

JDAI System Assessment and RFK Recommendation Crosswalk

Lancaster County has recently undergone review by two national technical assistance providers. The Robert F. Kennedy Resource Center received grant funding to conduct a probation system review in District 3J probation. Their review included interviews and focus groups with probation staff and selected system stakeholders over the course of nine months. The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) conducted a system assessment for three days in February 2018. This review consisted of interviews with probation involved community organizations, service providers, and juvenile justice system stakeholders. Both national entities focus on research related to juvenile justice system improvement efforts and made recommendations to probation and Lancaster County. The chart below shows common themes from both sets of recommendations that may help the JDAI Collaborative and Steering team focus their efforts moving forward.

RFK Executive Summary Recommendations	AECF JDAI System Assessment Recommendations
It is recommended that a specific training schedule precede the roll out of the juvenile graduated responses policy and implementation. This schedule must incorporate all juvenile court stakeholders (e.g., probation staff, judges, county attorney’s, and public defender’s)	The JDAI Collaborative should partner with probation to develop strategies to reduce the use of detention for technical and warrant cases; and, strategies to expedite pending placement cases. Probation should inform the JDAI collaborative on graduated response efforts as they are developed and implemented.
It is recommended that discussions be held within Probation to identify whether the current rotating schedule of PDI, CBR and Truancy officers is most effective. In addition to collaborative conversations with all partners involved in the detention intake process, Probation is encouraged to hold a short series of internal meetings to discuss the efficacy of intake training, payment structure, quality assurance, mentorship and supervision.	Training is needed for all stakeholders on the RAI tool and objective admission process. Collaborative efforts should occur using the data collected on reasons for overrides of the RAI to determine what policy or practices could be modified to achieve better outcomes for young people in Lancaster County.
It is recommended that the alternative response and diversion programs develop improved data sharing and communication processes with Probation.	Programs designed to divert low risk youth from the system must be diligent to avoid net widening and over supervision. The team would encourage Lancaster Co. to continue to monitor data and policies in this area. Some of the pre-adjudication programming could possibly “raise the rates” regarding system responses to juvenile offending (e.g., the diversion program is a 90 day regimen; PACS supervises pre-adjudication cases, including using drug testing and EM).

	<p>During interviews, there appeared to be uncertainty on the criteria and/or process on how youth are admitted to ATD programs within Lancaster County.</p> <p>The shelter appears to be utilized as a primary alternative to detention. It was reported the average length of stay in shelter is at least 30 days. Based off of this information, it appears shelter may be used less for short-term family reunification planning, but used more for holding purposes for youth waiting on long-term placements which is consistent with the observed culture of reliance on out of home placement.</p>
<p>It is recommended that routine monthly meetings be held with probation leadership, judges, prosecutors, and public defense. These on-going meetings will support the implementation and sustainability of the recommendations being presented in this report. Further, the routine meetings must be used to foster cross-discipline conversations that will hone and create a cohesive, unifying philosophy between and among key juvenile justice stakeholders. It is recommended that this unifying philosophy be forthrightly discussed amongst the partners and be founded in the neuroscience of adolescent development, family engagement and the core principles for reducing recidivism and improving other youth outcomes.</p>	<p>The JDAI Collaborative should create a system map that can be examined to determine whether there are unnecessary delays in handling of cases that may be addressed. Particular attention should be given to a) court continuances, b) Pre-adjudication timeframes and c) probation violations. It will be critical to have defense, prosecution, judiciary, and probation to assist in this process.</p>
<p>It is recommended that a short-term workgroup be created to discuss the pros and cons of conditional release, consider alternatives, and at a minimum define criteria and goals for who is best suited for this practice and to what end.</p>	<p>Lancaster County needs to define conditional release and minimize when it is utilized. (Pre-adjudicated, post-adjudicated, pending VOP). Concerns that data maybe skewed because of how frequently these are utilized.</p>
<p>To support the necessary enhancement of data collection, management and reporting of enhanced accountability measures related to youth and system outcomes, it is recommended that Probation continue to develop a set of priority outcomes and measures that may be produced in routine reports accessible to primary stakeholders (e.g., probation, judges, county</p>	<p>It is recommended that Lancaster County commit to developing strategic reports so stakeholders can monitor trends related to the initiative. In order to do this, it is recommended that Lancaster County designate an individual that focuses on data collection, analysis and presentation.</p>

<p>attorney and public defender counsel) and impacted parties (e.g., behavioral health, education, families). It is recommended that Probation introduce the use of the Data Working Grid (developed by Gene Siegel and accessible at: https://rfknrcjj.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Data-Planning-in-the-Dual-Status-Youth-Siegel-RFKNRCJJ1.pdf and can be found in Appendix H of the Probation System Review Guidebook, 2nd edition) to further inform this critical performance measurement improvement.</p> <p>This Grid details eight categories of data (see below) and a set of specific questions that support this recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Prevalence2. Case characteristics and history3. Case processing4. Case management, processing and supervision5. Protocol adherence and training6. Placement and services7. System outcomes and performance indicators8. Youth and family outcomes	<p>There must be a clear agreement on what data is shared and how it is used. Transparency is critical in system enhancements. Lancaster County should consider a standard agreement, such as an MOU around a collaborative data sharing process.</p>
---	---