PS COMMITTEE #2
January 24, 2013

MEMORANDUM

January 22, 2013

TO: Public Safety Committee

FROM: Susan J. Farag, Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT: Update: Commission on Juvenile Justice

Today, the Committee will receive an update from the Commission on Juvenile Justice on its activities over the past year. The following are expected to update the Committee:

Francha Davis, Chair
Diane Lininger, Program Manager

The most recent annual report for 2011-2012 is attached.

Montgomery County, Maryland
Department of Health and Human Services

COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012

Mission Statement

MISSION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION

The thirty-six member Commission on Juvenile Justice is tasked with:

Evaluating State and County-funded programs and services that serve juveniles and families involved in the juvenile justice system, to address capacity, utilization, and effectiveness;

Informing and advising the Juvenile Court, County Council members, the County Executive, and State legislators on the needs and requirements of juveniles and the juvenile justice system;

Studying and submitting recommendations, procedures, programs, or legislation concerning prevention of, and programs addressing, juvenile delinquency and child abuse or neglect;

Making periodic visits to juvenile facilities serving Montgomery County juveniles; and

Promoting understanding and knowledge in the community regarding juvenile needs and the effectiveness of programs.

HISTORY OF THE COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

The Montgomery County Juvenile Court was created by Maryland statute in 1931. The Juvenile Court Committee, along with its counterparts in other Maryland jurisdictions, was formed to support and assist an evolving juvenile justice system. Under County law enacted in 1981, the Juvenile Court Committee began serving in an advisory capacity to the Montgomery County Council and Executive. The Juvenile Justice Court Committee of Montgomery County served this role actively and effectively. On April 4, 2000, the Montgomery County Council passed legislation revising and expanding the functions of the Juvenile Court Committee, and transformed it from a committee into the Commission on Juvenile Justice, effective July 14, 2000.Thoughtful analyses and position papers on such far-reaching issues as judicial appointments, treatment alternatives, State legislation, local budget allocations, and disproportionate minority representation in the juvenile justice system have become associated with the work of the Juvenile Court Committee and the Commission on Juvenile Justice.

MEETINGS

The Commission on Juvenile Justice meets on the third Tuesday of each month, with the exception of August and December. Committee meetings are held from 7:00pm-7:45pm. Commission meetings are held from 7:50pm - 9:00pm. Commission meetings are open to the public and are held at the Juvenile Assessment Center, 7300 Calhoun place, Suite 600, Rockville, Maryland 20855. The work of the Commission is supported and staffed by the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Behavior Health and Crisis Services, Juvenile Justice Services.

Contact Information

For more information about the Commission, please contact:
Diane Lininger, Program Manager
Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services
Behavioral Health and Crisis Services
7300 Calhoun Place, Suite 600
Rockville, Maryland 20855
(240) 777-3317 Voice Mail
(240) 777-4665 Fax
E-mail: Diane.Lininger@montgomerycountymd.gov

A Message from the Chair - Francha Davis

The Montgomery County Commission on Juvenile Justice is pleased to present this annual report of its activities during fiscal year 2012. The Commission on Juvenile Justice's primary focus this year was "Positive Youth Development" (PYD) programs in the County. The Commission identified this focus because PYD programs provide a strength-based approach of prevention, intervention and suppression services for at-risk youth and do foster efficient and effective partnerships across County agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services, the Recreation Department, and Montgomery County Public Schools. At a time when both State and County budgets have experienced cuts, we believe that this collaborative approach better responds to the needs of our most at-risk youth. The Commission has implemented this focus through targeted involvement in the County budget process, the State legislative process and the State and County policy development process.

The CJJ also continued to build relationships at the County, State and national level during the year through participation with work-groups and organizations that focus on issues facing our juvenile justice system, including the Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families' Disproportionate Minority Contact Committee, the Montgomery County Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (CJCC), and the Juvenile Drug Court Task Force. Ongoing partnerships with these groups and many others, as well as regular communication with our Juvenile Court judges, enable the CJJ to advocate more effectively for youth as well as to identify emerging issues quickly.

In addition to its committees and the above referenced groups, the Commission continued to work closely with the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Public Defender, State's Attorney's Office, Family Crimes Division of the Police, Montgomery County Circuit Court, Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program, Department of Juvenile Services, Montgomery County Public Schools, and Office of the County Executive, all of whom are represented on the CJJ.

As you will see in this report, the Commission has been very active this year in advocating on behalf of youth involved in the juvenile justice system.
If after reading the report, you should have questions about the work of the Commission, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. We welcome your inquiries.

Commission on Juvenile Justice
Vision Statement and Objectives

Vision

The Commission envisions a partnership between the State and counties in which the State is responsive to locally identified, data-driven service needs and creates a framework for optimal service to youths and their families. This partnership recognizes that the counties are in a position to identify and propose solutions, align and coordinate existing county-provided services to youths, and build on existing in-county relationships among local agencies, non-profit organizations and universities. This partnership will strengthen mutual accountability and support counties' responsibility to serve their local community. Finally, this partnership will enable the State to enact standards of practice and care that will ensure equity across counties.

Commission on Juvenile Justice Membership 2011-2012

Executive Committee
Executive Committee
Francha Davis, Chair
Mark Resner, Vice Chair
Gladstone Marcus, Editor
Chris Fogleman and Dana Pisanelli - Government and Community Relations Co-Chairs
Mary Poulin and Barbara Holtz - Evaluation and Analysis Co-Chairs
Marge Currie and Amy Morantes - Care, Custody and Placement Co-Chairs

Citizen Commissioners

Stacey Boehm- Russell
Carole Brown
Michael Citren
Susan Cruz
Margaret Currie
Sharon Diamant
Christopher Fogleman
Jennifer Gauthier
Barbara Holtz
Timothy Hwang
Ashok Kapur
Sharon Kelly
Gladstone Marcus
Mehul Madia
Barry Moultrie
Dana Pisanelli
Mary Poulin
Wendy Pulliam
Mark Resner
Paul Vance
Ronald Wright

Program Manager

Diane M. Lininger, LCSW-C

Agency Members
Margaret Burrowes, State's Attorney's Office

Blaine Clarke, Department of Health and Human Services – Juvenile Justice
Francha Davis, Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program
Susan Farag, County Council
Lauree Hemke, Montgomery County Public Schools
Risa Mainprize, Juvenile Court
Amy Morantes, Department of Health and Human Services – Child Welfare
Kathi Rhodes, Montgomery County Police Department – Family Crime Division
Mary K. Siegfried, Office of the Public Defender
Michael Subin, County Executive's Office
Dave Thompson, Department of Juvenile Services
Elijah Wheeler, Disproportionate Minority Contact Coordinator, Collaboration Council on Children, Youth and Families

Emeritus Members
Lee Haller
Jeffrey Penn

Commission Structure 2011-2012

During FY-11, the Commission had four committees:

The **Executive Committee** represents the Commission at meetings with the Department of Health and Human Services Director, County Executive, and County Council; drafts and presents testimony on legislation of interest; and provides administrative support to the Commission. The Executive Committee organizes Commission membership, orientation, the annual work plan, and the annual report.

The **Government and Community Relations Committee** recommends the legislative agenda for the Commission. Its duties include lobbying and testifying before local and State legislators. The Committee monitors and tracks legislation that affects the juvenile justice system. The Government and Community Relations Committee also oversee the annual forum with the Juvenile Court judges.

The **Care, Custody, and Placement Committee** monitors and tracks the quality of care provided to Montgomery County juvenile justice youth who are in community placements or residential facilities, which may be located outside of the County. Its duties include examination of mental and physical health care, education, programming, and transportation.

The **Evaluation and Analysis Committee's** role is to evaluate, analyze, review, and monitor programs, plans, and Commission issues. There have been a number of plans and reports developed to address juvenile justice and at-risk children's issues. The committee analyzes and reports on the progress of established plans.

The Commission also worked within a*d hoc* committees, as follows:

- **Retreat Committee**
- **Orientation Committee**

- **Nomination Committee for Executive Committee**

Members of the Commission served on the following County boards, commissions, committees, and task forces, and reported to the Commission on their activities:

- **Montgomery County Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (CJCC)**
- **Juvenile Drug Court Task Force**
- **Montgomery County Gang Prevention Task Force**
- **Juvenile Justice Information System Task Force**
- **Collaboration Council for Children,Youth and Families – Disproportionate Minority Contact Committee**
- **Collaboration Council for Children,Youth and Families - Children with Intensive Needs Committee Youth Strategies Initiative**
- **Operations Board for the Tree House (Montgomery County's Child Assessment Center)**
- **Juvenile Mediation Committee**
- **Teen Court Advisory Committee**
- **Family Justice Center Steering Committee**

In addition to its committees and the above referenced groups, the Commission worked closely with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Office of the Public Defender, State's Attorney's Office, Family Crimes Division of the Police, Montgomery County Circuit Court, Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee, Montgomery County Public Schools, Collaboration Council of Children, Youth and Families and Office of the County Executive.

FY-12 Annual Retreat Report

By Gladstone Marcus, Editor, Citizen Member of the CJJ

The Juvenile Justice Commission (CJJ) annual retreat was held on May 19th, 2012 at the Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program facility at Grandin Avenue, Rockville, MD.

The Retreat Committee organized a very productive session that engaged 20 members with the main purpose of producing plans for fiscal year 2012-2013, reviewing the past work of the Commission, and finding opportunities for improvement, while establishing collegial working relationships among commissioners.

The day began with Commissioner Barbara Holtz facilitating an ice breaking session that proved to be very interesting, allowing members to identify their communication styles and like-minded colleagues. Members organized into groups by communication styles and each group reported on the essential characteristics of its type. The exercise promoted a better understanding and familiarity among members.

Lauree Hemke facilitated the morning session of the retreat and focused on identifying some ground rules for the conduct of CJJ meetings. Agreement centered on mutual respect, staying on point and keeping the CJJ mission in focus.

Francha Davis led the discussion to examine the enabling legislation for the Commission. Members were asked to point out any concerns, or comment on information that was not widely known about the legislation. It was noted that the CJJ consisted of only three classes of members: Citizen, Agency and Emeritus, whereas the legislation calls for four. Diane Lininger pointed out that the legislation has been changed and we should be able to get a corrected copy after August 2012. Members raised the question of whether the legislation should enable the Commission to advise the State's Attorney's Office regarding the needs and requirements of juveniles under the court's jurisdiction. Other discussions examined the Commission's role in influencing legislation and decisions, and measuring the outcomes of the Commission's work.

A breakout session allowed each of the committees, Government and Community Relations Committee (GCRC), Care, Custody and Placement Committee (CCPC), and the Evaluation and Analysis Committee (EAC), to discuss its roles and responsibilities and discover any redundancies that could be eliminated.

The GCRC resolved to focus on legislation, outreach to stakeholders, the budget, initiating advisories to the county government, site visits and community relations. It aims to be more proactive rather than reactive.

The EAC discussed its viability and raised concerns about difficulties in gathering data from the county. In the past, it has done research on localization and will reassess its options.

The CCPC will focus on strategic planning, networking and educational trips, gathering information and data for monitoring and tracking, and giving feedback to the Commission.

The afternoon breakout session of the committees addressed the following questions:

1. On a scale of 1-10, how do you think your committee met the goals of FY-12 work plan?
2. What were the challenges your committee faced?
3. Where would you like your committee to be a year from now?

The three committees' reports were generally optimistic and laid out concrete ideas to be implemented over the next year. The information from this session formed the basis of the committees' work plans included in this document.

Diversion Services in Montgomery County

The Commission on Juvenile Justice has made diversion services to youth involved with the Department of Juvenile Services one of its priorities for FY-12 and FY-13. We

asked two providers of those services to write an article describing what they are providing to our youth.

Lead for Life

By Jennifer Gauthier, Citizen Member of the CJJ and Executive Director of Lead for Life

The Linking Youth to Diversion Options (LYDO) has been in existence since January 5, 2009. The LYDO works collaboratively with the Montgomery County Family Crimes Division (FCD), the Department of Health and Human Services' Screening and Assessment Service for Children and Adolescents (SASCA), and the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). The LYDO outreaches to first-time youthful offenders to connect them to diversion options, rather than having the case move further into the juvenile justice system. The program services youth 9-18 years old. Youthful offenders are eligible if the offense was a first-time misdemeanor offense and they admit to their involvement in the crime.

In FY12, Lead for Life (L4L) had one hundred eight-six (186) youthful offenders referred. Of the one hundred eight-six (186), one hundred eight-six (168) received services through the L4L Linking Youth to Diversion Options. Representation of ages are 11-14 16.6% (31), 15-17 66.6% (124), 18 or older 16.1% (30), and .7% (1) Unknown. Males represented 54.8% (102), females 44.6% (83) and unknown .6% (1). Race was represented by African American 41.9% (78), Caucasian 23.6% (44), Hispanic 26.8% (50), Asian 3.5% (6), Bi-racial 2.1% (4), and Unknown 1.6% (3).

Some of the eligible diversion charges/citations were 55 Liquor Law Violation, 49 Possession of Marijuana, 33 Possession of Implementation, and 36 Larceny $200 or Over Shoplifting. The Juvenile Case Manager made four hundred eleven (411) phone calls, conducted eighteen (18) home visits, made thirty-two (32) contacts with FCD to get updated mailing addresses, and sent three (3) emails, and twelve (12) text messages. Of the one hundred sixty-eight (168) youth, eighty-two (82) participated in Teen Court and forty-nine (49) in SASCA.

L4L had a 95% average rating for families satisfied with services and the knowledge of the worker. Of the families who participated in survey, 95% understood the diversion process and eligibility requirements. Of the workers from FCD, DJS, SASCA and Teen Court, 100% were satisfied with L4L's performance.

TEEN COURT OVERVIEW

By Georgine M. DeBord Teen Court, Mediation Coordinator, States Attorney's Office

Teen Court is a program that offers teenage offenders (defined as respondents) an important second chance to learn from their mistakes without the high cost of having a criminal record.

The Court is a real justice program run by teens for teens i.e., juveniles aged 12 through 17, who have committed a crime (generally a misdemeanor), appear before a jury of their peers. The crime is usually a first offense, and the respondent must admit involvement (guilt) since this is a disposition (sentencing) hearing only.

Teen Court is offered as a positive experience to divert a first time teen offenders away from a pattern of criminal behavior. Offenses generally include theft, vandalism, possession of alcohol, assault, etc.

In Teen court, volunteer teens perform the roles of the prosecuting and defense attorneys, bailiff, clerk and jury.

After hearing the case, the teen jury determines a disposition for the offense, based upon sentencing guidelines. After careful consideration of the facts, the jury deliberates and decides upon a constructive disposition, including a minimum number of community service hours and serving on a teen jury. Also, the respondent may be assigned educational programs, essays and/or apology letters. Restorative justice principles are followed in this process, considering what is best for the respondent, the victim, and the community at large. The offender has the chance to complete the disposition within 60 days and have the original charge dismissed. If the disposition is not completed, the case is sent back to the referring agency.

Teen Court is held twice a month on Wednesday evenings in the Circuit Court building.

Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) Montgomery County: The Year in Review

By Frank Duncan, Metro Regional Director and Department of Juvenile Services Representative to the Commission on Juvenile Justice

Organizational Changes

Over the past year, there have been several changes in the organization in Montgomery County Juvenile Services. Ms. Delmonica Hawkins was appointed Regional Director for the Metro Region, which includes Montgomery County. The Violence Prevention Initiative Program (VPI) has been restructured in Montgomery County. Dwain Johnson has been assigned to oversee the VPI operations and has appointed Anjelene Branch as the Assistant Director in charge of the Metro Region VPI Program. In addition, Montgomery County recently resumed the Court/Investigation Unit. Eric Gaines has been named the Acting Supervisor in charge of the newly reformed unit. With the Court/Investigation Unit operational, the plan is for cases to be processed more quickly and services identified and implemented as soon as possible.

Case Management Standards
Montgomery County Juvenile Services has continued to improve the quality of the case management of the workers. Despite an increasing caseload averaging 32-35 cases per worker, the Management Team has been emphasizing the importance of providing appropriate services to the youth and their families. In order to ensure these services are being delivered, Supervisors and the Assistant Regional Director are completing reviews and audits on all cases. An example of the effectiveness of the reviews has been Montgomery County continuing to stay well below the State average in regards to the detention Pending Placement population. Recently, the Department completed a Workload Study statewide to determine the appropriate caseload size per worker. The study is expected to be completed soon and the results reviewed with all Regional Directors.

Future Goals
Montgomery County has been working closely with our partners to develop alternatives to detention. By the end of the year, two new choices (Harriett Tubman Shelter and the Evening Reporting Center-ERC) will be up and operational. It is anticipated that both programs will be able to accommodate 14-15 youths each. The shelter will be operated by Hearts and Homes for Children and Families and the ERC is currently up for bid. The shelter will be taking youth from all over the State with the priority being on accepting Montgomery County youth. The ERC will be located in the Silver Spring area and will only be working with youth who live in that area. In addition to these goals, Montgomery County DJS will continue to try and maintain stability with the staffing situation in the county. Currently, there are four open positions for Case Managers, with two of those slots slated to be filled by the middle of September.

Summary
Based on the current state of Montgomery County DJS and the future goals, the Department will continue to provide appropriate outcomes for both the youth and community that are served.

Monthly Meeting Highlights for FY-12

July 2011
Commission members voted in the FY-12 Executive Board; Francha Davis - Chair, Mark Resner - Vice-Chair, Gladstone Marcus - Editor, Chris Fogleman and Dana Pisanelli – Co-Chairs of Government and Community Relations Committee, Marge Currie and Amy Morantes - Co-Chairs of Care, Custody and Placement Committee, Barbara Holtz and Mary Poulin – Co-Chairs of the Evaluation and Analysis Committee.

August 2011
The Commission does not meet in August.

September 2011
We are collaborating with Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission on a Continuum of services for DJS involved youth – Mary Poulin reported that she had met with Wendy Stickle, CJCC, Mike Subin, CJCC , Diane Lininger, CJJ , Elijah Wheeler and Carol

Walsh, Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families about mapping out a path from the point of arrest/first police contact in order to determine what decision points were necessary to help choose programs for targeted program evaluation.

News regarding the letter we wrote to the Governor about Value Options: – Jennifer Gauthier represented the CJJ and attended a meeting with the Director of DHMH, Value Options, the Psychiatrist who evaluates for Value Options and DJS Regional Manager, Dave Thompson, who is also on the CJJ. We questioned why so many referrals are denied. There are about 150 youth in RTCs at any given time. Value Options is currently piloting a program where they are bringing teens together. They meet on Wednesday mornings to try and coordinate services. They plan to pilot this structure statewide and will also atternpt to get other services for youth who don't quality for 24/7 care.

Victor Cullen is a long-term behavior modification program, and Waxter has accommodation for those who are a public threat. There is not 24/7 care. No one is being referred to an RTC unless there is a psychiatric opinion that recommends an RTC. Mary Siegfried noted that the medical professionals are "overruling" the Court referrals. They are looking at certain kids as higher risks due to their charges. Mary Poulin said that this was a meeting to understand what was happening and why. DHMH listened to the concerns and heard the probation officers' frustration.

Commissioners decided to write a letter to the Juvenile Judges letting them know that the meeting had taken place and that we will continue to monitor the process.

October 2011
Speaker Uma Ahluwalia, Director of the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services spoke on Positive Youth Development (PYD) and the efforts being made in the County to develop services.
Below is a summary and highlights from her presentation:

- PYD is a three-pronged approach: prevention, intervention, suppression. We should think of all the services as a tool box for youth
- History/background: There was a 2004 gang report from the County Council that identified *Positive Youth Development Initiative* as an intervention plan. In 2007, there was a Positive Youth Initiative (PYI): Examples of programs include recreation, "Beyond the Bells", prevention, high school wellness center, and a youth empowerment program.
- Interventions also exist for students who are involved in gangs. Street Outreach Network, Crossroads, and Up county Youth Center are agencies that work with positive engagement, life skills, and mediation. DHHS is working with the agencies since identifying more incidents of Latino and African American youth getting into fights.
- Most services are provided through non-profit partners and this is important to note
- The third prong of PYD is suppression, which completes the three-pronged approach. A couple of years ago, there was a report about Latino Youth and 24

recommendations were made. A review of these also considered implementation and how to impact other youth. With the budget cuts, some of the initiated services were lost.

- The curfew is another tool that PYD can implement for youth.

November 2011
Speakers: Delegate Kathleen Dumais and Senator Brian Frosh
Purpose of the meeting with the Commission: To hear about issues with legislation affecting youth and juvenile services. Delegate Dumais indicated that it is almost too early for a discussion of proposed legislation. Last year, there was a Senate bill on recidivism rates which is going to help DJS work to be more transparent. The delegate's focus has been on girls in DJS. There is a new DJS secretary who has done a good job of moving DJS forward, especially with girls. The delegate also appreciated the work of the ACLU, who lifted up issues with girls.

Two years ago, the delegate brought forward a bill about the Waxter's girls' facility and has been working on it. Secretary Abed has changed policies and now the facility is not used for girls who are pending placement.

The girls who are committed are in a facility on the Eastern Shore: Secretary Abed has provided a bus for the families to visit the girls. The new supervisor has a vision for improvement.

Senator Frosh thanked the delegate for appearing with him before the Commission and suggested that she does not give herself enough credit for work she has done with girls.

The only piece of legislation that the senator was aware of would be for the department to be responsible for children charged as adults; for DJS to deal with them rather than turn them over to the adult correctional system.

The Victor Cullen facility was a surprise and the senator saw contrasts between the report and his information from observation. In summary, it was clean; the kids sat around the tables and the food looked good. This was in sharp contrast to the Hickey School for teenage boys. The facility was observed for about 3 weeks after a recent break out; it was clean. The school was up and running. There have been disturbing reports that there is little programming and that the facility is understaffed. The senator hoped that our kids are getting treatment and was not sure if that was happening.

The Committee visited the juvenile justice systems in Baltimore City. They were not appropriate for the youth and the committee was not happy with the services.

December 2011
The Commission does not meet in December

January 2012

Francha, Jennifer and Elijah went to the Overview of Services meeting with CJCC and the Collaboration Council for Children, Family and Youth. The group had difficulty getting information about all the different programs available. The Collaboration Council has money that will help the group map the system. The result is that juveniles should have services at every point in the juvenile justice system, from beginning to end.

GED Requirements- Mary Siegfried said the GED requirements have changed in two different ways. Firstly, juveniles no longer need a social security number to take the GED test. If a juvenile does not have a social security number, he or she can call a number on the front of the GED test and get a 9-digit reference number. Secondly, if a juvenile has difficulty meeting the identification requirement, he or she should call the Secretary of Labor for a waiver to take the exam. You still have to show proof of residence and an ID, but you will not have to show a specific type of identification.

Government and Community Relations committee report - Chris stated that the committee met via teleconference and discussed the budget. The budget cuts are likely to be a 1% across the board cut on all programs. Because we do not know where these cuts will be, the Government and Community Relations committee recommends sending a letter to the County Executive stating that efforts should be made to save programs with a PYD focus, because cuts to those programs would create a high risk to public safety. Discussion of Budget Priorities - Chris reiterated the proposal from the Government and Community Relations Committee, that the Commission would send a letter to the County Executive that states that the Commission is aware that budget cuts are likely to happen but that the County Executive should preserve, as much as possible, cuts within the PYD family of programs because those cuts would endanger public safety A motion was made to write a letter from the Commission that advocates to the County Executive that he preserve those programs within the PYD family because cuts to those programs will cause a high-risk of public safety. Additional language was to be added that the Commission is making this decision with limited information about what programs are affected and how deep the budget cuts will be. The motion was seconded and passed with a majority vote.

February 2012

The legislative committee wanted Commissioners to be aware of the bills pending. There was discussion about Senate Bill 245. It ordered that the Judge's ability to describe the type of program a child should go to, be removed. DJS had asked for this bill. There was a motion to oppose the bill. A vote was taken and the motion passed (to oppose the bill), with no objections. There was discussion about HB 798 (allowing kids charged as adults to be sentenced as adults into juvenile facilities), there are pros and cons on both sides, but there are many unanswered questions about the bill. There were also questions about Bill 562 (having victims informed of juvenile offenders work, address, school, etc). People had some strong views about revealing offenders information, but will express them as citizens.

Diane talked about creating a letter in support of the evening reporting center. Elijah said there is no site chosen yet. There was a motion to draft a letter in support of an ERC. No one opposed this motion. The motion passed.

Nick Moroney gave an update on the Juvenile Justice Monitoring Unit relationship with DJS. JJMU says they see a slow change happening. For instance, the ERC for boys and girls, and/or shelters for boys and girls are better alternatives for the child, and a lot less costly than detention, so increasing the number of these types of facilities would be helpful. Senator Frosh called DJS into hearings to talk about what DJS has done, and what their plans are. Frosh asked JJMU to come to the briefing to talk about their views of what DJS is doing. JJMU outlined that detention overcrowding was a huge problem. JJMU felt this reflected too limited treatment options within the state, as many were waiting for placements. Some individuals are being sent all the way out to IOWA. Instead, this money should be spent developing programming in state. The Victor Cullen facility has had many problems. Aggression related incidents have shot up exponentially. It is not being run very well. They are looking for a new superintendent. In the last 3 or 4 years, they have had 7 superintendents. There are ongoing problems in the current administration and problems that the current administration needs to correct. They are having difficulty finding a good leader who can promote a therapeutic atmosphere, and staff appeal. Finally, the females still have fewer services available than males. There have been improvements made, but there is still a long way to go.

March 2012

In March, the Commission held its annual meeting with the Juvenile Court Judges. Mary Poulin (Chair) opened the meeting by greeting our guests, Judges Debelius, Savage, Callahan, and Boynton, and Austine Long, Juvenile Drug Court Coordinator.

Austine Long presented an update regarding the Juvenile Drug Court stating the six points below:

- Planning is in progress to restructure and restart the Court
- The Court was shutdown temporarily in May 2011
- New team members are in place
- The Court will restart on April 5th with 5 participants
- Updates are being made to the procedure manual and referral form
- Court will be held on Thursdays

There followed a question and answer period, some of the topics discussed were:

- New Case management system for CINA cases
- How DJS staffing affect Juvenile Court individuals
- Concerns about Value Options and referrals for treatment for DJS youth
- Value Options process
- Shortening youth time in detention

April 2012

In April, the CJJ went on a field trip to Teen Court. Lauree Hemke stated that the field trip was a great experience and was well organized. The youth who were acting as

jurors gave thoughtful consequences, which could have included JETS, a fire program, a letter of apology, community service or an essay. Teen Court is a diversion program offered for first time offenders. Francha and Diane met with the Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2012 to give an update about the CJJ and to answer questions regarding the legislation to make the DMC Coordinator position an agency member. The Public Safety Committee is interested in the activities of the Commission. They would like to meet with the CJJ this summer.

May 2012
In May, the CJJ held their annual retreat. Please see the retreat article by Gladstone Marcus, Editor.

June 2012
Nominees for the FY2012 Executive Committee were presented and nominations were accepted. They are as follows: Francha Davis - Chair; Gladstone Marcus- Secretary; Amy Morantes and Carlean Ponder - Co-Chairs Care, Custody and Placement Committee; Chris Fogleman and Mehul Madia - Co-Chairs Government and Community Relations Committee; Barbara Holtz, and Mark Citren - Co-Chairs Evaluation and Analysis Committee.

At our June meeting, Frank Duncan, Assistant Regional Manager of the Department of Juvenile Services spoke to us and gave us information on what happens to cases that are referred to DJS:

How Cases Come to DJS
Two Sources:

1. **Police** - police file reports alleging delinquency
2. **Citizen Complaints** – Individuals or agencies can come in and file a criminal complaint or report a Child in Need of Supervision (CINS)
   Individuals can also seek to obtain a peace order.
   For Peace Orders (no contact order) or CINS – staff is available to address walk-ins.

Peace Order – This can be processed for formal intake or sent directly to court. A hearing will take place in the court in 10-14 days. Montgomery County is also working with the Domestic Violence Group to develop a protocol to assist teens who are victims of abusive boyfriends/girlfriends.

Peace Orders can be reviewed to determine if criminal charges should be filed. DJS is not an investigative body so if the case goes to the State's Attorney's office, DJS will only have a written statement from the victim.

Both Police and Citizen Reports are entered into the system through the Intake Process. Kids must accept involvement at intake. An intake worker is assigned the case and schedules an interview with the respondent and her family using a risk assessment instrument.

The intake worker then has to make a decision as to what will happen in the case:
Resolved – The case will be closed – if there is no prior history and/or no real risk factors. In the resolved cases/closed cases- the children are tracked. If the child gets into trouble again, the prior case will show up in the risk instrument.

Informal Pre-Court Supervision – There is prior history or the seriousness of charge means that some community services such as Screening & Assessment Services for Children (SASCA) or Lead4Life are needed. The case can then be closed out successfully if the child does everything as instructed. If the child does not comply, the case can be closed with a warning or sent to the State's Attorney's office.

Formal – The case is sent to the State's Attorney's office - In the event of a Formal decision or in an Informal Pre-Court Supervision Decision in which the child does not don't comply, the case can be closed out with a warning or sent to the State's Attorney's office for a formal petition. Once with the State's Attorney's office, the decision is made to file a petition with the court for adjudication. If found not involved = case closed. If found involved = disposition /sentencing.

Disposition/Sentencing - Probation/ commitment. If committed, services are provided and can consist of placement in foster care /substance abuse treatment programs / behavior modification programs. The length of programs range from 60 days to over a year. Once released, the children are placed in a program of aftercare, which is similar to probation. The court orders certain conditions and DJS oversee the individual to make sure those conditions are not violated.

Police Custody
The Police contact DJS and request detention.
DJS then performs an assessment using the Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (DRAI) DJS then makes a recommendation to:

- Detain
- Authorize Detention = Noyes
- Authorize Alternative Detention = Home Electronic Monitoring (HEM)

DJS is working with Montgomery County to reopen Caithness Shelter by October 1 and to obtain an Evening Reporting Center.

DJS works very hard to only refer to the State's Attorney's office those individuals who need court interaction. Victims are always kept informed.

If informal supervision is recommended and the victim does not agree, then informal supervision is no longer an option.

Mentoring Program

By the Honorable Katherine D. Savage, Juvenile Judge in Charge

---

Every year at our Annual meeting with the Juvenile Judges we are informed about the Mentoring program by the Honorable Katherine D. Savage. This year we thought we could put the information in our annual report so we can help get the word out for new mentors. Please see below:

In my years as a Juvenile Court Judge, I have seen countless youngsters who were and are in dire need of some consistent, supportive adult figure in their lives. Mentoring programs always come to mind when faced with this reality, but I have found that there are actually precious few mentors out there – willing to commit on a regular basis to a child in need. With that in mind, several agencies and interested individuals developed a program to help our court-involved kids. We now have an active collaborative group dedicated to providing mentors for both Children in Need of Assistance (CINA) and delinquent youth.

The children chosen for this program are either involved with the child welfare system because they have been abused and/or neglected; or have committed delinquent acts and are now involved with the Department of Juvenile Services. The YMCA Youth & Family Services is functioning as our day-to-day coordinating agency, with Ottoniel Perez as the program director. The partnership includes the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, and the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services.

The program is looking to expand the mentoring pool and we are in need of more mentors. We need both male and female volunteers and can desperately use mentors who are bilingual, particularly Spanish-English. Right now we have mentees in the **Up-County/Germantown area** waiting for a mentor. You may contact the Mentoring Coordinator, Ottoniel Perez at 301-587-5700 (ext. 2574) by cell at 202-438-5051 or e-mail Ottoniel.Perez@ymcadc.org *if you or anyone you know* would be interested in being a mentor.

Thank you for your help.

Judge Katherine D. Savage

Care, Custody and Placement Committee

By Margaret Currie and Amy Morantes, Co-Chairs

For the year 2012, the Care, Custody and Placement Committee reviewed the concepts and objectives of the Montgomery County Positive Youth Development Initiative (PYDI) and developed a two-year plan to evaluate the needs of identified Montgomery County youth in the area of prevention, intervention and rehabilitation. To accomplish this, we continued to observe the monthly numbers of youth detained at the Alfred D. Noyes Children's Center, focusing on the disproportionate numbers of African American youth detained. We also monitored the development of the Evening Reporting Center.

To consider circumstances that might prevent a youth's involvement in the DJS system, the committee sought to identify relevant community-based organizations, public and private, in the areas of Montgomery County from which a larger number of youth are detained at Noyes. In addition, we sought to identify the cohorts of youth, ages 11-14, male and female, who were detained at Noyes, as these youth are in their formative adolescent years, and issues of psycho-social-educational needs could be more easily addressed in their communities. This plan was threefold: prevention, intervention and rehabilitation.

Montgomery County provides numerous services for its youth. To ascertain what services are available in a particular area, the committee generated a community-based model, similar to the Montgomery County PYDI pyramid, to identify the support systems available to youth in a particular community. This community would be identified through the zip codes made available through the DJS information compiled for youth detained at Noyes. In the identified community, support systems such as: family, school, social services, after-school programs and evening sports programs. Law enforcement and reporting center data would be collected to ascertain how these services impact youth before and during their involvement with DJS.

To understand the available youth services Mr. Luis Cardona, Director of Street Outreach Network (SON) and Youth Violence Prevention Coordinator, spoke with the committee about his work with youth. Several commission members also attended a presentation on "Montgomery County's Positive Youth Development Initiative (PYDI) with speakers from SON, the police gang prevention unit and the office of the Assistant State's Attorney. The outcome of this meeting emphasized the need for enhanced community-based programs; coordination, at the basic level among the existing youth programs together with the DJS to enhance the outcomes of the alternative community programs; and additional community involvement in preventing placement in detention facilities. This model is being advocated by the County. This collaboration, coordination and partnership development to better respond to the needs of all youth, and importantly at-risk youth, was in line with our committee's two year plan.

In addition, the committee and several Commission members met with Mr. Thompson, acting superintendent of Noyes, who briefed members on the positive behavioral modification changes that were instituted under his direction. Our request for more detailed information regarding the data for Montgomery County youth was referred to the DJS.

The committee receives monthly statistics of youth placed at Noyes, including specific information pertaining to Montgomery County youth. Unfortunately, information pertaining to zip codes, as discussed above, was not readily available for our 2012 work plan.

The 2012 committee plan for specific data to track the DJS identified and committed youth, and available community-based resources for prevention, intervention and rehabilitation, followed the pyramid that defines the County's PYD initiative.

Montgomery County has many programs for youth as indicated in this initiative. The committee 2012 plan was perhaps too ambitious. The effort to receive the relevant information from the DJS in a timely manner did not occur. However, the committee began a dialogue to discuss community-based organizations whose primary objective is to serve the needs of all youth through prevention programs, and at-risk youth through intervention programs, and offer rehabilitation to committed youth returning to the community.

The question is: What Community-Based programs are available to identified at-risk youth as intervention services in the community, and what rehabilitation services are available for those returning from Noyes-this being the identified cohort? We will continue to work with the DJS to zero in on specific information regarding the Montgomery County youth under their jurisdiction, in order to ascertain how Montgomery County can provide the best community-based services for these youth, through public and private partnerships.

Government and Community Relations Committee

By Christopher Fogleman and Dana Pisanelli

During fiscal year 2012, the Government and Community Relations Committee continued to focus on increasing outreach to, and collaboration with, other individuals and organizations serving youth in the Juvenile Justice System (JJS). In addition, the committee monitored and tracked legislation that affected the DJS, recommended the legislative agenda for the Commission, and advocated for legislation at the State level.

The committee's goals for FY 2012 were to:

(1) Foster greater collaboration among state and county officials and agencies to ensure that services for juveniles are responsive to local needs and, in particular, to Montgomery County and the metro region.

(2) Advocate for necessary changes to State and County resource allocation and, in particular, for the re-allocation of responsibilities and resources from the state level to the County/Regional level for programs and services that the Commission identifies as being more appropriately managed at the local level.

Such collaboration and advocacy was accomplished through targeted involvement in the county budget process, the state legislative process and the state and county policy development process. This involved building relationships at the County, State and National level with individuals, organizations and agencies that impact the treatment of juveniles in the county/region.

During FY 2012, the committee made significant progress toward achieving these goals. The committee's outreach list includes local and State legislators, other County Boards, Commissions and Task Forces, public and quasi-public agencies (Department of Health

and Human Services, Department of Juvenile Services, Office of the Public Defender, Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families), as well as non-profit and community-based services providers for court-involved youth and juvenile justice commissions in other jurisdictions in Maryland.

The committee was active in gathering information and conducting outreach to key policy makers at both the County and State level during the fiscal year.

- Director of the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services Uma Ahluwahlia spoke at the October Commission meeting about Positive Youth Development (PYD) and efforts by the County to develop PYD services.
- Senator Brian Frosh and Delegate Kathleen Dumais spoke at the November meeting and discussed juvenile justice legislation affecting youth in Montgomery County.
- Commission members visited the County's Juvenile Court in January and also participated in a field trip to the Alfred Noyes Children's Center in February.
- Commission members visited Teen Court in April to get a better understanding of this diversion program offered for first-time offenders.
- Commission members met with Delmonica Hawkins, DJS Metro Acting Regional Manager and Frank Duncan, DJS Metro Acting Assistant Regional Manager to discuss how the Commission and DJS can work together to ensure the proper services exist for youth in the juvenile justice system. Mr. Duncan also spoke at the Commission's June meeting.
- In January, Nick Moroney, Director for the State's Juvenile Justice Monitoring unit (JJMU), gave a short presentation about the JJMU.
- Commission members attended the intra-agency PYD committee meeting in January to get a better understanding of what the State and County agencies and community organizations are doing to promote PYD initiatives.
- The committee facilitated the Commission's annual meeting with the Juvenile Court judges in March.
- The Commission drafted a letter in support of the Evening Reporting Center.
- The committee monitored and reviewed pending State and local legislation applicable to the juvenile justice system and reported its findings to the Commission on a routine basis.

At the Commission on Juvenile Justice's annual retreat in May, the committee evaluated progress toward achieving the goals set out in the FY 2012 work plan and fine-tuned its plans for FY 2013. During FY 2013, the Government and Community Relations Committee will continue to focus its outreach on PYD issues.

Evaluation and Analysis Committee: Examine Violence Prevention Initiative in Montgomery County

By Barbara Holtz and Mary Poulin - Co-Chairs

During the fiscal year of 2012, the Evaluation and Analysis Committee focused on acquiring data which would be useful in analyzing the efficacy and cost effectiveness of specific programs designed to serve the needs of juveniles in the Juvenile Justice system.

This year's work plan focused on continuing to access data specific to the Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI) and its use for Montgomery County youth. According to the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, this program provides "intensified levels of supervision and services for youth who are at highest risk of being victims or perpetrators of crimes of violence." This is one of DJS' signature programs and we wanted to know how it was working for Montgomery County youth in order to determine whether the benefits of the program warranted the cost, given the limits of county and state budgets for youth programming. This data was unable to be procured during this year.

The committee also looked at information available on Positive Youth Development (PYD) programs. Mary Poulin researched and wrote a summary explaining what Positive Youth Development means. She also identified a PYD model used for working with youth in the juvenile justice system. The model delineates critical skills and assets which youths need in the various aspects of their lives such as education, work, relationships and community. The committee will continue to look at PYD programs in Montgomery County in order to make recommendations as to additional data points that DHHS may wish to collect in order to make future budget and programming decisions.