

Speaker 1 ([00:00:18](#)):

Hello everyone and welcome. My name is Felice and I'm here on behalf of the National Reentry Resource Center and I'd like to take a moment to thank, the RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice for today's event. People are still being admitted into the webinar. So, we will wait a few moments until we begin. But I just want to let you know that this event is part of second chance month, and you can learn more about this event as well as other learning opportunities at [www.buildsecondchances.org](http://www.buildsecondchances.org). This webinar is being recorded for archive purposes, and will be available in mid may. The panelists and presenters would like you to submit any questions to the Q&A feature, which is located at the bottom view of your screen. Now I will pass it over to John Tuell who is the executive director of the RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. John, are you ready?

Speaker 2 ([00:01:30](#)):

I'm ready. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:01:32](#)):

Great. Sure.

Speaker 2 ([00:01:34](#)):

Hey good afternoon, everyone. Good morning to many. Thanks for joining us. We appreciate you taking the time to join us. As we begin today, I do want to offer a special thanks, much of the information that's been developed for this webinar presentation over the past several years is in no small part a result of the leadership, the guidance, support, and partnership from our program manager at OJ JDP, Julia Allen, and so a special shout out to her and thanks for her creative partnership with us in this endeavor. The National Resource Center was launched in 2013. We provide an array of training, technical assistance and consultation, much of it, an intensive partnership with local, state, national leaders, practitioners, and youth serving agencies across the spectrum that impact the youth justice system. Our partnership with communities and jurisdictions across the nation allows us to guide and inform, not prescribe, youth justice system improvement.

Speaker 2 ([00:02:36](#)):

We believe, and we will present evidence, that it leads to better outcomes for children and families. And we also believe that it's founded in our commitment to adolescent development science, to best practice methods, research informed approaches and evidence based treatment and programmatic interventions, as well. We place a premium value on local and state driven solutions that acknowledge the environment, context and the local expertise that factors in our ability to promote sustainable transformational system enhancements. We hope that gets represented today. I'm John Tuell. I'm the executive director of the National Resource Center, and I'm supported as co-facilitators and co-hosts of this webinar this afternoon by our two senior program directors and senior consultants. And I'm now gonna turn it over to them to introduce themselves.

Speaker 3 ([00:03:30](#)):

Hi everyone. I'm Michelle darling. I'm a Senior Director and Senior Consultant with the National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice.

Speaker 4 ([00:03:38](#)):

Hello, I'm Jodi Martin, Senior Program Director and Senior Consultant with RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. So now that you know a little bit about us, we like to get to know a little bit about you. There is going to be a poll question that pops up in a couple seconds in the poll. If you could please let us know, Are you a probation officer probation, counselor human service worker, maybe juvenile corrections specialist, or are you a probation supervisor or manager? What about youth justice stakeholder that would include judges, court administrators, program and service providers, or a legal representative. So defense attorneys prosecuting or district attorneys guardian ad litem or youth advocate.

Speaker 4 ([00:04:31](#)):

Let's take a couple more seconds. If you could please just submit a single choice there. We will know who we have joining us today. I see we have 122 participants. That's great. Oh, we're still, we're still going up in numbers just real quick, please submit in the poll, who you are. Okay. Are we able to see who's joining us today? Wow. Okay. So a lot of youth justice stakeholders, good number of probation, officers, probation, supervisors, managers, as well as legal representatives and a lot of youth advocates. That's great. Thank you so much for joining us today.

Speaker 3 ([00:05:44](#)):

So it's good to see that we have such an equal split amongst all the stakeholders of the juvenile justice system for today's webinar step by step decision making for youth justice system transformation. We're going to focus on the findings and solutions of jurisdictions that were involved with the Dennis Mondoro Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Project, which was supported by OJJDP.

Speaker 3 ([00:06:12](#)):

We have three learning objectives for today. The first is to discuss the goals of the Mondoro Probation Project, which was funded by OJJDP in 2018 through a second chance act award. The second is to talk about the challenges and barriers that the participating jurisdictions encountered, and we encourage you to identify similar challenges in your own communities. And then thirdly, we want to identify the solutions and reform efforts that the participating sites adapted to address those barriers. We want to talk about how those solutions can be applied in your communities. And we want to provide information about tools and resources that are available to support replication of the success of these efforts that were achieved during the project.

Speaker 4 ([00:07:07](#)):

The Dennis Mondoro project uses the framework detailed in our probation system review guidebook third edition. It's available on our website at RFKNRCJJ.org. The guidebook aligns reform approaches with the most current advances in the field based on up to date and relevant research on adolescent brain development, risk need, responsivity approaches, probation, supervision, graduated system of responses, family engagement, and data driven decision-making

Speaker 2 ([00:07:47](#)):

Fundamental to the framework that's articulated in that Probation System Review guidebook is the research on adolescent brain development and how youth differ from adults in key ways. This widely accepted research supports having a youth justice system that is obviously separate and distinct from the adult criminal justice system and reaffirms that the focus should be on rehabilitation due to the malleability of the adolescent brain. During that period, while these three bullet points reflect

diminished capacity to exercise judgment during adolescents, again, a period loosely defined as between ages 10 and 17, they also present an enhanced opportunity to shape the future exercise of judgment and increase positive behavior change consistent with youth justice goals of accountability, reduction in re-offending and community safety. The practice brief depicted focuses on the research, Supreme Court decisions impacted by the science and key decision points and practices where developmental reform can be applied that enhances system performance and youth outcomes in your jurisdiction. You can find the resource listed on this slide at our website, [RFKNRCJJ.org](http://RFKNRCJJ.org). It was developed as a response to the National Research Council's report on developmental reform released in 2013. I was privileged to serve on the committee that produced the depicted report to OJJDP as a guide for OJJDP. This resource reflects the seven hallmarks of successful youth justice systems consistent with this research that adopts a developmental approach to support a genuine commitment, to fairness, addressing disproportionality and providing for accountability and community safety that involves individualized assessment of risk and need.

Speaker 2 ([00:09:54](#)):

RFK National Resource Center has used the probation system review in over 40 jurisdictions to provide and promote more successful positive outcomes for youth and families by supporting system enhancements and transformative practice in line with this available current research, as we've mentioned previously. The OJJDP funded Mondoro project used this framework in six jurisdictions highlighted on this slide in the darker, bold font. And it has produced system transformation and universally sought youth outcomes of which we are proud and so are the jurisdictions that participated. This session is going to feature some of your professional contemporaries that directed and lived these transformative efforts.

Speaker 3 ([00:10:43](#)):

So the probation system review that John just talked about is a framework that focuses on four elements. These allow for reflection and review of the key components that will have the maximum impact on the professional participants of the youth justice system, whose job it is to ensure that we are the most informed on the best practices and research that supports the best outcomes while providing the highest impact for the youth and families, so they'll have an opportunity to desist from delinquency by addressing their needs through a system that is committed to a philosophy and mission that is anchored in fairness through its policies, trainings, stakeholder relationships, and is driven by data of the overall system outcomes.

Speaker 2 ([00:11:32](#)):

You know, I mentioned the 40 jurisdictions; it really is an effort to enhance our credibility with you, but to reflect that jurisdictions, like you, can undertake this work and produce these changes when you have a committed group of leadership that submits to an organized analysis of your own system, using your own expertise. The review begins with the administration element, it's important for the vision and mission to align with the goals, current research and intended outcomes for youth that may seem obvious, but we begin by asking, when was the last time the mission and vision statement was examined for currency in your jurisdictions. Next policies and practices need to reflect the vision and mission. Is it your reality that the philosophy of practice and approach is not aligned with the existing policies and procedures? Is it also true that probation and our court practitioners often in your jurisdiction play by their own rules, despite procedural or practice mandates? This can create confusion and inconsistency that deleteriously affects the youth and the system as we query partner jurisdictions.

Speaker 2 ([00:12:44](#)):

Our experience is that this dynamic far too often prevails. I'm certain, some of you all have a reaction that indeed it does for you as well. So examining the policies and updating them to have consistency with the values that produce a culture change that will support the efforts of change management, that is necessary to produce this transformative action as a critical accompaniment in this element. The revisions or updates resulting from this review need to be communicated to the system at large through training is the initial way that this new information will reach partners. So, it is imperative to review current training curricula, to update, to remove older procedures and policies and to include new methods and approaches and they need to be accessible for easy reference. Having everyone trained and the policies accessible is just one step to ensuring there's clear communication and expectations, but there also needs to be managerial support in the form of coaching and mentoring as well as oversight of these expectations, that support staff performance to these standards of practice. This critical component of system change ensures consistent reinforcement of the philosophy, goals and procedures for achieving the desired outcomes, particularly among all stakeholders. And it's great to see the cross agency representation here today. And that includes those who are present attorneys, judges, service providers, schools, law enforcement, given the imperative of collaboration to successful transformational change

Speaker 2 ([00:14:23](#)):

Element B in the probation system review is directly focused on the probation supervision, the probation practice. It focuses on how probation performs its roles and responsibilities and defines them at all key case management and court decision points. The review often draws on parts of element a and administration. And for example, we seek to know whether probation is sufficiently trained for understanding and proficiency of application on the tenets of adolescent development. This effort also ensures application and practices related to case planning using RNR instruments, case management to promote behavior change using a balance of incentives and sanctions, consistent review for risk reduction, addressing active trauma were indicated and including families and caregivers as active partners in the behavior change and accountability process. The element also examines fidelity of philosophy and practice within the daily probation officer role through a comprehensive examination of the job description by aligning the job descriptions with the agency's focus on best practice.

Speaker 2 ([00:15:32](#)):

Then there is a harmony between how we are asking Probation Officers to perform their role and responsibilities. The outcomes for these expectations need to be communicated in routine intervals and probation needs clarity for which expectations and measures they are accountable. I hope this is a part of your ongoing process. If not this review leads to those opportunities to further support, consistent and research driven decision-making. The review examines whether or not there is a routine supervisory oversight for criteria that is used by probation personnel at each key decision point. Again, this area of analysis includes the reliable use of RNR instruments, whether or not that is in place in your jurisdiction, translation of these results into a viable case plan and research informed case management techniques and approaches by those probation officers. The review in this element examines efforts to ensure fidelity of practice and embraces the managerial approach to Institute effective and consistent coaching and mentoring to achieve the highest level of performance among each probation officer.

Speaker 4 ([00:16:44](#)):

Element C focuses on intra and interagency work processes. The first thing that needs to occur is identifying the critical stakeholders in your community that need to be included. Next, there needs to be established meetings between these stakeholders to review the process, challenges, trends, and policies. There needs to be an understanding of the relationship between the court and probation. The probation system review examines the system as a whole, not just probation's relationship to the outcomes within the review. There is recognition that each event for a youth has an impact on them. With that in mind, it's necessary to understand the court calendaring process and learn if there's been an examination of that process for effectiveness and efficiency, it's important for the youth and families. We serve to be able to understand the documents that affect them to that end. We partner with the Gault Center who conducts a review of probation orders to make recommendations on how to make them more readable.

Speaker 4 ([00:17:42](#)):

We also review releases of information and relevant forms used in the court and probation processing of cases. Successful probation experiences are a partnership, it's important for the professionals, the youth being served to understand all elements of what is occurring, and that includes the paperwork in order to have a well-functioning youth justice system. There needs to be cross-agency training of probation, court, staff, and community providers to ensure consistency of practice and alignment of treatment programs. This relationship extends beyond the resources that exist to serve criminogenic needs and includes relationships with the schools specifically around the exchange of information, relative to policies developed to address behavioral transgressions at schools. Another key component of effective intra and interagency relationships is assessment of the perspectives of probation staff relative to their professional interactions with attorneys, probation management, and the judiciary. All of these partners have an equal role toward providing the best outcomes for youth. Probation officers have access to information that informs decision making for each of these partners and their perspective of the relationship between the professional partners will determine the manner and ability for the information to be delivered in a way that is useful and timely.

Speaker 3 ([00:19:03](#)):

So element D is about quality assurance. And it's the last element we examine in a probation system review. The benefits of quality assurance are two-fold. It provides for system outcomes and for opportunities to assure processes and practices are occurring, as they were trained to be done. As an agency is building their quality assurance capacity, they need to have a few basic reports. The first of these is a recidivism report. But, in order to have a recidivism report, there needs to be a clear definition of recidivism. And we need to know if it is the same definition for every program initiative. This is just a starting point. In addition to recidivism, we want to measure other outcomes. These include behavioral health change, education, reduction of risk, and that's just to name a few. There needs to be identified system performance measures and desired outcomes.

Speaker 3 ([00:19:58](#)):

So there can be a measure of achievement or barriers in these areas. And most importantly, an agency needs to assess and identify their capacity to collect, manage, and generate data reports within their operating system. Then, you can identify the routine for producing these reports on a daily, weekly, monthly or annual schedule that can reflect the trends in the areas that need to be focused on. And then, once the production of reports, schedules and types of reports are identified, they need to be incorporated into regular management and supervisory meetings. Having the data available will help to

define which areas require training and support and which areas are working and need to be celebrated. And this is part of the cycle of continuous quality improvement or CQI.

Speaker 2 ([00:20:52](#)):

So let me pause for just a moment to reflect on those four elements. That's a lot of detail, lots, a lot of questions, but let me emphasize, and I hope our partners would say the same, this is not anywhere close to an audit. This is a collaborative partnership to collectively examine the policies, the procedures, the mandates, the practices, and identify opportunities to enhance those current practices. Our efforts are supportive of the change process that comport with research driven practices and approaches. It is not an ideology. It is not a model. And we were given the privilege of using this framework with six jurisdictions in this Dennis M. Mondoro probation and juvenile justice system and enhancement project through the funding of second chance act funds through OJJDP. As mentioned previously, we were able to partner with six sites to conduct this work. And I want to pause for just a second to simply say, if you're wondering about the name, the name we've got permission after being awarded the grant, to name the project after Dennis Mondoro, who is the late colleague who worked at OJJDP for nearly two decades. I had the opportunity to partner with him while I was there, also had the opportunity to partner with him when we worked in the local Fairfax county, juvenile and domestic relations court.

Speaker 2 ([00:22:13](#)):

So there's passion behind this project for us in keeping alive the spirit of Dennis Mondoro in his consistent efforts to change positively youth justice practices. And I wanted you guys to make, to be aware of that before we talk about other specifics of the project. We want to share the impactful outcomes. Earlier this year, we convened an all-sites meeting for the six participating jurisdictions. When we ask them about the most impactful changes from this project among a plethora of positive results from their participation, in the project and they are depicted in this word puzzle. The following three words outcomes prominently emphasized the use, the improvement of assessment methodologies in identifying the needs, the risks and the opportunities for these youth, the commitment to data and improvement of continuous quality improvement, methodologies and techniques that improve the consistency of their systems performance were identified. And in fact, leadership both in directing, managing, supervising the change management process and in a partnership of supervising overseeing leading, the change in practice with probation officers and other practitioners. And as you can note, other areas of progress included, diversion, practice, trauma identification and services, structural organization, capacity training enhancement, and adolescent and positive youth development,

Speaker 2 ([00:23:46](#)):

They were referenced briefly. I want to make sure that this was not an endeavor done individually. We partnered with the Gault Center, formerly known as the national juvenile defender center, to conduct probation and court order analysis, using their proven approach, the national center for juvenile justice using their data capacity assessment model and relying on the fundamental measures of juvenile justice, Dr. Keith Cruz, as he applied his trauma informed decision protocol to support effective trauma screening and evaluation of needs, and the Frank Porter Graham impact center at UNC- Chapel Hill to institute principles and practices that support effective implementation science and change management that indeed improves sustainability of these transformational practices. It's the convergence of these partnerships that we believe produce the positive, measurable, collaborative, and sustainable outcomes throughout the system and consistently among youth and families that were served.

Speaker 2 ([00:24:50](#)):

So there were two cohorts selected for this process. The first cohort identified on the slide had already completed a probation system review process, and we were able to seize upon their endorsed recommendations and support the effective implementation with this cohort. In the second cohort, which we will feature two of the sites that are you're about to hear from, they undertook the probation system review and upon the completion of the report or recommendations and findings, they also endeavored to prioritize their endorsed recommendations and seek to establish the implementation of these practices to the impact of the systems performance and the youth outcomes. So we are pleased to have representatives from two of the participant jurisdictions in the Mondoro project here with us today, as noted. We welcome from Green County, Stacy Dennis Director of Youth and Family Services, Julie Austin, the Director of Youth and Family Programming, and Rachel Hogan, the Director of Quality Services. From King County, Paul Daniels, the Director of Juvenile Court Services, Robert Gant, the juvenile court services manager and Aaron Parker, the juvenile court services manager, starting with Green county. Let me ask, could one of you from each jurisdiction briefly share why you applied for inclusion in the project that included a probation and juvenile justice system review.

Speaker 5 ([00:26:23](#)):

Yeah, thanks, John. So I think we really had a several year long trajectory to get us ready for this project. Starting in 2017, we had the juvenile officer performance standards. So to give a small bit of context, we serve on the county level, but had statewide direction of how juvenile officers should perform and a part of that laid out to follow evidence based practices build in, quality assurance, make sure that we are following trauma informed behaviors, as well as several very specific, versions of what probation services should look like. Along with that, you know, our chief juvenile officer had also put forward a vision statement for our office to do similar things: take on evidence based practices, follow trauma, informed practices. When we saw the grant available for this project, it really, really married well with where we wanted to go.

Speaker 5 ([00:27:32](#)):

I also think our office prides ourselves on always being open to change and looking at improving ourselves and this was an excellent opportunity for us to partner, and really see from additional perspectives where we could go. I would say, I, I think our partnership thus far has done exactly that, and would just also highlight the fact that it is a partnership. We worked with John and we had an additional consultant Peg, and both really came alongside us to help us see where we could go with this project.

Speaker 2 ([00:28:09](#)):

Casey, thanks so much. You have identified several of the important predicates that I think over and over again, produced the opportunity to experience the positive change. And I appreciate you capturing that, uh, on behalf of green county king county.

Speaker 6 ([00:28:25](#)):

Good morning and good afternoon everyone! Paul Daniels from King County. You know, to be perfectly honest and blunt about it, we knew we needed to do better. And you know, there's not one area, that's been discussed in the Mondoro project from quality assurance to, you know, services on the ground, adolescent brain development, behavioral health. I mean, everything that we do, we know that we could, we could improve upon. We could bring up to date with, the latest research and best practices.

And, you know, in King County we've been under an immense amount of political pressure. The juvenile justice system itself is at odds with a lot of folks in our community and we knew we needed to make some improvements. I would say, you know, the reality is in doing this work, you need a partner, you need someone you can trust, you need someone that is willing to come in and help you clarify a path.

Speaker 6 ([00:29:17](#)):

And also someone who's willing to sit in the hot water with you. I think, you know, part of that is relationship. And I would say, you know, one of the things that was clear in this endeavor is that we were able to build that relationship and have that partner to do this work. And I think, you know, from our team's perspective, our obligation as leadership of a, a significant community serving system is to provide the very best service we can to our community and, uh, holding up the communities that we have impacted disproportionately in our history, in communities of color LGBTQ+ youth. And so we found this an incredible framework to help us clarify a path forward and to, to help, you know, really provide us resources and partnerships from those various stakeholders.

Speaker 2 ([00:30:12](#)):

Paul, thanks so much again, very shortly, we look forward to hearing from Stacy and the rest of your team and Paul and Robert and Aaron from king county about their, additional experiences in this effort, Jody,

Speaker 4 ([00:30:26](#)):

Thanks John. So a survey was conducted with members from the six Mondoro project sites and their responses highlighted the most impactful changes during the probation system review. And they fell into these four categories, focus on adolescent brain development, commitment to risk need responsiveness, importance of change management and commitment to continuous quality improvement. We're going to start with the focus on adolescent brain development. So in one of the earlier sites, John talked about the importance of translating the science of adolescent development to sustainable best practice. In the project sites members shared with us the importance of providing adolescent brain development training to staff and stakeholders and using the brain development science to inform policies, practices, and programs. So we're gonna put up a polling question right now. The question asks in my organization, we have not received adolescent brain development training. We have awareness of adolescent brain development research. We have received adolescent brain development training. We have developed adolescent brain development training for staff and stakeholders. We have trained stakeholders and we use adolescent brain development to inform policy programs and practice while you're responding to the poll. Um, John, will you share how Lancaster and Fairfax integrated adolescent brain development into their work?

Speaker 2 ([00:32:01](#)):

Oh, certainly. I'll start with Fairfax county and it mimics itself in Lancaster county as well. They developed a training curriculum, that featured the core components of the adolescent development research, that curriculum was able to be delivered, uh, via, uh, remote technology so that it could during the period of, uh, the pandemic where there was no in-office work, uh, this was developed. Um, and it, it just stayed true to the fundamental components. It was also in interactive. Uh, it also provided the opportunity to test, to not only provide the information, but test that proficiency of application in the practices that were unique to Fairfax county, juvenile court's deci uh, decision making tree, Fairfax county is one of those six sites as you saw on the slide. Uh, and I, I think, um, if, uh, jurisdictions were



able to listen to that kind of curriculum development or that that curriculum recording, uh, they would recognize, uh, how it benefited, uh, not only the understanding, but the proficiency.

Speaker 2 ([00:33:07](#)):

And second, very quickly Lancaster county developed six modules focusing on six key components of adolescent development, positive youth development, trauma impact, et cetera. They provided them in one hour modules and they provided training, not just for their probation staff, but to other key stakeholders, including judges, county, attorneys, and public defenders. So in each instance, they built a foundation of understanding and the application of this understanding in practice, not only among their probation staff and court staff, but among all the key stakeholders, I think both, uh, jurisdictions would be more than willing to share, uh, future with future jurisdictions about how they develop that and the quality of the, of the training's impact.

Speaker 4 ([00:33:54](#)):

Great. Thank you, John. Okay. So I'm sorry. The results did pop up there for a second. There, there, again. Thank you. So it looks like, um, there are, looks like about almost 10% used adolescent brain development to inform policy programs and practices, and a couple percent have trained stakeholders as well as developed training for stakeholders. But I think the majority of us are in that area of, we have some awareness around the research and we've received some level of training. Great, thank you so much for sharing that with us.

Speaker 3 ([00:34:35](#)):

So the next area of importance that came out of this work was, um, risk need responsivity and the commitment to it. And so R and R principles helped to identify the right youth for supervision, identify the key needs that are driving the youth behavior. And then through responsivity match services to the youth during the Manura project, we found that several jurisdictions had success in applying R and R principles. Uh, and so before we hear about a specific example from a Manura participant site, I want to invite everyone to take our next poll. Um, and this is going to help us to understand in your organization what you're, uh, using for risk assessment. So the options are we do not have a validated risk assessment instrument. We have a risk instrument, but do not use it regularly. We use a validated risk assessment or the risk assessment informs the use case plan. And while you're taking the poll, John, I'd like to turn to you and see if you could highlight Lancaster county and their commitment to risk needs responsivity,

Speaker 2 ([00:35:41](#)):

Indeed, Michelle and I think, uh, Lancaster county, once again, has an effort to be proud of. They engage the co-creation of a new policy and procedure to use the reassessment of risk using the ILS to reflect whether or not their efforts to target services and behavior change had in fact, reduced the risk. And when there was an indication that the risk was reduced by that reassessment, they created a PO process for early closure of probation. They did that with prosecuting attorneys. They did that with the judges. They did that with probation to create that procedure. Um, they, uh, ultimately over the last two years after implementation have realized from their original 14% early closure and, and success rate, uh, to a 36% early closure and success rate just in the last quarter. Uh, the first quarter of this year, uh, corresponding with that Lancaster county has realized a reduction in overall recidivism despite those early closures for risk profiles that, um, ranged from low to moderate to high, uh, we think that's pretty

impressive. They think that's pretty impressive. And the methodology for them to create that process can easily be replicated by jurisdictions that are represented on this, uh, webinar today.

Speaker 3 ([00:37:04](#)):

You know, John, what I just heard you talk about really takes us from seeing risk assessments as being a one and done type instrument for early classification of levels supervision, and really makes it part of the entire continuum of a youth's experience with probation. So that's a great example. I'm glad you shared it with us. Is it possible we could see the results of the poll. All right. So it looks like 79% of the jurisdictions either use a validated risk assessment, and then 37% of that 79% use it and incorporated into the case plan. That is fantastic because it means that risk is being considered for supervision, but the needs, are being considered for service planning. So that's excellent to see.

Speaker 4 ([00:38:05](#)):

Okay, the next item that we're gonna highlight is the importance of change management and knowledge of implementation science. So we know that change is all around us. However, people are not predisposed to embrace change from general discomfort, with change, to change fatigue from other projects, or maybe a pride of ownership in something being replaced. Change management is a set of activities or steps that planned for implement, manage and reinforce organizational change, change comprises the processes, tools and techniques used to manage the people side of change and achieve desired agency outcomes. Ultimately change management focuses on how to help employees embrace, adopt, and utilize a change in their day to day work. Taking time in the beginning will save time in the end. All right, let's take another poll. This poll asks in my organization we have regularly scheduled meetings with stakeholders, developed and follow a communication plan, developed a training plan for staff and stakeholders, When policy and procedures are updated, we have data to support communication and education for organizational goals, or none of the above. Okay. While you're answering the poll, I'd like to ask king county and green county to share the activities that they undertook to manage the change process. Let's start with king county.

Speaker 6 ([00:39:39](#)):

Thanks, Jody. I would just say upfront, I think change management and implementation science, if not the most important component of all this work is one of it is, is paramount. I think, as far as lessons learned around this in a county where radical change is happening in a very, very fast pace change brings out and exposes your weak points. There's no better way to put it. I don't think. And I think what we learned is essentially what, what was just said, you sometimes you have to go slow to go fast. You have to, um, allow for what sometimes we described on our team as a grieving process. I think we learned how much change in our world exacerbates sort of the growth focus mindset versus a fixed mindset. And, the importance of, of coaching and training and awarding orrewarding change for the positive and reform efforts and change in a positive direction are not something that are part of our cultures as these large systems.

Speaker 6 ([00:40:41](#)):

I think that implementation science and the, and the fundamentals that are provided as part of this partnership and especially the, the impact center at UNC, it just provided such a concrete and clear way to frame this work. And I think for us, you know, we're still in, in the last few months of our Mondoro project with a long road ahead of us, but I think we have a better foundation now because we understand the components of building out the infrastructure and you know how to make decisions

around how you communicate change fundamentally. And then, you know, how do you seek feedback? And then on the back end, how do you provide that QA, quality assurance for managing and maintaining anything you're changing and then follow up on adjustments along the way. It's it is an incredibly complex and involved process, but probably nothing more important when you're looking to create sustainable reform. So I don't know if any of my partners want to jump in and add anything there, if there's a lot to this one, for sure.

Speaker 7 ([00:41:45](#)):

Just quickly, what I would just add is that, you know, I think one of the things that Paul hit on is like having a framework and the way I think we looked at this is kind of approaching it from five different perspectives. And so kind of inspiring a shared vision. I think folks need to understand like where you're trying to go and that's across all stakeholders, not just within our own department. Next thing I think about, or we think about is like enabling others to be able to act so people need what they need to be able to do their jobs and be able to shift and change with the times. And if they don't have that, they're gonna be stuck in the mud. The next I think about is modeling the way we have to not just talk the talk. We have to actually show up and do the work. And the last two I would say is challenge the process. We have to challenge our staff, our department, our system, everybody involved. And most importantly, I would say encouraging the heart along the way, be able to make sure that our staff know that we are there with them walking alongside them and encouraging them along the way.

Speaker 4 ([00:42:41](#)):

Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Robert. I, you know, I heard a couple, uh, things I just wanna repeat there, there was so much, um, great information you just shared, but that go slow to go fast, right? It is really, um, sometimes we just have to slow it down in order to be successful during this organizational change process, but then also sharing that vision early on. It's so important that we share the vision early on with the organization. So we all, um, we're on the same page and we're going in the same direction. So thank you so much. How about green county?

Speaker 5 ([00:43:13](#)):

I mean just, wow. That's already such a great answer. Um, I would echo so much of what has already been said. Um, as I talked about previously, our office is very open to change. Um, and so we really had to look at taking on change very differently. Um, and learning about change management has been huge for us. Um, I would really echo, um, taking things slow, um, never being afraid to course correct. Um, I, I think that sometimes, historically we have taken on a change, um, and just wanted to move forward with what that decision was without looking at input and feedback along the way, and being willing to, um, take on things differently if that's, what's gonna be the better outcome for us. Um, I would say the biggest, um, lesson learned that we have around change management is the understanding, um, that readiness for change is never complete and we are always working on how do we build that readiness?

Speaker 5 ([00:44:16](#)):

How are we continuing to share that messaging, get that input, how we're using that? When we first started with this partnership, I know I personally had an idea of, okay, we're going to do X, Y, and Z, and then everybody's going to be ready for change. So we really had to learn the lesson that it is a continual process that we will always be working on as we move forward, because this is a big project that we are looking at taking, you know, several years to be able to complete. We always have to be making sure that we are catching up with people because you can also have people that are ready for change one

day and move backwards a little bit. And so that's why it's so important to continue the work of bringing people along with you and helping to build that readiness for them.

Speaker 4 ([00:45:06](#)):

Ah, thank you so much, Stacy, those were such great points. I think about, you know, you mentioned that course correct. Right. You start this process, but then you're continuing to evaluate it as you go through and then being able to course correct when you need to. And it really isn't, we just, we share the vision at one time, but we continue to bring everybody back to the table and continue these conversations. And I think that's where we're going to be the most effective, the most successful. And another thing you mentioned is this is not a quick process. It takes years, right. And it is something that we just need to stick to and be committed to. So thank you both for sharing that. I'm wondering if we can share the polling results.

Speaker 4 ([00:45:45](#)):

Okay, great. Thank you. So, we see there's a lot of these regularly scheduled meetings with stakeholders. That's great. It looks like there's a lot of training plans that have been developed when policies and procedures are updated. That's crucial. There are some that have data to support the communication and education for the goals. And also some have developed a communication plan, but there's also about a quarter of the folks here today that have not focused on any of the ones that were options here. So thank you for sharing those results with us. I appreciate it.

Speaker 3 ([00:46:26](#)):

Just like Paul mentioned in his response about change management, we saw all six project sites embrace CQI during the Mondoro Project. And so rather than give you a general overview of CQI, I'm going to turn to our partners on the project, King County and Greene County, and ask them to share their experiences. Before I do that, we do have another poll. And so if you could respond to the poll when I turn to King and Greene County, that would be great. The question is, in my organization, CQI is supported by individual coaching, peer to peer case staffing, booster trainings, sharing outcome data, or none of the above. And so, Greene County, I know that you're going to discuss in greater detail later in the webinar, CQI for you and your experience. But I'm wondering here at the top of this commitment to, continuous quality improvement, if you could tell us a little bit about how things were done before CQI. How were decisions made?

Speaker 5 ([00:47:35](#)):

Well, I think we are all in a helping profession because we want to help people. And so I think that we all made a lot of decisions based on gut. And once we were able to start seeing data behind some of the decisions that we were making, some of those were supported and some of them were not. And we really had to figure out how to make those changes that we wanted. I would also see if Rachel, our Director of Quality Assurance, would want to add anything.

Speaker 8 ([00:48:10](#)):

Yes. Thank you, Stacy. I just completely agree and echo that we were just living by anecdotes essentially. And I would say because we were taking on so many different change products or processes, then we were just kind of jumping from ad hoc piece of information to ad hoc piece of information. And so it was really hard to engage like a CQI model. And so, again, even with CQI, we're kind of slowing down so we can gain momentum.

Speaker 3 ([00:48:37](#)):

So Stacy, Rachel, I think you hit some of the key points when talking about CQI. Right. I heard the word gut, I heard the word anecdote, I heard ad hoc. Right. And those tend to be the way when you don't have a structured CQI system, that tends to be how decisions get made. King County, do you want to give us a little preview or some information about your commitment to CQI?

Speaker 6 ([00:49:07](#)):

Yes, I'll just briefly say, I think, you know, again, just talking about systems, I think it's really common for us to protect ourselves, protect our culture. And I think CQI in a lot of ways is a way to push through that, to push beyond that layer and, you know, allow us to be more transparent in our work and share our results in a way that does get us past anecdotal. I think one of the phrases we heard most commonly across our department when talking about change was, yeah, we do that. And I think you can take that at face value, but when you really start applying CQI to that and you apply measures to those things, you can check that for yourself and realize if you're consistent or not. And I think one of the things we realize is we weren't, and so I'll leave it at that for now. And I, I definitely want to give my colleagues a chance to respond to that when we, when we talk a little more about it.

Speaker 3 ([00:50:01](#)):

I appreciate that Paul. So, I love that you said it gives us opportunity to be more transparent. And I think what it can do is in that transparency that oftentimes is, you know there could be fear around that, particularly when you don't have information about your organization. It provides confidence to have a CQI process because it gives you data that you can talk about, but it also gives you confidence in what is working well for your agency. What do you have consistency and commitment towards and gives you the ability to talk about what you're working on. So I love those answers from both King and Greene County. Is it possible we could see the results of the poll?

Speaker 3 ([00:50:45](#)):

Alright, so it looks like there's a fair split amongst the types of CQI processes across many of you with individual coaching, peer to peer case staffing, booster trainings, and sharing outcome data. But interestingly, it looks like there's none of that happening in a lot of organizations. And so, you know, there's a real opportunity to think about what can you implement. What's a fair way to do that so that you can help to support some of transformation efforts and some of your processes with the training, and the information that you need to make sure that you can sustain it long term, and that it's providing the results that were intended to be provided.

Speaker 2 ([00:51:43](#)):

So thank you to our local jurisdictions. It obviously is important part of this presentation. We want to include the words from representatives who live this experience, who have realized the success. Their insights and perspectives may be infinitely more valuable to your understanding and appreciation of the effort and results than anything we could explain earlier in this presentation. So in just a moment, I'm going to hand the floor to them as they've already responded to specific questions, to share brief presentations with you on some of the key components that they would like to offer to you for your consideration. But before I do there's been one series of questions that I'd like to respond to in the Q and A. And generally speaking, it really tries to examine... Well, first of all, the specific question is why there is no element E, speaking to community municipality readiness for difficult populations.

Speaker 2 ([00:52:37](#)):

And then of course the notion of reentry for young people in trouble, in challenging communities, challenging socioeconomic responses, and challenging educational forums. I think that's behind a lot of this process that in an hour and 15 minutes, we may not be able to cover. But at least let me try to address that. Fundamental to that readiness before we appear in a site to work with a team is the development of a leadership team. And we try to outline the key representatives from that team. And often in our experience, they've included community leaders, board members, commission members, legislators. Again, just recognize acknowledged leaders within the community that are supporting youth and families in a challenging, difficult environment. A second phase is really to raise up that risk-need-responsivity assessment, which over time if universally and routinely applied can begin to identify the kinds of services and treatment and programs that are necessary within a community to be funded, to be active.

Speaker 2 ([00:53:45](#)):

And by developing that early relationship with community leaders, an active community partnership, we get in a place where we could systematically ID the needs for the community to respond to. So it really does depict an active community engagement and partnership where we've been successful at building that with our collaborators. And finally, I think your question also kind of infers where is the family as an active partner, where is the family support. This truly is a youth and family innovation. It truly is a youth and family centered approach in this probation and juvenile justice system review. So therefore the community in the face of these families and caregivers are part of our partnership as well. That's a question that demands many more complex answers. But I hope I've at least laid a foundation for you to understand that there really is an element E, just not articulated as element E, in this probation review that counts on the community partnerships to be an integral part of our success. With that to preserve the time, let me hand it off to Paul Daniels, to Robert Gant, to Aaron Parker, to characterize some of the successes, some of the challenges they faced, courageously and effectively, from their leadership position within King County Juvenile Court. Paul,

Speaker 6 ([00:55:05](#)):

Thanks again, John. Well, you know, I think King County has been a, maybe a little bit of a unique environment in the last several years. We opened a new juvenile court facility, which brought immense pressure and controversy from the community. And some of that rightly so, you know, and I think what it forced us to do is take a really long look in the mirror and be honest about who we are and whether or not we're actually meeting the goals that we say that we're going to meet. And through that effort and then eventually, with our partnership with RFK, we started to really try to put our efforts in alignment with who we want to be and who we say we are. And that led to what I would say is sort of the development and the vision of our JTRAC model, which is sort of the underpinning model for our entire juvenile court services department at this point. I'm going to hand it off to Mr. Parker to kind of talk about what that model is and what that looks like for us.

Speaker 9 ([00:56:04](#)):

Thanks, Paul. So as you see here, JTRAC stands for the Juvenile Therapeutic Response and Accountability Court. Really what we were seeing just as a quick background, we only offered the only therapeutic model we had in juvenile court was juvenile drug court. And we realized that it was a great intervention. It was just being offered at the wrong time. The youth had been in the system for a number of years, had continued to gain, you know, to get other charges and continued their behaviors. Self-medication

through drug and alcohol, trying to mask really the mental health symptoms that they had versus actually just strictly drug and alcohol issues that they were dealing with. And so for a very rigid program, like juvenile drug court, where you spent a lot of time in front of the court, where you had, it was all about abstinence and getting to zero, not really understanding harm reduction. Youth would get into this program and very few would be successful in getting out of it, or they would spend so much time in the program that they spent more time like going into detention or getting sanctions than actually being lifted up to change some of those behaviors.

Speaker 9 ([00:57:17](#)):

So we took a step away from the juvenile drug court model and realized that when we looked at our stats, majority of the youth coming through the door were dealing with behavioral health needs. And so we had to take that framework of wraparound approach of multiple professionals, get in the connections to treatment, and all those things, being our focus and spreading that across our court. And that's how we came up with the JTRAC model, the Juvenile Therapeutic Response and Accountability Court, which really is the overarching umbrella of everything that we do. And the basis for that are three main pillars, which are the early screening and support, the community centered, and positive youth justice. When you think of early screening and support, we're going to get into this on the next slide, just a little in more detail, but you have to think that early in the old model, you really waited for adjudication or disposition before you decided, okay, here's what you're eligible for and what I can connect you to, to help address your needs, you and your family's needs.

Speaker 9 ([00:58:17](#)):

And we realized we gotta jump on it. As soon as we get connected to the kid, we gotta get involved. And then community centered, we're going to be involved a very short time and we hope to be involved for a very short time. So we have to focus on building that safety net for the youth and the family, so that when we're done working with them, they know where they can go and hopes to never have to come back to us. And positive youth justice is being mindful of adolescent brain development, really focusing on incentives, and incentivizing the change in behavior. And then our department is really looking at a shift from being in these silos of "these are my cases, I know what's best, my two eyes are the only ones looking at it, maybe my supervisor might look at it" and moving to a care team model, which you see in the medical field and the community mental health, where multiple professionals are looking at this case and working together to help them move along.

Speaker 9 ([00:59:09](#)):

We all have different goals but we want to make sure that they're aligning together so that we're not one, overwhelming the youth, but also making sure that they're making progress through that. And as you see here, it just says that we designed this to align our efforts under a single framework to continue to advance progress, amplify the high quality research-backed therapeutic approaches that we know work and to eliminate disparities that some youth and families experience. And again, this is the way that we do the work within Juvenile Court Services. It's not a program. It's the way that we do everything. And as you can see, the youth is the bird flying through the forest and the trees are all the different programs that they will tap into while connected to our services. Here we have a, when Robert spoke about having a vision and making sure people know what that vision is, we spent a lot of time envisioning what JTRAC was without having it written down on paper.

Speaker 9 ([01:00:09](#)):

You could ask Robert, Paul or myself what it was, and we could talk to you for hours about it, but in terms of like having it written down and really concrete what it is, it took us probably a year, year and a half, to get to this place. And this document is really just an overview of what that is. And so when we talk about the WHAT we're implementation of the Juvenile Therapeutic Response and Accountability Court and expanding therapeutic resources to support the overall wellbeing of young people, the approach rooted in trauma informed care practices and healing focuses on early screening and support, community centered connections and positive youth justice and skill development. The WHY is to improve outcomes for youth and families by connecting them with timely appropriate interventions that build strengths, foster desistance, and reduce contact with the criminal legal system, especially for youth of color who are disproportionately engaged in the criminal legal system.

Speaker 9 ([01:01:07](#)):

And some of our constraints, because you have to be real about there is there are going to be some roadblocks to making this shift happen to the JTRAC model from the old school model. And part of that is effective collaboration across the legal system. So between the court staff, prosecutor, defense, community, the families that we serve that effective collaboration across that can sometimes be, be a constraint. And it's complex and it requires time for relationship and trust building, resistance to new approaches, both from internal staff and external parties, can lead to delays in implementation and appropriate resources in the community may be limited or unavailable. And so when the 1 – 3 – 9 strategic plan, you have one goal, three critical priorities, and the nine tactics. I'll go into the goal and then I'll let Paul and Robert, each of us, kind of oversaw and continue to oversee one of the critical priorities. And so we'll just talk briefly about those. And so our overall goal is to create a web of support that honors the dignity, agency, belonging and safety for all young people engaged with the juvenile court and to help them develop skills needed to achieve their goals and avoid future engagement with the court. So I'll let Paul talk to us about the early screening and support.

Speaker 6 ([01:02:30](#)):

Thank you, Aaron. Thanks for walking through that. I'll be brief in the respective time here. One thing I want to say up front is I think one of the driving philosophies behind all this is understanding that the legal system often prescribes incorrectly what is the appropriate response to a young person in their family? What I mean by that is we use crimes and criminal behavior, alleged criminal behavior to determine what a kid needs. And that's very faulty. It's not aligned with research. And so part of this model is to try and disconnect how we respond to kids and families from the legal process, not completely possible, but it's where we're trying to go. To that point, the early screening and support component is a real effort to identify the needs of youth and families incorporating trusted clinical tools, as well as centering the voice and choice of the family and letting that drive how we're responding rather than, you know, what a crime type is. For example, that does incorporate again, those R-N-R principles, risk assessments and clinical tools. So I'll leave it at that, just in the essence of time and pass it to Robert. Thank you.

Speaker 7 ([01:03:42](#)):

Thanks, Paul. So as Aaron talked about, these are our three pillars and we'd like to look at it kind of as a golden thread. And so once that early screening and support is in place upfront, we talked about it's really important to make that bridge back to community. In our new building, we are lucky to have an actual resource center space in the building. And so part of that, what that looks like is having pre-COVID and also post-COVID having community providers actually on site to be able to connect with families and



young people as they enter into our space or into our building and ensure that they are able to be connected and have that warm handoff that people kind of talk about. On the next piece of it, I think is looking at kind of culturally responsive skill development and really, really honoring the voice of our young people.

Speaker 7 ([01:04:28](#)):

I mean, one of the, I think key pieces of our leadership team is that we all have background in community. Like I've spent 25, 27 years working in community, only been in the court for three years. And so we're trying to bring some of the efforts that we utilize in community within this big, gigantic court system to make some of the changes. And part of that is being able to offer programming that speaks to young people in a real way. Like we sometimes think we have all the answers like, oh, let me create this program for this young person. And the young person's looking at like, what the heck is this? And so really being thoughtful around how do we ensure that those programs that we're offering support and meet their needs. And then the next piece that we'll talk about is kind of like our families and systems collaboration.

Speaker 7 ([01:05:10](#)):

I mean, I think, and community collaboration, I think this is so, so important because oftentimes what we do is we, we lean on our community, right, to connect with us and partner with us. But I think sometimes one of the missing elements is how are we helping them with capacity development and capacity building. Because you know, a lot of people in community have lived experience what we, which we need. But as you all know, whenever you're getting funding or, are being, or partnered with government systems, there's going to be a lot of pieces that are in place, expectations for these government systems. And so how are we supporting and helping the community build their capacity to be able to apply for RFP or be able to meet the needs of reporting and all those different things that come along with partnership. And the other pieces of how are we building into those family supports, whether it's through peer-to-peer, parent supports, how are we bringing in our youth voice through our youth action team?

Speaker 7 ([01:06:03](#)):

And how are we often talking with our system partners? And part of that is also helping to shift the narrative. I mean, people are oftentimes so unaware, really what actually happens in juvenile court and being able to really kind of explain where we're at, own the fact that we have a lot of work to do, own the fact that these systems have been built on racist principles and just be really transparent about that. And so, I'll stop there because I know we don't have a lot of time, but this is something I really get excited about or we get excited about as we talk about this work.

Speaker 9 ([01:06:34](#)):

Yes. And I'll take 30 seconds to wrap it up. Positive youth justice is the last critical priority. And that's really using that PYJ framework to serve youth and families focusing on the youth development. And so we're using that individualizing plans for youth. We're not doing cookie cutter responses, we're looking at what the needs are through the early screening and the community centered and developing that plan. And it looks different for every person that we work with and every family we work with. In incentive based supervision, moving away from do this or I'll put you in detention and more like here's the plan let's work together. And when you make and reach milestones, I have gift cards and other incentives to give you, it could be that we end supervision early. And then the final one, like I mentioned

earlier, the move to care teams, not having just two eyes on it, being reactive to when it hits the fan, but having multiple professionals throughout our department, through our clinical staff, through our probation officers, through our education and employment people, through our CSEC workers, everybody working around to say, let's all talk about what we're doing to help move this youth and family forward and how can we align this and support each other to do that.

Speaker 9 ([01:07:44](#)):

So that's kind of the final priority for JTRAC.

Speaker 2 ([01:07:48](#)):

So Paul, Aaron, and Robert, thank you. I just want to say it's been a tremendous privilege in working with you, your other colleagues in King County as well. You guys are truly dedicated professionals that set an example for those to follow. I want to quickly transition at this point to Greene County in our remaining seven minutes and allow them to share their experiences with our audience today as well.

Speaker 5 ([01:08:11](#)):

Great. Thanks again, John. So I am going to talk with you guys a little bit about the first thing that we had to take on and it was ultimately an organizational restructure of our office. So when you look at the Probation System Review and the four elements that have been laid out, we really had to start with that administrative piece and reevaluate what the administration in our office looked like to be able to build capacity, to take on the additional recommendations that were given to us. So we really had to look at our structure and recognize that we had an archaic organizational structure, which is pretty common in government agencies. So we had one organizational head for an office of almost a hundred employees and that made it very difficult for one person to be in charge of building capacity, holding people to a standard of accountability, and being able to move forward with all of the different recommendations that we knew we needed to take on.

Speaker 5 ([01:09:16](#)):

So we ultimately had to come to a decision about, if we really wanted to make these changes to improve our community and the services that we offered to youth and families, and take on this huge first step. So we created a change task force that reviewed our structure and made several decisions regarding that structure. So, we moved our organization from one main leader, to creating an executive team of seven department heads. So what that did was allowed us to build capacity to take on the additional recommendations towards our probation review that we wanted to take on. It really allowed us to legitimize things that were really important to us moving to evidence based practices. Making sure that continuous quality improvement was an important step forward for us, making sure that we were following trauma informed care.

Speaker 5 ([01:10:17](#)):

And we specifically did that by creating directors of clinical and quality assurance so that we had leadership at our executive level to make sure that we were pushing that forward with everything else that we did. So we've really been able to come to a lessons learned place. And we've been able to see that while it's a difficult transition, we are really starting to see the fruits of our labor. And really starting to see the movement in our office towards the legitimization of the different recommendations and different structures that we wanted to take on. We really had to see some parts of our leadership team move to be able to start moving in this direction that we wanted to see. And we really needed this team

to, like I talked about earlier, have that continual build of readiness. So being able to build in the capacity between those seven people versus one allows us to have the space to have conversations and work on ways of communicating the different changes that we're going to take on and continue to move forward with our vision. So with that, I will pass it off to Julie. Julie, you are muted.

Speaker 5 ([01:11:50](#)):

That was really good too. I was saying a lot of good things. So juvenile detention is really a little bit unique to the probation review process. But, as John was talking about Element B and fidelity between policy and practice and they were coming through and kind of looking at the structure of our office and how we did things, they did notice that there was a disconnect between the written policy of our detention center and the practices. What their feedback was was that we had a pretty punitive, kind of archaic again, approach to detention practices. And so what we did was we restructured, to create a leadership team that embraced this brain development science, and really get to a restorative practice. Now that's not done without a lot of work and effort. We did actually have an issue that happened that resulted in a change in leadership that allowed us to probably fast forward this process quite a bit.

Speaker 5 ([01:12:49](#)):

But we did close down our detention center for three months. We rehired most of our staff, developed new policies and practices, and the result is we don't have a baby jail anymore. We're really, really careful and cognizant of identity formation in this age group and the results and the negative impacts of being in a secure facility. And so this again is a really long process. We take two steps forward, one step back, but it has been a really critical part of our transformation to bring this adolescent brain development science into our detention center. And I'll turn that over to Rachel.

Speaker 8 ([01:13:30](#)):

Thank you, Julie. And I'll just wrap up real quickly. As it comes to continuous quality improvement and through all this organizational change, we realize, you know, how do we make decisions without data? How do we make decisions without learning something from what we're doing in our practice? And so we just made it a priority to add data to our leadership team, to have a designated position for that, and also to designate positions to help analyze that information. So we have a three-person quality unit now, that's designated solely at looking at our data. Which is important because as we're entering into our data systems, we're just collecting mounds and mounds of data that doesn't get analyzed and then used for decision making. So we have a brand new unit to do that. And we are excited because we're kind of in our infancy, but over the next few years, we're looking forward to having even more information, to just continue moving towards a best practice approach for our probation system.

Speaker 2 ([01:14:32](#)):

So Stacy, Julie and Rachel, that was awesome. Succinctly put. There is so much work behind what Paul, Aaron and Robert have done, and you and Julie and Rachel have done, along with your colleagues in both of those jurisdictions. I hope our participants will follow up with you to learn more about the specifics of the detention reform, the specifics of the JTRAC, the specifics of the quality improvement moving forward. This is truly outstanding work. Maybe I'm not the best judge because I've pulled for them all along, but I can attest to the fact that these guys are great leaders and they've produced transformative change in challenging environments. We think you can too. And there's a framework, maybe even a little bit of a call to blueprint that would give you guidance and peers like you, who are on this call that you can rely on for guidance, instruction, and support.

Speaker 2 ([01:15:25](#)):

So we are, at the end of our time, I mentioned we may run a few moments over, but we don't want to be dishonorable to the time that we were allocated. So we answered the question that was posed. We don't have time for an open question and answer. I would simply say, this is how you contact us to follow up. We are more than interested in talking with you about your interest, your commitment, your passion. We share those similar traits in the work on behalf of juvenile justice. And we would welcome the fact that more progress we made throughout the country as a result of the considerable lessons learned from King County, Greene County, our other jurisdictions that are part of the Mondoro Project and the OJJDP support that has put us in this place. I have to mention, as you look at our contact information, that's direct lines to us or direct emails.

Speaker 2 ([01:16:14](#)):

We welcome that. We would also want you to be aware that our podcast series is up and running. We're about to release our part two of the second episode for the 2022 podcast series. This is featuring a conversation with the renowned and well established expert, Dr. Gina Vincent, on risk needs responsivity instruments. We featured Adolphus Graves in our inaugural event, where he spoke about the leadership that he exercised in Cobb County. We would welcome you to that. And take a look at our website. We offer Training Institutes to focus on these individual areas that have been frequently referenced in the progress made by King County and Greene County. Thanks to Michelle and Jodi, as my teammates in offering this webinar series, and certainly to our guests from King and Greene County.

Speaker 8 ([01:17:10](#)):

Thank you all.