PSRTs</li> <li>• Employee Interviews – Distribute Employee Survey</li> <li>• Stakeholder interviews</li> <li>• Continue Process Mapping</li> <li>• Assessment/Analysis activities 1-5 detailed in the proposal (order TBD in discussion w/PSRTs)</li> <li>• Review, examination and analysis of all received input and materials</li> </ul>	June 2018          Project period: 4 - 6 months	\$12,500.00
Conduct of Site Visit #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparatory conference calls and exchange of informational / instructional materials</li> <li>• RFK NRC consultant facilitation of site visits in three separate jurisdictions</li> <li>• Convene participant site PRSTs</li> <li>• Discussion/Focus Groups and/or Stakeholder interviews</li> <li>• Continue Process Mapping</li> <li>• Assessment / Analysis activities 1-5 detailed in the proposal (order TBD in discussion w/PSRT's)</li> <li>• Review, examination and analysis of all received input and materials</li> <li>• Preliminary discussions of observations and potential findings</li> <li>• Convene site-based meeting w/OH JJ Committee in Columbus, OH; present initial Summary of Observations memorandum</li> </ul>	August 2017          Project period: 6-8 months	\$14,000.00
Conduct of Site Visit #4	October 2018	\$12,500.00

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparatory conference calls and exchange of informational / instructional materials</li> <li>• RFK NRC consultant facilitation of site visits in three separate jurisdictions</li> <li>• Convene participant site PSRTs</li> <li>• Discussion/Focus Groups and/or Stakeholder interviews</li> <li>• Assessment / Analysis activities 1-5 detailed in the proposal (order TBD in discussion w/PSRT)</li> <li>• Review, examination and analysis of all received input and materials</li> <li>• Preview &amp; discuss preliminary findings w/site-based PSRTs</li> </ul>	Project period: 8-10 months	
<p>Conduct of Final Project Site-based visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare &amp; present Final Report to PSRT (in each selected jurisdiction)</li> <li>• Prepare and present Executive Summary to Juvenile Justice Committee</li> </ul>	December 2018 - January 2019  Project period: 10-12 months	\$13,000.00
<b>Three Site Probation System Review - TOTAL</b>		<b>\$69,000.00</b>
<b>Four Site Probation System Review - TOTAL</b>		<b>\$87,150.00</b>
<b>Five Site Probation System Review - TOTAL</b>		<b>\$105,300.00</b>



To: Jo Ellen Cline  
From: Katie Plumer  
Re: Best Practices in Juvenile Probation  
Date: February 15, 2017

## **Juvenile Probation**

Historically, the criminal justice system has treated juveniles and adults differently, however, sometimes that line gets blurred when looking at the penalties for breaking the law. In regards to probation it is especially important that the system be tailored to juveniles and does not simply treat them like “short adults”. The system must be tailored to treat juveniles and not just an amended version of adult probation. Juvenile probation officers should be trained in how to treat the juveniles; they should be focused on rehabilitation; and they should avoid incarceration; and they should incorporate community-based techniques into the goals they set. All of these goals can be accomplished by properly training the officers.

### **Officer Training: *Accountability & Collaboration***

A focus of the juvenile system is accountability, however, juveniles are not the only ones that must be held accountable. Officers need to be held accountable to the programs and policies that are in place in order to ensure the juvenile is receiving the best assistance that they can. This accountability should be to themselves and also to their supervisors in the office. The officers should know their expectations and have the goals for themselves and the juveniles that they are monitoring defined clearly. There should be a review completed on cases of juveniles who are on probation.

A collaborative meeting that involves all individuals who participate in any form in the juvenile justice system should occur within each jurisdiction. This list would include people like Judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation officers, service providers, and anyone else who may be consulted during the adjudication and rehabilitation of a juvenile. A collaborative meeting will help to hold all positions accountable to the goals of the system. It is essential to have a working relationship between all of these individuals in order to best identify the practices for each county.

### **Smaller Case Loads: *Focus on High-Risk Offenders***

Smaller case loads will allow officers more time to focus on individual high-risk cases. Smaller caseloads can be achieved by focusing resources on those individuals that truly need the service. A risk-assessment tool can be used to identify these individuals and allow the officer to spend less resources in monitoring them. This tool should use an evidence-based screening process in order to focus the assessment on the best programming that an individual may need. By eliminating the resources that are spent on those individuals who do not need it the officers will be able to have smaller more focused caseloads.

It is important that officers be trained on how to perform a risk-assessment tool. A risk assessment tool can be a huge help to officers. The results of the tool not only help identify who is a high-risk verse low-risk offender, but they can also start to identify the areas in which probation should be focused in order to set appropriate goals.

### **Community-Based: *Service Providers & Families***

In order for a juvenile to be rehabilitated it must be a community effort. One way to do this as stated above is to get all the service providers at one table to create a collaborative effort to identify the best course of action in a particular community. Officers need to be on board with bringing other professionals in to help on cases. Bringing the focus to a community-oriented probation system will allow for the juveniles to receive the best referral to any form of social service that may help. It will also ensure that juveniles are referred only when they have actual needs that can be addressed by individuals.

The second step to developing a community-based system includes involving the juvenile's parents. The juvenile probation system has historically avoided involving parents in the treatment of the juvenile. There has been a shift in this belief especially now that the focus is on finding treatment options other than placement for the juveniles. Some strategies for involving families include "working collaboratively with youth, families, and the courts to ensure goals developed for youth are achievable and measurable; setting clear expectations and structure for supervision processes with the inclusion and help of families; ensuring that systems staff and probation are amenable to working with youth in their homes when needed; and utilizing best and promising practices to improve youth's cognitive development and problem-solving skills." <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf](http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf)

## **Re-Focus Goals: *Identify Root of Problem, Reduce Incarceration***

The focus of Juvenile Probation should be changed focusing on positive aspects. Officers should be trained to be optimistic, and measures need to be taken in order to avoid officers getting stuck in a routine or the same line of thinking. Officers should be trained to reformulate the goals of the probation to look for the root of the problem, rather than focusing on strictly punishment for that behavior. By incorporating many of the items stated previously in this document officers will have a better chance of getting to the root of the problem, which will then lead to a better chance of less revocations and lower recidivism rates.

A goal of each officer is to reduce the number of revocations that each office has. Sometimes goals that are formulated create hoops that are simply too high for the juveniles to be able to jump through. By restructuring the goals and the officer's thought process it will lead to a reduction in revocations.

Finally, one of the biggest shifts in the best practices in juvenile probation is to reduce the reliance on placement and identify alternatives to both punishment and treatment. The goal of the criminal justice system as a whole is to protect the community. However, by focusing on alternative treatments that allow the system to focus on the root of the problem the community will be protected. Incarceration of juveniles may be warranted in some cases, but by choosing incarceration as a last option for juveniles the system will run better as a whole.

### **Resources:**

*This document is a summary of the following resources. Reading the documents and pulling out the key reoccurring ideas for the best practices and the reforms that the juvenile probation system should make.*

- 1- [http://www.ncjj.org/pdf/DesktopGuide2002\\_full.pdf](http://www.ncjj.org/pdf/DesktopGuide2002_full.pdf) (*National Center for Juvenile Justice*)
- 2- <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/177611.pdf>
- 3- <http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/516>
- 4- [http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf](http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf) (*National Council for Crime & Delinquency*)
- 5- <http://rfknrcjj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Probation-System-Review-Guidebook-2ndEdition.pdf> (*National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice*)