DELAWARE RE-ENTRY EDUCATION TASK FORCE
October 31, 2014
9:30 a.m.
Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Multi-Purpose Facility, Building #9 (Conference Room 1)
1825 Faulkland Rd., Wilmington, DE 19805

MEETING MINUTES

Task Force members in attendance:
Ed Atwood, Justice of the Peace Court
Patricia Dailey Lewis on behalf of The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Attorney General's Office
Jennifer Davis, Department of Education
Nancy Dietz, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Karl Hines on behalf of The Honorable Robert M Coupe, Department of Correction
Eliza Hirst on behalf of Tania Culley, Office of the Child Advocate
Frederika Jenner, Delaware State Education Association
Tyrone Jones, AstraZeneca
The Honorable Chandlee Johnson Kuhn, Family Court, New Castle County Courthouse
Kendall Massett, Delaware Charter Schools Network
The Honorable Jennifer Ranji (Chair), Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
John Sadowski on behalf of The Honorable Mark T. Murphy, Dept. of Education
Laurisa Schutt, Teach for America Delaware
Kim Siegel on behalf of The Honorable Matthew Denn, Lieutenant Governor's Office
Dory Zatuchni, Jewish Family Services of Delaware

Others in attendance:
Charles Adams, Teach for America Philadelphia
Kit Lunger, Office of the Public Defender
Angie Porter, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Anthony Powell, Kingswood Community Center
Richard Morse, ACLU
Cara Sawyer, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Kelly Schaffer, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families (consultant)
Elizabeth Seigle, Council for State Governments Justice Center

1. Welcome and Introductions

Secretary Ranji welcomed the group to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. She noted we are in the process of understanding what is happening here in Delaware as well as what is happening in other states. Meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.

2. <u>Report Outs</u>

Secretary Ranji stated we are trying to get the best data on what is happening educationally to the kids leaving secure care. It is challenging to find out where all kids are. Angie Porter provided data on a cohort of children who were in secure care in 2012 and Kelly Schaffer reviewed the data in DELSIS to see what happened to the children.

Kelly Schaffer presented information summarized on a handout about a cohort of students who were in Youth Rehabilitative Services (YRS) secure care in 2012. Ms. Schaffer stated that the cohort includes 66 total students who were at Ferris, Mowlds Cottage and Grace Cottage. Most students were at Ferris. Students entered their placement mid-late 2012 and left late 2012 to early 2013. Next, she reviewed demographic information stating that a majority, 59%, of students did not have a special education need identified. 40% did have a special education need, which included learning disability, emotional disturbance or other health impairment. The current age of the students is 17 to 20, meaning that they would have been 15 to 17 years old when in their secure care placement. Three students in the cohort are now deceased.

Ms. Schaffer spoke about students' pathway after leaving their YRS secure care placement. Most students transferred within YRS to another placement before leaving. 12% of students went directly to a traditional school, 3 went to a district alternative program and 1 went to a CDAP program. There are also 7 students for which their pathway is unknown. When searching for these students in DELSIS it does not appear there are records that exist after they left their YRS secure care placement. Since so many students transferred within YRS after their secure care placement we also looked at where students went after leaving YRS, regardless of how long they may have stayed in YRS care after their secure care placement. For 45% of the students, their last known placement was YRS and then there is not a record on file afterwards. A third of

students transitioned directly back to a traditional school, 11% to a CDAP program, 8% to a district alternative program and 3% to a charter school. Next, Ms. Schaffer described the number of known placements the students have had since their YRS secure care placement. Nearly a third of students transitioned 3-4 times, and 15% have transitioned up to 5 to 7 times.

Ms. Schaffer stated that when looking at the current status of students there is some information that is unknown. For 45 out of the 66 students we do not know their current status. 20% of the cohort is currently enrolled in school, 3 students are in the care of YRS, 3 are deceased and 2 dropped out due to truancy. Ms. Schaffer explained that of 13 students who are currently enrolled, 5 are in a traditional school, 4 in a CDAP alternative program, 2 in a district alternative program and 2 in charter schools.

Ms. Schaffer described what we know as the reasons some students have an unknown current status. When researching students' records we found 33 students had a most recent record that said they left YRS and went to a Delaware public school. However, no public school opened a record for them afterwards. This makes up half of the students for which there is an unknown current status. We will be working to find out more about what might have happened to these students. Their records are in the system up until they left YRS and then we don't know where they went. The other unknown statuses are due to students transitioning to Groves School (3), registered no show (3), transfer to out of state school (2), left a CDAP program for a reason recorded as "other" (2), no data is present on placement after YRS (1), and no exit data was recorded by the student's school (1).

Secretary Ranji noted that we are continuing to explore whether or not we can find out where the students with unknown statuses went. She acknowledged this is Ms. Schaffer's first time using DELSIS and we are continuing to learn what data is available. Ms. Schaffer noted that a

staff member from Woodbridge School District Was helpful in providing information to her on how to pull data and interpret the codes in DELSIS. Ms. Schaffer stated that the students for which we have unknown statuses have records in DELSIS, but those records end with them leaving YRS. John Sadowski confirmed that we would see separate line items in DELSIS for students who have left YRS and enrolled in a school. Ms. Schaffer confirmed she was pulling all available student records and looking at all records that exist for students.

A Task Force member commented that this data is a reminder of the need to have everyone at the same table for the reenrollment process.

Nancy Dietz stated that the department should have information in its FACTS database about where the kids went after YRS. A Task Force member asked if the FACTS system allows you to track students over time, and Ms. Dietz responded yes. A Task Force member asked if we might think about recommending one system that pulls all relevant information. Secretary Ranji noted that FACTS includes more of a narrative type of information from caseworkers. A Task Force member noted it is similar to way the healthcare system uses electronic medical records that allows tracking patients, and noted there must be somewhere that uses an electronic system that allows tracking, monitoring and evaluating students' progress through the system. Secretary Ranji responded that FACTS II is going live in the next year, but that still doesn't get to the level of detail about what's going on with the kids. Ms. Dietz added that discussions have been taking place about the data unit and what would need incorporated.

Karl Hines of the Department of Corrections asked if adult programs would be in DELSIS. Mr. Sadowski confirmed adult education would not be in DELSIS. For example, for the students that went to Groves School we would have to contact Groves to find out if they enrolled. Mr. Hines offered to research the cohort of students in the adult education system if the students' SBI

numbers can be provided. Secretary Ranji agreed that would be helpful.

Judge Kuhn asked whether it would be helpful to look at court files, and offered that if the department can provide names and SBI numbers then they could have someone manually pull the files. They would need to be provided guidance about what to look for in the files.

3. <u>Charles Adams, Executive Director, Teach for America of Greater Philadelphia and Former Head of School at The SEED Public Charter School</u>

Secretary Ranji introduced Charles Adams. Laurisa Schutt connected the Task Force with Charles. Mr. Adams is currently the Executive Director at Teach for America Philadelphia. He is also the former Head of School at SEED School in Washington, DC. SEED School is a boarding school, and Secretary Ranji noted the Task Force talked at previous meetings about potential options and started to think about another type of school for our students. Mr. Adams will talk about pros and challenges of the model, similar to what David Domenici talked about related to challenges faced at Maya Angelou.

Mr. Adams stated he joined SEED in its 9th year and he stayed there for seven years. He came to the school from NYC as principal, before that he was a social studies teacher and has a background in urban education. When he got to SEED he was the 4th or 5th Head of School within four years. SEED School is a charter school for 350 students, co-ed, in grades 6 to 12. Both founders of SEED are currently on the board, and the intent has been to engage students 5 days a week. Originally they intended 7 days a week, but moved to a 5 days a week model. SEED School has a single entry point and was designed to prevent entry into juvenile justice. 99% of students served are African America. SEED sits in ward 7 in Washington DC, east of the river. 100% of students are boarding, and 30 staff members live on campus. Students are enrolled through an open lottery system. Mr. Adams noted that one of the challenges of the

model is it having a single entry point and he acknowledged if Delaware likes the SEED model it could be layered onto the work being done in Delaware. SEED School has access to interesting data as it looks at students longitudinally.

Next, Mr. Adams described the other SEED Schools. He noted the Governor of Maryland wanted a SEED School, as did Miami. There are now three SEED Schools. DC has a robust charter sector and the school is open for everyone. Students need to be a resident of DC and a certain age. The students at SEED DC mirror the demographics of SEED Maryland. Maryland has requirements – for example, incarcerated parents, or identified special education needs. SEED Miami is mix between public education and foster systems.

Mr. Adams described a philosophical shift among SEED School staff when thinking about student intelligence. When students came in, they had some students who were on a college prep track and others who were not. Yet SEED found that students who were engaged in some way with the school to prison pipeline had the same success as other students once they opened up their way of thinking.

The two founders at SEED School looked at a unique student funding formula. There is a multiplier depending on the severity of disability, and thus they inserted a 1.7 multiplier into the funding formula. SEED DC costs about $32,000 per year per student. Mr. Adams stated we know this is an economic lift that will pay off. It's a huge private financial lift, and sometimes facility is the investment. A fully funded SEED School is 92-96% public funding. A Task Force member asked if the $32,000 includes room and board. Mr. Adams responded the cost without boarding would be whatever DC students would usually get, probably $12-14,000. A Task Force member stated there is no facilities funding and asked what private support there was in the beginning. Mr. Adams responded that SEED DC took over an elementary school that was

open for a cost of $1,000 per month. All of the property the SEED School owns, but not the land. They built dorms and a student center over a number of years, and the cost was about $20-$25 million dollars. He stated if he were creating a new school he would start with 6 graders in a day school setting, and start with 9th graders boarding. That could cut the $20-$25 million down by a third. Mr. Adams noted the founders believed in starting everyone at the same time, however that creates attrition issues. SEED found that if a student left anytime after 9th grade they still graduated from their next school because they were on a better track.

A Task Force member asked where SEED Maryland is located. Mr. Adams stated it is in the old Southwest High campus in Baltimore. It cost more money to raze buildings then build new ones. A Task Force member asked if there was any difficulty getting students from other counties in Maryland. Mr. Adams responded that most students come from local counties, but you could get someone from eastern shore because it is statewide school.

Next, Mr. Adams spoke about pros and cons of the model. He acknowledged there was a question about whether or not the school was truly wrap-around in terms of being a fully staffed school and able to provide mental health and other health services. There is an increased cost serving special education students. 12-18% of students have usually been identified as special education. He noted the school didn't have capacity to serve students with the greatest need. Those students would often end up in non-public placements or the juvenile justice system. Mr. Adams stated SEED is good at counseling students and curriculum supports and intellectually engaging students. Mr. Adams stated there have also been questions about how to engage students in conjunction with families. Many people thought it was a residential school because of tall gates on campus and there was some tension around it being a college prep school but also having a need for CTE and other supports. This led to questions about how to measure success.

Mr. Adams stated SEED is a no excuses charter school. Academic success is theirs and shared with a student's family. There is a purposeful interaction with families. He stated he would often see parents at a minimum at drop off and pick up each week. Mr. Adams also noted staffing was challenging. Staff didn't have training on therapeutic holds and didn't necessarily have all of the skills to work with the population served.

Mr. Adams stated one of the biggest challenges he encountered, particularly as an African American male and father living on campus, was the outcomes for African American male students. He noted the young men that stayed did well, and the ones that left followed trends that we see across the country. Data found that African American males were disproportionately represented in positive ways when they did well, but those that left did disproportionally unwell. A Task Force member asked if the SEED founders would have considered an all boys school versus co-ed. He responded he thinks he would have done that differently. A challenge was finding staff to work with this population of students. A boys-only model would have forced them to adjust the program to meet their specific needs. On the female end they are having similar struggles. Mr. Adams questioned if private funding conversations could lead to openness to other models.

A Task Force member asked the proportion of girls to boy served. Mr. Adams stated it was 50/50 when students started, but was closer to 58 to 42 when they end. He noted another benefit to allowing students at multiple entry points is it would allow you to have gender balance throughout. At SEED they found that attrition would leave classes gender unbalanced. A Task Force member asked if gender could be weighted as a preference. Mr. Adams responded that a decision was made to lean on priorities related to gender because they wouldn't be able to generate space in dorms that are full. He noted SEED would pull 50/50 in the lottery knowing

spots would open in the summer, and then would backfill off the waitlist.

Secretary Ranji asked how many students typically leave the school under not good circumstances. Mr. Adams responded that most students who leave in 6-7th grade leave based on it not being the right fit. Once you get to 8-9 grade students, it is because the reality of where they were coming from started to affect them. Some students would be SEED students during the week and do something else on the weekend. He estimated 10-15% of girls left and 20-30% young men. He also noted they found they always had a teenage mother, and a disproportionate number of teens who got pregnant after they left SEED. They also encountered some students getting in trouble on weekends. Oftentimes since students were in SEED School the court system had options for them. SEED had what they needed 5 days a week. Judge Kuhn asked if the percentage of boys who were fathers was known. Mr. Adams responded that students would have to tell them they are fathers to know. He stated the demographics of students at SEED aren't different from the district, and the only real difference would be success. In wards 7 and 8, 1 in 9 students would go to college. At SEED, 60% of students go on to college. Mr. Adams stated SEED Foundation helps supports SEED graduates through college. Every SEED graduate gets a visit their first semester of college.

Ms. Dailey Lewis asked what SEED DC has done to partner with local colleges. Mr. Adams responded that is an area where partnerships grew, though it wasn't a top priority at the time. SEED DC focused on expanding AP courses and internships. SEED Maryland had more state school options to partner with colleges. SEED DC had a different focus at the time.

A Task Force member asked if there were any considerations in terms of privatizing the school. Mr. Adams responded there was not, as they wanted to have boarding schools that were public. He acknowledged that he thinks a private model is doable. A Task Force member asked

if they had any problems with licensing. Mr. Adams responded they did not, and noted the program was accredited. The school often falls between a charter and the traditional boarding environment. He noted it was challenging to train staff due to the uniqueness of the model. They had to design their own strategy. Staff would be trained in academics and emotional wellbeing. Secretary Ranji asked how the school has dealt with attracting and retaining quality educators and supporting them to serve challenging kids. Mr. Adams responded the novelty of the model is part of what attracted people; a lot of folks came onboard interested. However, they encountered challenges with staying in line with the pay scale. It became difficult to have a highly qualified workforce. Educators at SEED were slightly below the pay scale. A positive offset was the success the school was having. They had an extremely high number of people stay longer than staff in schools serving similar populations.

Mr. Adams noted SEED serves a high number of siblings as they are given high preference for the charter. This could help to prevent re-entry. It was a preference but families acted as though they were already in. Families committed for 7 years with a single point of entry. Mr. Adams added that staff was underpaid but they had housing. He acknowledged this only worked for certain groups of people. SEED DC made adjustments since staff was under the scale.

A Task Force member noted a need to remember that the Task Force is talking about something different than what SEED does. The model is potentially something to look at. She noted Mr. Adams is describing a true charter model, aside from the boarding piece. This group is looking at how to serve kids in the juvenile justice system. Secretary Ranji stated Mr. Domenici spoke at the last meeting about how it didn't work having a separate school for kids coming out of secure care. He talked about how Maya Angelou moved to a model where they are serving kids leaving secure care plus kids needing additional structure. Secretary Ranji

added that Mr. Domenici stated clearly at the last meeting that it's hard to staff a school if it exists solely to serve kids coming out of juvenile justice facilities. Mr. Adams responded that is more like what SEED Miami is starting to do. A Task Force member asked if what SEED Miami is doing is because of the challenges other SEEDs experienced. He responded it was a way to get into Florida because it was a model understood there and made sense economically.

A Task Force member asked for students who graduate and go to college, know how many go back to their communities and stay there. Mr. Adams responded they had five alumni who became employees out of about 100. He added that SEED is a powerful experience for students. He noted one of the benefits of sitting in the community is that the issues you want students to think about they are bringing to you. Students are loyal to DC and their communities. SEED has information on where every SEED student is – whether they are incarcerated, in a masters program, oversees, or something else. SEED Foundation captures that information and can share dialogue with current students. Secretary Ranji thanked Mr. Adams for presenting to the group.

4. **Elizabeth Seigle, Policy Analyst, Council of State Governments Justice Center**

Secretary Ranji introduced Elizabeth Seigle from Council of State Governments. Elizabeth is currently working with YRS and was able to stay to meet with us today. Ms. Seigle noted her colleague, Emily Morgan, who represents the CSG Justice Center, would be joining briefly by phone. Emily Morgan has worked extensively related to re-entry and contributed to the School Discipline Consensus Report.

Ms. Morgan noted she is on the School Discipline team, which recently released the School Discipline Report. In planning the report, the School Discipline team brought together experts from law enforcement and juvenile justice, advocates, students, teachers, family and others. They had over 100 people on the committee to develop recommendations. Recommendations

reflect the broad sector commitment to keeping kids in school and out of the juvenile justice system. The report talks about partnerships and the importance of coordination between education and juvenile justice. In particular, the report provides recommendations around re-entry with a focus on how to ensure students transition back into their home school in a coordinated and supported way. It also talks about the importance of designating a transition coordinator as well as how to facilitate appropriate placements. Sometimes it is appropriate for students to attend their prior school, sometimes not. Parents and others come together to decide the most appropriate placement and ensuring enrollment procedures are followed and appropriate health support is in place. The report also addresses the issue of records transfer between juvenile justice and education to help facilitate the re-enrollment process. Judge Kuhn noted that she participated on the committee and Ms. Morgan was one of the leaders on the project. Ms. Seigle added that David Domenici was working in close partnership with School Discipline team, so some of the information the Task Force heard will be reiterated.

Next, Ms. Seigle provided background information on the Council of State Governments Justice Center (CSG). CSG is a national, non-profit organization that works with policymakers at local, state and national levels. Their goal is to provide consensus, research-driven strategies to make better, cost effective decisions for how to work with youth and adults in the juvenile justice system and prevent future involvement. Since the passage of Second Chance Act, CSG has been operating the National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC). The NRRC provides support to Second Chance Act programs across the country. CSG has been running NRRC in partnership with the Department of Justice since 2009 and has worked with close to 600 grantees on a handful of issues. A large piece of the work is education. There are resources on the website that are related to juvenile re-entry. Ms. Seigle offered that the Justice Center would be glad to

be a resource to Delaware. The Youth Program at CSG Justice Center is growing rapidly. Last July CSG formalized their juvenile justice work. On the website you can also learn more about CSG's School Discipline work, the reports that have been released, and juvenile justice projects underway.

In July, the Juvenile Justice program put out a paper entitled Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. The paper came out of a need to focus juvenile justice systems and improving outcomes. As a result of some of the reforms, we see more youth in communities and systems that are coordinated. Gaps in data are an issue across the board in juvenile justice. Most states cannot give a clear answer about what happens when students leave the juvenile justice system. The paper is meant to highlight and distill research on what works. Principle 3 of the paper highlights the coordinated approach of systems to address youth's needs. Ms. Seigle stated we know youth in juvenile justice have complex needs and have significant educational barriers and challenges. It is important and essential that systems work together.

Ms. Seigle discussed strategies for employing a coordinated approach. She stated it starts with an overarching framework. The first fundamental strategy is establishing a body or structure that will be committed and responsible for this type of collaboration. The Task Force has displayed its commitment to wanting to address this issue. She noted they see other re-entry task forces or collaborations that are growing, and the one in Delaware is quite comprehensive. A key piece of the work is identifying cross-system goals. Ms. Seigle noted it is important to think about what are our goals; what do we want for these young people. If you haven't established what you want for these young people, then you don't know where are you going. We need to be clear about what we want for youth and describe clear action gals. Once goals are

established then determine what tasks need to be completed, what the timelines are for reaching those goals and what the resource requirements are. This is especially important when thinking about resource allocation. Creating an action plan allows you to set priorities. Ms. Seigle noted that since there is a task force in place there are opportunities to break into subcommittees to take on challenges that come up along the way. For example, some of the issues that have arisen around credit transfer, transitional supports, and where kids are going once they are in the school. This may provide opportunities to make progress in an aggressive way.

Ms. Seigle stated that another key piece to the recommendation is data sharing. It is essential to establish data sharing processes and protocols for doing this work. Often we hear questions about what the relationship looks like; but the question is about whether a relationship is formalized and institutionalized in work. Are there interagency agreements that are established clearly and with accountability. Everyone should have a clear distinct role with what the re-entry process looks like, and with corrective action if those responsibilities are not followed. The data-sharing piece is fundamental. Ms. Seigle noted often groups develop protocols after work is started, but it is incumbent to have them in place.

Next, Ms. Seigle discussed the importance of communication. A big part of the work is communicating with each other about what happens with these youth; for example, coming together on a monthly basis to understand the status of youth who are still in the system. Data is important, because what doesn't get measured doesn't get done. We don't know what's going well if it's not measured.

Another key piece to success is developing cross-systems training and identifying systems liaisons to support the handoff. Instead of everyone trying to work with a student, figure out if there are specific caseworkers that are responsible for the partnerships. This way the

responsibility doesn't fall on everyone and responsibility is designated to particular staff. Ms. Seigle referenced the social psychology theory about if everyone is responsible for something then no one does it. If you can have someone responsible then it becomes clearer. Ms. Seigle noted that in Washington State- King County, the youth serving agencies coming together on a regular basis and have one person from each system responsible for follow up and information sharing. Their system has created more accountability of what needs to happen. Often when we hear about a gap in the re-entry process we hear people can't get in touch with someone. If you designate individuals for certain tasks then you know who to go to.

Next, Ms. Seigle spoke about creating opportunities for cross-systems training. She raised a question about whether there are regular trainings for those involved in the work to understand how each part of the system functions. Often when we hear systems are in silos it can be because people don't trust the other system is doing its job. It can help to build a better understanding of what to expect when there is cross-systems sharing. She noted sometimes there are perceived or actual barriers to information sharing and trainings are important ways to uncover that.

Evaluating outcomes and sharing data to guide improvements is also an important component. Ms. Seigle posed the question about how often information about the department's cohort of students is shared and whether the department shares that information with schools, and whether schools share that information back with the department. This goes back to the importance of collecting and managing the data. Ms. Seigle referenced how someone had mentioned building out a data system. She stated it is important to understand the infrastructure in place to manage the data, how it can be accessed and used and by whom, as well as how that information shared. Ms. Seigle noted she spent the day with DSCYF staff yesterday talking

about data and building upon what exists could be good first step. Three systems exist to store information and it is important to not only collect but also connect them.

Next, Ms. Seigle discussed examples of cross-systems coordination. She highlighted King County's Uniting for Youth Initiative. Through this initiative they created subcommittees to address particular areas of need – education, child welfare, and others. Ms. Seigle noted Ms. Morgan spoke earlier about the School Discipline Consensus Report. In the Consensus Report, the piece on re-entry is in the Courts and Juvenile Justice chapter. She shared facts such as youth in the juvenile justice system are more likely to receive suspensions or expulsions, have a learning disability and to drop out of school. Also, as many as two-thirds of youth fail to reenroll after release from confinement. Youth who are not attached to school immediately upon release are more likely to drop out and reoffend. She noted planning for release and who is at the table should go way back to before a young person leaves.

Ms. Seigle provided information on re-entry challenges. Challenges may include data sharing, transfer of records, deciding enrollment placements, and developing academic plans. Schools are also reluctant to welcome back youth based on their previous behavior and there is sometimes a stigma attached to the population. Success is often tied to funding.

Ms. Seigle next discussed school re-entry recommendations. The first recommendation is to designate a transition coordinator who is responsible for facilitating transition. Of those that have been successful it's because there is a person who knows the youth and is following them. If it is someone who knows the student and has a relationship with a family then they will know where the young person is going. The coordinator can help facilitate the placement and make sure supports and services are in place for the youth as early as possible.

The second recommendation is related to developing guidelines for what happens to youth

when they leave a juvenile correctional facility in terms of where they will enroll and who comes together. The criteria should be spelled out, in an MOU or some type of written pact, to get those folks to the table. It could be a district liaison. If a youth is expected to return to a particular district, then staff will know the districts and the environment. In addition, Ms. Seigle noted probation officers would know environments and safety concerns. Transition meetings are an opportunity to create a plan that reflects youth needs. The student will know staff are on board and it is important that there are guidelines driving the process. It is also important to measure if processes are happening and to what extent. This ties to accountability for both systems.

Ms. Seigle also noted that transition meetings are an opportunity to engage families. Team meetings should engage all of the individuals in a young person's community. The earlier a young person resumes school the better. There should be a plan in place the day a young person leaves so they know where they are going. Best practice would have the students visit the school before they are released. This would allow them to become familiar with the environment. There should also be consideration for factors such as gang membership to make sure expectations are realistic. That's something that can be legislated.

The final recommendation is to ensure students reenroll as soon as possible. Ms. Seigle noted Virginia has legislative code that mandates youth has to be enrolled within two days of release. That put pressure on their system. Both Virginia and Maine have put systems in place to do this. She also noted Mr. Domenici talked at the last meeting about legislative changes to become a district. Another way to help with transitions is to work at the legislative level to mandate that these things happen.

Next, Ms. Seigle discussed supporting school re-entry activities. She first spoke about

educational assessments. When students leave a juvenile justice facility they undergo assessments. At intake, a student goes through a diagnostic and ideally the family is included, which provides an opportunity to learn about the youth, their community and concerns with school. Intake surveys and questions should be in place.

Ms. Seigle provided an example of California, which mandates that at least partial credit be transferred to schools, and ideally all credit, from the juvenile justice facility. Maine has legislated reintegration teams. Ten days before a student's release the district comes together to meet with youth, family and the student's probation officer where they complete a comprehensive review of the student's educational plan. They had a baseline of what was happening with youth, enacted policy and are seeing significant change. Maya Angelou School is another example. Finally, NYC has court liaisons for each of the four family courts. They established a liaison program for people to voluntarily access. The purpose is to provide assistance from beginning to end to help youth get placed in the appropriate school setting. The liaison has relationships with each of the schools and will stay with the student. The liaison has to report out so that the judge knows they are making contacts. Its not just about getting youth enrolled in an effective way; it's also about making sure they stay there. Ms. Seigle also acknowledged the need to consider what success looks like down the road in terms of family supports, educational success, and if an IEP is being followed. Educating family and youth on their rights is also important. They deserve to know and understand where their rights lie throughout the process and this needs to be communicated in a clear way.

Secretary Ranji asked if the examples are the places where people are seeing different outcomes because they had a transition coordinator or a law was passed mandating timelines. Ms. Seigle responded it is difficult to know. Data is a challenge for states. Right now the work

is promising practices. Connecting to youth outcomes is a challenge. Maya Angelou is seeing improvements. She noted that with legislative changes you know youth have credits transferred that will help with educational success. Ms. Seigle acknowledged that data and baseline measurement, as well as setting improvement targets, is a great conversation to be having. It is difficult to be clear without data.

Ms. Sawyer asked if there are examples of places making progress with data. Ms. Seigle responded that King County started the PathNet program, which includes work with juvenile justice involved youth. They are collecting data and using it with a larger group. She added that the Palm Beach County Reentry Task Force that was started as result of the Second Chance Act has a goal to improve educational progress. People are starting to think about this more. Its one thing to do this work in one system, but with multiple data systems it's even harder. Ms. Seigle added that that there are juvenile justice systems doing great work. Oregon Youth Authority, and Florida Department of Juvenile Justice have data systems. In addition, the Council for Juvenile Correction Administrators is doing work around performance-based measurements, looking at what juvenile justice systems should be measuring, and supporting them in measuring those items. The Positive Behavioral Supports initiative is applied to youth in the juvenile justice system and could be a support in Delaware's efforts.

A Task Force member asked if the Core Principles document is available. Ms. Seigle responded it is on the CSG website. Principle 3 of the report talks about re-entry. Re-entry recommendations are also fleshed out more in the School Discipline Consensus report. Secretary Ranji thanked Ms. Seigle for presenting to the Task Force.

5. **Exploring Possible Task Force Recommendations**

Secretary Ranji stated we are beginning to put together ideas and questions about the types of

recommendations the Task Force might consider. A summary may be circulated before the next meeting.

6. <u>Next Steps</u>

In addition to exploring recommendations, Secretary Ranji noted we would also come back with more data. We are also starting to think about next steps with drafting the final report.

7. <u>Public Comment</u>

No public comment.

8. <u>Adjournment</u>