Transforming Safety North Aurora Local Planning Team Meeting 3 – January 18, 2018

LPT Members Attending: LaKeshia Hodge, Tonya Rozencwajg, Ken Crawford, Harry Glidden, Reid Hettich, Hanni Raley, Robert Andrews, Yemane Habtezgi, Farduus Ahmed, Nancy Jackson, Debi Hunter-Holen, Brian Arnold, Dara Goldsby, Omar Montgomery, Crystal Murillo, Ronald Blan, Molli Barker

LPT Members Not Attending: Dana Jenkins, Hassan Latif

Guests Attending: Ernie Duff, Kasey Neiss, Bob Hagedorn, Lea Steed – community members; Richard Morales and Shannon Morales – Latino Coalition for Community Leadership, evaluation and capacity building team; Patrick Horvath – The Denver Foundation; Christie Donner – Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition; Ben Stephan – Community Enterprise Development Services, lender for Transforming Safety business loan program; Kim English – research director for the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice

Facilitators: Wendy Talley and LaDawn Sullivan.

LaDawn introduced an exercise that asked meeting participants to discuss things they know about and things they are curious about. She encouraged participants to think about this difference when they are participating in LPT meetings. At the conclusion of the exercise, everyone introduced themselves.

Wendy then presented a suggestion to the group about how to manage the participation of guests in the LPT meeting and decision-making process. The suggestions included the following:

- Guests will be invited introduce themselves at the beginning of the meeting.
- A short time will be reserved at the start of each agenda for guests to provide verbal comments.
- Guests will be invited to observe at meetings, but may not play an active role in the meeting and may not participate in any decision-making activity.
- After the LPT makes a decision, guests will be invited to offer written comments regarding their observations to Denver Foundation staff, who will compile these comments and distribute them to the LPT, and will also post them on the website.

Several participants shared their feedback on the suggestions. After some discussion, the LPT members agreed by consensus to adopt these rules to guide the participation of guests in the LPT meetings.

Defining North Aurora

Wendy then brought the group back to the decision that was deferred from the end of the prior meeting, defining the boundaries of North Aurora. This is a decision point that the Transforming Safety legislation entrusted to the LPT. Crystal shard her suggestion that the decision about priorities be deferred until after the decision is made about grantmaking priorities, since those priorities may influence the geography. Harry stated that he did some research on the broadest definition of North Aurora that came out of the prior meeting. He said that if the area is extended south to Iliff and east to Watkins, it would include 56 neighborhoods, 5 wards, 3/5 of the total population of the City, two police districts, and a military installation. It is so large an area that he could not pull accurate crime statistics. After brief discussion the group agreed to table the boundary decision until after the priorities are set.

Transforming Safety Loan Program

Ben Stephan from Community Enterprise Development Services (CEDS) provided an overview of the loan program that is also part of the Transforming Safety program. The Transforming Safety legislation

provides $500,000/year for the three year term of the program in North Aurora. CEDS will make loans through this program to North Aurora based businesses for three purposes:

1. Business Startups
2. Business Expansion
3. Business Acquisition

Loans are available from $500 to $50,000, for a term of up to five years at interest rates ranging from 7 – 11%, and CEDS provides technical training and capacity building to borrowers as well. CEDS is partnering with Rocky Mountain MicroFinance Institute and Mi Casa Resource Center for additional technical assistance. A handout on the loan program will be distributed to the LPT members and posted on the Transforming Safety website.

Permissible Uses of Transforming Safety Grant Funds

Christie Donner from CCJRC then handed around copies of sections of the Transforming Safety legislation, HB 17-1326, pointing out the permissible uses of the legislatively designated grant funds. She noted that these were derived from the best research about community reinvestment, and are meant to be interpreted broadly. For example, the permissible use of "academic achievement" includes all grades of school-age children, not just high school. She explained that the LPT does not have to ensure that some grants are made in each of the permissible use areas. Christie then introduced Kim English from the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice. Kim shared a wealth of information about best practices in criminal justice, summarized in handouts called Promoting Successful Community Reintegration and Crime Prevention Strategies, What Works: Effective Recidivism Reduction and Risk-Focused Prevention Programs; and an article called "Cops and Kids: Setting Rules that Save Lives." All of these resources are also posted on the website. The group engaged Kim in a Q & A and also shared their observations and reflections on criminal justice and crime prevention work in North Aurora. One conclusion that emerged from this discussion is that there are three distinct points of intervention:

1. Young people who have never been involved in crime – how to keep them from ever getting involved in the criminal justice system
2. People who are involved in low-level crime or just starting to engage with the criminal justice system – how to ensure desistance, or positive progress in avoiding further criminal justice involvement
3. People who are returning from the criminal justice system – how to keep them from re-offending

Program Development and Community Impact

Richard Morales from the Latino Coalition gave a brief presentation about the Coalition's experience making and evaluating the outcomes of grants in communities trying to address the issues that Transforming Safety is designed to address. From doing this work all over the country, he has learned the following lessons:

- Successful programs take longer than you think
- Invest in high performing organizations
- Multi-year funding for successful programs is really important

Each of these points included additional detail, which is included in a handout that is also posted on the website.

Local North Aurora Facts

- Harry Glidden, Aurora Police Department District 1 Commander, handed out and walked the group through a variety of maps showing crime statistics in the area traditionally understood as Original Aurora. He pointed out that, despite the public perception, there are large swaths of North Aurora where there is almost no reported crime. Whatever is happening in these pockets of the community should be looked to for replication.
- Participants asked for the following additional data:
    - Whole city and Original Aurora temporal maps for the third quarter of the year
    - Data and information on trauma and its link to criminal activity, to inform decision-making on priorities
    - Additional information on juvenile crime, suspensions and expulsions by grade and ethnicity for APS
    - Recidivism rates for prison and jail, broken down by race for juveniles and by substance abuse involvement
    - List of resources already existing within North/Original Aurora, plus brief description of services provided – Debi can provide some of this from APS
    - More data on socioeconomic status of residents and linked to crime statistics

Priority Setting

Wendy asked the group to start thinking about priorities between now and the next meeting. Everyone in the group agreed to come with five priorities that they would like to make recommendations to begin the process of identifying grantmaking priorities.

The next meeting of the North Aurora LPT will be on Thursday, February 1, 2018. The meeting will be at the Village Exchange Center from 5:30 – 8:30 pm. If any non-LPT members would like to attend and would need interpretation and/or childcare should notify LaDawn Sullivan at lsullivan@denverfoundation.og.

Promoting successful community reintegration
and crime prevention strategies

Handout for Aurora Local Planning Team for HB1326

January 18, 2018

Research has found family and work to be key components of the desistance process

FAMILY

- Marriage for men
    - Enduring attachments seem to lead to
        - Changes in everyday routines, especially regarding peer groups (limits exposure to antisocial peers)
        - May transform the person's identity with greater responsibilities as spouse and parent
- Family support
    - Contact during incarceration is critically important
    - Community based programs include:
        - Housing support, counseling, social skills training, mentoring (at least 1 session per week, 5 hours per session), assistance with family reunification and rebuilding, parent education, family support groups
    - Strengthen bonds with children
    - Avoid behaviors that stress relationships

WORK

- Job stability is significantly related to desistance
    - Employment programs include job readiness, training, placement
    - Provide workers with credentials that match private sector demands
    - Literacy programs

COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL PROGRAMMING has been successful, especially among young people, in forestalling the onset, ameliorating the severity, and diverting the long term consequences of behavior associated with crime and violence

- Requires skilled practitioners
    - Focus is on a problem as a learned behavior: must learn to identify and anticipate high-risk situations, learn strategies to manage urges and cravings, and remembering to engage in positive behaviors

For more information, see *Parole, Desistance from Crime, and Community Integration*, National Research Council, National Academies of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

- Especially useful for (1) violence and criminality, (2) substance abuse, (3) teenage pregnancy and risky sexual behaviors, and (4) school failure
- Especially effective with higher risk, harder-to-reach individuals

Substance abuse treatment

- Chronic drug abuse alters the brain chemistry of addicted people, and therefore relapse is a risk even after long periods of abstinence
- Releasees with substance abuse issues may also have mental health problems so integrated drug and psychiatric may be necessary and prolonged because research has shown that multiple episodes of treatment may be required to help substance users maintain abstinence over time
- Three primary approaches to substance abuse treatment exist:
  - Therapeutic communities
  - Outpatient treatment
  - "12-step" programs
- To be effective, in-prison treatment must be followed by community based treatment
  - Continuing drub abuse treatment in the community is believed to be necessary to help new releases deal with problems that only become salient at reentry, such as learning how to handle situations that could lead to relapse, learning how to live drug free, developing a drug-free peer support group
- Better outcomes are associated with treatment that lasts longer than 90 days
- Best practice calls for better coordination between in-prison and post-release treatment providers, and better joint community case management between the criminal justice system and community treatment providers

Re-entry programming

- Re-entry services and programs focus on immediate needs to prevent individuals from cycling in and out of prison
  - Develop an individualized plan for the first few weeks and months after release
    - Working with a case manager in the community
      - Housing, physical health, and mental health needs, and providing mentoring programs for support
- The probability of arrest declines with months out of prison: the risk of a new arrest: the probability of a new arrest a Month 1 is double that of Month 15 in the community
- Peer support from formerly incarcerated people is associated with positive outcomes

For more information, see *Parole, Desistance from Crime, and Community Integration*, National Research Council, National Academies of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

- Wraparound services—a comprehensive array of individualized services and support networks that are wrapped around clients: services are provided by multiple agencies working together as part of a collaborative interagency agreement
  - A service plan is developed and managed by an interdisciplinary team that includes a caseworker, family members, community residents, social services, and mental health professionals

Community capacity for prisoner reentry refers to two types of capacity: social capacity and resource capacity

- Communities can facilitate behaviors that contribute to desistance when neighborhoods and broader communities try to reintegrate former prisoners into law-abiding roles (social capacity: the links and networks between residents)
  - Success is more likely when individuals can readily find places to live, have supportive families, are offered employment or educational opportunities, and have a way to participate in noncriminal networks
  - Successful reentry occurs in the context of – and with the support of – personal and community institutions such as families, churches and employers

A few additional points….

Interventions should be strengths based (focusing on resilience, empowerment, and solutions) and delivered with cultural sensitivity and competency

Informal social controls, such as marriage and work, are more effective than formal social controls, such as parole supervision and rearrest, in desistance from crime

Effectiveness of interventions to increase desistance from crime depends heavily on staff quality and training, program length and intensity

Programming should distinguish between those leaving prison for the first time versus repeat offenders as the probability of success is very different

For more information, see *Parole, Desistance from Crime, and Community Integration*, National Research Council, National Academies of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Cops and Kids: Setting Rules That Save Lives

By **Lisa H. Thurau and Deborah Lashley** | January 8, 2018

Photo by West Virginia State Police via Flickr

It's been over three years since 12-year old Tamir Rice (http://www.cleveland.com/court-justice/index.ssf/2017/01/tamir_rice_shooting_a_breakdow.html) was shot and killed by a police officer on Nov. 22, 2014 as he played with a toy gun in a park in Cleveland, and since an unarmed 18-year old Michael Brown (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/08/13/us/ferguson-missouri-town-under-siege-after-police-shooting.html?_r=0) was gunned down on Aug. 9, 2014 by a police officer—two tragedies which rocked the nation and helped trigger a national clamor for police reform.

But why has so little actually changed in police practices? Why do we continue to read about and watch a steady stream of stories and videos depicting police mistreating young people? Why do relations between communities and law enforcement continue to deteriorate in so many jurisdictions?

From our experience, the answer is clear. State agencies play virtually no role in setting enforceable standards regulating police behavior toward, and treatment of, youth.

Only five states out of 50 have issued standards to guide law enforcement's treatment of youth, according to a recent report by Strategies for Youth (ttp://strategiesforyouth.org/sfysite/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/SFY_StandardsReport_053117.pdf). (One of the authors founded and is executive director of SFY.) Law enforcement agencies that do attempt to regulate police/youth interactions almost always develop their guidelines in isolation—and rarely reflect the expertise of adolescent psychologists.

Neither do they include recommended best practices or incorporate the perspectives of educators, parents, youth workers, and juvenile justice professionals.

This lack of oversight of police is all the more perplexing when contrasted with the active engagement by state agencies in regulating other professions.

In the fields of child care, health care and education, states convene diverse groups of stakeholders to develop standards based on best practices, which they rigorously enforce. Professionals working in these fields are required to demonstrate mastery of a minimal set of skills and knowledge, and to continually update these.

The public accepts and expects this level of scrutiny and accountability. Would any of us consider sending our toddler to a day care center where the staff had not received training in child development? Or bring our 10-year old, suffering from the flu, to a doctor who had not been required to pass state-level medical boards?

Or allow our teenager to attend a high school filled with teachers lacking credentials?

Yet too often, police officers are expected to respond to youth who are traumatized and distressed, under the influence of drugs and alcohol, mentally ill, autistic, or simply acting like adolescents. Their repertoire is severely limited to four responses: warn, arrest, strike out, and hospitalize.

As a result of inadequate training and knowledge about effective strategies for interacting peacefully with youth, police often over-react and escalate situations unnecessarily, leading to arrests, violence and tragedies that are entirely preventable. Departments that invest in training, partner with mental and health care workers, and adopt community policies approaches that emphasize problem-solving have shown major reductions in use of force and major improvements in addressing systemic problems.

strategies for Youth

Take for example, the Cambridge (Massachusetts) Police Department and its partnership with the Cambridge Safety Network. This department adopted SFY's *Policing the Teen Brain* training, updated and revised its policies, and saw a 65 percent reduction in juvenile arrests, an 80% reduction in runaways, and immediate trauma-informed care for children witnessing domestic violence.

The absence of state-approved standards creates wildly inconsistent legal consequences for youth.

The absence of consistent state-approved standards also creates wildly inconsistent legal consequences for youth. In one neighborhood, a jaywalker receives a mild rebuke. In another, he is tackled and arrested. Two teenagers shoving each other in one jurisdiction might receive a stern lecture; elsewhere they face assault charges.

Often the obvious factors in disparate treatment of youth across and within communities are race, culture and socioeconomic status. These can—and do—provoke challenges to law enforcement authority and decrease perceptions of its legitimacy. They also heighten the risk that police departments will face legal challenges and federal oversight.

Everyone loses.

Fortunately, there is a solution. State legislators need to require state agencies such as state level executive offices of public safety, to create, and then enforce, developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed, equitable training, standards and practices for officers.

That's the easy part. The hard part is creating the political will to bring about such legislative fixes. Standards that guide law enforcement officers and agencies responses to youth must focus on key aspects of stops, addressing bias and disproportionate minority contact.

Such policies must make explicit the expectation that interactions with officers avoid escalation and promote positive relationships in non-incident contexts. As any prosecutor who has attempted to build a case on a juvenile's confession can tell you, officers need guidelines for interviews and interrogations of youth.

Reading and reviewing Miranda rights is now a highly litigated area of juvenile defense law and law enforcement loses cases when it doesn't follow some basic procedures that ensure justice to youth.

In *Where's the State* (http://strategiesforyouth.org/sfysite/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/SFY_StandardsReport_053117.pdf), at pages 18-22, SFY proposes a comprehensive set of policies to address the many and varied interactions between law enforcement and youth.

We owe future Michael Browns, Tamir Rices, Laquan McDonalds and unnamed youth the chance to safely mature into adults. We also have a responsibility to equip courageous law enforcement officers with a comprehensive arsenal of strategies for keeping encounters peaceful and orderly.

Program Development & Community Impact
North Aurora Local Planning Team Meeting
1/18/18

1. It Takes Longer Than You Think
   a. Program Design
   b. Staff training and development
   c. Outreach & Referral
   d. Relationship/Partnership Development
   e. Tweaks to Program Design to Meet Performance
   f. Developing Administrative Infrastructure and Process
   g. Applying Innovations and Lessons Learned
2. Investments in High Performance
   a. Client/Outcome Focused
   b. Concentrate Resources where Impact is Demonstrated
   c. Demonstrate Good Stewardship with Public Dollars
   d. Demonstrate Transparency and Accountability
   e. Low Performers are Defunded, Resources Given to Higher Performers or New Organizations
3. Multi-Year Funding
   a. Stability in Services & Programs
   b. Ability to Attract & Retain Staff and Partners
   c. Adequate Timeframe for Data Collection
   d. Time to Develop Sustainability Strategies
   e. Time for Organization and Programs to Mature/Evolve