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Webinar Recording and Evaluation Survey

• This webinar is being recorded and will be made available online to view later
• After the webinar, you will receive a notice asking you to complete a webinar evaluation survey. Thank you in advance for completing the webinar evaluation survey. Your feedback is important to us.
Tips for viewing this webinar:

• The questions box and buttons are on the right side of the webinar window.

• This box can collapse so that you can better view the presentation. To unhide the box, click the arrows on the top left corner of the panel.

• If you are having technical difficulties, please send us a message via the questions box on your right. Our organizer will reply to you privately and help resolve the issue.
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Stepping Up: A National Initiative to Reduce the Number of People with Mental Illnesses in Jails

Reducing the Number of People with Mental Illnesses in Jail
Six Questions County Leaders Need to Ask

Released in January 2017

To read the full report, please visit:
https://stepuptogether.org/updates/stepping_up_releases_foundational_report
Reminder: To Reduce the Number of People With Mental Illnesses in Jails, County Leaders Should Ask These Questions

1. Is your leadership committed?

2. **Do you have timely screening and assessment?**

3. Do you have baseline data?

4. Have you conducted a comprehensive process analysis and service inventory?

5. Have you prioritized policy, practice, and funding?

6. Do you track progress?
Reminder: Four Key Measures To Track Progress of Stepping Up Efforts

1. Reduce the number of people with mental illness booked into jail
2. Shorten the average length of stay for people with mental illnesses in jails
3. Increase the percentage of people with mental illnesses in jail connected to the right services and supports
4. Lower rates of recidivism
People with Mental Illnesses May Have Many “Central 8” Dynamic Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static Factors</th>
<th>“Central 8” Dynamic Factors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>1. History of antisocial behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of arrests</td>
<td>2. Antisocial personality pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of convictions</td>
<td>3. Antisocial cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of Offenses</td>
<td>4. Antisocial associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Charges</td>
<td>5. Family and/or martial discord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first arrest</td>
<td>6. Poor school and/or work performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td>7. Few leisure/recreation outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8. Substance Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dynamic factors predict recidivism more strongly than mental illness

Question 2: Do You Have Timely Screening and Assessment?

- System-wide definition of mental illness
- System-wide definition of substance use disorders
- Validated screening and assessment tools for mental illness and substance use
- Efficient screening and assessment process
- Validated assessment for pretrial risk
- Mechanisms for information sharing
System-Wide Definition of Serious Mental Illness

Work with county partners in **behavioral health and corrections** to obtain consensus on the definition of whom should be included

**Range of criteria for counties’ definition, including:**

- The need for psychotropic medication
- Service utilization data, such as data matching
- Specific diagnoses or “flags”
- State or county definitions for “serious” and/or “persistent” mental illnesses
- Do **NOT** include acuity of symptoms, such as suicidality
- Do **NOT** include people posing behavioral challenges within jail

**Questions to ask when choosing a definition:**

- What will the definition(s) be used for?
- How does the definition(s) relate to your Stepping Up objectives?
- How practical is obtaining the information needed to establish your definition(s)?
- What resources are available/needed to establish your definition(s)?
- How soon can you start using your definition(s)?

System-Wide Definition of Substance Use Disorders

**Substance Use Disorders:**

Substance use disorders occur when the recurrent use of alcohol and/or drugs causes clinically and functionally significant impairment, such as health problems, disability, and failure to meet major responsibilities at work, school, or home. According to the DSM-5, a diagnosis of substance use disorder is based on evidence of impaired control, social impairment, risky use, and pharmacological criteria.

**Severity of Substance Use Disorder:**
- **Mild** presence of 2-3 symptoms
- **Moderate** 4-5 symptoms
- **Severe** 6 or more symptoms

**Diagnoses associated with substance class:**
- Alcohol Use Disorder
- Cannabis Use Disorder
- Hallucinogen Use Disorder
- Opioid Use Disorder
- Stimulant Use Disorder
- Tobacco Use Disorder

**Co-occurring Substance Use and Mental Disorders:** Clients are said to have co-occurring disorders when at least one disorder of each type can be established independently of the other and is not simply a cluster of symptoms resulting from a single disorder.

Source: SAMHSA Substance Use Disorders: [https://www.samhsa.gov/disorders/substance-use](https://www.samhsa.gov/disorders/substance-use) and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fifth Edition: [https://psychiatry.org/dsm5](https://psychiatry.org/dsm5)
Validated Screening and Assessment Tools for Mental illness and Substance Use

**Screening Tools**
- Short in duration
- Can use information routinely available, such as demographics and charges
- Can be self-administered (if appropriate)
- Can be administered by properly trained jail, behavioral health, or community provider staff
- Does not identify the nature or severity of the problem, but determines whether a full assessment is warranted

**Assessment Tools**
- A longer process that collects more comprehensive information from multiple sources to confirm screens, such as:
  - Pathways to criminal involvement, criminogenic needs, clinical needs, strengths and protective factors, and social and community needs
  - Conducted by appropriately trained professionals
  - Should take place as people proceed through criminal justice settings and as new issues emerge

*Example Screening Tools*
- Brief Jail Mental Health Screen
- Texas Christian University Drug Screen V (TCUDS V)
- Correctional Mental Health Screen
- Mental Health Screening Form III

*Stepping Up does not endorse the use of any specific screening and assessment tools
Conduct universal screening as early as booking and throughout the criminal justice continuum, and confirm positive screenings by conducting a full clinical assessment by a licensed mental health professional.

**Initial Screenings/Assessments Inform:**
- Immediate treatment needs
- Diversion decisions
- Pre-trial decisions (FTA, risk of new crime, risk of violence, release conditions)
- Jail management
- Criminogenic risk

**Subsequent Screenings/Assessments Inform:**
- Sentencing
- Criminogenic risk and needs
- Community supervision case planning
- Programming and treatment needs
- Reentry strategy
- Programming effectiveness
Validated Assessment for Pretrial Risk

Research shows that **detaining low-risk defendants**, even just for a few days, is strongly correlated with **higher rates of new criminal activity**, both during the pretrial period and years after case disposition.

**Purpose of Validated Pretrial Risk Assessments:**

1. To inform judges on which defendants are low or high risk for failure to appear in court, committing a new crime if released, and likelihood of violence.
2. To help judges decide if a defendant should be released to the community or detained in jail during the pretrial stage.
3. To help judges set appropriate pretrial conditions for the defendant, if released.

**LJAF 2013 report shows:**

1) Low-risk defendants had a **40% higher chance of committing new crime before trial** when held 2-3 days compared to those held one day or less and
2) Low-risk defendants had a **51% higher chance of committing new crime** in the next two years when held 8-14 days compared to one day or less.

The Criminogenic and Behavioral Health Needs Framework

Low Criminogenic Risk (low)

- Mild/Low Severity of Substance Use Disorder (low)
  - Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
    - Group 1: I-L
      - CR: low
      - SUD: low
      - MI: low
    - Group 2: II-L
      - CR: low
      - SUD: low
      - MI: mod/high

- Serious Mental Illness (med/high)
  - Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
    - Group 3: III-L
      - CR: low
      - SUD: low
      - MI: mod/sev
    - Group 4: IV-L
      - CR: low
      - SUD: low
      - MI: med/high

High Severity of Substance Use Disorder (moderate/severe)

- Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
  - Serious Mental Illness (med/high)
    - Group 5: I-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: low
      - MI: low
    - Group 6: II-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: low
      - MI: mod/sev

- Serious Mental Illness (med/high)
  - Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
    - Group 7: III-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: mod/sev
      - MI: low
    - Group 8: IV-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: mod/sev
      - MI: med/high

Medium to High Criminogenic Risk (med/high)

- Mild/Low Severity of Substance Use Disorder (low)
  - Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
    - Group 5: I-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: low
      - MI: low
    - Group 6: II-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: low
      - MI: mod/sev

- Serious Mental Illness (med/high)
  - Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)
    - Group 7: III-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: mod/sev
      - MI: low
    - Group 8: IV-H
      - CR: med/high
      - SUD: mod/sev
      - MI: med/high

Low Severity of Mental Illness (low)

Serious Mental Illness (med/high)

Mild/Low Severity of Substance Use Disorder (low)

Serious Mental Illness (med/high)

Medium to High Criminogenic Risk (med/high)

High Severity of Substance Use Disorder (mod/sev)

Mild/Low Severity of Substance Use Disorder (low)

High Severity of Substance Use Disorder (mod/sever)
Mechanisms for Information Sharing

What can the planning committee do?

- Meet on a regular basis and get IT staff involved
- Form partnerships through contractual arrangements
- Develop uniform authorization or consent forms where clients can give advance permission for sharing information among multiple agencies
- Create a flag process that serves as an indicator of the need to connect people to services
- Ongoing training and regular reviews to improve information-sharing processes

What is the gold standard for information sharing?

An Integrated Data System

- Allows multiple agencies to enter and access data
- Also important to collect baseline data (Question 3) and to track progress (Question 6)

The **Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)** allows a mental health care clinician to share the name of a current patient and the day and time of the most recent treatment with a law enforcement officer who needs the information to locate a suspect.

**42 CFR Part 2** is the federal legislation regarding the sharing of information on substance use disorders and is more restrictive.
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Background

- Total County Population 208,861
- Champaign-Urbana 132,857
- University of Illinois 44,880

73.1% White, not of Hispanic origin; 13.1% Black or African American; 10.6% Asian; 5.7% of Hispanic or Latino origin; 2.8% of two or more races; .3% American Indian or Native Alaskan; and .1% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
County Criminal Justice System

• Champaign County operates two jails: capacity 313.
• A partnership between the Sheriff’s office and a community behavioral health provider seeks to improve system outcomes related to mental health and justice.
• Champaign County is served by numerous law enforcement agencies, the largest of which are:
  – Champaign County Sheriff
  – City of Champaign
  – City of Urbana
  – University of Illinois
History of the Initiative

• In 2012, a Community Justice Taskforce with representatives from behavioral health treatment providers and community stakeholders prepared recommendations regarding the adult system of care within the criminal justice system to reduce bookings, bed days, and recidivism.

• The County Mental Health Board prioritized funding for programs consistent with the recommendations and coordinated with criminal justice authorities.

• Faced with capacity issues in the jail, the County Board commissioned architectural surveys and a study from the Institute for Law and Policy Planning
Recommendations

• Task Force and consultant recommendations were to build on the existing initiatives of:
  – Crisis Intervention Team trained officers
  – bond court 7-days per week
  – community mental health workers in the jail
  – health benefits enrollment in the jail
  – drug court

• A county funded reentry program was established to serve those completing sentences in state and county facilities.
Internal Challenges

• In 2015 we received a Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program grant to continue our work; the planning group identified two key challenges related to data and system planning.
  – No system-wide outcome measures and data collection.
  – Lack of system-wide, standardized, evidence-based screening and assessment tools and practices.
Internal Challenges

While many positive initiatives were underway it was difficult for us to answer some essential questions.

1. How many persons with mental illness or co-occurring disorders were being incarcerated?
2. What was the length of incarceration compared to the general population?
3. How many were effectively linked to community services?
External Challenges

• A state-level budget crisis that has placed significant strain on social services and caused the elimination or reduction of core community services; resulting in increased competition for local funding.

• Uncertainty regarding the continued availability of Medicaid funded services we rely on for community options.
Solutions

• Mental health and addictions screening of every person booked into the county jail.

• Data on screenings used to facilitate referrals to community providers and track outcomes.

• Correctional Officers administer the instruments at booking.
  – Brief Jail Mental Health Screen
  – Texas Christian University Drug Screen
Solutions

• Initial screen triggers a referral to on-site clinical providers – but is not the only mechanism for referral.

• On-site providers conduct a secondary screen which includes program eligibility, funding, trauma screen, and criteria for referral to full clinical assessment.

• Assessment can be completed on-site or in the community.
Decision Considerations

• Instruments were chosen that complimented already existing screening and engagement activities by community providers in the jail.
• Time was a significant factor, as correctional staff have many duties to perform at booking.
• The screening process needed to provide information for service tracking while ensuring compliance with applicable confidentiality regulations.
• A process map was developed to track the flow of information and identify decision points.
Decision Considerations

• Process map was populated with existing data to determine capacity need
• In the future, screening data will provide the baseline for tracking our key goals to reduce jail admissions, reduce length of incarceration, increase connection to care, and reduce recidivism.
• Being able to state documented progress on those goals is the key to seeking additional support.
Observations

1. Build on your system’s unique strengths. Doing so will set you up to benefit from “easy wins” and build the momentum necessary for more difficult challenges.

2. While an external consultant may be able to provide you with valuable information about your system, stakeholders going through a mapping process consistent with shared goals is far more valuable. It builds commitment and shared language.

3. Involve as many stakeholders as possible. While it may seem to slow you down at the time, you are building support you will need down the road.
Observations

4. Beware of those things that “everyone knows” as they are often conclusions based on self-interest, anxiety about change, incomplete information, and assumptions.

5. Insist on evidence based practices and data-driven decision making. Decisions made with incomplete information or unproven approaches will stall progress and momentum.

6. Remember that resistance is the fear of losing something important to me; when you encounter resistance, always ask yourself what they stand to lose.
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The Need

- Growing Jail Population
- Decreasing Access to State Hospitals
- Decreasing Funding to Community Mental Health Centers
- Community is Engaged
Goal

- **Assess** Individuals Early in the Criminal Justice System
- **Identify** Needs that can be Addressed Safely in the Community
- **Divert** Individuals from the CJ System and Specifically the Jail

A-I-D Program
Partners

- Douglas County Sheriff’s Office
- Bert Nash Community Mental Health Center
- University of Kansas School of Social Welfare

- Justice Mental Health Collaboration Program Grant, 2015-MO-BX-0012; FY15-16
Target Population

- Individuals believed to have a Serious Mental Illness (SMI) or Co-Occurring Mental Health Disorder
- Women
- Veterans

Exclude:
- Violent Offenders (Grant Requirement)
- Non-county Residents
Screening and Assessment

Screenings Administered at Jail Booking and Follow Up Assessments in Douglas County, KS

- Brief Jail Mental Health Screen
- Level of Service Inventory: Screening Version
- AUDIT-C and DAST-10
- Brief Trauma Questionnaire
- Bond Risk Assessment

Information Sharing Agreements between Agencies is Recommended

Recommended Uses for Informing Decision-Making

- Jail Management
- Pretrial Release
- Non-Charge
- Mental Health Court
- Link to Treatment
- Bond Supervision
Diverting Options

- Community Mental Health Center
- Domestic Violence Shelter
- Behavioral Health Court
- MH Respite Housing
- Pretrial Release
- Substance Abuse Treatment
Early Outcomes

- Mental Health Screening for all Bookings
  - Brief Jail Mental Health Screen
  - Automated MH Referral
- New Partnerships for Trauma Services:
  - Domestic Violence Shelter
  - Sexual Trauma & Abuse Center
Contact

Mike Brouwer, M.Ed.
Douglas County Sheriff’s Office
www.dsgo.org
mbrouwer@dgso.org
785-830-1001
Questions?

The questions box and buttons are on the right side of the webinar window.
Upcoming Stepping Up TA Resources

Monthly Webinars and Networking Calls

• Stepping Up Network Call: Conducting Mental Health Screening and Assessment in Jails (April 12 at 2pm ET)
• Next Webinar: Establishing Baseline Data for Mental Illness in Jails (May 11 at 2pm ET)
• Register at www.StepUpTogether.org/Toolkit

Quarterly Small-Group Networking and TA Calls

• Next calls in June. Stepping Up counties will receive an email to register.
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