

Maryland Juvenile Justice Reform Council Technical Assistance

Proposal Submitted by Justice System Partners

P.O. Box 970

South Easton, MA 02375-0970

1-774-501-2286

Contact Person: Kate Florio

kate@justicesystempartners.org

Prepared 10/21/2019

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I. Project Summary	3
II. Narrative	3
Introduction.....	4
Problem Statement.....	4
Juvenile Evidence-Based Practices Overview	6
Statement of Work	7
Justice System Partners Capacity.....	15
III. Timeline and Workplan	22
IV. Budget and Narrative.....	26
V. Proof of 501(c)(3).....	28



I. Project Summary

Maryland has made great strides in examining their juvenile justice system. The Juvenile Justice Reform Council (JJRC) is the most recent of several strategies that is designed to help develop a plan for Maryland to move juvenile justice reform forward. Supported by the Department of Juvenile Services Research and Evaluation Unit, the JJRC is designed to use data to help drive juvenile justice reform in Maryland. Justice System Partners (JSP) is a juvenile justice reform agency that assists local and state jurisdictions in developing strong coalitions across diverse groups to ensure that the reforms undertaken are supported in research, data-driven with clear outcomes, implemented effectively, and supported by internal capacity to ensure long-term success.

Justice System Partners is proposing a four-step process to support the work of the Juvenile Justice Reform Council. First, we will facilitate a series of meetings to help the JJRC identify the current needs of the system, where there are strengths and gaps, and provide recommendations to the committee for areas of improvement. Second, we will facilitate roundtable listening sessions throughout the state, ensuring that the JJRC has a clear understanding of the expectations of the community and how the community can support the reform efforts. Third, JSP will provide technical assistance to the team to collect and analyze existing data, develop reports to help understand the data, and provide recommendations to improve the data efforts of Maryland including ways in which the state can provide clear and effective views of the results. Fourth, JSP will work with the JJRC to examine existing policies and provide recommendations for future policies that will support broad juvenile justice reform.

Deliverables for this project include 1) a well-defined system map that will provide a robust picture of the current system across each decision point, 2) a communications package that will define the work the JJRC has been tasked with as well as a summary of the findings from the overall project, 3) a summary report from the roundtable discussions that provides the overall themes, strengths, and areas of recommendations from the community, 4) a data plan including a robust data translation package, and 5) a system wide reform plan synthesizing the findings across the entire project.

II. Narrative

Introduction

The following proposal outlines Justice System Partners' (JSP) plan for technical assistance for the Maryland Juvenile Justice Reform Council (JJRC). JSP's approach to reform is rooted in evidence, cross-systems collaboration, and forging consensus among diverse stakeholders. JSP's staff and consultants have a wide range of expertise in systemic reform, data analysis, evidence-based practices, and innovative policy reform. This proposal includes a clear technical assistance plan that will: 1) use a data-driven approach to develop a statewide framework of policies and investment strategies that increase public safety and reduce recidivism of youth who commit offenses; 2) share information on best practices for the treatment of youth who are subject to the criminal and juvenile justice system; and 3) identify and make recommendations to limit or otherwise mitigate risk factors that contribute to youth contact with the criminal and juvenile justice systems. JSP's TA plan follows a clear and organized process for facilitation of the JJRC, advisory group, and roundtable listening sessions; presents a detailed strategy to assess and analyze data; and establishes a thorough, consensus-based process for developing policy recommendations and creating a system-wide plan for juvenile justice reform in Maryland.

Problem Statement

Juvenile justice reform is surging across the country. For the past two decades, an increasing number of jurisdictions have been changing their approaches to youth who commit crime and abandoning policies that were developed in response to fears of "juvenile super-predators."¹ These changes have resulted in better outcomes for youth, safer communities, and innovative practices that affirm the potential of youth to grow, change, and achieve success.

Reformers are now armed with research that demonstrates the ineffectiveness of punitive approaches to youth who commit crime, and the limitations of the current juvenile justice system to provide opportunities for youth to improve.² There is clear evidence that young people's

¹ Dilulio, J. "The Coming of the Super-Predators." *The Weekly Standard*, November 27, 1995.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/weekly-standard/the-coming-of-the-super-predators>

² Confinement has been shown to have negative consequences. Howell, J.C. & Lipsey, M.W. (2012). "Research-Based Guidelines for Juvenile Justice Programs." *Justice Research and Policy*, 14(1): 1-18.

<https://doi.org/10.3818/JRP.14.1.2012.17>. "The highly structured and predictable environment [of incarceration] severely limits decision-making opportunities and removes vestiges of independence and autonomy..., which are highly valued commodities during adolescence. Furthermore, research findings generally serve to document a criminogenic effect of incarceration...." (citations omitted). Augustyn, M.B. & McGloin, J.M. (2017). "Revisiting Juvenile Waiver: Integrating the Incapacitation Experience." *Criminology*, 56(1): 154-190, 158.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12165>. And, Fabelo, T., Arrigona, N., Thompson, M.D., Clemens, A., & Marchbanks, M.P. III. (2015). "Closer to Home: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms." New York, NY: The Council of State Governments Justice Center. Retrieved from <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/texas-JJ-reform-closer-to-home.pdf>. And, Aalsma, M.C., Lau, K.S.L., Perkins, A.J., Schwartz, K., Tu, W., Wiehe, S.E., Monahan, P., & Rosenman, M.B. (2015). "Mortality of Youth Offenders along a Continuum of Justice System Involvement." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 50(3): 303-310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.030>. And, Gatti, E., Tremblay, R.E., & Vitaro, F. (2009).

brains continue to develop well into their 20s, and that punishment does little to shape behavior, but instead the support of caring adults, opportunities to learn from mistakes, and environments that support incremental change.³ Many youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system face significant barriers including living in poverty, witnessing violence, experiencing trauma, lacking stable housing, and enduring neglect.⁴ These issues, coupled with a system that uses punishment as the primary intervention, result in high costs to youth and their communities, and these costs only compound as youth enter adulthood and lack the skills to become productive members of society.⁵

Over the past 20 years, the juvenile justice system has begun to amass a body of research that points us in the right direction, a direction that has shown to have significant positive impacts on youth and their families. The challenge for many jurisdictions is to identify the areas in which the system needs to change and implement those changes in a successful manner.

While Maryland has implemented several juvenile justice reforms, the creation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Council (JJRC) solidifies the state's commitment to system-wide reform. The JJRC is poised to take on several of Maryland's challenges with technical assistance from JSP. First, the JJRC will build on an already robust data collection system to better understand how youth are processed and where there are areas of need. Second, the JJRC will examine existing services and identify the quality of those services as well as where there are gaps. Third, the JJRC will develop cross-system collaboration to provide evidence-based and cost-effective services to youth and their families. Fourth, the JJRC will review and restructure existing policies to support behavioral change and reduce barriers that prevent youth and their families from receiving effective services.

"Iatrogenic Effect of Juvenile Justice." *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 50(8): 991-998. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02057.x>. And, Latessa, E.J. & Lowenkamp, C.T. (2006). "What Works in Reducing Recidivism?" *University of St. Thomas Law Journal*, 3(3), 521-535. Retrieved from <https://ir.stthomas.edu/ustlj/vol3/iss3/7/>. And, Lipsey, M.W. (2009). "The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview." *Victims and Offenders*, 4(2):124-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880802612573>. And, Lowenkamp, C.T. & Latessa, E.J. (2005, May). "Increasing the Effectiveness of Correctional Programming through the Risk Principle: Identifying Offenders for Residential Placement." *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4(2): 263-290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2005.00021.x>.
³ Cohen, A.O. & Casey, B.J. (2014). "Rewiring Juvenile Justice: The Intersection of Developmental Neuroscience and Legal Policy." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(2): 63-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.11.002>. National Research Council. (2013). And, "Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach." Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/14685/reforming-juvenile-justice-a-developmental-approach>.

⁴ Baglivio, M.T. et al. (2014). "The Prevalence of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) in the Lives of Juvenile Offenders." *OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 3(2): 1-23. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/246951.pdf>.

⁵ Petteruti, A., Schindler, M. & Ziedenberg, J. (2014). "Sticker Shock: Calculating the Full Price Tag for Youth Incarceration." Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute. http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/sticker_shock_final_v2.pdf. And Aizer, A. & Doyle, J. Jr. (2015). "Juvenile Incarceration, Human Capital, and Future Crime: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, (130)2: 759-803. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv003>.

Juvenile Evidence-Based Practices Overview

The juvenile justice system has made great strides over the past 20 years to produce better outcomes. Facing growing numbers of youth in detention and state-level residential facilities in the early 1990s, committed state and local juvenile justice agencies, with the support of private foundations, advocacy groups, and community organizations, have reduced the number of delinquency cases 42% since 2005.⁶ A range of innovative reforms at all stages of the system have enabled many jurisdictions to reduce the number of youth in custody, decrease racial and ethnic disparities, and successfully deliver community-based interventions that have been shown to significantly reduce future offending.

The National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (NICJR) has recently encouraged juvenile justice systems to “reduce, improve, and reinvest”.⁷ NICJR calls for juvenile justice systems to follow ten key steps to reform:

- 1) Strive to keep youth out of the system
- 2) Collaborate with youth and families
- 3) Build on youth’s strengths and address needs
- 4) Enable community-based organizations to take the lead
- 5) Avoid detention for pre-adjudication youth
- 6) Keep any probation time short
- 7) Keep youth in their homes and communities
- 8) Incarceration is harmful
- 9) Provide exceptional care
- 10) Reinvest

While there are no juvenile justice systems following all 10 of these steps perfectly, there are examples of jurisdictions across the country that have implemented a range of interventions that have had significant impacts on the juvenile justice system. Ultimately, these reforms are focused on three specific areas of the system.

First, jurisdictions should reduce the number of youths formally entering the juvenile justice system. The juvenile justice system is often described as a catch-all for youth who have fallen through the cracks of existing social service systems. Failed policies, like the adoption of school resource officers, have often resulted in more youth, not fewer, being referred to the juvenile justice system. Since many of the deterrence-based interventions that were adopted during the 1980s and 1990s have demonstrated similar outcomes, jurisdictions have consistently moved to more front-end diversion and deflection programs. Diversion and deflection programs are often initiated by law enforcement officers to keep youth out of the system recognizing that exposure to the justice system has significant iatrogenic effects. In fact, a recent meta-analysis Wilson and Hoge found that lower risk youth who are diverted from the system are 1.6 times less likely to

⁶ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2018). Juvenile Justice Statistics: National Report Series Fact Sheet.

⁷ Muhammad, David (2019). A positive youth justice system. National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform.

return to the justice system than similarly situated youth who are arrested and placed in detention.⁸

The second area that recent reforms focus on is for youth who do enter the juvenile system, all efforts should be made to allow the youth to remain in their communities and services should revolve around the youth and their caregivers. Too often, youth who did not pose a significant risk to the community were removed from their families and placed in detention or short-term residential programs. Jurisdictions that have adopted a risk, needs, and responsivity (RNR) framework to deliver services have been successful at reducing future delinquency.⁹ The risk principle ensures that the youth with greater needs receive necessary services, while minimizing the exposure of lower risk youth. The need principle suggests that services should be related directly to the needs of youth and that they should be cognitive-behaviorally based and should also help provide skills to caregivers. The responsivity principle suggests that services should be culturally and gender responsive, should be delivered in the least restrictive setting, and should be focused on increasing youths' skills and avoiding deficit-based interventions.

For those youth who do have to be removed from their environment, the third area of reform is the design and purpose of out-of-home placements. First, any placement should be the least restrictive, closest to home, and should result in the shortest times. Second, the focus should be short-term, match needs with appropriate treatment services, and provide an effective dose of treatment.¹⁰ Third, youth and their families need to receive supportive aftercare services focused on helping the youth transition back to their community successfully.

Statement of Work

Task 1: Juvenile Justice Reform Council

Goal: To support JJRC members in working together to assess Maryland's juvenile justice system structure, needs, and opportunities.

JSP will work with the JJRC to facilitate a thorough, timely, organized, and consensus-based process for system mapping, building collaboration among stakeholders, and development and presentation of analyses, recommendations, and communication materials. Activities will include:

1. **Meeting facilitation:** JSP will facilitate bi-monthly meetings of the JJRC for the first six months of the grant period, and monthly meetings for the second six months. Facilitators will be JSP staff and consultants with expertise in consensus-building across government

⁸ Wilson, Holly A., and Robert D. Hoge. 2012. "The Effect of Youth Diversion Programs on Recidivism: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* (published online Oct. 15, 2013).

⁹ Bonta, J and Andrews, D. (2017). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.

¹⁰ Baglivio et al. (2018). The search for the holy grail: Criminogenic needs matching, intervention dosage, and subsequent recidivism among serious juvenile offenders in residential placement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*; 55: pp 46-57.

agencies, data analysis and presentation, juvenile justice policy reform, and community engagement and partnership. JSP will draw on local consultants as well as national experts.

2. JJRC member interviews: JSP will conduct individual interviews with all JJRC members in order to gather information on their roles as they relate to Maryland's juvenile justice system, their goals for reform, and their view of potential roadblocks to reform. JSP will develop an interview protocol prior to beginning interviews and will present a summary of interview themes to the entire council.
3. Supporting Authentic Engagement of Impacted Individuals: Married with data and research, the authorizing legislation for the JJRC and associate activities recognized the importance of engaging impacted individuals. Youth and community engagement are crucial to the strength and success of the JJRC and Advisory Group, but similar decision-making bodies frequently lose these benefits when they fall short of authentic engagement. Hallmarks of authentic youth and community engagement include equal weight of voices around the table, conscious and consistent rejection of adultism and other pervasive minimizing of youth and community representatives, and a "we're stronger together" attitude shared across all members.

JSP will provide educational sessions for the JJRC and Advisory Group that will include practical tools all members of the groups can use to support authentic youth and community engagement and underline the benefits of achieving authenticity in their processes. Each session will include recognition of adultism and other barriers to authentic engagement, ways to recognize our own behaviors that stand in the way of the strongest decision-making bodies, and tools each individual member can use to increase collaboration and partnership among all members.

4. Learning from innovation sites: JSP will identify innovation sites that have successfully enacted reforms in line with the council's goals and that have comparable youth populations and system structure. Learning opportunities may include site visits, webinars/conference calls, report/outcome data sharing, and summaries developed by JSP.
5. System mapping: JSP will work in partnership with JJRC members to engage in detailed system mapping that will assess all decision points in Maryland's juvenile justice system. Decision points may include arrest, diversion/referral, detention risk assessment, prosecutorial filing of charges/transfer, plea/trial/adjudication, sentencing, probation/revocation, placement, and parole/aftercare. System mapping will identify options currently available at each decision point, decision-making policies and processes, "on ramps" into the juvenile justice system, and "off ramps" out of the juvenile justice system, which will ultimately be linked to JSP's data analysis for each decision point. Mapping will identify strengths in current system structure as well as gaps and areas of opportunity. Mapping will also identify juvenile justice system stakeholders and decision makers associated with each decision point, including: law enforcement, educators/school administrators, court intake staff, detention staff, prosecutors/defense

attorneys, judiciary, probation staff, group home/facility staff, and parole/aftercare staff. System mapping will identify overlap between juvenile justice system decision points/decision makers and other youth-serving agencies responsible for child welfare, mental health, public health, housing, and education.

6. Building collaboration and consensus: JSP has extensive experience facilitating policy and data analysis and justice reform in a variety of jurisdictions and will bring its expertise to bear on its work in Maryland. System mapping will identify stakeholders and partners who are essential to building effective collaboration and could enact concrete change. JSP will engage all critical stakeholders identified by the JJRC and use detailed system mapping, data analysis, adolescent development and evidence-based practices research, and policy analysis to create buy-in and build consensus. JSP understands the different opportunities and constraints associated with various stakeholder groups and will identify collaborative practices that maximize the potential for stakeholders to meet their varied goals and use limited resources wisely.
7. Presentation of analysis and status updates: At each JJRC meeting, JSP will provide status updates, which will focus on topics such as JJRC member interview themes, system mapping, data collection and analysis, roundtable themes, policy research and analysis, policy priorities and recommendations, and system-wide reform plan development. JSP will develop detailed reports during the grant term on system mapping and data analysis, noting areas of interest relating to equity and cross-systems collaboration, and on roundtable/survey themes. All status updates and reports on analyses will be comprehensible, clear and concise.
8. Presentation of final recommendations: Based on its research and policy analysis (see Policy Analysis and Recommendations, below), JSP will work with the JJRC and advisory stakeholder group to develop consensus policy recommendations. JSP will use its extensive experience in forging consensus among groups with diverse interests to help identify potential areas of compromise, collaboration, and resource-sharing (both financial and otherwise), and to ensure that the recommendations in the plan fairly and transparently reflect the goals and concerns of all stakeholders. The final, thoroughly vetted policy recommendations will be actionable for juvenile justice system stakeholders, government agencies, policymakers, and community groups that serve youth in the justice system or at risk of system involvement. Based on the policy recommendations, JSP will develop a system-wide juvenile justice reform plan that includes measurable outcomes and focuses on implementation of evidence-based practices and increasing racial and ethnic equity (see Policy Analysis and Recommendations, below, for more detail).
9. Development of JJRC communication materials: Subject to JJRC approval and based on JSP's analysis of current practice, data, and research, JSP will create clear communications materials that convey the evidence-based, data-driven rationale for the JJRC's policy recommendations. Materials may include one-page fact/recommendation sheets, infographics, PowerPoint presentations, executive summaries, frequently asked questions, press releases, and written interviews with stakeholders. Communications

materials will emphasize the JJRC's consensus-based work to develop policy recommendations that are in line with best practices and strive to achieve equity and fairness for youth of color at all stages of the justice system.

Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group and Roundtables

Goal: To develop a better understanding of the needs of the community stakeholders.

Similar to its process facilitation with the JJRC, JSP will facilitate the work of the advisory group and the statewide roundtable listening sessions. Activities will include:

1. Convening of advisory group: JSP will ensure the advisory group includes experts on juvenile justice policy reform, equity/racial and ethnic disparities, youth leadership, family and community engagement, victims' rights, restorative justice, credible messaging, and lived juvenile justice system experience. Advisory group members may include representatives from Maryland-based groups as well as national organizations such as the Center for Children's Law and Policy, Community Connections for Youth, Justice for Families, National Center for Victims of Crime, and W. Haywood Burns Institute.
2. Facilitation of advisory group processes: JSP will develop processes for the advisory group to work with the JJRC to convene roundtable listening sessions across Maryland. Through these processes, stakeholders will consider:
 - Where and when to convene roundtables, ensuring that roundtables reach all geographic areas of the state as well as all demographics, and take place at locations and times that are convenient for participants, especially working parents and families from lower income neighborhoods.
 - Who to involve in the roundtables, taking into particular consideration families and neighborhoods that are most likely to be impacted by juvenile justice policies, especially people of color; individuals with lived experience in the juvenile justice system and/or the adult criminal system as youth; victims of juvenile crime; local policy-/decision-makers; local advocacy groups; local educators; local law enforcement; and local faith-based and community groups.
 - Goals of the roundtables, which may include hearing directly from individuals with lived system experience and their family members; hearing the concerns of victims of juvenile crime; learning about local efforts related to juvenile justice policy, practice and reform; ascertaining community assets and opportunities for prosocial youth engagement; identifying successful local youth-serving strategies and partnerships; identifying local barriers to youth opportunity and success; and identifying local juvenile justice policy and practice opportunities and constraints.
 - Potential need for broader data collection beyond roundtables, such as surveys or interviews.

Additionally, JSP will:

- Support the Advisory Stakeholder Group by providing practical tools all members of the groups can use to support authentic youth and community engagement and underline the benefits of achieving authenticity in their processes.
 - Develop recruitment strategies and materials for roundtables. Strategies will target community-based organizations, schools, police stations, courts/detention facilities, libraries, and government offices. Materials will include hard-copy flyers and announcements through various social media channels including Facebook, Twitter and Instagram.
 - Develop roundtable protocols, with a focus on ensuring a balance of power among participants, creating space for equitable opportunity to be heard, maintaining civil discussion while allowing participants to discuss issues openly and honestly, and developing clear takeaways that reflect the priorities and concerns of all participants.
 - Recruit roundtable participants through locally posted flyers, Facebook/Twitter/Instagram posts, and individual outreach to local agencies and organizations.
3. Roundtable facilitation and follow-up: JSP's experienced facilitators will ensure all roundtable participants have an equal voice, guide the conversation to meet the roundtable goals through targeted questions and activities, and maintain a productive and respectful environment. JSP facilitators acknowledge the profound personal impact juvenile crime and juvenile justice system policy and practice can have on individuals and communities, and the correspondingly high level of interest, concern and passion.

JSP will record roundtable discussions and takeaways, summarize input from roundtables, and identify actionable themes from discussions. If surveys are used in addition to roundtables, JSP will work with the advisory group to develop survey protocols and identify survey participants. JSP will analyze survey responses and develop a summary report. Summaries and themes from roundtables (and surveys, if used) will be presented to the advisory group and JJRC.

Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis

Goal: To examine the current data infrastructure, better understand current system impacts and outcomes, and provide recommendations to better use data to make reform decisions and analyze system effectiveness.

One of the hallmarks of effective juvenile justice reform is data. It is imperative that systems collect, review, and integrate their data efforts to help support change in each jurisdiction. Maryland, like many states, has embraced a data-driven approach and sees the great value in developing strategies to best use data. In 2018, Maryland released the Data Resource Guide: Successful Youth, Strong Leaders, Safer Communities, a comprehensive data guide to the current status of Maryland's juvenile justice system. This guide reviews strategies currently used to address juvenile delinquency and includes a robust baseline for juvenile recidivism rates.



In order to assist the JJRC in developing a true data-driven system—one in which continuous data gathering and analyses inform all aspects of system operations and reform initiatives—JSP will work with key stakeholders to collect and analyze existing data, help identify gaps within the existing data, and develop a series of methods to translate data into clear directions to support system-wide reform. Specifically, JSP will provide the following assistance:

Data Collection and Analyses

1. Review existing data and sources: JSP will work closely with the Department of Juvenile Services Research and Evaluation Unit to determine what data are available and review those areas in which the data are collected. A comprehensive data mapping process will help Maryland's stakeholders have a better understanding of what data are available to monitor the success of the reform efforts and where there needs to be greater attention in both data collection and focused interventions.
2. Review cross-systems data integration: As juvenile justice systems reduce their populations and reinvest resources into local programming and other state-level departments (e.g., education, social services), it is imperative that data systems be linked and that youth diverted from the juvenile justice system be flagged so that reform successes and challenges can be documented effectively. JSP will work with the Research and Evaluation Unit to determine if such data mechanisms are available and if not, JSP will provide recommendations to the JJRC on how to link cross-systems data.
3. Analyze existing data: JSP will work closely with the Research and Evaluation Unit to analyze existing data to best understand current juvenile system operations and outcomes, the drivers of each decision point, and data trends over time – especially regarding racial and ethnic disparities. These analyses will provide the JJRC with a better understanding of how youth move in and out of the system, what are the characteristics of the youth who move forward at each stage, and where the system has succeeded in reducing racial and ethnic disparities.
4. Data translation: JSP will help Maryland develop means to report data back to stakeholders in a clear and actionable way. While juvenile justice systems have begun collecting and analyzing data more effectively, often they struggle to communicate the findings in a manner that can be interpreted easily by a variety of stakeholders and presents a clear and compelling case for reform. JSP will recommend strategies Maryland can utilize to assist in translating data analysis into meaningful reports.

Task 4: Policy Assessment and Analysis

Goal: To review and analyze existing policies and make policy recommendations to the JJRC that will effectively support the system-wide reform.

JSP will conduct policy analysis and research in order to develop policy recommendations and a system-wide reform plan that is tailored to the needs of Maryland's youth and families, responsive to community and victim concerns, constructive in providing youth with meaningful opportunities for prosocial growth and rehabilitation, and attentive to the state's fiscal environment.

Specifically, JSP will:

1. Review existing policies: JSP will review all state agency policies related to youth who enter the juvenile justice system, youth who are transferred to the adult system, and youth who are diverted, paying particular attention to policies that may be tied to racial and ethnic inequity (as indicated by JSP's data analysis and broader research in the field). The review will include Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) policy, as well as non-DJS policies that affect juvenile justice system on and off ramps (e.g., child welfare interventions, status offense responses, mental health and substance use treatment), and outcomes for youth in the justice system (e.g., Department of Human Services policies related to homelessness/youth independent living, Medicaid/Maryland Children's Health Insurance Program, or family permanency planning). The policy review will identify areas of consensus or redundancy in agency policies as well as areas where policies diverge, and therefore may factor into the state's ability to effectively collaborate across systems (e.g., juvenile justice privacy protections that inhibit educational record-sharing or Medicaid termination policies that create obstacles to youth accessing health care upon release from a facility). JSP will also seek to identify local policies that significantly drive noteworthy local practice, are tailored to specific local needs/communities, or lead to notable racial/ethnic inequity at the local level.
2. Interview key stakeholders: JSP will use interviews with key stakeholders to better understand how policies drive practice across the state and across agencies. Interviews will also allow JSP to develop an understanding of informal practice norms that function similarly to policy in how they dictate decision-making, influence on and off ramps, and affect equitable treatment of youth, and to gain insight into local policy and practice. JSP will develop an interview protocol that focuses on use of evidence-based practices, receptivity to reform, reform approaches and receptivity, and equity. JSP will summarize interview themes for presentation to the JJRC.
3. Review budget allocations and fiscal environment: JSP will review state budget allocations to the Department of Juvenile Services, as well as budget allocations to other agencies that are directly tied youth in the justice system or at high risk of system involvement (e.g., Department of Human Services funding for youth who are victims of sex trafficking). JSP will review federal funding for juvenile justice interventions in Maryland. JSP will assess budget trends over time as well as the current fiscal

environment in the state. Budget review will also identify the extent to which local jurisdictions contribute to juvenile justice funding and the stability of local funding.

4. Assess overlap with best practices: JSP will conduct a system-wide multicomponent assessment to determine the extent to which current policies and practices in Maryland are consistent with evidence-based practices and adhere to best practices of effective juvenile justice interventions. Evidence-based practices will be identified through a literature review. Additional best practices will be identified through research of model policies from other jurisdictions across the country, particularly those established through the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative/deep-end site work, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change initiative, and The Pew Charitable Trust's Public Safety Performance Project, as well as those advocated by national groups such as the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National Research Council, National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform, American Psychological Association, and American Bar Association.
5. Assess equity: JSP will conduct a specific analysis of the extent to which current Maryland policy promotes equity and fairness for youth of color in the juvenile justice system. The analysis will compare Maryland policy to policies that have been shown in other jurisdictions to move systems closer to equity, such as family-engaged case planning, graduated responses and incentive-based probation, shifting discretion from prosecutors to the judiciary, and elimination of zero-tolerance policies in schools that lead to court referrals.
6. Develop policy recommendations: JSP will work with the JJRC to build consensus around a statewide framework of policy recommendations for juvenile justice reform that promote a cross-systems approach to serving youth, identify barriers to collaboration, increase public safety, and reduce youth recidivism. Policy recommendations will be rooted in JSP's data analysis, research on evidence-based/best practices, and equity assessment, and will be responsive to roundtable/survey themes, JJRC member interview themes, stakeholder interview themes, and advisory group recommendations. Recommendations will apply to the full juvenile justice continuum, including mitigation of risk factors that contribute to youth system involvement, diversion opportunities to keep youth out of the system, equity and fairness in system processes and dispositions, best practices in community engagement, and evidence-based practices for both community and residential interventions.
7. Develop system-wide reform plan: JSP will develop a system-wide reform plan to implement the policy recommendations. The plan will include measurable performance outcomes tied to robust data collection and analysis. The plan will include strategies to implement and sustain evidence-based practices and will focus on decision points that the data reveal are most closely tied to system inequities. The plan will draw on strategies illuminated by JJRC members, advisory group members, and roundtable participants; research on what interventions are most successful with adolescents; and innovations in juvenile justice reform that have proven success in other jurisdictions.

Capacity

JSP's mission is to improve the safety and quality of life for both justice-involved individuals and communities through evidence-based strategies and systems, relaying on data-based decisions and practices. In support of our mission, we:

- Educate criminal and juvenile justice system stakeholders regarding the efficacy of evidence-based approaches, data-based decisions, and practice;
- Support implementation of evidence-based strategies that reduce over-reliance on incarceration;
- Assist agencies and jurisdictions with the development and implementation of programs that reduce recidivism for people involved in the justice system;
- Improve criminal and juvenile justice administration by serving as a resource to public and private sector agencies on policy and program design, implementation, training, research, and evaluation; and
- Promote rational public policy and practical strategies for criminal and social justice issues;

Justice System Partners is comprised of a set of experts with hands-on leadership experience in the fields of juvenile and criminal justice. For each project we work on, our team brings a unique combination of strengths, including customized technical assistance; custom-built tools; capacity building; recognition of the roles of organizational culture, constraints, and funding practicalities in system change; the ability to work with a variety of stakeholders; and a commitment to building long-lasting relationships.

Each JSP team member brings unique experience and specific content expertise; all our staff are skilled facilitators with broad content knowledge and project management skills who have worked with numerous jurisdictions. Our technical assistance is noteworthy for the following:

- **JSP team members are consultants and public-sector managers and leaders.** JSP team members have been not just consultants, but public-sector leaders who bring a balanced perspective from across the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Our experience gives us credibility with local stakeholders, the creativity to troubleshoot and solve problems in a practical way, and the ability to view agencies in the context of systemic policy and practice.
- **JSP brings practical strategies and solutions.** JSP emphasizes objective, data-driven decision making. Over the past two decades, our staff have authored or co-authored tools for system assessment, decision-point mapping, policy modeling, leadership development, data dashboards, risk assessment, population projection, and cost-benefit analyses. We bring the creativity, experience, and project management skills to apply these tools for a variety of initiatives. Ensuring a strategy, tool, or facilitator is the best fit for a jurisdiction is important to us. Our focus is on matching our services to what is in our client's best interest. We combine the knowledge of how to apply current methods with the ability to develop new solutions if existing resources do not meet your needs.

- **JSP builds capacity.** In all engagements, JSP partners with local leaders to enhance their ability to sustain reform over the long term. This includes helping systems instill a commitment to collaboration amongst stakeholders and to use data to inform policy decisions. We encourage local ownership of planning and implementation by coaching executives and working with local representatives to co-facilitate processes.
- **JSP innovates.** JSP works with local analysts to collect and analyze information from various stakeholders across system decision points (law enforcement, courts, detention facilities, probation, etc.) to create profiles of current populations, project future population growth, and model the impact of potential policy changes. Our analysts can project facility population trajectories under current jurisdictional policies, as well as model the impact of potential policy changes. JSP is uniquely positioned to offer groundbreaking user-friendly projection models to sites, build sites' capacity to populate the models and interpret the results, and ensure that users are prepared to take ownership of the models once the technical assistance period ends.

JSP takes a data-driven approach to decision making in all projects, and we use high-quality evidence and research to support the work we do. This means that data and the latest research guide us in the development of project findings. We then facilitate discussions with project stakeholders to incorporate local contextual factors and develop recommendations that support buy-in and long-term commitment.

Experience and Expertise

JSP provides consulting and technical assistance to local and state criminal and juvenile justice agencies seeking to improve the effectiveness and quality of their justice programs or adopt new practices to effect significant change. We tailor our services to the needs of the jurisdiction or agency and work with our clients to incorporate data-driven, evidence-based management techniques and decision-making processes into their organizational processes.

The projects below illustrate JSP's experience and expertise relevant to this project.

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice's Transformation Initiative (2015-present)

Through an initial grant from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and subsequent contract with Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), JSP has worked with DJJ to develop evidence-based alternatives to juvenile correctional centers in Virginia. In support of DJJ's Transformation Initiative, JSP facilitated development of a strategy and design for a regionalized system of service delivery in the community. As part of this work, JSP assisted in the design and procurement of services from regional coordination agencies and developed a readiness self-assessment for potential community-based service providers; the assessment let vendors evaluate their preparedness to provide services under new, evidence-based requirements related to the statewide transformation project.

Additionally, JSP provided support to address quality assurance needs associated with service care coordinators, direct service providers, regional probation staff, and central office supports. JSP's efforts focused on planning and implementation assistance to identify structure, role, staffing, and resource needs; develop performance measures and reporting procedures; and help integrate this work with DJJ's larger Transformation Initiative.

Recognizing that change cannot happen without staff buy-in, JSP created leadership training for front-line supervisors. The Justice Transformation Institute (JTI) was designed to prepare supervisors working in intake, probation, parole, and institutions to implement and sustain organizational change. The training includes a 360-degree leadership assessment and supplemental coaching and support so that trainers can tailor their approach to match the needs of each participant. In 2019, JSP contracted directly with DJJ to expand JTI in a mixed, online and in-person format, train onsite staff to facilitate the training, and develop a JTI for executive staff.

System Assessment and Policy Recommendations (2016-present)

JSP works with local administrators and elected officials to assess their systems for alignment with evidence-based practices, and to support efficient and fair operations. To do so, JSP provides holistic assessments of system decision points, including system mapping, data analysis, population projection, and policy review, all with an eye toward reducing recidivism and improving public safety.

In 2018-2019, JSP partnered with the Annie E. Casey Foundation to help Milwaukee County (Wisconsin) determine the drivers of post-disposition secure bed placement for local youth, identify policies and practices that could reduce the unnecessary use of placement, and create a population projection model to help the county understand the impact that the closure of the state-run juvenile detention facility would have on secure bed needs at the local level. JSP worked closely with agency staff to map the juvenile justice decision points in Milwaukee County that could result in a secure placement decision, analyze historical data to determine historical placement trends for Milwaukee County youth, and create a projection model that allows stakeholders to identify the impacts that policies or practices targeting specific populations (e.g. offense level, risk level, and etc.) would have on secure bed usage.

From 2018 to 2019, JSP worked with the City of Vancouver, Washington to assess community corrections services for city misdemeanants for efficiency and cost effectiveness; make recommendations of how the services could be improved; and estimate the cost to the city to take the services in-house. Through data collection and analysis, policy and case reviews, surveys, interviews, and observation JSP worked with local stakeholders to identify several opportunities for operational and programmatic improvement, as well as opportunities for the city to generate cost-savings.

In 2017, JSP worked with Washtenaw County (Michigan) to assess the effectiveness (including recidivism outcomes) of the reentry and rehabilitation programs, policies, and practices of Washtenaw County Sheriff's Jail and Community Corrections offices. The primary objective was to find those treatment programs, policies and practices that could be eliminated, modified or enhanced to improve public safety in Washtenaw County. The project included reviewing

community corrections and jail assessment practices, cataloguing existing programs, and observing delivery of services by community providers and assessing their fidelity to evidence-based practices. Through a series of facilitated group discussions with stakeholders and individual interviews with key agency administrators, JSP then developed recommendations based on the findings and agreed action items and produced a report summarizing next steps for the county.

In 2016, JSP worked with the Boulder County (Colorado) Commissioners and Sheriff's Department to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the local jail population that included demographic profiles and risk and needs snapshots that identified population drivers. The team also catalogued existing programs, observed delivery of services by community providers and assessed fidelity to evidence-based practices. Armed with this information, JSP developed jail population projections and forecasted programming needs. Through a series of facilitated group discussions with stakeholders and individual interviews with key agency administrators, JSP then developed recommendations based on the jail population projection and the potential impact various policy changes could have on the population.

Data Analysis and Research (2015-present)

In 2019, JSP was selected, in partnership with Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, to participate in the Reducing Revocations Challenge. The Challenge is national initiative of Arnold Ventures and the CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance dedicated to understanding the drivers of probation revocations and identifying ways to reduce the community supervision failures that send hundreds of thousands of people to jail and prison each year. The project aims to increase success on probation through the identification, piloting, and testing of promising strategies grounded in a robust analysis and understanding of why revocations occur. To carry out this work, JSP will conduct on-the-ground, in-depth research and data analysis on the drivers of probation failures in Harris County, Texas. The findings will be used to propose evidence-based solutions for policy and practice changes.

From 2015 to 2017, JSP provided strategic support to the Smart Pretrial Justice Initiative. Smart Pretrial is an evidence-based, analysis-driven effort funded by the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and managed by the Pretrial Justice Institute (PJI). The initiative tested how improving pretrial policies and practices could save money and enhance public safety. JSP's role on the initiative was multi-pronged. We participated in the Pretrial Justice Working Group (PJWG) as a strategic advisor to PJI and BJA, and also served as the technical assistance team leader at the Yakima County (WA) and Denver (CO) sites, providing technical and analytic support for the implementation of pretrial risk assessment processes, performing cost-benefit analyses, and conducting assessments of each site's system culture and readiness for change. In Yakima County, Washington, JSP assisted with the implementation of the Public Safety Assessment (PSA), a pretrial risk assessment tool, and conducted a post-implementation analysis. The analysis showed that the pretrial release rate rose from 53 percent to 73 percent, while court appearance and no new arrests rates held steady.¹¹

¹¹ Brooker, Claire M. B. (2017). "Yakima County, Washington Pretrial Justice System Improvements: Pre- and Post-Implementation Analysis," Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Justice Institute and Justice System Partners.

The Safety and Justice Challenge (2014-present)

In 2015, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation announced a major initiative to address over-incarceration and change the way America thinks about and uses jails. JSP has been a proud partner of the Safety and Justice Challenge (SJC) since 2014, serving as a strategic advisor as the initiative was being developed and providing technical assistance since its inception.

JSP continues to serve as a strategic partner to the Foundation and initiative team. Over the course of the SJC, JSP has provided technical assistance to Ada County, Idaho; Charleston County, South Carolina; Cook County, Illinois; Lucas County, Ohio; Mecklenburg, North Carolina; Multnomah County, Oregon; Palm Beach County, Florida; Pima County, Arizona, and San Francisco County, California as they develop and model effective ways to keep people out of jail who don't belong there, work to decrease racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal justice system, and increase community engagement with criminal justice initiatives. For example, since joining the SJC in 2015, Cook County has reduced its jail population by 32 percent (i.e., 2,692 fewer people held in the county jail). JSP has also helped sites develop mental health diversion policies, eliminate prosecution of low-level crimes associated with high levels of racial and ethnic disparities, and implement comprehensive bond reform.

Staffing and Project Management

JSP has identified a highly qualified team with extensive juvenile justice reform experience for this project:

Lore Joplin, JSP Principal, will direct all aspects of the project, supervise JSP's team of experts, attend and facilitate all JJRC meetings, and be the main point of contact. Lore has been with JSP for three years and has over 25 years of experience working with government agencies and non-profits. Her professional focus is on policy analysis and reform implementation at the local, state, and national levels. She has comprehensive experience managing complex, multi-partner projects and facilitating cross-system collaboration with criminal and juvenile justice systems, and in the intersection between these and health systems. Prior to joining JSP as principal she worked as a private consultant providing technical assistance to jurisdictions for five years. Previous positions include director of programs at the Center for Evidence-based Policy at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU), at which she had a lead role in the Medicaid Evidence-based Decisions Project and the Drug Effectiveness Review Project (two national collaborations of State Medicaid Medical and Pharmacy Directors); national director of policy and planning at the Crime and Justice Institute in Boston where she supported implementation of evidence-based practices (EBP) in state and local criminal justice systems; senior policy analyst for the Department of Community Justice in Multnomah County, Oregon and a program evaluator for Oregon Judicial Department. During her tenure at Multnomah County, she helped to coordinate major system reform efforts in juvenile justice and adult community corrections, including analysis of pre-trial populations, jail bed usage and population management strategies, juvenile detention reform, reduction of disproportionate minority

<https://justicesystempartners.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2017-Yakima-Pretrial-Pre-Post-Implementation-Study-FINAL-111517.pdf>.



contact, and other system enhancement efforts. Lore holds a Master of Public Administration degree from Lewis & Clark College.

Dr. Brian Lovins, JSP Principal, will conduct the data assessment and analysis tasks for the project. Dr. Lovins earned his PhD in Criminology from the University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice. He is currently president elect for the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and the Co-Editor for APPA's Perspectives Journal. Prior to JSP, he has worked as Assistant Director of Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD) and the Associate Director for the University of Cincinnati's Corrections Institute. While at University of Cincinnati, Dr. Lovins worked closely with juvenile justice agencies across the United States to assist in development and implementation of services to support their work with justice-involved youth. Furthermore, Dr. Lovins led the team that developed the Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS), a risk assessment system designed to assist jurisdictions in assessing youth in their care. Dr. Lovins has been invited to present to over 200 agencies and routinely trains agencies in the principles of effective intervention, leadership development, risk assessment, and the delivery of cognitive-behavioral interventions. Dr. Lovins has received the Dr. Simon Dinitz Award for his work and dedication in helping correctional agencies adopt evidence-based programs and the David Dillingham Award, as well as a being recognized as a Distinguished Alumnus from the University of Cincinnati. His publications include articles on risk assessment, sexual offenders, effective interventions, and cognitive-behavioral interventions.

Sarah Galgano, an associate with Justice System Partners, will serve as the project coordinator and technical assistance provider. Sarah will support the project director, coordinate project activities, and provide technical assistance. Sarah has a decade of experience working with criminal and juvenile justice systems. She has over seven years of experience managing complex initiatives and has partnered with close to 20 jurisdictions, helping them identify and implement evidence-based criminal and juvenile justice programs and practices; training detention staff on program model fidelity for Aggression Replacement Training and other cognitive behavioral programs; examining program outcomes, including impact evaluations and financial analyses such as cost-savings and cost-benefit analysis; facilitating communication about lessons learned and best practices; creating and implementing data collection tools; and communicating complex material to diverse audiences with varying levels of technical expertise.

In partnership with the Casey Foundation, Sarah recently served as the lead technical assistance provider to Milwaukee County, WI to help stakeholders understand the impact that the closure of the state-run juvenile detention facility would have on secure bed needs at the local level and identify reforms that could help the site reduce unnecessary secure placement.

Sarah holds a Master of Science degree in public policy and management from Carnegie Mellon University and Bachelor of Art degrees in psychology and sociology from the University of Iowa. Prior to joining JSP, Sarah worked for the Crime and Justice Institute, where she led the state of Utah's efforts to implement juvenile justice reform and model fidelity work. Previously, Sarah worked for the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, where she led technical assistance efforts to support the integration of economic principles and evidence-based practices into policy-making and budgetary processes. Before joining the Results First Initiative, Sarah worked for the Vera Institute of Justice (VIJ). At VIJ she provided technical assistance to help state and

local jurisdictions implement cost-benefit analyses and developed material to further the use of economic analyses in criminal and juvenile justice policymaking.

Annie Balck will provide technical assistance and help with report writing. Annie is an independent writer, editor, and consultant who has been working on behalf of youth and social justice for 15 years. She has extensive expertise in juvenile justice reform and has also worked in the areas of criminal justice, child welfare, disability rights, and special education. Annie advises clients on a variety of writing projects, from in-depth research papers to blog posts, offering services at all stages of development. Additionally, Annie assists clients with project development and management, lending a progressive reform-oriented perspective combined with practical, strategic analysis. Current and previous clients include the Annie E. Casey Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Justice System Partners, Justice Policy Institute, and Professor Francine T. Sherman of Boston College Law School. Prior to working independently, Annie was the Deputy Director for Policy and Programs at the National Juvenile Justice Network, where she oversaw all written products and worked on strategic planning and organizational management. Just after graduating from Georgetown University Law Center with a juris doctor degree, Annie served as guardian ad litem at the Children's Law Center in Washington, D.C., representing children in abuse and neglect cases. Annie has a bachelor's degree in English from the University of Michigan. She resides in Reston, Virginia.

Laura Furr will provide educational sessions and support to the JJRC and Advisory Stakeholder Group to support the authentic engagement of impacted individuals. Laura supports organizations of all types to engage youth in decisions affecting them. She has supported adults and youth as partners in shared decision-making, advocacy and governance since 2006 and now dedicates her work exclusively to this through Laura Furr Consulting LLC. Prior to creating her own business, Laura was the Program Manager for Justice Reform and Youth Engagement at the National League of Cities. Laura has also served as the Interim Executive Director and Senior Director of Youth Justice Initiatives at Community Law in Action, Inc, a non-profit that engages youth as active citizens, critical thinkers and advocates for positive change in Baltimore and Maryland. In her home city of Washington DC, Laura volunteers as the Chair of the District's Juvenile Justice Advisory Group. Laura holds a law degree from the University of Maryland School of Law and a B.A. from Washington College.

III. Timeline and Workplan

Area	Task	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
Task 1: Juvenile Justice Reform Council (JJRC)															
	a) JJRC Meeting #1: Kick off meeting, review and revise workplan as needed														
	b) Individual Interviews with JJRC members (develop protocol, schedule & conduct interviews, and summarize themes)														
	c) Opportunities for council members to learn from and visit innovation sites														
	d) System mapping (JJRC+ others): review system decision points, strengths and gaps														
	e) JJRC Meeting #2: Identify preliminary goals, build collaboration & consensus, conduct authentic engagement presentation, review Advisory Group membership and plan														
	f) JJRC Meeting #3: Review Advisory Group work plan and logistics for roundtables/survey, review JJRC & Policy interview themes														
	g) JJRC Meeting #4: Status update, expert presentation – Innovation in juvenile justice systems														
	h) JJRC Meeting #5: Status update, present preliminary data assessment & interview themes, policy assessment														
	i) JJRC Meeting #6: Present roundtable/survey summary/themes														
	j) JJRC Meeting #7: Present data assessment, analysis & preliminary data recommendations														
	k) JJRC Meeting #8: Identify priorities for recommendations/ reform plan														

Area	Task	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
	l) JJRC Meeting #9: Review & refine draft recommendations and outcome measures for reform plan														
	m) JJRC Meeting #10: Present final report & recommendations for reform plan														
	n) Develop JJRC communication materials														
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group and Roundtables															
	a) Identify & invite members for participation														
	b) Convene Advisory Group, introduce project, and adjust membership if necessary, review workplan & protocols, provide status updates, and present summary of roundtables & survey														
	c) Develop roundtable & survey goals & target participants														
	d) Develop roundtable & survey workplan and timeline, schedule and coordinate logistics and review w/ Advisory Group														
	e) Develop roundtable recruitment/comm materials and review w/ Advisory Group														
	f) Develop roundtable protocol and review w/ Advisory Group														
	g) Develop survey protocol and distribution mechanisms, if appropriate, and review w/ Advisory Group														
	h) Conduct roundtables & survey (if appropriate)														
	i) Summarize roundtable & survey input/themes and review w/ Advisory Group, prioritize themes for JJRC														
Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis															
	a) Execute required DUA's and other data agreements, if necessary														

Area	Task	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
	b) Assessment of the availability & quality of data across the system														
	i. Interview research staff in related agencies (develop protocol, conduct interviews, and summarize themes)														
	ii. What data is available?														
	iii. What are the data gaps?														
	iv. Can cross-system analysis be done? Where and to what extent?														
	v. What do we know about system stakeholder's data collection, analysis and sharing capacity?														
	vi. How can the quality of data collection & measurement be improved?														
	c) Collect, examine & present data & decisions related to system decision points.														
	vii. What do we know about system-involved youth?														
	viii. How deep do youth penetrate the system?														
	ix. What do we know about multi-system youth by region?														
	x. What do we know about service availability and system capacity by region?														
	xi. What do we know about how well youth are matched with appropriate services by region?														
	xii. What do we know about disparities by region?														
	xiii. Other questions?														
	d) Present preliminary data assessment & interview themes at JJRC Meeting #5														

Area	Task	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
	e) Present data assessment, analysis and preliminary data recommendations at JJRC Meeting #7														
	f) Finalize data recommendations														
Task 4: Policy analysis and recommendations															
	a) Interview key stakeholders (develop protocol, conduct interviews, and summarize themes) – topics include EBP, reform, and equity														
	b) Present interview summary to JJRC														
	c) Collect and review existing policies for adherence to EBP, promotion of reform and equity														
	d) Review budget allocations and fiscal environment re support and incentives for EBP, reform, and equity														
	e) Summarize and present assessment as to the extent to which policies and practices and fiscal allocations adhere to EBP and promote reform and equity														
	f) Work with JJRC to develop policy recommendations that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote a cross-systems approach to serving youth and identify barriers to collaboration Develop a reform plan w/measurable performance outcome that focuses on implementation of EBP and increased equity 														
	g) Work with JJRC to use these recommendations to develop a reform plan														

IV. Budget and Narrative

Justice System Partners proposes the total project budget, broken down by task, shown below. As described in the project narrative, the proposed scope of work is a robust and intensive effort; however, JSP is willing to negotiate the scope to meet the needs of the JJRC and potential budgetary limitations.

Project Budget by Task	Fees	Travel	Subtotal by Task
Task 1: Juvenile Justice Reform Council	\$152,683	\$27,757	\$180,440
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group and Roundtables	\$120,480	\$26,416	\$146,896
Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis	\$51,840	\$4,156	\$55,996
Task 4: Policy Assessment and Analysis	\$40,308	-	\$40,308
Totals	\$365,310	\$58,329	\$423,639

The specific deliverables and products included in each task area are described in the project narrative of this proposal. The following is a proposed payment schedule based on milestones marking completion of those deliverables. Once the workplan is finalized in collaboration with the JJRC, JSP will update the approximate dates of completion for each milestone.

Payment Schedule Milestones	Approximate Completion	Fees	Travel	Amount
Task 1: Juvenile Justice Reform Council				
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #1	Month 2	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: Interviews with all JJRC Members	Month 2	\$13,000	-	\$13,000
Task 1: System Mapping Session	Month 3	\$10,000	\$2,500	\$12,500
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #2	Month 4	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #3	Month 5	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #4	Month 7	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #5	Month 8	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #6	Month 9	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #7	Month 10	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #8	Month 11	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #9	Month 12	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: JJRC Meeting #10	Month 13	\$12,144	\$2,526	\$14,670
Task 1: Produce Communications Materials	Month 13	\$8,240	-	\$8,240

Payment Schedule Milestones	Approximate Completion	Fees	Travel	Amount
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group and Roundtable Listening Sessions				
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group Meeting #1	Month 4	\$7,550	\$1,616	\$9,166
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group Meeting #2	Month 6	\$7,550	\$1,616	\$9,166
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group Meeting #3	Month 8	\$7,550	\$1,616	\$9,166
Task 2: Advisory Stakeholder Group Meeting #4	Month 10	\$7,550	\$1,616	\$9,166
Task 2: Roundtable Listening Sessions and Survey	Month 8	\$90,280	\$19,952	\$110,232
Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis				
Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis - Preliminary Presentation to JJRC	Month 8	\$41,480	\$2,078	\$43,558
Task 3: Data Assessment and Analysis - Final Presentation to JJRC	Month 12	\$10,360	\$2,078	\$12,438
Task 4: Policy Assessment and Analysis				
Task 4: Interviews with Key Stakeholders	Month 5	\$13,000	-	\$13,000
Task 4: Policy Assessment & Analysis - Summary Report & Presentation to JJRC	Month 8	\$27,308	-	\$27,308
Totals		\$365,311	\$58,329	\$423,640

V. Proof of 501(c)(3)

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
P. O. BOX 2508
CINCINNATI, OH 45201

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Date: **AUG 27 2014**

JUSTICE SYSTEM PARTNERS
C/O ELYSE CLAWSON
2008 NE 10TH AVE
PORTLAND, OR 97212

Employer Identification Number:
46-5733688
DLN:
17053172750004
Contact Person:
CUSTOMER SERVICE ID# 31954
Contact Telephone Number:
(877) 829-5500
Accounting Period Ending:
December 31
Public Charity Status:
170(b)(1)(A)(vi)
Form 990 Required:
Yes
Effective Date of Exemption:
May 22, 2014
Contribution Deductibility:
Yes
Addendum Applies:
No

Dear Applicant:

We are pleased to inform you that upon review of your application for tax exempt status we have determined that you are exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions to you are deductible under section 170 of the Code. You are also qualified to receive tax deductible bequests, devises, transfers or gifts under section 2055, 2106 or 2522 of the Code. Because this letter could help resolve any questions regarding your exempt status, you should keep it in your permanent records.

Organizations exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Code are further classified as either public charities or private foundations. We determined that you are a public charity under the Code section(s) listed in the heading of this letter.

For important information about your responsibilities as a tax-exempt organization, go to www.irs.gov/charities. Enter "4221-PC" in the search bar to view Publication 4221-PC, Compliance Guide for 501(c)(3) Public Charities, which describes your recordkeeping, reporting, and disclosure requirements.

Sincerely,



Director, Exempt Organizations

Letter 947

VI. Key Staff Resumes / CVs

Lore A. Joplin
4921 NE 26th Ave.
Portland, OR 97211
503.706.5262
lore@justicesystempartners.org

Professional Focus

- Comprehensive policy and issue analysis
- Management of complex projects with multiple and diverse stakeholders
- Facilitation of strategic and tactical planning, and system mapping efforts
- Support for change implementation at operational and systems levels
- Technical assistance with the integration of evidence into practice in criminal justice systems
- Development of policy documents, including white papers, policy analysis and recommendations, educational materials and curriculum, and standards and guidelines

Professional Experience

JUSTICE SYSTEM PARTNERS

Principal (January 2017-Present)

- Executive management team member responsible for agency operations and strategic direction
- Assist government agencies and systems to implement evidence-based strategies through inclusionary and sustainable collaboration
- Promote the use of quality evidence in public policy development and implementation
- Support cross system interaction and collaboration between criminal justice, juvenile justice, and primary and behavioral health agencies.

JOPLIN CONSULTING, Portland, Oregon

Principal (2008-Present)

- Provide technical assistance to local, state, and national organizations in the areas of system assessment, planning and facilitation, coaching, and implementation of research-based practices and system change.
- Facilitate collaborative, multi-stakeholder processes, including conducting interviews and surveys, facilitating work sessions, and building sustainable collaborations
- Conduct policy, data, and financial analysis, and make recommendations based on current evidence and best practices

Recent Clients

- Arizona Adult Probation Services Division (Planning for implementation of EBP)
 - Arizona Juvenile Justice Services Division (Planning for implementation of EBP)
 - Connecticut Department of Corrections (System mapping and Medicaid Enrollment)
 - Crime and Justice Institute, Boston, Massachusetts (Multiple)
 - Justice System Partners (Arnold Foundation Public Safety Assessment Implementation TA provider)
 - Justice System Partners (MacArthur Foundation Safety and Justice Challenge TA provider)
 - Justice Systems Assessments and Training, Colorado (Multiple)
 - Meyer Memorial Trust (Oregon's 40-40-20 Higher Education Goals Analysis)
 - Multnomah County Department of Community Justice (OJJDP Gang Assessment Model)
-

-
- Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (Mental Health Jail Diversion)
 - National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies, Washington DC (Diversion Advisory Committee)
 - National Institute of Corrections, Community Corrections Division, Washington DC (Multiple)
 - Oregon Department of Corrections, Health Services (Corrections Health Assessment)
 - Pretrial Justice Institute, Washington DC (Pretrial and the Affordable Care Act)
 - San Francisco, California (BJA Justice Reinvestment Initiative)
 - San Francisco Probation Department, California (Strategic Planning)
 - 2nd Judicial District Probation Department, Illinois (Strategic Planning)
 - Volunteers of America, Portland, Oregon (Transition from Jail to Community Planning)
 - Washington State Department of Corrections and King County (BJA Second Chance Reentry)
 - Washington State Office of Financial Management (Analysis of Statewide Adult Correctional Needs and Costs) with BERK Consulting
 - Washington State Office of Financial Management (Jail Diversion for People with Mental Illness Study)

CENTER FOR EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon

Director of Programs (December 2010 – March 2013)

- Oversee and provide guidance for all Center programs and projects, including the Medicaid Evidence-based Decisions Project and the Drug Effectiveness Review Project (national collaborations of state Medicaid medical and pharmacy directors).
- Direct development of corrections related programs and technical assistance.
- Provide direct technical assistance to local, state, and national organizations in the areas of planning and facilitation, coaching, and implementation of research-based practices and system change.

Senior Program Director and Policy Manager (April 2008 – December 2010)

- Manage the Center's role in engaging stakeholders in the Effective Healthcare Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services' Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
- Manage corrections-related projects, including correctional health services assessments and analysis.

CRIME AND JUSTICE INSTITUTE, Boston, Massachusetts (December 2002 – February 2008)

National Director of Policy and Planning (September 2006 – February 2008)

- Manage CJI's national presence by developing strategic opportunities, leading the development of national initiatives, and supervising and providing guidance to project managers on national projects.
- Act as Project Director on various projects, including a comprehensive public safety system planning process in Multnomah County, Oregon. Manage the project team's work and deliver direct technical assistance, including building collaboration among key stakeholders, soliciting diverse input through citizen and line-staff engagement efforts, and developing a system-wide public safety plan.
- As part of the executive management team, manage a fast growing, dynamic organization of professionals dedicated to improving the effectiveness of criminal justice and juvenile justice systems.

Deputy Director (December 2002 – September 2006)

- Manage an ongoing national project focused on reforming adult community corrections systems. Through a cooperative agreement between the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) and the National Institute of Corrections, manage an ongoing initiative designed to assist community corrections systems to implement evidence-based practices using an integrated implementation model. This model focuses equally on the content of evidence-based practices, the internal strategies of organizational development, and the external strategies of collaboration with stakeholders. Manage the project; coordinate the work of a national

advisory group, pilot state project coordinators, and implementation teams; and provide direct technical assistance and consultation regarding the systemic change process.

- Develop, manage, and monitor CJI's divisional budget, including federal, state, and private foundation grants and contracts. Provide corporate-wide budget and policy development assistance and consultation.
- Manage divisional operations, including staff supervision, strategic planning, project coordination, and development strategies.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY JUSTICE, Portland, Oregon

Management Analyst (August 2000 – November 2002)

- Provide fiscal and policy analysis to the department's executive management team, county, and state leadership relating to operations, policy, budget, and legislation for adult community corrections and the juvenile justice system.
- Track and monitor state and federal legislation; develop legislative testimony and other materials.
- Research current literature and best practices, develop educational materials and presentations, and make policy and program development recommendations.
- Support the department's efforts to achieve the organizational change necessary to implement the principles of *what works* in community corrections.
- Assist with the development and coordination of comprehensive departmental succession planning for management positions, in anticipation of future workforce shifts.
- Develop communication materials designed to educate both external and internal stakeholders about the adult community corrections and juvenile justice systems, the department's efforts toward organization change, and the implementation of best practices.
- Coordinate special analysis projects including the following:
 - Recidivism Reduction: Provided research, consultation, and editing for the *Reducing Recidivism: Cost-Effective Crime Prevention* report of the Recidivism Reduction Committee of the Citizens Crime Commission of Portland, Oregon (May 2002).
 - Jail Bed Management: Staffed a cross-agency group of public safety representatives (community corrections, district attorney, sheriff, and county budget personnel) to provide data analysis and information compilation, and write a summary report regarding jail bed management strategies.
 - Pre-Trial Services Redesign Workgroup: Researched and compiled information regarding the progress of the redesign, developed a status report, and made preliminary recommendations to a sub-committee of the local public safety coordinating council.
 - Co-wrote the document titled *Redesigning Community Corrections: The Multnomah County Experience* describing the Multnomah County experience implementing evidence-based practices in adult community corrections.

Budget and Finance Manager / Senior Administrative Analyst, (November 1997 - August 2000)

- Assisted with the annual participative budget development process, including the following:
 - Development and analysis of the Department's \$72 million budget submission, narrative, and presentation to the board of county commissioners;
 - Facilitation and coordination of cross-functional budget development teams; and
 - Analysis of and development of presentation materials on implications of budget decisions.
- Managed the department's fiscal and grant accounting and contracting operations including budget development, procurement, performance measurement, and performance and fiscal reporting for state, federal, and private foundation revenue in excess of \$48 million.

STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE, OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, Salem, OR

Trial Court Programs Analyst, (July 1995 – November 1997)

- Analyzed and evaluated Oregon Judicial Department programs and policies, making recommendations to leadership regarding changes to legislation, administrative rule, and judicial policy.
- Evaluated the Oregon's pilot one-day/one-trial jury management system, provided analysis for the subsequent full implementation, and disseminated results nationally.
- Conducted research and analysis on the effects Oregon's mandatory sentencing laws have on the courts.
- Facilitated and coordinated project-based teams of court staff to develop court operations manuals for Domestic Relations and Juvenile court processes.

Education

Masters in Public Administration, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon	1995
Double B.A. in English Literature and French, Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon	1987

Publications

- Joplin L., Sihler, A., Enslow, B., Chambers, B., Griffith, N. Jail Diversion for People with Mental Illness in Washington State. November 2016. [http://www.ofm.wa.gov/reports/Jail Diversion for People with Mental Illness in Washington State Study.pdf](http://www.ofm.wa.gov/reports/Jail_Diversion_for_People_with_Mental_Illness_in_Washington_State_Study.pdf)
- Joplin L., Sihler, A. Multnomah County Feasibility Assessment: Mental Health Jail Diversion Project: Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council. February 2015. <https://multco.us/lpscc/mental-health-jail-diversion-feasibility-study>
- Calder, A., Pflug, A., Joplin, L., and Campbell, N. Analysis of Statewide Adult Correctional Needs and Costs. Washington State Office of Financial Management. November 2014. [http://ofm.wa.gov/reports/Correctional Needs and Costs Study2014.pdf](http://ofm.wa.gov/reports/Correctional_Needs_and_Costs_Study2014.pdf)
- Joplin L., Sihler, A. Multnomah County Comprehensive Gang Assessment: Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council. June 2014. <https://multco.us/lpscc/multnomah-county-comprehensive-gang-assessment>
- Joplin, L. Mapping the Criminal Justice System to Connect Justice-Involved Individuals with Treatment and Health Care under the Affordable Care Act: National Institute of Corrections. June 2014. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/028222.pdf>
- Balshem H, Curtis P, Joplin L, Justman RA, Rosenberg AB. Stakeholder Involvement in Improving Comparative Effectiveness Reviews: AHRQ and the Effective Health Care Program (Prepared by the AHRQ Effective Health Care Program Product Development Work Group under Contract No. HHS 290-2007-10057-I). AHRQ Publication No. 11-EHC079-EF. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. September 2011. <http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov>
- Howe, M., Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Sperber, K., Woodward, W., 2005. "Implementing Evidence-based Practice in Community Corrections: Quality Assurance Manual." Crime and Justice Institute, Boston, MA. http://www.cj institute.org/files/QAmanual_122705.pdf
- Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W. 2005. "Implementing Effective Correctional Management of Offenders in the Community: Implementation Checklist." Crime and Justice Institute, Boston, MA. <http://www.cj institute.org/files/checklist082205.pdf>
- Bogue, B., Woodward, W., Joplin, L., Goldberg, A., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., and Wasson, B. 2005. "Implementing Effective Correctional Management of Offenders in the Community: Outcome and Process Measures." Crime and Justice Institute, Boston, MA. <http://www.cj institute.org/files/matrix110905.pdf>
- Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W. 2005. "Using an Integrated Model to Implement Evidence-based Practices in Corrections." In *What Works and Why: Effective Approaches to Reentry*, 109-145. Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Woodward, W., Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., and Wasson, B. 2003.

-
- "Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Collaboration for Systemic Change in the Criminal Justice System." National Institute of Corrections, Washington DC. <http://www.nicic.org/Library/019343>
- Joplin, L., Fuller, J., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W. 2004. "Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Leading Organizational Change and Development." National Institute of Corrections, Washington DC. <http://www.nicic.org/Library/019344>
- Bogue, B., Joplin, L., Campbell, N., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., Woodward, W. 2004. "Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention." National Institute of Corrections, Washington DC. <http://www.nicic.org/Library/019342>
- Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W., 2004. "Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: An Integrated Model." National Institute of Corrections, Washington DC. <http://www.nicic.org/Library/019341>
- Maiocco, F. A., Joplin, L., and Keifer, P. 1997. "An Evaluation of the Marion County Court One-Trial/One-Day Jury Term." Marion County, OR: Office of the State Court Administrator, Trial Court Programs Division.

Skills & Abilities

Critical Thinking

- 20 Years developing and implementing criminal justice research agenda.
- Designed, developed, and implemented new ways to address criminogenic needs with justice-involved populations.
- Worked with multi-purpose teams to develop strategies to solve cross systems issues.

Communication

- Distributed knowledge through 16 peer-reviewed articles.
- Delivered over 500 presentations to criminal justice stakeholders.
- Presented research findings at national & international conferences and authored over 50 technical reports.

Research Design

- Designed, conducted and managed over 50 research projects accounting for 10+ million dollars in funding.
- Developed technologically-integrated data collection methods
- Experienced with multiple research designs including experimental, longitudinal, and cross-sectional methods.

Data and Statistical Analysis

- Extensive training and experience collecting and analyzing data.
- Expert knowledge of SPSS and MS Office Software.
- Conducted statistical analyses using logistic and linear regression, ANOVA, & time-series models.

Education

University of Cincinnati

Ph.D. Criminology/Criminal Justice 2013

M.S.W. Social Work 1995

Denison University

B.A. Sociology/Anthropology 1993

National Organizations

American Probation and Parole Association
President-Elect

Interests

Major league baseball—Cincinnati Reds
Photography
Advances in technology
Cooking

Experience

Principal Justice System Partners | 2019-Present

- Develop strategies to implement effective practices in corrections
- Support agencies in creating strategies to address the needs of justice-involved individuals
- Manage large multi-site implementation projects

President-Elect American Probation and Parole Association | Current

- Elected to President-Elect in 2019 voting
- Serve on Executive Board as President-Elect and assume the position of President at the Summer Institute 2021

Assistant Director Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department | 2013-2019

- Develop and implement evidence-based practices in a large urban department.
- Oversee the creation and implementation of the Criminal Justice Strategic Plan.
- Oversee operations of 48,000 probationers as well as manage 650 employees across 15 sites.

Associate Director University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute | 2008 to 2013

- Provided oversight on 50+ research projects
- Delivered over 500 trainings and presentations

Awards/Recognition

Simon Dinitz Award, Ohio Community Corrections Association, 2014.

Distinguished Alumnus Award, University of Cincinnati, 2017.

David Dillingham Public Service Award, International Community Corrections Association, 2018.

Publications

- 2018 **Lovins, B.**, Cullen, F., Latessa, E., & Jonson, C. Probation officer as a coach: Building a new professional identity. *Federal Probation*. 82(1), pp 13-19.
- 2018 **Lovins, B.**, Latessa, E., May, T., & Lux, J. Validating the Ohio Risk Assessment System-Community Supervision Tool with a diverse sample from Texas. *Corrections: Policy, practice, and research*. 3(3).
- 2018 Latessa, E., **Lovins, B.**, & Lux, J. The Ohio Risk Assessment System In Sing, Kroner, Wormith, Desmarais, & Hamilton (eds). *Handbook of Recidivism Risk/Needs Assessment Tools* (pp 147-164). Hoboken, NJ.
- 2017 Ormachea, P., **Lovins, B.**, Eagleman, D., Davenport, S., Jarman, A., & Haarsma, G. The role of tablet-based psychological tasks in risk assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 44(8).
- 2016 Vaske, J., Gehring, K., & **Lovins, B.** Gender differences in the measurement of criminal thinking. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 44(3).
- 2015 Vincent, G. & **Lovins, B.** Using a decision matrix to guide juvenile dispositions. *Criminology & Public Policy*. 14(1).
- 2014 Labrecque, R., Smith, P., **Lovins, B.**, & Latessa, E. The importance of reassessment: How changes in the LSI-R risk score can improve the prediction of recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 53(2).
- 2014 Latessa, E. & **Lovins, B.** Risk assessment, classification, and prediction. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 4457-4466.
- 2013 **Lovins, B.** & Latessa, E. Creation and validation of the Ohio Youth Assessment System and strategies for successful implementation. *Justice Research and Policy*. 15(1), 67-93.
- 2012 Latessa, E. & **Lovins, B.** Risk assessment, classification, and prediction. *Encyclopedia of Community Corrections*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- 2012 Tillyer, M., Engel, R., & **Lovins, B.** Beyond Boston: Applying theory to understand and address sustainability issues in focused deterrence initiatives for violence reduction. *Crime & Delinquency*. 58(6).
- 2010 Latessa, E. & **Lovins, B.** The role of offender risk assessment: A policy maker guide. *Victims & Offenders*. 5(3).

- 2009 **Lovins, B., & Lovins, L.** Cognitive behavioral tools for providers. In B. Glick (Ed.) *Cognitive Behavior Programs and Interventions: What Works with At-risk Youth, Volume II*. Kingston, NJ: Civics Research Institute.
- 2009 Lowenkamp, C., **Lovins, B., & Latessa, E.** Validating the Level of Service Inventory-Revised and the Level of Service Inventory: Screening version with a sample of probationer. *The Prison Journal*. 89(3).
- 2009 **Lovins, B.,** Lowenkamp, C., & Latessa, E. Applying the risk principle to sex offenders: Can treatment make some sex offenders worse? *The Prison Journal*. 89(2).
- 2006 **Lovins, B. & Latessa, E.** Cognitive behavioral interventions for youthful offenders. In B. Glick (Ed.) *Cognitive Behavior Programs and Interventions: What Works With At-Risk Youth*. Kingston, NJ: Civics Research Institute. Reprinted in Juvenile Justice Update 12 (3&4).
-

Technical Reports (Selection of reports authored)

- 2015 Lovins, Brian and Teresa May. Texas Risk Assessment System Validation Study.
- 2013 Lovins, Brian, Edward Latessa, and Jenni Lux. RECLAIM Evaluation-Final Report
- 2013 Lovins, Brian and Edward Latessa. Development of the ORAS-MAT.
- 2012 Lovins, Brian, Edward Latessa, Jenni Lux, & Bobbie Ticknor. OCJS Reentry Coalition Experience.
- 2010 Latessa, Edward, Brian Lovins, and Kristin Ostrowski. Preliminary Results of the Implementation of the Ohio Youth Assessment System: Indiana.
- 2009 Latessa, Edward, and Brian Lovins. The Ohio Youth Assessment System: Final Report.
- 2008 Latessa, Edward, Brian Lovins and Beth Ellefson. ODRC Children of Incarcerated Parents Annual Report.
- 2007 Latessa, Edward, Brian Lovins, and Beth Ellefson. TANF/WIA/ODJFS Jobs Reentry Annual Report.
- 2007 Lovins, Brian and Edward J. Latessa. ODRC Returning Home Process Evaluation.
- 2007 Travis, Larry, Edward J. Latessa, Brian Lovins, and Christopher Lowenkamp. An Analysis of the Ohio Department of Youth Services Release Authority's Decision Making Process.
- 2007 Lovins, Brian and Edward J. Latessa. TANF/WIA/ODJFS Jobs Reentry Programs: Process Review.
- 2006 Latessa, Edward J. and Brian Lovins. Children of Incarcerated Parents: Annual Report.
- 2006 Lovins, Brian and Edward J. Latessa. Children of Incarcerated Parents: Working Towards Best Practices.

- 2006 Lovins, Brian and Paula Smith. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the Hennepin County Drug Court, Minneapolis, MN.
- 2006 Lovins, Brian and Edward Latessa. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the Phoenix House at the State Prison at Corcoran, CA.
- 2006 Lovins, Brian and Jodi Sleyo. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the Tidewater Detention Program, Chesapeake, VA.
- 2006 Sleyo, Jodi and Brian Lovins. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the Shenandoah Valley Detention Center, Chesapeake, VA.
- 2005 Latessa, Edward J. and Brian Lovins. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the RSAT at Lawton CCC.
- 2005 Lovins, Brian and Edward J. Latessa. Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist: Evaluation of the Key To Life Program, Fort Supply, OK.
- 2005 Lovins, Brian and Edward J. Latessa. Children of Incarcerated Parents: A Process Evaluation.
-

Research and Grants

- 2018 Project Director, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Grant (\$660,000).
- 2016 Grant Writer, Hardware Support for Case Management (\$65,000).
- 2016 Project Director, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Grant (\$660,000).
- 2016 Validation of Riverside Pretrial Assistance to California Project (\$8,500).
- 2014 Project Director, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Grant (\$440,000).
- 2012 Project Director, Evaluation of Multisite 2nd Chance Act Reentry Grants (\$120,000).
- 2012 Development of a Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool—San Francisco (\$10,000).
- 2011 Project Director, Evaluation of Ohio's Community Corrections Act Programs. Funded by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (\$180,000).
- 2011 Project Director, Evaluation of RECLAIM Ohio. Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$199,408).
- 2010 Project Director, Assessment and Training of Reentry Programs. Wisconsin Department of Corrections (\$522,000).

2010	Project Director, Ohio Risk Assessment System-Automation project. Funded by Ohio Dept Rehabilitation and Correction (\$750,000).
2010	Project Director, Family Reentry Evaluation Project. Funded by Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (\$120,000).
2010	Project Director, New Ways to Address Old Problems: Evaluating Ohio's ARRA JAG Reentry Initiatives. Funded by Office of Criminal Justice Services, (\$300,000).
2009	Project Director, Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Training. Ohio Department of Youth Services. (\$80,000).
2009	Project Director, Indiana Risk Assessment Process. Funded by Indiana Department of Community Corrections (\$400,000).
2009	Project Director, Statewide Evaluation of the DYS Jobs Reentry Programs. Funded by Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$250,000).
2009	Project Director, DYS Risk, Needs, and Responsivity Assessment. Funded by Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$450,000).
2006	Project Director, Developing a Classification System for ODYS. Funded by Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$125,000).
2006	Project Director, Evaluating the Release Authority. Funded by Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$52,000).
2005	Project Director/Trainer, Development and Implementation of a Motivational Interviewing Model. Funded by the Treatment for Alternatives to Street Crimes (\$15, 000).
2004	Project Director, Statewide Evaluation of Ohio's Children and Family Reentry Initiative. Funded by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (\$650,000).
2004	Project Director, Implementation and Monitoring of the Youth Care System at Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility. Funded by the Ohio Department of Youth Services (\$198,000).

Invited Addresses and Workshops

I have conducted over five hundred workshops and addresses. Below is a sample of some of the workshops and keynote addresses I have presented.

2017	Alternatives to Incarceration: The United States Experience. Moroccan Ministry of Justice/Danish Ministry of Justice.
2016	Stepping down from the Ivory Tower. Ohio Community Corrections Association Conference.
2014	Transitioning From Research to the Field. Ohio Community Corrections Association Conference.
2014	Translating EBP to Probation: The Development of the TRAS. Texas Probation Association.

- 2013 Gender differences in risk assessment. Southeast Asia Criminology and Victimology Conference.
- 2012 Theory to practice: What works with offender populations. Effective Intervention for Strengthening Community Supervision, Community Justice Assistance Division.
- 2012 What Works in Specialty Courts. San Francisco Criminal Courts.
- 2012 What Works—Understand Risk Assessment. National Association of Drug Courts.
- 2011 What Works in Juvenile Justice and Behavioral Health. Virginia Board of Mental Health.
- 2011 What Works with Co-Occurring Disordered Youth. Lucas County Board of Mental Health.
- 2011 Implementing the IRAS. Marion County Court.
- 2011 Understanding the Impact of the CPC- Eau Claire Drug Court. Wisconsin Problem Solving Court Conference.
- 2010 Implementing the IRAS/IYAS and Evidence Based Practices. Indiana Judicial Center.

Technical Assistance and Consultation

Community Justice Assistance Division (CJAD), State of Texas
 Wisconsin Department of Corrections
 Ohio Department of Youth Services
 Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
 Arkansas Department of Youth Services
 Northwest Juvenile Rehabilitation Center (JRC); Bowling Green, OH.
 Hamilton County Juvenile Court. Columbus, OH.
 Franklin County Juvenile Court. Columbus, OH.
 Muskingum County Juvenile Court. Zanesville, OH.
 SAVORY Project. Little Rock, AR.
 Lane County Juvenile Court. Lane County, OR.

SARAH WITTIG GALGANO

75 Rattlesnake Hill Rd ♦ Andover, MA 01810 ♦ (301) 281-3907
sjayne00@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA May 2011
H. John Heinz III College-School of Public Policy and Management
Master of Science in Public Policy and Management with Distinction

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA May 2009
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology (with Honors) and Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

EXPERIENCE

Justice System Partners October 2017-present
Associate

- Manage organizational projects, ensuring that staff and local partners have the necessary resources (often through remote support) and project milestones are met.
- Oversee data collection, analysis, and reporting results.
- Conduct policy analysis, assess organizational practices, and interpret public safety data.
- Deliver targeted technical assistance and training to help state and local jurisdictions implement criminal and juvenile justice policy and practice reforms.
- Assist jurisdictions with implementing evidence-based policy solutions by engaging state and county-level stakeholders.
- Convene and co-facilitate groups of policy makers, practitioners, researchers, and other stakeholders to support their efforts to move toward desired outcomes.

Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice October 2016- October 2017
Associate

- Conducted policy analysis and data analysis to inform policy recommendations.
- Developed publication plans and reports.
- Provided technical assistance and training to state, local, and tribal organizations and led juvenile justice reform efforts in Utah.
- Assisted states with implementing program model fidelity measures and monitoring plans.

Pew Charitable Trusts, Washington DC August 2014-July 2016
Senior Associate, Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative

- Led technical assistance efforts in five states to support the integration of economic principles and evidence-based practices into policy-making and budgetary processes. Supported technical assistance efforts in two additional states.
- Built and maintained relationships with governmental agency leadership and analysts and other key stakeholders to develop state-specific strategies that advanced project goals.
- Represented the Initiative at conferences, meetings, and other public events by leading panels of speakers and presenting before groups ranging in size from fewer than 10 to over 100 people. Venues included: government and committee briefings, national conferences, and roundtable meetings.
- Developed and updated technical training materials in criminal justice, child welfare, mental health, education, and substance abuse policy areas and tools to assist jurisdictions with implementing benefit-cost analysis, program inventory and analysis, and capacity building efforts.

Vera Institute of Justice, Iowa City, IA

May 2012-July 2014

Policy Analyst, Cost-Benefit Analysis Unit

- Conducted cost-benefit analyses, fiscal impact analyses, cost, and budget analyses using the appropriate analytic methods.
- Served as co-lead on a nationwide project examining correctional health care spending trends from 2007-2011 and lead researcher on the cost-benefit analysis of the Pathways from Prison to Postsecondary Education Project.
- Assisted with technical assistance efforts in York and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania and the Washington State Department of Corrections.
- Developed publications, blogs, toolkits, webinars, and other training material for the Cost-Benefit Knowledge Bank.

Linn County Juvenile Detention and Diversion Services, Linn County, IA

October 2011-May 2012

Tracker

- Assessed juvenile probation clients' adherence to court and probation requirements.
- Developed quality improvement tools to enhance communication between trackers and other agencies.

State of Iowa Department of Corrections, Des Moines, IA

October 2011-May 2012

Volunteer Research Assistant

- Assisted with the implementation of the Results First cost-benefit model, including large scale data analysis.
- Developed community impact statements and policy recommendations for government officials.

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

August 2010-December 2010

Project Manager, "Relieving Overcrowding at the Allegheny County Jail"

- Led a team of nine students to develop and evaluate the outcomes of various methods for reducing overcrowding at the Allegheny County Jail.
- Assessed the predictive accuracy of Allegheny County's risk assessment instrument.

Department of Corrections in conjunction with AmeriCorps, Iowa City, IA

August 2008-August 2009

One on One Mentoring Volunteer Coordinator

- Designed and implemented program materials for AmeriCorps' One on One Mentoring Program.
- Recruited mentors from the community and probation clients to participate in the program.
- Assessed mentor/mentee adherence to program standards and requirements.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Christian Henrichson and Sarah Galgano. *A Guide to Calculating Justice-System Marginal Costs*. Vera Institute of Justice. May 2013.

Sarah Galgano. *Barriers to Reintegration: An Audit Study of the Impact of Race and Offender Status on Employment Opportunities for Women*. Journal of Social Thought and Research. January 2009.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES

Troop Leader, Girl Scouts (Troop 5645). 2013-2014

Classroom Volunteer, Lemme Elementary School. 2012-2014

Volunteer Consultant, Johnson County Metropolitan Planning Organization. August 2011-July 2012

ANNIE BALCK

703 371 1067 anniebalck@yahoo.com

Objective: To achieve justice system change through strategic reforms and accurate, persuasive communications.

Skills: Written and oral communication, research and analysis, justice policy reform, non-profit management

EXPERIENCE

INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT, RESTON, VIRGINIA

Self-employed.

Writer and Editor

8/2014–Present

Write research-based, analytical, and persuasive products to meet clients' needs. Conduct in-depth research and literature reviews, develop strategic messaging tailored for audience, create detailed organizational frameworks for written pieces, synthesize information, and write content that is clear, concise, and effective. Edit documents, attending to style, structure, clarity, and grammar.

Clients include the Annie E. Casey Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Justice Policy Institute, Justice System Partners, and Professor Francine T. Sherman of Boston College Law School.

Written products include: *Gender Injustice: System-Level Juvenile Justice Reforms for Girls*, a research and advocacy report on girls in the juvenile justice system, and "Because Kids Are Different: Five Opportunities for Reforming the Juvenile Justice System," a report reviewing five policy areas in which juvenile justice practice is particularly ripe for reform in light of adolescent development.

NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE NETWORK, WASHINGTON, D.C.

A network of state-based non-profit organizations working to reform juvenile justice policy in the U.S.

Deputy Director for Policy and Programs

4/2010–6/2014

Oversaw development of all publications. Researched, wrote, and edited white papers presenting fact-based arguments for reform and exploring issues of interest to the juvenile justice reform field.

Researched, wrote, and edited fact sheets, newsletters, and web content designed to synthesize and disseminate research developments, policy changes, and best practices in juvenile justice reform to educate the network's state-based members as well as the larger reform field.

Collaborated with director and communications director to develop ideas for written materials, prioritize publications based on needs in the field, and craft effective messaging strategies.

Conducted outreach to member organizations to discuss reform strategies and identify needs. Engaged in nationwide outreach to juvenile justice advocacy organizations and system stakeholders to compile material for multiple editions of the network's signature publication, *Advances in Juvenile Justice Reform*.

Created system for developing policy recommendations representative of the network's diverse membership body. Developed nine detailed "policy platforms" in coordination with member committee.

Played a key role in creation of member-focused 10-year strategic plan for the organization. Created and rolled out detailed work plans at the organizational and individual levels to implement the plan.

Worked on fundraising initiatives with the director: built relationships with funders, wrote grant proposals and reports, and managed grant obligations.

Supervised communications and administrative assistant and volunteers, managed internship program, played a key role in recruiting and hiring, and collaboratively managed the organization with the director.

Program and Policy Associate

4/2008–4/2010

Researched, wrote, and edited policy papers, fact sheets, and research summaries designed to educate state-based members and provide them with tools for their advocacy.

Staffed the development and launch of the Youth Justice Leadership Institute, a committee-led leadership training program that seeks to clear a broad path for people of color to lead the U.S. toward justice system reform, now in its seventh year (70 participants total).

CHILDREN'S LAW CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Non-profit organization providing legal representation to indigent youth and families in D.C.

Staff Attorney

10/2005–11/2006

Represented children as guardian *ad litem* in child welfare cases. Legal representation included oral and written arguments advocating for appropriate housing, education, and health services; negotiations with government and parents' attorneys; and advice to clients on legal rights and recommended courses of action.

Engaged in intensive outreach to family members, foster parents, schools, counselors, social workers, and other attorneys to ensure appropriate service delivery, safety, and permanency for children.

Investigated allegations of abuse and neglect by interviewing family members, friends, school officials, medical personnel, and community members.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER LEGAL WRITING PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Academic program focused on teaching legal research and writing skills to law students.

Law Fellow

8/2003–4/2004

Selected through competitive application process to serve as writing instructor and coach for first-year law students.

Led workshop of approximately 20 students, using hands-on exercises, reinforcing lessons from larger lecture, offering one-on-one coaching, and facilitating peer review. Reviewed writing assignments and provided extensive comments on style, argument, structure, tone, research, and citations.

Developed skills to work with students from a variety of educational backgrounds and students for whom English was their second language.

EDUCATION/PROFESSIONAL LICENSES

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Juris Doctor, May 2005

Visiting student at Boston College Law School, 2004/2005 academic year

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MI

Bachelor of Arts, English, with High Distinction, December 1997

LICENSED TO PRACTICE LAW IN WASHINGTON, D.C. AND MICHIGAN

Laura Furr

Supporting Stronger Decisions Through Youth-Adult Partnership

lfurrconsulting.com

laura@lfurrconsulting.com

SKILLS

Build Youth-Adult Partnerships

- Supported youth-led program for 200 youth at 10 national conferences
- Engaged justice-involved youth in advocacy campaigns

Analyze Challenges

- Collected and applied data to unpack challenging issues as technical assistance provider to 10+ cities
- Asked questions that revealed disparities in police practices

Develop Creative and Collaborative Solutions to Problems

- Partnered with diverse local leaders to achieve their goals
- Built knowledge and skills of adults and youth through hundreds of workshops, classes and peer learning opportunities

EXPERIENCE

Laura Furr Consulting, Washington DC - Owner

July 2019 - Present

National League of Cities, Washington DC - Program Manager, Justice Reform and Youth Engagement

December 2013 - June 2019

Community Law In Action, Inc., Baltimore MD - Senior Director of Youth Justice Initiatives

June 2005 - December 2013

EDUCATION

University of Maryland School of Law, Baltimore, Maryland

Juris Doctor, 2006

Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland

Bachelor of Arts, *cum laude*, 2001