



Grant Programs Report

Youth Justice Oversight Committee

DECEMBER 2022



Steven H. David, Senior Judge

Justice (RET) • Indiana Supreme Court • courts.in.gov

To the Members of the Indiana General Assembly and the Commission on Improving the Status of Children,

On behalf of the Youth Justice Oversight Committee ("YJOC") and the Grants Process Workgroup of the YJOC, I am pleased to submit the first work product of HEA 1359. This interim report is the product of a monumental, and continuing effort of the YJOC and all of its workgroups, but with particular admiration and appreciation to the Grants Process Workgroup under the leadership of Devon McDonald and Judge Lori Schein.

Specifically, we were initially tasked with proposing diversion, community alternatives, and behavioral health grant programs and funding requirements. In this report we provide our recommendations regarding appropriate funding recommendations, proposed funding formulas, proposed performance measures and proposed grant programs processes and management.

While we are very proud of this work, it should be noted that this is indeed a work in progress and everyone should recognize that as the other workgroups complete their tasks, we will most likely be in the enviable position of being able to make additional recommendations with respect to the work being done by the YJOC that will enhance this report. We will report these supplemental recommendations in a timely manner.

Our budget numbers are based upon significant research and work across a spectrum of experts and expertise, but as we benefit from additional work, we may be in a better position to affirm these numbers and/or amend them slightly; however, they represent the best numbers that we can determine appropriate at the present time.

It is important to note that all of the work of the YJOC and the collaborative efforts of our Legislative, Executive and Judicial Branches will be dependent upon the ability of all of us to provide our Trial Judges, Probation Officers, Mental Health Providers—all necessary

stakeholders—with the ability to easily access resources and grant funding to support their work. The goal is a process that is transparent, simple and effective to lead everyone involved to embrace the opportunities to improve the lives of our children and families in Indiana.

The Indiana Office of Court Services (“IOCS”) of the Indiana Supreme Court will be a critical partner in the success of this work and it will be necessary to ensure that they have proper funding for the appropriate resources that will be needed to provide education and training. Success of this reform will depend on the ability of individual counties and groups of counties to work together. The simpler the requirements are, the more likely we will achieve buy-in and the more likely our children will benefit.

Simply stated, the work being done is transformational and without any real national model to go by. Indiana does have a juvenile justice system that is the envy of much of the nation. This work is a collaborative effort to ensure that Indiana’s system of juvenile justice is not only the best in the nation but is also the best at on-going system improvement.

This is one of the first steps in our current journey. Many steps are to follow. Much collaborative work has been done for years. Now is the opportunity to move forward more quickly, together.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steven H. David". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "S" and "D".

Steven H. David

Senior Judge, Indiana Supreme Court

317-224-4293

Contents

- I. Introduction.....5**

- II. Recommendations7**
 - A. Diversion and Community Alternatives Grant Programs.....7
 - 1. Funding Appropriation..... 7
 - 2. Funding Formula 8
 - 3. Performance Measures..... 9
 - 4. Grant Programs Process and Management 10
 - B. Behavioral Health Competitive Grant Pilot Program11
 - 1. Funding Appropriation.....11
 - 2. Performance Measures..... 17
 - 3. Grant Programs Process and Management 18
 - C. Youth and Family Advisory Group 20

- III. Conclusion 20**

- IV. Youth Justice Oversight Committee Members21**

- V. Grants Workgroup Members 22**

I. Introduction

House Enrolled Act 1359 (HEA 1359) established diversion, community alternatives and behavioral health grant programs, subject to available funding, and identified the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) as the administering agency. The Act requires that the Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) develop a plan for implementing these grant programs. To accomplish this, the YJOC created the Grants Process Workgroup (GPW) to make recommendations and support the YJOC in meeting this statutory obligation. Another statutory charge to the YJOC is to establish policies for diversion programs and practices and to develop a plan to provide behavioral health services to youth in the justice system. These related tasks necessitate the alignment of policies, programs, and services with funding. The YJOC acknowledges and appreciates the assistance of the Diversion and Behavioral Health Plan workgroups in this coordinated effort to provide a recommended plan to the Indiana General Assembly.

Pursuant to I.C. 2-5-36-9.3(d), the grant implementation plan must include determination of 1) the amount of money dedicated to each grant program; 2) the funding formula, accounting for the needs of both more rural and more populated communities; 3) the required set of performance measures that grantees must collect and report; and 4) the process to streamline and manage the entire grant life cycle. Further, the planning process must define parameters for use of the funds and allow a proportion to be used for staffing, training, and administrative expenses so that rural communities with limited-service capacity are supported.

The GPW convened in July and met four additional times. The following sub-committees formed and provided information for consideration by the GPW: 1) Performance Measures, Eligibility and Process; 2) Funding Formula; and 3) Report Writing. The group considered funding formulas, eligibility criteria and processes from existing state-administered programs, county population data, available data from county-level youth justice systems (i. e. referrals to the system and filings of delinquency petitions), and county-level, youth justice system expenses by the Department of Child Services (DCS). Using these resources and learning from the members, the GPW developed consensus on core elements of the plan:

1. Valuing the voices of those with lived experience is of paramount importance when developing new or enhancing existing programs and services. An authentic partnership with youth and families promotes efficiency and stewardship in funding

decisions, as consumers of services are more likely to be engaged if they trust programs and service providers. Youth and families should be involved at all points in the grant decision-making process; a structure for including them in the grant application development, review and funding recommendations needs to be developed.

2. Grant funds can only be used to fill a gap in current funding, not to supplant an existing funding source. For example, DCS funds a plethora of services for youth involved in the legal system, but not for youth who are diverted. Therefore, grant funds cannot be used to serve youth with an open case, unless it is for a program/service for which DCS does not have a contracted provider.
3. If a funding source exists for a particular program/service, but the program/service is not available in a geographic area, grant funds could be used to increase service availability as long as the pay structure aligns with the existing funding source. For example, if DCS has a service standard for Program A, but there are no contracted providers in a county, the county could apply for funding to contract with a local agency to provide Program A if the payment structure was aligned with what the provider would receive if they contracted with DCS.
4. It is critical that the grant process includes provision for upfront distribution of a portion of the funds and is not solely a reimbursement model. A reimbursement model disincentivizes counties and smaller agencies from applying because of the inability to pay costs up front and remain solvent.
5. Both county government and local nongovernmental agencies must be eligible to apply for all three of the grant categories. However, all applications must clearly identify that there was review and approval by a local collaborative group that included a judicial officer with juvenile court jurisdiction and other key juvenile justice stakeholders.
6. To support local needs and economies of scale, regional partnerships to implement the grant programs are encouraged. This could be multi-county government-based programs and/or nongovernmental agencies committed to serving a group of geographically clustered counties.
7. To promote good stewardship of these public funds, applications for planning grants should be encouraged. The development of new or expansion of current programming should be data informed and collaboratively undertaken. Some counties may be in more advanced states of readiness than others to implement the grants. Planning grants support a deliberate and intentional approach to utilization of funds, especially for counties without existing programming.

8. The grant cycle will be two years and operated on a calendar year beginning in January 2024.
9. The work of the GPW and the YJOC is in the infancy stages and must be ongoing. The GPW collaborated with the diversion and behavioral health workgroups in preparing this report. However, the reports of the other workgroups under the YJOC will not be finalized and submitted until July 1, 2023. Therefore, the GPW recommendations are preliminary in nature and both the content and funding recommendations will likely need to be revised after further discussion with the other workgroups on their recommendations for data requirements, the state behavioral health plan, and diversion and transitional services programming.

II. Recommendations

A. Diversion and Community Alternatives Grant Programs

1. Funding Appropriation

The YJOC recommends that \$20 million be appropriated to the diversion and community alternatives grant program fund, established pursuant to I.C. 31-40-5(6)(a). This is the sum of \$10 million for each grant program for each year of the two-year budget cycle. The funding formula outlined below identifies a total of approximately \$7.9 million that would be passed through by ICJI to counties in grant awards each year. Counties opting to apply for a planning grant in year one could apply for additional funds in year two to support start-up costs for new programs. An additional \$2.1 million is requested for salaries and associated costs of hiring and training three to four new staff at ICJI for grant administration, training and outreach for local stakeholders during the grant solicitation and the grant application process as well as increases due to inflation.

2. Funding Formula

The YJOC recommends a funding formula based on county population. The formula allots a base amount of \$37,500.00 per grant per county. Additional funds in the amounts of \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$15,000 are added to the base amount based on county population, with smaller counties receiving more funding to comply with statutory requirement of focus on rural counties.

County Population Category	Diversion Grant Program	Community Alternatives Grant Program	Population-Based Funding	Total Funding
< 25,000	\$37,500	\$37,500	\$15,000	\$90,000
25,000-50,000	\$37,500	\$37,500	\$10,000	\$85,000
> 50,000	\$37,500	\$37,500	\$5,000	\$80,000

To comply with the statutory requirement of supporting rural counties with limited-service capacity by allowing a proportion of the funding to be used for staffing, training and administrative expenses, the YJOC recommends that counties are eligible for an additional \$20,000 for a one-year planning grant to prepare for implementation. Counties exercising this option must convene their local or regional Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council (JRAC) or another local collaborative body that includes juvenile justice stakeholders and a juvenile court judge to assess needs for diversion and community alternatives programs. The assessment must include review of youth justice system data, review of existing programs and services identification of community organizations and groups with which partnerships could be developed for program implementation, review of best-practices, and consideration of any economies of scale in regionalization. To support the planning process, ICJI and IOCS can provide technical assistance and outreach to the local planning entity and judicial officers. At the end of the planning year, counties shall provide an updated application to ICJI that reflects the intended use of grant funding for implementation in the second year of the grant cycle.

3. Performance Measures

The YJOC recommends that grantees choose to report performance measures on either a monthly or quarterly basis and are required to provide an aggregate, annual report at the end of each year of the grant cycle. Grantees will be required to maintain case-level data for the purposes of research and evaluation. The required performance measures are as follows:

Reporting Requirement	Definition
Age	Youth's age on date of referral to program
Ethnicity	Youth's self-identified ethnicity (Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)
Race	Youth's self-identified race (categories consistent with census)
Gender	Youth's self-identified gender
Referral Source	Entity/Agency referring youth to program
Referral Process Point	Decision point at which referral made (pre-arrest, pre-referral to legal system, etc.)
IYAS Tool - Decision Point	Which IYAS Tool was used to determine risk level?
IYAS Tool - Result	What was the risk level at time of referral?
Allegation/Offense Referred	Offense, classification (misdemeanor, felony), and level
Delinquency History	Of the youth referred to the program, how many had previously been referred to the youth legal system?
Referrals Received	# of referrals to program

Reporting Requirement	Definition
Youth Referred	# of youth referred
Program Completion - Referrals	# of program completions
Program Completion - Youth	# of youth completing the program
Program Completion - Time	Of the completed referrals, how long (days) did it take from the date the referral was received to the date the program was completed? Report the average and median.
Program Termination - Referrals	# of referrals that were terminated before program completion
Program Termination - Youth	# of youth that were terminated from the program without completing it
Re-Offense - During Program	Of the youth referred, # who were alleged to have committed a new offense while in the program
Re-Offense - Program Completion	Of the youth who completed the program, # who were alleged to have committed a new offense within six (6) months of date of completion

4. Grant Programs Process and Management

ICJI will work with the GPW and YJOC to develop a statewide solicitation for applications for the funds as outlined in I.C. 31-40-5 and will conduct outreach to inform all potential applicants of the grant opportunities. With input from the GPW, YJOC, and IOCS, ICJI will conduct informational and educational sessions for potential and actual applicants, including opportunities for questions and clarification.

In addition to ICJI grant administration requirements pursuant to I.C. 5-2-6, and with deference to ICJI's established grant solicitation processes, the YJOC, or a subgroup thereof, will review applications and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees of

ICJI regarding funding decisions. The core review team should include representatives from DCS, the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC), the Family and Social Services Administration – Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA), ICJI, and the Indiana Office of Court Services (IOCS). After awards are determined, ICJI will engage in the contracting process with the recipient agencies.

Pursuant to I.C. 31-40-5(4)(b), ICJI will prepare an annual report regarding the grant programs. The report will be provided to the YJOC and ICJI will provide periodic updates throughout the year as requested by the YJOC.

B. Behavioral Health Competitive Grant Pilot Program

1. Funding Appropriation

The YJOC recommends that \$40 million be appropriated to the behavioral health competitive grant pilot program fund, established pursuant to I.C. 31-40-6(5)(a). This is the sum of \$20 million for each year of the two-year budget cycle. This includes funds passed through to counties and costs of ICJI for administration of the grant program.

The funding appropriation is based on recommendations from the Behavioral Health Workgroup (BHW) and input from non-profit organizations regarding the costs of implementing regional models for service delivery. A Grants Coordination sub-committee of the BHW provided a list of recommended programs that comply with statutory categories of activities that can be funded by the behavioral health pilot grants. A description of these programs and estimated costs to implement is included below. These programs are by no means exhaustive of those for which funding can be applied. There are many more programs that can fit within the statutorily permitted categories of activities. Funding for programs varies significantly by the type of program, the length and intensity of the program and the number of youths served. Funding to implement only the examples statewide would require an appropriation of approximately \$70 million. However, the YJOC recognizes that statewide implementation within the first two years is not a reasonable expectation and is, therefore, recommending a lesser amount to allow for planning and readiness assessment to occur. The examples provided are programs that have demonstrated success in diverting youth from formal court proceedings and reducing out-of-home placements, resulting in cost savings as outlined in the program

descriptions. There could be additional cost savings if some of the programs are implemented on a regional basis due to economies of scale.

Pursuant to I.C. 31-40-6, the purpose of the behavioral health competitive grant program is to support jurisdictions (with an emphasis on rural areas) to evaluate a child's behavioral health needs and divert from court involvement and out-of-home placement into community or school-based mental health treatment. The grantee must use a validated mental health screening tool and a full mental health assessment tool, if necessary. HEA 1359 then provides for grant funds to be utilized to conduct activities in six areas. Examples of programs that could be funded in each of the statutorily defined activities are as follows:

1) Partnering with law enforcement to implement a program to divert a child from formal court proceedings [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(1)]

- a. *The Early Intervention Diversion Program (EIDP)* is a diversion program run by the Los Angeles County (Calif.) Probation Department that provides an alternative to formal processing in the juvenile justice system for juveniles after they have committed their first offense. By providing intensive case management and coordinated services to youths and their families, the overall goal of EIDP is to reduce the number of youths entering the juvenile justice system, while also reducing recidivism. Estimated costs are approximately \$350,000-550,000 per year to fully implement statewide.

More information about EIDP: <https://perma.cc/P5NM-HKRR>

- b. *Adolescent Diversion Project* as implemented at Michigan State University is a strengths-based, university-led program that diverts arrested youth from formal processing in the juvenile justice system and provides them with community-based services. The program is rated Effective by CrimeSolutions clearinghouse. Participants in the program had statistically significantly lower rates of official delinquency, compared with the control group youth. However, there was no statistically significant difference between groups in self-reported delinquency. A cost analysis found that the Adolescent Diversion Project (ADP) costs approximately \$1,020.83 per youth for an 18-week intervention, which includes overhead and administrative costs. In comparison, a local juvenile court spent \$13,466 for the average youth served. In a typical year, ADP provides services to 144 youth and the county juvenile court system serves 375 youths. The difference in cost of serving

144 youths in ADP versus traditional juvenile court results in a savings of approximately \$1,799,104 per year (Sturza and Williams 2006).

More information about Adolescent Diversion Project: <https://perma.cc/GBM8-Z5PS>

2) and 3) Activities two and three listed in the statute are combined below, as example programs are applicable to both areas.

Creating crisis stabilization services and a mobile crisis unit [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(2)] and providing comprehensive case management for a child or family in crisis [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(3)]

Mobile Crisis Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS) are a cost-effective alternative to the use of Emergency Departments (ED) and inpatient treatment. MRSS provide mobile, on-site and rapid intervention for youth experiencing a behavioral health crisis, allowing for immediate de-escalation of the situation in the least restrictive setting possible; prevention of the condition from worsening; and the timely stabilization of the crisis. The mobile crisis component of MRSS is designed to provide time-limited, on-demand crisis intervention services in any setting in which a behavioral health crisis is occurring, including homes, schools and EDs. Depending on the needs of the child, the stabilization component may include a temporary, out-of-home crisis resolution in a safe environment. A growing body of evidence points to MRSS as a cost-effective method for improving behavioral health outcomes; deterring ED and inpatient admissions; diverting youth from arrest and juvenile detention; reducing out-of-home placements; reducing lengths of stay and the cost of inpatient hospitalizations; and improving access to behavioral health services. The State of Vermont estimated an investment of \$664,000 for each MRSS team with other states showing significant cost savings from implementing MRSS. For example, the State of Connecticut noted that the 2014 average Medicaid cost of an inpatient stay for children and youth was \$13,320 and MRSS services were \$1,000 (resulting in a savings of \$12,320 per youth). In addition, an estimated \$3.8 to \$7.5 million in hospital costs and \$2.8 million in out-of-home placement costs were saved because of the implementation of MRSS in Seattle, Washington.

Additional information about MRSS: <https://perma.cc/HKS8-CKYW>

4) Identifying and strengthening community based intensive treatment and management services [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(4)]

- a. *Cure Violence* (formerly known as Chicago Ceasefire) seeks to create individual-level and community-level change in communities where it is a norm for youth to carry a gun and to use a gun to resolve personal conflicts and disputes. The CV model relies on three key elements to stop the transmission of violent behavior. It aims at changing norms regarding violence, to provide on-the-spot alternatives to violence that are more acceptable and less harmful, and to increase the perceived risks and costs of involvement in violence among high-risk youth. The CV model does not involve the use of force or the threat of punishment. It is designed to introduce at-risk individuals to alternative models of conflict resolution that, in turn, may spread to the larger community. Exact programming costs are not detailed on the Cure Violence website and funding can vary depending on implementation location. For instance, the website Tools of Change reports that an investment of \$5.4 million (from state and city law enforcement budgets) was made in 2018 to implement the program in Chicago, Illinois. A more dated document identified via the City of New York's website reported an annual programmatic budget of \$2.16 million during fiscal year 2013. Based on an analysis of 10 years (2006-2015), in Chicago, Cure Violence efforts saved \$33 for every \$1 spent with \$4 in government savings for every \$1 spent.

[Additional information about Cure Violence: https://perma.cc/6NQV-FF6H](https://perma.cc/6NQV-FF6H)

- b. *Credible Messenger Mentoring for Justice Involved Youth* is a transformational process through which individuals from similar backgrounds, especially men and women who were themselves system-involved, engage youth in structured and intentional relationships that help them change their attitudes, beliefs, and actions. This approach has demonstrated improved outcomes for system-involved youth, including increased engagement with programs and services, reduction in youth re-arrests, violations, and anti-social behavior(s), increased compliance with court mandates, improved relationships between system stakeholders and community, and community capacity to support system involved youth. A sample program budget (from the year 2015) estimated that it would cost at least \$250,000 per year to implement this program.

The [budget](https://perma.cc/B3WE-PBY7) can be viewed at: <https://perma.cc/B3WE-PBY7> and [more information about Credible Messenger Mentoring](https://perma.cc/R88D-U2J7) at: <https://perma.cc/R88D-U2J7>

- c. *Project BUILD's* Intervention Specialists work on the front lines to diffuse neighborhood conflicts, mentor youth away from gangs and help them overcome histories of violence, trauma, and incarceration. The Youth Leadership Council, Restorative Justice Initiative, and Inward Healing Camping Trips are just some of the ways BUILD ensures that court- and gang-involved youth invest in their futures. By offering both individualized as well as community-based programming, BUILD opens doors for at-risk youth, empowering them to take charge of their lives, futures, and communities. This program has demonstrated improved outcomes for system-involved youth, including 100% of youth connected to school being promoted to the next grade; 88% of youth reducing high-risk behaviors; 96% of youth who attended a life-skills workshop reporting increased knowledge of healthy conflict resolution; 33 youth have detached from gangs' w/intervention assistance in past year; 85% of court-involved youth avoiding recidivism; and 65% of youth decreasing their use of illegal substances while involved with BUILD.

[Additional information about Project Build: https://perma.cc/GZG7-MS6Z](https://perma.cc/GZG7-MS6Z)

- d. *Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART)* is a cognitive behavioral intervention program to help children and adolescents improve social skill competence and moral reasoning, better manage anger, and reduce aggressive behavior. The program specifically targets chronically aggressive children and adolescents ages 12-17 years. The estimated cost to implement ART in the State of Washington was \$745 per youth. In addition, a 2004 Washington State Institute for Public Policy cost-benefit analysis showed that, when implemented with fidelity, the intervention can generate \$11.66 in avoided crime costs for every \$1.00 invested in the program.

[More information about ART](https://perma.cc/LM4Y-TSWM), including training costs: <https://perma.cc/LM4Y-TSWM>

- e. *Multisystemic Therapy (MST)* is an intensive family and community-based treatment that addresses the multiple determinants of serious antisocial behavior in chronic, violent, or substance abusing male or female juvenile offenders, ages 12 to 17, at high risk of out-of-home placement. The multisystemic approach views individuals as nested within a network of interconnected systems that encompass individual, family, and extra-familial (peer, school, neighborhood) factors. Intervention may be necessary in any one or a combination of these systems. The primary goals of MST programs are to decrease rates of antisocial behavior and other clinical problems, improve functioning (e.g., family relations, school performance), and promote behavior change in the youth's natural environment. These outcomes are achieved

at a cost savings by reducing the use of out-of-home placements such as incarceration, residential treatment, and hospitalization. Organizational costs to set up a single MST team (i.e., a supervisor and four therapists with the capacity to serve around 48 families a year) are estimated at \$589,980. State economic analyses of MST have demonstrated the following: a \$3.34 total return for every dollar spent on MST, \$4,643 in savings (across a two-year period) for juvenile offenders who received MST, an average net savings per youth treated of \$1,617 for MST compared with usual services, and \$15,019 in average net benefits of MST for juvenile crime.

[Additional information about MST](https://perma.cc/E5RL-6UVT), including a breakdown of estimated costs:
<https://perma.cc/E5RL-6UVT>

5) Establishing telehealth services (as defined in I.C. 25-1-9.5-6) and programs [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(5)]

The subcommittee did not have specific programs to recommend; rather, they recommended that grantees outline the evidence-base or support for establishing a telehealth service within a chosen program or requesting to use grant funds to implement a telehealth program. If no relevant research has been published for the service or program (or if the existing evidence primarily relies on non-experimental, correlational research designs), grantees should be asked to outline how they will evaluate the telehealth service or program including the credentials and background of the individual or team of individuals who will be tasked with evaluating the effectiveness of the service or program. Grantees are encouraged to collaborate with researchers and evaluators at local colleges and universities if possible.

6) Supporting mental health evaluations, which include the use of telehealth services [I.C. 31-40-6(3)(b)(6)]

Community Mental Health Center Partnerships - contract with Indiana's Community Mental Health Centers to designate qualified staff to complete court ordered mental health evaluations, which could include telehealth services. Community Mental Health Centers serve as the state's public safety net for all 92 counties.

2. Performance Measures

The YJOC recommends that grantees choose to report performance measures on either a monthly or quarterly basis and are required to provide an aggregate, annual report at the end of each year of the grant cycle. Grantees will be required to maintain case-level data for the purposes of research and evaluation. The required performance measures are as follows:

Reporting Requirement	Definition
Age	Youth's age on date of referral to program
Ethnicity	Youth's self-identified ethnicity (Hispanic/Non-Hispanic)
Race	Youth's self-identified race (categories consistent with census)
Gender	Youth's self-identified gender
Referral Source	Entity/Agency referring youth to program
Referral Process Point	Decision point at which referral made (pre-arrest, pre-referral to legal system, etc.)
Allegation/Offense Referred	Offense, classification (misdemeanor, felony), and level
Referrals Received	# of referrals to program
Youth Referred	# of youth referred
Screening Tools Completed	# of screenings completed
Youth Screened	# of youth who received screening tool
Formal Evaluations Completed	# of formal evaluations completed

Reporting Requirement	Definition
Youth Evaluated	# of youth who received formal evaluation
Program Completion - Referrals	# of program completions
Program Completion - Youth	# of youth completing the program
Program Termination - Referrals	# of referrals that were terminated before program completion
Program Termination - Youth	# of youth that were terminated from the program without completing it
Re-Offense - During Program	Of the youth referred, # who were alleged to have committed a new offense while in the program
Re-Offense - Program Completion	Of the youth who completed the program, # who were alleged to have committed a new offense within six (6) months of date of completion
Referrals to Other Programs	Of the referrals received, how many resulted in a referral to another program or service?

In addition to these, the grantee should maintain program metrics that are consistent with fidelity to the intervention and provide those to the referral source. For example, for a grantee providing MST, there are metrics required for providers to remain certified.

3. Grant Programs Process and Management

ICJI will work with the YJOC, IOCS, the GPW and the BHW to develop a statewide solicitation for applications for the funds as outlined in I.C. 31-40-6 and will conduct outreach to inform all potential applicants of the grant opportunities. With input from the YJOC, IOCS, GPW and the BHW, ICJI will conduct informational and educational sessions for potential and actual applicants, including opportunities for questions and clarification.

In addition to ICJI grant administration requirements pursuant to I.C. 5-2-6, and with deference to ICJI's established grant solicitation processes, the YJOC, or a subgroup

thereof, will review applications and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees of ICJI regarding funding decisions. The review team should include representatives from DCS, the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC), the Family and Social Services Administration – Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA), ICJI, the Indiana Office of Court Services (IOCS), and experienced practitioners in the mental and behavioral health profession. After awards are determined, ICJI will engage in the contracting process with the recipient agencies.

DMHA has statutory responsibility to oversee crisis services for the State of Indiana, and coordinate with designated 9-8-8 centers (I.C. 12-21-8-6). As a result, all grantees awarded funds for any crisis-related activity (i.e., crisis stabilization services and/or a mobile crisis unit and/or providing comprehensive case management for a child or family in crisis) must integrate with DMHA's 988 and crisis system implementation efforts, including the implementation of the MRSS model. In order to ensure consistency in delivery of services, grantees should contract directly with DMHA for these services. Because of the foregoing, the YJOC recommends that ICJI consider an agreement with DMHA that the behavioral health competitive grant pilot funds pass through to DMHA for management of applications, awards, contracts and reporting, with the requirement that the funds be used solely for justice-involved youth. Another option is for the Indiana General Assembly to consider making a statutory change that would make DMHA the administrator of the fund. Either option would minimize risk of duplication and maximize opportunities for blended or braided funding, as DMHA has knowledge of and utilizes multiple funding sources for other mental and behavioral health programs and services.

Pursuant to I.C. 31-40-5(4)(b), ICJI will prepare an annual report regarding the grant programs. The YJOC requests that ICJI provide the annual report to the YJOC and provide periodic updates throughout the year as requested by the YJOC.

C. Youth and Family Advisory Group

The recommendations of the GPW were shared with the YJOC's Youth and Family Advisory Group. The Group provided the following input:

- Programs should operate from a strengths-based framework and should support youth and family empowerment through skills and job training. Specifically, the solicitation should avoid deficit-based language and the process should encourage application by non-governmental organizations.
- Programs should include opportunities for joint participation by youth and families.
- Develop or expand partnerships with local community-based organizations such as the YMCA and Boys and Girls Clubs.
- Providers need to have specific training regarding serving youth.
- Support peer mentoring programs that are focused on advocacy.

III. Conclusion

The YJOC appreciates the opportunity to provide recommendations for consideration by the Indiana General Assembly. The YJOC will provide additional information and possibly amendments to these recommendations for the grant process and appropriations after it receives and reviews the reports from the other YJOC workgroups that are working on the recommendations for data requirements and programming/services for diversion, behavioral health and transitional services. The GPW is prepared to continue in service to the YJOC to support fulfilling the statutory obligations that promote better outcomes for justice-involved youth.

IV. Youth Justice Oversight Committee Members

Justice Steve David, Chair

INDIANA SUPREME COURT

Leslie Dunn, Counsel/Support Staff

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT SERVICES

Dr. Matt Aalsma

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Steve Balko

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Sirrilla Blackmon

DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION (FSSA)

Judge Marshelle Broadwell

MARION SUPERIOR COURT 16

Judge Vicki Carmichael

CLARK CIRCUIT COURT 4

Shannon Chambers

JOHNSON COUNTY PROBATION

Terrie Decker

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

Judge Darrin Dolehanty

WAYNE SUPERIOR COURT 3

Tracy Fitz

INDIANA PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS COUNCIL

Magistrate Carolyn Foley

ALLEN SUPERIOR COURT

Judge Faith Graham

TIPPECANOE SUPERIOR COURT 3

Mary Kay Hudson

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT SERVICES

Devon McDonald

INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Nichole Phillips

BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY PROBATION

Terry Stigdon

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SERVICES

Nancy Wever

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT SERVICES, JDAI

Joel Wieneke

INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COUNCIL

James C. Wilson

CIRCLE UP INDY

Kia Wright

VOICES CORPORATION

V. Grants Workgroup Members

Devon McDonald, Chair

INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Judge Lori Schein, Co-Chair

BOONE CIRCUIT COURT

Nancy Wever, Support Staff

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT SERVICES/JDAI

Damon Cox

JOHNSON COUNTY JUVENILE COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS

Dr. Chris Drapeau

FSSA, DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH AND
ADDICTION

Leslie Dunn

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT
SERVICES/CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Angie Hensley

INDIANA OFFICE OF COURT
SERVICES/GRANTS

Rebecca Humphrey

TIPPECANOE COUNTY COURT SERVICES

Joann Keys

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTION/DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES

Ross Maxwell

ELKHART COUNTY COURT SERVICES

Judge Lynn Murray

HOWARD CIRCUIT COURT

Carmen Sims

HENDRICKS COUNTY PROBATION

Kim Whitehurst

GRANT COUNTY PROBATION

James Wilson

CIRCLE UP INDY