



Montgomery County, Maryland
Department of Health and Human Services

**COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE
ANNUAL REPORT
2009-2010**

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 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 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 (CJJ), 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 7pm-7:45pm. Commission meetings are held from 7:50pm -9:00pm. Meetings are open to the public and are held at the Council Office Building, 5th Floor Conference room, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rockville, Maryland 20855. The work of the Commission is supported and staffed by the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Children, Youth and Family 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
Children, Youth and Family 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 Mary Poulin

Use of research and evidence to set policies, provide services to youths, and make day-to-day decisions will not only help Montgomery County youth served by the county and state, but will also promote community safety and save state and the county law enforcement, court, and corrections resources in the short- and long-term by preventing delinquency and avoiding recidivism. For these reasons, the Commission on Juvenile Justice has been and will continue to be focused on the identification and expansion of evidence-based treatment options for youths and the use of data in decision- and policy-making. The recommendations in this report and the work of the Commission this year, as can be seen in the articles throughout this report, indicate our commitment to these concerns. Our focus and recommendations are in line with many of the strategies for cost-effective juvenile justice reform described in the National Juvenile Justice Network report entitled, “The Real Costs and Benefits of Change: Finding Opportunities for Reform During Difficult Fiscal Times” (http://njjn.org/media/resources/public/resource_1613.pdf). We will continue to work with the county to find ways to use research and evidence for the betterment of our youth and community.

Commission on Juvenile Justice Vision **Statement and Objectives**

Vision

We envision a partnership between the state and counties in which the state is responsive, with funding and other resources, to locally identified, data driven service needs. Further, the state works in collaboration with counties to create a framework for optimal service provision to youths and their families. This partnership recognizes that the counties are in a better position to quickly identify and propose solutions to needs, align and coordinate already existing county-provided services to youths, and build on pre-existing in-county relationships (e.g., among local agencies, with universities). Further, this partnership will strengthen mutual accountability and support counties’ responsibility to serve the local community. Finally, this partnership will enable the state to enact standards of practice and care that will ensure equity across counties.

Objectives for Juvenile Justice System

1. Youths will receive services and be placed at home or close to home
2. Knowledge of input from county residents, agencies, and service providers will be used to identify service needs
3. Youth and parent access to services managers and providers to meet other identified service needs will increase
4. Cultural, gender, racial, ethnic, and other competencies to meet other identified service needs

5. Youths will be able to access an array of evidence-based programs and practices when needed
6. Increase service capacity for evidence-based programs and practices
7. Ensure multiple sources of data are used to identify individual youth and county-wide needs and ensure accountability

Recommendations for FY 2011

Please note that the Commission on Juvenile Justice decided to keep most of the recommendations from last year as the County and State continue working on these same issues.

Based on its work in 2009-2010, the Commission on Juvenile Justice recommends for FY 2011 the following:

1. **Expand the availability of evidence-based treatment options in Montgomery County:** Research has shown that evidence-based practices can cost a fraction of secure detention or group homes while demonstrating significantly better results. Funds were allocated by the state to support a small number of evidence-based treatment slots in Montgomery County during fiscal year 2010. The Commission would like to see a significant increase in the number of juveniles and their families receiving these services. The County and the State should consider options to fund more slots by pursuing private foundations to fund program start-up costs and by utilizing more evidence-based treatment options that qualify for private insurance coverage.
2. **Promote the utilization of “best practices” in Montgomery County:** “Best practices” are treatment options, such as wrap-around services, that have been shown to be effective in Montgomery County, but which have not yet been subject to the rigorous control group studies of “evidence-based” practices. The more “best practices” that are identified and used, the more empirical evidence will be available to support research that shows the efficacy of these practices. Since research and start-up costs for evidence-based practices are substantial, and slots and treatment options for these services are currently limited, the Commission supports greater utilization of “best practices” that have been shown to be effective for Montgomery County youth.
3. **Expand alternatives to placing youth in detention:** Research has shown that community-based alternatives to detention reduce crowding, reduce the costs of operating juvenile facilities, shield juveniles from the stigma of institutionalization, help offenders avoid association with juveniles who have more serious delinquent histories, and help juveniles maintain positive ties with the family and community. Research has also shown that community-based programs are more effective than traditional correctional programs in reducing recidivism and improving community adjustment. The Commission believes that reliance on detention for delinquent juveniles must be reduced and the number of effective community-based alternatives to detention must be increased.

4. **Maintain and expand delinquency prevention and youth development programs.** The Commission urges the County to give community based juvenile delinquency prevention programs and services a high priority. Such programs lessen the need for law enforcement intervention and confinement, particularly in the areas of gang and violence prevention and/or reduction. The Commission urges the County to continue collaboration with MCPS and the Collaboration Council to maintain and expand prevention and youth development programs, such as school support and afterschool programs.
5. **Adequately fund mental health and substance abuse services.** A majority of youth involved in the juvenile justice system suffer from mental health or substance abuse disorders. The Commission urges the County to continue its support for adolescent mental health and substance abuse treatment, and as funding allows, to increase access to such services.
6. **Maintain support for the Juvenile Drug Court.** Continue already budgeted funding for program operations, including the needed case manager.
7. **Improve juvenile justice data to inform program cutting decisions:** Currently, there is a severe lack of information available from law enforcement, courts, school, and juvenile probation on juveniles that could be used to assess how well the County is doing to, for example, match youths to appropriate services, reduce disproportionate minority contact, and use evidence-based services. The County should focus the resources it has to help gather, analyze, and release juvenile justice data and information.

Commission on Juvenile Justice Membership 2009-2010

Executive Committee

Mary Poulin, Chair
 Christine Bartlett, Vice Chair
 Mark Resner, Editor
 Francha Davis, Government and Community Relations Chair
 Pam Littlewood and Carrie Mulford, Evaluation and Analysis Co-Chairs
 Elijah Wheeler and Jennifer Gauthier, Care, Custody and Placement Co-Chairs

Citizen Commissioners

Jennifer Barmon
 Christine Bartlett
 Susan Cruz
 Margaret Currie
 Christopher Fogleman
 Jacob Frenkel

Nancy Gannon-Hornberger
 Rob Goldman
 Jennifer Gauthier
 Barbara Holtz
 William Jawando
 Ashok Kapur
 Sharon Kelly

Mondi Kumbula-Fraser
Gladstone Marcus
Carrie Mulford
Dana Pisanelli
Mary Poulin
Wendy Pulliam
Mark Resner
Leon Suskin
Paul Vance
Elijah Wheeler
Ronald Wright

Program Manager

Diane M. Lininger, LCSW-C

Agency members

Margaret Burrowes, *State's Attorneys Office*
Francha Davis, *Court Appointed Special Advocates*
Blaine Clarke, *Department of Health and Human Services – Juvenile Justice*

Madeleine Jones, *Juvenile Court*
Pamela Sue Littlewood, *Department of Health and Human Services – Child Welfare*
Susan Farag, *County Council*
Maurice Sessoms, *Department of Juvenile Services*
Kathi Rhodes, *Montgomery County Police Department – Family Crime Division*
Mary K. Siegfried, *Office of the Public Defender*
Michael Subin, *County Executive's Office*
Martha Young, *Montgomery County Public Schools*

Emeritus Members

Jeffrey Penn
Irving Slott
Lee Haller

Commission Structure 2009-2010

During FY10, the Commission had four standing committees:

The **Executive Committee** represents the Commission at meetings with the HHS 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 Commission Vice-Chair facilitates committee meetings.

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 oversees 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** 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 issues. The committee's role is to analyze and report on the progress of established plans.

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

Retreat Committee
Orientation Committee

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

Montgomery County Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (CJCC)
Montgomery County Children's Action Team
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
Noyes Advisory Board
Teen Court Advisory Committee
Family Justice Center Steering Committee
ALERT (Assessment Lethality Emergency Response Team)
LAP (Lethality Assessment Protocol Committee)
Vulnerable Adult/Elder Abuse Task Force

In addition to its committees and the above referenced groups, the Commission worked closely with the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Public Defender, States Attorney's Office, Family Crimes Division of the Police, Montgomery County Circuit Court, Court Appointed Special Advocate, Department of Juvenile Services, Montgomery County Public Schools, and Office of the County Executive.

THIS PAST YEAR, THE COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE WAS UNFORTUNATE TO LOSE TWO OF OUR LONGSTANDING FOUNDING MEMBERS. EMERITUS MEMBER IRVING SLOTT DECIDED TO STEP DOWN FROM HIS POSITION ON THE COMMISSION AFTER 17 YEARS. AGENCY MEMBER PAMELA LITTLEWOOD RETIRED FROM HER POSITION AT CHILD WELFARE AND HAD ALSO BEEN ON THE COMMISSION FOR 17 YEARS. THE COMMISSION MEMBERS FELT THAT WE SHOULD HONOR BOTH OF THESE DEDICATED MEMBERS BY HAVING ARTICLES ABOUT THEM IN OUR ANNUAL REPORT.

Emeritus Member: Irving Slott

Mr. Slott is one of the founding members of the Commission on Juvenile Justice, which evolved from the Juvenile Court Committee. Mr. Slott was on the Juvenile Court Committee from 1993 – 2000. Mr. Slott then served on the Commission on Juvenile Justice as a member for one year and as an emeritus member for the last nine years. Mr. Slott has given numerous hours of his time and energy to the Commission and has provided the Commission with a great deal of knowledge and assistance in Juvenile Justice Issues. Moreover, Mr. Slott has been a strong advocate for the Commission and has given of himself tirelessly. He has held the positions of Commission Secretary, Vice Chair, and was a key member of the Legislative Subcommittee. Mr. Slott has been an historian, advisor, educator, and a mentor to all members. Mr. Slott recently resigned from his position on Emeritus member on the Commission. The Commissioners expressed their heart-felt beliefs that we should honor him in this edition of the Annual report. We are eternally grateful for all of his hard work and commitment these past 17 years. Irving Slott has Montgomery County's thanks and appreciation for helping to make our community a better place to work and live.

We asked Mr. Slott to write a short biography about himself and how he came to be on the Commission. Please see his biography and comments below:

I was an operations research analyst and came to Washington in early 1969 after working in industry and in consulting. It was after the late 1968 passage of the Safe Streets Act. I was the first Deputy Director of the National Institute of Justice, then NILECJ, of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). Beginning in 1967, I had begun studies of criminal justice and was consulting for states and cities.

From 1970-71, I was the Acting Director. When a director was appointed, I moved to the Office of Criminal Justice in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General as Senior Technical Advisor. In 1973, I returned to LEAA and directed a number of divisions.

In 1982, LEAA was devolved to a new grouping of offices known as the Office of Justice Programs. I joined the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and subsequently directed three divisions during the final

ten years of my career with the Department. I retired in November of 1992. In September 1993, I applied and was pleased to be appointed to a two-year membership on the Juvenile Court Committee, replacing a member who resigned after one year. Since the County rules allow only two consecutive three-year appointments at that time, I served eight years on the Committee and succeeding Commission. I was honored thereafter to serve until now as an emeritus member.

My years of the Juvenile Court Committee and the Commission on Juvenile Justice have been interesting, fulfilling, and fun. I have enjoyed meeting and befriending many fine people whom I would have never met otherwise. We accomplished a number of real improvements in juvenile justice in Montgomery County and even in Maryland. Association with members of the County Council who showed real commitment to juvenile justice and applied their intelligence changed my off-hand and too common attitude towards politicians. Montgomery County is fortunate to have them and many key staff members who believe in the importance to society of what they do and they do it well.

Pamela Littlewood: Agency Member

Pamela Littlewood is one of the founding members of the Commission on Juvenile Justice and was the Agency Member representing Child Welfare until her retirement in June 2010. Ms. Littlewood started her involvement on the Juvenile Court Committee in 1993, which evolved into the Commission on Juvenile Justice in 2000. The Commissioners believed that Pam's achievements in the Commission were truly amazing: stayed with us for 17 years and has been a strong presence and that she attended all Commission meetings is a huge achievement by itself, but that is not all Pamela has done for the Commission. Pamela's major achievement has been her legacy of volunteerism and willingness to give numerous hours of her time and energy to the Commission. Pamela has held several positions during her tenure on the Commission. Pamela has been a historian, an advisor, an interviewer of new members, educator at our orientations, Co-chair of the Evaluation and Analysis Committee, and a mentor to all members. We are eternally grateful for all of her hard work and commitment this past 17 years. We asked Pamela to write a short biography of her life and tell us how she came to be on the Commission.

I have lived in Montgomery County most of my life. I attended Montgomery County public schools (Wheaton Woods E.S, Belt Jr. High School then Robert E. Peary High School). I graduated with honors from the University of Maryland - College Park. I began working for Social Services in March 1970 in Frederick County, transferring to Montgomery County in November 1993. As a social worker associate from 1970-1976, I handled a variety of caseloads including day care licensing, foster care, single parent services, and residential services for children and adolescents. In January 1976, I was assigned as the Child Welfare

Services (CWS) Liaison to Juvenile Court and held that position until my retirement. As the liaison, I was responsible for writing the Child in Need of Assistance petitions. In addition to working closely with CWS staff and the county attorneys, I also served as the contact person from CWS for the juvenile court judges, court staff, and the Department of Juvenile Services. I served as the co-chair of the DJS-CWS Consultation Team for over 11 years.

I participated in several task forces regarding juvenile justice issues in the county including development of the Comprehensive Strategies in the 1990's. I assumed the role as the CWS agency representative to Juvenile Court Committee in the early 1990's and then remained in that capacity when the Commission on Juvenile Justice was formed.

The system has changed considerably in the last 30+ years. We were always different in Montgomery County. Until 2002, the Juvenile Court was part of the District Court. We had the same judges for many years. Their days were long and the caseloads for the court, Juvenile Services, and Child Welfare were large. It was difficult to find time on the docket, especially for complicated cases that required multi-day trials. Although we did not officially have a one family, one judge system, it often worked out that way. Children and adolescents would identify one of the judges as being their judge.

In 2002, jurisdiction in juvenile matters was officially transferred to the Circuit Court. Three judges were assigned to handle juvenile cases full-time (Judges McHugh, Savage, and Bernard). In order to meet mandatory time lines, the court administration assigns additional judges as needed. Eventually, the assignments to Juvenile Court became part of the court's rotation system. A judge now spends approximately 12-18 months in Juvenile Court and in general, the cases do not remain with one judge.

I enjoyed my time on both the Juvenile Court Committee and the Commission on Juvenile Justice. The commissioners, both citizen and agency, have impressed me with their knowledge, interest, and willingness to devote their time and energy to addressing the needs of children and families in Montgomery County. I doubt that there is another group at the local government level that has the respect of both people working in the system, and government officials.

Girls in the void

A case study on girls in the juvenile justice system

by Susan Cruz, Citizen Commissioner

Kina* called me early on a Tuesday morning crying. Between sobs, she told me that her grandmother had kicked her out of the house again. This was the third time her grandmother kicked her out since her release from the detention facility two months earlier. She and her younger brothers had been placed with their grandmother because Kina's father was in prison and her mother had lost parental rights due to her substance abuse. Now at 17, Kina was on probation, having been caught in a stolen car with her friends. From the beginning, she feared she might not last in her grandmother's house. What made this situation different and more decisive was the fact that her grandmother threw all of Kina's belongings on the street in front of the house-in the rain. I tried to convince her to get out of the rain and to talk to her grandmother. But it was no use, her grandmother refused and so I got into my car and went to meet her.

When I arrived Kina was sitting on the curb, all her wet belongings piled next to her. She was soaked and shivering. You couldn't tell tears from raindrops on her face. As I sat next to her and began talking to her about her options, I was reminded once more just how limited the available choices are for girls like Kina. Luckily, she did not have children of her own, nor did she have a problem with drugs or alcohol, and she had not turned to prostitution in order to survive. In fact, she was ahead of the curve in comparison with most girls in the juvenile justice system.

She also was not a violent person, even though she belonged to a gang and had been exposed to violent and traumatic experiences in her home and neighborhood from a young age. The reason she said she had joined a gang-was for protection. A shy girl with a slight stutter when I met her for the first time in the detention facility a year prior, it was her mild manner and honesty that made her easy to work with once I gained her trust. Developing a basis for trust with Kina took time because of the physical and emotional abuse she had been subjected to at home. According to the Chesney-Lind and Shelden's 1998 book "Girls, Delinquency and Juvenile Justice," over 90% of girls entering the juvenile justice system in the United States have survived physical and/or sexual abuse(<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=183683>). Rarely do these girls receive treatment. Rarely is justice restored for them as victims, and yet as a society we are quick to hold them accountable when they act out.

I thanked Kina for calling me this time. The first time her grandmother kicked her out of the house, she called her homies from the gang, who promptly picked her up. That was a day after her release. This rescue operation was short lived as she was detained by the police at a gang party that same week and turned over to her Probation Officer (PO). Her P.O. allowed her go back to her grandmother because she tested clean for

drugs. The second time she was kicked out, it was a boyfriend who retrieved her. When he ended up in jail she went back with her grandmother again. Although I was glad that she called me first this time, I also felt a bit like I was between a rock and a hard place. Unlike her homies I was bound by professional ethics—I could not take her home with me—and the resources I had access too were limited. *What was I going to do?*

The options for young women in Kina's position include being placed with another family member or in a foster home if one can be found. Too often in cases like this which involve probation, the outcome is return to a detention facility, perhaps even with a new charge. Stories like this repeat themselves over and over across the United States. National data from 1988 show that unlike boys, girls are disproportionately returned to detention facilities for status offenses, such as truancy, running away, and curfew violations. (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/abstractdb/AbstractDBDetails.aspx?id=111083>) Nationally, status offenders are more likely to be detained in 2007 than in 1995 (<http://www.ncjservehttp.org/ncjwebsite/pdf/jcsreports/jcs2007.pdf>). Though these more recent data are not broken out by gender, prior patterns of data suggest reasons to continue to be concerned. Like disproportionate minority contact, the systems that are supposed to protect children and youth often end up criminalizing them based on conditions they cannot change or control, like gender, race, age and socio-economic status.

Kina and I followed the rules set by the system and called her probation officer and informed him what happened. The P.O. called the grandmother and spoke to her, as Kina waited with me in my car. When he called me back, he asked if I could take Kina in to his office so he could find her a placement. Kina was upset as she was convinced he would put her in detention again. She cried and pleaded for me not to take her to her P.O. I reasoned with her that she should hear him out, told her about emancipation and independent living programs. As we put all her wet belongings in the trunk of my car, I reminded her that she was an intelligent young woman and asked her to be patient, and to give her P.O. and me a chance to help her.

When we arrived, her P.O. was on the phone trying to find a community placement. He told us it would be a while until he heard from the community placements that could take a probation youth like Kina. Most placements opt for taking in foster youth, but generally refuse to take in youth who have had cases in delinquency court, or who have been detained for long periods of time. For gang-involved youth its far more difficult. Some placements do not have the capacity, experience or training available to learn how to work with girls who need help reinserting themselves back into the community. Girls tend to experiment sexually while in detention with each other and that proves a challenge for placements who do not know how to deal with a girl's developing sexuality, or with youth who identify as "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning". The P.O. warned us it was going to be a long day.

All the community placements he called were either full or refused to take Kina in because of her record, age, and gang affiliation. I tried calling a couple that were over 30 miles away and did not have any luck either. I turned to Kina and asked her to let

me try talking to her grandmother. After a discussion among the three of us, we decided that this was not an option. And so, we arrived at the last resort: an emergency shelter for runaway youth. Her P.O. agreed that for the night that was the only option while he found a placement for her. With a heavy heart, I took Kina to a homeless youth shelter and checked her in with the case manager. I gave her a hug. It was the last time I saw her free.

Kina languished in the youth shelter waiting for a proper placement. She managed to stay out of trouble and enrolled in the GED program at the shelter. I checked in with her by phone and with the case manager who reminded me frequently, that this was not a permanent solution. After 30 days in the shelter Kina would have to leave. Shortly before this deadline, her P.O. still had not found a suitable placement for Kina and told her that she would have to be placed in a detention facility if another shelter could not be found. Other youth in the shelter advised her that she was aging out of the system and would have to learn to fend for herself. She was reminded that, like her grandmother, her PO had younger wards to worry about and there is no sympathy for kids who break the law. This was the last straw for Kina. She called her homies, who collected her and provided her with a place to live, drugs to sell. It seemed everything she needed to keep herself off the streets and out of jail-at least for a while.

The next time I saw Kina she was being arraigned for a felony homicide charge in criminal court. Her homeboys killed a rival gang member, and Kina was arrested with them at the apartment they shared. She was charged in order to pressure her into testifying against her homeboys. Even though Kina was not the one who committed the murder, she knew and lived with the murderers and it was assumed that she had knowledge about the crime. Because she was a documented gang member, she was presumed guilty by association. Kina tried to sever her case from her co-defendants, but was unsuccessful. She took her case to jury trial and lost. She is now serving a life sentence at a women's maximum security prison. Ironically, she will never lack a roof over her head again.

While she was living with her homies, Kina managed to finish her GED and had enrolled in a private trade school to earn her dental assistant certificate. She paid for her tuition with money earned selling the drugs the gang provided her. She shared an apartment with her homies where they all shared the expenses of rent, utilities, and food. Gangs fill society's voids-at a high price.

Imagine what Kina's life might have been like if we filled those voids.

**Not her real name.*

EVIDENCE BASED PROGRAMS

By Maurice Sessoms, Agency Member, Department of Juvenile Services

The Maryland Department of Juvenile Services promotes evidence based programs, which are those programs that have been proven through research to reduce recidivism by matching services and approaches with client needs in order to maximize the effectiveness.

- **Strong Research Design-This criterion is the “gold standard” for research. Relatively few programs have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing the onset, prevalence, or individual offending rates of maladaptive, delinquent behaviors.**
- **Sustained Effects- Although one criterion of program effectiveness is that it demonstrates success by the end of the treatment, it is also important to demonstrate that the program effects endure beyond treatment and from one developmental period to the next.**
- **Multiple Site Replication- Replication is an important element in establishing program effectiveness and understanding what works best, in what situations, and for whom. Some programs are successful because of unique characteristics in the original site that may be difficult to duplicate.**

In Montgomery County, the Department of Juvenile Services is currently using the following evidence-based services:

Functional Family Therapy (FFT) is a family-based intervention for youth with moderately severe antisocial behavior. Youth ages 10-18, and their families, at risk for and/or presenting with delinquency, violence, substance use, conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, disruptive behavior disorder, and depression. Often these families tend to have limited resources and exposure to multiple systems. FFT can be provided in a variety of settings, including schools, child welfare, probation, parole/aftercare, mental health, and as an alternative to incarceration or out-of-home placement.

FFT requires as few as 8-15 sessions of direct service time for youth and their families, and generally no more than 26 total sessions of direct service for the most severe problem situations. FFT is delivered by one or two-person teams to clients in their homes, in clinics, schools, juvenile court, and community-based programs, including at time of re-entry from institutional placement.

A wide range of interventionists can be trained to deliver FFT, including probation officers, mental health technicians, mental health professionals (e.g., M.S.W., Ph.D., M.D., R.N., M.F.T., and L.C.P.).

Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) is a cost effective alternative to group or residential treatment, incarceration, and hospitalization for adolescents with chronic and severe antisocial behavior, emotional disturbance, and delinquency. Community families are recruited, trained, and closely supervised to provide MTFC-placed adolescents with treatment and intensive supervision at home, in school, and in the community. This treatment includes clear and consistent limits with follow-through on consequences; positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior; a relationship with a mentoring adult; and separation from delinquent peers.

MTFC targets adolescents with histories of chronic and severe criminal behavior at risk of incarceration and those with severe mental health problems at risk for psychiatric hospitalization.

MTFC Training for Community foster families emphasizes behavior management methods to provide youth with a structured and therapeutic living environment. After completing a pre-service training and placement of the youth, MTFC parents attend a weekly group meeting for ongoing support and supervision. Foster parents are contacted daily during telephone calls to check on youth progress and problems. MTFC staff is available for consultation and crisis intervention 24/7.

Services to the youth's family occur throughout the placement. Family therapy is provided, with the goal of returning the youth to their home. The parents are supported and taught to use behavior management methods that are used in the MTFC foster home. Closely supervised home visits are conducted throughout the youth's placement in MTFC. Parents are encouraged to have frequent contact with the MTFC program supervisor to get information about their child's progress in the program. Frequent contact is maintained between the MTFC program supervisor and the youth's case workers, parole/probation officers, teachers, work supervisors, and other involved adults.

The Department of Juvenile Services plan to expand evidence based services in FY 2010 and 2011. Evidence-Based Services Supported by DJS FY 2009:

- Functional Family Therapy
- Multi-systemic Therapy
- Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care
- 7 Challenges
- Trauma Cognitive Behavior Therapy
- Aggression Replacement Training
- Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP)

For more information visit <http://www.djs.state.md.us/best-practices/evidence-based-services.doc>

Monthly Meeting Highlights for FY-10

July 2009

Commission members voted in the FY-10 Executive Board; Mary Poulin; Chair, Christine Bartlett; Vice-Chair, Mark Resner; Editor, Francha Davis; Chair of Government and Community Relations Committee, Elijah Wheeler; Chair of Care, Custody and Placement Committee and Carrie Mulford and Pam Littlewood; Co-Chairs of the Evaluation and Analysis Committee.

Kiran Dixit, Senior Associate, Children with Intensive Needs, Montgomery County Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families spoke at the meeting about evidence-based practices for DJS-involved youth and current service gaps.

August 2009

The Commission does not meet in August.

September 2009

The Commission voted to finalize their Vision statement. Speakers were Ron Rivlin, Manager HHS/CYF/JJS and Susan Farag, County Council Liaison, to speak on budget recommendations for the upcoming year. Ron Rivlin reported that the County budget situation is bleak, the County is still getting reductions in funding from the State. Ron predicts that it will be a fiscal year-long process because of ongoing shortages in revenue at the State level. The County Executive has maintained funding for DHHS as much as possible, but shortages in funding both at the County and State level have a real impact on service provision.

Susan Farag reported that the budget situation is bleak as well. She reports that the Council is looking at options, personnel costs are 80 % of the budget and as personnel get cut, staff's work-loads get higher. Susan also pointed out that lobbying efforts on the part of the Commissions and Task forces really do matter to the County Council members.

Commissioner Jennifer Barmon brought up that in her research she has learned that youth who do not have identification, i.e. State ID's, DJS ID's or military ID's are not allowed to take the GED test. These youth are primarily in group homes and as a result, they cannot complete the court's requirements to be released because they cannot take the GED tests. It was suggested that the Commission would send a letter to Tom Perez, head of the State Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation to request a change in this rule that would include both birth certificates and passports as acceptable forms of Identification. The Commission made a motion to send the letter with one abstention.

October 2009

The Guest speaker at the October Commission on Juvenile Justice meeting was County Executive Isiah Leggett. Commission members discussed their concerns on Juvenile Justice issues in Montgomery County. Chris Bartlett, Vice Chair explained to Mr. Leggett, that although the statistics show that youth crime has been declining in

Maryland, the Commission still has an issue with the number of juveniles that are in detention or in group facilities and the effectiveness of those placements. The Commission's focus, the State's focus, and the County's focus have been on alternatives to detention and evidence-based practices. In November, the County is rolling out a new evidence-based practice of multi-dimensional treatment foster care. This will target juveniles who would otherwise be in restricted facilities either in-state or out of state. While this requires a lot of money and a lot of work to start, they have proven to be more positive and cost effective. This year, in order to gather information about the facilities and their programs, the Commission has met with State and County officials including Secretary Devore and the Juvenile Justice Monitor, the Circuit Court judges, the Juvenile Drug Court Coordinator and the Collaboration Council. The Commission also meets regularly with Ron Rivlin to be kept up to date on budget issues. In order to see how State and County programs and facilities are working, the Commission visits various facilities each year. This year the Commission visited Noyes, Victor Cullen Center, and the Clarksburg Facility because they have a youthful offenders program for boys 18-21. The Commissioners met with some of the boys at the Clarksburg facility to see how its program differs from juvenile facilities that they have previously visited. This month the Commission will be observing the Juvenile Court and Teen drug Court while they are in session. Next week the Commission will be touring Silver Oak Academy, which is the newest juvenile facility that has opened at the former Bowling Brook site. The intent of this meeting was for the Commission to present their vision statement of how the State and County can work together and also to discuss some of the issues that the Commission has been addressing.

We planned a discussion with the County Executive, and the Commission welcomed the questions and comments of County Executive Leggett. Mr. Leggett thanked all of the commissioners for their work and active participation on the Commission. He noted that Montgomery County has to do more with less and be creative as to how resources are spent in order to not to fail youth who are in need. Mr. Leggett also noted that the County is changing demographically, culturally, and linguistically. As a result, the County and the Commission have to do two things: 1) be concerned with real safety concerns within the County, and 2) try to provide some alternative ways to appropriately intervene with young people and their families. County Executive Leggett indicated that he was there to listen and respond to any questions and concerns the Commissioners had.

November 2009

Six Commissioners attended field trip to Silver Oak (SO) facility. They learned a lot about the SO program and were impressed with the work being done there. Silver Oak staff mentioned that the NFL Baltimore Ravens Team had donated a gym that contained vocational equipment rooms. Overall, the Silver Oak facility is impressive. Right now Silver Oak is limited to 48 beds, however, it may expand in the future.

State Senator Brian Frosh and State Delegate Kathleen Dumais came to speak at the November Commission meeting on upcoming Juvenile Justice legislation in 2010.

Delegate Dumais discussed the law limiting Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) facilities to 48 beds. They also mentioned that pending bills would limit the time a child can stay in detention while waiting for placement. The Public Defender's Office is working with legislators on this bill. They noted that DJS has made great strides in moving the children quicker. "Secretary Devore is trying, but he is faced with moving a mountain." The budget cuts make it much more difficult. Although there are great ideas about building local facilities, there is no money to build them. Delegate Dumais indicated that maybe the Commission could help in this regard. Delegate Dumais opined that we would see more bills balancing the rights of juvenile defendants with the victims and the public. Delegate Dumais believes that the most critical bill is dealing with the timing of the children in detention waiting for placement. DJS has been open in discussing all of the issues. Senator Frosh reported that he has taken several tours of facilities including the Cheltenham Facility, Noyes, and the Fairfax County, Virginia youth program. He was dismayed at the dire contrast between the two states, acknowledging Virginia's system as far superior. Maryland is light years behind from where we should be. Advocates have said maybe it's time to dismantle the whole DJS system and have it run regionally. The Senator intends to implement legislation to attempt to regionalize DJS. He doesn't think it will pass at this time. Montgomery County is far above most jurisdictions in its treatment of juveniles. A major obstacle is the State budget cuts. DJS will continue to suffer budget cuts.

Senator Frosh also brought up with dismay the State Attorney's attempts to change the legal definition of gang to make it easier to convict juveniles (and adults) of crimes, which may not be in the best interest of society. The Senator surmised that new legislation would be introduced regarding the GPS tracking devices that juvenile's are often monitored with. This stems from a case in Baltimore City where a juvenile allegedly committed murder while on GPS monitoring device. Some evidence shows this child didn't fire the shot and was abiding by the GPS tracking system. Nonetheless, because of this incident new legislation regarding the GPS is likely to be introduced. Delegate Dumais said one of the things the Commission can do to help is send the legislators an e-mail or call them about things that might impact the juvenile delinquent system/life.

December 2009

The Commission does not meet in December

January 2010

At January's Commission meeting our guest speaker was Ron Rivlin, Manager HHS/CYF/JJS. Ron reported that Montgomery County is facing a \$6M deficit starting in July 2010, however it is dependent on labor union negotiations that are still ongoing. In order to prepare, the County has gone through two rounds of FY 10 budget reductions to reduce the budget going into FY 11 so it will not be so dramatic. He said that the County is fortunate in that the County Executive is holding Health and Human Services to the same level as county public safety functions such as police services because of the increased dependence on HHS services in difficult economic times. He pointed out that HHS is more dependent on state DJS funding than other Montgomery County

functions and HHS is being affected by reductions in the state budget. Examples of how the state reductions impact county HHS functions are a \$47K reduction in intensive care programs resulted in the program being closed. There was a couple hundred thousand dollar cut to the family intervention specialist program. The inability to increase county funding has caused us to reduce the number of participants in the substance abuse programs through county contracts from 200 last year to 60 this year. There is not enough funding to execute contracts for these services; however, the county has somehow found a way to treat approximately 90 juveniles when it is really intended for 60 . Ron added that he does not know how this can be sustained over the long-term. Moreover, Ron said that he wanted to provide the CJJ with an idea of how the budget cuts will impact county HHS programs such as wraparound and after school programs. In some instances, staff members have voluntarily taken cuts in salary as opposed to cutting services provided but again this may not be sustainable over time. He said the goal is to maintain the core services for the county and perhaps in FY 12, we will be able to expand services again to what we were last year. Further, there will actually be a reduction to the base budget in FY 11 with negative growth in programs. In conclusion, he advised that we should prioritize areas like public safety and education as opposed to the specific programs that we believe are most important and link them to our testimony to the County Council on February 8, 2010.

February 2010

The Commission visited Alfred D. Noyes Children's Center on January 27, 2010. Commissioners who attended believed the trip was a positive experience. Noyes has a new psychologist and psychiatrist – both of whom seem to be doing an excellent job. We also met with their new teacher. We learned that there is one less unit for boys since they are now taking girls from Prince Georges County.

Our guest speaker at the February Commission on Juvenile Justice meeting was Donald W. Devore, Secretary, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). Secretary Devore gave a presentation detailing the use of evidence-based services in Maryland. Secretary Devore believes that the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services has the best data in the country in terms of the use evidenced-based services due to its affiliation with Innovations Institute at the University of Maryland.

The Maryland Department of Juvenile Services is a data driven/results driven agency. Improving public safety is an important function/goal. The contracts to provide evidence-based services are highly competitive contracts. The contractors are required to meet stringent requirements to become and remain an evidence-based service provider. DJS is using slots to drive regions to make reductions in per diem usage or out of home care usage. This has been a great challenge because Maryland is using evidence-based models on serious youthful offenders. The criterion is that they have been identified as eligible for out-of-home care. Secretary Devore noted that he would like to see Montgomery County experiment with the Nurse-Family Partnership Program. The program is currently available only in Garrett County. When a juvenile female is identified as pregnant, a family nurse practitioner stays with the juvenile mother and child for a year or in some jurisdictions for 2 years to ensure that the juvenile continues

to attend school and that the disruption to the juvenile's life is minimal and manageable. The program is the most expensive of the evidence-based models and the most effective. DJS prioritizes services based on where evidence-based services are most cost effective. For example, a group home and bed will cost the state 100K/year, while an evidence-based slot such as MST costs under 10K/year. Evidence-based practices have much better outcomes - a 70% to 80% success rate. MST Dashboard is produced through state statistics. Every two weeks DJS can see results of outcome data to see how they are doing with various programs in various jurisdictions.

March 2010

In March, the Commission holds its annual meeting with the Juvenile Court Judges. Mary Poulin (Chair) opened the meeting by greeting our guests, Judges Savage, Jordan, Callahan, McCally and Burrell, and Samantha Lyons, Juvenile Drug Court Coordinator.

Samantha Lyons provided an update about Juvenile Drug Court. She explained that the Juvenile Drug Court was a partnership between the Circuit Court, Montgomery County Department of Health & Human Services, the State Attorney's Office and the Department of Juvenile Services. She reported that the number of referrals has doubled and they have gone past their capacity of 20 clients. She noted that the Department of Juvenile Services had been very helpful. The referrals have been more diverse.

Below are just a few of the issues brought up by the Judges and Commissioners at the annual meeting:

- The first discussion point brought up with the Judges was that there is concern regarding the lack of family involvement from the beginning of a juvenile case. If there had been such involvement, perhaps the case might have been handled differently. There is no mechanism to engage the families such as the Family Involvement Meetings used by Child Welfare Services.
- Judge Callahan is concerned that there is no place to send the children. DJS involved youth are spending 3-4 months waiting at Noyes to get into a 90-day program, and then they get reevaluated for a long term program. The children are not getting services and eventually, she lets them go home because they can't wait any longer.
- Judge Savage talked about the children whose families don't want their own children back in the home. The parents want the child placed because he/she is out of control. Jeff Williams, Disproportionate Minority Contact Coordinator with the Montgomery County Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families spoke about the Detention Alternatives Wraparound program. According to Jeff, the program was not utilized as much as it had been in 2008.

- In discussing factors that bring children to the attention of the court, the judges noted many including drugs, family dysfunction, lack of parental control, mental
- health issues, gang involvement, peer pressure, truancy, cognitive challenges, and lack of school success. The judges recognized that next to their families, school personnel know the most about the children. There is apparently pending legislation that would allow the sharing of information with schools.
- Judge Savage encouraged people to be mentors and noted that there is a court-based mentoring program at the YMCA serving both delinquent and CINA children under the court's jurisdiction. Otto Perez manages the program and they are always looking for adult volunteers.

April 2010

At the April meeting, Chair Mary Poulin initiated a discussion on the February Meeting with Secretary Devore and the March Meeting with the Judges. Mary asked for recommendations from the commissioners based on what was learned from the Judges and Secretary Devore. The commission decided to explore the following issues:

- The Commission will plan a field trip to Waxters secure detention facility in P.G. County.
- Advocate for funding of a shelter for females – \$400K has already been secured by Hearts and Homes to reopen Caithness shelter but they are awaiting DJS licensing.
- The Commission would like to know from the Secretary how decisions are made to in allocating resources.
- It was suggested that the Government and Community Relations Committee contact the Secretary to explore having smaller programs in the face of budget constraints and to find out what he is planning.

May 2010

In May, the Commission held it's fourth annual all day retreat. At the Retreat, the Commission works on their annual work-plan for the Coming year. This year the Commissioners decided that they would have their May meeting at the retreat. Please see article on the retreat.

June 2010

At the June meeting, the Commissioners bid a fond farewell to Pam Littlewood, Carrie Mulford, and Martha Young. Certificates were awarded to Pam, Carrie, and Martha for all their hard work on the Commission and dedication to the youth of Montgomery County. Ron Rivlin, Juvenile Services Manager and Supervisor of the Commission on Juvenile Justice retired. Angela Talley will take his place. Ron expressed his appreciation for the commitment of the volunteers on the Commission. He thanked the

Commission for all the hard work including the Competency bill, Educational Rights Pamphlet, and raising awareness of localization issue. Ron's replacement, Angela Talley, comes from Department of Corrections and has a lot of experience with the criminal justice system. She will be at our September meeting.

Jeff Williams, DMC Coordinator for the Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families, has left his position. A new person has not yet been hired.

Starting July, meetings will be held only on the 3rd Tuesday of the month. Committee meetings will be held in conference rooms at the Council Office building from 7 to 7:45 p.m. Commission meetings will be from 7:50 to 9 p.m. at the Council Office building, 5th floor conference room. We hope that this change will encourage Commissioners to attend Committee meetings.

Election of FY 2011 Executive Board: New board Nominations are: Mary Poulin, Chair, Christine Bartlett, Vice Chair, Wendy Pulliam, Chair of Evaluation and Analysis Committee, Jennifer Gauthier and Elijah Wheeler, Co-Chairs of Care, Custody and Placement, Francha Davis, Chair of Government and Community Relations Committee, and Mark Resner, Editor Executive Board was approved by the Commission.

Care, Custody and Placement Committee

By Elijah Wheeler and Jennifer Gauthier, Co-Chairs

This past year, the Care, Custody and Placement Committee has undergone a series of changes to its membership. We lost the leadership of Nancy Gannon- Hornberger, our Chair who was instrumental in guiding our work plan and objectives over the course of the past few years. Under her tutelage, I, along with Jennifer Gauthier learned a great deal and we were nominated as Co-Chairs of the committee. We only hope to steer the committee in the direction in which Ms. Gannon-Hornberger had us headed.

While our work plan for Fiscal Year 2010 had us looking at a plethora of issues and gaps within our (be specific as to what system) system, we decided to focus on a couple of areas.

Objective 4 on our work plan was to evaluate the mental health and related services available to youth detained at Alfred D. Noyes Children's Center (Noyes). Noyes is a co-ed secured facility that houses anywhere from 40-57 youth daily. Dr. Lee Haller was invaluable in researching this topic and reporting back to the Commission on what he found. After speaking with several of his sources, Dr. Haller found that the screening services at Noyes for mental health were acceptable. At the time of Dr. Haller's inquires, there were 57 youth at the Noyes facility. Dr. Cullins is the new psychiatrist on staff at Noyes, and he is affiliated with Adventist Behavioral Health Care System at Potomac Ridge, and therefore able to provide the youth at Noyes with the mental health services needed. Dr. Cullins also agreed to increase her hours at Noyes, and will work in collaboration with Dr. Bunkley, who is the staff psychologist there.

Another highlight from this past year was when we had Cynthia Theo Harris from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) present to us a more detailed explanation of the

Care, Custody & Placement work plan. The presentation was in a PowerPoint format to guide us through the point of entry for youth till their case is closed. This shed more light on the information we needed to identify existing services provided to youth under supervision with DJS. The presentation detailed different types of services youth would receive on DJS levels such as Resolved at Intake, Pre-Court Supervision, and Formal Petition. The Committee learned in depth about the processes by which DJS determines what services are appropriate for particular youth and the decision point for out of home placement.

Furthermore, there has been plenty of discussion around a shelter to be located in Montgomery County for females. There is \$400,000 in funding secured for Hearts and Homes to open the shelter. Hearts and Homes are in the process of DJS licensing. The committee continues to communicate with Montgomery Collaboration Council and DJS for any updates or changes in the initiative to open the female shelter.

Although we have many issues targeted to explore and understand greater, we have decided to focus in on a specific task for the time being. The Care, Custody and Placement Committee made it a priority to study the services provided for female youth offenders under DJS supervision. While female offenders are in the minority within the system, we would like to know what is being done for them in terms of mental health, substance abuse, gender specific programming, and educational services.

Government and Community Relations Committee

By Francha Davis, Chair

During fiscal year 2010, the Government and Community Relations Committee continued to focus on increasing outreach to, and collaboration with, other individuals and organizations serving youth involved in the juvenile justice system. In addition, the Committee monitored and tracked legislation that affects the juvenile justice system, recommended the legislative agenda for the Commission, and represented the Commission by lobbying and submitting testimony to local and State legislators. During FY 10, the Government and Community Relations Committee focused its outreach in three specific areas:

1. Small institutions: Research has proven that smaller, more localized facilities improve treatment outcomes for children, reduce recidivism, and encourage family participation that is vital to a child's continued success after commitment.
2. Expanding the availability of evidence-based treatment options in Montgomery County: Research has shown that evidence-based practices can cost a fraction of secure detention or group homes while demonstrating significantly better results. The Commission would like to see a significant increase in the number of youth and their families receiving these services.
3. Alternatives to placing youth in detention: Research has shown that community-based alternatives to detention reduce crowding, reduce the costs of operating juvenile facilities, shield juveniles from the stigma of institutionalization, help

offenders avoid association with juveniles who have more serious delinquent histories, and help juveniles maintain positive ties with the family and community. The Commission believes that reliance on detention for delinquent juveniles must be reduced and the number of effective community-based alternatives to detention must be increased.

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) as well as non-profit and community-based services providers for court-involved youth and juvenile justice commissions in other jurisdictions in Maryland.

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

- In October, Commission members visited the new Silver Oak facility in Sabillasville, Md.
- In November, State Delegates Brian Frosh and Kathleen Dumais attended the Commission's meeting to update the Commission on upcoming legislative issues related to Juvenile Justice.
- Commission members visited the Alfred D. Noyes Children's Center in January 2010.
- DJS Secretary Donald DeVore presented information on evidence-based practices at the Commission's February meeting.
- In March, the Committee participated in the Commission's annual meeting with the Juvenile Court judges. This meeting provides an opportunity for Commission members to hear specific concerns from the judges and solicit suggestions for action that the Commission can take to address their concerns.
- Also in March the Committee submitted testimony, on the Commission's behalf, in support of Senate Bill 880 which would have established a pilot program to redirect children from costly residential placements and detention into wraparound services tailored to their specific needs.
- Members of the Commission participated in a "field trip" to Juvenile Court where they observed several hearings and learned about the Court process first-hand.
- Marlena Valdez, Director of the Juvenile Justice Monitoring Unit Office of the Attorney General, spoke at the Commission's June meeting.

At the Commission on Juvenile Justice's annual retreat in May, the Committee evaluated progress toward achieving the goals set out in the FY 09-10 work-plan and fine-tuned its plans for FY 11. During FY 11, the Government and Community Relations Committee will seek 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 Montgomery-Prince Georges County region, and (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. The Committee will continue to focus on expanding the availability of evidence-based treatment options in Montgomery County and effective community-based alternatives to placing youth in detention.

Evaluation and Analysis Committee

By Wendy Pulliam, Chair

A few of this year's goals of the Evaluation and Analysis Committee were: to conduct a review of data used by the Department of Juveniles Services, make recommendations to improve data, close service gaps, and meet service needs. The goals were created to assist the Evaluation and Analysis committee in making more informed recommendations based on the DJS data and to ensure said data are available to answer questions such as, whether available services match service needs of youths.

In order to meet our goals and to assist the committee in gaining a full understanding of how data is collected and how data should be interpreted, the committee brought in a number of guest speakers:

- John Irvine, Director, DJS Office of the Research, Evaluation and Planning - The committee explained to John Irvine that interpreting DJS data appears to be difficult for anyone outside of DJS. Mr. Irvine explained how to interpret DJS state stats and offered to be a data explanation resource to the committee. This meeting was also useful because the committee has now developed to with the Office of Research, Evaluation and Planning and can now request data specific to Montgomery County.
- Marlana Valdez, Director, Maryland Juvenile Justice Monitoring Unit responded to specific questions regarding data used in the Quarterly Report from the Juvenile Justice Monitoring Unit of the Office of the Attorney General.
- Representatives from Family Crimes Unit of Montgomery County Police Department summarized the types of incidents the Family Crimes Unit processes, such as runaway children, internet crimes against children and sexual assaults.
- Jeff Williams, now former DMC coordinator and Cynthia Fincham from the provider for the new treatment foster care program, Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care, attended our April meeting. Ms. Fincham helped the committee learn how an evidence-based program is actually being implemented in Montgomery County.