



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition

July 27, 2009

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
300 West Adams, 7th Floor (Conference Room)
Chicago, Illinois 60606
2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- ▶ Call to Order
- ▶ Acting Executive Director's Remarks

I. Meeting Minutes: May 12, 2009

II. FFY05 Through FFY07 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Plan Adjustments

- ▶ Adjourn

This meeting will be accessible to persons with disabilities in compliance with Executive Order #5 and pertinent State and Federal Laws upon anticipated attendance. Persons with disabilities planning to attend and needing special accommodations should contact by telephone or letter Mr. Hank Anthony, Associate Director, Office of Administrative Services, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 300 West Adams Street, Suite 700, Chicago, Illinois 60606 (telephone 312-793-8550). TDD services are available at 312-793-4170.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MINUTES

JUVENILE CRIME ENFORCEMENT COALITION

Tuesday, May 12, 2009
James R. Thompson Center
100 West Randolph Street
Room 2-029
Chicago, Illinois, 60601

Call to Order and Roll Call

The Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) met on Tuesday, May 12, 2009, in Room 2-029 of the James R. Thompson Center, located at 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois. Chairman Sorosky called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m. Associate Director John Chojnacki of the Authority's Federal and State Grants Unit (FSGU) called the roll. Other JCEC members and designees present were: Rodney Ahitow, Cheryl Barrett (for Director Cynthia Cobbs, via teleconference), Patricia Connell (via teleconference), Barbara Engel, Steven Kossman (via teleconference), JCEC Co-Chairman Gary Leofanti, Kurt Friedenauer (for Director Roger Walker), Wayne Straza, and Sylester Williams (via teleconference). Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority Program Supervisor Mike Carter, Rick Krause representing the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), and other Authority staff members.

Minutes of the January 7, 2009 JCEC Meeting

Ms. Engel said that the minutes of the January 7, 2009 JCEC meeting reflected a comment she had made regarding a lapse of \$314,000 by the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ). She said that she believed her comment was actually in reference to the \$510,000 that the IDJJ had been given and whether the IDJJ would be able to effectively spend those funds.

Director Levin said that she thought that Ms. Engel was actually referring to Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) funds that had been awarded to the IDOC. She said that those funds hadn't really lapsed, but they had been returned and then used for cameras at women's prisons. She said that the Authority did reprogram approximately \$300,000 to the IDOC.

Ms. Engel said that she was certain that \$314,000 had lapsed.

Director Levin said that the funds in question were probably JAG funds and if they were, they were reprogrammed to the IDOC for cameras for women's prisons. She said that she did not think two separate amounts of \$300,000 were in question.

Ms. Connell asked how it would be possible to use JABG funds for adult women.

Director Levin said that the funds were from JAG, not JABG. She said that the previous paragraph referenced JAG and if JABG funds were in question, then the funds would not have gone to the women's facilities. She said that she knew that approximately \$300,000 in JAG was returned by IDJJ and those funds were reprogrammed. She said that she did not think another \$300,000 in JABG funds was addressed. She said that perhaps the confusion lies in that the funds were lapsing and there was approximately two months to spend those funds and Director Walker had requested funds for cameras in all of the women's prisons. She said that, of course, the idea was to not lapse anything at all.

Motion: Mr. Straza moved to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2009 JCEC meeting. Mr. Leofanti seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

FFY05 – FFY07 JABG Plan Adjustments and FFY08 Plan Introduction

Program Supervisor Mike Carter said that staff recommends designating a total \$21,096 to the City of Evanston for the continuation of their community services and restorative justice program. These funds will be split evenly out of FFY05 and FFY06 at \$10,548 each. He also said that staff recommended designating a total of \$144,220 consisting in FFY05 and FFY06 funds to the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority (IVPA) for the continuation of its Safety Net Works (SNW) program.

In response to a question by Ms. Engel, Mr. Carter said that the IVPA would pass the funds through to SNW contracts.

Mr. Carter said that staff recommended designating a total of \$73,315 to the IDJJ for its Parole Readjustment Program. He said that this recommendation was based on the last funding period which consisted of only four months, but approximately \$220,000 would be needed to fund this program for twelve months. He said that rather than come back to the JCEC and/or the Budget Committee four months from now to re-opt this program for another eight months, perhaps the JCEC would want to continue this for twelve months at the figure that Mr. Krause is going to bring to us... right now.

Mr. Krause, of the IDOC, said that the twelve month total would be \$260,514.

Mr. Carter said that the \$73,315 recommended here would be subtracted from that amount and the difference would be funded using FFY07 state/discretionary funds. This would allow the program to continue for 12 months.

Mr. Carter said that staff's recommendations would have the oldest funds used first and there is nothing left in state/discretionary FFY05 funds and FFY06 has been zeroed out.

Mr. Krause said that the funds would pay for a lead case manager and three other case managers and other administrative costs. He said that \$12,000 would go toward hygiene kits and other supplies for youths in the facilities. It is a pre-release and post-release program, so the case managers follow the youths out of the facility once a week. He said that the program provides for a maximum of 96; half (48) are pre-release and half (48) are post-release.

Mr. Friedenauer, responding to a question from Ms. Engel regarding evaluation, said that the program does not have its own research component, but the program does track return rates and the return rates for the program are better than those of the department overall, which is 48 percent. He said that this program's return rate is in the low 40's. He said that the return rate on parole violators coming through the program is somewhat less than the overall return rate. He said that the IDOC does not have enough data to do a large aggregate study at this point.

Mr. Friendauer said that the history of the program had been that the parole violator rate was and continues to be very high for the department for a lot of circumstances that can't be controlled at this point. He said that this program was developed to address issues that were particular to young people who recycle through the department. He said that this program has much more targeted counseling that is provided in the main campus program; there is a greater emphasis on post-release transition in terms of putting these kids back in to the community and follow-up services are consistent with those provided in the Parole Readjustment program. He said that the program has a healthy educational component, too. He added that the kids in this program, for the most part, were high-risk the first time they entered IDJJ facilities. He said that marshalling additional resources to such a high-risk population is consistent with what researchers have found to be where the best return on investment is.

Mr. Friedenauer, in response to a question by Ms. Engel, said that there is some community mentoring, that that it is not a central feature of the program at this point.

Mr. Friedenauer, in response to questions by Chairman Sorosky, said that the overall parole rate violation right now is running about 45 or 46 percent. He also said that, of that approximate 46 percent, about 38 percent are returning as technical parole violators, while somewhere between eight and 11 percent are new offense violators. He said that the vast majority of youths that come back to the IDJJ as parole violators are coming back as technical parole violators, however, that's misleading because with an estimated 40 to 50 percent of those that coming back as technical parole violators have picked up a new charge that is dropped once they're back in IDJJ custody.

Mr. Carter said that staff recommends designating a total \$80,000 in FFY06 local funds to assist Illinois county probation departments or departments of similar functions in developing and implementing a job readiness and supervised paid internship program for probationary juveniles. He said that this is the program that was discussed the last the JCEC met. He said that a request for proposals (RFP) has been prepared and is ready to go out. He said that the program would teach youths job skills by putting them through a five or six-week job skills training program and then, upon completion of that program, the parolee would be placed into a five to six-week paid internship program to put their learned skills to use.

Mr. Carter, in response to a question by Chairman Sorosky, said that the county would build partnerships with businesses and grass roots organizations which would provide places for the probationary juveniles to work.

Director Levin said that Cook County had its own similar program and, therefore, Cook County was not intended to be included in this program. She said that she just wanted to mention that before the JCEC panel and, ultimately, it would be up to the JCEC to decide whether or not to include Cook County.

Ms. Connell said that she was aware of the situation regarding Cook County. She said that she was more concerned, however, with hearing from staff whether or not there's any support, either as a promising program or an evidence-based program, that something like this actually has a positive effect. She said that she didn't want to single this program out, since she expressed a curiosity about all of the staff recommendations put forth in the memo. She added that whether or not any of the programs presented in the memo are either based in a promising program or an evidence-based program that has proven to work is a general question for all of these programs.

Director Levin said that, regarding the SNW program, staff is in the course of process evaluation and staff has been meeting with various community groups. She said that the idea was to get all of the neighborhood coalitions and statewide stake-holder together. She said that she had personally been at three of the meetings at these sites. She said that Director Lonbom has had staff at each and every one of these groups. She said that IDOC has hosted such groups also. She said that this was a pilot program funded by the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS), the Department of Human Services (DHS), and the Authority via JABG money.

Director Levin said that Mr. Carter had discussed the juvenile pre-employment request at the last JCEC meeting in January. She said that at that time, Mr. Carter had explained the issues involving Cook County. She said that Ms. Engel had addressed the issues regarding the City of Evanston. She said that she would leave it to Director Lonbom to explain whether or not the IDJJ's program would be evidence-based.

Ms. Connell, addressing Mr. Carter, said that she did not think that there was any evaluation at all on the pre-employment program and that was her concern. She said that

she respected the fact that the SNW evaluation is in process and she said that she was very pleased that staff have been reporting back on the Evanston program. She said that she got a sense from staff at the last JCEC meeting that there was some hesitation about recommending the pre-employment program. She asked if anything had changed in the interim.

Director Levin said that she didn't recall any hesitation when the program was introduced at the last meeting.

Ms. Engel said that she thought that Ms. Connell had been very positive about the program when it was first introduced.

Mr. Carter said that he also thought the idea of the program had been well received. He said that one issue that had been discussed was the fact that not enough funds were available to support a formal evaluation process, so the JCEC talked about the possibility of providing them with more funding so that perhaps they could perform an evaluation. He said that he did not recall any negative commentary on the proposed program.

Ms. Connell said that she remembered the program being very expensive in terms of the number of kids it would serve and the length of time the program would serve them. She said that it was as expensive as some of the evidence-based programs that have established track records. She said that she hoped that this time, wherever we fund these programs, whether it's in Cook or somewhere else, that somebody gets out there and really looks at the grantees.

Mr. Carter, in response to questions by Chairman Sorosky, said that Cook County's Project Reclaim has operated since 2005. He also said that, as was revealed in discussions at the last meeting, no formal evaluation has been conducted. He said that his assessment is that the program was a good concept, but he didn't want to further detail without having the proper information available.

Director Levin said that she had the impression that the JCEC wanted to pursue a pilot-type of program such as this and that was one of the reasons why the Authority took funds away from the programs that weren't working and the whole point was to do something new and innovative with the money.

Ms. Engel asked if the Authority could perform some sort of evaluation for this program. She said that she liked the idea of putting money in the pockets of kids, because one way to keep them from illegal drug trade would be to demonstrate that they can actually make money legitimately and I think that's a really good idea. She added that often a great deal of money is spent to similar programs, but it all goes to program staffs.

Chairman Sorosky said that, to follow up on what Ms. Engel said, this is not the first time these youngsters have had an opportunity to get into the cliché of the real capitalist world

in the sense that you succeed by working and doing a good job and getting paid for it. He asked if such an opportunity has any long-range value beyond the program.

Ms. Connell said that she was hoping to demonstrate just such issues. She said that if enough data is collected, then it can be shown that not only can the youths get attached to the work for this brief period, but that this results in a lasting avoidance of crime by becoming part of the labor force. She said that such is the data that she would like to see collected.

Director Levin said that on Page 13 of the minutes of the January 7, 2009 JCEC meeting there was a discussion about this program because the JCEC felt at the time that the Governor's office wanted to pursue similar programs. She said that the discussion also included a history of what the DHS did during the summer of 2008 in funding at-risk youths. She said that an extensive conversation had taken place at the last meeting regarding this topic and it is on Pages 13 and 14 of the minutes. She said that Mr. Straza had asked about criteria measurement factors and Ms. Engel had talked about some of the same things that she's talking about today.

Mr. Ahitow said that this reminded him of the old Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and Work Experience Career Exploration Program (WECEP) programs that existed back in the Youth Commission days that combined work experience and career exploration. He said that he was sure that there were a lot of positive evaluations of those programs, but when the funding for those programs dried up, the programs were gone. He said that he recalled that the CETA program was, "excellent."

Ms. Engel said that lots of people made it into the workplace that otherwise would have never even been there. She offered an amendment; that if more than \$80,000 is available, some portion of the extra funds be used for evaluation.

Mr. Carter said that funds were very tight at the moment, but staff would keep Ms. Engel's suggested amendment in mind.

Ms. Engel said that this program sounded like a good idea. And it doesn't sound like there's any opposition. She said that it would be helpful to know if this would formally qualify as an innovative program, although there might be a longer track record that is not addressed here.

Director Levin said that the Authority's Research and Analysis Unit could generate program profiles or some other such analysis.

Ms. Connell noted that Cook County would be eligible for the Parole Readjustment program RFP.

Motion: Mr. Straza moved to approve the FFY05 through FFY08 funding recommendations. Mr. Leofanti seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

FFY06 Request for Proposals

Mr. Ahitow asked for clarification on the difference between violent and non-violent probationary offenders, as they pertain to the RFP. Mr. Carter said that crimes against persons would be considered violent.

Chairman Sorosky asked why it wouldn't be allowed under the programming if a judge says an offender should be on probation.

Mr. Chojnacki said that business owners might not want to take chances with somebody who has been convicted of robbery or something more serious. He said that for such reasons, it would probably be a lot easier to operate the program exclusively with non-violent offenders as opposed to having the program inclusive of both violent and non-violent offenders.

Mr. Friedenauer said that if the court so determines that a youth, regardless of the crime committed, is suitable for probation and the nature of the offense is used to determine risk then that would assume that an offense for a crime against a person would be a more serious offense than a crime against property or a drug violation. He said that resources should be concentrated on the higher-risk probationers. He said that it is best to marshal high resources with high-risk youths, not low-risk youths. He said that for this reason, the high-risk youths should not be excluded, but they are ones who very much should be included.

Ms. Barrett said that maybe an assessment should be done to determine what types of offenders would most benefit from this type of program. She said that would match risk and need with the actual program.

Ms. Connell concurred with Ms. Barrett. She said that she would limit what a probation office could do by virtue of directing them to a particular population. She said that the probation offices would be acquainted with any potential employers and they know the kids on their probation caseloads and they can handle the most serious offenders, even ones who have committed crimes against persons, and if the probation office can match these offenders with employers who would take them then this is a good idea. This would give them discretion as opposed to forcing them one way or another.

Ms. Engel said that it makes the most sense to reach the kids who are going to be hardest and most likely to get into trouble unless they are offered a really different kind of opportunity. She said that she agreed with Mr. Friedenauer that efforts could be spared on

the kids who would probably be alright anyway. She said that some resources should be focused on kids for whom it is more important that our culture addresses.

Ms. Barrett said that intervention should be tied in based on risk, need, and assets. Adding that component would better match the kids and would produce better outcomes.

Director Levin said that she wanted to be sure the staff knew that the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI), or something similar, should be used on the RFP.

Ms. Engel said that she thought there was a pending amendment to not preclude it automatically, but it would be at the discretion of the probation officer who has direct contact with the individual youth.

Mr. Ahitow said that simply by removing the term “non-violent” from the RFP was what he was trying to address. He noted that the third line in the first paragraph of the RFP read, “...selected, non-violent, juvenile probationers...”

Ms. Barrett suggested that the program be tied to assessment.

Chairman Sorosky said that if the term “non-violent” was removed, then the RFP would comply with Ms. Barrett’s request that the program be based on assessment; that all youths would be assessed and, conceivably, a non-violent offender could be found by the probation department to not be a good risk for a job for whatever reason.

Motion: Mr. Ahitow moved to remove the term “non-violent” from the RFP program summary. Mr. Leofanti seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Engel said that the RFP called for a lot of reporting on households; total occupied housing units, owner occupied housing units, renter occupied housing units, vacant housing units. She said that none of this information would be accurate because there are daily foreclosures and unless they are just using the census bureau and we could get that data too, it isn’t necessary to make these applicants jump through these particular hoops.

Mr. Carter said that many communities and a lot of counties have updated information and if they do not use the 2000 census, they’re using 2005 through 2007 estimates or they have proactive village administrators who maintain annual assessments. Reasonably good data does exist.

Mr. Carter, in response to a question by Ms. Engel, said that this data would be important in making determinations especially when evaluators consider male and female households, households with no spouse present, with children under a certain age, etc.

Ms. Engel said that she agreed that such information is important, especially the stuff that looks like it’s more demographic for a particular place and that it might indicate a changing environment. She voiced concern that the application might appear

overwhelming and that might discourage some entities from applying. She suggested limiting the application to germane questions.

Mr. Carter said that the information would help to identify a county or an area that is in relative financial and/or social need. Social and economic data is important in evaluation.

Ms. Engel said that if the information is useful and nobody feels that the questions would be a deterrent for potential applicants, then there's really no problem.

Motion: Chairman Sorosky moved to approve the RFP, as adjusted, in its entirety. Mr. Leofanti seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Other Business / RFP Funding Cap

Ms. Engel said that there is a lot of money per the summary on Page 4 of the JABG memo. She noted that there was \$21,000 that expires in November of 2009, there is \$64,000 that will be available for approximately another year, and then there is \$526,000 that is set to expire a year from now. She said that the JCEC should discuss using the funds that are set to expire in November.

Mr. Carter said that the only issue with the \$21,000 would be that they must go to a local entity.

Ms. Engel said that there should be a bunch of "usual suspects" that the Authority can go to so as to quickly expend such funds. There's really no reason to lapse even so small an amount as \$21,000.

Mr. Carter said that staff is proactive in searching for a local agency that might be able to use these funds, but staff has been unsuccessful so far.

Director Levin said that Authority Staff Member Jessica Ashley had talked about putting this money toward training. She said that the Authority had a new Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) guide coming out soon. The new BARJ guide will deal with BARJ in schools. She said that a new BARJ training, to accompany the new guide, would be an appropriate use of these funds.

Ms. Engel said that demand for the new BARJ guides would likely be very high.

Ms. Engel said that there is another \$274,000 in local funds and \$215,000 in state funds that basically needs to be spent within the next year and it is important to keep that in mind.

Director Levin said that staff hasn't done much with FFY07 funds yet as the Authority usually deals in arrears. She said that FFY07 funds are expected to receive an extension, so their expiration date is really in 2011.

Chairman Sorosky said that the only thing that needs close attention now is the \$21,000.

Director Levin said that plenty of time remains to use those funds if the tentative plan is to use them for BARJ training.

Mr. Carter, in response to a question by Ms. Connell, said that the programs funded via the RFP, since they would be 12-month programs, would need to be up and running by November of 2009. Ideally, they would coincide with the coming school year.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Ms. Connell, said that staff had hoped to get these programs running over the summer, but managing stimulus funds has occupied a lot of staff time, so that probably wouldn't happen this summer.

Mr. Carter said that the RFP would need to be out for at least 30 days, so if it were to be put out tomorrow, it would be mid-June by the time the RFP comes back. If all 102 counties apply, then staff would need another 30 to 45 days for the review process and by that time it would be early August, so August could be a realistic goal.

Director Levin said that at least two, but possibly three, grants would be generated by the RFP. She suggested adding FFY06 local funds to the RFP.

Ms. Connell suggested waiting to see what the Authority gets back in terms of applications and if five or six come in that staff thinks are excellent then there is no reason why funds couldn't be moved at that point. She said that this would be preferable to moving the funds now and forgetting how it might be spent for those months.

Ms. Engel said that if there is an extension forthcoming on FFY06 funds, then staff could afford to wait to see if a number of good applications come in, but an announcement should be made that more than just two or three applications would be chosen for funding because some agencies might not apply because they might assume that they would not get chosen. She said that if between \$80,000 and \$140,000 was available for the RFP, staff would have the ability to spend more if good proposals come in.

Mr. Carter, in response to a question by Mr. Straza, said that individual counties would likely serve as implementing agencies, but whatever department within that county's government they assign to probation would likely be treated as the program agency. In response to a question by Ms. Engel, Mr. Carter said that individual counties would be able to decide which departments would execute the program; this is in the event that a county without a formal probation department is selected.

Ms. Engel said that the motion under consideration is that the Authority would put out an RFP and the amount would not exceed \$144,750, with the other details as described in the memo. This would allow for between \$80,000 and \$144,750 to be used, depending on what applications are received.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Ms. Engel, said that the Authority might need to build \$25,000 into the RFP for evaluation purposes. She said that if staff can have discretion to add in an evaluation component (she hoped costs wouldn't be more than \$5,000 per county), that would be great, but she would need to talk to somebody else to figure out how much an evaluation component would cost. She said that with some leeway, staff could build an evaluation component that would be helpful.

Ms. Connell said that the amount for evaluations should not exceed \$40,000.

Chairman Sorosky said that the motion would reflect that evaluation would not exceed \$40,000.

Director Levin asked for staff to be allowed some discretion in funding evaluation. She said that \$20,000 might not even be needed. She said that \$20,000 for evaluation would be too expensive for a \$40,000 grant. She said that she anticipated that evaluation would cost somewhere between \$5,000, \$10,000, or maybe \$15,000, but she said that she would hope not even \$15,000 if for a \$40,000 grant.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Mr. Straza, said that each approved program would track their respective youths for 12 months. She said that if staff used the tracking numbers with the evaluations, this could possibly be done in-house. She said that if the JCEC wanted to consider doing this again in the future, it would want to see some reasonable results from this RFP.

Mr. Straza said that in terms of a basic questionnaire to collect data, the questionnaire should be included in the RFP package so that potential applicants would know what they must comply with in the first monthly report.

Director Levin said that the motion would put forth \$144,750 for the RFP, but without the evaluation component.

Motion: Ms. Engel moved to cap the RFP at \$144,750. Mr. Straza seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Adjourn

Chairman Sorosky moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Engel seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MEMORANDUM

TO: Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) Members

FROM: John Chojnacki, Associate Director, Federal and State Grants Unit

DATE: July 23, 2009

RE: **FFY05 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program**
FFY06 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program
FFY07 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program

This memo describes proposed adjustments to the FFY05, FFY06, and FFY07 Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) plans.

Designation Reductions

Illinois Violence Prevention Authority:

At the May 12, 2009 JCEC, Staff recommended designating a total of \$144,220 to the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority (IVPA) to support its Safety Net Works program. The amount of this designation was made from three federal fiscal year awards:

Federal Fiscal Year Award	Amount
FFY05	\$31,191
FFY06	\$43,305
FFY07	\$69,724
Total	\$144,220

On July 9, 2009 the IVPA notified the Authority that it no longer wished to receive these funds. Citing the fiscal and program data reporting requirements relating to the 2009 Justice Assistance Grants American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (JAG/ARRA) funds recently awarded to the Safety Net Works program as so overwhelming that compliance would detract from its ability to manage the funds.

Recommended Designations

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority:

Staff recommends designating a total of \$21,958 in FFY05 lapsed state/discretionary-use funds to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority's Research and Analysis Unit (R&A). R&A will use this funding for the purpose of providing three one-day seminars on Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) and schools for school administrators, social workers, and teachers. These seminars will be held in conjunction with the release of the latest BARJ implementation guide, *BARJ and Schools*. The seminars will be held in three locations across the state; northern, central, and southern, during the fall of 2009. Individuals chosen to be seminar facilitators will be professionals who are experts on how to incorporate BARJ into schools in Illinois. These funds will cover facilitator expenses as well as venue rental, audio/visual needs, working lunch fees, materials, and additional accommodations.

Summary of Available FFY05 - FFY08 Funds

The table below describes currently available funds, assuming the adoption of the recommendations described in the memo above by the JCEC and the Authority's Budget Committee:

Available Funds	FFY05	FFY06	FFY07	FFY08	Total
Local	\$0	\$0	\$274,621	\$281,402	\$556,023
State / Discretionary	\$31,191	\$43,305	\$108,221	\$308,920	\$491,637
Available Interest Earned as of 6/15/09	\$337	\$2,042	\$39,465	\$13,094	\$54,938
Total	\$31,528	\$45,347	\$422,307	\$603,416	\$1,102,598
Expiration Date	11/26/09	11/26/10	11/26/09	5/31/10	

Staff will be available at the meeting to answer any questions.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) Members

FROM: John Chojnacki, Associate Director, Federal and State Grants Unit

DATE: July 24, 2009

RE: **FFY05 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program**
FFY06 Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program

This memo describes proposed adjustments to the FFY05 and FFY06 Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) plans. This memo is a supplement to the memo dated July 23, 2009 that JCEC members received in their hard-copy meeting materials that were sent to them.

Recommended Designations

FFY05: Department of Human Services – Youth Network Council, Court and Law Enforcement Personnel Training

Staff recommends designating \$30,000 to the Illinois Department of Human Services for the purposes of contracting with the Youth Network Council to provide court and law enforcement personnel training. Specifically, trainings on integrated approaches to juvenile justice and the Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI) will be offered to court/probation personnel and youth services organizations.

FFY06: Macon County States Attorney's Office – Truancy Court Program

The Macon County States Attorney's Office, in collaboration with Decatur Public Schools District 61, developed and implemented a student truancy monitoring and truancy court program for the district's middle school. This program was initiated for the 2008/09 school year and works to identify students who have recorded 10 or more unexcused school absences in each of the past two school years. Once identified, students are required to attend "Creating Lasting Family Connections" classes or various other sanctions imposed by a peer jury trained in the principles of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ). These peer jurors also take on mentoring roles for the truant students.

The Macon County States Attorney's Office has identified a need to expand this program into the MacArthur High School. The high school has identified approximately 150 chronic truants in the 9th grade and this program will attempt to serve 15 to 20 percent of these students in the first year.

Staff recommends designating \$45,347 in FFY06 JABG funds to provide the Macon County States Attorney's Office with start-up funds for the MacArthur High School truancy program. These funds will cover costs associated with the truancy court's director's salary/benefits, case manager salary/benefits, telephone, travel, and service provider subcontracts.

Summary of Available FFY05 - FFY08 Funds

The table below describes currently available funds, assuming the adoption of the recommendations described in the memo above and in the original memo, dated July 23, 2009, by the JCEC and the Authority's Budget Committee:

Available Funds	FFY05	FFY06	FFY07	FFY08	Total
Local	\$0	\$0	\$274,621	\$281,402	\$556,023
State / Discretionary	\$1,191	\$0	\$108,221	\$308,920	\$418,332
Available Interest Earned as of 6/15/09	\$337	\$0	\$39,465	\$13,094	\$52,896
Total	\$1,528	\$0	\$422,307	\$603,416	\$1,027,251
Expiration Date	11/26/09	11/26/10	*5/31/10	*5/31/11	

* Note: Corrected fund expiration date.

Staff will be available at the meeting to answer any questions.