

FINAL REPORT
JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Meeting Dates

Advisory Committee Charge

Summary of Meetings

Committee Information and Memoranda

Recommendations

Appendix

- "Iowa Report" - Report on the Iowa juvenile justice system by a consultant under contract with the American Correctional Association
- Child Welfare and Juvenile Plan - Five-year plan for child welfare and juvenile justice approved by Iowa Human Services Council

AVAILABILITY OF MINUTES

Copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Advisory Committee are available from the Legislative Service Bureau.

F I N A L R E P O R T

JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 1989

The Legislative Council created a Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee pursuant to a request contained in HF 2447 (appropriations to the Department of Human Services). The members of the Advisory Committee were as follows:

Senator Eugene Fraise, Chairperson
Representative Robert Fuller, Vice-Chairperson
Senator Ray Taylor
Representative Don Hermann
The Honorable Larry Eisenhauer, Des Moines
Ms. Pat Hendrickson, Davenport
Ms. Maribelle James, Council Bluffs
Mr. Ron Stehl, Des Moines
Ms. Joan Vagts, Des Moines,
Mr. Lynn Vorbrich, Des Moines,

MEETING DATES

The Legislative Council granted the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee four meeting days. The meetings were held on August 19, 1988, September 23, 1988, November 18, 1988, and December 9, 1988.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARGE

The charge of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee was to: "Develop a plan for the future use of the Eldora and Toledo juvenile institutions to improve Iowa's juvenile justice system. Plan will include needs statement; type of juveniles to be served; length of stay; type of programming needed; and modifications in juvenile justice system including law, the Department of Human Services, the courts, and a tracking system upon a child's release from an institution."

SUMMARY OF MEETINGS

For the first meeting on August 19, 1988, the Advisory Committee received invited testimony describing the juvenile justice system in the state. Seven speakers provided written and oral testimony regarding the parts of the juvenile justice system which are directly managed and operated by the state.

Mr. Dean Luxford, superintendent of the state Juvenile Home at Toledo, delivered a comprehensive overview of the Home which included history, changes in mission, current types of children in residence (adjudicated delinquent girls and Child in Need of Assistance (CINA's)), treatment program, staffing and living arrangements, and education program. He expressed concern about overcrowding, shortened average lengths of stay, funding limitations, lack of control over admissions, and the Home's use as a "placement of last resort".

Mr. Steve Huston, superintendent of the state Training School at Eldora, delivered a similar overview of the Training School. In addition, Mr. Huston expressed concern that the role of the Training School is not clear, resulting in placement of children that may be more appropriately placed elsewhere. He referred to the latest accreditation report from the American Correctional Association which contains positive comments regarding program and is critical of the condition of facilities. He stated that while the new funding approved in 1988 will help alleviate staff problems, the Training School will still be short of the student to staff ratio required of private providers.

Ms. Almo Hawkins, administrator of the Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse under the Iowa Department of Public Health, described the Alliance's efforts to promote and encourage coordination of services in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse prevention, intervention, treatment, and drug enforcement.

Ms. Pat Hendrickson, member of the Advisory Committee, Chairperson of the Toledo Advisory Committee, and Chief Juvenile Court Officer of Scott County, outlined the authority of the juvenile court to order and modify orders for placement of children. Types of cases include, but are not limited to, delinquency, mental health, substance abuse, and CINA. In addition, juvenile courts provide probation and can contract for local programming.

Mr. James Peterson, Assistant Citizen's Aide/Ombudsman, made a number of observations including the need for an improved data management system, problems with a child's transition from an institution to a bifurcated aftercare system, multiple placements, serious deterioration of the Eldora facilities, and too many students supervised by too few staff for rehabilitation purposes.

Mr. Harold Templeman, Division of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Developmental Disabilities of the Department of Human Services, described services to children at the state mental health institutes. The services consist of evaluations and treatment of mental health disorders or substance abuse.

Mr. Gil Cerveny, juvenile justice specialist for the Division of Children, Youth, and Families of the Department of Human Rights, described the responsibility of the Division to administer funds under the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Mr. Cerveny's remarks included recommendations to restrict secure custody of juveniles to those most in need by using a classification system and an expression of concern about inappropriate usage of the MHI's.

At the September 13, 1988, meeting there were presentations regarding the legislative history of the Advisory Committee and an overview of the system from the perspective of private providers.

Senator Charles Bruner discussed recent improvements at Eldora and Toledo and the chronic problems with the system. He strongly recommended that the Advisory Committee focus its attention on the two institutions in its study of the juvenile justice system and resulting recommendations.

Mr. Eric Sage, Bureau of Adult, Children, and Family Services of the Department of Human Services, described the progress made by the Department in fulfilling the General Assembly's directives for changes in the juvenile justice system. He also discussed an analysis of the population at Eldora which among other items indicated that a larger than anticipated number of youth are sent to Eldora for their first placement.

Ms. Mary Nelson, Bureau of Adult, Children, and Family Services of the Department of Human Services, discussed the efforts of the Governor's Out-of-State-Placement Committee to reduce the number of children committed to programs outside of the state.

Ms. Joan Vagts, Advisory Committee member and executive director of the Coalition for Children and Family Services in Iowa, and Mr. Bill McCarty, director of Youth Homes, Inc. of Iowa City and member of the Coalition discussed and distributed a list of recommendations prepared by the Coalition.

Mr. Jim Wacker, director of Youth Homes of Mid-America and member of the Coalition, made a number of personal recommendations. They included reducing the number of beds at Eldora to 100 and closing Toledo with private providers accepting this population; and if the first two options are not enacted, then sufficient resources should be appropriated in order for the institutions to provide quality services, and reduce out-of-state placements.

In the afternoon portion of the meeting, the Advisory Committee visited a small group home and main campus of the Youth Homes of Mid-America.

At the meeting of November 18, 1988, the Advisory Committee heard recommendations from Mr. Russ Van Vleet, a juvenile justice consultant underwritten by the American Correctional Association

and the federal government to provide technical assistance and heard a presentation of a five-year plan from Department of Human Services staff.

Mr. Van Vleet conducted a two-day visit which included on-site visits to Eldora and Toledo and meetings with officials of the Department of Human Services, the Judicial Department, the Coalition for Family and Children's Services in Iowa, Committee Members, and legislators. His recommendations were restated in a document entitled "Iowa Report" which is attached and by this reference made a part of this report.

Mr. Eric Sage and Ms. Mary Nelson of the Department of Human Services distributed and discussed a five-year plan for the juvenile institutions which was recommended to the Governor by the Council on Human Services. The plan is attached and by this reference made a part of this report.

At the final meeting of the Advisory Committee on December 9, 1988, the agenda included discussion and passage of recommendations.

COMMITTEE INFORMATION AND MEMORANDA

The Advisory Committee considered the following printed documents which have been placed on file with the Legislative Service Bureau:

1. A monograph entitled: "Final Recommendations: Iowa Juvenile Home Advisory Committee" (January 1988).
2. A monograph entitled: "Final Recommendations: State Training School Advisory Committee" (January 1988).
3. A report prepared by the Bureau of Adult, Children, and Family Service of the Department of Human Services entitled: "Funding Decategorization - An Approach to Welfare Reform" (February 1988).
4. The final report of the Child Placement Study Advisory Committee of the Department of Human Services, (October 1985).
5. An executive summary of a report prepared by the Department of Human Services entitled "Recommendations for Study of Child Welfare in Iowa" (December 1983).
6. A report of the proceedings of an Iowa youth services workshop sponsored by the Department of Human Services at Springbrook State Park entitled: "They're Our Children: A Progress Report on Community Services to Iowa's Juveniles" (September 1981).

7. Two booklets published by Center for the Study of Youth Policy of the University of Michigan School of Social Work entitled "Reinvesting Youth Corrections Resources: A Tale of Three States" and "Juvenile Justice Reform: The Bellwether States" (May 1988).
8. Two reports prepared by the National Conference of State Legislatures entitled "Youth Corrections in Utah: Remaking a System" and "Current Juvenile Justice Issues Facing State Legislatures" (1988).
9. A policy statement prepared by the American Correctional Association entitled "Public Correctional Policy on Juvenile Corrections" (1988).
10. Remarks of Ms. Almo Hawkins, Administrator of the Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse.
11. A description of the State Training School at Eldora.
12. A copy of the compliance audit conducted at Eldora by the American Correctional Association.
13. A description of the Iowa Juvenile Home at Toledo.
14. A description of the juvenile court system prepared by Ms. Pat Hendrickson.
15. A report on the State Training School prepared by Mr. James Peterson, Assistant Citizen's Aide/Ombudsman.
16. An overview of juvenile services provided at the state mental health institutes.
17. Testimony of Mr. Gil Cervený, juvenile justice specialist with the Division of Children, Youth, and Families of the Department of Human Rights.
18. Proposals for agendas, issues, and sources of technical assistance prepared by the Legislative Service Bureau.
19. A presentation and plan prepared by Ms. Joan Vagts for the Coalition for Family and Children's Services in Iowa.
20. A report on out-of-state group foster care placements prepared by Ms. Mary Nelson of the Department of Human Services.
21. A report on the Department of Human Services progress on legislative directives prepared by Mr. Eric Sage of DHS.
22. Reports on governmental expenditures for juvenile justice prepared by the Legislative Fiscal Bureau and Legislative Service Bureau.

23. A report entitled "Legal Dispositions and Confinement Policies for Delinquent Youth" (July 1988), prepared by the National Conference of State Legislatures.

24. An information packet prepared and mailed by Mr. Bill Reichardt.

25. A five-year child welfare and juvenile plan approved by the Council on Human Services for submission to the Governor and General Assembly.

26. A report on the numbers of boys who were admitted to the State Training School from 1984 to 1987 and were later admitted to the adult corrections system facility at Oakdale prepared by Mr. Steve Huston, Superintendent of the Training School.

27. An analysis of the Council on Human Services recommendations to the Governor for major maintenance and capital expansion at Eldora and Toledo prepared by Mr. Steve Conway, Senate Democratic Caucus.

28. A report on expenditures and per diems at the juvenile institutions prepared by the Legislative Service Bureau.

29. A copy of the juvenile portion of Utah's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Criminal Justice (November 1978) provided by Mr. Van Vleet.

30. A listing of all DHS major maintenance and capital improvement priorities for FY 90 prepared by Mr. William Armstrong of DHS.

31. A set of scenarios for status quo, closing, or reducing the population at the juvenile institutions prepared by the Department of Human Services.

32. A copy of the full recommendations to the Governor by the Council on Human Services provided by Mr. John Fairweather of DHS.

33. A copy of a report entitled "Reforming the California Youth Authority" provided by Mr. Van Vleet.

34. A copy of a listing of community-based alternative programs for juveniles under contract to the Utah Division of Youth Corrections provided by Mr. Van Vleet.

35. A copy of Mr. Van Vleet's report to the Committee entitled "Iowa Report".

36. A copy of Mr. Van Vleet's report to the American Correctional Association entitled "Technical Assistance Report".

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the following items of the five-year plan proposed by the Council on Human Services be adopted by the General Assembly with the time schedule outlined in the proposal:

a. The proposal for capital improvements and remodeling the State Training School at Eldora.

b. The proposal to end state institutional care of children adjudicated as a Child in Need of Assistance (CINA) at the State Juvenile Home at Toledo.

2. That a classification system which will reduce the number of youth committed to Eldora be put in place.

3. That the five-year plan proposed by the Council on Human Services in regard to foster care and home-based services (family-centered services) be adopted and that per diems paid to private providers be increased to accomodate the resulting increase in service costs.

4. That the Code of Iowa be amended to permit the juvenile court to order supervision of an adjudicated delinquent youth until the age of 21 upon the recommendation of a juvenile authority.

5. That the Code of Iowa be amended to require that consistent criteria for classification is established to protect the community and that evaluations are performed to determine the needs of the child in both the pre and post dispositional process utilized by the juvenile court.

6. That the delivery of services to juveniles under the Department of Human Services be restructured to establish a division for services related to juvenile corrections which is separate from programs related to CINA and other youth services.

7. That the number of Department of Human Services staff who are responsible for supervision of youth following release from a state juvenile institution be increased.

JUJU,1186AC
jp/sw:jw/5

A P P E N D I X

- "Iowa Report" - Report on the Iowa juvenile justice system by a consultant under contract with the American Correctional Association
- Child Welfare and Juvenile Plan - Five-year plan for child welfare and juvenile justice approved by Iowa Human Services Council

IOWA REPORT

Prepared by: Russ Van Vleet, Consultant
Salt Lake City, Utah
December 1, 1988

First impressions of the Iowa system are that it is not unlike 10-15 other states I have visited over the last few years.

There is system discontent which has bred mistrust between the three branches of government which creates a lack of cooperation and misinformation which results in a system replete with questionable direction.

The Institutions (buildings) are in disrepair, in need of extensive renovation and continue to exist with an outdated mandate, questionable philosophy and an operational budget which, if continued, will lead Iowa to a financial crisis.

The private sector anxiously waits in the wings wanting to be an equal partner but not enjoying the confidence of the government and its' own interests being questioned by those whose institutions and programs are under scrutiny. The division of labor and the disparity in reimbursement has led to a system of out-of-sight-out-of-mind facilities that are at the same time, both economic necessities and economic dilemmas for the state.

The system mandate is very unclear since Medical Model terminology and program design abound within Eldora and Toledo, yet the unspoken seems to be that of general agreement that most of the youth at Toledo and at least half those at Eldora could be comfortably located in community based correction systems.

Since the Mandate is unclear and no sense of mission exists (at least not a state wide shared mission) the organizational issues are confusing. Is Iowa operating a child welfare system with an institution of CHINAS on one end and a training school for boys on the other? Or is it a corrections system that is partially penetrated by non-delinquent placements?

Since Iowa has distinguished between CHINA and delinquents there is an implied corrections philosophy inherent in one end of the system (Eldora). That mandate is not embraced by Eldora however, since treatment models that tolerate runaways are a part of Eldora. Running away is

okay since public safety is not an issue. If public safety is not an issue then you have to ask the question of appropriateness of placement and the larger question of need for facility and/or number of "secure" beds.

At the same time, Toledo operates as a facility for CHINAS (children-in-need-of-assistance) who, in theory, if not always in fact are victims and not perpetrators of delinquent acts. This perpetuates a philosophy of orphanages or shelter care that is reminiscent of the turn of the century approach to child welfare. These youth, in most states are maintained in their home communities, usually at less cost to the state, and certainly without the attendant risk that institutional programs create, i.e., detention and program disciplines that often result in CHINAS spending a greater time in the system than do youth adjudicated delinquents.

These two facilities, if maintained will require somewhere in the neighborhood of \$15,000,000 to repair and renovate and approximately \$10,000,000 annually to operate.

If the question confronting Iowa is allocation of scarce resources and one is to put aside the philosophical debate that is a part of such a state system it seems that economics alone requires that Iowa adopt a different strategy. I understand in suggesting an economic review that small-town Iowa is economically dependent on these two facilities but I also understand that the greater good, for both child and Iowa taxpayers, is served by a change in philosophy and an attendant reduction and/or closing of one or both of these facilities.

The issue in Iowa, like every other state I have visited is one of political leadership. It seems quite clear what needs to happen, but the question is whether there is sufficient political courage to make it happen. The roles of the Governor, key legislators, state staff, private sector and public need to be assessed and determined and a general direction developed through a task force convened by the Governor.

Iowa can take solace in the experiences of other states and in understanding the national perspective of youth-at-risk. The at risk population (10-18) is declining, juvenile arrests are down, status offenders are being arrested 64% less often in the last ten years. We know that as crime decreases court sanctions stiffen, institutions fill up, length-of-stay goes up, minority youth find their way to the facility and that 40% of all children in the Juvenile Justice System are status offenders or abused, neglected

youth. They are mostly substance abusers, they are mentally ill, but they are not for the most part, seriously delinquent. Many may be chronic in their delinquency, but few represent clear threats to public safety and require secure lock-up programming

National trends show a system becoming more formal, restrictive, and punitive, and this mostly manifests itself through the continuation of large institutions whose purpose is questioned but whose roots are so community entrenched as to make change both laborious and hurtful.

We tend to perpetuate these old systems because we aren't sure what really works, we embrace ideologies, both political and philosophical that are often not substantiated by fact, and we thrust personal beliefs on state systems. We perpetuate myths that pray to public misconceptions and fears. The notion of deterrence and prison cures are the most used and yet we know there is no relationship between corrections philosophy and crime rate. Crime is a product of society and responds to police activity. Getting them off the street won't stop crime since we know that one has to return each time one is placed and we also know that we are just as successful at making kids worse as making them better when they penetrate our large institutions.

Status offenders do not necessarily become chronic delinquents and therefore facilities like Toledo don't necessarily deter, they only provide a perceived respite to the community. The same could be achieved in a far less intrusive way if such benefit is really achievable.

The major question is how to most effectively allocate juvenile justice resources so as to maximize both public and child protection.

What did Utah do? It didn't abandon rehabilitation, it continued to "treat" all youth, but an emphasis was placed on individualized care, with strong supervision in a community based corrections system. It did close its' old Youth Development Center that housed from 200 to 400 kids over the 80 years of its existence, and replaced it with two secure, 30 bed facilities, one in Ogden, and one in Salt Lake to handle 60 youth we decreed really constituted a public threat and needed secure custody.

Utah's system changed because the facility was in disrepair (as is Iowa's), the care was not humane, the ACLU sued the state, and we all agreed that there was a better

way to do business. Heavy reliance on a large dormitory style facility was no longer necessary, environmentally feasible, nor in the best interest of the youth of our state.

The reform process included a settlement of the lawsuit. This required a change in current practices at that time, but also an expectation of the closure of the facility.

Governor Scott Matheson convened a task force to examine the entire system which made the following recommendations for the juvenile system:

- * Removal of runaways
- * Adherence to philosophy of "least restrictive setting" - "Deinstitutionalization".
- * Reliance on private sector
- * Commitment and release guidelines.
- * Masterplanning

The Masterplan that came out of the Blue Ribbon Task Force included the following:

- * Mission statement
- * Architectural assessment
- * Client data analysis
- * System snapshot
- * Structured Decision Making
 - Number of beds
 - Commitment/release guidelines
 - Statutory change.
 - Regionalization
 - Observation and assessment centers
 - Close the Youth Development Center
 - Build two 30 bed facilities
 - Creation of multi-use facilities in rural areas.

The community programming that came out of this Utah reform included a continuum of care that ranged from foster care to specialized psychiatric residential placement, but the emphasis was on individualized care. The Proctor Advocate model borrowed from Massachusetts has been the cornerstone of this model. It emphasizes individual placement with a single adult utilizing tracker care (small caseloads, 3-4 contacts a day or a week). The assumption is that youth need role modeling, not surrogate parents, and that they need supervision more than therapy.

In addition, alternative schools, family therapy and specialized placement allowed for youth to be placed regionally across the state with little reliance on secure care, few out-of-state placements and at no increased total cost to the state.

The actual program costs varied from \$15.00 for foster care, to \$50.00 per day for Proctor, \$22.00 per day for tracker to \$115.00 per day for secure care.

The result of this reform is a system that is humane, secure, and not jeopardizing public safety. Dr. Barry Krisberg of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) conducted a three (3) year study of the Utah system and has this to say: "The Utah experience proves that a strong effective system based on community care can be successful in reducing delinquent activity."

"There is nothing in the Utah experience that suggests that closing the Youth Development Center and the development of community programs jeopardized public safety."

Utah has shown that change is not only possible but also desirable.

If Iowa wants to change it must have political commitment, a Master Planning effort, legislative changes, a reallocation of funds and an administrative climate that allows for extensive change in a system-wide cooperative effort.

With a strong coalition of interests, utilization of other state experiences, and bi-partisan support, Iowa can change.

Let me share with you my impressions of Iowa and my recommendations.

I IOWA IMPRESSIONS

A. Not unlike many other states

- 1) "Out of sight...out of mind"
- 2) Institutional philosophies
- 3) Reliance on residential placements
- 4) Few alternatives
- 5) Questionable working relationships
- 6) No clear philosophy or agency mission

B. Eldora

- 1) Well managed
- 2) Crowded
- 3) In need of repair
- 4) Outdated
- 5) Caught between treatment and justice models
- 6) Not really secure (AWOL rate)
- 7) Release based on institutional adjustment not on committing offense.
- 8) Are the right kids there?
- 9) Do they all need to be there?
- 10) Management
 - a. 200 plus kids = understaffed
 - b. Success rate may suggest wrong population
 - c. Cost analysis would suggest portions too expensive.

- 1 - Detention component
- 2 - Others?

Summary: Relatively speaking, a good facility whose usefulness is probably past.

C. Toledo

- 1) Well-managed, caring facility
- 2) probably one of the few CHINA institutions still in operation.
- 3) Utilizes well accepted treatment approaches
- 4) Villages comparison (similar to the villages a community based program in Topeka, Kansas)
- 5) Girls placements - Why are they there?
- 6) Use of security - Institutional management
- 7) Status offenders - violation of JD Act.
- 8) Mitchellville transfer/locked to open/shows system can change.
- 9) Why are girls or CHINAS placed and then confined?
- 10) How many are there who are victims?
- 11) How many could be handled in less restrictive settings?

Summary: Really can't justify programmaticaly, politically or economically.

D. Private sector community system inadequate, not trusted and under-utilized.

II RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Do not authorize renovation funds until some decision about the number of beds in system is determined.
- 1) 15-25 million in capital improvements commits the state to a system it cannot afford.
 - a) New Jersey example - The 'get tough' policy of the 1980's is costing far more than anyone predicted and is yielding little or nothing in the way of better crime control.
 - b) California example - 9,000 locked up - 2 billion budget - no end in sight.
- B. Develop Classification System
- 1) System Snapshot
 - 1 - What does it really look like?
 - 2 - What is the profile of youth in Eldora, Toledo, private system?
 - 2) Apply criteria to Eldora and Toledo (Use other state examples and your own for comparison)
 - a) Colorado
 - b) Rhode Island
 - c) Oregon
 - d) Develop your own from snapshot
 - 3) Do extensive audit to determine "real costs" of care.
 - a) Factor hidden costs
 - b) Break out separate units for cost of care.
 - 4) Consider Legislative Changes
 - a) Jurisdiction of court - commitment and release
No to youth authority/Yes to division responsibility
 - b) Separate division for delinquent youth - separation of CHINAS and delinquents may help separate them institutionally and programmatically.
 - 5) Review current placement practices.
 - a) "Justice by Geography" Rural areas commit sooner? Fewer alternatives in some areas of state.

- b) "Justice by Gender" Apply classification to girl placements. If they have to be treated differently - How much? If the same classification scheme is applied to girls in the system, they will almost all have to be moved to community.
- 6) Community based Corrections?
 - a) Determine role
 - b) Review cap - \$68.00 won't buy needed services
 - c) Don't base contracts on success
 - d) Make equal partners
 - e) Outcome measures are artificial - don't expect of private what you don't expect of state
 - 7) Do not build state diagnostic and reception centers
 - 8) Do not build system on failed placements
 - a) Develop continuum of care
 - b) Develop "system patience"
 - c) Allow providers to handle all youth not defined as secure custody
 - d) Secure care is not backup to community programs
 - 9) Regionalize entire system
 - 10) Recognize that there is substantial agreement in system at least on these areas:
 - a) Adherence to least restrictive setting
 - b) Reliance on community based programs
 - c) Downsize Eldora
 - d) Develop diversion to Eldora and Toledo
 - e) Develop Diagnostic and Assessment Centers

- f) Increase aftercare
 - g) Bring kids back from out-of-state
 - h) Don't allow training school to become backup to community
- 11) Identify political leadership - the decision to renovate, close and/or downsize is the most important one you will make for Iowa's youth.
- a) Who will be responsible?
 - Governor > Task Force
 - Legislature >
- 12) Recognize political and economic realities. Economic considerations may allow the system to reform to proper system. The money will drive political decision.

II WHAT SHOULD SYSTEM LOOK LIKE

- 1 - Close/downsize Eldora - 90 to 100 beds
- 2 - Close Toledo
- 3 - Go to a community based system
- 4 - Do not convert budget savings to group care. System must be program diverse.
- 5 - Rely heavily on individualized placements
- 6 - Develop good day treatment - alternative schools
- 7 - Completely regionalize
- 8 - Create O & A facilities on a regional not state-wide basis.
- 9 - Require aftercare through case management system that is state operated.
- 10 - Management Information System (MIS) - Create a system that tracks kids so that measures of success can be developed.
- 11 - Do not send kids out of state. Good community system in state will handle them.

A total system review should result in a budget conversion sufficient to reform system.

A three to five year period allows for system and institutional conversion.

Summary: Given a strong plan, carefully developed, Iowa can confront the reality of the need to change. A three to five year period allows for staff transition and facility conversion to other use. It isn't necessary to harm staff or kids in this process. Not undertaking this reform will be harmful in the long run, both to Iowa's troubled youth, and to it's economy.

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE PLAN

FIVE YEAR GOALS

- o Prevention services available statewide

- o Family-centered services (including Family Preservation, Intensive Reunification and Aftercare) available statewide to all eligible families

- o Standardized, community based Diagnostic and Evaluation Services available statewide

- o Family foster care enhanced to serve children otherwise placed in group foster care

- o Group foster care enhanced to serve children otherwise placed in a juvenile institution or out-of-state

- o Toledo and Eldora provide care to youth with long history of delinquency and out-of-home placements

- o On-going training for DHS and provider staff

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE PLAN (5 YEAR)

- PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS -

	<u>1) 90</u>	<u>2) 91</u>	<u>3) 92</u>	<u>4) 93</u>	<u>5) 94</u>
<u>Eldora</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Law change reduces population to 200, phase out MR/MH youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 50 Delinquent youth to Toledo campus, MR/MH population removed, Eldora population reduced to 150 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase out DBE population reduced to 120 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eldora population remains at 120 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construct new gym 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remodel 3rd living unit - 2 cottages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construct new school/vocational training complex
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group care licensure staffing standards met - DBE and short term programs continued - Remodel 1 living unit - 2 cottages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remodel 2nd living unit - 2 cottages 			<p>Ongoing Service Components:</p> <p><u>Institutions</u></p>
<u>Toledo</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Law change reduces population to 90, phase out MR/MH youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population continues at 90, 50 Delinquent males phased in from Eldora - End State institutional care for CINA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population at 90 - DBE phased out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population at 90 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eldora - 120 male delinquents with long histories of delinquency and out-of-home placements
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical major maintenance - Group licensure staffing standards met - DBE and short term programs 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toledo - 90 female and male delinquents with history of delinquency and out-of-home placements
<u>Independence MH</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase in 20 new MH beds, enhanced treatment for youngsters with MH diagnosis and behavioral problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20 adolescent MH beds operate full year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20 adolescent MH beds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20 adolescent MH beds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MH - 20 beds for enhanced treatment for MH/behavioral problem youngsters

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE PLAN (5 YEAR)

- FOSTER CARE -

1) 90

Enhanced Residential Treatment

- Contract to develop new payment methodology for foster care

- Enhance 115 additional beds (85 to reduce out-of-state by 50% and 30 beds to serve CINA, Delinquent and MK/MH clients from the juvenile institutions) for a total of 159 enhanced beds

Enhanced Family Foster Care

- Expand enhanced family foster care by 85 beds for a total of 115 beds to prevent or shorten group placement
- Develop brochure, TV PSA and videotape to recruit foster parents

2) 91

- Enhance 115 additional residential treatment beds (65 beds to expand out-of-state removal efforts and 50 to accommodate CINA population from Toledo campus) for a total of 274 enhanced beds

- Expand enhanced foster family care beds by 115 for a total of 230 beds to prevent or shorten group care placements

- Revise and update foster care recruitment materials

3) 92

- 274 enhanced beds
- Implement standard community based D&E procedure
- Enhance independent living program as a component of aftercare

- Expand enhanced foster family beds by 30 for a total of 260 beds to prevent or shorten group care placements

- Revise and update foster care recruitment materials

4) 93

- 274 enhanced beds
- Continue to develop enhanced independent living and community based D&E services

- 260 enhanced beds

- Revise and update foster care recruitment materials

5) 94

- 274 enhanced beds for youth with severe emotional/behavioral problems or dual diagnosis of mental health and educational problems; payment system revised to encourage provision of needed programs

- 260 enhanced beds recruited and developed for youth otherwise placed in group foster care/residential treatment

- Continue to revise and update foster care recruitment

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE PLAN (5 YEAR)

- HOME-BASED -

	<u>1) 90</u>	<u>2) 91</u>	<u>3) 92</u>	<u>4) 93</u>	<u>5) 94</u>
<u>Family-Centered</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intensive family reunification to 70 families per month - Continue cooperative family preservation/family-centered training for DHS and private agency staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue intensive family reunification to 70 families per month - Expand family preservation/family-centered training for DHS and private agency staff - Establish a D&E standard procedure as well as rate of payment - Establish aftercare projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to expand intensive family reunification - Continue family-centered efforts - Continue training efforts - Family preservation statewide - Implement standard D&E procedure - Expand aftercare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to expand intensive family reunification - Continue family-centered efforts - Continue training efforts - Family preservation statewide - Implement standard D&E procedure - Expand aftercare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Services available statewide to all eligible families - Family preservation available statewide - Aftercare services available statewide - Projects for intensive family reunification available statewide - Ongoing training for DHS and provider staff - Standard D&E services available statewide
<u>Prevention</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue domestic abuse, child abuse and adolescent pregnancy projects, and child care resource and referral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue domestic abuse, child abuse, adolescent pregnancy projects with child care resource and referral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue prevention efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue prevention efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expanded prevention services available statewide