

Office of the Child Advocate
Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 27th, 2019

Council Members or Designees Present:

Maria Mossaides, The Child Advocate, Chair (OCA)
Commissioner Peter Forbes (DYS)
Rebecca Brink (DCF)
Cristina Tedstone (DCF)
Lindsey Tucker (DPH)
Katherine Lipper (EOE)
Kevin Kennedy (MA Chief of Police Association)
Naoka Carey (Citizens for Juvenile Justice)
Tammy Mello (Children's League of MA)
Tom Capasso (Juvenile Court)
Barbara Kaban (CPCS)
Elizabeth Walk (Representative Dykema's Office)
Juan Jaramillo (Senator Bonocore's Office)
Rebecca Hamlin (Representative Whelan's Office)

Other Attendees:

Melissa Threadgill (OCA)
Melissa Williams (OCA)
Lindsay Morgia (OCA)
Members of the Public

Meeting Commenced: 1:05pm

Welcome and Introduction from the Child Advocate:

Maria Mossaides welcomed the attendees to the second Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board meeting. Each person introduced themselves.

Ms. Mossaides held a formal vote for the approval of the minutes from the December 12, 2018 Full JJPAD Board meeting. A quorum of 12 out of 21 members were present. All agreed. The December 12, 2018 Full JJPAD Board meeting minutes were approved.

Ms. Threadgill discussed the status of the remaining appointees to the JJPAD Board and noted that the Board is still awaiting appointment of several members.

Ms. Threadgill reviewed the agenda.

Report out from Data Subcommittee:

Ms. Threadgill briefly discussed the goals and guiding principles of the Data Subcommittee. The goals were developed based on a pre-meeting survey that was sent out to the Data Subcommittee members as well as the robust discussion during the first meeting.

1. **Be purposeful and strategic: we need a cross-agency plan:** We need to know why we are collecting the data, what questions we are answering, what we are going to do with the data, and make sure the data analysis is connected to the day to day work.
2. **Report on outcome data as well as process data:** Process data is important to look at what the agencies are doing, but we should be looking at the outcome of those efforts as well.
3. **Disaggregate data by demographic categories:** Data will be more useful if we break it down in a variety of ways (e.g. demographic category, geography).
4. **Desire for more multi-agency collaboration and reporting:** We could produce more useful data analysis if we broke down barriers and use data from multiple agencies. This requires conversations on issues such as universal definitions and privacy/confidentiality.
5. **Increase transparency and public accessibility:** Information should be made available to the public with context and in a way that is easily understood by a lay audience.

Ms. Carey posed a clarifying question. She stated that in terms of thinking of the first goal with cross-agency planning, many agencies are at different points in their planning. She asked, how do we work together so that the agency furthest behind doesn't slow everything else down?

Ms. Threadgill stated that this particular concern has not come up in discussion. However, in general the goals are not designed to hold any particular agency back from doing agency-specific work. The goal instead is to add an additional focus on cross-agency communication and collaboration.

As a general response, the JJPAD supports the goals of the Data Subcommittee.

Ms. Threadgill explained that the Data Subcommittee is focused on the goal of improving aggregate data collection. She went over the group's three Year-One objectives.

1. Aggregate Data Collection Improvement Feasibility Report (Due: June 30, 2019)
2. Develop Juvenile Justice System Data Website

3. Develop Interagency Data Collection and Reporting Plan

Ms. Threadgill provided a chart that explained the specific mandates of the feasibility report. The chart outlines what legislature is looking for, who has what data, caveats on data quality, etc. She stated that if anyone has feedback, please let her know. The chart should give everyone an idea of what legislature is looking for in the report. The goal of the feasibility report is to reveal holes in data availability and the possible ways to address the data collection issues.

In terms of the second goal, Ms. Threadgill explained that the OCA is partnering with EOTSS to build a juvenile justice system data website. She will be reaching out to specific agency to discuss next steps. OCA hopes to have the website up by this coming fall.

After June 30th feasibility report is complete, the focus will shift to the third goal: developing interagency data collection and reporting plan. This will include conversations on data definitions, data collection, reporting schedules, etc.

The next Data Subcommittee meeting will be held on Monday, March 4, 2019.

Report out from Community-Based Interventions Subcommittee:

Ms. Threadgill started off by stating that the next CBI Subcommittee meeting is Friday, March 1st, 2019.

Ms. Threadgill discussed the Year-One objectives for the Community-Based Interventions Subcommittee.

1. Research current diversion policies & procedures in MA:
 - a. Police Diversion
 - b. District Attorney Diversion
 - c. Judicial Diversion
2. Conduct a statewide assessment on the availability of community-based treatment programs and services for justice-involved youth, including gaps in program availability by community, programming type and/or population served. A survey will be sent out to gather community feedback. The goal is to report back to the full JJPAD Board by the fall.
3. Develop recommendations for expanding & improving community-based interventions.

Ms. Threadgill talked about the upcoming CBI Meetings. On March 1st, 2019, the focus of the CBI Subcommittee meeting will be on police diversion. The April and May meetings will be

focused on prosecutorial and judicial diversion. During the summer meetings, there will be presentations on diversion referral and community providers surveys.

Ms. Mossaides and Ms. Threadgill have and will continue to meet with various child welfare and juvenile justice agencies about issues communities are facing re: availability of services. They discussed how key barriers can differ depending on the geographic location. As an example, one barrier for services within rural areas can be the struggle with transportation.

Ms. Mossaides asked the board if there are any datasets that could help for the JJPAD to look into.

Ms. Tucker said that DPH has data on the health outcomes and social determinants of communities. During the upcoming Spring/Summer, DPH will be releasing a tool that will allow people to look at outcomes by community. The project also discusses resiliency factors.

Ms. Carey mentioned how language differences between the services being offered and the families using the services can be a major barrier. She explained how only offering services in English within a community where multiple other languages are widely spoken can lead to families not being able to take part in needed services.

Ms. Mello further commented that aside from language barrier challenges, misinterpretation could also result in lack of adequate services. She stated that interpreters cannot always translate the context and emotion behind what is being said.

Ms. Tucker discussed the importance of cultural competencies.

Ms. Threadgill will send out a draft of the survey to see if anyone wants to weigh in before finalizing it and sending the survey out.

Ms. Threadgill provided a brief summary of the CSG Justice Center presentation that was held during the last CBI Subcommittee meeting. Six main recommendations from CSG came out of the presentation:

1. Divert youth who commit status offenses and low-risk youth from system involvement pre and post-arrest;
2. Use risk screening tools to help objectively identify low-risk youth;
3. Establish clear criteria, policies, and protocols to identify youth that should be eligible for and/or automatically be diverted based on risk level and offense;
4. Use needs screening tools and service guides/matrices to identify youth with potential mental health, substance use and trauma needs;

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

5. Establish formal partnerships, communication, policies, and joint training with law enforcement and community-based providers; and
6. Collect data on diversion program participation and quality to evaluate and improve performance.

Ms. Kaban spoke about the concerns she had during the CSG Justice Center presentation regarding the importance of having attorneys present at the arraignment.

Mr. Kennedy agreed with Ms. Kaban and stated that the presenters did not have a complete answer to the role/importance of attorneys.

Ms. Threadgill commented that not all states have a robust juvenile defender system like Massachusetts, and that could be part of the reason.

No further comments were made.

Report out from Childhood Trauma Task Force:

Ms. Threadgill discussed the Year-One objectives for the Childhood Trauma Task Force.

1. Understand & Document Current Trauma Screening, Assessment and Intervention Practices
2. Identify Gaps and Areas for Improvement
3. Develop Policy & Budget Recommendations

Ms. Threadgill reported on the progress made on the trauma mapping project. A total of 15 communities were selected to receive the survey.

Ms. Morgia, Research and Policy Analyst for the Office of the Child Advocate, discussed the thought process behind how the communities were selected. She stated that a primary goal was to make sure there were a diverse range of locations and demographics. She also explained that the areas chosen are areas that are likely to experience higher trauma. Some of the data they looked at to determine the appropriate areas to include were statistics on suicide and 51As. It was also noted that the survey has a balance of both rural and urban communities.

Ms. Morgia explained the five questions they are hoping to have answered through the survey.

1. Which agencies, organizations, and other institutions provide screenings, assessments, and interventions for children and youth under 18?

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

2. What types of screening and assessment tools are being used across the state?
3. What types of trauma interventions are being used throughout the state?
4. How are children and youth referred to trauma screenings, assessments, and interventions?
5. Are there any promising practices or programs that could serve as models for other Massachusetts communities?

The goal is to report back to the CTTF and the full JJPAD Board this summer.

Ms. Threadgill mentioned that the CTTF will be holding learning sessions with invited guests throughout the next few upcoming meetings. In March, ROCA and Child Witness to Violence Project will be speaking about violence and childhood trauma. In April and May, the meetings will focus on school interventions and immigration/refugee-related trauma. State agencies represented on the CTTF will also be presenting on the work of their respective agency in terms of the screening and assessment of youth experiencing trauma.

Report out from Diversity & Inclusion Working Group:

Ms. Threadgill introduced Tammy Mello, Executive Director of the Children's League of Massachusetts, to present the feedback from the first Diversity and Inclusion Working Group meeting. The meeting was held on January 28th, 2019.

The working group was formed with the purpose of making sure those who are currently not at the table are still represented.

Ms. Mello briefly discussed the primary strategies for addressing inclusion that arose from the working group.

1. Have true, meaningful representation; It's important to have meaningful representation from minority and specialized groups to make sure it does not come across as having a "token person" just to represent the population at hand.
2. In-person formal representation
3. Maintain open outreach and communication

Ms. Mello explained that open outreach and on-going communication should be prioritized first. The first step will be to build a list of organizations. The list should be inclusive of small organizations and faith-based programs as well.

Ms. Threadgill stated that it would be helpful to have the perspectives of the other subcommittees as well to make sure they are thinking about diversity within their work.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

. The Office of the Child Advocate will be responsible for reaching out to the groups listed and see if they have an interest in working with the JJPAD Board. The groups and organizations will self-select into the topics they are interested in.

Ms. Mello talked about being intentional with the language being used while talking to outside organizations. She provided the example of the word trauma and how youth do not refer to their experiences as trauma, but instead, they refer to their experiences as life. It's important to use language that youth and families are able to relate to.

Ms. Threadgill commented that the working group aims to meet monthly. She stated that anyone can join.

Ms. Carey stated that she wants to make sure there is an ongoing conversation between the working group and subcommittees to avoid a disconnect.

Ms. Mello stated that she wants to make sure the JJPAD Board casts a wider net to reach out to diverse communities that are often not included.

Ms. Carey replied that the CFJJ would be willing to share the information they collected from their community-held focus groups.

The JJPAD Board members provided positive feedback and approval of the work that has been done in the working group thus far.

Framework for Assessing Impact of Statutory Changes:

Ms. Threadgill reminded the board of the discussion that was held during the first JJPAD meeting regarding the assessment of the impact of statutory changes mandate. The board agreed that a framework would be necessary before starting the assessment. Ms. Threadgill discussed the draft framework she created.

Ms. Threadgill started out by stating that legislation was clear in their expectations of what they are looking for. She explained that the goal of the project is to assess the impact of any statutory changes that expand or alter jurisdiction or functioning of the juvenile court by looking at:

1. changes in the age of the youth involved with the juvenile justice system;
2. changes in the way youth are being matched to and provided services;
3. youth outcomes as a result of these changes in service delivery;
4. changes in delinquency charging patterns; and
5. any remaining or emerging gaps in educational supports and other needed services.

Ms. Threadgill stated that she is not sure if all of the data in the framework exists and noted that the group will also need to think about using qualitative data along with quantitative data.

Ms. Threadgill explained that when looking at the changes in the age of youth involved with the juvenile justice system, the focus will be on comparing the number of arrests/overnight arrests for youth under 12 years old, the average age of youth arrested/overnight arrests, number of delinquency filing for youth under 12, the average age of youth with delinquency filings, the number of DYS commitments for youth under 12, and the overall average age of DYS commitments from before and after the effective state of the statutory change.

Mr. Kennedy discussed how youth can no longer be found delinquent for certain first offenses of lower-level misdemeanors. He stated that this brings up the issue on the accuracy of first offense filings and how lack of universal definitions has caused some people to file an offense and others not to.

Mr. Capasso stated that arrests and delinquencies are down, but it may be a false number. He explained how it's still in the very beginning of the collection and it may be a better idea to wait a year until things start to calm down and produce a more accurate picture of what is going on.

Ms. Carey brought up the idea to look at 2017 as baseline data.

Mr. Kennedy commented that the JJPAD Board should be looking at the data from the juvenile courts and not from police due to lack of universal definitions and practices.

Ms. Kaban stated that she would like to see data collected on the number of delinquencies requested for 12 and 13-year olds.

Ms. Brink said that it's important to think about CRAs to address the concern that if DYS is not taking the kids, DCF will.

Ms. Threadgill next discussed the framework for measuring the impact of changes in the matching and delivery of services. She stated that when looking at these changes, the focus will be on comparing the frequency of delinquency filings and arraignments for impacted offenses, frequency of filings/arraignments for offenses SIMILAR TO impacted offenses, and conversions of delinquency filings to civil infractions from before and after the effective state of the statutory change.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

She noted that, for example, she has heard from some practitioners that they are seeing an increase in the number of Assault & Battery charges in schools as the number of disorderly conduct charges in schools declines.

Mr. Kennedy said to look at civil infractions.

Ms. Carey asked if CPCS would have any of this data.

Ms. Kaban said that CPCS does not have a way to collect this type of data.

Mr. Capasso stated that the court might have this data but is unsure of how to get it.

Ms. Threadgill stated that the following categories could be potentially compared from before and after the effective state of the statutory change, if the data is available:

1. Number/Type of CRA Filings
2. Number/Type of Referrals to FRCs
3. Use of Judicial Diversion
4. Use of Police/DA Diversion
5. Referrals to Restorative Justice Programs
6. DCF STARR Placements
7. Referrals to BSAS

Ms. Threadgill stated that she is unsure if there are any other relevant DMH metrics that should be included.

Ms. Carey asked if DMH has data on CBHI and the Mobile Crisis team services.

A member of the public suggested that the JJPAD Board look at court clinician referrals.

Ms. Mello suggest that the board should use general DCF placements including foster care instead of just STARR placements. She believes we will miss a lot of kids that are placed outside of STARR programs.

Ms. Brink stated that there is no way to look at why a child was placed as there are so many different clinical reasons for placement choice. We should be careful about causation.

Ms. Mossaides explained that she doesn't think the data will answer all of our questions, but believes that this will lead us in the right direction to see what questions should be asked and

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

where the focus should be centered on. One possible recommendation that comes out of this is that we need more structured data.

Ms. Carey commented that DESE has data that could be useful since there are arrests in school, detentions, expulsion, etc.

Mr. Capasso suggested looking at CRA data.

Mr. Kennedy stated that police are not tracking non-crimes. There is no checkbox that police use to note diversion. One issue is that there is a lack of consistency across the board and everyone is collecting police diversion differently.

Ms. Threadgill recommended sending the framework to the Data Subcommittee to get their opinion. She would also like to work with DCF to see what data might be relevant.

Ms. Threadgill discussed that when looking at the changes in youth outcomes, we are unlikely to see significant changes within the first year of implementation. She stated that the JJPAD Board could consider partnering with an academic institution to look at pre/post recidivism and other youth well-being metrics. This way, in three years, the board could look at this data if we have a baseline to start off with, as Ms. Carey recommended.

Mr. Capasso agreed and said that it will be easier to see what the impact is on numbers of violations later on.

Ms. Threadgill stated that she will add probation to the framework metrics and will talk to them about caseloads.

Ms. Mello explained that it's important to look at outcomes and impacts holistically and focus on other youth well-being metrics as well.

Commissioner Forbes explained that the changes observed might not be because of statutory changes. The changes could be a result of other measures that were put in place.

Ms. Carey agreed and stated that this is an opportunity to look at the what the data says, but also provide context to the data. There is a possibility that other initiatives that could have had an impact as well.

Ms. Mossaides commented that CBHI services could have an impact on any data changes we see as well.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

Ms. Mello talked about the Organization Full Frame Initiative in St. Louis, Missouri out of the juvenile court. She said it would be nice to think of a framework that all state agencies could use.

Mr. Capasso commented on the well-being metrics including the impact of statutory changes re: expungement, as youth become more employable since they wouldn't have a record when they would have before the changes were made. He also talked about information on the sealing of records and expungement data is hard to get as there is not a lot of data available.

A member of the public commented from personal experience stating that one reason why a lot of youth don't go through the expungement process is because not everyone knows about it or knows how to do it.

Mr. Capasso agreed that the lack of education on expungement is an issue. However, in many cases, it is easy process to go through.

Mr. Jaramillo asked if the court system tracks how long sealing or expungement can take.

Mr. Capasso responded that they do track the sealing of records process. They do not track expungement yet since it's still new. Sealing usually takes about two weeks or it could go to court and it's their decision.

Ms. Kaban stated that youth don't understand that when a record is sealed, the court and police can still see their record.

Mr. Capasso commented that Greater Boston Legal Services helps with this.

A representative from Representative Whelan's office stated that the representative wanted to bring up that the school resource officer in his school district would be interested in speaking to the JJPAD board.

Ms. Kaban stated that it's important to be hypervigilant about where we direct the youth towards.

Ms. Mello brought up that it's hard for a youth to get accepted in the military due to medication concerns.

Ms. Threadgill noted that it sounds like the board is interested in bringing expungement into the metrics, and that she will add that to the document. She then asked the board what process they like to go through to bring in qualitative data from the ground.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

Ms. Mossaides said that school resource officers are a wonderful resource and it would be great to have a focus group with them.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the Massachusetts Juvenile Police Officer's Association will be holding a conference in April that could be of interest to the board.

Ms. Carey explained how well-being metrics are likely to vary by agency.

Ms. Tucker commented that there are a number of DPH survey questions about well-being that could be helpful. Even if we don't see change now it could be helpful to develop the well-being metrics now to see if changes happen in the future.

Ms. Threadgill stated that she will add this to the work plan.

Board Member Updates and Reflections: Initial Impacts of Statutory Changes:

Ms. Threadgill posed a list of three questions for the JJPAD Board members to reflect on and share their thoughts with the rest of the group. The three questions were:

1. Has your agency implemented any changes to policy or practice as a result of the April 2018 law?
2. What positive changes, if any, are you seeing that you think are or may be related to the April 2018 law?
3. What challenges, if any, are you seeing that you think are or may be related to the April 2018 law?

Mr. Capasso commented that the trial court as a whole has had a ton of work to do since the implementation, but a lot has already been done. He explained that although diversion was a work in progress, it has been more of a focus since the statutory changes. They have seen positive changes with the sealing and expungement law changes, and an increase in expungement petitions. Some of the challenges he has noticed include confusion around the changes on the local law enforcement level. He stated that although numbers are showing delinquency rates decreasing, he believes this is a result of confusion on when someone should or shouldn't be arrested. He also has concerns that we are losing a population that we could be offering services to if police are reluctant to arrest youth that should be. He stated that there is an appeal pending on this matter. The chief of juvenile court also has a plan to track "time to permanency." He used the phrase "work smarter not harder" when referring to how the juvenile court triage cases.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

Mr. Kennedy agreed and stated that there is a lot of confusion between police on when to arrest versus when to divert youth. Another issue he has notice deals with the change of age to 12 years old. He commented on what happens to juveniles under the age of 12 committing serious delinquency charges who are not offered services since they are under age. He explained that schools are not equipped to handle these issues and this is creating a public safety issue. Many offenses cannot be charged now. There are a lot of unintended consequences as a result of the statutory changes. 12 and 13-year olds cannot make bail. Before, police officers were required to notify probation of all arrests, but now the officer has the ability to release on their own before asking a third party.

Ms. Carey asked how many families refuse services. She also asked if police can still offer services to a youth that was not arrested.

Mr. Kennedy replied that a lot of youth who were eligible to receive services prior to the changes are no longer able receive services. A lot of the services are now the responsibility of the schools.

Ms. Kaban recommended pushing IEPs.

Ms. Mello suggested using the Family Resource Centers as an option. However, she noted that not every community has a FRC. They have a lot of data on where the referrals are originating from. This is a place that services can be offered through.

Ms. Mossaides stated that the issue is a referral can be made, but there is no legal accountability to make sure those services go through unless there is a Care and Protection order or a CRA. There are many successful services, but if no one asks for the help and a referral, they will not receive the help.

Mr. Kennedy said that if a parent isn't willing to file a CRA, there needs to be a mechanism for police to bring those youth into the system.

Ms. Brink appreciated the concern of the lack of a formal system to offer children services, but believes that pushing kids deeper into the system and trying to offer services can sometimes have negative effects. She commented on whether or not parents choose not to receive a service just because they don't want to help their children, or if the lack of accessibility to services causes too much of a barrier.

Ms. Mossaides stated that there are some parents who cannot emotionally handle their children but then that would be a C&P case instead of a referral to services.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

Ms. Carey stated that the focus should be on what would lead to the best public safety outcome for both the families and the community.

Ms. Mossaides stated that the board can prioritize and complete a deeper dive on what the biggest issue is and then figure out how to give timely, affordable services.

A member of the public commented that parents often don't want to hear that their child needs to have certain services. She stated that there is a cultural component to this.

Mr. Capasso stated that the trajectory on working with children is more service oriented than before.

Ms. Threadgill confirmed that there is room for a deeper dive into the topic of youth that are exhibiting behaviors that would have gotten them arrested prior to the bill. She asked the board for feedback on who should be at the table for that conversation. The board can focus on problem diagnosis: what do we/should we do in these situations to help these youth?

Ms. Carey commented that this seems to be a good question for the CBI Subcommittee.

Ms. Mello stated that the issues isn't just in communities, but also in residential programs. It's important to have congregate care at the table and to hear their opinions as they are with the children 24/7.

Ms. Brink asked if the services are mandated through the court or offered through school. She posed two questions for the group.

1. What is the best way to offer services and where should the services be coming from?
2. Would services look different to the family coming from their pediatrician instead of the juvenile court?

Ms. Mossaides commented that this would be a good conversation to have with the Superintendent's Association and with the ESP providers. It might not be structured data, but we could see if people could come and talk to us about their experiences. She understands that they have limitations on how quickly they can respond to every situation. The focus on the conversation would be on services for those under 12 years old.

Ms. Carey said the focus should be on low-level offenses along with under 12 years old.

Approved by Board April 11th, 2019

Ms. Brink reiterated that the board needs to start with baseline data in order to see what changes are taking place.

Mr. Capasso believes there will not be a drastic change for youth under 12.

Ms. Brink said that it's important to look at wait lists for services as there is a critical moment of need for services and there may be a 2-month waitlist.

Ms. Mello stated that in a foster care meeting she recently attended, she heard that there is currently a six-month waitlist for CBHI services.

Commissioner Forbes stated that part of the problem is not only not being able to arrest youth under 12 with the statutory changes, but also that youth ages 12 and 13 are not eligible to be held on an overnight arrest at DYS. This had been the law for a long time but was not being enforced. He stated that there needs to be work done between police, bail magistrates, DYS, and DCF to work out the problems together. The long-term impact on delinquent kids is going to be that youth under 12 years old won't have early entry on their CORI. When the 10 and 11-year olds are re-offending at 16, they aren't going to seem as bad in court since they won't have a prior to 12 record.

A member of the public commented that not having a longer record would be a good thing.

Mr. Capasso stated that it could be a positive thing, but if we cannot offer these services now when the youth are under 12 years old, we are missing out on a window in which we could help now before it gets worse.

Commissioner Forbes continued by stating that when looking at macro recidivism, early onset of arrest is the biggest factor in predicting the likelihood of recidivism.

Ms. Mossaides posed the question of how to find a way to identify and appropriately respond at the first incident.

Closing Comments:

Ms. Threadgill wrapped up the meeting to be conscientious of everyone's time. She asked the board to think about who they would like to bring in to the next meeting to present on a specific topic.

Ms. Kaban would like to bring in someone from the medical community such as pediatricians and emergency department doctors to see if they are looking into this as well.

Mr. Capasso sees the benefit of bringing in a juvenile court judge.

Ms. Brink stated that if people want to hear from the Family Resource Centers, she can arrange someone to speak.

Ms. Mello commented that it's less about speakers but more about figuring out what questions we are trying to answer. It could be helpful to have a chart with the provisions that are affecting this group, and what we are seeing. This could be an opportunity to look into the impact of the provisions that are being implemented, or if they are being implemented in the first place There is a benefit to mapping out what the topics at hand.

A member of the public suggested having school employees and more youth present.

Ms. Carey stated that it could be hard for youth to attend the meetings because they are in school.

Ms. Kaban discussed the feedback she has heard from attorneys in the courtroom. She stated that as with any new law, there is a lot of ambiguity. Attorneys are seeing a lot of variability by county. Some counties are not offering any diversion. Shackling is still an issue. They have seen issues with clerk magistrates and first offenses. There are always growing pains with new laws, but from the attorneys' points of view, they do not understand the level of trainings provided to court judges.

Mr. Capasso noted that litigation may be needed to work through some of these issues.

Ms. Threadgill asked for members to email her if they have thoughts regarding the agenda and guests at the April meeting.

Ms. Threadgill provided the dates and times for the upcoming Full JJPAD Board meeting, Data Subcommittee meeting, CBI Subcommittee meeting, Childhood Trauma meeting, and Diversity and Inclusion meeting.

1. Full JJPAD Board Meeting: April 11th, 2019: 1-3pm
2. Data Subcommittee: March 4th, 2019: 2- 4pm
3. CBI Subcommittee: March 1st, 2019: 2-4pm
4. Childhood Trauma: March 13th, 2019: 1-3pm
5. Diversity & Inclusion: Feb 28th, 2019: 1-2:30pm

Adjournment: 3:03pm