

Jennifer Woolard, Chair
Tyren Frazier, Vice Chair
Dana G. Schrad, Secretary
Michael N. Herring
David R. Hines
Scott Kizner
Robyn Diehl McDougale
Quwanisha S. Roman
Robert Vilchez



Post Office Box 1110
Richmond, VA 23218-1110
804.588.3903

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Board of Juvenile Justice

MEETING MINUTES

June 19, 2019

Main Street Centre, 600 East Main Street, 12th Floor, South Conference Room
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Board Members Present: Tyren Frazier, Michael Herring, Scott Kizner, Robyn McDougale, Dana Schrad, and Jennifer Woolard

Board Members Absent: David Hines, Quwanisha Roman, and Robert "Tito" Vilchez

Department of Juvenile Justice (Department) Staff Present: Dhara Amin, Ken Bailey, Valerie Boykin, Juliet Buesing, Ken Davis, Jenna Easton, Katherine Farmer, Michael Favale, Wendy Hoffman, Joyce Holmon, Kristina McGuire, Mark Murphy, Margaret O'Shea (Attorney General's Office), Jamie Patten, Kristen Peterson, Jessica Schneider, Romilda Smith, Beth Stinnett, James Towey, and Angela Valentine

Guests Present: Jac Andrade (Legal Aid Justice Center), Marilyn Brown (Chesterfield County Juvenile Detention Center), Kerry Chilton (disAbility Law Center of Virginia), Aaron Danks (National Cancer Registrars Association), Adam Ebbin (Senate of Virginia), Jason Houtz (Fairfax County Juvenile Detention Center), Janea Mark (Legal Aid Justice Center), Lori Swain, Henry Watkins (Office of Senator Ebbin), and Amy Woolard (Legal Aid Justice Center)

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Jennifer Woolard called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairperson Woolard welcomed all who were present and asked for introductions.

APPROVAL of May 6, 2019, MINUTES

The minutes of the May 6, 2019, Board meeting were provided for approval. On motion duly made by Robyn McDougale and seconded by Dana Schrad, the Board approved the minutes as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There was no public comment.

DIRECTOR'S CERTIFICATION ACTIONS

Ken Bailey, Certification Manager, Department

Included in the Board packet were the individual audit reports and a summary of the Director's certification actions completed on May 29, 2019.

The audit for the Fairfax Shelter Care II found three deficiencies. The Certification Unit completed their monitoring visits, and the facility was in compliance. Fairfax Shelter Care II was certified until May 10, 2022.

The New River Valley Juvenile Detention Home and Post-dispositional Program received a 100% compliance on their audit and was certified until June 11, 2022. The facility was provided a letter of congratulations from the Board Chair.

The audit for the Prince William County Juvenile Detention Center found seven deficiencies, with critical deficiencies such as missing documentation on serious incident reporting and employee volunteer background checks not done in a timely fashion. The Certification Unit completed their monitoring visits, and the facility was in compliance.

The audit for the Richmond Juvenile Detention Center and Post-dispositional Program found one deficiency dealing with sharps and syringes. This deficiency was immediately corrected, and the facility was in compliance.

REMARKS ON THE JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER REGULATION

Senator Adam P. Ebbin and Lori Swain (Senator Ebbin's Constituent)

Last General Assembly session, the Senate Committee on Rehabilitation and Social Services considered a Senate bill that would have required the Board of Juvenile Justice to promulgate regulations governing the housing of youth detained in a juvenile correctional facility pursuant to a contract with the federal government and not committed by a court of the Commonwealth. The bill had bipartisan support but ultimately failed to move out of committee.

Senator Ebbin is requesting a separate set of regulations for youth placed in secure detention centers by the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR). According to Senator Ebbin, ORR youth are different from the court-detained general detention population and are a special class due to the trauma suffered from gang violence in their home countries, being victims of sex trafficking, other experiences, and the potential for mental illness.

Specifically, Senator Ebbin is seeking separate standards that address the use of physical force and mechanical restraints that prohibit isolation, and that address other topics relating to the care of federal youth, such as staff training requirements, cognitive behavioral interventions, trauma informed care, cultural background implications, de-escalation techniques, mandates for bilingual staff, and culturally relevant programs.

Senator Ebbin discussed the Shenandoah Valley Juvenile Center (SVJC) lawsuit regarding its contract with the ORR alleging many inhumane practices. such as, not having bilingual staff and destroying incident records. Senator Ebbin asserted that the ORR youth were treated worse than other youth at the facility despite not being convicted or charged with a crime and was concerned with the risk of legal liability to Virginia and the locality operating the facility.

Senator Ebbin requested that the Department be given the same level of access to youth in facilities with third party contracts that they ordinarily have with other youth in facilities certified by the Department. Senator Ebbin also recommended additional standards for recordkeeping and provisions prohibiting the destruction of video footage of reported incidents.

Senator Ebbin introduced his constituent Lori Swain, who outlined her concerns regarding the allegations at the SVJC and discussed the US Senate and Governor's Office reports addressing various challenges with unaccompanied alien children (UAC). Ms. Swain noted that no ORR guidance documents or policies are available to facilities to handle these youth. According to Ms. Swain, Yellow County, California, another facility in the country that handles UAC has had success in their program. Ms. Swain noted her support of the legislation brought by Senator Ebbin and encouraged the Board to establish a separate set of certification requirements to support UAC in secure Virginia juvenile detention centers.

Chairperson Woolard thanked Ms. Swain and Senator Ebbin for their comments and remarked that the Board already had begun work to address some of Senator Ebbin's concerns. Ms. Kristen Peterson, the Department's Regulatory and Policy Coordinator, provided an update on the amended regulations the Board passed in the aftermath of the SVJC report. According to Ms. Peterson, the Board added language to the Regulations Governing Juvenile Secure Detention Centers requiring a juvenile detention center that enters into a written agreement with a separate entity, such as the federal government, to include in their agreement a provision subjecting the program to the Department's regulations and requiring them to give the Department access to their records and to the juveniles for purposes of certification. This provision is currently moving through the fast-track process. The Governor's Office approved the regulation on June 5, and it will be published in the *Virginia Register of Regulations* to undergo a 30-day public comment period. Assuming no triggering incidents occur that would prevent the Department from moving forward with the fast-track action, the provision will take effect on August 22.

The Board members discussed the issues brought by Senator Ebbin. Some Board members were concerned that the regulations do not go far enough in addressing Senator Ebbin's concerns, specifically dealing with training, competency, and trauma-informed care for this population. Ms.

Peterson said that, absent the proposed amendments moving through the fast-track process, the Department's Certification Unit does not have the authority or reach to address specific program requirements that Senator Ebbin detailed. Ms. Peterson added that the amended regulation will allow the Certification Unit to ensure facilities in third party contracts are complying with all the regulatory provisions. Ms. Peterson also stated that the affected juvenile detention center has amended its contract to reflect the proposed amendments.

Senator Ebbin concluded that this population should be regulated separately and reminded the Board that these children are different, and different regulations should be drafted for certifying these programs.

Chairperson Woolard informed Senator Ebbin that he will be contacted if this issue is put before the Board again.

VIRGINIA JUVENILE COMMUNITY CRIME CONTROL ACT (VJCCCA) PLAN APPROVALS

Beth Stinnett, Statewide Program Coordinator, Department

VJCCCA was enacted in 1995 and authorizes the Department to administer funds to local government entities to design services and programs to respond to juvenile crime. All 133 cities and counties across the Commonwealth receive a state allocation. This is the beginning of the second year of the two-year biennium. Most localities are operating under biennial plans approved by the Department and the Board through June 30, 2020.

In the 1990s, many communities built new detention facilities and increased capacity. The intention now is for the Department to provide funding for detention alternatives, such as electronic monitoring, outreach detention, and daily reporting centers. In addition, funding can be used for early intervention programming for delinquent youth to be diverted for programming instead of placed on probation.

When VJCCCA began, the state share was nearly \$29 million, and through years of budget reduction, the state allocation is now \$10.3 million. Some localities still have a required Maintenance of Effort and local contributions. Total for state and local VJCCCA funding is \$23 million.

Participating localities identify a funds administrator and decide on services to be part of their plan. An initial formula grant is used based on the size of the community. Some localities receive as little as \$6,500 a year, and others receive several hundred thousand dollars a year. The amount of funding varies, which influences how the funds are spent. Some localities use the funds for detention alternatives, diversion, pro-social skills, skill-based groups, group homes, and behavioral services. Localities also can use funding to hire private provider agencies, contract for services, or hire local government staff to deliver services.

For the first time in many years, there will be changes to the program beginning July 1. The General Assembly passed House Bill 1771 that requires an addition to the VJCCCA allowable services: a new

category called prevention services. Traditionally, the funding could be used only for young people who enter the juvenile justice system by way of intake. This new category allows localities also to serve young people not involved in the juvenile justice system. The new law requires the department to have an evidence-based assessment tool to determine which young people should be served. Because this is the second year of the two-year biennium, at this time, only one locality has elected to add this new category to their plan. Most localities already have a plan that takes them through June 30, 2020. The Department is preparing for this new category by developing technical assistance, guidance documents, and implementation plans for the new law.

The Board packet contains a spreadsheet that lists each locality's plan type, programs and services, budget from the previous year's plan, and proposed changes. Localities may have been approved for only one year due to continued work with the Department on the plan, the addition of new categories of services or programs, the need for intensive supervision as the locality implements a new service or program, and high recidivism rates or low successful completion rates within the program or service. This would merit more work on the program to change the target population, staff development, or review the admission criteria. Twenty jurisdictions are a part of ten combined plans, and each has worked closely with its regional VJCCCA coordinators over the past year to enhance their plans.

Ms. Stinnett detailed a few highlights of the plan changes.

Hampton had a number of underutilized programs and was able to re-appropriate and budget for a new category, which will serve young people on probation suspended from school. Hampton hopes this program will reduce violations.

Martinsville would like to add a shelter care facility to serve youth in southwest Virginia as an alternative to detention. They have a zero budget and do not have full readiness. Martinsville is continuing work with the Certification Unit and others to prepare. The Department supports this addition.

Frederick County wants to be the first to add the prevention services category. Frederick County has an active juvenile judge who has taken an interest in this category and rallied the community. The locality has visited the Achievement Center in Washington, D. C., and is trying to replicate their program. The array of services will include prosocial engagement, educational programming, and behavioral health services.

Ms. Stinnett asked the Board to approve a motion for 20 localities, part of 10 combined plans, and adopt their plan for year two of the biennium that goes through June 2020.

On motion duly made by Robyn McDougle and seconded by Scott Kizner, the Board of Juvenile Justice approved the VJCCCA plans for the fiscal year 2020 for the following: Combined Plan for Frederick, Clarke, Winchester, and Manassas City; Combined Plan for Rockingham, Harrisonburg, Warren, Hampton, Newport News, and Norfolk; Combined Plan for Martinsville, Henry, Patrick,

and the City of Roanoke; and Combined Plan for York, James City, Gloucester, Williamsburg, Mathews, and Poquoson.

REQUEST EXTENSION OF VARIANCE APPLICABLE TO JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL CENTERS, SECURITY STAFF SUPERVISION OF RESIDENTS DURING TRANSPORTATION

Kristen Peterson, Regulatory and Policy Coordinator, Department

Ms. Peterson presented a request on behalf of the Bon Air Juvenile Correctional Center to extend the variance, originally approved by the Board in September 2016, to the regulatory requirement in Subsection A of 6VAC35-71-830 of the juvenile correctional center regulation. Currently, during the hours residents are awake, there must be at least one direct care staff member who is awake, on duty, and responsible for the supervision of every 10 residents, either on the premises or off campus participating in facility sponsored events. In order to be considered direct care staff, staff must be responsible primarily for maintaining the safety and well-being of the resident, implementing the behavior management program, and maintaining security of the facility.

The Department implemented the Community Treatment Model in 2015 and reclassified its direct care staff. The juvenile correctional officer position was divided into two separate classifications: resident specialist and security staff. The resident specialist has enhanced programmatic responsibilities to help facilitate the community treatment model and serve as a personal advocate for residents. The resident specialist is also responsible for security functions. The security staff primarily has security functions and is responsible for conducting perimeter checks, facility searches, and similar types of activities. Because of the existing definition of direct care staff, security staff are not authorized to be alone with residents outside the presence of direct care staff and are not responsible for implementing the behavior management program. As a result, security staff do not meet the definition of direct care staff.

In order to address this deficiency, in 2016, the Department asked the Board for a variance. The variance has been in place since September 19, 2016, and gives security staff the authority to supervise residents during emergency and routine transportation. Security staff can transport residents to medical appointments, court, or similar appointments. The proposed amendments to the JCC regulation that incorporate the concepts of the variance have not gone through the regulatory process and likely will not take effect before this variance expires. Therefore, the Department is requesting an extension of the variance for three years or until the regulation is amended, whichever occurs first.

A definition of security staff was incorporated as part of the existing variance and includes three separate positions: 1) security coordinator, 2) security manager, and 3) security specialist. Earlier this year, the Department retitled the security specialist position in order to address shortages that occur on the units with resident specialists I who fall under the direct care staff classification. In addition to the security related functions, the former security specialists now must assume temporarily the duties of a resident specialist I in the event of a vacancy or a shortage.

The Department is requesting that the Board extend the variance originally approved by the Board in September 2016 but modify it to address the changes the Department has recently undergone.

The proposed definition for security staff on page 56 of the Board packet includes resident specialists, security coordinators, and security managers. All other provisions in the proposed variance remain the same as the existing variance. There remain compelling reasons to continue to allow this variance. Primarily, the Board has already approved this concept when it approved proposed amendments to the regulation, which incorporated the variance language. Additionally, security staff receive the same 120 hours of initial training as direct care staff and the same 40 hours of retraining each year. Extending this variance will allow security staff to continue to transport residents and free up direct care staff to implement the community treatment model concepts.

On motion duly made by Jennifer Woolard and seconded by Michael Herring, pursuant to 6VAC35-20-92 of the Regulation Governing the Monitoring, Approval, and Certification of Juvenile Justice Programs and Facilities, the Board of Juvenile Justice approved an extension of the variance to the regulatory requirement provided in subsection A of 6VAC35-71-830 that requires at least one direct care staff member on duty and responsible for supervision of every 10 residents on the premises or participating in off-campus, facility-sponsored activities. This variance shall continue to authorize staff classified as security staff to actively supervise residents during routine and emergency transportation. This variance shall remain in effect until 6VAC35-71 is amended or for three years, whichever occurs first.

REQUEST TO AMEND REGULATION GOVERNING MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR JUVENILE INFORMATION REQUESTS FROM AND RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE (6VAC35-170) THROUGH THE FAST-TRACK REGULATORY PROCESS

Kristen Peterson, Regulatory and Policy Coordinator, Department

The Regulation Governing Minimum Standards for Juvenile Information Requests from and Research Involving Human Subjects within the Department governs the process for review, submission, and approval of research proposals and data requests to the Department. The Board amended this regulation in 2016. There are issues and provisions that have continued to cause confusion among the regulated community. As a result, the Department's Research Unit has recommended additional amendments to help with clarification.

Ms. Peterson reviewed the most important proposed amendments.

There are three definition changes. The existing definition for "human subject" fails to contemplate individuals who are under the guidance or supervision of Department-regulated facilities, such as juvenile detention centers and group homes. The recommendation of the Research Unit is to amend the regulation to clearly state that these provisions apply to entities regulated by the Department, such as juvenile detention centers and group homes.

The “human subject” definition also has been expanded to include staff and contractors, which will allow researchers to submit proposals or requests involving facility or program staff, rather than only residents. A similar change is proposed for the definition of “organizational unit.” The current definition applies only to Department-operated facilities and programs.

The existing regulation establishes requirements for two different committees. One of the committees is responsible for overseeing case-specific data requests. Another committee is responsible for reviewing human research proposals. The current regulation does not distinguish between the two committees. The recommendation is to add a definition for “internal committee,” which is responsible for overseeing case-specific data requests.

Section 55 is a new section that contains existing content. Language in Section 62 was repealed and moved to Section 55 for structural purposes and to improve the regulation.

Under the existing regulation in Section 65, researchers who seek or request external case-specific data must submit a Research Proposal Form and a Research Agreement Form. There is no provision in the existing regulation regarding the Confidentiality Agreement Form. The proposal adds a requirement that the Confidentiality Agreement also must be submitted when an external case-specific data request is made.

Under the existing regulation, certain identifiers must be removed from case-specific data requests before that information is transferred from the Department to the researcher including, for example, the individual’s name, social security number, date of birth, dates of admission, dates of release, account numbers, and direct care numbers. Under Subsection E of Section 65, the Department Director has the authority on a case-by-case basis to approve the dissemination of some data with a limited number of identifiers. Because some identifiers that must be stricken are not sensitive by their nature, the exception has become a rule, and the Director constantly must approve data requests with limited identifiers. The Research Unit has determined that some identifiers listed under this section are not sensitive by nature and are only sensitive when paired with other more sensitive data. Therefore, the recommendation is to remove from the list of identifiers that must be stricken certain identifiers, such as dates of admission, dates of release, and account numbers. Because email addresses often can serve as identifiers, the Department recommends adding them to the list of identifiers that must be stricken.

The Department recommended additional language in Section 70 to require that when a research proposal or request is submitted, the researcher must comply with the appropriate security and non-disclosure requirements. This addition is intended to ensure sensitive data is protected.

Section 80 deals with the statute that addresses human research and the provision of informed consent. The Department recommends additional language requiring that before a human research proposal request can be approved, informed consent must be provided by either the legally authorized representative or the human subject. This is consistent with current state law but is not explicit in the existing regulation.

Research proposals exempt from the human research process are noted in Section 90. For example, research conducted by the Department of Health on preventive disease investigations and some education-related research are exempt under the existing regulation. Section 90 omits exceptions to these exemptions that are set out in the federal regulations. The Research Unit has added those exceptions to the exemptions in Section 90.

In Section 100, there are certain endorsements researchers must obtain when conducting external research. For example, for student research, the student must obtain the endorsement of the academic advisor. If the research involves juvenile court records, the endorsement of the juvenile court judge for the applicable jurisdiction is required. The Research Unit recommended striking these requirements. Obtaining the endorsement of the academic advisor for student research is not necessary because typically, the student researcher is not the principal researcher. The academic advisor would be involved in the process. With respect to court service unit records, it is the court service unit director who is better equipped to provide the endorsement.

Section 185 addresses researcher noncompliance and provides that if a researcher deviates significantly from the approved proposal or if he fails to comply with statutory or regulatory requirements, the Department can restrict or terminate further research or prohibit the researcher from publishing the research results. The proposal adds an alternative that will allow the Department to bar the researcher from future studies with the Department.

Section 190 requires the Human Research Review Committee (HRRC) to provide an annual report to the Governor, General Assembly, and the Department Director that sets out and summarizes all of the research proposals approved by the HRRC. The Research Unit has recommended adding language consistent with the requirement in § 32.1-162.19 of the Code of Virginia, which requires the HRRC, in addition to completing that report, to ensure that an overview of the report is placed on the Department's website. The language was added to conform to state law.

State agencies are prohibited from incorporating into regulations by reference documents that the agency has created. There are provisions in the existing regulation that violate this requirement. The recommendation is to strike those provisions and add language into a new section, Section 230, which gives the Department the authority to establish written procedures to address or impose additional requirements regarding the submission and approval process. The Department also recommends new language directing that written procedures be established to outline the process for obtaining organizational unit endorsement. These written procedures must be published on the Department's website.

Ms. Peterson invited Dhara Amin, Research Analyst and Coordinator of External Research, Department, to respond to questions from the Board.

Board Member Schrad asked if the new requirement that research results be made public on the agency's website is helpful and whether the Board traditionally is made aware of outside research being conducted.

Ms. Amin answered that a report is presented to the Board on an annual basis summarizing all proposals submitted to the Department whether or not approved, still pending, not decided on, or rejected. The report also details significant findings in the research. This year's report will be presented to the Board at the November meeting.

Chairperson Woolard asked if the human research regulations have any implications with the changes to the federal Common Rule.

Ms. Amin explained that, out of the seven changes to the Common Rule that have been implemented or will be implemented in 2020, two impact the Department's process. The first is the elimination of continuing review, which is more for the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The HRRC has a separate safeguard and will continue its annual review to ensure researchers are handling their projects. The second involved making the informed consent clearer, shorter, and more concise. The Department already follows this practice; its informed consent forms are between sixth and eighth grade reading levels depending on the topic.

Chairperson Woolard questioned the Department's stringent requirements for approving research projects. The federal provisions require that the risks of research be reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits. Section 150 of the regulation, however, requires the benefits of the research to outweigh the risks. Chairperson Woolard was concerned with this requirement given the fact that social science research often has no direct benefit to the subject but has implications for public policy and practice.

Ms. Amin responded that this requirement is consistent with statute.

Board Member Schrad asked how the director's exception allowing the dissemination of data with some identifiers on a case-by-case basis works and whether the justification is recorded.

Ms. Amin responded that the Department requires the researcher to justify why sensitive information or identifiable data is necessary on its proposal form.

On motion duly made by Robyn McDougle and seconded by Michael Herring, the Board of Juvenile Justice approved the proposed amendments to the Regulations Governing Minimum Standards for Juvenile Information Requests from and Research Involving Human Subjects within the Department of Juvenile Justice (6VAC35-170) as agreed upon at the June 19, 2019, Board meeting and granted the Department of Juvenile Justice permission to proceed with the filing of the regulatory package through the Fast-Track stage of the regulatory process.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

James Towey, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager, Department

Mr. Towey provided a brief overview of the legislative process and explained his duty to visit court service units across the Commonwealth to provide a legislative update on laws that take effect on July 1 that could impact their units. During these visits, Mr. Towey discusses the Department's legislative process and the importance of obtaining input from the field because of their practical knowledge on the issues and statutes. The Department conducts research and analysis on potential legislative proposals in July. The Legislative Unit then drafts rationale and actual language for any legislative proposals the Department wants to move forward on.

The Legislative Unit ensures any proposals considered are not in conflict with state or federal law and decides if the proposal could be better handled through procedure or regulation. The unit also considers the likelihood of success for each legislative proposal. The Department holds internal discussions with the Director, and decisions are made on proposals to submit to the Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security. Nothing is done without the Secretary's authorization, who in turn receives his authorization from the Governor's policy team. The Department usually submits the agency legislative proposals by mid-to-late August. The Secretary meets with the Department to discuss the proposals and to prioritize. It is unclear whether the special session will affect the timeline of the legislative process this year. The Secretary selects the proposals and sends them to the Governor's policy team, who determines the Governor's legislative package. The Department is usually notified by November or December which legislative proposals have been approved and then the Department must recommend patrons. The Governor's policy team informs the Department about two weeks later on which patrons were accepted. Throughout the session, the Department cannot support or oppose legislation unless the Secretary authorizes it. The Governor's administration selects the bills to be vocally supported or opposed.

Mr. Towey invited the Board to provide their ideas and concepts. The Board is welcome to provide input on bills that might be harmful or helpful.

DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Valerie Boykin, Director, Department

Director Boykin was invited to present to the House Appropriations Committee on June 17. The committee asked Director Boykin for an update on transformation. Director Boykin thanked the committee for allowing the Department to use the funds from the closure of Beaumont Juvenile Correctional Center and the Reception and Diagnostic Center for reinvestments and informed them that it is too early to see results, but funding program services on the front end is the right direction.

Dr. Lisa Floyd announced that graduation was on Friday, June 21. The Division of Education has decided to hold two graduation ceremonies each year to accommodate the varying school completion dates. This semester, there are 50 graduates with advanced diplomas and only nine GEDs. There is a push towards diplomas instead of GEDs. New research shows that a GED is

equivalent to a drop out. The guest speaker for graduation is former NFL running back Howard Stevens, and there will be seven student speakers. An expected 275 parents and family members will attend the ceremony. When students finish school mid-year, they immediately enroll in post-secondary programming. On June 7, there was a post-secondary celebration for 69 youth, 79 certificates, and 148 college courses completed with credit earned. For the first time, the Department provided two scholarships through the Missouri Youth Services Institute for \$1,000 each and entered into a partnership with a Virginia foundation to provide \$2,500 each for two additional youth.

Deputy Director of Residential Services Joyce Holmon added that for the second year, the Department sponsored a senior class trip off campus, this year for 18 youth at Boomerang Air Sports.

Earlier in the year, Director Block announced the Department's formation of an Equity Workgroup. The Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention Act requires states to focus on disproportionate minority contact, and now more of the research is focused on racial and ethnic disparity. A growing trend is to look at race equity and inclusion. The Department launched this workgroup, co-chaired by Jenna Easton, Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Coordinator, with representation from all divisions. The group's charge is to establish a uniform understanding of race, equity, and inclusion across all units within the Department, to adopt and embed practices and procedures that promote equity and inclusion, and to eliminate current practices that create disparities. The workgroup has had three meetings, and the initial work is to revise the Department's electronic data system and capture more information on race and ethnicity. This category uses census data, and the Department is trying to capture more of this type of information. Beginning in July, the Department will be capturing more of this data in its system.

In addition, the Department has partnered with the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), which has a grant with an organization to provide training and technical assistance on these issues. The Department is soliciting jurisdictions to create teams that might look at the data and see what the issues are in those localities. Overall, the data show more youth who penetrate the system in Virginia are youth of color. The Department is interested in the root causes and what can be done to change these statistics.

Director Boykin introduced the newest member of the Executive Team, Michael Favale, who was promoted to the Director of Policy and Legislation.

Director Boykin acknowledged and thanked three Board members whose terms expire at the end of this month. Chairperson Woolard, Board Member Herring, and Board Member Schrad. Ms. Boykin said that appointments are being considered, and the board will welcome new members in the fall.

BOARD COMMENTS

Board Member Kizner said that he is impressed by the professionalism and passion of the staff. Board Member Kizner learns a lot at meetings and gains a greater appreciation of the work the Department does for a population of terrific young people who made a bad decision. It is good to know that the Department is looking out for their best interests.

Chairperson Woolard expressed her pleasure at serving as the Board Chair, indicating that it had been an educational experience. Chairperson Woolard echoed Board Member Kizner's comments regarding the Department's commitment to the children and families it serves.

NEXT MEETING

The next Board meeting is scheduled for September 18, 2019, at Main Street Centre, 600 East Main Street, Richmond.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Woolard adjourned the meeting at 11:05 a.m.