

Child Protective Accountability Commission → EJ Workgroup April 22, 2015

1. Attendance: Christina Jones-Bey, Rachel Neff, Julie Miller, Lauren Brueckner, Nate Badell, Barbara Crowell, Felicia Kellam, Eliza Hurst
2. Approval of Minutes from 2/6/15. Julie approved, Nate second.
3. Best Practices Packet: all is good, the packet is complete and ready for distribution. Julie suggested that the packet be sent out to all AGALs and CASAs. **Lauren will handle this.**
4. Updates
 - a. DFS being served: It is confirmed that DFS will continue to be served with EJ petitions. Judge Crowell is working on drafting legislation which would allow a judge to waive the serving of the petition or to do it via email. Judge Crowell will see what happens once she submits her legislation. She's working with Tania on this language. **Judge Crowell will bring the draft legislation back to this workgroup.** Family Court will propose the legislation to the General Assembly.
 - b. CASA won't do a new Order of Appointment, as it is specified in the Petition for EJ.
 - c. Felicia brought up an issue with a current youth who is entering into EJ who doesn't want to continue having an AGAL. They still want EJ but doesn't want a GAL to represent her. What should we do? There is no requirement to have an additional support. How can we as a workgroup no longer require an AGAL or CASA?
5. Discussion on Questionnaire for AGAL/CASA: a questionnaire to be completed by the AGAL/CASA might be a compromise. Currently, if the youth mentions to the IL provider he/she no longer wants EJ, then the IL provider tells Felicia, who tells the DAG, who will then inform the AGAL/CASA. The reason for terminating isn't always known. Rachel asked Judge Crowell in her experience, why do youth want to terminate EJ? Judge Crowell said it's either been because kids are doing really well or really poorly, they don't want to come to court. Generally, Judge Crowell requests that the AGAL/CASA continue to reach out to the youth to determine their desire for EJ. However, the committee realized that each judge handles this situation differently. Nate shared that some of the judges he's experienced, have terminated EJ after one hearing when a youth hasn't attended. Nate further questioned why a survey for adults was necessary, as the IL or CASA/AGAL can just report why EJ was terminated. One additional question might be "What else could have been provided to the youth to maintain EJ?"
 - a. CONCLUSION: after a lengthy discussion, the IL provider can provide feedback to Felicia, as the IL provider may or may not know the youth the best and be able to get an answer directly from the youth as they arrange transportation to the youth to attend court. At this time, we'll maintain contact with all players and the goals are being accomplished so no formal survey/questionnaire.
 - b. Notice to IL: IL is not noticed by the court and sometimes the provider changes, so at the moment, IL is notified of hearings via DFS as they are recipients of the notices.
 - c. Eliza brought up an issue of a youth who isn't involved with IL services but still wants EJ. She gave an example where a youth is severely limited and will transition to adult services. Eliza brought up that there are a few kids in this situation, when a youth will

transition from DFS to DDDS and there are no mechanisms in place currently that will help with this transition. The youth can have a board extension until he/she is 19 years old. However, they need a lot of help transitioning to adult services. Regardless of being eligible for DDDS, the youth is also eligible for IL services. However, there is little that an IL provider can do to provide such services, as DDDS will be the best agency to help this youth enter into adulthood since they are better equipped to provide these youth with the necessary tools and supports to live independently.

- d. Felicia brought up another point about a youth not wanting IL services but still wanting EJ cases.
6. Legislative Change: Julie suggested that if we make a lot of changes to the legislation, then CPAC needs to review the changes, as they've already signed off on the minimal changes. Julie suggested holding off until the next legislative session to get all the changes done. Judge Crowell and Eliza disagreed in that they want to get it right once and not continue to tinker with the legislation. The option of approving CPAC by email was discussed rather than waiting for the next meeting which is July 10th. Judge Crowell will provide her changes and draft to Tania, Judge Jones, and Julie Miller. She will also speak with Family Court's attorney.
7. Training
- a. IL Providers, AGALs, and CASAs have all been trained in all counties. Julie updated the group on our training at the Protecting Delaware's Children conference in March. Tania is currently editing the tape.
 - b. Judge Crowell suggested having the presentation done to the judges at a Judge's Retreat. This might be a possibility. Felicia suggested having a youth provide personal experience, discussing the difference between what services were like prior to turn 18 and post 18 in EJ.
 - c. Felicia stated DFS has roughly 36 kids currently in EJ. Eliza asked how many youth total are in IL (who are over 18). Felicia doesn't have that number right now. CY14, a total of 300 youth 18+ were served. In terms of serving them, they weren't necessarily served that entire year but at some point during that calendar year. Christina mentioned that IL providers are serving roughly 20 youth each.
8. Next Steps
- a. Judge Crowell will let us know how the legislation process comes along
9. No next meeting is currently scheduled.