

## APPENDIX 1



	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD
A Jjudicatory Hearing (number of cases)	17	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	17	14	16	192
Attorney Present	17	14	14	15	13	14	16	14	12	16	14	16	175
Attorney Present %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Rights Form (protection from self-incrimination)	17	14	14	15	13	14	16	14	12	16	14	16	175
Rights Form (protection from self-incrimination) %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Petition	17	14	14	15	13	14	16	14	12	16	14	16	175
Petition %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Amended Petition	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Amended Petition %	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	6%	2%
Trial	4	3	2	4	4	1	4	2	2	2	1	0	29
Trial %	24%	21%	14%	27%	31%	7%	25%	14%	17%	13%	7%	0%	17%
Waiver and Admission	13	11	12	11	9	13	12	12	10	14	13	14	144
Waiver and Admission %	76%	79%	86%	73%	69%	93%	75%	86%	83%	88%	93%	88%	82%
Plea and Rights Form	13	11	12	11	9	13	12	12	10	14	13	14	144
Plea and Rights Form %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Order	17	14	14	15	13	14	16	14	12	16	14	16	175
Order %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Nolle Pros by State	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	2	4	1	2	2	21



Opposing Probable Cause	3	6	4	3	1	3	2	3	1	4	3	3	36
Opposing Probable Cause %	33%	67%	40%	60%	17%	75%	50%	50%	100%	36%	38%	75%	53%
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction	3	6	4	3	1	3	2	3	1	4	3	3	36
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction %	33%	67%	40%	60%	17%	75%	50%	50%	100%	36%	38%	75%	53%
<b>Defense Waived Evidence</b>													
Opposing Probable Cause	6	3	6	2	5	1	2	3	0	7	5	1	41
Opposing Probable Cause %	67%	33%	60%	40%	83%	25%	50%	50%	0%	64%	64%	25%	47%
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction	6	3	6	2	5	1	2	3	0	7	5	1	41
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction %	67%	33%	60%	40%	83%	25%	50%	50%	0%	64%	63%	25%	47%

\* Calculating the percentage does not give an actual representation of the data for the transfers.

## Monthly Review 2013

	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD
<b>Detention Probable Cause</b> (number of cases)	15	21	18	26	23	20	14	18	16	20	191
Attorney Present	15	21	18	26	23	20	14	18	16	20	191
Attorney Present %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Affidavit of Complaint	15	18	15	23	22	20	14	18	16	20	181
Affidavit of Complaint %	100%	86%	83%	88%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%
Uncontested	0	3	0	1	2	4	3	9	3	5	30
Uncontested %	0%	17%	0%	4%	9%	20%	21%	50%	19%	25%	17%
Contested	0	4	1	6	13	5	7	9	13	15	73
Contested %	0%	22%	7%	26%	59%	25%	50%	50%	81%	75%	40%
By Oral Argument	0	2	0	2	12	4	7	7	13	14	61
Oral Argument %	0%	50%	0%	33%	92%	80%	100%	78%	100%	93%	63%
By Written Documents	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Written Documents %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
By Live Witnesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Live Witnesses %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%	0%	0%	2%
By Continuance for Proof	0	2	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	10
Continuance for Proof %	0%	50%	100%	67%	8%	20%	0%	0%	0%	7%	25%
Statement of Attorney Regarding Notice and Advisement of Rights	3	5	8	14	13	10	12	18	16	20	119
Statement of Attorney Regarding Notice and Advisement of Rights %	20%	24%	44%	54%	57%	50%	86%	100%	100%	100%	63%
Rights Form by Magistrate (protection from self-incrimination)	3	10	15	21	14	15	12	18	16	20	144
Rights Form by Magistrate (protection from self-incrimination) %	20%	48%	83%	81%	61%	75%	86%	100%	100%	100%	75%







	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	YTD
The Nature of the Delinquent Act Alleged	5	7	3	7	8	10	6	9	6	9	70
The Nature of the Delinquent Act Alleged %	71%	78%	75%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%
The Child Social Factors	0	0	1	4	1	0	6	9	6	9	36
The Child Social Factors %	0%	0%	25%	50%	13%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	49%
The Alternatives Within the Juvenile Justice System Considered and Ratic	1	2	2	5	1	1	6	9	6	9	42
The Alternatives Within the Juvenile Justice System Considered an1	14%	22%	50%	63%	13%	10%	100%	100%	100%	100%	57%
Whether the juvenile court and juvenile justice system can provide rehabil	7	9	3	8	8	10	6	9	6	9	75
Whether the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Justice System Can Provi1	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
Defense Presented Evidence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense Presented Evidence %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Opposing Probable Cause	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Opposing Probable Cause %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In Support of Continued Juvenile Jurisdiction %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

## Notes:

This data is compiled from a physical review of the legal jacket only. The absence of a required form indicates only the lack of written documentation, not the failure to address a particular issue, procedure or right.

Court orders in 2014 will include findings of evidence presented by the defense related to probable cause and continued juvenile jurisdiction. This information is currently available only through recordings of court proceedings.

The heading of "Appointment of Attorney", (under Detention Probable Cause), was changed on September 1, 2013 to "Attorney Present". This allows documentation of both appointed and private counsel. Numbers have been recalculated from March, 2013, forward to reflect the change.

Prior to October, 2013, rights forms were required at every stage of proceedings. Therefore, numbers from prior months may not accurately reflect advisement of due process rights absent such duplication.

## APPENDIX 2

## PROBATION CONFERENCE REVIEWS

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG YTD
<b># CASES REVIEWED</b>			7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	36.7
<b>ATTORNEY</b>													
None			6	36	39	40	38	39	38	39	37	40	
%			86%	90%	98%	100%	95%	98%	95%	98%	93%	100%	
Private				3					1				
%				8%					3%				
Public Defender							1				3		
%							3%				8%		
Panel			1	1	1		1						
%			14%	3%	3%		3%	3%	3%	3%			
<b>PERSONS PRESENT</b>													
<b>PARENT</b>													
Mother			7	27	27	29	27	30	28	25	33	35	
%			100%	68%	68%	73%	68%	75%	70%	63%	83%	88%	
Father				5	3	6	3	5	7	3	5	1	
%				13%	8%	15%	8%	13%	18%	8%	13%	3%	
Both				5	6	1	2		1	3	1	2	
%				13%	15%	3%	5%		3%	8%	3%	5%	
Guardian				2	3	3	6	3	2	8	1	1	
%				5%	8%	8%	15%	8%	5%	20%	3%	3%	
Other			1	1	3	2	3	2	4	1	3	1	
%			14%	3%	8%	5%	8%	5%	10%	3%	8%	3%	

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Age

< 10

%

10-12

%

13 - 15

%

16-17

%

18

%

				3%						
	1	3	1		4	4	4	4	5	
	3%	8%	3%		10%	10%	10%	10%	13%	
	4	14	14	18	16	19	17	19	13	16
	57%	35%	35%	45%	40%	48%	43%	48%	33%	40%
	3	22	22	21	22	17	20	16	23	19
	43%	55%	55%	53%	55%	43%	50%	40%	58%	48%
	3	1		1		1	1			
	8%	3%		3%		3%	3%			

**SEX/RACE**

MB

%

MW

%

M Other

%

FB

%

FW

%

F Other

%

	4	21	24	24	17	27	22	20	27	24
	57%	53%	60%	60%	43%	68%	55%	50%	68%	60%
	1	8	4	2	4	2	4	5	3	1
	14%	20%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	13%	8%	3%
			1				1	1		
			3%				3%	3%		
	1	10	9	11	18	10	12	12	10	14
	14%	25%	23%	28%	45%	25%	30%	30%	25%	35%
	1	1	2	3		1	1	2		1
	14%	3%	5%	8%		3%	3%	5%		3%

3%

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Yes

%

No

%

	1	4	3	4	2	2	4	8	5	5
	14%	10%	8%	10%	5%	5%	10%	20%	13%	13%
	6	36	37	36	38	38	36	32	35	35
	86%	90%	93%	90%	95%	95%	90%	80%	88%	88%

**OFFENSE**

Offense Level on Grid

Level I	6	31	35	34	31	38	31	34	34	37
%	86%	78%	88%	85%	78%	95%	78%	85%	85%	93%
Level II	1	8	4	6	9	2	9	6	6	2
%	14%	20%	10%	15%	23%	5%	23%	15%	15%	5%
Level III		1	1							1
%		3%	3%							3%
Level IV										
%										

**CONFERENCE**

Right to Remain Silent Understood

Yes	7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

No

%

Self Incrimination Understood

Yes	7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

No

%

Right to a lawyer Understood

Yes	7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

No

%

Collateral Consequences Understood

Yes	7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

No

%

Was a Lawyer Requested

Yes	1	1	1		2	1	2		3	
%	14%	3%	3%		5%	3%	5%		8%	

No

	6	39	39	40	38	39	38	40	37	40
%	86%	98%	98%	100%	95%	98%	95%	100%	93%	100%

Process to obtain Lawyer Understood

Yes	7	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

No

%



**SERVICES RECOMMENDED**

No Services Provided	6	36	34	40	36	16
%	86%	90%	85%	100%	90%	40%
Services Provided						14
%						35%
Services Declined						22
%						55%

**Resource Directory**

Provided					15	10	6	6
%					38%	25%	15%	15%
Declined					25	30	34	34
%					63%	75%	85%	85%

**E&R Referral**

Referred					2	5	3	8
%					5%	13%	8%	20%
Declined					38	35	37	32
%					95%	88%	93%	80%

Services Recommended

Substance Abuse		2	1			1	1	2	
%		5%	3%			3%	3%	5%	3%
Mental Health		1	1		1	3	2		1
%		3%	3%		3%	8%	5%		3%
Family Counseling					1	1	3		
%					3%	3%	8%	3%	
Anger Management		1	1	3		3	3	5	6
%		14%	3%	8%		8%	8%	13%	15%
Domestic Violence Program			1	1				1	
%			3%	3%				3%	3%





**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Age

< 10	
%	3%
10-12	6
%	15%
13- 15	16
%	40%
16-17	16
%	40%
18	1
%	3%

**SEX/RACE**

MB	22
%	55%
MW	2
%	5%
M Other	
%	
FB	13
%	33%
FW	1
%	3%
F Other	2
%	5%

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Yes	2
%	5%
No	38
%	95%

**OFFENSE**

Offense Level on Grid	
Level I	32
%	80%
Level II	8
%	20%
Level III	
%	
Level IV	
%	

**CONFERENCE**

Right to Remain Silent Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Self Incrimination Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Right to a lawyer Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Collateral Consequences Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	
Was a Lawyer Requested	
Yes	
%	3%
No	39
%	98%
Process to obtain Lawyer Understood	
Yes	40
%	100%
No	
%	

**DISPOSITION**

Admitted Charge	
Yes	33
%	83%
No	7
%	18%

## Disposition

**NPF**

%	
Verbal Warning	7
%	18%
Warn/Counsel only	27
%	68%
Non-custodial Diversion	1
%	3%

**BYPASS**

%	
JC-180 (continue probation)	
%	
Evaluation & Referral (E&R)	5
%	13%
Forfeiture	
%	

## Sanction Level on Grid

Level I	37
%	93%
Level II	3
%	8%
Level III	
%	
Level IV	
%	

## Sanction Consistent with Grid

Yes	34
%	85%
No	6
%	15%
Override <i>wt</i> approval	6
%	100%

**SERVICES RECOMMENDED**

No Services Provided

%

Services Provided

%

Services Declined

%

**Resource Directory**

Provided

8

%

20%

Declined

32

%

80%

**E&R Referral**

Referred

5

%

13%

Declined

35

%

88%

**SERVICES RECOMMENDED**

Substance Abuse

2

%

5%

Mental Health

1

%

3%

Family Counseling

3

%

8%

Anger Management

3

%

8%

Domestic Violence Program

1

%

3%



**J**

**H**

616 ADAMS AVENUE MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38105  
P.O. Box 310 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38101

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Powell

FROM: Barry Mitchell, Chief Probation Officer

DATE: January 15, 2015

SUBJECT: December 2014 Monthly Review

---

The following information relates to the eight items being tracked in a monthly sampling of 40 cases that were handled nonjudicially.

All of the cases reviewed this month involved a child/parent who did not request an attorney. The parent and child are notified that they may request an attorney to represent the child at the conference. As mentioned previously, the relationship between the parent/child and the probation counselor is favorable. Our counselors continue to handle the same family when a child comes back for an additional complaint.

The juvenile's mother still is the most consistent party at the conference. Most of the families involved with the Court are single family matriarchal homes.

Approximately 88% of the cases reviewed involved juveniles between the ages of 13 and 17. Very infrequently, staff will work with children under the age of 13.

Approximately 95% of the cases reviewed involved male and/or female blacks.

Most of the juveniles conferenced are not considered as "special education." Therefore, most are functioning at a normal educational level.

Most of the offenses are petty or misdemeanor by charge. All of the cases reviewed this month were handled at Level I of the Graduated Sanctions Grid (GSR). The most frequent diversion is a verbal warning and/or a non-custodial diversion.

The probation counselor does a good job of explaining the Miranda rights to the parent and child. Also, with most sanctions being from Level 1 of the GSR, the majority of cases are diverted from the system.

The probation counselor provides a mental health resource directory to all parties. Although most parents and their children still do not request services, they are encouraged to look at the directory and follow-up with services if necessary.



616 ADAMS AVENUE MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38105  
P.O. Box 310 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38101

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Powell

FROM: Barry Mitchell, Chief Probation Officer

DATE: February 18, 2015

SUBJECT: January 2015 Monthly Review

---

The following information relates to the nine items being tracked in a monthly sampling of 40 cases that were handled nonjudicially.

Most of the juveniles do not request an attorney at the conference. This has been very consistent since we began tracking these cases. As mentioned previously, the relationship between the parent/child and the probation counselor is favorable.

The juvenile's mother is the most consistent party at the conference. Most of the families involved with the Court are single family matriarchal homes.

Most of the cases reviewed involved juveniles between the ages of 13 and 17. Very infrequently, staff will work with children under the age of 13. Most of the cases reviewed involved male and/or female blacks.

Most of the juveniles conferenced are not considered as "special education." Therefore, most are functioning at a normal educational level.



Many of the offenses are petty or misdemeanor by charge. Most of the cases reviewed this month were handled at Level I and/or Level II of the Graduated Sanctions Grid (GSR). The most frequent diversion is a verbal warning and/or a non-custodial diversion .

The probation counselor does a good job of explaining the Miranda rights to the parent and child. Also, with most sanctions being from Level 1 of the GSR, the majority of cases are diverted from the system.

The probation counselor provides a mental health resource directory to all parties. Although most parents and their children still do not request services, they are encouraged to look at the directory and follow-up with services if necessary .

## APPENDIX 3

Juvenile Court Training  
2012 - 2015

Training	Training Hours	Dates	Presenters	Classifications Attending	# Attendees
DMC 101	16	Sept. 10-11, 2012 Sept. 13-14, 2012	Andrea Coleman, DMC Coordinator, OJJDP & Team	Magistrates, Management Staff, Professional, Clerical, Custodial, and Facilities Staff	176
JDAI Fundamentals	16	October 9-10, 2012	Frenando Giraldo, Rick Quinn, Brian Smith, Valerie Thompson	Cross Section of Juvenile Court employees and Community stakeholders	52
National DMC Webinar Part II	2	Oct. 24, 2012	Andrea Coleman	Cross Section of Juvenile Court employees	
Cultural Diversity Training	16	Jan. 9-10, 2013 Feb. 13-14, 2013	Dr. Rita Cameron-Wedding & Team	Magistrates, Management Staff, Professional, Clerical, Custodial, and Facilities Staff	233
Defense Panel Training	4.75	March 25, 2013	Sandra Simkins & Team	Juvenile Defense Panel (earned CLE credits)	40
Racial/Ethnic Disparities Reduction Training	12	March 27-28, 2013	Mike Finley - W. Haywood Bums Institute (JDAI)	JC Staff (8), Community Representatives	35
Detention Training					189
Use of force	8	March 21, 28, April 4, 11, 17, 2013	Crisis Prevention Institute	Detention Management, Probation Counselor B, Detention Officers, Cooks, Facilities Staff	
Suicide Prevention	8	March 19, 26, April 2, 9, 16, 2013	TN Dept of Mental Health		
CPR/First Aid	8	March 22, 29, April 5, 12, 19, 2013	American Heart Association		
Strategies for Monitoring Conditions of Youth Confinement	1.5	May 22, 2013	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Webinar)	DMC members, Detention management, CSB Management, YSB Management	10
Miranda	1	May 28, June 4, 11, 2013	Chief Magistrate Dan Michael	Probation Counselors; Probation Management	62
Basics of Performance Measurement & Evaluation	1.5	June 25 & 27, 2013	National Training & Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	DMC Coordinator; DMC Points of Contact employees; Director of Court Services	3
Advanced Program Logic	1.5	July 9, 2013 July 18, 2013	National Training & Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	DMC Coordinator, DMC Points of Contact employees; JDAI Rep; Director of Court Services; Counseling management	2
Implementing DMC Assessment Plans	1.5	July 23, 2013 July 25, 2013 (AM/PM)	National Training & Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	DMC Coordinator, DMC Points of Contact employees; JDAI Rep; Director of Court Services; Counseling management	5

Promising DMC Delinquency Prevention and Systems Improvement Strategies	1.5	July 30,2013; August 7,2013; August 8, 2013 (AM/PM)	National Training & Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	Committee A, DMC Coordinator, DMC Points of Contact employees; Director of Court Services, Counseling management	8
Bricks and Mortar of Restorative Justice: Build to Withstand the Winds of Change	1.5	August 13, 2013 August 22, 2013 August 28, 2013	National Training and Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	Judicial Staff, Committee A, DMC Coordinator, DMC Points of Contact employees; Director of Court Services, Counseling management	5
Understanding the Importance of Implementing an Effective Justice System Response for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning and Intersex Youth in Custody	1.5	September 5, 2013 (AM/PM)	National Training and Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	Judicial Staff, Points of Contact employees; Director of Court Services; Counseling Management; Detention Management	5
Effective Strategies to Help Sustain Your Quality Programs	1.5	September 10, 2013	National Training and Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	Judicial Staff, Committee A; Director of Court Services; Counseling Management; Detention Management	4
Strategies for Effective Facility-Based Behavior Management	1.5	September 17, 2013 (AM/PM)	National Training and Technical Assistance Center (Webinar)	All Court Management	4
DMC 201	4	November 13 & 14, 2013	Andrea Coleman	Magistrates, Management Staff, and Professional Counseling Line Staff and Management	140
New/Revised Court Policies/Procedures		November 2013	Mamie Jones		75
Detention Training					218
Use of Force	8	March 18, 25, April 1, 8, 15, 2014	Crisis Prevention Institute	Detention Management, Probation Counselor B, Detention Officers and Food Services	
Suicide Prevention	8	March 19, 26, April 2, 9, 16, 2014	Correct Care Solutions		
CPR/First Aid	8	March 20, 27, April 3, 10, 17, 2014	American Heart Association		
Adolescent Development	4	April 25 & May 2, 2014	Dustin Keller, Director – Council on Children's Mental Health - TCCY  Melissa McGee, Family and Youth Engagement Coordinator AND Susan "Sukey" Steckel, LMSW, Director - Statewide	Probation Counselors, and Probation Management (2014 Counselors' In-Service)	68

			Systems of Care Initiative TN Dept of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services		
DMC 101 & 201	16	June 3 & 4, 2014	Andrea Coleman	Detention Officers and New Hire Staff	25
YASI (Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument)	16	June 2 & 3 2014	Diana Wavra, ORBIS Partners	Juvenile Services Counselors, JC Management and Public Defender	34/33
Human Trafficking Forum	8	September 9, 2014	Ed Stanton, DOJ Office of US District Attorney	Juvenile Services Counselor	1
Living and Working Effectively in Diverse World	8	September 12, 2014	Jodi Pfarr	Manager, Supervisor and Juvenile Services Counselors	6
YASI (Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument)	16	September 29 & 30, 2014	Diana Wavra, ORBIS Partners	Juvenile Services Counselors, JC Management and Public Defender	34/34
Child Welfare Trauma Tool Kit	16	December 1 & 8, 2014	Dr. Melissa Hoffman	Supervisor and Juvenile Services Counselor	5
Understanding and Utilizing The Danger Assessment for Female Victims of Domestic Violence	4	January 14, 2015 8:15 am – 11:45 am – Session 1 12:15 pm – 3:45 pm – Session 2	Jacquelyne Campbell, PhD, RN, FANN Ann D. Wolf Professor at The John Hopkins School of Nursing	Juvenile Services Counselors and Juvenile Service Specialist	8
Implementing an Adolescent Developmental Approach in Juvenile Justice	1.5	January 21, 2015	Coalition for Juvenile Justice (Webinar)	Coordinator, Management/Admin. Svcs and Director of Clinical Services	3
School Pathways Data Collection	1	February 24, 2015	National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (webinar)	Interagency Services, Administrative Services, IT, Management (CBS and YSB), Juvenile Services Counselor II and IDAI	8
A Framework for Understanding Economic Classes	8	March 3, 2015	Dr. Ruby Payne, Ph.D. <i>"A Framework/or Understanding Economic Classes"</i>	Juvenile Services Counselor II and Director of Clinical Services	J3
DMC IOI & 201	16	NEED DATE	Andrea Coleman	Detention Officers, School Resource Officers and New Hire Staff	

## APPENDIX 4

Strategic Plan..for\_DMC Reduction - Action Steps  
 Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County  
 By Lisa Hill  
 February 22, 2015

	Responsibilities <i>Who Will Do It ?</i>	Timeline <i>By When? (Month/Year)</i>	Resources <i>A. Resources Available B. Resources Needed (financial, human, political &amp; other)</i>	Potential Barriers <i>A. What individuals or organizations might resist? B. How?</i>	Communications Plan <i>Who is involved? What methods? How often?</i>
Step 1: Summarize, Analyze, Interpret Data and Make Recommendations	Donna Gray, Mamie Jones, Felicia Hogan, Fran Gonzales	By the 20 <sup>01</sup> of each month	A. POC's  B. None	A. None  B. <i>N/A</i>	Reports are due to the DMC Coordinator by the 23 of each month, and submission to the DoJ will be the 25.  This process is still flawed and the data analysis and recommendations require improvement.  Juvenile Court has hired a new Data Analyst who will assist Juvenile Court in the data analyses efforts.
Step 2: Develop a synopsis of the monthly management reports and submit to Bill Powell	DMC Coordinator	By the 25 <sup>11</sup> of each month	A. Lisa Hill  B. None	A. If reports are not submitted on time by the POC's then delays may occur in submitting a synopsis to Bill Powell  B. Possible delays in receiving data from IT	Reports are due to the DMC Coordinator by the 23 of each month, and submission to the DoJ will be the 25.
Step 3: Meet monthly to	Strategic Planning	Monthly	A. POC's and Lisa Hill	A. Potential barriers may occur when discussing and	On-going but needs improvement

<p>review recommendation requests and devise a plan to implement such requests</p>	<p>Committee</p>		<p>8.None</p>	<p>attempting to implement plans that address the recommendations made by the POC's</p> <p>B. Funding may be an issue</p>	
<p>Step 4: Examine existing programs and service offerings. Determine whether or not these existing programs and services address the contributing factors to DMC. If not, Juvenile Court should consider the types of intervention they want to utilize to address DMC.</p>	<p>Strategic Planning Committee,</p>	<p>February, 2014</p>	<p>A. POC's</p> <p>B. Funding may be needed to implement new or improve existing programs, as well as develop partnerships with community partners.</p>	<p>A. POC's</p> <p>B. There may be disagreements on assessing existing programs</p>	<p>Call-in program MOU with MPD has been signed and working closely with JDAI to reduce referrals. Survey Monkey has been developed and will be administered to court personnel regarding disparities within their own departments. Several county employees are participating in a 12 to 18 month Capstone project with Georgetown University in which the team is working on a project to reduce the number of DV referrals to detention. Also, a probable cause MOU with the Sheriff's Office is being considered.</p> <p>Update: A follow up is needed from Deputy Chief Cash regarding the proposed probable cause concept.</p> <p>Juvenile Court shall begin to collect "good" data on the Call-In program</p>



					<p>January, 2015.</p> <p>Data will be available during the week of March 16, 2015.</p>
<p>Step 5: Juvenile Court shall follow up with MPD Director Toney Armstrong and SCS Security Chief Gerald Darling in regards to the meeting that took place on 10/29/2013 to discuss the purpose of working together to reduce delinquency within defined zip codes served by MPD precincts and SCS.</p>	<p>Strategic Planning Committee</p>	<p>March, 2014</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>B. Undetermined at this time</p>	<p>A. MPD Director and SCS Security Chief</p> <p>B. There may be disagreements or a lack of cooperation on implementing programs that will reduce crime in certain areas. Also, there may be a need for additional resources, such as community partners, to assist in creating productive programs for youth.</p>	<p>Exploring placing existing juvenile court staff in various precincts to handle qualifying children. A meeting was held with DCS, MPD, Juvenile Court, the DMC Coordinator and Michelle Fowlkes to begin the process of developing procedures to have DCS/Probation Counselors work directly from the Old Allen precinct to address the high number of Frayser referrals. Also, currently developing a plan to put people in the targeted zip codes and create pilot programs using existing staff to work with children who commit minor infractions (status offenses).</p> <p>Also, Lisa Hill and Kimbrell Owens have been working with the Hickory Hill Redevelopment group on a Youth/Law Enforcement Summit. Mark Soler and the TN DMC Coordinator are</p>

					<p>providing assistance as far as locating funding to support the summit. Update: A SHAPE extension agreement has been signed for the expansion of additional SHAPE schools.</p> <p>Kimbrell Owens will research any available funding through the Annie E. Casey Foundation to support a local summit.</p> <p>Update: No funding is available through the Annie E. Casey Foundation to support a youth/law enforcement summit; however, other initiatives are being considered.</p>
<p>Step 6: Further define the "Clearing House" concept as proposed by MPD where juveniles facing delinquency charges can be taken first to a precinct for screening rather than directly to Juvenile Court</p>	<p>MPD, Juvenile Court Lead Management Staff</p>	<p>March, 2014</p>	<p>A. MPD  B. Financial and human</p>	<p>A. MPD  B. There may be a staffing and financial issue involved with implementing a "Clearing House" program.</p>	<p>Pending update from Director Armstrong or Larry Scroggs. Same update as step 7.</p>
<p>Step 7: Research, for the purpose of</p>	<p>Strategic Planning Committee</p>	<p>Effective Immediately</p>	<p>A. None  B. Resource requirements</p>	<p>A. Juvenile Court may resist modeling this program due to financial reasons.</p>	<p>Other programs designed to help reduce referrals are being researched,</p>

<p>modeling, Kentucky's Court Designated Worker (CDW) Program as an effort to reduce the number of black youth who are referred to Juvenile Court.</p>			<p>will depend on what the program will entail.</p>		<p>such as current programs that were implemented by Santa Cruz, CA detention will be discussed at the next meeting. Kimbrell Owens and Lisa Hill shall provide an update  Update: Kimbrell Owens is tasked with working with the Santa Cruz Detention Facility to gather information on their JDAI efforts.</p>
<p>Step 8: Develop after school programs at the four prep/alternative schools. Alternative school students are clearly more "at risk" as is borne out by the number of referrals involving that group. Juvenile Court has pointed out that about half the referrals to the court, especially to detention intake, involve alternative school students.</p>	<p>Chief Darling Ron Pope Dr. Joris Ray</p>	<p>Effective Immediately</p>	<p>A. Funding B. Staffing level</p>	<p>A. SCS</p>	<p>Larry Scroggs is working with Chief Darling. Shannon Caraway will provide data on which schools law enforcement transports juveniles, and the number of alternative school children referred to the court by summons or transports.</p>
<p>Step 9: JDAI Model Site Visit</p>	<p>Annie E. Casey Foundation, JDAI Coordinator,</p>	<p>Effective Immediately</p>	<p>A. Funding will be needed for travel.</p>	<p>A. Annie E. Casey Foundation, Mark Soler and Santa Cruz, CA Juvenile Justice Center</p>	<p>Kimbrell Owens will provide an update on upcoming site visits for 2015.</p>

	Mark Soler, Juvenile Court			B.Funding may not be available	
Step 10: Develop programs within the Shelby County School system that will impact DMC/address referrals	Juvenile Court, MPD, SCS, and the DMC Coordinator	Beginning February, 2014	A.Juvenile Court personnel, DMC Coordinator and MPD	A. SCS may resist due to class schedules.	Northwest Prep has been selected as the first "Real-talk" school.A meeting is scheduled to take place with school administration February 5, 2015 at 9:00. Select members of Juvenile Court will participate.  Update: Real-talk is scheduled to take place on 3/13/2015 at 9:00 am at Northwest Prep Academy.
Step 11: Develop a School-Based Probation Liaison Program at select Shelby County Schools	Larry Scroggs, SCS	Beginning 2013	A. School Staff	A. SCS may resist having this program take place within their facilities.	Pending update from Juvenile Court
Step 12: Begin review process of POC monthly management reports and recommendations	Strategic Planning Committee	September, 2014	A. DMC Coordinator		Currently underway. This process still requires much work.
Step 13: CJJC community forums with parent involvement	CJJC, DMC Coordinator, Community involvement (parents of children who have been through the juvenile detention center)	Beginning February 27, 2014	A. Refreshments, flyers	A. The CJJC might resist	New Leadership has been established and the first CJJC public forum took place on July 28, 2014.  The DMC Coordinator and a representative from Juvenile Court shall attend CJJC meetings.

## APPENDIX S



THOMAS W. COUPE  
SUPERVISING ATTORNEY  
OFFICE OF NON-CUSTODIAL ADVOCATE  
JUDGE'S ACTION CENTER

J

H

616 ADAMS AVENUE MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38105  
Telephone: 901-405-8447

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Hon. Dan Michael, Juvenile Court Judge

FROM: Thomas Coupe

DATE: December 12, 2014

### RE: Transfers of Juveniles with Burglary Charges

During yesterday's Committee A Meeting, Bill Powell noted that the number of children transferred to criminal court on burglary charges may need to be examined. My initial response was that there would likely be extenuating circumstances regarding youth transferred on that charge and it would be instructive to take a look at the cases individually.

Shannon was kind enough to send me a list of all juveniles transferred this year, along with the charges and ages of the juveniles at the time of transfer. After looking through the cases, my initial suspicions were validated and it appears that the age or previous history of the juvenile (and many times a combination of both) would have a bearing on the decision to transfer, notwithstanding any other circumstances that would further lead to transfer.

As of today, there have been 10 juveniles charged with burglary transferred to criminal court. Of those 10 juveniles, only one was transferred on the sole charge of "burglary." That juvenile was 17.96 years old and was before the court on his 1<sup>th</sup> complaint. This profile was commonplace for juveniles transferred with a burglary charge.

In fact, most juveniles transferred with burglary as a charge were older than, or closely approaching, 18 years old. The average age of the 10 juveniles transferred with that charge was 17.61 years old and the median age was 17.96 years old. The median complaint number was between 140 and 145.

On a side note, the average age of all juveniles transferred so far this year is 18.31 and only five juveniles under the age of 17 have been transferred this year.<sup>1</sup> Of those five, two were charged with murder and the other three were charged with aggravated robbery plus additional charges.

I thought this information would be helpful in light of the discussion that took place yesterday. If you have any questions or would like more information, please let me know.

---

<sup>1</sup> There were five transfers of individuals well over the age of 18 due to charges from many years in the past. Even if those individuals are removed from the totals, the average age of transfer is still 17.68. The median age of all persons transferred is 17.76 and is 17.73 if the adult aged transfers (20+ yrs old) are omitted from calculations.

## APPENDIX 6

Point Of Contact Report  
Referrals  
January 2015

## DATA

In January, four hundred seventy-five (485) delinquent referrals were made to the Court via transport by law enforcement (188) and juvenile summons (297). Four hundred twenty-two (422) youth of color were referred to the Court and sixty-three (63) white youth were referred to the Court.

### Summonses:

238 were issued to youth of color  
59 were issued to white youth

### Transports:

184 youth of color were transported  
4 white youth were transported

*Two year snapshot: The Court received five thousand five hundred seventy-three (5,573) delinquent referrals in 2013 and four thousand four hundred fifty-five (4,655) in 2014. There was a seventeen percent (17%) reduction in delinquent referrals from 2013 to 2014.*

## ANALYSIS

A review of the delinquent referral data reveals that youth of color are overrepresented. Eighty-seven percent (85%) of delinquent referrals to the Court were for youth of color. Juvenile summonses accounted for sixty-one percent (61%) of delinquent referrals. Eighty percent (80%) percent of juvenile summonses were issued to youth of color. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of delinquent referrals were transports with ninety-eight percent (98%) of transports for youth of color. The total number of referrals increased slightly from four hundred seventy-three (475) to four hundred eighty-five (485) for the month of January.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Mark Soler, Keri Washington and Dr. Althea Stewart will train Memphis Police Department (MPD) officers on February 26, 2015. The training will include adolescent brain development, the LEAP Call-In Program, and a JDAI update.

The 2014-20105 SHAPE MOU was executed October 2014. Six (6) additional offenses have been added to the eligibility list: simple possession of a controlled substance, vandalism under \$500, theft under \$500, possession of alcohol, public intoxication and possession of drug paraphernalia. *Update: (Correction from December 2014 Report) Spoke to John Hall, SHAPE Coordinator for Shelby County School, who advised that public intoxication is a SHAPE offense.*



*Moreover, Mr. Hall advised that the number of SHAPE schools was not expanded and that actually some schools are removed or added to the list for the 2014-2015 school year due to fluctuations in SHAPE offenses. He reported that Highland Oaks Middle School was new to the list for this school year.*

The MOU for the Juvenile Court Precinct Liaison program is being circulated. The program will allow a probation counselor from the Court to be present at a Memphis Police Department precinct (TBA). The youth will be transported to the precinct where the probation counselor will review the youth's case and make a recommendation. The program will serve as an intermediate step between the youth being taken into custody and transport to the Detention Center. *Update: The City of Memphis is currently studying the precinct liaison initiative due to potential liability issues at the precinct. The Court is waiting for a response.*

MPD signed the Call-In Program Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on October 22, 2014. The Call-In Program will allow MPD officers to call CDC before transporting a youth to the Court. The CDC staff will administer the DAT for the youth and advise the officers if a child meets the criteria for secure detention. *Update: Program fully implemented. Data Collection is underway.*

Juvenile Court has managed to reduce the numbers of transports to the Detention Center through the SHAPE, LEAPP and the Summons Programs. However, a reduction in the total number of delinquent referrals will need to focus on summonses as well as transports. Alternatives for youth who are "eligible" for a juvenile summons need to be explored.

Point Of Contact Report  
Admits to Secure Detention  
January 2015

## DATA

In January, one hundred one (101) youth were admitted to secure detention. Ninety-three (96) youth of color and five (5) white youth were admitted. Thirty-one (31) youth were admitted to secure detention for the following misdemeanor offenses: domestic assault, simple assault, disorderly conduct, theft of property < \$500, vandalism < \$500. The top five charges for admits to detention were domestic assault (17), aggravated burglary (12), aggravated assault (8), aggravated robbery (8) and simple assault (7),

There were thirty-one (31) overrides of the DAT with thirteen (13) overrides for domestic assault. All overrides were for black youth. Twenty-three (23) of the overrides were for *unable to locate parent* and *parent refusal*.

## ANALYSIS

The data reveals that youth of color are overrepresented in admissions to secure detention. Ninety-five percent (95%) of admissions were for youth of color.

Admissions to detention and admissions to detention for misdemeanors increased by twenty-two percent (22%) and sixty-three percent (63%), respectively. DAT overrides for domestic assault accounted for forty-two percent (42%) of the total overrides in January. Parent Refusal and Unable to Locate Parent accounted for seventy percent (74%) of DAT overrides.

As stated last month, it is important to note that in 2006 the Court began looking at ways to reduce the number of youth admitted to secure detention. Earlier that year, the Court implemented the Detention Assessment Tool (DAT). In 2009, the Court partnered with Memphis City Schools to implement the SHAPE Program. In 2010, the Court, MPD and SCSO implemented the Summons Program. In 2012 and 2013, the Court implemented the LEAPP Program (SCSO) and the School-Based Probation Officer Program (MCS), respectively.

Since 2006, admissions to the secure detention have decreased by eighty-five percent (84.8%). Admissions during the last quarter of 2006 dropped from two thousand two hundred fifty-nine (2,259) to three hundred forty-three (343).

Moreover, the Court anticipates an additional decrease in the number of youth admitted to secure detention due to implementation of the LEAPP Program (MPD) and expansion of the offenses for the SHAPE Program. See program updates below.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Detention Services Bureau (DSB) contacts parents who refuse to pick up their child from Central Detention Control (CDC). Parents are advised that their child will be referred to the Department of Children's Services (DCS) as abandoned in detention and that a Detention Bill of costs may be assessed if admitted. CDC staff also attempts to locate parents through police notifications if the parent cannot be reached by phone or the parent refuses to accept the call from CDC staff. All contact information for parent and/or other family members is stored in JCS's *Family Member/Contacts* and all attempts to contact recorded on the DSB parental notification tracking form. Each time CDC staff attempt to contact an individual to pick up a child the names and phone numbers are recorded on the tracking form. Once contact is made that information is recorded on the youth's detention card. This is standard practice for DSB. *Update: On-going.*

Judge Dan H. Michael advised that children who are abandoned in detention by their parent/guardian are at risk of being placed in the protective custody of DCS through a Protective Custody Order (PCO). *Update: On-going.*

MPD signed the Call-In Program Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on October 22, 2014. The Call-In Program will allow MPD officers to call CDC before transporting a youth to the Court. The CDC staff will administer the DAT for the youth and advise the officers if a child meets the criteria for secure detention. *Update: Program fully implemented. Data collection is underway.*

The 2014-2015 SHAPE MOU was executed October 2014. Six (6) additional offenses have been added to the eligibility list: simple possession of a controlled substance, vandalism under \$500, theft under \$500, possession of alcohol, public intoxication and possession of drug paraphernalia. *Update: (Correction from December 2014 Report) Spoke to John Hall, SHAPE Coordinator for Shelby County Schools, who advised that public intoxication is a SHAPE offense.*

*Moreover, Mr. Hall advised that the number of SHAPE schools was not expanded and that actually some schools are removed or added to the list for the 2014-2015 school year due to fluctuations in SHAPE offenses. He reported that Highland Oaks Middle School was new to the list for this school year.*

The MOU for the Juvenile Court Precinct Liaison program is being circulated. The program will allow a probation counselor from the Court to be present at a Memphis Police Department precinct (TBA). The youth will be transported to the precinct where the probation counselor will review the youth's case and make a recommendation. The program will serve as an intermediate step between the youth being taken into custody and transport to the Detention Center. *Update: The City of Memphis is currently studying the precinct liaison initiative due to potential liability issues at the precinct. The Court is waiting for a response.*

**JUVENILE COURT OF MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY**  
**616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, TN. 38105**

**Reporting Department: YSB**

**Reporting Point of Contact: LaKeisa Martin**

**Reporting Submitted: February 17, 2015**

**Reporting Period: January, 2014**

**Department Manager: Frances Gonzales**

**JUVENILE COURT MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT IDENTIFYING CONDUCT  
OR DECISION-MAKING THAT INCREASES DMC OR FRUSTRATES EFFORTS TO  
REDUCE DMC**

**Summarizing Data (What Does the Data Show)?**

During January, 2015, YSB received a total of 25 new cases. All were African American males.

Percent of African American youth referred to Case Management	75% (N=22)
Percent of African American youth referred to Intensive Case Management	25% (N=3)
Average Risk Assessment Score	5
Average Risk Assessment Score for Previous Month	5.18

Percent of Caucasian youth referred to Case Management	0.00% (N=0)
Percent of Caucasian youth referred to Intensive Case Management	0.00% (N=0)
Average Risk Assessment Score	0
Average Risk Assessment Score For Previous Month.	6.5

During this reporting period there were three (3) overrides. The percentage of override for the month is 25%. The percentage of overrides for last month was 10.34%.

**Analyzing and Interpreting the Data (What Does the Data Mean)?**

As has been previously noted those youths placed on Intensive Case Management are deemed to need a higher level of supervision. Based on the above data it appears to be an increase in the percentage of African American youth placed on Intensive Case Management during January 2015 compared to the previous month.

Of the three youths placed on Intensive Case Management, all were overrides. All were due to the youth having been released from the program less than a year.

There is a significant decrease in the number of females (0) placed under supervision compared to last months (8).


Three (3) referrals were made to JIFF. Three (3) were referred to the Drug Offenders Control Systems (DOCS). Eight (8) were referred to Evaluation and Referral Bureau.

The average Risk Assessment score for African American youth also decreased from 5.18 the previous month to 4.4 for the current month. The instrument being used to obtain a Risk Assessment Score is the Community Risk Assessment Scale (Basic Scale). That score is then transferred to an assessment tool developed within the bureau with other risk factors, and a final score is determined. Scores between 1-11 are assigned to Case Management and those 12 and above are assigned to Intensive Case Management.

During the month of January, eighteen (18) youths had new contacts. Five of the contacts were issued a juvenile summons in lieu of physical detainment. Seventeen (17) were African American males and one (1) was an African American female. Of the new contacts, one was handled nonjudicially. Eight of the court cases have been recommended to continue under the supervision of the Youth Services Bureau. Eight of the cases were not recommended for continued supervision due to the home not being available, the child exhausting placement or the child being a community risk. One case will be reviewed in thirty days. By utilizing graduated sanctions the bureau was able to reduce DMC by handling new contacts nonjudicially and also by continuing to work with a youth if the case did require court action. These actions reduced further contact by 50%.

## Recommendations

1. Data will be collected to look for any trends that led to or deterred away from disproportionate contacts (i.e. Beginning in December, data will be collected on the number of new delinquent contacts and/or technical violations for youths placed under the bureau's

— — —  spreadsheet was developed and raw data will be included in December's report.

**Update**

Information is included in the narrative and data will continue to be

Information is included in the narrative and data will continue to be gathered. After three months, the information will be reviewed.

2. With the increase of African American females placed under YSB supervision, over the next three months, the bureau will collect data to assist in identifying if this is a trend or not.

**te** Information is included in the narrative and data will continue to be

Information is included in the narrative and data will continue to be gathered. After three months, the information will be reviewed.

3. The bureau will look for resources in the zip codes not serviced by JIFF.

**Update (Jan)** The bureau continues to look for resources. Additionally, we have met with the Human Resource Manager to suggest the possibility of a vendor/resource fair.

**Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County**  
**616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, TN 38105**

**Reporting Department:** Debra Monroe-Lax , Consultant

**DMC Point of Contact:** Donna Gray, Corrective Service: To review, interpret, and provide recommendations based on summary of findings (see below).

**DMC Decision Points for Judicial (N=2) Cases** Petitioned (charges filed) and Non-Judicial/Diversion Cases

**Reporting Date:** January 2015

**JUVENILE COURT MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT IDENTIFYING  
CONDUCT OR DECISION-MAKING THAT INCREASES DMC OR FRUSTRATES  
EFFORTS TO REDUCE DMC**

**Summary of Findings: Non-Judicial/Diversion Cases**

For the month of January, there were 246 African American (n=211, 86%) and White juvenile offenders' (n=35, 14%)<sup>1</sup> cases that resulted in non-judicial hearings. Of the 246 juvenile offenders, African American males represented 53% (n=130) of the cases, while White males represented 9% (n=23). African American females accounted for 33% of the cases (n=81), whereas White females accounted for 5% (n=12).

The results of the graduated sanctions grid (GSG), which is utilized to determine the appropriate sanction level for a juvenile offender based on offense and classification level, revealed that 13% (30 African Americans and 2 Whites) of the non-judicial cases (N=246) were overridden-down for the month of January. There were no overrides-up for the month of January. Of the 30 overrides down for African American offenders, 21 were found to be sufficient enough to analyze for similar situated circumstances (i.e., offense and case type) to that of their White counterpart, in order to determine if the present GSG is adequate in assessing disparate impact in the decision-making process. This report will only examine African American juvenile offenders' cases (n=21) that were overridden down in comparison to White juvenile offenders' cases that were not overridden up/down (n=13). Among the 21 African American offenders, 5 different types of misdemeanor offenses were committed between them which included: 1) Assault; 2) Carry Weapon on School Campus; 3) Domestic Assault; 4) Criminal Trespassing;

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Monthly Management Point of Contact Report only African American and White juvenile offenders-cases were included in an attempt to assess possible Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC), if any, in the handling of African American juvenile offenders' cases. Other races (Mixed Race, Hispanic and Asian) have been excluded from this analysis, which represented 4% (n=15) of the cases.

and 5) Theft of Property < \$500. Again, it is worth noting that the overrides down for these particular offense types (n=5) committed amongst the 21 African American juvenile offenders' seeks to determine the effectiveness of the GSG in its efforts to address disparate impact.

Overall findings pertaining to the 5 offense types revealed that African American juvenile offenders whose charges resulted in Criminal Trespassing dispositions (warn and counsel) were equivalent to that of their White counterpart; although the White offenders' dispositions did not result from overrides. For charges relative to Assault and Theft of Property under \$500, African American offenders' dispositions (warn and counsel/no petition filed) were less severe or equal to White offenders. Charges associated with Carrying a Weapon on School Campus indicated that African American offenders' dispositions (warn counsel) were less severe, whereas for Domestic Assault charges they were equal to or greater than that of their White counterpart; even though the White offenders' dispositions were not overridden-down and the offense and case type were the same.

#### **Summary of Findings: Cases Petitioned (charges filed)**

For the month of January, there were 108 African American (n=105, 97%) and White juvenile offenders' (n=3, 3%) cases that were petitioned for court hearings. Of the 108 juvenile offenders, African American males represented 83% (n=90) of the cases, while White males represented 2% (n=2). African American females accounted for 14% of the cases (n=15) whereas, White females accounted for 1% (n=1) of the cases that were petitioned for court in January.

According to the findings for cases petitioned to court (N=108), only 5 (5%) of the African American offenders' cases (n=105) resulted in overrides-up. There were no cases petitioned for court that included overrides-down for the month of January. Findings further revealed that of the five overrides-up, 1 of the cases had been dismissed. The remaining 4 cases with overrides-up pertained to African American juvenile offenders who had been charged with Assault (n=2), Domestic Assault and Evading Arrest. The dispositions resulted in the cases either being taken under advisement or placed on probation. Findings in the data did not reveal a White juvenile offender (N=3) with either of the aforementioned offense types that had not been under/overridden; therefore, no comparison could be examined between the two races to determine if racial disparities could have possibly occurred in the decision-making process. Based on the findings in this section of the report, no possible disproportionality could be concluded in the data provided for the month of January.

**JUVENILE COURT OF MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY**  
**616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, TN 38105**

Reporting Department: Judicial

Reporting Point of Contact: Felicia Hogan

Report submitted: February 25, 2015

Reporting Period: January, 2015

Department Manager: G. Erguden

This report is in response to the Office of Outcome Evaluation and Performance Improvement's (OEPI) report (attached).

The data from the OEPI report indicates that the results of a review of cases adjudicated in the month of January revealed that there were no Caucasian Juveniles adjudicated. The focus and goal of this report is to reconcile any cases that appear to treat differently African American juveniles from Caucasian juveniles charged with the same offense. As a consequence there are no cases from this time frame upon which to report.

**Recommendations:**

1. The Magistrates continue to meet weekly to review their adherence to all directives and procedures.
2. The magistrates should continue to grant continuances to defense counsel, when requested and appropriate, for purpose of preparing for dispositional hearings.
3. Magistrates should also continue to apply the alternatives of the graduated sanctions in an effort to achieve rehabilitation in the least restricted environment.
4. Magistrates should ensure that all of their orders include detail findings of the criteria he/she used as a basis for the decision.
5. The Court's current administration is continuing to evaluate the following DMC Committee's recommendation: that the Court institute changes in its Delinquency proceedings to a process whereby after adjudication, the case is mandatorily continued for a week or two for a dispositional hearing.





**JUVENILE COURT OF MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY**  
**616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, TN 38105**

Reporting Department: Judicial

Reporting Point of Contact: Felicia Hogan

Report submitted: February 25, 2015

Reporting Period: January, 2015

Department Manager: G. Erguden

This report is in response to the Office of Outcome Evaluation and Performance Improvement's (OEPI) report (attached).

The data from the OEPI report indicates that the results of a review of cases adjudicated in the month of January revealed that there were no Caucasian Juveniles adjudicated. The focus and goal of this report is to reconcile any cases that appear to treat differently African American juveniles from Caucasian juveniles charged with the same offense. As a consequence there are no cases from this time frame upon which to report.

**Recommendations:**

1. The Magistrates continue to meet weekly to review their adherence to all directives and procedures.
2. The magistrates should continue to grant continuances to defense counsel, when requested and appropriate, for purpose of preparing for dispositional hearings.
3. Magistrates should also continue to apply the alternatives of the graduated sanctions in an effort to achieve rehabilitation in the least restricted environment.
4. Magistrates should ensure that all of their orders include detail findings of the criteria he/she used as a basis for the decision.
5. The Court's current administration is continuing to evaluate the following DMC Committee's recommendation: that the Court institute changes in its Delinquency proceedings to a process whereby after adjudication, the case is mandatorily continued for a week or two for a dispositional hearing.



Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County  
616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, TN 38105

Reporting Department: Debra Monroe-Lax, Consultant

DMC Point of Contact: Felicia Hogan, Judicial: To review, interpret, and provide recommendations based on Summary of Findings (see below).

DMC Decision Points for Judicial (N=4): Auxiliary Probation Services (APS), Youth Services Bureau (YSB), Tennessee Department of Corrective Services (DCS) and Transfers to Adult Criminal Court

Reporting Date: January 2015

**JUVENILE COURT MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT IDENTIFYING  
CONDUCT OR DECISION-MAKING THAT INCREASES DMC OR FRUSTRATES  
EFFORTS TO REDUCE DMC**

**Summary of Findings:**

For the month of January, 67 juvenile offenders had formal court hearings resulting in one of the four dispositions reflected in Table 1. All of the juvenile offenders were African American (100%) males (n=63, 94%) and females (n=4, 6%). No White juvenile offenders had a court hearing during the month of January. Therefore, no comparison of similar situated circumstances could be conducted or determined for disproportionality in dispositions based on race, and most severe offense committed by juvenile offenders with the same type of offense.

Table 1: Magistrate by Disposition and Race: January 2015

#	Magistrate	Auxiliary Probation Services Total Cases = 26		Youth Services Bureau Total Cases=30		Department of Corrective Services Total Cases=7		Transfers to Criminal Court Total Cases=4	
		African American	White	African American	White	African American	White	African American	White
		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
1	Erguden, Garland	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
2	Ferguson, David	18	0	18	0	2	0	0	0
3	Hogan Felicia	3	0	7	0	2	0	0	0
4	Home, Harold	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5	Lane, Herbert	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
6	McCall, Sheldon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Michael, Dan								
	Walker, David	2	0	2	0	2	0	3	0
8									
Total Cases by Race		26 (100%)	0 (0%)	30 (100%)	0 (%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)

## APPENDIX 7

Report Card  
2015

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
<b>Detention Assessment Tool</b>														
1 Total Number of DATs Completed	193	141											167.0	334
2 Number of DATs Release Eligible	137	101											119.0	238
3 Total Number of DATs Overridden	31	18											24.5	49
4 Percentage of Release Eligible DATs Overridden	22.6%	17.8%											20.2%	20.6%
5 Percentage of Total DATs Overridden	16.1%	12.8%											14.4%	14.7%
6 Number of Overrides that were for Youth of Color	31	16											23.50	47
7 Number of Overrides that were for White Youth	0	2											1.00	2
8 Percentage of Overrides that were for Youth of Color	100.0%	89%											94.4%	95.9%
9 % of Total Youth of Color Admitted who were overridden	32.3%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	30.3%
10 Percentage of Overrides that were for White Youth	0.0%	11.1%											5.6%	4.1%
11 % of Total White Youth Admitted who were overridden	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	25.0%
12 Number of Overrides that were for Males	28	15											21.50	43
13 Number of Overrides that were for Females	3	3											3.00	6
14 Percentage of Overrides that were for Males	90.3%	83.3%											86.8%	87.8%
15 % of Total Male Youth Admitted who were overridden	33.3%	28.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	30.1%
16 Percentage of overrides that were for Females	9.7%	16.7%											13.2%	12.2%
17 % of Total Female Youth Admitted who were overridden	21.4%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	25.0%

Report Card  
2015

Reasons for Overrides		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
18	DATs overridden for Danger to Community	6	6											6.00	12
19	% of DATs overridden for Danger to Community	19.4%	33.3%											26.3%	24.5%
20	% of DATs overridden for Danger to Community for Youth of Color	100.0%	100%											100.0%	
21	% of DATs overridden for Danger to Community for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%											0.0%	
22	% of DATs overridden for Danger to Community for Males	100.0%	100.0%											100.0%	
23	% of DATs overridden for Danger to Community for Females	0.0%	0.0%											0.0%	
24	OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm	2	0											1.00	2
25	% of DATs overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm	6.5%	0.0%											3.2%	4.1%
26	% of DATs overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Youth of Color	100.0%	0%											50.0%	
27	% of DATs overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%											0.0%	
28	% of DATs overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Males	100.0%	0%											50.0%	
29	% of DATs overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Females	0.0%	0%											0.0%	
30	DATs overridden for Parent Refused to pick Up	6	4											5	10
31	% of DATs overridden for Parent Refused to Pick up	19.4%	22.2%											20.8%	20.4%
32	% of DATs overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Youth of Color	100.0%	100%											100.0%	
33	% of DATs overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%											0.0%	
34	% of DATs overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Males	83.3%	75.0%											79.2%	
35	% of DATs overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Females	16.7%	25.0%											20.9%	





Report Card  
2015

OATS Mitigated		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
4	Number of OATS Mitigated	0	0											0.00	0
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for Youth of Color	0	0											0.00	0
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for White Youth	0	0											0.00	0
4	Percentage of DATs Mitigated for Youth of Color	0.0%	0.0%											0.0%	
41)	% of Total Youth of Color Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	
4r	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	% of Total White Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for Males	0	0											0.00	0
5.)	Number of OATS Mitigated for Females	0	0											0.00	0
51	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for Males	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
5	% of Total Male Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
53	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for Females	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
54	% of Total Female Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	

Report Card  
2015

<b>SUICIDE PREVENTION</b>		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
1	Total Number of Youth Admitted to Detention	101	62												163
2	Total Number of QMHP Calls/Contacts	10	13												23
3	Rate of QMHP calls per 100 youth	0.514	0.692												0.601
4	Number of Youth Cleared without Restrictions	0	0											0.00	0
5	Number of Youth Cleared with Restrictions	10	12											11.00	22
6	Number of Youth Transported for Psychiatric Care	0	1											0.50	1
7	Percentage Change in Number of Calls	42.8%	30.0%											36.4%	
8	Rate of youth on Suicide Precautions per 100 youth	0.514	0.692											0.603	0.601
9	Number of Youth Placed Suicide Precautions	10	13											11.500	23
1	Average Time on Suicide Precaution (in hours)	60.8	51.8											56.300	65.19
1	Percentage Change in Average Time on Precaution	-2.0%	-14.8%											-8.4%	
1	Average Time between Admittance and Suicide Screening (in hours)	0.02	0.02											0.02	
1	Average wait time for the QMHP (in hours)	0.7	0.39											0.55	

\* CCS replaced Mobile Crisis in August of 2013 as the QMHP for the Detention Services Bureau.



Report Card  
2015

<b>SAFETY AND ORDER</b>		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
1	Injuries to youth per 100 person-days of youth confinement (non-assaultive)	0.05	0.11											0.080	0.494
2	Injuries to youths by other youths per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.1	0.16											0.130	0.418
3	Suicidal behavior with injury by youths per 100 person--days of youth confinement	0.0	0											0.000	0.000
4	Suicidal behavior without injury by youths per 100 person--days of youth confinement	0.51	0.69											0.600	0.418
5	Assaults on youth per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.46	0.45											0.455	1.027
6	Assaults on staff per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.0	0											0.000	0.000
7	-Percent of interviewed youths who report that they fear for their safety	33.3%	14.3%											0.238	0.46%
8	-Percent of staff who report that they fear for their safety	6.1%	45.0%											0.256	0.00%
9	Physical restraint use per 100 person-days of youth confinement	1.75	1.5											1.625	1.369
1)	Mechanical restraint use per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.1	0											0.050	0.304
1	Use of room confinement and segregation /special management unit use per 100 person days of youth confinement	2.42	1.70											2.060	3.080
1	Average duration of room confinement and segregation/special management unit in hours	20.5	21.6											21.05	45.27
1	Percent of youths presented for admission that had a suicide prevention screening completed by trained or qualified staff in one hour or less	100%	100%											#####	

Report Card  
2014

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
<b>Detention Assessment Tool</b>														
1 Total Number of DATs Completed	176	198	247	238	304	192	193	246	247	217	201	158	218.1	2617
2 Number of DATs Release Eligible	133	143	168	189	215	130	129	169	140	147	139	102	150.3	1804
3 Total Number of DATs Overridden	11	16	19	27	32	21	20	35	31	27	30	20	24.1	289
Percentage of Release Eligible DATs Overridden	8.3%	11.2%	11.3%	14.3%	14.9%	16.2%	15.5%	20.7%	22.1%	18.4%	21.6%	19.6%	16.2%	16.0%
4 Percentage of Total DATs Overridden	6.3%	8.1%	7.7%	11.3%	10.5%	10.9%	10.4%	14.2%	12.6%	12.4%	14.9%	12.7%	11.0%	11.0%
5 Number of Overrides that were for Youth of Color	9	16	19	26	32	18	18	33	29	26	30	19	22.92	275
6 Number of Overrides that were for White Youth	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	2	1	0	1	1.17	14
7 Percentage of Overrides that were for Youth of Color	81.8%	100%	100%	96.3%	100.0%	85.7%	90.0%	94.3%	93.5%	96.3%	100.0%	95.0%	94.4%	95.2%
8 % of Total Youth of Color Admitted who were overridden	13.2%	17.4%	16.5%	26.8%	25.0%	20.0%	20.0%	27.0%	20.9%	25.0%	30.9%	23.5%	22.2%	24.4%
9 Percentage of Overrides that were for White Youth	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	14.3%	10.0%	5.7%	6.5%	3.7%	0.0%	5.0%	5.6%	4.8%
10 % of Total White Youth Admitted who were overridden	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	15.4%	40.0%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	50.0%	18.7%	20.3%
11 Number of Overrides that were for Males	8	13	16	17	17	12	12	26	21	18	23	12	16.25	195
12 Number of Overrides that were for Females	3	3	3	10	15	9	8	9	10	9	7	8	7.83	94
13 Percentage of Overrides that were for Males	72.7%	81.3%	84.2%	63.0%	53.1%	57.1%	60.0%	74.3%	67.7%	66.7%	76.7%	60.0%	68.1%	67.5%
14 % of Total Male Youth Admitted who were overridden	13.3%	15.7%	15.7%	20.7%	14.9%	16.2%	13.5%	24.8%	17.2%	16.1%	27.1%	16.0%	17.6%	21.5%
15 Percentage of overrides that were for Females	27.3%	18.8%	15.8%	37.0%	46.9%	42.9%	40.0%	25.7%	32.3%	33.3%	23.3%	40.0%	31.9%	32.5%
16 % of Total Female Youth Admitted who were overridden	21.4%	17.6%	18.8%	52.6%	62.5%	36.0%	57.1%	40.9%	35.7%	50.0%	43.8%	100.0%	44.7%	55.3%

Report Card  
2014

Reasons for Overrides	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
	18 DATs overridden for Danger to Community	1	1	1	0	3	4	2	0	12	2	6	3	2.92
19 % of DATS overridden for Danger to Community	9.1%	6.7%	5.3%	0.0%	9.4%	21.1%	10.0%	0.0%	38.7%	8.0%	20.0%	15.0%	11.9%	12.1%
20 % of OATS overridden for Danger to Community for Youth of Color	100%	100%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	77.1%	
21 % of DATS overridden for Danger to Community for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	
22 % of DATS overridden for Danger to Community for Males	100.0%	100.0%	100%	0.0%	66.0%	50.0%	100%	0.0%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	67.0%	67.3%	
23 % of OATS overridden for Danger to Community for Females	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	33.0%	15.9%	
24 OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm	1	1	1	2	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	1.33	16
25 % of OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm	9.1%	6.7%	5.3%	7.4%	12.5%	5.3%	0.0%	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%	3.3%	15.0%	5.9%	5.5%
26 % of OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Youth of Color	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	
27 % of OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	
28 % of OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Males	100%	0%	100%	100%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	67.0%	53.5%	
29 % of OATS overridden for Threat of Bodily Harm for Females	0%	100%	0%	0.0%	33.0%	100%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%	30.5%	
30 DATs overridden for Parent Refused to pick Up	5	10	13	18	12	13	8	18	8	11	14	8	11.5	138
31 % of OATS overridden for Parent Refused to Pick up	54.5%	66.7%	68.4%	66.7%	37.5%	68.4%	40.0%	52.9%	25.8%	44.0%	46.7%	40.0%	51.0%	47.8%
32 % of DATS overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Youth of Color	100%	91%	100%	94.4%	100.0%	92.3%	87.5%	89.0%	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.1%	
33 % of DATS overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	7.7%	12.5%	11.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	
34 % of OATS overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Males	60.0%	90.0%	76.9%	66.6%	33.0%	38.5%	37.5%	72.2%	62.5%	55.0%	71.4%	38.0%	58.5%	
35 % of OATS overridden for Parent Refused to Pick Up for Females	40.0%	20.0%	23.1%	33.3%	66.0%	61.5%	62.5%	27.8%	37.5%	45.0%	28.6%	62.0%	42.3%	

Report Card  
2014

36	OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent	3	3	4	7	13	1	9	15	10	12	9	6	7.67	92
37	% of OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent	27.3%	20.0%	21.1%	25.9%	40.6%	5.3%	45.0%	44.1%	32.3%	48.0%	30.0%	30.0%	30.8%	31.8%
38	% of OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent for Youth of Color	67%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	90.0%	92.0%	100.0%	83.0%	94.3%	
39	% of OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent for White Youth	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	8.0%	0.0%	17.0%	5.7%	
40	% of OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent for Males	67%	100%	100%	42.8%	54.0%	0.0%	66.6%	80.0%	60.0%	83.0%	66.7%	83.0%	66.9%	
41	% of OATs overridden for Unable to Locate Parent for Females	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	46.0%	100%	33.3%	20.0%	40.0%	7.0%	33.3%	17.0%	32.3%	



Report Card  
2014

<b>OATS Mitigated</b>		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
4	Number of OATS Mitigated	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.00%	0.0%	2	0	0	0.33	4
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for Youth of Color	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.00%	0.0%	2	0	0	0.33	4
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for White Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.0%	0	0	0	0.00	0
4	Percentage of DATs Mitigated for Youth of Color	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	100.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	
4	% of Total Youth of Color Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	1.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	
4	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for White Youth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	% of Total White Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	Number of OATS Mitigated for Males	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.25	3
5	Number of OATS Mitigated for Females	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.08	1
5	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for Males	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	
5	% of Total Male Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	
5	Percentage of OATS Mitigated for Females	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	
5	% of Total Female Youth Admitted who were Mitigated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%	7.7%	0.00%	0.00%	0.6%	

Report Card  
2014

<b>SUICIDE PREVENTION</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
Total Number of Youth Admitted to Detention	74	100	118	101	138	99	103	129	150	109	101	83	108.75	1305
2 Total Number of QMHP Calls/Contacts	3	6	3	29	34	28	7	8	19	13	11	7	14.00	168
Rate of QMHP calls per 100 youth	0.247	0.571	0.220	2.236	2.061	2.082	0.556	0.460	0.809	0.630	0.650	0.395		0.894
Number of Youth Cleared without Restrictions	3	6	3	13	8	4	4	1	1	1	0	0	3.67	44
Number of Youth Cleared with Restrictions	1	2	1	14	23	23	3	7	17	10	11	7	9.92	119
6 Number of Youth Transported for Psychiatric Care	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0.67	8
7 Percentage Change in Number of Calls	-40.0%	100.0%	-50%	866.7%	17.2%	-17.6%	-75.0%	14.3%	137.5%	-31.6%	-15.4%	-36.4%	72.5%	
Rate of youth on Suicide Precautions per 100 youth	0.082	0.190	0.220	1.696	2.000	2.082	0.556	0.460	0.809	0.630	0.650	0.395	0.814	0.820
9 Number of Youth Placed Suicide Precautions	1	2	3	22	33	28	7	8	19	13	11	7	12.83	154
10 Average Time on Suicide Precaution (in hours)	27.13	27.18	33.24	45.7	117.00	132.30	114.0	65.20	103.10	108.90	65.60	62.05	5.43	65.19
11 Percentage Change in Average Time on Precaution	-48.0%	0.2%	22.3%	37.5%	156.0%	13.1%	-13.8%	-42.8%	58.1%	5.6%	-39.8%	-5.4%	11.9%	
Average Time between Admittance and 2 Suicide Screening (in hours)	2.1	2.41	2.41	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.60	
13 Average wait time for the QMHP (in hours)	1.42	0.47	0.57	0.24	0.22	1.19	1.25	0.24	1.18	1.18	0.2	1.88	0.84	

\* CCS replaced Mobile Crisis in August of 2013 as the QMHP for the Detention Services Bureau.

Report Card  
2014

USE OF FORCE		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
1	Number of Bed Days	1217	1050	1363	1297	1650	1345	1260	1739	2349	2057	1693	1771	1565.9	18791
2	Total Number of Use of Force	6	2	11	21	33	54	48	28	38	27	26	16	25.83	310
3	Use of Force Rate per 100 youth	0.493	0.190	0.807	1.619	2.000	4.015	3.810	1.610	1.618	1.313	1.536	0.903	1.659	1.650
4	(2) Appropriate Force	6	2	11	21	33	54	48	28	38	27	26	16	25.833	310
5	% of Appropriate Force per Number of Use of Force	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
6	(3) Number of Restraint and Room Confinement	6	2	10	21	24	54	48	28	37	26	24	14	24.5	294
7	% of Restraint and Room Confinement per Number of Use of Force	100.0%	100.0%	90.9%	100.0%	72.7%	100%	100%	100%	97.4%	96.3%	92.3%	87.5%	94.8%	94.8%
8	(4) Number of Documentation and Reporting	6	2	11	21	33	54	48	28	38	27	26	16	25.833	310
9	% of Documentation and Reporting per Number of Use of Force	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
10	(5) Hierarchy of Non-Physical Alternatives Used	2	0	2	2	11	25	9	10	13	5	3	3	7.0833	85
11	Hierarchy of Non-Physical Alternatives Waived due to Active Physical Assessment	4	2	9	19	19	29	39	18	25	22	23	13	18.5	222
12	% of Times Hierarchy of Non-Physical Alternatives Used	33.3%	0.0%	18.2%	9.5%	33.3%	46.3%	18.8%	35.7%	34.2%	18.5%	11.5%	18.8%	23.2%	27.4%
13	(6) Non-Physical Alternatives Documented	2	0	2	2	11	25	9	10	13	5	3	3	7.0833	85
14	% of Times Non-Physical Alternatives Documented when required	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	86.1%	100.0%
15	(7) Medical Evaluations Completed	6	2	11	21	30	54	48	28	38	27	26	16	25.583	307
16	% of Time Medical Evaluations Completed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
17	(8) Wrongful conduct uncovered	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5833	7
18	% of Wrongful Conduct	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	3.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
19	(9) Violations of Policy or Protocol	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0.5455	6
20	% of Violations of Policy or Protocol	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
21	(10) Were steps taken to address Violations	NA	NA	NA	yes	NA	NA	yes	yes	ives	nla	nla	nla		

Report Card  
2014

<b>SAFETY AND ORDER</b>		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Monthly Average	Year to Date
1	Injuries to youth per 100 person-days of youth confinement (non-assaultive)	0.08	0.19	0.37	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.32	0.35	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.147	0.494
2	Injuries to youths by other youths per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.164	0.19	0.29	0.07	0.36	0.30	0.63	0.12	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.06	0.202	0.418
3	Suicidal behavior with injury by youths per 100 person--days of youth confinement	0	0	0	0.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.026	0.000
4	Suicidal behavior without injury by youths per 100 person--days of youth confinement	0	0.57	0.15	0.85	2.18	1.86	0.40	0.46	0.81	0.49	0.53	0.34	0.720	0.418
5	Assaults on youth per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.246	0.29	0.59	0.54	0.60	0.82	1.43	0.75	0.38	0.49	0.95	0.40	0.623	1.027
6	Assaults on staff per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0	0	0	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.24	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050	0.000
7	-Percent of interviewed youths who report that they fear for their safety	50.7%	39.3%	48.8%	31.3%	42.1%	30.9%	34.4%	37.3%	35.9%	39.3%	28.6%	13.7%	0.360	0.46%
8	-Percent of staff who report that they fear for their safety	9.1%	42.9%	21.1%	10.4%	20.4%	43.9%	57.1%	33.3%	43.6%	6.3%	8.3%	5.1%	0.251	0.00%
9	Physical restraint use per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.74	0.67	1.17	1.39	2.00	4.00	3.65	1.61	1.58	1.30	1.54	0.90	1.713	1.369
10	Mechanical restraint use per 100 person-days of youth confinement	0.08	0	0.07	0.31	0.54	0.37	0.63	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.17	0.193	0.304
11	Use of isolation and room confinement and segregation/special management unit use per 100 person days of youth confinement	6.57	5.14	3.23	3.70	3.15	2.68	4.37	3.22	1.66	1.36	0.95	0.90	3.077	3.080
12	Average duration of isolation and room confinement and segregation/special management unit in hours	5.4	4.4	11.3	11.1	12.1	22.2	17.3	10.9	27.9	21.6	33.2	22.9	16.70	45.27
13	Percent of youths presented for admission that had a suicide prevention screening completed by trained or qualified staff in one hour or less	21.5%	20.0%	15.0%	96.6%	99.4%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	20.77%	

## APPENDIX 8



# Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County

616 Adams Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38105

P.O. Box 310, Memphis, Tennessee 38101

## Interagency Services Report February 2015

### Highlights this Month

#### Judge Dan H. Michael's Calendar

In February, Judge Michael opened the Court for tours by the Shelby County Board of Commissioners.

The swearing-in ceremony for the Honorable Terre Fratesi as Juvenile Court Magistrate was held on February 3, 2015.

Judge Michael attended the Three Branches Institute Quarterly Meeting in Nashville, TN on February 5, 2015.

On February 6, 2015, Judge Michael attended Hope Academy's 5-year anniversary celebration.

On February 6, 2015, Judge Michael met with Shelby County Sheriff Bill Oldham and key staff, along with Juvenile Court Clerk, Joy Touliatos.

On February 10, 2015, Judge Michael hosted Shelby County Commission Chairman, Justin Ford on a Court tour.

On February 12, 2015, Judge Michael hosted Shelby County Commissioner, Eddie Jones on a Court tour.

On February 13, 2015, Judge Michael hosted Shelby County Commissioner, Reginald Milton on a Court tour.

Judge Michael met with Senator Mark Norris, Susan Robinson of the Casey Foundation, and Doctors Stewart, Hoffmann and Stern on February 13, 2015.

From February 22-25, 2015, Judge Michael attended the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and Tennessee Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges joint Mid-Winter Conference in Nashville, Tennessee.

Judge Michael toured Davidson County Juvenile Court at the invitation of Judge Sheila Calloway, on February 25, 2015.

On February 27, 2015, Judge Michael attended the Tennessee Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Advisory Commission on the Rules of Practice and Procedure Meeting. Further, he was invited to serve as the Judicial Liaison for this Committee.

## **Juvenile Court Staff Activities**

**Hope Academy** celebrated 5 years at Juvenile Court on February 6, 2015. Since opening, Hope Academy has served 4,264 youth in Juvenile Court Detention.

On February 12, 2015, the **Memphis Flyer** published an article on JDAI and how juvenile detention rates have decreased due to this new approach.

The **In Home Tennessee Committee on Domestic Violence** hosted a Technical Assistance Site Visit by Futures without Violence (FWV), contractor of OJJDP, on February 12-13, 2015. Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett attended.

The **American Correctional Association (ACA)** Audit of Detention Services was conducted February 23-27, 2015. Reaccreditation was successful pending an ACA Panel Interview in August 2015. Detention Services scored 100% in mandatory standards.

Juvenile Court's **Evening Reporting Center Pilot Program** formally launched and received the first youth at JIFF on February 24, 2015. The Reporting Center is a community-based alternative to detention for a target group of youth under supervised probation. Referrals from Juvenile Court are made in response to probation violation for youth needing additional supervision and a structured environment for a brief time. The Reporting Center is designed to help keep youth involved in positive experiences while ensuring they are occupied during times they are most likely to recidivate.

On February 24, 2015, the **National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFJ)**, School Pathways to the Juvenile Justice System Project, hosted a Webinar on Performance Measures and Data Collection Methods. Participants were Shannon Caraway, Fran Gonzales, Kimbrell Owens, Lisa Hill, Sharon Fuller, Donna Gray, Marquita Evans and Sherry Schedler.

Avis Allen and Pamela James attended a training event, "Effective Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: Youth Courts Best Practices", from February 25-27, 2015 at Montgomery Bell State Park hosted by the **Tennessee Bar Association**.

On February 25, 2015, Kimbrell Owens received an executive certificate from **The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) at Georgetown University, Mccourt School of Public Policy** for successfully completing Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities. As a result, Kimbrell is a new member of the CJJR Fellows Network.

On February 25-26, 2015, Satina Williams participated in the **University of Memphis** Internship Fair.

If you have questions, please contact Mrs. Marquita Evans at 901-405-8518 or the Juvenile Court designee as indicated to the right of each project description. Additional information is available at the following:

*Find us on nwitter and Facebook*

Web: <http://juwnilccourt.shelb\counhtn.go>

Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County  
Office of Interagency Services  
Monthly Activity Report  
February 2015

Active Program Collaboratives/Partnerships

American Correctional Association (ACA) Accreditation- Juvenile Court Detention has undergone accreditation through the ACA. Accreditation is a system of verification that correctional agencies/facilities comply with national standards promulgated by the ACA. Accreditation is achieved through a series of reviews, evaluations, audits and hearings. ACA standards are the national benchmark for the effective operation of correctional systems throughout the U.S. and are necessary to ensure correctional facilities are operated professionally. They address services, programs and operations essential to good correctional management, including administrative and fiscal controls, staff training and development, physical plant, safety and emergency procedures, sanitation, food service, and rules and discipline. Standards reflect practical, up-to-date policies and procedures that safeguard the life, health and safety of staff and offenders. Final audit-October 3-5, 2011 & accreditation recommended. Accreditation Awarded on 1/22/2012. (New) February 23-27, 2015: ACA Audit conducted and reaccreditation was successful pending Panel Interview in August 2015. Detention Services scored 100% on mandatory standards. Contact: Crystal Norment

Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiatives (JDAI) Site-Memphis' success in reducing the number of youth in Detention earned the City a coveted partnership with the AECF in June 2011. Memphis is one of the largest urban Courts in the U.S. and the first in Tennessee selected by AECF as a JDAI Site. The AECF has JDAI sites in approximately 250 jurisdictions in 39 states and Washington D.C. focusing on education, counseling, rehabilitation, and therapy. The Foundation's juvenile justice reform agenda is designed to improve the odds that delinquent youth make successful transitions to adulthood. Contact: Kimbrell Owens, JDAI Site Coordinator

Child Protection Investigation Team (CPIT) Advisory Coalition - Coordinated interagency multidisciplinary response to prevent, detect, investigate, treat, and prosecute child sexual abuse & severe physical abuse. Contact: Michael Blancett

Department of Children's Services Community Advisory Board (CAB) – Mission is to empower families and support community safety and partnerships to insure the safety, permanency and well-being of children. The Board meets monthly and membership is composed of community organizational leaders. Contact: Barry Mitchell

Defending Childhood Initiative (DCI) Grant/Network for Overcoming Violence and Abuse (NOVA)- U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Initiative addressing children's exposure to violence. Goals are to prevent children's exposure to violence as victims and witnesses, mitigate the negative effects experienced by children exposed to violence, and develop knowledge about and increase awareness. A key component is a multiyear demonstration program whereby eight cities were awarded planning grants. Shelby County's Office of Early Childhood and Youth is coordinating the local Initiative and spearheading the comprehensive, coordinated community response. *Note:* Plan developed in coordination with the Memphis Youth Violence Prevention Plan & Operation: Safe Community 2012-2016. On 10/10/2012, Memphis' Plan launched under project name of Network for Overcoming Violence and Abuse (NOVA). 5/2/2013 Update: Family Violence Specialist (FVS), housed at Juvenile Court, began employment. May 2014 Update: FVS funding ended. Contact: Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett

Hope Academy - Partnership between Juvenile Court and Memphis City (now Shelby County-SCS) Schools to provide full-time academic instruction and programming for detained youth. Classes began in February 2010 as partners recognized the need to insure a quality education to all children and the need to prepare youth to be successful and productive citizens. Hope Academy staff includes a Program Manager, certified teachers, special education services, and support staff. Further, SCS provides a liaison to work with the LEA after the student is no longer detained and transitioning back to the school system.



## Active Program Collaboratives/Partnerships. continued

### Hope Academy, continued

A Recreational Coordinator employed by Juvenile Court enhances Hope Academy with daily activities to improve the child's health, wellness, and physical fitness. *The Hope Academy Advisory Council* meets quarterly to discuss program progress and make recommendations. Contacts: Larry Scroggs, Gary Cummings, Willie Walton, Mamie Jones, Larry Weichel and Sherry Schedler

Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County Evening Reporting Center (ERC) Pilot Program - The ERC formally launched and received the first youth at JIFF on 2/24/2015. The ERC is a community-based alternative to detention for a target group of youth under supervised probation. Referrals from Juvenile Court are made in response to probation violation for youth who need additional supervision and a structured environment for a brief time. The Reporting Center is designed to help keep youth involved in positive experiences while ensuring they are occupied during times they are most likely to recidivate. (Fran Gonzales) (New)

Juvenile Intervention & Faith Based Follow-up (JIFF) – Provides youth from the juvenile justice system with the skills support and direction necessary to break the destructive cycle of delinquent behavior. JIFF provides holistic, intensive intervention with a goal of successful reintegration to the community for youth under the supervision of Youth Services Bureau (YSB). Since 2003, JIFF has served over 700 youth under YSB supervision. JIFF is a partner under Operation: Safe Community 2012-2016 and the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), Memphis Face Forward grant. Contact: Fran Gonzales

Mediation and Restitution/ Reconciliation Services (MARRS) - MARRS is a program of Memphis Leadership Foundation (MLF). The mission of MARRS is to intervene in the lives of first and second-time juvenile offenders by providing mediation, restitution, character development and positive outreach activities. MARRS' vision is to change lives thereby empowering youth served to become healthy community members and avoid further offenses using a restorative justice approach. MARRS is a partner in the U.S.DOL, Memphis Face Forward grant. Contact: Yolanda Rumph and Donna Gray

Memphis and Shelby County Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) and Confinement Task Force - Sponsored by Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth (TCCY), the mission is to bring together citizens, stakeholders, and families to identify and address issues leading to overrepresentation of minority youth in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Contacts: Gary Cummings, Morrie Noel and Lisa Hill

Memphis and Shelby County Juvenile Justice Board (Juvenile Justice Board) -The Juvenile Justice Board provides direction in developing and implementing school safety programs and strategies. Further, Board works collaboratively with partners in seeking improvements and policy changes addressing emerging and changing needs of Memphis & Shelby County youth at risk of delinquency. In January 2009, group adopted bylaws, elected executive committee, and adopted Gang Resistance Assistance to Save Society's Youth (GRASSY) national model. In June 2009, GRASSY became the GRASSY Steering Committee and Implementation Team separate from the Juvenile Justice Board. Contacts: Larry Scroggs, Gary Cummings, Kimbrell Owens, Lisa Hill and Sherry Schedler

Memphis and Shelby County Truancy Prevention Initiative (TPI) – Group of community-based agencies that meet monthly to study and formulate truancy reduction strategies. Meetings are held during the school year. Contacts: Sharon Fuller, Donna Gray, Lisa Hill and Sherry Schedler

(Memphis City Schools-MCS now Shelby County Schools-SCS) GRASSY Steering Committee & Intervention Team (IT): The GRASSY Steering Committee & Intervention Team (IT) participates in the planning and launch of the national gang model, Gang Resistance Assistance to Save Society's Youth (GRASSY) in SCS. Work originally began in the Memphis and Shelby County Juvenile Justice Board and evolved to separate entities. \*See Memphis and Shelby County Juvenile Justice Board. Contact: Steering Committee and IT Member - Steven Allen

**Active Program Collaboratives/Partnerships, continued**

**Memphis Police Department (MPD) "Real Talk" Program** – "Real Talk" engages high school students in an informal way and provides opportunities for productive dialogue to build relationships among law enforcement, schools and communities. MPD schedules a monthly presentation with a local high school. Officers arrange a basketball scrimmage or drill challenge with students followed by a brief presentation and small group breakout session. Juvenile Court provides staff to assist MPD in "Real Talk" & began participation in January 2014. **Contacts-Barry Mitchell and Lisa Hill**

**Memphis Youth Violence Prevention Plan Project** – Memphis was selected as one of six cities by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) tasked to develop a comprehensive, community-based plan to prevent gang and youth violence. In 2011, Memphis and other cities presented their plans at a Youth Violence Summit in Washington D.C. Memphis' project coordination is provided by the Memphis Shelby Crime Commission, spearheading Operation: Safe Community. The Initiative is led by Mayor A C Wharton and Mayor Mark Luttrell and participating agency representation is provided by U.S. Attorney's Office, District Attorney's Office, Public Health, Public Safety, Children's Services, both City and County governments and school system, as well as representatives from the non-profit, business and faith-based communities. Project developed in coordination with the *Defending Childhood Initiative (DCI) Grant*. April 2012 Update - 2nd National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention Summit in Washington, D.C. Presentation by Memphis on youth violence prevention initiatives. Larry Scroggs attending. **Contacts-Judge Michael and Larry Scroggs - Policy Council; Gary Cummings, Fran Gonzales, Nancy Roll, Sherry Schedler and Mike Smith (Hope Academy)**

**National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) Initiatives:**

- **Juvenile Justice Model Court-Juvenile Justice Model Courts Project** of the Juvenile and Family Law Department of the NCJFCJ; Short Title: NCJFCJ Juvenile Justice Model Courts Project- On 7/1/2011, Juvenile Court became one of only a dozen courts nationwide designated a Juvenile Justice Model Court. A Juvenile Justice Model Court is one that makes the commitment of human and fiscal resources to follow key principles and recommendations set forth in the *Juvenile Delinquency Guidelines*. In this context, the term means that a court seeks to improve practice by implementing the *Juvenile Delinquency Guidelines* and assessing its progress serving as a "model" for broad systems change. The Project sets forth essential elements to help courts achieve improved delinquency case processing and outcomes for youth, families and communities while aspiring to excellence. Project is underway. **Contacts: Larry Scroggs and Dini Malone**
- **School Pathways to Juvenile Justice System Project** - On November 25, 2013, the NCJFCJ selected Juvenile Court as one of 16 courts in the nation to participate in the School Pathways to Juvenile Justice System Project. The NCJFCJ will provide training and technical assistance to help judicial leaders develop efforts to reduce referrals of youth to juvenile courts for school-based misbehaviors and to expand the use of positive disciplinary practices in schools. The NCJFCJ's goal for this project is to support student engagement and reduce students' school exclusion. The work is based largely on the successes of Judge Steven Teske (Clayton Co., GA) and former judge Brian Huff (Jefferson Co., AL) that have addressed school-to-juvenile justice system issues in their jurisdictions and have assisted other courts to address the issue as well. Selected sites are assigned a Site Visit Facilitator recruited by the NCJFCJ due to their knowledge of school-court issues and/or experience with team facilitation and strategic planning. The first Technical Assistance Site Visit occurred on December 16-17, 2014. Judge Steven Teske of Clayton County, Georgia, Judge John Romero of Albuquerque, New Mexico and Cheri Ely are NCJFCJ Facilitators.
- **National Implementation Site for Dependency and Neglect** - On July 7, 2014, the NCJFCJ chose Juvenile Court as one of only eight sites in the country as a National Implementation Site for Dependency and Neglect. This is a nationwide child welfare program to

## **Active Program Collaboratives/Partnerships, continued**

### **National Implementation Site for Dependency and Neglect, continued**

"implement best practices and to improve court systems for the benefit of the children and families in the respective jurisdiction. Juvenile Court was chosen, in part because of "the court's commitment and motivation to implement system reform efforts; the court's willingness to organize and form a strong collaborative team; and the court's desire to improve current court practice." The NCJFCJ has been partnering with courts across the country since 1992 to improve outcomes for abused and neglected children and their families. The selected sites will receive individualized assessments, training, and technical assistance as they implement principles and recommendations set forth in the Resource Guidelines and work toward improving practices and outcomes. The new Implementation Sites will be "laboratories for change" as they participate in ongoing assessments of their performance and share results with the NCJFCJ and other sites to inform and sustain a larger system improvement effort. NCJFCJ staff will work closely with the lead judges and their court teams to provide individualized assessments, which will include site visits to observe, analyze, and provide feedback on system reform implementation, as well as provide tailored and proactive technical assistance on a spectrum of child welfare issues and promising practices. In addition, the NCJFCJ will provide training on the Enhanced Resource Guidelines and foster important connections to the network of the NCJFCJ Model Courts. On November 12-14, 2014, the first Technical Assistance Site Visit was conducted by Franz Braun and Sarah Ray, NCJFCJ Project Leaders.

**Operation Hope** – Founded in 2001, Operation Hope is a faith-based program designed to provide intervention for high-risk juveniles and empower them toward a healthy productive future. Operation Hope provides intensive intervention for those at highest risk of custody and is under the administration of Memphis Leadership Foundation. **Contact: Yolanda Rumph/Donna Gray**

**Operation: Safe Community (OSC)** - Partnership of government leaders, faith-based community, neighborhood groups, business leaders, and citizens across Memphis and Shelby County in an unprecedented joint effort to reduce crime. Goal is to make Memphis & Shelby County one of the safest communities in the U.S. Key local and federal agencies and partners originally convened to develop the strategic plan presented at the Crime Summit. 2012 Key Updates: **OSC 2012-2016** launched incorporating the Memphis Youth Violence Prevention Plan and Defending Childhood Initiative (DCI). (NOTE: DCI Grant Project Name: Network for Overcoming Violence and Abuse (NOVA)).

**Contacts: Honorable Dan H. Michael and Larry Scroggs -Executive Committee.**

**\*See Memphis Youth Violence Prevention Project and Defending Childhood Initiative**

**School House Adjustment Program Enterprise (SHAPE)** – Memphis City Schools (MCS) originally awarded grant funds in 2007 by TCCY for a DMC Pilot to develop & implement an informal adjustment program. Grant funds ended in 2011 and program sustained by MCS (now Shelby County Schools). Community partners created guidelines & strategies through a Project Implementation Board (PIB). SHAPE provides immediate intervention with students who commit minor offenses & provides alternatives from transporting to Juvenile Court. Coordinators at target schools assign dispositional alternatives such as community service, restitution, and/or counseling. On 8/24/11, MCS was notified that SHAPE was selected as a DMC Best Practice by OJJDP and added to the OJJDP Model Programs Guide. **Contacts: Morrie Noel, Gary Cummings and Sherry Schedler**

**University of Tennessee, Center of Excellence-Community-Based Learning Collaborative (CBLC)** - The Evaluation and Referral (E&R) Bureau was invited to participate in a CBLC on Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT) in July 2013. E&R completed "train the trainer" sessions to serve as community "brokers" to identify, connect & refer children who may have experienced trauma. The goal of the project is to develop a community-wide approach for professionals and agencies to learn, implement and sustain the use of Evidence Supported Treatments (EST) over time. Further, to insure children receive appropriate trauma-focused treatment and planning. E&R participated in TF-CBT specialized training, participates in conference calls, data collection and senior leadership meetings.

## **Active Program Collaboratives/Partnerships, continued**

### **University of Tennessee, Center of Excellence, CBLC, continued**

Because of the specialized, trauma-focused training, all children referred to E&R receive a trauma screening. **Contact: Nancy Roll**

**Youth Court** - Juvenile Court and project partners, Tennessee Bar Association, Memphis Bar Association, Memphis Area Legal Services, and (Memphis City-MCS now Shelby County Schools- SCS) Schools implemented a Youth Court in 2010 pursuant to state statute. The first cases were heard on 2/24/11. Students from Cordova, Hillcrest, Overton, and Middle College High Schools comprised the inaugural student volunteer panelists and perform the roles of prosecutors, defense counsel, and jurors. Participation provides a rich learning experience and mentoring by volunteer attorneys. The Youth Court Coordinator serves in the leadership role at Juvenile Court, acts as liaison to external project partners, schedules cases, provides training to volunteers, recruits, and provides public awareness. Since passage of Tennessee's Teen/Youth Court law in 2000, thirteen counties have established programs. Teen/Youth Court is a model program of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and incorporates elements of restorative justice to hold youth accountable for offenses and prevent future delinquency. Youth courts, also known as teen or peer courts are an alternative sentencing mechanism for first time, non-violent juvenile offenders who appear before and are sentenced by a jury of their peers. July 2013: Participating high schools currently include *Arlington, Germantown, Bartlett, Central, Cordova, Hillcrest, Overton, Memphis Academy of Science and Engineering (MASE), Middle College and Southwind.* **2014 Update:** Youth Court added 2 new schools for a total of 12 participating schools. 175 students underwent training. **Contacts: Avis Lamar Allen, Thomas Coupe and Pamela James**

### **Board and/or Advisory Council Involvement**

- **Child Protection Investigation Team (CPIT) Advisory Coalition-** Michael Blancett
- **Commission on Missing and Exploited Children (COMEC) Board of Directors-** Pamela Taylor
- **Defending Childhood Initiative (DCI)/ Network for Overcoming Violence and Abuse (NOVA), Steering Committee Member & Grant Management Team** - Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett
- **DCS Community Advisory Board (CAB)-** Barry Mitchell, Vice-Chair
- **DMC Taskforce of Memphis & Shelby County** -Morrie Noel, Gary Cummings and Lisa Hill
- **DMC State Taskforce-** Gary Cummings and Lisa Hill
- **Early Success Coalition Steering Committee** - Michael Blancett and Erica Glynn
- **Hope Academy Advisory Council** -Larry Scroggs, Gary Cummings, Mamie Jones, Willie Walton, Larry Weichel and Sherry Schedler
- **In Home Tennessee Committee on Domestic Violence** - Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett
- **In Home Tennessee Committee on Intensive Family Preservation** - Barbara Jackson
- **In Home Tennessee Implementation Team-** Thomas Coupe and Nancy Roll

## **Board and/or Advisory Council Involvement, continued**

- **In Home Tennessee Mental Health Assessment Workgroup-** Nancy Roll
- **Just Care Family Network Coordinating Council** - Nancy Roll, Co-Chair
- **Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Advisory Committee** - Sherry Schedler
- **Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) Local State Advisory Membership Board (SAMB)** - Larry Scroggs - Chairman; Trisha Monteil, Fran Gonzales and Sherry Schedler
- **Memphis and Shelby County Juvenile Justice Board** -Larry Scroggs, Gary Cummings, Thomas Coupe, Kimbrell Owens, Lisa Hill, and Sherry Schedler
- **Memphis and Shelby County Truancy Prevention Initiative (TPI)** -Sharon Fuller, Donna Gray and Sherry Schedler
- **(Memphis City Schools-MCS now Shelby County Schools-SCS) GRASSY - Committees** -Member: **Steering Committee & Intervention Team** - Steven Allen
- **Memphis/Shelby County Children and Youth Council-** Fran Gonzales, President; Michael Blancett and Fran Gonzales, *Executive Committee*; *Other Members*-Barry Mitchell, Gary Cummings, Pam Taylor, Avis Lamar Allen, Belynda Dwyer, Erica Glynn and Sherry Schedler
- **Shelby County Interagency Domestic Abuse Fatality Review Team-** Michael Blancett
- **Shelby County Relative Caregiver Advisory Board-** Faye Howard and Stacey Smith
- **Southwest Tennessee Community College (STCC) , Business, Criminal Justice and Paralegal Studies Advisory Committee** - Sherry Schedler
- **Tennessee (Shelby County) Integrated Policy Academy Action Network** – Barry Mitchell

## **Active Interagency Memoranda of Understanding and/or Agreement**

- **April 25, 2002:** User agreement between **TBI** and Juvenile Court for administration of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), telecommunications equipment, and/or interfaces for transmission and retrieval of information.
- **June 11, 2003:** Interagency MOU with **COMEC** for use of computer network system.
- **January 13, 2006:** MOA between Memphis City Schools (now **Shelby County Schools**) and Juvenile Court for free appropriate public education for identified special education students in Detention. Purpose is to provide a part-time teacher for Special Education students and implement the goals and objectives of child's Individual Education Plan (IEP).
- **October 13, 2006:** MOU with **Shelby County Sheriff's Office, Jail Division**, to establish policies and practices for communication & information for juveniles transferred to Criminal Court.
- **April 30, 2008:** MOA between Juvenile Court and Memphis City Schools (MCS), Division of Alternative Schools and Programs, to implement a **Transitional Center**. The Center serves delinquent youth in YSB and those leaving secure residential programs. The Center provides academic assessment, instruction and comprehensive services with the aim of returning the youth to the appropriate school setting. Center opened on 8/12/08 with a capacity of 60.
- **July 17, 2008:** Updated 2nd Revision Multi-agency MOU signed with The Memphis Child Advocacy Center, Child Protection Investigation Team (**CPIT**) and project partners. Purpose is to work through interagency approach to insure best outcomes for child victims of sexual and severe physical abuse. Protocol is culmination of teamwork of law enforcement, child protection, medical, victims' services, mental health, and prosecution per TCA 37-1-607.

## Active Interagency Memoranda of Understanding and/or Agreement, continued

- **August 8, 2008:** Multi-agency MOU signed between Memphis City Schools, City of Memphis, Memphis Police Department, Shelby County Government, Shelby County Public Defender's Office, and Juvenile Court for the School House Adjustment Program (**SHAPE**). August 27, 2010: Updated Revision to Multi-agency MOU signed for (**SHAPE**). Revision updates original MOUs of 8/8/08 and 1st revision of 6/3/09 extending partnership for additional year. November 22, 2013: Updated MOU signed. 11-30-2014: Updated MOU executed with expanded project partners, charges and schools.
- **November 26, 2008:** MOU with **Tennessee Career Center Memphis** (TCCM) to establish policies and practices for referrals and outcome reporting for individuals referred by the Court for job training and employment services.
- **December 21, 2009:** MOU signed and approved by MCS Board of Education to develop and implement educational services in Juvenile Court Detention. **NOTE: Hope Academy** opened in February 2010. **NOTE:** February 8, 2011: MOU Extension approved for 1 year. MCS Attorney, Andrea Hood. October 5, 2012: Extension approved. **October 15, 2014:** MOU Extension approved. SCS Attorney - Sybille S. Noble
- **June 22, 2010:** MOA signed with local law enforcement, Memphis City Schools (MCS), District Attorney General, University of Memphis, DCS, and community agencies for the Gang Reduction Assistance for Saving Societies Youth (**GRASSY**). **GRASSY**, in partnership with community stakeholders, is a school-based intervention working with identified gang members to reduce gang involvement, criminal behavior, and school disruption by providing targeted services to gang-involved youth.
- **November 8, 2011:** MOU with Memphis City Schools (now Shelby County Schools) to establish policies and practices for Memphis and Shelby County Youth Court (**Youth Court**).
- **December 14, 2011:** MOA with **Shelby County Health Department** for nursing services, screenings and coordination of indicated support services for youth in Detention.
- **August 3, 2012:** MOU with **CASA** to define the working relationship and policies and practices for **CASA's** daily operations in accordance with the Juvenile Court Administrative Manual and facility usage.
- **December 7, 2012:** MOU with **JIFF, Inc.** in support of Operation: Safe Community 2012-2016, Action Item 18e, & to increase the number of youth referred for intervention services.
- **February 15, 2013:** Letter of Agreement between The Annie E. Casey Foundation (**AECF**) and Shelby County Government on behalf of Juvenile Court (and Shelby County) for grant funds and to support replication of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). **NOTE:** Updated MOU executed on 10-14-2014.
- **April 22, 2013:** MOU with MCS (now Shelby County Schools) to implement a School-Based Probation Liaison (**SBPL**) Initiative.
- **May 6, 2013:** MOU with Memphis Leadership Foundation (**MLF**) & community partners for program expansion for Dept. of Labor (DOL) grant application. Note: Memphis Fast Forward grant funds awarded.
- **September 4, 2013:** MOU with Shelby County Sheriff's Office (SCSO) for the Law Enforcement Assessment Phone-In Pilot Program (**LEAP**). October 31, 2014: MOU signed to expand LEAP with the addition of Memphis Police Department as project partner.
- **January 29, 2014:** MOU with Shelby County Office of Early Childhood and Youth and project partners for grant application to U.S. DOJ, Office on Violence against Women (OVW). If funded, grant will expand services of **DCI/NOVA** for children and youth exposed to violence.
- **June 2, 2014:** MOA with **Shelby County Early Success Coalition** (ESC) for participation as Endorsing Partner.
- **July 22, 2014:** MOA between Shelby County Government on behalf of Juvenile Court and **Christ Community Health Services, Inc.** for dental exams, treatment and services for detained children.

## Juvenile Court Grant Initiatives & Activity

### •• Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

The Tennessee AOC awards grant funds through the Access and Visitation Grant for development of or continuation of initiatives that aid self-represented litigants in accessing the Tennessee court system regarding child support issues. Juvenile Court utilizes funds for a part-time law student assistant in the Office of the Advocate of Non-Custodial Parents.

- o August 8, 2014: Application submitted for FY 2014-2015.
- o August 22, 2014: Funds awarded for FY 2014-2015.

### •• Child and Family Intervention Grant

Grant award by the Tennessee Department of Children's Services (DCS) directly to Juvenile Court for work with children and families at risk of entering State custody.

- o September 2014: Received notice of new proposals due & change from 1to 3-year grant term.
- o October 7, 2014: Grant proposal submitted to DCS for FY 2016-2018.
- o January 28, 2015: Program Accountability Review (PAR) conducted by Jamillah Norrells and Minnie Butts, DCS. **(Sherry Schedler)**
- o January 29, 2015: Fiscal Review conducted by Russell Todd, DCS Internal Audit Staff **(Tinny Bryson)**

### •• Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) / YSO - TCCY State Supplement

Grant award from TCCY to Juvenile Court and redirected to CASA for services of Youth Services Officer (YSO). Administrative support provided by Juvenile Court Administrative Services.

- o June 4, 2009: Multi-year contract received from TCCY and approved via Shelby County.
- o June 30, 2013: Effective date of merger with The Exchange Club Child and Family Center.
- o April 1, 2014: DCS Program Audit conducted on State Supplement grant.
- o April 22, 2014: DCS Fiscal Audit conducted.

### •• Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)

Grant funded by OJJDP, administered by TCCY, & passed through to Shelby County Government. Program Purpose Areas promote greater accountability within the juvenile justice system. Grant requires State Advisory Membership Boards (SAMB) to make funding decisions.

- o **NOTE: All JABG funds end on 6/30/2015.**

### •• Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)

JAG replaces Byrne Formula & Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEBG) with a single funding mechanism for specific purpose areas including programs for law enforcement, prosecution and court, prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment, and planning, evaluation and technology improvement. Funds provided by the U.S. BJA passed through to Shelby County Government.

- o Audits scheduled via Shelby County Government on March 24, 2015. **(Trisha Monteil)** (New)

## Interagency Activity Detail

- February 2, 2015:** DCI Steering Committee (NOVA) & Grants Management Team Meetings **(Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)**
- February 3, 2015:** Swearing-in ceremony for the Honorable Terre Fratesi as Juvenile Court Magistrate **(Judge Dan H. Michael and Court & Clerk's Office Staff)**

Interagency Activity Detail, continued

February 5, 2015: CPIT Advisory Coalition Meeting (Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 5, 2015: Three Branch Institute Quarterly Meeting, Nashville, TN (Judge Michael)

February 5, 2015: GRASSY Intervention Team Meeting (Steven Allen)

February 6, 2015: Hope Academy 5 Year Anniversary Celebration (Judge Michael, Magistrates Garland Erguden, Joe Little, Lyttonia Cunningham, Debra Sanders, and Nancy Kessler; Larry Scroggs, Pam Skelton, Trisha Monteil, Donna Gray, Mamie Jones, Willie Walton and Sherry Schedler,)

February 6, 2015: Meeting with Shelby County Sheriff Bill Oldham and key staff, and Juvenile Court Clerk, Joy Touliatos (Judge Michael)

February 9, 2015: In Home Tennessee Intensive Family Preservation Committee Meeting (Barbara Jackson)

February 9, 2015: DCI Steering Committee (NOVA) & Grants Management Team Meetings (Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 10, 2015: Court tour by Shelby County Commission Chairman, Justin Ford (Judge Michael)

February 12-13, 2015: In Home Tennessee Committee on Domestic Violence hosts a Technical Assistance Site Visit by Futures without Violence (FWV), contractor of OJJDP (Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 12, 2015: Court tour by Shelby County Commissioner, Eddie Jones (Judge Michael)

February 12, 2015: COMEC Board of Directors Meeting (Pam Taylor)

February 12, 2015: DMC Strategic Planning & Points of Contact Meetings (Lisa Hill)

February 12, 2015: CPIT Advisory Coalition Meeting (Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 12, 2015: GRASSY Intervention Team Meeting (Steven Allen)

February 13, 2014: Court tour by Shelby County Commissioner, Reginald Milton (Judge Michael)

February 13, 2015: Meeting with Senator Mark Norris, Susan Robinson of the Casey Foundation, and Doctors Stewart, Hoffmann and Stern (Judge Michael)

February 16, 2015: DCI Steering Committee (NOVA) & Grants Management Team Meetings (Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett-cancelled due to inclement weather)

February 17, 2015: Memphis and Shelby County Juvenile Justice Board Meeting (Larry Scroggs, Kimbrell Owens and Sherry Schedler-cancelled due to inclement weather)

February 17, 2015: DCS Community Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting (Barry Mitchell)

February 17, 2015: Just Care Family Network Coordinating Council (Nancy Roll)

February 17, 2015: Tennessee Suicide Prevention Network Meeting (Rita Hall)

February 19, 2015: Memphis and Shelby County Truancy Prevention Initiative (TPI) Meeting (Donna Gray, Sharon Fuller and Sherry Schedler)

February 19, 2015: Shelby County's Office of Early Childhood and Youth (OECY), Strategy Meeting (Sherry Schedler, invited)

February 19, 2015: GRASSY Intervention Team Meeting (Steven Allen)

February 19, 2015: CPIT Advisory Coalition Meeting (Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 22-25, 2015: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and Tennessee Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges joint Mid-Winter Conference, Nashville, Tennessee (Judge Michael)

February 23-27, 2015: ACA Audit-Juvenile Court Detention Services (Crystal Norment, Gary Cummings, Mamie Jones, Willie Walton and Lawrence Weichel)



Interagency Activity Detail, continued

February 23, 2015: DCI Steering Committee (NOVA) & Grants Management Team Meetings (Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 23, 2015: In Home Tennessee Committee on Domestic Violence (cancelled due to inclement weather-Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 23, 2015: Attendance/Truancy Task Force Meeting, sponsored by Operation: Safe Community and PeopleFirst Partnership (Larry Scroggs and Sherry Schedler for Judge Michael-cancelled due to inclement weather)

February 23, 2015: Memphis Shelby Crime Commission, Reduce Youth Violence Planning Meeting #2 (Larry Scroggs- cancelled due to inclement weather)

February 24, 2015: Juvenile Court's Evening Reporting Center (ERC) Pilot Program formally launched. (Fran Gonzales) (New)

February 24, 2015: Shelby County Relative Caregiver Advisory Board Meeting (Faye Howard and Stacey Smith)

February 24, 2015: NCJFCJ School Pathways to the Juvenile Justice System Project- Webinar on Performance Measures and Data Collection Methods. (Participants- Shannon Caraway, Fran Gonzales, Kimbrell Owens, Lisa Hill, Sharon Fuller, Donna Gray, Marquita Evans and Sherry Schedler)

February 24, 2015: Shelby County Interagency Domestic Abuse Fatality Review Team (Michael Blancett)

February 25, 2015: Tour of Davidson County Juvenile Court at the invitation of Judge Sheila Calloway (Judge Michael)

February 25-27, 2015: "Effective Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: Youth Courts Best Practices", a training event hosted by the Tennessee Bar Association (TBA) and held at Montgomery Bell State Park. (Avis Allen and Pamela Coleman)

February 25-26, 2015: University of Memphis Internship Fair (SaTina Williams)

February 25, 2015: GRASSY Steering Committee Meeting (Steven Allen)

February 26, 2015: Hope Academy Quarterly Council Meeting (Larry Scroggs, Gary Cummings, Mamie Jones, Willie Walton and Sherry Schedler)

February 26, 2015: GunSTAT Meeting (Shannon Caraway)

February 26, 2015: CPIT Advisory Coalition Meeting (Michael Blancett and Demetria Maxwell-Hughlett)

February 26, 2015: GRASSY Intervention Team Meeting (Steven Allen)

February 27, 2015: TN AOC Advisory Commission on the Rules of Practice and Procedure Meeting (Judge Michael)

\*\*\*\*\*