

C. Overview of WGYI report processes and resources

The legislative language laying out the charge for the Working Group on Youth Intervention was broken out into three research questions. These research questions serve as the foundation for the Working Group's report language as it guided research and data analysis. The following information is an overview of the process undertaken for each research question and the resources that were utilized.

1. Research Question 1

Data Summary of the Current State - Describe community-based programming, various treatment models, how programs operate, and the types of these services currently being provided in the state, including licensure model, and provide data specific to current total capacity and availability, level of care, outcomes, and costs.

Jackie Braun-Lewis, Head of Analytics for Hennepin County's Law, Safety and Justice Line of Business undertook the data compilation and presentation role. Various updates and opportunities for input were provided to the WGYI and her work is ongoing.

2. Research Question 2

What are the licensing requirements from the State of Minnesota to function as a residential treatment provider for youth with behavioral health needs? 1) How are the licensing requirements different from DOC vs DHS? 2) What barriers do our licensing requirements present for potential community providers?

To answer these questions, the project team conducted a series of informational interviews with subject matter experts from various stakeholder organizations. They spoke with staff from the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) and the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS), staff from Dakota County and Hennepin County, the former CEO of a former provider, and the executive director of an association that provides resources and advocacy for children, youth, and families. The individuals that were interviewed are below:

Name	Organization	Org Type
Kirsten Anderson	AspireMN, Executive Director	Advocacy
Leslie Chaplin	The Hills Youth & Family Services (Woodland Hills residential juvenile justice program), former CEO	Provider
Diane Neal	MN DHS, Deputy Director of Mental Health, Behavioral Health Division	State
Nancy Just	MN DHS, Supervisor, Residential and Intensive Services Team, Behavioral Health Division	State
Paula Halverson	MN DHS, Mental Health/Substance Use Disorder/Children Residential Facilities Unit Manager, DHS Licensing Division, Office of Inspector General	State

Kristi Strang	MN DOC, Inspection, Enforcement and Licensing	State
Matt Bauer	Dakota County, Detention Facility Superintendent, member of the Minnesota Juvenile Detention Association (MNJDA)	County
Tim Hastings	Hennepin County, Senior Contract Analyst, Health and Human Services, Contract Management Services	County
Cynthia Slowiak	Hennepin County, Human Services Area Manager, Behavioral Health	County

3. Research Question 3

What can we learn about juvenile justice models across the nation that also have residential treatment centers? What models can best address the behavioral health needs of youth involved in the justice system? How have juvenile rehabilitation systems partnered with community? What can we learn about these efforts that can inform this taskforce?

Recognizing the large volume of information that would be compiled to appropriately analyze the 3rd research question and valuing the importance of having subject matter experts determine what information should be utilized by the WGYI, a Research Question 3 Sub-Group was created. The purpose of the Sub-Group was to review the project team's research, best practices, and resource documents to make recommendations to the WGYI on best practices that should be included in the Working Group's final report to the Legislature.

The project team undertook a landscape scan of the juvenile justice systems and reforms undertaken in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Using the priorities identified by the WGYI, the states were narrowed down, and a report was written that highlighted the programmatic treatment methods/philosophies of California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Idaho, Missouri, New Jersey, New York City, North Carolina, and Washington State.

The Research Question 3 Sub-Group met three times for 11.5 hours.

Session 1 key themes: Kick-off, collaborative understanding of the current state - begin understanding what we are doing and what others have done.

Resources:

- a. Star Tribune five-part series
- b. Implementing Effective Short-term Residential interventions
- c. Small is Beautiful
- d. Principles and Strategies for Community-led Diversion in Juvenile Justice

Session 2 key themes: Deepen understanding of the current state and expand understanding of other interventions.

Resources:

- a. State juvenile programming landscape scan report
- b. Presentation on the MN DHS Reducing Reliance on Children’s Residential Care Settings report – Michael Koehler and Neerja Singh

Session 3 key themes: Familiarize the group with State level efforts, identify recommendations.

Resources:

- a. Presentation on the Results First Initiative – Weston Merrick
- b. Presentation from The Children’s Cabinet – Brittany Wright

Research Question 3 Sub-Group Members:

Name	Organization	Org Type
Nicole Kern	Morrison County	County
Terry Fawcett	Pine County	County
Suzanne Artnston	Scott County	County
Gaonu Yang	Yipa	Advocacy
Brittany Wright	Governor’s Children’s Cabinet	State
Jasmine Mattison	Against All Odds Twin Cities	Advocacy
Kirsten Anderson	AspireMN	Advocacy
Callie Hargett	Office of Justice Programs	State
Sarah Ellsworth	Public Defender’s Office	State

4. Report content and recommendations

The content for the final report that the WGYI will be submitting to the Legislature in February 2024 has been generated using the processes outlined in the previous sections as well as resources provided and discussed in WGYI meetings, public testimony, and input from individual WGYI members. The recommendations that have been drafted as a part of the draft report and presented to WGYI members for discussion and approval have been drafted directly from language provided by subject matter experts, Research Question 3 Sub-Group members, public testifiers, and WGYI members. The two January Working Group meetings will be utilized to have in-depth discussions of the draft report recommendations. Finally, the WGYI members will have the opportunity to view and provide input to the final report at the February Working Group Meeting, with the WGYI Co-Chairs having final editing authority.