

Juvenile Justice Reform Taskforce: System Financing Working Group

Key Funding Elements Regardless of Fiscal Structure	
Goal Oriented:	Funding supports adoption and effective implementation of research-based programs and practices that improve public safety and youth outcomes
Flexible:	Counties use funding as they see fit for pre-arrest diversion through reentry
Incentivizes Diversion and Community-Based Supervision/Services:	Incentivizes increased use of diversion/community-based supervision and services and reduced reliance/funding for residential placements
Reduces Administrative Burden:	Streamlines oversight from DHHS and administrative requirements, with focus on budget management, cost reporting, and risk-based auditing
Provides for Collaborative/Local Oversight:	Establishes funding oversight committee, heavily comprised of local representatives/associations, that provide coordinated statewide leadership for funding policies, evidence-based practice improvements/technical assistance, and quality assurance/data/collection
Requires and Supports Statewide Evidence-Based Approaches	<p>Increase in base funding levels to support evidence-based funding requirements, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of detention screening tool, diversion screening, and risk assessment tool pre-disposition, and participation in associated training, quality assurance, and data collection activities. • Programs/services that have a general research base of effectiveness (i.e. not ineffective practices) • Adoption of best practice probation standards (developed by oversight committee), and probation officers must attend and be certified in curricula every two/three years. All counties, or those above a certain population size, must employ a JJ QA Specialist. • County/regional cross-systems youth services committee (recommended as part of existing human service committees) to improve availability, use, funding, and capacity building of community-based services for youth in the juvenile justice system
Promotes Local Fidelity and Best Practices	Investment in building the capacity of SCAO JJ Bureau/entity TBD to employ QA monitors to help oversight committee manage the grant at local level and provide/coordinate training and TA. Locales would provide brief programmatic/data reports to this oversight entity and they would report on statewide performance measures on an annual basis.

Option 1: Retain Child Care Fund Basic Structure	
Funding Formula:	Increase state reimbursement level to something like 60/65% for community based services (including respite/shelter) + maintain 50% for residential (detention and longer-term placements)
Funding Level:	Planning process can help determine what DHHS should request from the legislature to account for increased reimbursed rate + potential increased local investment to support evidence-based practices
Funding Components:	Includes community-based + residential Question on how, if at all, to incorporate raise the age (RTA) potentially in the short term or after current reimbursement structure sunsets.
Local Cost Control:	Same as current
State/Residential Cost Control:	Same as current with hope that higher community reimbursement rate + other system reforms drive down residential use/expenditures.
Reinvestment:	Potentially reduced cost to the state above certain amount gets reinvested into discretionary grant opportunities.

Option 2: Shift to Single or Partial Block Grant Structure			
Funding Formula:	<i>Historical Average</i> (with sufficient time span to smooth out year to year fluctuations)	<i>Basic Formula</i> (juvenile population, court referrals, etc.)	<i>Basic + Incentive Based Formula</i> (probably can't be implemented in short term due to data gaps)
Funding Level:	<i>Current + Multiplier for EBPs</i>	<i>Current + Multiplier for EBPs/RTA</i>	<i>Start from Scratch</i>
Funding Components:	<i>Residential + Community + RTA</i>	<i>Residential + Community, and RTA as current until sunset</i>	<i>CCF for Residential + Block Grant for Community, and RTA as current until sunset</i>
Cost Controls and Local Overflow Management:	<i>None</i>	<i>Hard or Soft Cap on Amount or Proportion Used for Residential + Some or No Approval Process to Exceed</i>	<i>Recoup Process with Unspent Funding and/or Overflow Fund</i>
Reinvestment:	<i>Unspent grant funds reinvested in discretionary grants statewide</i>	<i>Individual counties that spend less than "allocated" on residential get incentive bonus used for community based purposes in following year</i>	