JUVENILE CORRECTIONS STUDY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER 1, 2018

Location: Wisconsin Department of Corrections
3099 East Washington Ave
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Secretary Cathy Jess, Department of Corrections

Secretary Jess opened the meeting and requested roll call.

ATTENDANCE/ROLL CALL

Glen A. Mercier II, Department of Corrections

Roll call was conducted by Glen A. Mercier II. The following members were present.

Representative Mark Born, Wisconsin State Assembly
Honorable M. Joseph Donald, Milwaukee County Circuit Court
Honorable William Domina, Waukesha County Circuit Court Judge
Ms. Marye Beth Dugan, Nehemiah Project, Executive Director
Superintendent Tony Evers, Department of Public Instruction
Sheriff Joseph Fath, Vilas County
Representative Evan Goyke, Wisconsin State Assembly
Superintendent Ed Kamin, Racine Juvenile Detention Center
Director Kris Korpela, Department of Human Services, Dunn County
District Attorney David Lasee, Brown County
Chief of Police Greg Leck, City of Stoughton
Administrator Mark Mertens, Division of Youth & Family Services, Milwaukee County
Mr. Fred Royal, President, NAACP Milwaukee
Sheriff Dale K. Schmidt, Washington County
Representative Michael Schraa, Wisconsin State Assembly
Secretary Linda Seemeyer, Department of Health Services
District Attorney Melinda Tempelis, Outagamie County
State Public Defender Kelli Thompson
Senator Van Wanggaard, Wisconsin State Senate
Mr. Carl Wesley, President, Center for Self-Sufficiency
Secretary Cathy Jess, Department of Corrections
Secretary Eloise Anderson, Department of Children & Families

The following members were present via teleconference.

Senator Lena Taylor, Wisconsin State Senate

The following members were not present.

Senator Alberta Darling, Wisconsin State Senate
Mr. Mike Dempsey, Executive Director, Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators

The following facilitators were present but not identified during roll-call.

Wendy Henderson, Director, Youth Services, Department of Children and Families
Marcel Maul, Director, Bureau of Real Estate Management, Department of Administration
Shelby McCulley, Assistant Administrator, Division of Juvenile Corrections, Department of Corrections

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Secretary Eloise Anderson, Department of Children and Families

Secretary Anderson reviewed the meeting agenda and public notice that was posted on September 26, 2018. She also reviewed the contents of the packets including the meeting minutes from September 14, 2018.

MOTION by Director Kris Korpela.

Move to accept September 14th meeting minutes.

Seconded by Chief Greg Leck.

Motion Passed without dissent.

AGENDA REVIEW & MEETING SCOPE

Secretary Cathy Jess, Department of Corrections

Secretary Jess discussed the current charge and purpose/goal of this meeting: *develop recommendations for the location of Type 1 juvenile correctional facilities*. The previous meeting set the stage with relevant background information. Secretary Jess reviewed the agenda and the contents of the meeting folders.

MENDOTA JUVENILE TREATMENT DISCUSSION

Tom Engels, Deputy Secretary, Department of Health Services

Deputy Secretary Tom Engels asked the committee if there were any questions regarding the Mendota Juvenile Treatment expansion.

Discussion:

- There was an inquiry as to whether or not direct placement of youth to Mendota Juvenile Treatment is feasible. This has been something that has been discussed and staff at the Departments of Health Services and Corrections are trying to review how the process would work. If a youth is directly placed at Mendota Juvenile Treatment, there would need to be a system outlining how youth would be returned to SRCC.

- Mendota Juvenile Treatment does not have the ability place females. However, in the expansion there is potential for 20 beds for females.
- There will be additional training requirements for Mendota Juvenile Treatment staff to ensure they are using trauma-informed principles.
- What happens with a child that needs immediate stabilization? The counties will need to review how they do this. Youth at Mendota Juvenile Treatment need more long-term stabilization. Counties seem to be more involved in short-term crisis situations and they may have more resources at their level.

JUVENILE CORRECTIONS POPULATION DATA

Shelby McCulley, Assistant Administrator, Division of Juvenile Corrections, Department of Corrections

Secretary Jess introduced Assistant Administrator Shelby McCulley.

Handout: Juvenile Corrections Population Data – Follow-up Handout

Assistant Administrator McCulley discussed three questions that came up during the last meeting.

- Division of Juvenile Corrections visiting overview.
- Juvenile correctional facility population and most serious offense.
- Juvenile corrections facility population and risk scores.

Assistant Administrator McCulley reviewed and explained the following data and concepts that were included in the handout.

- Chart 1 – Total visits and visitors, by year and type.
- Table 1 - Personal visits per average daily population.
- Chart 2 – Percent of unduplicated youth and personal visits.
- Table 2 – General bus statistics.
- Chart 3 – Most serious offense by commitment.
- Chart 4 – Commitment by most serious offense.
- Juvenile corrections facility population and risk assessment overview.
- Chart 5 – Risk assessment scores by commitment
- Chart 6 – Risk assessment scores by commitment at Copper Lake and Lincoln Hills schools.

Discussion:

- A committee member requested a copy of an assessment tool.
- There was a discussion about the YASI assessment tool versus adult COMPAS tools.
- A youth with an adult conviction would receive a new assignment after they transition to the adult system after they reach age 18.
- How do we correlate the data so we are comparing data similarly? How can we make the data understandable at each point of the process? There are several systems being used among counties. The Department of Children and Families is working on a unified assessment system (YASI). The Department of Corrections is working closely with them to help maintain consistency where possible. These systems should be cohesive.
- The Department of Children and Families can share more information about the YASI.

- Both departments are working to achieve uniformity with regard to assessments and have been including the counties in their decision-making.
- Inter-rater reliability is challenging yet important.
- It was also noted that decisions makers can also use professional judgement along with assessment tools to make placement decisions.

OVERVIEW OF SURPLUS STATE-OWNED LAND

Marcel Maul, Director, Bureau of Real Estate Management, Department of Administration

Administrator John Klenke was not able to present today. Director Maul will be presenting on surplus state-owned land.

Handout: Surplus land handout with maps (revised version).

Director Maul stated that the land listed on the handout is at least six acres. If committee members are interested in any of the properties on the list, the Department of Administration can get more detailed information. They can also see how they are currently being utilized or if they are in the process in being sold.

DISCUSS TYPE 1 LOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary Eloise Anderson, Department of Children and Families

Presented before the committee were the values and principles that could be considered for Type 1 facilities discussed at the previous meeting. These included the following:

- Support positive youth development.
- Family engagement.
- Successful transition to the community.
- Research-informed/evidence-based practice.
- Multi-disciplinary coordination and collaboration.

Secretary Anderson asked the committee if there were any others that should be considered.

Discussion: Proximity for family engagement should be considered. The physical location should be near populations that include youth in the justice system. Milwaukee area needs to be considered.

The following item was added to the guiding values and principles list:

- Proximity to home county.

Discussion:

- Engaging and collaborating with community organizations is important. How do we create a mechanism that allows for this?
- The Department of Corrections is working on a prototype of what this facility will look like based on best practices and recommendations that were discussed at previous meetings. They are looking at a facility with up to 32 beds in small pods. Many staff may be needed. There should be space for food service,

laundry, a multi-purpose room, an outdoor recreation area, and a calming room, that incorporates trauma-informed principles. It should not look institutionalized although it will have correctional security. Natural light is being considered as an important factor. The Department of Administration is working on a prototype that includes these concepts.
- Costs to counties sending youth to facilities needs to be considered. Type 1 facilities with serious juvenile offenders and adult commitments are state funded. Secure Residential Correctional Centers are county funded.

COMMITTEE BREAK

The committee took a break from 10:09am to 10:25am.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION – CRITERIA FOR SOUTHEAST WISCONSIN & BALANCE OF STATE LOCATIONS

Shelby McCulley, Assistant Administrator, Division of Juvenile Corrections, Department of Corrections
Wendy Hendricks, Director, Youth Services, Department of Children and Families

Director Hendricks and Assistant Administrator McCulley facilitated a discussion with the committee concerning criteria for the location of a Type 1 facility in Southeast Wisconsin and locations that could serve other youth throughout the state.

- **Proximity, accessibility, and ease of transportation for families.** Factors discussed included:
  - Therapeutic interventions.
  - Visitation frequency.
  - Credible messengers.
  - Downtown Milwaukee can be intimidating to families.
  - Number of families approximate to Milwaukee/Southeast Wisconsin.
  - Current visitation issues – do families struggle to visit youth?
  - Surrounding county access.
  - Are there other ways to encourage family members to visit?
  - Online experiences.
  - Cultural segregation.
  - Safety plan.
  - Other methods of communication.
  - Significant investment in technology for youth.
  - Use of technology for visitation.
  - Potential transportation options offered - Public transit and alternatives, bus lines, transportation times, van pool services, regional support for transportation.

- **Proximity to community resources.** Factors discussed included:
  - Collaborative partnerships.
  - Resources available to support the programming.
  - What programs are available locally in the community?
  - Relationships between facility and the professional staff
  - Community resources for families of youth who need resources themselves.
  - Transition times from a correctional environment to the community.
  - Services available after youth transition to community.

- Partnerships during case management.
- School districts partnerships.
- Use of technology for healthcare services.
- Access to medical care services.
- Access to pediatric services.
- Aftercare and transitional planning.
- Trauma-informed resources.
- Frequency of probation/parole agent contact.

- **Proximity to skilled/professional workforce.** Factors discussed included:
  - Staffing levels needed.
  - Availability of qualified professional staff.
  - Diversity.
  - Strong medical system.
  - Mental health providers.
  - Trauma-informed staff.
  - Drawing from technical/university systems.
  - Cultural relevancy.
  - Current partnerships that are already formed.
  - Commuting distance/time for workers.
  - Available non-profit organizations.
  - Technical college and university support.

- **Land type.** Factors discussed included:
  - Land near the zoo interchange.
  - The state would own the land.
  - Green space vs. urban environment look/feel.
  - Playgrounds for younger siblings.
  - Enough land to provide all services needed.
  - Outdoor recreation availability.
  - Existing facility conditions.

- **Other considerations.**
  - Inviting, approachable, and welcoming environment for family members, volunteers, staff, etc.
  - Transitional considerations/aftercare.
  - Budget criteria and reasonable costs for Type 1 facilities.
  - Consider buildings from previous meeting handouts.
  - Is there evidenced-based information regarding using technology for visitation?

NEXT STEPS & ADJOURNMENT

Shelby McCulley, Assistant Administrator, Division of Juvenile Corrections, Department of Corrections

Next meeting will be October 16th.

A motion for adjournment was requested.

MOTION by State Public Defender Kelli Thompson.

Move to adjourn.

Seconded by Melinda Tempelis.

Motion passed without dissent.

Meeting adjourned at 11:52am.

POST-MEETING ITEMS

Parking-lot items posted by committee members:

- Prior meeting: No parking lot items were posted during the previous meeting.
- Today's meeting: No new parking lot items were posted during this meeting.

Future meeting dates:

- October 16, 2018 – 9:00am – 12:00pm