

a newsletter of the

Pennsylvania
Juvenile Court
Judges'
Commission

Volume 14, Number 1

P E N N S Y L V A N I A J U V E N I L E J U S T I C E

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Edward G. Rendell, Governor

www.jcjc.state.pa.us

January 2006

The Pennsylvania/ MacArthur Foundation Partnership

**Update from the Mental Health/
Juvenile Justice Coordination
Workgroup**

Pennsylvania was the first site chosen by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to participate in the *Models for Change* juvenile justice reform initiative because it was seen as having a favorable reform climate, there are strong partnerships among Pennsylvania's stakeholders, and considerable consensus about the strengths and weaknesses of the state's juvenile justice. Our efforts are focusing on bringing about change in three major areas: the coordination of the mental health and juvenile justice systems; the system of aftercare services and supports; and disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system. The *Models for Change* initiative was a major focus of the 2005 Pennsylvania Conference on Juvenile Justice.

The mental health/juvenile justice component of the initiative is coordinated by the Mental Health/Juvenile Justice (MH/JJ) Workgroup. Activities related to this component of the initiative began in August 2004, when a State-level Stakeholder Planning Meeting occurred. The MacArthur Foundation announced its intention to provide \$50,000 grants to three counties to hire mental health / juvenile justice coordinators. Allegheny, Chester, and Erie Counties were subsequently selected to receive these grants, and to serve as "model" counties for the mental health/ juvenile justice component of the initiative.

In February 2005, a team consisting of representatives from state agencies and statewide organizations, and multi-disciplinary teams from the three model counties, participated in a Comprehensive Systems Change Initiative (CSCI) strategic planning workshop in Harrisburg. The state team developed a strategic plan that included goals in two major areas:

- the development of a statewide screening and assessment process; and,
- the development of a continuum of services for children in the juvenile justice system who are experiencing mental health problems, with an emphasis on facilitating the proliferation of evidence-based programs and the provision of services to children returning home from placement.

A training program for chief juvenile probation officers and their staff was held in State College, in May 2005, to provide an overview on screening and assessment. Tom Grisso, the author of the Massachusetts Adolescent Screening Instrument (MAYSI), conducted the training program for over 110 participants.

MacArthur Foundation, continued on back page

Models for Change—Pa Website Released

On December 23, 2005 the Juvenile Law Center launched the Models for Change (MfC)-Pa website. Consisting of a public and a private page, this site describes the MfC initiative nationally, with a focus on the efforts in Pennsylvania. The site is accessible from JLC's homepage: www.jlc.org.

MfC is a John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation funded effort to enhance and expedite change efforts in the field of juvenile justice. Reform efforts in Pennsylvania are focused on three areas: coordination of the mental health and juvenile justice systems; the system of aftercare services and supports; and disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system. A year into the project, there are many exciting changes taking place at both the county and state level, and across systems, including (but not limited to): the courts, probation, education, public welfare, and mental health. This website provides a mechanism to keep stakeholders and other interested persons informed of these efforts.

The public portion of this site explains the project and contains frequent updates, announcements, and news articles. The private portion facilitates communication among stakeholders who are working on effecting change at the state and county level in each of the three targeted areas of improvement. It contains notes from meetings, a calendar of events, and message boards to facilitate communication among stakeholders across systems, at the state and county levels.

Please direct questions or comments to Autumn Dickman at the Juvenile Law Center 215-625-0551. adickman@jlc.org or visit www.jlc.org

This publication is produced monthly at the Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research at Shippensburg University.

Guest articles are always welcome; please submit them by email or on a disk. We particularly enjoy your photographs, but we ask that these be mailed - we will be happy to return them to you.

Greg Young is the editor. Our address is CJJT&R, Shippensburg University, 1871 Old Main Drive, Shippensburg, PA 17257-2299. (gyoung@state.pa.us)

Please send additions or changes to the mailing list to Julie Bozich at Signal Graphics Printing, 1010 Wesley Drive, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 (SigGraph60@aol.com)

Weekend Master's Degree program accepting applications for the Shippensburg University Class of 2009

Applications are now being accepted for the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission sponsored Weekend Master's Degree program at Shippensburg University. Members of the class of 2009 will begin classes in the fall of 2007.

The Shippensburg University program offers students a Master of Science degree in the Administration of Justice. This is a 36-credit hour program that includes courses in research methods, theory, administration, and policy analysis. Also featured is a summer internship where students will get an opportunity to develop, implement, and evaluate a program in their home county, or evaluate an existing program that serves juvenile offenders. Classes in this two-year program are scheduled every third weekend in the fall, spring, and summer, with no classes scheduled in the months of July and August. This program is open to county juvenile probation officers who will have at least two years of post-baccalaureate experience in the juvenile justice field prior to the start of classes. Applicants who have an undergraduate grade point average of less than 2.75 must take and pass the Miller Analogies Test (MAT) or the GRE.

The deadline for applying to the JCJC-sponsored MSAJ program class of 2009 at Shippensburg University is September 1, 2006.

Tuition costs, educational fees, and room and board are paid for by the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission for all eligible students. If you would like more details or are interested in applying for the program, please call Greg Young at 717-447-1797, go to the JCJC website www.jcjc.state.pa.us, or send an e-mail to gyoung@state.pa.us.

First Community Restorative Justice Forum held

More than 120 participants representing 11 Pennsylvania counties attended the first of five regional forums designed to assist counties juvenile courts in engaging community members and organizations. The forum was held December 7, 2005, at the Cross Creek Resort in Titusville, Venango County, and served the North-west Communities That Care technical assistance region.

The forum, titled “Building Bridges: Community Restorative Justice Forum,” was based on the *Building Bridges* monograph developed by the Court and Community Collaboration Committee of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers. The forum’s goals included assisting jurisdictions in their efforts to engage communities in attaining an understanding of the balanced and restorative model for juvenile justice, and sharing means by which community members and organizations can take active roles in juvenile crime prevention and early interventions.

County chief juvenile probation officers were asked to develop teams of 10 participants from their jurisdictions representing multiple sectors of the community; schools, social services, civic organizations, victims services, and faith communities, to name a few. The agenda was developed to enable participants to learn from each other, with a particular emphasis on the engagement of the community in responding to delinquent behavior. The agenda included a plenary session, four workshops, and a team break-out session which provided an opportunity for members of the county teams to meet and begin to identify local resources and training issues and begin the development of a local action plan.

The Honorable H. William White, President Judge for Venango County and member of the Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission, opened the forum with a presentation which challenged the participants to work together and leave the forum with ideas to help develop juvenile justice systems that work with the young offenders and their communities.

The next forum is projected for June 2006 in the Southwestern CTC region. Chief juvenile probation officers in that region will be notified as soon as the preliminary arrangements are confirmed. For more information on the regional forums or community restorative justice, contact Susan Blackburn, @sblackburn@state.pa.us or 717-477-1411.

Act 68 of 2005—The Resource Family and Adoption Process Act

House Bill 127 (2996) was signed into law by Governor Rendell on November 16, 2005 as Act 68 of 2005, and becomes effective on January 16, 2006. Act 68, known as the “Resource Family and Adoption Process Act,” grants rights to a “Resource Family Parent” who is interested in adopting a child who has resided with that individual for at least six months. Act 68 defines the term “Resource Family” as “a family which provides temporary foster or kinship care for children who need out-of-home placement and which may eventually provide permanency for those children, including as an adoptive family.” The Act defines “Resource Family Parent or Parents” as “an individual or individuals approved by a county or private agency who is responsible for providing foster care to a child with a resource family.”

The intent of Act 68 of 2005 is to ensure that persons serving as resource parents are treated equitably during all stages of a foster child’s placement, including adoption. Act 68 requires that a Resource Family Parent or Parents be given an interview with the appropriate county or private agency in cases where a child is placed in the care of a resource family; and the child’s goal has been changed from foster care to adoption; and the child has resided with that resource family for six months or more; and the resource family parent is interested in becoming an adoptive resource for that child.

The interviewing agency would be required to convey the information obtained from the interview of the resource family, in addition to information obtained from the interviews of other prospective adoptive families, to the county children and youth agency for its consideration when making a determination as to placement of the child. Where more than one adoptive resource is available and considered for the child, the county agency shall document the reasons for choosing to place the child with particular adoptive parents in the child’s case record. Act 68 specifically provides that no resource family parent be denied consideration as an adoptive parent for a child who has resided with that individual’s care for six months or more solely because of the inability to access that individual as a resource family parent in the future.

Pathways to Possibilities: Strengths-Based Collaborative Practice in the Juvenile Justice System

by Dean C. Wolf, MSW

“There’s nothing wrong with you that what’s right about you couldn’t fix” –Baruch Shalem

In 1973, I began my career as a drug and alcohol counselor in a court-mandated program for adolescent and adult offenders arrested for substance-abuse-related charges. The work was deficit-based in that I looked for evidence of problems and what was wrong with my client. If they were not cooperative I threatened them with court action. In remembering those days I now understand to a large extent how it was these clients were so resistant to exploring the possibility of behavior change. This article is about a different sort of approach emphasizing strengths-based practice and family and community collaboration in working with juvenile offenders and their parents.

In the juvenile justice system the tendency is to focus on problems, deficits and what is wrong with youth and their parents. Although there is nothing inherently wrong with this approach, research and practice experience suggests this way encourages our clients to resist our efforts to help them. In strengths-based practice the emphasis is on competence, ability and capacity for change. The focus is then on solutions not problems. I often ask questions such as “What are your best qualities that most people often don’t see?” and “What will you be doing while you are on probation that will make me proud of you?”

In our work we tend to define for our clientele what the problems are and how they most solve the problem. Another possibility is to invite a conversation with youthful offenders and their parents where they define what is important for them to change and assist them in finding the solution that works best for them. In approaching clients in this way they become more open and trusting in that they feel supported and often will considering changing in directions they have prescribed for themselves. I often ask questions like “What is the most important or pressing problem that you would like to solve while your child is on probation?” and “What could I do that might be helpful to you and your family to solve this problem?”

In this approach great attention is paid to family empowerment that is involving parents as much as possible in all evaluative, treatment and intervention efforts. Parents become involved participants and considered experts regarding their children and they are given status as decision-makers in organizing ongoing planning for their children. I have found that trusting parents in this manner yields significant

benefits including encouraging the belief they can be helpful and authoritative in changing behavior of their children and the changes they make are more likely to extend beyond the probation experience.

A pathway for encouraging change in youth is to focus attention on building partnerships between the youth/family and community helpers in schools, agencies and extended family. Bringing together important people in the child’s life enhances the possibilities for change by pooling joint wisdom, resources and energy in solving problems. In this regard the probation officer does not have to shoulder so much of the responsibility for change. I often ask the following questions “Who are the people in your life who care for you and inspire you?” and “Who could be helpful to us in solving the problems you are facing?” In many situations I will ask these caring and inspirational others to become a part of the helping effort.

Dean C. Wolf, MSW is founder, Partners For Creative Collaboration with 32 years experience as trainer, consultant and service provider for juvenile probation departments, child welfare agencies, mental health and substance abuse programs, residential centers and public and non-public schools. The practices outlined in this article have been implemented in the juvenile justice and child welfare system in Adams County, Pennsylvania and have resulted in significant cost savings through reduced out-of-home placements. If you are interested in learning more about this practice feel free to come to the JCJC-sponsored training “Navigating Minefields: Traveling the Path of Least Resistance” to be presented May 4-5, 2006, at the Days Inn Penn State, State College, PA.

Blueprints, from page 5

has been shown to save \$9,315 per child after program costs.

Not only do these prevention programs have excellent outcomes for youth and families, they also have a substantial economic return as well. Community planning boards all over Pennsylvania have been implementing “Blueprint” programs as an integral part of the *Communities That Care*® prevention strategy. More information on this study can be found at www.wsipp.wa.gov

Tom Jenkins Named Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer for Nurse-Family Partnership

Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP), based in Denver, Colorado, has announced the appointment of Thomas R. Jenkins, Jr. as Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer. Tom has more than 35 years of experience in senior level management positions in the public, non-profit, and for profit sectors serving the needs of children, youth, and families, and is well known throughout Pennsylvania's juvenile justice and child welfare systems.

Tom served as Director of the Bureau of State Facilities in the Office of Children, Youth and Families in the Department of Public Welfare for two years and served as the Director of Department's Bureau of Child Welfare Services for eight years. Prior to joining Nurse-Family Partnership, Mr. Jenkins served as President and Chief Operating Officer for Cornell Companies, Inc. Prior to his work at Cornell, he was the Vice President of Operations at Abraxas Group, Inc. In his new position, Tom is reunited with his Pennsylvania colleague, Clay Yeager, who has served as President and CEO of Nurse-Family Partnership since January of 2005.

Nurse-Family Partnership is the most rigorously tested program of its kind. Randomized controlled trials conducted over the past 30 years have shown that compared to their peers without services, Nurse-Family Partnership mothers show a 79% reduction in child abuse and neglect, a 69% reduction in arrests and mothers are more likely to move off welfare to successful employment with 30 fewer months of welfare use. Benefits to Nurse-Family Partnership children include a dramatic improvement in readiness to enter school, a 56% reduction in alcohol use and 54% fewer arrests by the age of 15.

A recent cost-benefit analysis by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy showed a savings of over \$17,000 for children born to Nurse-Family Partnership mothers. In light of these proven outcomes, Nurse-Family Partnership has been praised by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, the Office of the Surgeon General, and the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health. Nurse-Family Partnership serves 20,000 families a year. Nurse-Family Partnership plans to make the program available to all low-income, first-time mothers across the U.S. There are currently 23 NFP sites in Pennsylvania.

Evidence-based "Blueprint" prevention programs create an economic "return on investment"

by: Joe Markiewicz, NW Regional Strategic Consultant, CJJT&R

Evidence-based "Blueprint" prevention programs have been shown to be effective in reducing adolescent problem behaviors such as school drop-out, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, juvenile delinquency and violence. The *Communities That Care*® prevention-planning model uses the programs as part of its community planning strategy. "Blueprint" programs have been selected out of hundreds of international programs by a group of researchers at the Center for the Study & Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado (CSPV). Few people realize these same programs have a substantial economic impact on communities as well. Some of these programs include; Big Brothers/Sisters Program, Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care, Functional Family Therapy, LifeSkills, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS), Nurse-Family Partnership, Midwestern Prevention Project, Multisystemic Therapy, Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, and The Incredible Years.

One of the qualifications of a "Blueprint" program is cost effectiveness. Costs associated with the program cannot exceed the desired outcome or benefit to the participants of the program. Many "Blueprint" programs have a favorable economic return as well as being cost effective. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy conducted a national study on the economic return of prevention programs and found that most research-based programs have a substantial economic return on investment. The study has shown that programs that intervene with specific groups of high-risk youth have the greatest cost benefit of all prevention programs, and programs that intervene at a very early age have the greatest potential to be successful in delaying the onset of problem behaviors later in adolescence.

Benefits of using evidence-based prevention programs include: taxpayers can expect to save \$14.07 for every dollar spent in future criminal justice costs by using the Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care Program; Home Nurse Visitation Programs can save between \$6,000-\$17,200 per youth; Big Brothers/Sisters programs can expect to save \$2,822 per child after program costs are deducted; children enrolled in Preparing for the Drug-Free Years have a \$6,918 cost savings; and, Multisystemic Therapy

Blueprints, continued on page 4, col. 2

Competency Development: The least understood Balanced and Restorative Justice Goal

by Margery K. Miller

From the newest juvenile probation officers to members of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Committee (JJDC) of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD), there is agreement that the competency development goal of balanced and restorative justice is difficult to explain. While there has been a well-used definition of competency development, “the capacity to do something well that others value,” there has never been a blueprint for achieving it.

To establish guidelines for the practical application of competency development goals within the juvenile justice system, state and local juvenile justice specialists and members of JJDC met with Patricia Torbet and Douglas Thomas of the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) over two and a half years.

Their shared goal was the research and development of a “white paper” (a white paper expresses a specific opinion or point of view) that would be written by Torbet and Thomas and funded by a PCCD grant to NCJJ. The white paper, “Advancing Competency Development: A White Paper for Pennsylvania” (Torbet, P. and Thomas, D. 2005 *Advancing Competency Development: A White Paper for Pennsylvania*. Pittsburgh, PA. NCJJ) defines competency development, discusses why it’s important, reviews best practices for achieving it, and describes a plan for measuring it—all within a balanced and restorative justice paradigm.

The white paper is, in effect, the current “official” position on competency development in the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system. According to Torbet and Thomas, it is not the “last word,” but “the start of an extended discussion on the subject.” (p. 1)

Historically, parents, schools, law enforcement, and communities have viewed the juvenile justice system as having the primary responsibility for ensuring that juvenile offenders develop competencies. The focus group came to the conclusion that, for various reasons, e.g., financial, time limitations, etc., the juvenile justice system cannot possibly “fix” all the problems that some youth bring to the system. Although, the group acknowledged that by virtue of a court’s orders, the juvenile justice system does have a primary role in helping offenders become responsible and productive members of their communities, *it cannot be the only entity involved.*

The focus group reached consensus on the *role* of the juvenile justice system: “to facilitate efforts that

advance youths’ competencies so that offenders are less likely to take part in anti-social, delinquent behaviors and better able to become responsible and productive members of their communities.” (p.12) Many times, the juvenile justice system will be the “middle man” in connecting juveniles to appropriate services.” Juvenile justice policy and practice should not relieve other public systems, or communities...of fulfilling their responsibilities to youth.” (p. 11)

After an extensive review of available research that examined youth within and outside of the juvenile justice system and hours of debate among focus group participants, five skills that young people need to succeed in school, in work, and in life were identified. The five skills were the foundation upon which competency development was defined as a *process* in which “juvenile offenders acquire the knowledge and skills that make it possible for them to become productive, connected, and law abiding members of their communities.” (p.3) Enhancement of these skills increases resistance to delinquency while deficits in them can lead to increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

The five identified skill areas, or domains, are: *prosocial skills* help adolescents interact with others in positive ways and include problem solving, impulse control and interaction skills; *moral reasoning skills* help adolescents understand how their thinking, choices, and values affect their behavior; *academic skills* help adolescents improve school performance and include study, learning, reading, writing, and math skills; *workforce development skills* help adolescents plan for becoming financially self-sufficient and include skills for getting and keeping a job as well as specialized job skills for specific careers; and, *independent living skills* help older adolescents who are unable or cannot go home to live successfully on their own and include budgeting, money management, and career planning skills. (p.3)

Not surprisingly, the five identified skills are most effectively delivered through skill training that combines classroom learning and/or counseling with practical applications, e.g., juveniles must not only talk about managing their anger, they must practice it in a classroom or in a job. Torbet and Thomas explain that “Skill training will not lead to competency or change real-life behavior if training is stopped after the youth learns to produce the skill in counseling, classroom, or role play. Juvenile offenders need real-life opportunities to practice and

demonstrate their new skills in the community.” (p.7) Successful skill training programs usually consist of some or all of the following techniques: *selling* the benefits of the skill; *modeling* use of the skill; *role playing/experiential learning*; *correcting* via feedback; *generalizing* use of the skill in various settings; *encouraging* participation in skill building activities; *reinforcing* so positive behaviors will be repeated; and, *recycling* any/all of the above, as necessary.

Yet, this is not the whole picture: A review of the literature finds that “interventions that don’t help build strong relationships or bonds to pro-social entities or offer positive community roles for offenders are unlikely to have long term impact.” (p.7) Schools, parents, positive peers, and community groups can play a significant role in helping offenders learn competencies. These interpersonal relationships are the key to adolescent well-being and an offender’s success. (p.8) Offenders themselves can become active participants in developing competencies rather than passive recipients of services.

Important as well are the relationships between offender and probation officer, offender and counselor, offender and detention center/residential worker. “A probation officer who models and reinforces pro-social behavior and attitudes will likely have a positive impact on an offender.” (p.13) Juvenile probation officers actually have supervision guidelines—described in the *Desktop Guide to Juvenile Probation*—to help youth under their supervision become more competent. Practices include needs and strengths assessments, supervision plans based on the assessments, identifying appropriate services and responsibilities, connecting juveniles to pro-social opportunities, monitoring progress, motivating offender’s participation in skill building activities, and documenting outcomes.

Arguably, one of the best and most cost-effective activities for achieving competency development is community service. Besides providing opportunities for juveniles to learn vocational skills such as painting and landscaping, it also teaches life skills such as being organized, getting along with co-workers, and arriving on time. By also providing opportunities for juvenile offenders to make amends to their communities through meaningful work and protecting community members when juveniles are working at supervised projects, community service meets all balanced and restorative goals.

Community service enables offenders to develop positive pro-social relationships with community members that can continue long after the community service assignment has concluded. For evidence of this, look at non-profit agencies where offenders continue to volunteer, visit, or in some way remain

connected long after their court-ordered assignment has been completed.

The focus group debate that occasioned the greatest number of opinions was the one over competency development and treatment, i.e., are they synonymous? Although the group reached consensus on the issue—they are not synonymous—the debate has not ended; especially around substance abuse. Most agree that being the recipient of a service, for example, drug treatment, does not make one competent according to the new definition. Competency development has to do with acquiring skills and knowledge, e.g., ability, capability. Treatment is defined as the administration or application of remedies to a patient or for a disease or an injury, e.g., therapy, rehabilitation. In her presentation to the BARJ Committee, Torbet noted that “not all court-involved youth are in need of treatment, but most could benefit from competency development activities.” (p.8) Treatment may be necessary before competency development training can take place for some youth, particularly in areas of substance abuse, mental illness, sexual aggression, and thinking errors.

With an applicable and practical definition of competency development, the results of the system’s efforts to achieve it can be measured. If the juvenile justice system is successful in delivering and/or providing competency development training, then juveniles should, in fact, leave the system better off than when they entered it.

Two kinds of information can be collected: outputs and outcomes. Outputs are any skill-building or reinforcing activity the offender engaged in while under supervision. To measure outputs, juvenile probation officers assess each juvenile based on the five identified skill areas, whether deficits were addressed and whether the activities to ameliorate the problems were partially or successfully completed.

Intermediate outcomes, i.e., the immediate effect of service delivery in an individual case, can be measured at the end of a service or case closing.” (p.17) Outcomes include all goal-related activities that tell us whether the offender is more competent in terms of being a productive citizen, more connected, and more law-abiding. At case closing, juvenile probation officers can record whether juveniles are: attending school and passing, attending vocation school, working (productive); participating in a positive school or community group, working with a mentor (connected); and, completing terms of probation with no new adjudications (law abiding) (p.20)

To read or download a copy of the document, go to www.ncjj.org.

MacArthur Foundation, from page one

During the summer of 2005, Lourdes Rosado, Senior Attorney with the Juvenile Law Center, began work on researching state statutes and local memorandums of understanding to address self-incrimination issues relating to the screening and assessment process.

In September 2005, the Research Committee of the Pa. Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers reviewed the large number of screening and assessment instruments that currently exist to determine those most appropriate for use by juvenile probation departments in Pennsylvania. In October 2005, the Executive Committee of the "Chiefs' Council" endorsed the concept of a second training program, to be conducted in January 2006, to provide more detailed information on six specific screening and assessment tools.

An ad hoc committee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice Workgroup was established to create a Joint Position Statement, similar in fashion to the Joint Policy Statement created for the Aftercare component of the *Models for Change* initiative. The goal is to have the MH/JJ Joint Position Statement endorsed by department heads of state agencies and leaders of statewide organizations, and to then assign specific goals contained in the Joint Position Statement to subcommittees of the MH/JJ Workgroup. A final draft of the MH/JJ Joint Position Statement is now being circulated among the signatories for their review.

The MH/JJ Workgroup participated in a retreat during November 2005, to review the progress of the workgroup during 2005, and to plan how the initiative should move forward during 2006. An Executive Committee was created, comprised of the following individuals: Keith Snyder (Chair), Juvenile Court Judges' Commission; Dr. Stan Mrozowski, Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (DPW); Dan Rhoads, Pa. Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers; Mike Chambers, MH/MR Program Administrators Association; Wendy Luckenbill, Mental Health Association of Pennsylvania; and, Lourdes Rosado, Juvenile Law Center.

Subcommittees were also created to achieve the goals related to the development of a statewide screening and assessment process and the development of a continuum of services. Two ad hoc committees were also created to develop work products related the Joint Position Statement and the provision of legal protections regarding the screening and assessment process.

The following goals have been established by the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice Workgroup for 2006:

- The final draft of a Mental Health / Juvenile Justice Joint Position Statement will be circulated among signatories for their review and approval;
- The specific goals contained within the Joint Position Statement will be assigned to either the Screening and Assessment or Continuum of Services Subcommittees.

A training session will be held on January 19, 2006 to provide chief juvenile probation officers and their staff with more

detailed information on six specific screening and assessment instruments.

Chief juvenile probation officers will be asked to participate in a pilot program to create a screening and assessment process in their jurisdictions, in conjunction with other local agencies.

Both short-term and long-term strategies will be developed to address self-incrimination issues relating to the screening and assessment process.

Language emphasizing the coordination of mental health and juvenile justice services will be included in the Department of Public Welfare's Integrated Children's Services Plans.

Additional information regarding the work of the Mental Health/Juvenile Justice Workgroup and the other components of the MacArthur Foundation's *Models for Change* Initiative can be obtained at the Juvenile Law Center's website, at www.jlc.org.

In the next several months, the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission will be converting its monthly "Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice" newsletter to online dissemination only. Information regarding subscription to the online version of "Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice" will be detailed in future issues.

