

MINUTES
Juvenile Justice Standing Committee
July 16, 2013

Board of State and Community Corrections
Large Conference Room
660 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95811

Chair Steinhart called to order the Juvenile Justice Standing Committee meeting at 1:00 p.m.

The following Committee members were in attendance:

Chair Steinhart, Chair
Mr. Bell
Ms. Burrell

Chief Davis
Dr. Herz
Judge Kumli

Mr. Lopez
Ms. McBrayer

Agenda Item A – Welcome and Introductions

Agenda Item B – Approval of Minutes

Ms. McBrayer moved to approve the minutes; Ms. Burrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Steinhart noted two members had indicated a desire to attend this meeting by phone, but staff had informed him that, due to timing and law, such as ten days advanced notice and open access to the public required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Bagley-Keene), such would not have been legal. Chair Steinhart commented that he was puzzled by this interpretation as any comments would be audible at the primary meeting site, which is accessible to the public. He added that this policy eliminated participation for any members of the Committee with last minute changes to their schedules.

He requested a second review of the policy by staff and whether full formality need be applied to such calls.

Ms. Burrell asked for clarification on who required the ten days' notice prior to the meeting for those calling in. Ms. Hunter replied that her understanding was that Bagley-Keene required the public be notified of the location of each remote caller ten days prior to the meeting. She added that the member requests had been received after notice had already been posted, which named both time and location of this meeting, excluding any ability to act in compliance with Bagley-Keene in the matter of teleconferencing. She stated that she would again inquire of legal counsel, but noted that prior response had not indicated room for interpretation.

Chair Steinhart noted that he understood the interpretation if a meeting were to be held entirely via conference call, but desired additional information as relates to the circumstances of this instance. Ms. McBrayer commented that additional information would be helpful for all of the

members' committees as they regularly had to take such steps in compliance with Bagley-Keene and that both the former Corrections Standards Authority and the State Advisory Committee followed similar policies. Ms. Burrell observed that, even if the policy remained, members with forewarning could make arrangements to teleconference in compliance with Bagley-Keene. Ms. McBrayer noted that such was the current practice of the State Advisory Committee.

Agenda Items C – Chair and Staff Updates

Board and Staff Changes

There was an extended discussion of the legislative change affecting staff and Board positions for BSCC. Per budget language adopted in June, Ms Scott explained the change in the BSCC Board which will create a 13th Board position to be filled by a Governor-appointed Executive Officer of the Board and simultaneously as the Chair of the Board. The new Board Chair position will be filled by Linda Penner effective September 1, 2013, and her vacated Probation Chief slot on the Board will be filled later by a new Governor's appointment. The new law retains the Director of CDCR, Mr. Beard, as a Board member but no longer as the Chair of the Board. There was continuing discussion regarding the status of the Executive Director position, currently filled by Curtis Hill, and varying opinions were offered regarding the future status of that position. Chair Steinhart requested additional clarification on the titles and distribution of labor among the staff. Ms. Scott stated that her understanding was that the Executive Officer position would be abolished, to be replaced by the Chair, and would include the addition of an Executive Director position.

Mr. Bell asked if there was an estimate on when the Executive Director position would be filled. Ms. Scott responded that Mr. Hill had been asked by the Governor to stay with the Board as Acting Executive Officer until the end of November.

Ms. Burrell asked if the new Chair position would be an independently salaried position. Ms. Scott confirmed and Chair Steinhart clarified that the new Board Chair position was accompanied by an independent and new salary for that position.

Relationship between JJSC and other Standing Committees

Chair Steinhart asked Ms. Scott to provide information on the relationship between this Committee and other Standing Committees. Speaking for the staff, Ms. Scott stated that Ms. Penner had raised the issue of information sharing between Committees and the Board at the May meeting of the Board. She noted that it had been resolved to implement a process to facilitate such communications between Standing Committees: Juvenile Justice, Gang Issues, and Data & Research. She included the long-standing State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP), as well. She stated that such a process would be intended to prevent overlap of research and responsibility. Ms. Penner raised the issue to the Board at the July meeting and it was resolved that staff would develop options for the Board on how to develop such a communication plan. Chair Steinhart commented that the manner by which the Board would receive information from Committees had also been discussed at the July meeting of the Board, although no resolution was achieved. He added that having each Committee report to the Board in each meeting was rejected by the Board as too cumbersome a process. Ms. Scott added that including Committee meeting minutes in each meeting packet for the members of the Board as well as a presentation by the Executive Director to the Board, which had been a policy in use in the past, was another possible option.

Ms. McBrayer stated the SACJJDP had asked Ms. Penner to take this issue to the Board to ensure issues of Juvenile Justice were agendized and given an adequate platform before the Board. She added that there was no method that allowed each Committee to know what issues the others were engaged in.

Agenda Item D – Current BSCC Data Responsibilities and Corresponding Data Systems (Overview)

Presentations were offered to describe current juvenile justice data systems in use in California and also to describe the status of related BSCC data, program and grant responsibilities.

1. Data systems

A. Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System

Ms. Julie Bascoe, Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis (the Bureau, or BCIA) at the California Department of Justice (DOJ), presented information to the Committee on the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). She stated that the Bureau is the State's repository for criminal records, performed applicant background checks for the State and at the federal level, and maintained the Criminal Justice Statistics Center. She noted that California was defined as a summary State, as opposed to an incident-based State. She stated that, since 2002, JCPSS had been web-enabled and data was entered electronically directly by Probation Departments.

She stated data are categorized as one of four Record Types. Types I and II are new records which are further defined by specific criteria. Types III and IV updated previously reported information without overwriting older data. She commented that this allowed for a composite view of data over time. Below is her summary of these types of records.

- Type I Records
 - Referrals
 - Intake
 - Informal Probation
 - Diversion
 - Transfers
 - Deportation
 - Traffic Court
 - Direct Files
- Type II Records
 - Provided by Juvenile Court to Probation Department
 - Dismissals
 - Remands
 - Diversions
 - Transfers
 - Fitness Hearings
- Type III Records
 - Used to augment a Type I or Type II Record
 - Ex. - probation is being terminated, transfer to another County
- Type IV
 - Additional information to a Type I or II Record

JCPSS is a live system and information remains in the system without being purged. Probation Departments can enter data from any point in time. There is an annual “close out” of JCPSS that leads to the publication of a report, but Ms. Bascoe noted that the information is fluid and the system may have been updated by Probation Departments between the time the file was “closed out” and the time of publication.

- Mr. Bell asked if the information on the projection screen was inclusive of all elements. Ms. Bascoe replied that it was not, but was a sample of those elements.
- Ms. Burrell asked whether a list of all data elements existed. Ms. Bascoe stated she had provided the Committee members with a disk that includes the JCPSS manual, which she referred to as the “user guide” for the Probation Departments.
- Dr. Herz inquired if Probation Departments were required to collect this data on every case and referral they received. Ms. Bascoe responded that the requirement only applied to individuals falling under the 601 and 602 W and II categories. She added that DOJ had no power of enforcement to ensure records were complete or accurate.
- Mr. Bell asked if there was a common understanding of the definitions, such as “Technical Violation,” across the State or if the terms were open to subjective interpretation and reporting. Ms. Bascoe informed the Committee that she did not believe it was uniform and provided that the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) had yet to develop and implement a training program for exactly that purpose, as had been intended in previous years, though she volunteered that this evidence was anecdotal.
- Chair Steinhart asked what the submission compliance level was. Ms. Bascoe replied that Alpine County has never reported and Del Norte County reported in 2011, but later asserted that they would be unable to continue reporting due to budgetary issues. The remaining counties have reported consistently.
- He then asked if larger counties had difficulties reporting or were behind. Ms. Bascoe stated that the issue was not likely with JCPSS, which is self-entered, but with other systems that have different timeline requirements.
- Ms. Burrell asked if counties had designated information officers or some primary individual reporting the information. Ms. Bascoe responded that, while her Bureau had an established contact for each County, she could not confirm whether the data was consistently entered by the same individual.
- Ms. McBrayer noted most counties published annual reports and inquired if the Bureau reviewed and compared numbers reported in said reports to those reported in JCPSS. Ms. Bascoe replied that the Bureau had not conducted such a comparison.

Chair Steinhart asked that Ms. Bascoe be allowed to complete the presentation before opening the floor to additional questions. He also thanked DOJ for upgrading the report from a minimal program in the past year or so. Ms. Bascoe related that the Bureau operated in the face of obstacles, such as being maintained by the General Fund and difficulty filling vacancies and retaining staff.

- Chair Steinhart asked what the limitations of expanding JCPSS to collect other data elements were or if there were other methods that could be used to gain a greater pool of comparative data concerning program outcomes and recidivism. He asked if there were concerns with hardware and software in that regard. Ms. Bascoe replied that the system was older and commented that attempting to expand or augment older systems often resulted in technical difficulties so extensive that it proved more costly than designing a new system. She relayed that the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) had criticized BCIA the previous year for including data fields that were not statutorily mandated or which were not uniformly reported, citing the “Name” field as an example. She continued that such systems were currently thought to have an effective lifespan of four or five years, at which point it became

necessary to develop new systems. She then noted that JCPSS had not undergone such a process since 2002. She stated that any overhaul of that nature would likely involve seeking statutory authority for more inclusive data ranges in the system.

- Ms. Burrell commented that the Juvenile Justice statutes in California provided statutory authority for “the Department” to collect data in a much broader sense for the purposes of bettering policy and improving systems. She noted that “the Department” likely referred to CDCR and suggested seeking a similar authority for DOJ to meet the needs of JCPSS. Ms. Bascoe stated that, if the authority mentioned, were in the section applying to DOJ, it hadn’t protected BCIA from BSA’s criticism. Ms. Burrell commented that she made extensive use of JCPSS, including the optional data not required by statute, and would appreciate an even greater diversity of data reporting options.
- Chair Steinhart commented that a list of data collection elements required under the Youthful Offender Block Grant had been placed in the statute in 2009. It was discovered that the extant system was unable to manage any one of those elements. Ms. Bascoe stated that maintaining a specific list of elements would generate an impractical amount of work and stated that general language allowing BCIA to adapt its systems to meet the needs of the stakeholders would be more suited.
- Chair Steinhart asked what Ms. Bascoe viewed the role of BSCC as in working with DOJ to improve those data systems. He noted that there was a current proposal to create a website to serve as a clearinghouse. Ms. Bascoe replied that she did not know the full boundaries of BSCC’s directives, but commented that data items or initiatives and the like could be brought to DOJ for review, but the relationship would have to be defined through discussion between said agencies.
- Judge Kumli asked why the “Name” field had become an issue during the audit. Ms. Bascoe replied that BSA wanted to review records in JCPSS, and then review the same individuals’ rap sheets in a different system. She stated that they desired a complete listing rather than a random sample. Judge Kumli commented that identifying information should be specific and all-inclusive, but should exclude name information due to the sensitive nature of the information. He observed that including that final piece of data beyond demographic information was ethically and legally questionable. Ms. Bascoe responded that the “Name” field had been included initially at the request of the field to allow for JCPSS to act as a resource in case management as well as statistical reporting and analysis. Judge Kumli stated that he felt excluding the name information would be sufficient for case management without creating the potential dangers of broader access to the name information.
- Ms. Bascoe stated that BSA had statutory authority under the Government Code to access anything. She noted that DOJ and BSA had engaged in legal negotiations in the past over criminal history records with the result consistently being confirmation of the absolute authority of BSA for access. Ms. Bascoe added that DOJ had nearly been subpoenaed recently for failing to immediately comply with a directive from BSA. Judge Kumli commented that access to information is problematic when it becomes specific to the individual. He added that he felt the Committee had the opportunity to significantly influence or control the discussion on the data points, especially if there were specificity.

Chair Steinhart thanked Ms. Bascoe for her presentation and commented that BSCC would likely be engaging in conversations on these issues with DOJ in the near future.

B. Juvenile Detention Profile Survey

Ms. Toni Gardner began her presentation on the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) by stating that the Board of Corrections began collecting data on juveniles in 1984, but the data was very basic. JDPS was established by an Executive Order from Governor Wilson as part of his veto message. Governor Wilson stated in the same message JDPS would be patterned after the Jail Profile Survey. The systems currently in use were implemented around 2002. She added that stakeholders had outlined the purpose of the Survey earlier, in 2000, as intended to provide decision-makers with information to assist with making the best decisions regarding designing, construction, operations, and planning of California's secured detention facilities.

Ms. Gardner expanded that an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) met in 2009 to revise the JDPS. Due to budget issues, the Committee did not complete its meetings or work, but some improvements were made in the JDPS by the staff.

Ms. Gardner drew the Committee's attention to quarterly reports (distributed), which were current up to the fourth quarter of 2012 and stated that the first quarter report of 2014 would be published soon. Chair Steinhart inquired as to the status of annual reports. Ms. Gardner replied that the research contract which previously produced annual reports had concluded due to budget constraints.

Ms. Gardner noted that the quarter reports presented some interesting findings, such as a 38% decrease in population at juvenile halls and camps and a 50% decrease in bookings. She commented that the decrease in bookings seemed to correlate to the implementation of front door risk assessment tools. She stated that the data was reviewed individually and BSCC was proactive in contacting counties to ensure data had been accurately reported.

- Ms. Burrell asked if all counties were reporting. Ms. Gardner stated that all counties with juvenile halls were reporting and those without had been given leave not to report for juveniles not detained in the county.
- Mr. Bell asked for clarification on the phrase "Alternative Detention." Ms. Gardner supplied that the definition provided that an alternative was any program that included custody credits.
- Chair Steinhart commented that the current JDPS was too limited and offered Florida as an example of a more versatile and open system and suggested that thought be given to how to increase the capacity of the current system.
- Mr. Lopez asked for confirmation that "Rated Capacity" referred to total available beds at a facility and "Facility Detentions" referred to actual population of juveniles. Ms. Gardner confirmed and commented that, when JDPS was designed, there was a significant crowding issue and the Survey was intended to demonstrate the need for additional facilities. In the present, she noted, the empty beds often represented vacant wings and many facilities lacked adequate personnel to staff them, making the capacity somewhat misleading.
- Ms. McBrayer commented that Senate Bill (SB) 81 consisted largely of construction funds and still had approximately \$80 million available. She stated that it would be prudent to discuss a possible repurposing of SB 81 monies, given the vacancies in juvenile facilities represented in the Survey. She also asked for confirmation that the decisions reached by the 2009 ESC on expanding JDPS had not been implemented. Ms. Gardner so confirmed.
- Mr. Bell posed a question as to the purpose of the presentations and how they relate to the activity of the Committee. Chair Steinhart stated that the intention was for members to assimilate the information, discuss it, and formulate possible solutions or improvements.

2. Programs and grants

Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and Youthful Offender Block Grant Review

Ms. Kimberly Bushard presented the Committee with an overview of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA). She commented that JJCPA began in 2000 and the technological aspects of the reporting system were in dire need of updating and improvement.

She stated that JJCPA required reporting on six Outcome Measures, with two Outcomes (Completion of Restitution and Completion of Court or Community Service) provided much less valuable information than the others. Judge Kumli commented that counties were able to skew data on matters they controlled, which might explain why there were criticisms from the field on those two Outcomes. Ms. Bushard responded that funding was not tied to the Outcomes themselves, which limited the likelihood of such manipulation.

She also suggested that Arrest Rate would provide much more valuable data if it included disposition of charges. Ms. Bushard provided that this data was not case specific and, thus, analysis of the data over time only provided an average of the average. It was noted that this report, as opposed to the two earlier Surveys, was focused on Outcome Measures as opposed to statistical analysis on intake.

She next addressed the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program, which she noted had been intended to be modeled after JJCPA but, in practical application, had developed very differently. She added that JJCPA had explicit specifications of what funds could be directed to, whereas YOBG was more permissive in fundable juvenile justice issues.

Ms. Bushard informed the Committee that BSCC pulled samples from JCPSS and tasked counties with tracking those cases each year. The data revealed that only one-third of the sample received some form of YOBG-funded services. She added that three years of JJCPA data collection had demonstrated YOBG yielded insufficient information to draw a reliable inference on cause and effect in juvenile delinquency.

She noted that consideration should be given to program parameters and data collection objectives of YOBG. According to the data for the previous three years, 70% of funds had been spent on placement, with 75% of those monies expended on Salaries & Benefits.

Chair Steinhart noted that the funding and criteria were static for the next three years as part of Realignment, but the issue warranted consideration for the future. Ms. Burrell, referencing the Audit Report, inquired if there was any assistance this Committee could provide. Ms. Bushard thanked her for the consideration and noted that BSCC would respond to the Audit Report on September 11 on how cited deficiencies had been addressed. She added the matter would best be addressed if these programs were placed on the legislative calendar.

Dr. Herz commented that the purpose and structure of the data were issues that needed to be addressed, otherwise the paradoxical stance on data represented by the audits of BCIA and BSCC and problems that arise there from would continue.

AB 526 Implementation

Mr. Oscar Villegas presented information on the Gang Issues Standing Committee (GISC) and the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 526. He stated that GISC had been established this year and was chaired by Chief Maggard. The Committee was tasked with presented

recommendations to the board on AB 526. He explained that AB 526 had three components: consolidating the grant application process for funds with similar target populations and desired outcomes; establishing standards with local governments and improving services to the broader population; and developing allocation policies directing seventy percent of grant funds to promising and proven evidence-based practices addressing gang issues by January 1, 2014.

He stated that he wished to involve all Committees to ensure equitable opportunity for input on those recommendations, which will be presented at the meeting of the Board in November. It was noted that SACJJD had requested evidence-based strategies be broadly inclusive rather than focusing on programs and had also endorsed the addition of funding for re-entry programs.

Mr. Villegas commented that, due to the truncated timeline, lack of additional resources for handling this new responsibility, and the scope of AB 526 beyond the immediate future, GISC had engaged in discussions with the University of Cincinnati on the development of a process and options for training to meet GISC's mandate.

- Ms. McBrayer noted AB 526 as first drafted seemed to cover all juvenile justice grants in California, and that the bill was later amended to limit its application to gang-related grants in California. Judge Kumli commented that the language, "promising and proven," may lead to difficulties with implementation when transposing programs between different areas. Ms. McBrayer provided that the language mandated "promising and proven principles and practices" and had been rejected when the language referred specifically to programs.
- Ms. McBrayer requested clarification whether the seventy percent funding requirement for gang issues would be derived from the total funding for Title II, Title V, and JABG funds or only CalGRIP monies. Chair Steinhart replied the issue was open to interpretation and added BSCC was the first line of interpretation, which prompted Ms. McBrayer to suggest this be an issue for the Committee to address to the Board.

BREAK

Agenda Item E – Options for Reframing CA Juvenile Justice System Data & Performance Measures

A discussion among members addressed various options for revising or "retooling" California juvenile performance measures and data systems.

- Chair Steinhart commented that the BSCC has become the data and system performance hub of juvenile justice in the state. He stated this presented an opportunity and an obligation to promote revision and improvement. Dr. Herz had assisted in creating guidelines to pursue that end.
- Chair Steinhart described the State of Georgia's web clearinghouse for juvenile justice data, and Dr. Herz observed that this was an example of her earlier comments on data collection and the impact of planning for effective collection. She stated that the State of Georgia collects a single set of data rather than disparate projects of data, but structured the collection of that information in such a way to allow for production of both descriptive and evaluative information.
- Chair Steinhart described the prior efforts of the now extinct State Juvenile Justice Commission to produce a performance measure and data reform plan for California. The commission was required to produce this plan as part of SB 81 in 2007. In 2009, the plan was published as the state's Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan, including a detailed needs analysis of data systems and a set of related recommendations on data system improvements and performance outcome measures for the future. The Master Plan, while comprehensive and still instructive for our current efforts, was never implemented.

- The Chair noted that the only performance measure focused on in the Juvenile Justice Commission Master plan was recidivism. He commented that emerging information from the fields of scientific, medical, and social research regarding juveniles suggested the need to evaluate system performance using a wider array of developmental data points, such as educational achievement, than were covered in the Master Plan.
- Mr. Lopez asked whether there were rewards and sanctions for counties tied to their reporting and, if not, how they could be created. He also commented that JJSC should ensure they are following evidence-based practices and thoroughly analyzing and researching successful programs to find the best options and understand how they were implemented. He continued that he thought it appropriate to include a data systems analyst in the conversation, since the Committee lacked technical expertise on the creation and deployment of such systems.
- Judge Kumli commented that data collection criteria, methodology, and processes must be scrutinized to ensure data could not be manipulated by entities which stood to gain or upon whom the data could reflect poorly.
- Ms. McBrayer asserted the goal of data collection was to improve outcomes to youth, not implicate reporting bodies. Ms. Burrell countered she had observed a pervasive concern in the counties that data reporting would be used against them.
- Chief Davis noted it would be prudent if counties were held accountable to the data collected and their compliance with reporting requirements, but transparency in the initial motives of data collection would encourage compliance.
- On behalf of the staff, Ms. Scott stated that BSCC had investigated technical assistance and advice on technical systems and had been in contact with the Institute for Justice Information Systems (IJIS) in regards to extant and possible data collection systems throughout the State. Ms. Scott clarified that there had been no distinction made in BSCC's mandate between adult and juvenile data, providing for versatility in systems and options. Mr. Bell suggested staff contact Jefferson County, Louisiana to determine if IJIS had been involved with their recent overhaul which, he said, had taken a long time to implement.

Ms. McBrayer made a motion to table Agenda Item F until the next meeting and devote sufficient time to discourse on the topic of data and related matters; Chief Davis seconded the motion. Chair Steinhart took a visual vote and observed that the motion carried.

Agenda Item F – W. Haywood Burns Institute – Data Systems Survey Request

Mr. Bell presented information on the Burns Institute's efforts to conduct surveys in eleven of the thirteen Title II Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Technical Assistance Project (TAP) counties. These surveys were designed to discover the data capabilities of those counties. The results demonstrated that many counties did not have confidence in their data and were largely unable to access most data that would be of use for analytics. Mr. Bell added that most county programs had been designed with case management in mind rather than analytics. He stated that the Institute had then devised a second survey, directed at the Chief Probation Officer, Information Technology Director, and Data Analyst of each county, to provide additional information, including disruptions to the flow of communication and technical deficiencies. He informed the Committee that this second survey had been conducted as a pilot in Alameda County and it took the three specified individuals approximately thirty minutes to complete. Mr. Bell responded to Judge Kumli's inquiry as to whether the Institute reviewed the data as an aggregate or if they examined disparities in reporting between individuals surveyed, noting that they reviewed both.

At the conclusion of this discussion, members agreed to support the release of such survey presented by Mr. Bell.

Agenda Item G – Future Agenda Items

Ms. McBrayer stated that the meeting should be sooner than usual, suggesting a date in September. She observed that several issues in the near future could impact the direction of the Committee, such as the GISC recommendations, due before the Board in November, the determination of the amount of funding directed to gang issues that would constitute the mandated seventy percent, and the outcome of matters before the Board relating to the Edward Byrne JAG grant. She also suggested that the normal meeting time be changed to midday.

Ms. McBrayer made a motion the next meeting be sooner than the normal schedule, offering September as the ideal, and that the meeting time be changed from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. to 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.; Ms. Burrell seconded the motion. Chair Steinhart took a visual vote and observed that the motion carried. He stated that he would communicate with staff as to options available for the next meeting.

Agenda Item H – Public Comment

Mr. Michael Herrington, Criminal Justice Consultant, presented information to the Committee pertaining to the organization Parenting Without Limits. He commented that the organization was outstanding and employed a wrap-around approach to services, working with local providers dealing with juveniles. He outlined the approach employed as involving informed trauma care as well as family and group therapy. He added that the family strengthening component of the program was critical and had a significant positive impact on outcomes.

Mr. Herrington commented that evidence so far had pointed to the efficacy of the program and seven major entities had recognized it as an evidence-based program, including SAMHSA, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and California's clearinghouse. He added that evidence demonstrated the program had led to reductions in cost, time, and recidivism and should be considered by the Committee for presentation to the Board as a pilot program in California.

Judge Kumli inquired if the program included a screening process for families of juveniles diagnosed with conduct disorders under the Diagnostics and Statistics Manual V. Mr. Herrington stated the program included this as part of their evaluation process. Judge Kumli also inquired if, after being adopted by a court system, training would be provided on implementing the program. Mr. Herrington stated that such training was available.

Mr. Herrington concluded that the program, unlike most others, incorporated research capabilities and data collection in its design.

Agenda Item I – Adjournment

Chair Steinhart adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

STAFF ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Jean Scott, Deputy Director, CPP
Shaline Hunter, Field Representative, CPP
Kimberly Bushard, Field Representative, CPP
Oscar Villegas, Field Representative, CPP
Toni Gardner, Field Representative, FSO
Veronica Silva-Ramirez, Secretary, CPP