

Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice Meeting

March 6, 2020

9 A.M.–4:18 P.M.

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

SUMMARY

The **Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (FACJJ)** held an in-person meeting on March 6, 2020. The meeting, which was open to the public, was hosted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Elizabeth Wolfe, Training and Outreach Coordinator for OJJDP, served as Designated Federal Official (DFO) for the meeting.

Caren Harp, OJJDP Administrator, led and moderated the meeting. FACJJ members participated, and members of the public observed. Ms. Wolfe provided staff support for the meeting. Bixal staff members Maegen Barnes, Melissa Kanaya, and Laura Nadel provided technical assistance.

A presentation was made on Performance-based Standards (PbS). FACJJ members engaged in a discussion on this issue with PbS Executive Director Kim Godfrey Lovett after her presentation.

FACJJ members participated in a listening session on the newly redesigned OJJDP website.

A presentation was made on understanding the challenges facing state juvenile justice specialists and compliance monitors.

The FACJJ determined the subcommittees for the coming year, and each subcommittee shared its planned focus and activities.

WELCOME, OPENING REMARKS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Wolfe opened the committee's quarterly meeting. She noted that a summary of the meeting would be available on the OJJDP website within 60 days.

Administrator Harp welcomed all participants, who in turn introduced themselves. She provided an update on the activities of OJJDP and the committee for the past year, including:

- OJJDP has engaged in significant tribal and rural outreach to assist communities in gaining access to funding; this has included working in tandem with the DOJ Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) in 10 locations throughout the country to provide training on applying for grants, contact information, and information about upcoming funding solicitations. The goal is to make applying for grants more accessible. OJJDP currently has 24 solicitations posted online, with 3 left to post. To ease the burden on these populations and to increase the pool of applicants, the application process has been simplified, with applications being two pages long at most.

- The FACJJ subcommittees this past year focused on the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 (JJRA), Special Topics, and Educating the Field.

Administrator Harp noted that the FACJJ would discuss subcommittee planning and assignments later in the day.

PERFORMANCE-BASED STANDARDS: MEASURING AND MONITORING PERFORMANCE

Kim Godfrey Lovett, Executive Director, Performance-based Standards (PbS)

Administrator Harp introduced Ms. Lovett, who is a co-founder of PbS. Ms. Lovett currently is working with OJJDP around reentry. Ms. Lovett noted that many of the states represented by FACJJ members are utilizing PbS.

Ms. Lovett noted the significant knowledge that now exists and the disconnect between that knowledge and what is being implemented on the ground. Old juvenile justice practices such as punishment, isolation, and segregation do not work. Things that do work are communities, supportive adults, education employment, and a sense of hope and purpose.

Ms. Lovett shared the story of a group of 17- and 18-year-olds who are completing a pre-apprenticeship program in which they spend at least 40 hours each week in the classroom learning skills and trades. After 4 weeks, they can leave with as many as four certifications. This is an example of kids who have spent time in the juvenile justice system; they now are ready to be productive, purposeful citizens, and they are out of the criminal justice system pipeline.

Ms. Lovett explained that data-driven decisions were made in the programming for these youths. Facility leadership made changes using PbS, which is a set of standards and measures, as well as the continuous collection of information.

PbS

PbS, which launched its development in 1995 with 28 participants, is the sole DOJ program to win the Innovations in American Government Award from the Harvard University Kennedy School Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation. It won a cooperative agreement to develop reentry standards and, in 2018, a coop agreement to build field capacity for collection analysis and reporting of reentry data.

PbS-participating facilities include 113 correction facilities, 42 detention facilities, 25 community facilities, and 12 assessment facilities.

PbS's guiding principles are:

1. Facilities should be operated as if the next child coming in is one of our own.
2. "Good, better, best. Never let it rest 'til your good is better and your better's best."

Helping Facilities Improve: Data Collection and Analysis

Kids do better if people recognize when they are “doing right,” and people who work with children perform better when they can recognize that their hard work pays off. PbS has codified goals in areas of safety, order, security, health, behavioral health, family and social supports, justice, programming, and reintegration.

PbS collects a large amount of data and provides them to a facility in the form of a site report with accompanying data analysis. Facility leadership uses the reports to understand what is and is not working and to develop facility improvement plans. PbS provides further support via help desks and expert coaches.

The measures PbS use come from a host of places. Administrative data – including but not limited to facility type; numbers of kids and staff; kids’ race, ethnicity, education level, and health – and perceptions of youth, families, and staff around fairness, safety, access to services (kids) and training (staff), and more are collected and analyzed. These measures provide a comprehensive picture.

PbS tracks data by race and ethnicity and shares that information with the facility.

PbS Blueprint and Data Collection

The blueprint links PbS goals with more than 100 standards and outcome measures that serve as flags. Data are collected almost entirely automatically (with only 1 percent done by data entry), and a facility can modify its online dashboard and can pull data within improvement domains. The data set, which gives the best picture of national information, is available for researchers as a searchable database.

Reports

PbS provides tools to analyze data in the form of reports, including bar graphs, pie charts, and interactive reports. Data are collected every 6 months (April and October); one can compare a program over time as well as across similar facilities. A significant amount of descriptive data – such as day, time, and location of violence and isolation – is available and is useful for practice change.

Improvement Plans

PbS’s online tool provides structure for making change. A PbS-designated staff member – facility administrator, agency director, or coach – gives deadlines and holds people accountable. Facilities use the data and the PbS dashboard to determine areas of improvement, fill in the steps, and track their results on a 6-month basis.

Results

Ms. Lovett reviewed some of the body of data. PbS has spent years convincing facility leaders that it is better to know the truth about, and address, their practices and outcomes so as to avoid costly lawsuits and real harm; now, there is less fear around data. People can lose their jobs over data, but far worse is that kids can get hurt or die without the knowledge that data provides. Only aggregated data are shared; individual facility information is not released. Ms. Lovett asserted that data change cultures.

Research shows that children need at least one trusting adult. Accountability, which generally is missing from these kids' lives, is another key factor to successful outcomes.

Data are disaggregated by rural, suburban, and metropolitan facilities. According to the data, facility conditions and quality of life are similar regardless of location. However, offenses and system responses – with rural facilities not having enough staff and services – vary.

Selected Results:

- Positive experiences reduce likelihood of reoffending.
- Kids feel safer when they know the rules.
- Kids feel unsafe in facilities, while families generally think their kids are safe.
- Use of restraints, which has significantly lessened, has only ever led to negative impact; it shows that the communication system has broken down.
 - The nature of a youth's offense that results in detention can lead staff to employ restraints more readily.
- Isolation/room confinement is declining, and average time of isolation/room confinement is shortening.
- Staff training positively affects outcomes.
- The data are more incident based than youth based.

PbS does not track staff shortages, although one could review staff levels as it relates to high-incidence data.

Effective Programming

The average age of facility youth is 17, whereas it used to be 15, and many kids have their high school diploma or GED. Education needs to be post-secondary, and this is not happening.

New Approach: Career Pathway

PbS has been developing a combination of education and employment/career planning, with the goal of assisting facilities in helping youth to find career paths based on their passions and helping youth develop plans to reach their goals. Elements may include certification programs, college, and/or apprenticeships. The goal is to support youth once they leave facilities; currently, one in seven fail post release.

Youth Reentry Survey

Ms. Lovett shared preliminary preparedness and readiness findings from the PbS survey:

- About 83 percent of youth are ready to work.
- About 74 percent of youth are confident they will succeed.
- About 57 percent of youth strongly agree that they have the support they need to be successfully employed.
- Only 13 percent of youth believe they will be able to afford their living expenses.
- Many kids do not have a way to get to work or the right clothing for a job.
- Youth report fairness around sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, and cultural respect.

- Youth want to give input and be heard in the facility. If they feel they are being heard, it turns their lives around.
- Youth have high rates of access to their cell phones, birth certificates, and social security cards, and they have a medium rate of access to a valid ID (driver's license, state-issued, or medical ID). They have low rates of access to their medical records, prescriptions, and passports.
- About 86 percent of parents know when their child will be released.
- Families are generally well prepared for their child's release, with 75 percent or higher responding that they are:
 - Kept up to date on their child's treatment plan.
 - Participating in, understanding, and agreeing with their child's discharge plan.
- About 81 percent of families feel that their child's discharge plan includes what to do if the child engages in negative behavior(s).

Many facilities now have family councils and provide tours to prospective families.

Discussion

All surveys are anonymous and confidential, and they are completed on a kiosk with a staff member. PbS recommends that surveys be completed with staff who are on the floor with the youth. The new reentry survey from the most recent work now is available for probations, and at least one court is interested in using it to ensure honest answers. Ms. Lovett's experience is that the kids tell the truth, especially when they use a kiosk. PbS has compared some responses to national surveys, such as the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement, and has found that they mostly align.

State agencies prefer to use their own machine information systems machines, which delays data submission. PbS built the Application Program Interface and provides it free of charge to agencies to encourage automatic data submission. Five or six states are submitting automatically, and two states are using software developed by private vendors that includes the necessary data elements in their case management platforms. PbS's system removes a lot of poor-quality data, and its helpdesk spends 2 weeks further removing data that do not make sense. At that point, the state coordinator reviews the data to confirm validity. PbS does not include poor data in its field average and does not use a program's data when it first joins; data compliance usually is well established by the end of the first year. Ms. Lovett shared the example of the North Dakota state agency paying the fees at the beginning on behalf of some detention centers and community residential programs to generate interest and help them see the value of PbS's data analysis.

In order to become involved with PbS, a state completes an online application. A trainer makes two site visits – once to prepare the agency to complete an overview, and then to review and analyze the first round of data. States are creative on funding this data analysis and use a variety of sources. Participation is relatively inexpensive and decreases after the first year.

PbS implements two youth surveys – a climate survey that includes all kids in the facility during either April or October, and the youth reentry survey performed within 2 weeks of release. Detention centers collect less data because their lengths of stay are very short.

There has been a significant reduction nationwide in juvenile delinquency, as well as a nationwide movement to reduce incarceration of youth even when they do commit offenses. As a result, most states have seen a significant decrease in the number of kids confined either in local detention facilities or in state institutions. Therefore, the youth who are confined are youth who have committed only the most serious offenses or have the most extreme and complex behavioral issues. However, data have not shown that violence rates among those in confinement have risen, and, therefore, there is no increased need per capita for use of restraints (physical or chemical). That said, staff have more challenging jobs given that a far larger percentage of youth enter detention more resistant, and there are fewer kids who would engage and could bring others in line. This highlights the need for more appropriate training and better support for staff at detention centers.

PbS provides annual training for every state coordinator with which it works. Some of the trainees are facility superintendents.

Although state directors attend annual trainings, OJJDP discovered that facility superintendents had no national training and instituted a certificate program. The program involves a 3-day in-person training, webinars, and other activities over the subsequent 6 months; the second cohort completed its training in December 2019.

CHALLENGES FACING STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIALISTS AND COMPLIANCE MONITORS: TITLE II FORMULA GRANT AWARD COMPLIANCE

Dr. TeNeane Bradford, Associate Administrator, OJJDP

Dr. Bradford provided the FACJJ with information on the history and purpose of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act), which was enacted in 1974 to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to preventing and addressing juvenile delinquency and to improve the juvenile justice system. The Act established OJJDP to support local and state efforts, and it created the Title II Formula Grant Program. The Act was reauthorized as the JJDP Act of 2002 and again as the Juvenile Justice Reform Act (JJRA) of 2018.

The JJDP Act established the four core requirements:

- Deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO)
- Separation of juveniles from adults in secure facilities (Separation)
- Removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups (Jail Removal)
- Addressing disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system (DMC) (added in 1988, originally; the 2002 reauthorization changed “confinement” to “contact”)

Title II Language: Eligibility vs. Compliance

The Compliance Monitor (CM) typically is responsible for getting information to OJJDP. As it relates to eligibility, the CM must describe the State Advisory Group (SAG) composition and the policies and procedures that govern a state’s effective (changed from “adequate” with the JJRA) system of monitoring, which includes meeting an 85 percent threshold for 8 requirements. The state must meet compliance on the 4 core requirements (above) and must inspect 100 percent of

its facilities over a 3-year period. However, a state that submits a report of its completed inspections, monitoring of 85 percent of facilities for violation, has a good SAG composition, and meets program benchmarks will receive 20 percent of Title II funds. Inspection involves validating and verifying facilities to a higher standard than previously accepted.

Core Requirements: Award Reductions

To administer the Act with fidelity, OJJDP applies the 85 percent rule by requiring states to submit compliance data for DSO, Separation, and Jail Removal.

- Submission must include 12 months of data of 85 percent of facilities in the state’s monitoring universe.
 - “Monitoring universe” = secure facilities statewide that may hold juveniles
- Data are collected for the fiscal year (FY) period of October 1 to September 30.
- If a state does not submit data for 85 percent of its facilities in its monitoring universe regardless of its violation rates, it is ineligible for Title II funding for that award year.

The goal is to ensure OJJDP has enough data to make good decisions about funding and to help a state come back into compliance. Any state found out of compliance must use 50 percent of its allocation for each unmet core requirement to come back into compliance. A state that has been out for 1 year is not eligible for funding the following year but can receive training and technical assistance (TTA) to help it become eligible for funding. Connecticut, Nebraska, and Wyoming have opted out of Title II funding.

Administrator Harp noted that the territories – with ongoing issues including connectivity, natural disasters, and turnover – need more help than OJJDP can provide at this time. The Office needs to find a unique way to support them, perhaps with a subcommittee focused on them.

State Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities around Title II within the state are:

- *SAG*: Advises on the expenditure of funds
- *Juvenile Justice (JJ) Specialist*: Performs overall implementation of Title II
- *Compliance Monitor*: Ensures state has an effective system of monitoring
 - CMs can range from part-time contractors to full-time staff.
- *Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) Coordinator*: Ensures RED data collection and reporting

There is a 50 percent turnover rate among these employees; due to this, states may be more compliant than is known, but may not have staff who can ensure OJJDP is receiving the necessary information. OJJDP is working to improve and ease the process with the hope of improving this situation. Economic realities can affect a state’s ability to retain staff. Succession planning is an important element to have in place.

Tiffany Franklin noted that the Louisiana SAG has identified some issues with getting the documentation from the field to the coordinator, and the need for assistance from OJJDP; such help could shift behavior. Dr. Bradford added that this issue is somewhat common across states, as the field does not feel required to comply with reporting up. Some states incentivize the field.

OJJDP's Training and Technical Assistance Tool (formerly known as the Guidance Manual) relays federal core requirements compliance guidelines. Also, the Center for Coordinated Assistance to the States (CCAS) represents OJJDP and will be visiting states this spring. Training and sharing of best practices are key, as they lead to job success. Connecting new staff with a seasoned CM or JJ specialist can reap rewards as well. Along with SAG webinars and quarterly calls, OJJDP will provide training and support for SAGs in the third and fourth quarters.

This fall, an in-person FACJJ meeting will be held in connection with OJJDP's State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD) Conference in Southern California.

A seasoned JJ Specialist can explain to a juvenile court judge why it is advantageous to participate because of the potential for lawsuits, loss of funds, and embarrassing exposure if information gets out that funds and opportunities had been provided and squandered.

Compliance Monitor Responsibilities

CMs are tasked with:

- Training staff on three core requirements.
- Collecting violation data from facilities.
- Submitting data to OJJDP annually.
- Providing information to the JJ Specialist for submission of a Title II application to OJJDP.
- Supporting the onsite compliance audit.

Onsite audits typically involve five to seven facilities per week; major pieces include education of new staff and succession planning.

Discussion

The equation for determining a state's compliance appears in the Code of Federal Regulations. Per regulation requirement, OJJDP sends out the rates with a threshold using a standard deviation – based on the last 2 years of data submitted from all states and territories – by the end of each August to CMs, JJ Specialists, and Designated State Agency heads. A single state's compliance requirement – which involves a rate per core requirement, except for RED – is relative to the remainder of the states and territories, and 85 percent reporting is the bare minimum. OJJDP plans to hold a meeting with each SAG to clarify this process.

OJJDP is aware of the financial and administrative burden placed on states regarding compliance for an ever-decreasing amount of money, and it knows that states and territories do a cost-benefit analysis on whether to comply. The Office has been simplifying and streamlining the reporting and funding process in every way it can to minimize the complication and to ensure that states are empowered to help children. The FACJJ knows the importance of the Act for kids, in that it ensures that they receive age-appropriate, safe services.

Another element of the calculation is that numerous states have passed legislation that mirrors Title II protections; this leads to a more challenging argument about why a state should choose to comply at the federal level. Additionally, federal money can still flow into the state through a

local government or a nonprofit organization. OJJDP adds value by providing tailored TTA. The Office seeks to facilitate the flow of federal funding and to give states and territories access to ideas and best practices.

The removal in the JJRA of minimum and maximum funding amounts for states and territories allows OJJDP to approach funding differently as it allocates scarce resources to address a greater need. One option is to do a cost-based minimum calculation and give a guaranteed amount of money beyond that to make sure actual programming is funded. A small percentage of a large state's funding amount could have a significant consequence in a smaller state or territory; in those places, a partial loss of funding can be devastating.

It is crucial to continue to push for nontraditional ways to identify data points that show good outcomes from the work that is being done, and to identify continuously partners such as statewide organizations and others to assist with that data development. That push could enable states to use nontraditional funding to address some issues internally, thus allowing OJJDP to open up other funding streams. It is important to tear down the notion that smarter ways of responding to the needs and issues of system-involved youth equal not being tough on crime, and we need to educate those who may not want to assist with such efforts.

SAGs need to expand their memberships to include state players that have access to money and potential for bringing creative programming ideas to the table. Examples include Department of Labor and Department of Education state-level offices and PbS.

Although in-person meetings (whether SAG or FACJJ) are more costly and require a higher level of commitment, they are significantly more effective than webinars. OJJDP works to strike a balance between in-person and virtual meetings.

OJJDP WEBSITE LISTENING SESSION

Jill Molter, Web Content Manager, OJJDP

Administrator Harp introduced Ms. Molter, who has reworked the OJJDP website based on the FACJJ's recommendation to organize information intuitively and in a user-friendly way. The new website was launched in October 2019, its first update in 15 years.

Ms. Molter shared the areas of focus for website development and ongoing improvement:

- Audiences and their goals, needs, and influences
- Web design: content; design; and functionality
- Scannability and readability
- Searchability/navigation
- Branding and trust

The goal of this listening session was to gather the FACJJ's feedback on the website for continued improvement. Ms. Molter walked the group through the current website pages and functions:

- Search Engine
 - OJJDP is working with the OJP Office of the Chief Information Officer to include acronyms in predictive searching.
 - Search results can be sorted by date or relevance and can be narrowed by type of information.
 - This new engine helps focus searches and includes predictive search.
 - A near-term goal is to add topic-specific pages.
- News and Events (including JuvJust, OJJDP’s bimonthly eNewsletter—*News @ a Glance*)
 - This section includes press releases and upcoming events.
 - FACJJ members are encouraged to subscribe to both.
- State Support (searchable by state or territory and including 3-year plans, compliance charts, DMC contact plans, and some performance measures)
- Publications (able to be sorted by date published or by title, and by descending or ascending alphabetical order)
- Implementation Guides
 - A goal is to secure future funding to add to the current, limited collection.
- Information on Core Requirements Eligibility and Regulations
- Multimedia (including videos of recent funding opportunity webinars)
 - Content will continue to be added.
- Research and Statistics (includes a link to the *Statistical Briefing Book*)
- Programs and Initiatives (includes spotlights of OJJDP-funded programs)
- A Pop-up 4C Customer Satisfaction Survey
 - Results will be used to fine-tune the website user experience.
 - FACJJ members are asked to complete the survey.

One of the next steps is to reorganize and consolidate the Title II information to include the core requirements and state supports. The website now has functionality that will allow for presenting the information more clearly.

The OJP-wide taxonomy is used to classify the website’s content. One of the upcoming enhancements is the addition of fields that can be used to support more filters; an audience filter could include judges, prosecutors, law enforcement, and other roles.

The updated, secure website is far more user-friendly than its predecessor. To ensure the site remains a trusted, valuable resource, all of its content must either be published by the federal government, or reviewed by OJJDP researchers or program staff. Any linked site must be funded by OJJDP or be a .gov site.

Ms. Molter explained that most respondents are topic-focused researchers and those seeking funding.

FACJJ members shared their suggestions for the website. These included:

- Creating awareness of the site as a trusted, first-stop resource in the field of juvenile justice.
- Increasing its user-friendliness (i.e., searchability of content by role).

- Driving juvenile justice professionals from social media to content through short videos showing how to navigate the site.
- Adding a “What is new/trending in juvenile justice?” section.
- Linking to vetted content related to juvenile justice (i.e., state court decisions, legislative updates).

FACJJ members will continue to provide feedback as they explore the content and use the website. The redesign of the FACJJ website has just kicked off as well.

SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Administrator Harp thanked the subcommittees for their work over the past year. The FACJJ had a brief discussion about how to move forward and then broke into subcommittees to discuss their focus and flesh out plans for 2020. The subcommittee breakout sessions were closed to the public.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: FACILITATING JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT IMPLEMENTATION

Members of the Facilitating Compliance with the Juvenile Justice Reform Act Subcommittee are Judge David Hejmanowski (Chair), Corey Haines, Danica Rubenstein, and Joseph Vignati.

The group discussed challenges to JJRA implementation experienced by states and territories. The subcommittee plans to focus on two specific areas:

Minimum Implementation Costs

What does it cost a state to do the compliance analysis simply and be able to provide data to be in compliance to receive its funding?

The subcommittee seeks confirmation that the costs of fulfilling the functions of the JJ Specialist, CM, and RED coordinator – whether one or more people handle them – are known already because the states are reporting that to OJJDP. That means that the Office could pull out that information, divide it by the number of states that have provided data, and use the resulting number to determine the average implementation cost.

To get a more accurate picture, OJJDP could ask states to report costs beyond those being reported from a budgetary standpoint (i.e., administrative costs, transportation costs, computerization costs) and include those data in determining a baseline cost. It would be helpful to identify states that are fulfilling some functions by way of an outside contractor.

Additional elements of focus are:

- Whether the analysis involves a 1-year review or multi-year review.

- Whether an average cost will be applied nationwide or whether it will be regionalized (West Coast/East Coast vs. Deep South/Midwest).

Waiver, Transfer, and Housing of Juveniles in Adult Facilities

Section 223(11)(b) defines when, for how long, and under what conditions a state or territory can house juveniles in an adult facility. This includes answering the following questions:

- When must juveniles be sight and sound separated?
- What findings are needed to make the initial decision to house a juvenile in a specific facility or to continue to house the juvenile?
- How often does a hearing need to be held, and how often does a decision need to be reviewed?
- What is the definition of an adult inmate?

Some decisions are simpler and more straightforward than others, and the subcommittee plans to work with OJJDP staff to develop a visual layout of the multilayer decision tree used to analyze and make determinations.

Administrator Harp offered to connect the subcommittee with Brittaney Ford, an OJJDP staff member who is skilled in this area. The decision tree document should identify as many unique situations as possible.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: SPECIAL TOPICS

Member of the Special Topics Subcommittee are Kate Richtman (Chair), Thomas Frawley, Russell Reihl, Melanie Shapiro, Korey Solomon, and Kenneth Tramble. Ms. Rubenstein will provide input to the group's work as available.

Ms. Wolfe shared the list of topics in interest created at the 2019 in-person FACJJ meeting for review by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee plans to focus on truancy. With a focus on middle schools or above, it will address:

- Helping families to engage, value education, and understand their children's needs.
- Helping middle and high schools address lack of engagement and truancy – this includes ongoing teacher training and family education.
- Identifying and developing/sharing of ideas for use and development of resources and interventions; sharing evidence-based best practices; collaborating with all players – school resource officer, social services, court, Department of Education, and law enforcement; and making sure community judicial officers are involved.
- Ensuring schools do not look to the courts as a solution to truancy and only use the court when it is truly needed as a last effort;
- Providing resources to help staff, kids, and families become and remain engaged.
 - Sexual orientation/LGBTQ, gender, mental health, and other issues bring unique life experiences.

- Helping schools to develop programs that work and to collect data on them for advocacy and for sharing information with all stakeholders (including kids, parents, and staff).
- Helping schools use data to focus efforts and to develop multiple pathways to success and college or career readiness.
 - These efforts help set reasonable expectations for parents.

The subcommittee will convene a subsequent phone conference to discuss this focus on truancy.

The goal is to support schools looking inwardly rather than to the courts for the solution to truancy and to identify available resources to help staff, children, and families become and remain engaged.

Ms. Wolfe provided the group with the reentry toolkit, and Administrator Harp directed members to reach out to her for additional resources.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: OUTREACH TO TERRITORIES AND STATES NOT PARTICIPATING IN TITLE II

Member of the Outreach to Territories and States Not Participating in Title II Subcommittee are Anthony Pierro (Chair), Adolphus Graves, Berlina Wallace-Berube, and Tiffany Wilkerson-Franklin.

The mission of this subcommittee is to provide recommendations to help territories and nonparticipating states participate in Title II with the goal of best serving youth. It plans to work with OJJDP staff to hold listening sessions – involving open, honest dialogue – to learn about the challenges, barriers, and hurdles to participation. It will identify and reach out to points of contact – to understand and address cultural differences that negatively affect territories’ and states’ ability to participate in the program.

OJJDP’S STATE RELATIONS AND ASSISTANCE DIVISION CONFERENCE

Keisha Kersey, Program Manager (Compliance), OJJDP

Ms. Kersey manages CCAS, OJJDP’s TTA provider to states and territories. Part of her work is to help put on the SRAD national conference. The next conference is expected to take place October 6 – 8, 2020, in San Diego, CA. As soon as the details are confirmed, OJJDP will share information.

CCAS is in the very initial stages of planning the conference, and it is reviewing TTA requests it is receiving from the states; currently, there are 18 current open TTA requests. CCAS also is looking at information and questions that program managers are receiving, and it is gathering feedback from onsite visits. The goal is to be as responsive to the field as possible.

Ms. Kersey asked the FACJJ for topic suggestions and for feedback on how it wants to be involved in the conference. The group would like to participate in presentations and listening sessions around the subcommittees' work; this would allow for input and feedback on those efforts, and for sharing helpful information and best practices.

NEXT STEPS AND WRAP-UP

The next in-person FACJJ meeting will take place in June or July 2020. The group will meet again around the October 6 – 8, 2020, SRAD conference in California.

Ms. Wolfe will reach out to members to begin setting up subcommittee meetings.

Written comments from the general public may be submitted to Ms. Wolfe at Elizabeth.Wolfe@ojp.usdoj.gov.

For more information on OJJDP or the FACJJ, visit www.ojjdp.gov or www.facjj.ojp.gov, or email Ms. Wolfe.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Judge Thomas Frawley, MO
Adolphus Graves, GA
Corey Haines, MI
Judge David Hejmanowski, OH
Anthony Pierro, NJ
Russ Riehl, ND
Danica Rubinstein, WV
Korey Solomon, ID
Kenneth Tramble, LA (via phone)
Joseph Vignati, GA
Berlina Wallace-Berube, USVI
Tiffany Wilkerson-Franklin, LA