Brian Moran, Chairman
Jeffrey Aaron
Andrew K. Block, Jr.
Kimberley C. Lipp
Janet S. Lung
Scott Reiner

COMMONWEALTH *of* VIRGINIA

Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

August 23, 2016
9:00 a.m.
Patrick Henry Building
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Task Force Members Present: Brian Moran, Victoria Cochran, Andrew "Andy" K. Block, Jr., Jeffrey "Jeff" Aaron, Janet Lung, Kimberley Lipp, and Scott Reiner

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Brian Moran called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the June 14, 2016, Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers (Task Force) meeting were provided for approval. On MOTION duly made by Andy Block and seconded by Jeff Aaron, the minutes were approved as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Allison Gilbreath, Juvenile Justice Foster Care Policy Analyst for Voices for Virginia's Children (Voices), believes that Virginia youth need a continuum of services that includes alternatives to youth prisons. Voices considers the recommendation to commit $40 million to a new juvenile prison in Chesapeake premature and feels that it locks the state into spending a great sum of money on yet another large youth prison. Ms. Gilbreath stated that Voices is a steering committee member for the RISE Coalition and supports the comments made today by their partners.

Donna Sayegh, citizen, stated that she became involved in the Task Force to help with the decision-making process. Ms. Sayegh remarked that for the Department of Corrections to spend $40 million in taxpayers' money without the citizens' consent is not upholding their oath of office to the Virginia constitution. Ms. Sayegh went on to talk about the International Institute for Restorative Practice in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and provided a notebook to Chairman Moran. Ms. Sayegh asked the Task Force members to meet with her after the meeting to review this information.

Mark Strandquist, Performing Statistics, works with incarcerated youth in the Richmond Detention Center. Mr. Strandquist was saddened to see the Task Force does not reflect the disproportionate

minority impact of the system. Mr. Strandquist played a recording of a youth reading a poem about his experiences in the system.

Kandise Lucas, Advocate with Advocates for Equity in Schools, commented on the significant lack of diversity on the Task Force, noting the absence of individuals who have been incarcerated and representatives from communities most impacted by the prisons and said that it was extremely problematic. Ms. Lucas talked about her concerns with the school to prison pipeline in Virginia and recommended using the $40 million to improve services and create proactive interventions for children instead of building a juvenile prison.

Laura Goren, Research Director at the Commonwealth Institute for Fiscal Analysis, noted that she was glad to see the analysis in the Task Force interim report showing that Virginia's current facilities are far too large to safely and effectively provide the treatment and community connections that our young people need to become productive adults. Ms. Goren talked about the crime rate of young people in other states, encouraged the Task Force to consider other community-based alternatives, and asked the Task Force to consider what can be done to hold youth safely and accountable outside of state-run facilities.

Gina Lyles, Performing Statistics, is a volunteer at the Richmond Juvenile Detention Center. Ms. Lyles read from the Performing Statistics newspaper on the voices of the youth in the system. Ms. Lyles discussed the need to support the youth by putting money towards programs and alternatives to incarceration, the importance of diversity, the impact of the school to prison pipeline, and the need to invest in the youth and community.

Tonya Osinkosky, Community Organizer for RISE for Youth, is concerned with the lack of engagement by the community and the Task Force. Ms. Osinkosky is concerned with the fact that an interim report was released before the town hall meetings were held. Ms. Osinkosky urged the Task Force to engage with the communities.

Tonya Jefferson, citizen and Special Education Doctoral student at George Washington University, talked about her dissertation on English language learners in the juvenile justice system, social injustice, and shared information from a public policy institute she attended at George Washington University. Ms. Jefferson also noted the lack of diversity on the Task Force and the need for a trauma-enforced advocate within the group.

Chairman Moran expressed his appreciation to the public comment speakers. Chairman Moran noted that he is confident that this radical transformation of the system is the way forward to have justice in Virginia for juveniles. Chairman Moran re-emphasized that the composition of the Task Force comes directly from the budget language written by the Virginia General Assembly. Chairman Moran continues to be frustrated and believes that we are talking over each other because everything mentioned in public comment is exactly what the Governor's Office and the Department of Juvenile Justice (Department) are trying to achieve through this transformation.

Chairman Moran hopes that a consensus can be reached by all involved after the end of the meeting. The discussion on the agenda includes the Missouri Model and the Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) assessment. Chairman Moran stated that the AECF spearheaded a comprehensive study of Virginia's failed juvenile justice system. The failure was already known, but an objective third party validator was needed. The AECF did a phenomenal job of studying Virginia's system. The AECF helped provide a

narrative to present to the Virginia General Assembly, and successfully developed what Chairman Moran is confident is a transformative process to provide opportunity and hope for our youth in Virginia.

EDUCATION PROGRAM
Lisa Floyd, Deputy Director of Education, Department

Dr. Floyd presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Department's educational program. The following are highlighted points of her presentation. The PowerPoint can be found on the Department's website at www.djj.virginia.gov.

Slide 4
This slide reinforces the fact that the Department is teaching the most challenged students in Virginia who have had significant trauma exposure.

Slide 5
The Department's educational services range from 6th grade through 12th grade with youth coming into the program well below grade level.

Slide 6
The Department's Division of Education has started using the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) system which is also used in Virginia's public schools. It measures the youth's reading, math, and language levels and provides a baseline for the youth just entering the program to allow staff to differentiate/individualize the youth's instruction.

Slide 11
The federal core content and state aligned courses include Math, English, History, Science, Physical Education, Art, Business, Marketing, and Keyboard. Courses are available for the academically challenged. All courses are offered in public schools, which will allow for a smooth transition when the residents return to their home schools.

Slide 12
Professional development for educational staff has expanded based on need and content. The Department's teachers attend Department of Education-sponsored training and also work on pacing guides and curriculum alignment. In addition, teachers are being taught instructional interventions to better manage youth behavior. Additionally, the Department has an ongoing partnership with Commonwealth Autism, and has partnered with Penn Foster.

Slide 14
Personal Development Courses include art, music, robotics, STEM, and sculpture.

Industry Certification includes certified vendors who teach dog handling, fiber optics, safe serve, and medical coding and billing.

College Courses included 26 youth participating in 2015 and 20 enrolled for this year.

Slide 17

With the Community Treatment Model, the youth are being taught in groups and at multiple levels. Space will be needed to accommodate these different groups. Teachers need a space to store their items, for planning, or to conduct professional development. Space is also needed for the big ticket items such as graduation and the large professional development sessions.

Slide 19

Radios currently are the most used form of communication within the Department's facilities. The education personnel would like a robust intercom system with call buttons, much like what most public schools use to make communication easier and assessable.

The movement piece is critical to security and safety needs. In a new facility, minimizing the time it takes residents to arrive at their classrooms is important and should be considered.

DELIVERING OPTIMAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SECURE ENVIRONMENTS

Stewart Roberson Ed.D, Chairman/President/CEO of Mosely Architects

Dr. Roberson presented a PowerPoint presentation from the architectural team of Moseley Architects and RRMM Architects. The presentation provided their perspectives and experiences with educational and detention correctional design. The following are highlighted points from their presentation. The PowerPoint can be found on the Department's website at www.djj.virginia.gov.

Slide 5

This slide illustrates Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Needs, which shows how students learn. Maslow's work has been foundational, focusing on psychological health. It is predicated on fulfilling innate needs leading to a state of thriving to self-actualization. You will not thrive without attending to the basic and psychological needs at the bottom of the chart.

Slide 6

This slide identifies the Taxonomy of Learning by Benjamin Bloom. Bloom created this scheme to suggest that teachers should design learning to incorporate foundational understandings and move students to a higher order of thinking skills. This will allow the students to be the most effective problem solvers possible, especially in real world settings.

One of the perceived goals of the Task Force is to examine how environments may be designed to enable students to earn a level of independence while they are still residents and successfully re-enter the general population.

Mr. Roberson introduced Mr. Douglas Westmoreland from Mosely Architects to continue the presentation.

Slide 16

The cornerstone of an educational space is the general academic classroom. The Department needs a space to handle 8 to 10 students who are in multiple grades with multiple abilities, including the post-secondary residents. The space should have the capability for individualized learning, access to technology, and group and collaborative learning.

Slide 17

There will be a need for laboratory space either within the general classroom or a separate specialized lab.

Slide 18

Career and Technical Education (CTE) is an important element in the Department's education program and has its challenges. CTE courses are specialized and need a specific environment for their instruction. Culinary Arts, Cosmetology, and digital graphic design are hard to teach in a typical classroom. Choosing the types of programs and spaces for the CTE courses is important.

The struggle with CTE in most districts in the Commonwealth is finding what courses interest the students. For example, Culinary Arts and Cosmetology are the top two CTE courses available with job openings. Horticulture and building trades are the biggest demands in the Commonwealth, but students are not interested in taking those courses. Students also decline to take programs such as masonry, carpentry, and heating/air conditioning because they do not want careers in these areas. It is a balance between the students' interests and affordable courses.

Slide 19

The library is an important area in schools where students can meet to collaborate and have access to technology. The library is the center of the educational environment.

Mr. Westmoreland introduced Mr. Ben Motley of RRMM Architects to continue the presentation.

Slide 21

Fine and Visual Arts is another type of educational space that is important to have.

Slide 22

Reflection Rooms are another type of educational space that creates and supports the idea of pulling back and considering the situation.

Slide 23

Conference rooms in a variety of settings with a variety of furniture give support to intimate family and counseling gatherings.

Slide 24

This slide displays a conventional gym. Other recreational spaces in a public school include wellness rooms, fitness centers, and even climbing walls. Allowing for movement and exercise is important.

Slide 25

This slide shows support spaces that many educational facilities are lacking, such as breakout rooms, smaller instructional spaces, and spaces like workrooms and mechanical rooms.

Slide 27

This slide shows the visual stimulation of the building itself and its interior.

Slide 30
The outdoors is rich with opportunities for learning. Some students are invigorated by the outdoors. Courtyards or amphitheaters can serve as instructor space and reinforce learning.

Slide 31
Access to technology is necessary, as students must learn technology to prepare for future careers.

Slide 32
The ongoing debate regarding libraries questions whether there is more value in the books and quiet spaces the library offers versus technology in libraries. The reality is some students respond better to a book while others respond better to technology. The library is a space with a variety of opportunities.

Mr. Motley introduced Mr. Westmoreland to continue the presentation.

Slide 34
Acoustics is important in an educational setting. Students may struggle in school because they cannot hear, and teachers struggle because they project their voices loudly all day. Examples of bad acoustics include background noise, loud mechanical systems, and the hum of old florescent lights. These are distractions for both students and teachers.

Slide 35
There are many studies on the benefits of natural daylight, including that it enhances the comfort and learning levels in the classroom.

Slide 36
For kinesthetic learners and students with disabilities, sitting still can be challenging. Several studies show that movement helps students learn.

Mr. Westmoreland introduced Carrie Henaghan from Mosely Architects to continue the presentation.

Slide 41
Sightlines must be established to ensure safety and security of not only the students but also teachers, staff, volunteers, and other individuals in the building. Spaces should be created that are open and have good sightlines to enable security officers to see the entire space.

Windows are another major design component, and in a correctional type setting must be strategically placed. Views should not be distracting. Teachers may need a window into another class or the hallway to feel safer. Therapeutic spaces promote positive thoughts and the use of wall color to excite the students.

Slide 44
Technology is essential in the educational setting. Several companies have developed devices and hardware for the correctional environment. It is important to install the proper infrastructure in the facility to allow for maximum flexibility, as it may be too difficult to retrofit the building later. Infrastructure should be secured within the walls, and not exposed, to avoid suicide risks. These elements should be considered during the design phase.

Slide 45
The library should be a flexible space to accommodate the different learning styles.

Slide 46
Designers should consider places where carpeting can be used, along with different kinds of ceiling panels, to help with noise reduction.

Slide 47
Movement inside and outside a secure facility is controlled. There are no free movements with individuals being escorted and observed at all times. Staff and student movements should be considered during the design phase. Points of consideration include: location of bathrooms (if the bathrooms are outside the classroom the students will need to be escorted), sightlines for the courtyard or outside area, and wiggle chairs for students with ADHD.

Slide 48
Spaces should have flexibility for breakout sessions or individual learning. This will require a space larger than a classroom that can be arranged according to the type of learning session. Each room should have its own storage space so tools used to break down a room can be locked up and not pose a safety issue.

Chairman Moran noted the cost of many of these amenities and asked if it is a reasonable expense?

Mr. Westmoreland said that it was too early in the process to determine the expenses. There are two things that affect construction cost: the size and the quality. There is speculation that the facility will cost more than the typical Virginia K-12 high school mainly because of security. However, these are smaller spaces with classrooms for 8 to 10 students. Mr. Westmoreland noted that the architect workgroup believes that delivering 21st century learning requires 21st century programs and a 21st century environment.

Slide 49
This slide lists a number of questions to consider that will affect the cost of the facility as this project moves forward with an architect.

Chairman Moran thanked the presenters and asked for questions.

Board Member Kimberley Lipp remarked that her biggest take away from the presentation is that the right spaces are needed before programs can be effective. Board Member Lipp asked the architect team who visited the Department's facilities what they felt was missing from the education area.

Mr. Westmoreland noted the technology piece is missing and the library was depressing.

Board Member Lipp remarked that what the architects are saying is that the Department currently does not have any of these spaces that have been discussed.

Mr. Westmoreland said in their tour of the Bon Air facility, the old dining room was the nicest space in the facility.

Board Member Andy Block stated that Departmental staff works well with the available spaces, but there are limitations.

Board Member Jeff Aaron noted that the current space is too big and the plans are to significantly downsize. Board Member Aaron believes Missouri tried to refurbish some of their already constructed space. This would create a cost in Virginia and may not lead to the same outcomes. Board Member Aaron asked for a sense of the cost and value of renovation compared to new construction.

Mr. Westmoreland stated that in educational design, the general rule is if it costs 75% to renovate a facility, building a new facility is recommended. Therefore, the value decision will be made after you spend 75% and see what you have. There are examples of renovated spaces that are wonderful. It is the same environment, but with a new mechanical system.

Board Member Aaron asked that given the kinds of opportunities, is it realistic to approximate those kinds of outcomes that we are looking for within that 75% cost?

Mr. Westmoreland responded that while it is within the realm of possibility, it is hard to say without knowing the specific building that will be renovated.

Board Member Aaron remarked that natural lighting is the best and asked whether, other than the hum of florescent lights, there are other benefits or drawbacks of the type of lighting used.

Mr. Westmoreland answered that they only use LED light. It is fully dimmable, better quality, and no humming.

Ms. Henaghan stated that lighting has the biggest impact in classrooms on learning and overall attitudes.

ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESS REPORT
Tom Woods, Senior Associate, Annie E. Casey Foundation

Mr. Woods presented a PowerPoint presentation on the AECF assessment and progress report. The PowerPoint can be found on the Department's website at www.djj.virginia.gov.

Slide 2
Two years ago, Secretary Moran invited the AECF to Virginia to partner in the transformation of juvenile justice. The AECF completed a wide ranging assessment of all aspects of the system, particularly the pieces that feed into and revolve around the youth who are in direct care and direct Department custody. AECF followed through with support and resources after the assessment.

The three elements of the transformation strategy include:

Reduce the population in the facilities safely, responsibly, and thoughtfully.

Reform the approach the Department takes to working with youth.

Replace its reliance on the current juvenile correctional centers (JCCs) for the following reasons: (1) The JCCs are located too far from where most youth come from and will return; (2) JCCs are built on a traditional correctional model and do not lend themselves to effective rehabilitation; and (3) JCCs are too oversized to be effective and safely managed.

The progress that has been made in each of those areas is noteworthy and proves the Department is headed in the right direction.

Slide 5

There is a significant decrease in the average length of stay for youth in direct care. The changes to the length of stay guidelines were made in a thoughtful and strategic way, informed by the data the Department captured about the youths' backgrounds, needs, and risk factors. This has brought about a renewed emphasis on reentry planning. If the Department is trying to move youth through state custody quicker, this forces the Department to make sure youth return to an environment that is more supportive, safer, and different than the one they left.

Rising to that challenge is complicated. The Department took a big first step with the award of a reentry planning grant from the federal government which brought in a new fusion of resources. The Department is applying those resources to creating a safer and more productive period of time for the youth while in the Department's care. The Department is accelerating the pace at which decisions are made based on services and supports in place as youth re-enter their communities.

Slide 6

The shaded blue area in the graph on this slide represents the increase in the number of youth in state custody being placed in a program other than a JCC. This placement is putting the youth closer to home with a shorter term and in a smaller-scale environment. At this point, the placements are primarily the Community Placement Program spots in the juvenile detention centers.

Slide 7

As the supply of alternative placements continues to expand and improve, the JCC population is not only decreasing, but the environment is becoming more manageable and safer.

Slide 8

Youth and family engagement are not limited to residents in the JCCs. They apply to every youth in direct care. The intention is to continue to expand to youth on probation or youth who have any type of level of involvement with the system.

The goals for the direct care program in the Department are stated on this slide in the circles.

Safety: The environment needs to be safe for the youth, staff, and families.

Connection: Youth should be placed where they are strongly connected in a positive way with the young people around them, the staff, and their family back home.

Purpose: Youth need to feel like they are making progress towards a goal and not just doing time. Staff should be mindful and recognize that all the accomplishments the youth made while in custody can evaporate if services are not in place when they return to the community.

Fairness: At every level and at every point in the process, youth need to be treated fairly.

These elements reinforce one another, and research evidence proves these elements can lead to a successful outcome.

Slide 10

The Department has made a significant investment in youth and family engagement. When the AECF did their assessment, more than a quarter of the young people surveyed said they had never had a family visit or had not had a family visit in more than a year. There were 30% of youth receiving family visits every month on a consistent basis. With the implementation of the Department's new transportation program, the number of transports is already over 100 per month.

There are few jurisdictions in the country that have taken to heart or found a way to operationalize the idea that family members are part of the intervention. The Department has revised the reentry planning process. The Department has identified points in the case management process for family members, staff professionals, and the youth to make decisions jointly on the youth's plans for their time in custody and for their reentry. The Department is on its way to developing a family partnership meeting model that would resemble and reflect many of the same core principles in the Department of Social Services' family partnership model.

There is a need in youth engagement to change the way they see their involvement while in the Department's care. A part of that is to reenergize the youth councils currently in the JCCs and to integrate them into a youth government. The youth government movement will develop and execute a plan that will eventually allow residents to weigh in on matters of policy and practice for the facility. This initiative is still in the developmental stages; but with the involvement and support of the Governor and other elected officials, it will be extremely worthwhile to see residents take ownership of themselves while in the Department's custody.

The youth writing elements of their own reentry plan, a practice used in Missouri, is therapeutic and requires the youth to think ahead to their eventual release. This idea has been embraced by Virginia and is part of the reentry manual upgrade. The youth is developing his or her personal action plan.

Slide 11

There is a significant change in the direct care intake and assessment process. If the right placement for a youth is not at a JCC, then the intake and assessment process can be done at a local detention center. This creates a faster and more adaptable intake process.

Slide 12

The Department is following in the footsteps of other states in using a structured dispositional matrix (SDM). An SDM is data-intensive and not based on subjectivity. The SDM will be implemented gradually and may play out differently across localities. This is a big opportunity for the Department to speak with a consistent and more effective voice. The SDM will also allow the Department to provide the court with a stronger disposition recommendation. This may reduce the likelihood that a youth will end up in the Department's custody.

In most states and jurisdictions in which AECF works, there are significant disparities by race, and Virginia is not an exception. What accounts for the disparity among races is a complex problem, but

acknowledging it and bringing it into the discussion at that decision-making point is important. One of the benefits of the SDM analysis is a more fair, consistent, and better-reformed system.

Slide 13

To the extent there is either new construction or extensive renovation as part of the transformation strategy, the proposed locations for the new JCCs would be much closer to where young people are from, especially the Chesapeake facility. About 40% of youth who are in state custody are from the eastern region, and having a placement option that is much closer to home for that population would improve the frequency and likelihood of family visitation and engagement for those youth.

Mr. Woods believes the time to do this transformation is now. It is clear from the AECF assessment that this journey will produce better results for Virginia, its communities, and its youth.

Missouri Model: Changing Juvenile Justice Systems to Achieve Better Outcomes for Youth
Mark Steward, Founder and Director, Missouri Youth Services Institute
Tom Breedlove, Senior Consultant, Missouri Youth Services Institute

Mr. Steward and Mr. Breedlove presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Missouri Model. The PowerPoint can be found on the Department's website at www.djj.virginia.gov; it includes two videos about the program.

Slide 2

Mr. Steward noted that after his 45 years in the correctional system in Missouri and 17 as Director under five Governors, he started a not-for-profit organization called the Missouri Youth Services Institute (MYSI).

Slide 4

Mr. Steward explained the history of Missouri's approach to juvenile justice and its transformation over a forty-year period. Initially, Missouri had a large, correctional-based prison with 500 beds for males and 200 beds for females. Missouri has seen immense success in its juvenile justice system in the forty years since the development of its transformation program.

Slide 5

Mr. Steward noted that he was at Bon Air yesterday and spoke with many residents who loved the Community Treatment Model. The program allows the youth to care about and get to know each other.

Missouri is a large geographical state, smaller in population than Virginia, with youth coming into the system from two central hubs of Kansas City and St. Louis.

Missouri's dual sentencing program was passed in 1995. Juveniles given an adult sentence by the court could delay their sentence if the Division of Youth Services accepted the youth into a dual sentencing facility. In Mr. Steward's 17 years as Director of the Missouri Division of Youth Services, he has had to send only one youth to an adult correctional facility.

Slide 6

The pictures on this slide are of a dual-sentencing facility in the central part of Missouri. There are four dorm buildings and an education and administrative building.

Slide 7

The picture on the left in this slide depicts a Missouri-style dorm room that is open and that the youth have decorated. Mr. Steward noticed that the youth at Bon Air have decorated their rooms. Mr. Steward remarked that in his years in youth services he has probably visited 30 juvenile facilities, and most of them look like the picture on the right; pretty correctional and not very good results.

Slide 15

Community monitors is an important program that Missouri started in 1990. Volunteers from the fire and police departments, colleges, etc., were able to enter the facility to work with the youth and help with their transition back to the community.

Slide 19

Missouri has open dorms where 10 to 12 youth can be seen at all times. Virginia's facilities should ensure that there is a process in place to monitor individual rooms. Eyes-on supervision is the key.

Slide 22

Missouri works from a relationship position; which encourages the youth to open up talk about their issues, and begin to care. Instead of punitive it is positive. Activities are to promote therapy and make the young people feel better.

Chairman Moran thanked them for their presentation and asked about the renovation of the Catholic school.

Mr. Steward remarked that the Hogan Youth Center was an old Catholic school that had everything Missouri needed to start its program (gym, classrooms, and dormitories). The building needed renovation. It was a difficult process with a high staff turnover rate and uncooperative youth, but the building was soon renovated, and the program started to work.

Mr. Tom Breedlove noted that he started at the Training School for Boys in 1977; the change process began in the late 1960s. It started slowly, with no script to follow. It took decades to get where Missouri is today. The training in Virginia started in May of last year. It has been pretty fast and furious. The Department is on target to convert all units in its facilities to CTM units by the end of the calendar year. Currently, there are 14 CTM units in place. Change is a process and does not happen overnight. Young people take a step forward and sometimes two back, which can be expected in the journey. However, Mr. Breedlove noted that the transformation process appears to be working in Virginia and that both youth and staff are responding well to the various changes.

Task Force Member Aaron asked the MYSI Consultants if the facility size is critical.

Mr. Steward said the main focus is what happens within the facility. Missouri built its facilities for several different reasons based on need in the different regions. Missouri built at the beginning and then renovated different sites like convents, schools, and job corps sites. Some sites did not promote a good environment for the youth or the staff. Virginia should weigh the options of what you have and what can be converted. The newer sites fit the model exactly; the spaces are bright and open. When MYSI recommends building, it is for 10 to 12 youth in a unit. Ten youth is a good number to have in a group. There are units with only 8 youth, but they require individualized attention. Fourteen youth in a group becomes difficult to manage.

Task Force Member Aaron asked about whether Mr. Steward advocate for dorms over single rooms.

Mr. Steward responded that they reviewed the data and realized there had been no suicides in the last 50 years due to the eyes-on supervision. For Missouri, the open dorms worked better because of the development of the program and the culture.

Deputy Secretary Victoria Cochran asked about design flexibility and asked whether a facility could start with individual rooms, and later shift to dorm style rooms with movable walls.

Mr. Steward noted that MYSI discussed that kind of design idea for a place in Washington, DC, but it did not work; sliding doors were not a good fit. Decisions should be made early during the design phase if you want dorm style.

Chairman Moran thanked everyone for their participation and the important information shared and commented that he wanted to have a meeting at one of the facilities, but it would have been challenging with logistics and security. Chairman Moran encouraged the Task Force members to visit either Bon Air or Beaumont.

The next meeting of the Task Force will be in October at a date to be confirmed.

SIGN-IN SHEET

Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers
August 23, 2016

Please Print

1. Bryna Dunn
2. Carrie Hanagan
3. Doug Westmoreland
4. BEN MOTLEY
5. ROB BERZ
6. Stewart Robertson
7. Angela Valentine
8. JACK Ledden
9. Greg Davy
10. Amy Woolard
11. Donna Sayegh -SP
12. Angela Cirilli
13. Joyce E. Holman
14. Lisa Floyd
15. Breauna Bensley

SIGN-IN SHEET

Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers
August 23, 2016

Please Print

16. [illegible]
17. Tim [illegible]
18. Allison Gilbreath - SP
19. Mark [illegible]
20. Carmen Dougherty
21. Mark Strandquist - SP
22. Will Egen
23. [illegible] Jones
24. Kandise Lucas - SP
25. Valerie Boykin
26. Kristen Peterson
27. Jessica Schneider
28. ~~KEN~~ JANOURA
29. Laura Goren - SP
30. Gina Lyles - SP

SIGN-IN SHEET

Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers
August 23, 2016

Please Print

31. Tonya Osinkosky - SP
32. Tonya N. Jefferson - SP
33. Janet Lung
34. Becky Bowers-Lanier
35. Scott Reiner
36. Kimberly Lipp
37. Jeff Aaron
38. Victoria Cochran
39. Dick Hickman
40. David Reynolds
41. Charlie Schmidt
42. Michael Martz
43. Mary Ann Saunders, City of Ches.
44. Daryl Francis
45. Julie McConnell

SIGN-IN SHEET

Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Centers
August 23, 2016

Please Print

45. DaQuon Beaver

46. Caleb Smith

47.

48.

49.

50.

51.

52.

53.

54.

55.

56.

57.

58.