

Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice Meeting

October 18-19, 2012

Washington, DC

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) convened a meeting of the Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (FACJJ) on Thursday and Friday, October 18-19, 2012, at the Office of Justice Programs office. The meeting was attended by 13 FACJJ members, OJJDP staff and non-federal observers. On Thursday FACJJ members heard from OJJDP leadership about the Office's priorities, programs, and funding; the subcommittees met to discuss recommendations they would like to make to the FACJJ and reported out to the full FACJJ; staff from the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) discussed ways JRSA can assist the FACJJ with collecting and analyzing data and information; and OJJDP provided a status update on *Sharing Information: A Guide to the FERPA and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs*. Members also elected a chair and vice chair. The second day of the meeting featured a panel discussion about juvenile justice reform nationwide followed by a discussion about trends in juvenile justice State legislation. The meeting concluded with a discussion by FACJJ members about best practices and challenges in their regions.

Call to Order, Friday, Oct. 18

Robin Delany-Shabazz, OJJDP's Designated Federal Official for the FACJJ, called the meeting to order at 8:45 AM. FACJJ chair Reggie Robinson welcomed members, noting that this meeting is the group's second in-person meeting since the October 2011 organizing meeting. Since that meeting, the advisory committee has been busy responding through web meetings and conference calls to OJJDP requests including comment on the draft OJJDP program plan and input on information sharing issues. FACJJ members have also been organizing the work of the subcommittees, which will drive the FACJJ recommendations. He also thanked co-chair Rob Lubitz for his assistance and work.

Updates from OJJDP Acting Administrator

Melodee Hanes, Acting OJJDP Administrator, thanked FACJJ members for their efforts, especially their input into the 2013 Program Plan. Before discussing OJJDP's priorities, she proudly noted that out of thousands of U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) employees, the U.S. Attorney General had recently recognized six Office of Justice Programs staff members for their distinguished service, three of whom are OJJDP staff members. OJJDP's Compliance Monitoring Coordinator Elissa Rumsey was one of three recognized for guiding DOJ's efforts to address sexual violence in prisons, jails, and lockups through the successful implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. OJJDP Research Coordinator Brecht Donoghue and OJJDP Program Manager Jennifer Tyson were honored along with a colleague for advancing the Attorney General's goal of increasing the use of science and evidence in the Department's work, and specifically for designing, planning, and implementing CrimeSolutions.gov, a searchable database of evidence-based programs covering a range of justice-related topics.

OJJDP Vision: Ms. Hanes said OJJDP adopted a new vision to guide OJJDP's work, including the program plan and reorganization -- *OJJDP envisions a nation where our children are healthy, educated and free from violence. When they come in contact with the juvenile justice system, it is rare, fair and beneficial to them.* She said OJJDP's job is to keep youth out of the system or to ensure

that should they enter the system, it is a rare event, that they are treated fairly, and that they benefit from the experience. The 'rare part' of that vision is incorporated into OJJDP efforts addressing youth development, prevention, early intervention, children's exposure to violence, the defending childhood initiative, and mentoring programs. The fairness aspect is embedded in all the Office's activities to improve the juvenile justice system. The fairness priority is also reflected in the proposed office reorganization, which ensures that the OJJDP is clearly focused on having a juvenile justice system that engages in the best practices, uses incarceration as a last resort, and uses alternatives that are much more beneficial to youth who are in the system. The vision to ensure that the juvenile justice system is beneficial to youth guided OJJDP's reorganization by ensuring the Office addresses the need to provide better services, including mental health, education and workforce development, to incarcerated youth so that they can develop into competent and caring citizens.

Reorganization: Ms. Hanes said OJJDP took into account the FACJJ's comments on Office reorganization and expects the new reorganization will be approved shortly. The reorganization, guided by the above vision, was staff driven.

Program Plan: OJJDP is in the process of approving its Program Plan, which includes input from FACJJ. Ms. Hanes noted that the FACJJ input was in close alignment with staff comment. The plan focuses on disproportionate minority contact; family and youth engagement; trauma and how it impacts youth in the juvenile justice system; and research. It also addresses the need for a greater emphasis on publications and outreach to let the public know how Federal dollars are helping youth.

OJJDP Initiatives: Despite budget woes similar to those faced around the nation, Ms. Hanes said OJJDP is pushing forward in its work, finding new ways to do business. Rather than simply serving as an ATM grant machine, OJJDP is successfully leveraging private/public partnerships in a number of areas. Among others, the Office is working with the Annie E. Casey Foundation on a judicial detention initiative and the McArthur Foundation on assessment and screening of youth. In collaboration with other Federal agencies, OJJDP recently held a national forum in 10 cities to develop a strategic plan to reduce youth violence. Ms. Hanes said the forum was developed without any new funding by leveraging the Federal agencies' existing funding and training and technical assistance. Ms. Hanes said the forum demonstrated that working with communities as a collaborative is the most effect way to facilitate change.

Ms. Hanes also discussed the Attorney General's Task Force on Defending Childhood Initiative. The Task Force will present its recommendations on ways to reduce children's exposure to violence to the Attorney General on Dec. 12 at the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention meeting. OJJDP's partnership with ED and other colleagues and philanthropy groups on school discipline is also moving forward. Ms. Hanes said that OJJDP has funded the Council of State Governments in conjunction with several philanthropies to bring all key stakeholders to the table to address the school to prison pipeline. This is one of four components of the joint DOJ-ED initiative, which has launched three other working groups to identify research and data collection needs; develop guidance for State and local educators and policymakers on ways to keep youth engaged in learning in school; build awareness among all stakeholders on the importance of keeping youth in school; and work with schools, law

enforcement, communities and courts to eliminate harsh student discipline and referrals of students to court for nonserious and nonviolent issues. Ms. Hanes also described OJJDP support for a national summit convened by the New York Permanent Judicial Commission on Justice for Children, last March to bring together educators and judicial leaders from all the states to beginning planning to improve school discipline practices and limit juvenile justice contact.

Finally, Ms. Hanes discussed a juvenile justice reform and reinvestment project, which awarded funds from the Office of Management and Budget to three sites to develop and implement evidence-based and cost measurement tools. Using an existing model, the sites are looking at what is most effective, then developing a tool they can use to analyze program effectiveness and cost effectiveness. The sites are in Delaware, Iowa, and Milwaukee.

OJJDP Operations and Funding

Janet Chiancone, Associate Administrator for Budget and Planning, provided an overview of why OJJDP does what it does and how it funds its activities. OJJDP's work is authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act but everything that is authorized isn't necessarily funded. The Act authorizes a number of activities, including support for the FACJJ, and the need to provide training and technical assistance to the juvenile justice field; to conduct research, evaluation, and statistical analyses; and to disseminate juvenile justice data and information to a wide audience. OJJDP is one of the few Federal agencies that has it written into law that the agency must conduct research and support data-driven and evidence-based programs.

Recent appropriations have allowed OJJDP to set aside 10 percent of the appropriations to be used for research, evaluation and statistics, and two percent for training and technical assistance. However, these set-asides must maintain the 'flavor' of the original funding stream. For example, dollars from the mentoring funding stream must be used to support mentoring research or training and technical assistance. These set-asides have been especially helpful since many of OJJDP's authorized programs have not been funded over the past several years. Unfunded programs include the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant Program; research, evaluation, technical assistance and training programs; demonstration initiatives; and Title V incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs. OJJDP's overall appropriation has dropped by 41 percent since 2009: from \$461.5 million in 2009 to \$227 million in 2012. The hardest hit programs have been the Formula Grants Program and the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program. The budget forecast for 2013 is mixed. The House appropriations bill for OJJDP allocates \$214 million while the Senate has proposed \$299.5 million.

Although no budget has yet been passed, OJJDP is operating on a continuing resolution, which allows the Office to operate at the prior year's funding level for up to 6 months. Ms. Chiancone said budget reductions have taught OJJDP to be more strategic in how it spends funds. The Office has learned to be flexible, conducting webinars in place of face-to-face meetings; ramping up partnerships with private organizations and other Federal partners; and coordinating efforts of researchers and training and technical assistance providers.

FACJJ Bylaws

Prior to breaking into subcommittee meetings, Ms. Delany-Shabazz updated members on two changes to the FACJJ bylaws. Originally the bylaws provided for members to serve two 2-year terms. Because this would result in everyone rotating off the FACJJ at the same time, OJJDP has

staggered the membership, extending one-half the current group's first term by 1 year. This means the first term of half of the group will in end in 2013 and the other half in 2014. Both groups are eligible to serve a second 2-year term, provided members retain their eligibility on their State Advisory Groups (SAGs). The second change affects the 1-year terms of the chair and vice chair. To better align these terms to the members' 2-year terms, the chair and vice-chair can serve two 1-year terms.

Subcommittee Meetings

Mr. Robinson reported that since the last webinar meeting in August, FACJJ leaders and OJJDP have developed a protocol subcommittees can use to invite non-FACJJ members to join their subcommittees. This will allow the subcommittees to expand their level of expertise. He also updated the status of the subcommittees. FACJJ originally organized six subcommittees but the Youth Justice and Information Sharing Subcommittee was eliminated in favor of the entire FACJJ taking up information sharing issues. Mr. Robinson proposed that the Youth Justice and Family Engagement Subcommittee also be eliminated and that instead all subcommittees infuse family engagement issues into their discussions and recommendations. The entire FACJJ concurred.

Prior to breaking into closed subcommittee meetings, Mr. Robinson directed the subcommittees to complete the following tasks:

- Identify one to three areas of focus with the objective of developing specific recommendations to present to the full FACJJ.
- Identify any anticipated products related to the recommendations and suggest dissemination strategies.
- Develop a process and timeline for drafting recommendations.
- Determine data collection and/or information gathering needs.

Mr. Robinson asked the subcommittees to have recommendations ready to present to the full FACJJ by the end of July. He proposed an August webinar to discuss the recommendations. He also reminded members that the FACJJ is an advisory group and not an operational entity. The FACJJ's primary task is to provide advice about juvenile justice to the Congress, Attorney General, and OJJDP. The group then broke into subcommittee meetings, followed by lunch.

Subcommittee Reports

Subcommittee members gave the following reports:

Evidence-based Youth Justice Practices Subcommittee: Dalene Dutton reported this group chose two areas of focus: first, to look at OJJDP measured outcomes to make sure they include positive youth outcomes and not just negative ones; and second, to look at ways OJJDP could assist jurisdictions to develop better systems for implementing and maintaining evidence-based best practices. The subcommittee wants to look at what is measured, how it is measured, and how much of this information might be driving practice. The group is unable to identify any written products until it knows what its final recommendations will be and to whom they are directed. The subcommittee could use helping gathering information about what jurisdictions think would be helpful or what tools they have that could be shared with other jurisdictions.

They also would like to gather information about what outcomes the SAGs are working toward to see how these outcomes align with the OJJDP's outcomes.

Youth Justice and DMC Subcommittee: Christine Perra Rapillo said this subcommittee is focusing on three areas. The first centers around entry points into the juvenile justice system with disproportionate impact on minority youth. The subcommittee wants to examine having OJJDP support DMC training for law enforcement and requiring other DOJ agencies to include DMC activities in their grants. Their second area of focus is to look at how the actions of other systems, such as schools and child welfare, impact DMC. This activity might require a literature review. The subcommittee's third area of focus is on youth and family engagement in DMC efforts. They believe it is vital to raise community awareness about the DMC issue. Proposed products include a fact sheet that would discuss research, training, and ideas for family, youth, and community involvement. The subcommittee will meet by phone on Nov. 30 and will have a first draft of the recommendations ready by April. The subcommittee was asked to include judicial referrals for probation violations in the literature review.

Youth Justice and Schools Subcommittee: Dean Williams reported this subcommittee is intent on advancing best practices and/or policies on school discipline and on advancing youth representation in policymaking. The subcommittee is concerned about the need to educate the public, policymakers, and educators about the problems associated with suspension, expulsion, and zero tolerance policies and about the importance of school engagement. Although there is a plethora of literature and research about school discipline, there is a scarcity of 'plain English' documents that distill this information in a usable format for parents, educators, and policymakers. The subcommittee is working on developing solid proposals.

Youth Subcommittee: Haley Reimbold summarized this subcommittee's vision, stressing the group's goal is to institutionalize youth involvement at the local, State, and Federal levels. The subcommittee is focusing on three areas. First, they want to raise awareness about the strengths and challenges of youth involved in the juvenile justice system and address misconceptions about these youth. Second, they hope to forge partnerships and collaborate with other youth-serving organizations to increase the voice of youth. Third, they see a need to disseminate information to help jurisdictions implement policies, programs, and practices that support youth involvement. The subcommittee developed a list of possible projects, including collecting and disseminating youth stories about youth in the system, and hopes to send out a brief questionnaire to FACJJ members to help with this project. They also proposed developing a white paper on promising youth engagement practices; creating opportunities to get youth to engage in a dialogue with police and court officials; developing a training curriculum to educate youth on how to navigate the juvenile justice system; sponsoring a youth justice webinar; and hosting youth listening sessions. Ms. Dutton suggested Ms. Reimbold get in touch with her to see what Maine is doing to engage youth.

Mr. Robinson reminded FACJJ members that their role is to use their ideas and expertise to advise OJJDP and others on topics and activities they believe the federal government should consider addressing. Ms. Delany-Shabazz suggested, for example, that the FACJJ could recommend that OJJDP develop a training curriculum on youth engagement and suggest areas the curriculum should address.

Information and Data Collection

Dr. Stan Orchowsky, research director for the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), and Dr. Carrie Williamson, JRSA research associate, discussed how JRSA could help the FACJJ subcommittees gather data and other information to assist them with developing recommendations. Dr. Orchowsky suggested FACJJ members think about the questions they need answered and then let JRSA suggest how to get answers to the questions. Subcommittee members should determine what they want to know and why, and from whom they want the information. JRSA can also help the subcommittees determine what information they need, and staff can sit in on subcommittee conference calls.

Based on this discussion, FACJJ decided on the following timeline: Subcommittee chairs will submit a brief paragraph or two to the FACJJ Chair, Vice Chair, and OJJDP by Oct. 26 outlining thoughts about recommendations they would like to make; this will help JRSA provide suggestions on information and data needed and the best way to gather this information. After discussing with subcommittee chairs, FACJJ leadership will meet with and/or submit subcommittee information to JRSA by the middle of December. JRSA will suggest ways to gather the needed information by the first of the year.

Election of Officers

The FACJJ unanimously re-elected Mr. Robinson and Mr. Lubitz to serve as chair and co-chair, respectively, for another year.

FERPA Document Update

Mark Sakaley, OJJDP Senior Policy Advisor, updated the FACJJ on the revision of *Sharing Information: A Guide to the FERPA and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs*. He thanked the FACJJ for their earlier feedback about the document and asked them to review the current version. First published in 1999, the document has undergone numerous changes to address new legislation. As part of their review, Mr. Sakaley asked FACJJ members to identify sections of the document that need further information and to provide examples of ‘real world scenarios’ of how information has been shared, both appropriately and inappropriately. OJJDP will explore putting the document on google.com and electronically send it to FACJJ members by Oct. 26. Comments are due back to Ms. Delany-Shabazz by Nov. 9. The comments will be consolidated and submitted to Mr. Sakaley by the middle of November.

Closing

Mr. Robinson thanked members for their hard day’s work and recessed the meeting until 8:30 AM Friday, Oct. 19.

Call to Order, Friday, Oct. 19

After calling the meeting to order, Mr. Robinson summarized Thursday’s activities and deadlines and thanked FACJJ members for all that was accomplished on Thursday. Friday’s agenda was devoted to exploring the state of juvenile justice reform and reflecting on how the reforms relate to FACJJ’s work and recommendations. Members were also asked to share examples of reform initiatives and best practices from their jurisdictions.

Status of Juvenile Justice Reform Nationwide

Lyman Legters moderated a panel discussion on juvenile justice reform. Mr. Legters recently accepted an assignment through Casey Family Programs to serve as a Senior Fellow at DOJ, where he works closely with OJJDP. He is also a faculty member of the Georgetown University Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.

The first panelist was FACJJ member Jim Moeser, who is co-chair of the executive committee of the National Juvenile Justice Network (NJJN). The network, comprised of 43 organizations in 33 States, supports a national movement to ensure that every State's juvenile justice system develops model laws, policies and programs. Issues addressed by member organizations include reducing institutionalization; reducing racial disparities; keeping youth out of adult confinement facilities; maximizing youth, family, and community participation; promoting smaller more rehabilitative-focused placements; increasing the range of effective community-based programs; improving aftercare and reentry programs; and serving youth with special needs. NJJN is also concerned about what happens to youth after institutions close and how these institutions' resources are being redirected. Mr. Moeser noted two NJJN publications. *Advances in Juvenile Justice Reform* illustrates the breadth of State reform efforts. *Bringing Youth Home* highlights what happens as institutions close and promotes a dialogue about "right sizing" and downsizing. The publications are available online at www.njjn.org.

Nancy Gannon Hornberger, executive director of the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (CJJ), discussed trends in juvenile justice Federal policy. CJJ is a coalition of juvenile justice SAGs. Ms. Hornberger said the Federal policy pendulum swings back and forth between a punitive approach versus developmental and rehabilitation approaches. She noted there is still a tendency to criminalize normal adolescent behavior especially that related to school discipline, underage drinking, and sexting. A big debate also remains regarding confinement in institutions versus family and community-based care. Issues and policies change with leadership. There have been trends where national policy has spurred State reform, then times when national policy is working to catch up with reform initiatives developed by foundations and State policy. She gave a brief history of the JJDP Act, noting Congress has generally regarded juvenile justice policy to be the responsibility of states. The Act, overdue for reauthorization, was last authorized in 2002—and that reauthorization took 6 years.

She briefly touched on other Federal legislation that has had an impact on juvenile justice: the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Second Chance Act, and the Adam Walsh Act. She also noted the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA), which gives DOJ's Civil Rights Division the authority to bring actions against State or local governments for violating the civil rights of persons institutionalized in publicly operated facilities. DOJ has recently taken action against juvenile facilities in Shelby County, TN, and Lauderdale, MS, for cruel and inhumane treatment of juveniles in juvenile facilities. Ms. Hornberger suggested several topics the FACJJ might want to consider. The Youth Promise Act, initially designed to guard against punitive gang legislation, has evolved into the Youth Development Act and focuses on engaging law enforcement and communities to work with youth at risk of gang involvement. The bill remains stalled. Juvenile justice appropriations continue to diminish and there are questions about the relevancy of formula grant funds. Although there have been positive status offender reforms, youth continue to come into the juvenile justice system for school referrals. The debate also

continues about punitive versus developmentally appropriate approaches to juvenile justice. Finally, she suggested, there needs to be more communication, advocacy, and clarification about evidence-based programs and exactly what evidence-based means.

Bart Lubow, director of the Juvenile Justice Strategy Group of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, discussed how reducing reliance on detention and incarceration is the most promising and positive trend for reforming the juvenile justice system. Although much has been accomplished in the past decade, much remains to be done, as illustrated by a series of photos Mr. Lubow shared. The photos, available online at www.juvenile-in-justice.com/, shed light on why detention and incarceration are both misguided and in many cases inhumane.

The United States incarcerates juveniles at a much higher rate than other countries. Moreover, incarceration is not resulting in positive youth development or enhanced public safety. Mr. Lubow said locking up juveniles is wrong for many reasons. Detention often results in system maltreatment. Detention is not effective with recidivism rates as high as 70 percent in some places. The public and policymakers have the impression juveniles are being locked up for egregious acts, when in fact the data don't support this. Juveniles are incarcerated for acts for which an adult would not be confined. Incarceration is not the primary means of changing juvenile behavior. Confinement is expensive. It costs up to \$88,000 per year to confine one youth. Mr. Lubow said some juveniles do need to be locked up, but if these were the only youth incarcerated, money would be available to provide the programs they need to change their behavior. He added that one of the common rationales for relying on confinement is to get treatment services for youth. In reality, correctional facilities are not therapeutic or educational.

On the positive side, there has been a pattern of deep reduction in the juvenile incarceration, especially in the past 6 years. Mr. Lubow said juvenile incarceration rates are driven in large part by juvenile crime, which has been decreasing, and by policy and practice s, things the FACJJ can promote. The success of the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI), an Annie E. Casey Foundation program that is receiving OJJDP support, will soon be in 39 states and more than 200 jurisdictions. Mr. Lubow said JDAI has reduced reliance on detention by more than 40 percent in these sites and improved public safety.

Mr. Lubow asked the FACJJ to consider six basic recommendations.

- Limit who can be incarcerated or committed to institutions by changing policies and laws.
- Expand nonresidential alternatives by building more robust systems of services and interventions in communities.
- Change financial incentives so that courts don't send youth to State institutions unnecessarily.
- Change things up and down the entire juvenile justice continuum by adopting best practices.
- Implement the model used by Missouri for those youth who do have to be confined; that State's corrections environment is totally different from most other States.
- Figure out how to get standardized data from the States. The juvenile justice system's lack of any kind of standardized data prohibits practitioners and policymakers from answering questions and doing the right thing for youth.

Trends in Juvenile Justice State Legislation

Sarah Brown, Senior Researcher with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), gave a video presentation from Denver, CO, on juvenile justice State legislative trends. NCSL provides information, training, and technical assistance to State legislators. Ms. Brown noted that out of 7,500 State legislators, close to 6,000 seats are up for re-election. This means there will be many new legislators with information needs. NCSL recently released *Trends in Juvenile Justice State Legislation, 2001-2011* (available online at www.ncsl.org). The analysis of State laws found that State legislatures are focusing on exploring innovative approaches in the juvenile justice system, in part because of fiscal cutbacks. New and better research has also contributed to this movement. In addition, the Supreme Court rulings abolishing the juvenile death penalty for juveniles and life without parole for nonhomicide crimes have influenced State trends. NCSL identified seven major trends in state juvenile justice legislation.

- States are distinguishing juvenile offenders from adults by passing laws that expand jurisdiction of the juvenile court, reform transfer and direct file laws, and address juvenile competency.
- State laws are providing increased due process and legal counsel requirements, and prohibiting waiving the right to counsel.
- State legislatures are enacting prevention and intervention laws based on evidence-based practices and cost-benefit analysis.
- States are enacting legislation related to juvenile mental health.
- State laws are exploring ways to reduce detention and provide meaningful alternatives. Detention reforms are also looking at gender-responsive correctional programs.
- State policymakers are paying more attention to DMC, although this trend is moving more slowly than the others.
- Legislatures are working to improve reentry and aftercare.

Juvenile Justice Reforms in FACJJ Regions

FACJJ member and Chief Judge (retired) George Timberlake facilitated a discussion by FACJJ members about juvenile justice reforms in their jurisdictions. Judge Timberlake said the Illinois SAG reorganized 3 years ago and vowed not to fund anything that did not lead to policy change that would result in public safety and positive outcomes for youth. The SAG has undertaken studies on the effect of parole on youth and on juvenile sex offenders.

ViEve Kohrs reported Louisiana is working on detention reform through JDAI with help from the Casey and McArthur Foundations. One concern is that the State might lose ground once the foundations leave. Robert Listenbee said Pennsylvania has addressed a juvenile scandal in Lucerne that involved youth being sent in shackles to institutions without a hearing, but the State has not put into place a plan to ensure this doesn't happen again.

Mr. Moeser said Wisconsin is working with law enforcement and training court personnel on DMC. Claudio Norita from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands said the island's major challenge is that Federal policies bind all the territories together as one State, which leads to fiscal issues. Mr. Williams from Alaska said his State is working on reinvestment issues, but is sending juveniles with English as a second language out of State for treatment. He said Alaska is hindered not by a lack of dollars but by an unwillingness to change. Ms. Perra Rapilla said Connecticut has done a lot of good work on DMC and PBS is going to do a documentary about

the State's efforts. Mr. Lubitz reported that Arizona is working to improve outcomes by building on what they already have, rather than bringing in new programs.

Adjournment

Following this discussion, Mr. Robinson thanked everyone for such a productive meeting and said he, Mr. Lubitz, and Ms. Delany-Shabazz would look at all the information that had been presented and think about ways to build on it. He adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.