



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

October 18, 2017

Agenda

- I. Call to Order**

 - II. Approval of August 17, 2017 Meeting Notes**

 - III. Old Business**
 - A. Juvenile Probation**
 - B. Juvenile Justice Data Project**

 - VI. Future work and Priorities**

 - V. Adjourn**
-

Juvenile Justice Committee
August 17, 2017
Meeting Notes

Members Present: Chair Dobson, Vice-Chair Beeler, Burns, Cole, Davies, DeLamatre, Foulke, Fragale, Hamm, Montz, Reed, Rezabek, Stanek, M. Williams

Guests: John Tuell (RFK Center), Cindy Peters (Sen. Thomas), Scott Lundregan (OHR), Shawn Welch (OJC), Lucy Chandler (SCO)

Staff Present: Sara Andrews, Jo Ellen Cline, Lisa Hickman

- I. **Call to Order.** Chair Dobson called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m.
- II. **Approval of Meeting Notes of July 13, 2017 meeting.** Upon motion and second the meeting notes were approved unanimously.
- III. **Juvenile Probation (System Review)**

After committee members briefly introduced themselves, John Tuell, Executive Director of the RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice gave a presentation on the National Center's work. Currently, the National Center is working with Summit County, OH on a dual status youth initiative, one topic of focus for the Center, and also working in jurisdictions outside of Ohio in probation system reviews. Those probation system reviews have been at the county level and statewide. A question was asked regarding local reviews and their impact on state policy and what entity in the current jurisdictions invited the Center to undertake a review. Mr. Tuell explained that it varies from place to place but, for example, in Arkansas the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Supreme Court asked for the review and picked the three local sites. He also noted that the National Center does try to translate local level recommendations to statewide impact and that recommendations regarding statutory change would have statewide impact regardless. Mr. Tuell then explained the National Center's review process, including the four elements of the review: administration, probation supervision, work processes, and quality assurance. A question was asked about how the National Center engages victims in the process and Mr. Tuell talked about the collaborative effort necessary for the review and recommendations to be impactful. He noted that victims groups are a part of the process particularly in the area of inter- and intra-agency collaboration. Mr. Tuell noted that the review process usually takes about a year to complete.

During discussion it was asked if the current Ohio statutes do not take into account current research on adolescent brain development is it better to look at updating those before doing a focused probation review. Mr. Tuell noted that

jurisdictions have done reviews both ways: focusing on big picture first and then specifics and vice versa; however, he noted that the probation review can be very helpful in informing the foundational narrative. On the question of cost Mr. Tuell noted that a standard review generally costs around \$50,000 per jurisdiction. He later clarified that if Ohio were to undertake a probation review in three counties he would anticipate a cost around \$60,000 total. Another question was raised regarding costs of implementing recommendations because of the concern that local jurisdictions would see this as another unfunded mandate. Mr. Tuell noted that most of the recommendations are practices not programs and so budgetary impact should be minimal but the National Center also works with jurisdictions on identifying opportunities for the reallocation of resources. He noted that another reason to have the local jurisdictions undertaking the review is to combat the “top down” mentality that can result from the state telling a local jurisdiction what is “best”. Concern was also expressed about buy-in, especially from probation officers and law enforcement. Mr. Tuell acknowledged that differing philosophies is a major challenge and they rely on their experiences in other jurisdictions and on the leadership team in the state to help with those issues. In response to a question regarding details, Mr. Tuell indicated that the National Center prefers to work in no more than 3 local jurisdictions of varying size/make-up and has, in the past, worked with jurisdictions involved with JDAI.

Mr. Tuell briefly addressed the training component that the National Resource Center can offer and then talked with the committee some more about getting participation and buy-in from all the players in the system.

The committee then engaged in a discussion about next steps. Director Andrews suggested that the committee formulate a recommendation to the full Commission for the September meeting. After discussion about the parameters of what the committee would be recommending to the Commission and some expressed concerns about bringing in an outside entity and paying for a report that sits on a shelf or recommendations that will not be adopted outside of the local jurisdictions where the review takes place, the committee unanimously agreed to present to the full Commission the following report in September:

- The committee has identified that there are problems with the juvenile probation system in Ohio.
- The committee believes that bringing a third party objective group into Ohio to engage in an objective, comprehensive review of the juvenile probation system would be beneficial.
- The RFK National Resource Center is poised to be the outside entity to do the review and the committee is comfortable in discussing that possibility further.
- The committee would like the approval of the full Commission to move forward with this project.

The committee also formed a small work group to flesh out what the committee would want to accomplish in a probation review and to put some thoughts and ideas before the committee in October. The small work group will be: Erin Davies, Shawn Welch, Jill Beeler, Kathy Hamm, Paul Dobson, and Jim Cole.

IV. Juvenile Probation (miscellaneous)

The committee then discussed proposed language regarding driver's license suspensions in probation. The proposed language clarifies that a driver's license suspension is discretionary as a condition of community control. Rep. Rezabek indicated that the language was already in the drafting stages with the Legislative Service Commission for inclusion in another of as yet unidentified bill.

V. Juvenile Data. Because of time constraints the committee did not get the opportunity to discuss juvenile data; however, it will be on the agenda for October.

VI. Other Business. Jo Ellen discussed the juvenile sentencing quick reference guide and asked for committee volunteers to help with an updating project. Brooke Burns and Erin Davies volunteered. The Ohio Judicial Conference will also be consulted on the project. Judge DeLamatre and Shawn Welch gave a brief update on the earlier development stages of a judicial group that will be looking at juvenile justice in the 21st century. They indicated they might have more information at the October meeting.

VII. Adjourn. There being no further business to come before the committee the committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.