**Competency Restoration**

|  |
| --- |
| Treatment #5: Review and reform the competency restoration process for adults (18-211/212) and juveniles. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION ITEMS AND OBJECTIVES** |
| **Recommendation 1: Conduct a comprehensive assessment and analyze ways to reform the competency to stand trial system.** |
| 1. **Gather and Analyze Statewide Data on Competency Evaluations and Restoration**
 |
| Gather data on each phase of the CST process including referrals, wait times, restoration outcomes, and service gaps.  |
| Evaluate each phase of the CST process to identify barriers, issues with timelines, and procedural concerns. |
| 1. **Identify and Review Best Practices from Other States**
 |
| Conduct a comparative analysis of states with successful competency restoration reforms.  |
| Evaluate alternative models such as community-based restoration and outpatient competency programs.  |
| 1. **Engage Stakeholders in Policy and System Review**
 |
| Convene legal, behavioral health, developmental disabilities and correctional system experts to assess challenges.  |
| Evaluate facility and program capacity for inpatient and community-based restoration. |
| 1. **Assess Workforce and Infrastructure Capacity**
 |
| Identify shortages in forensic evaluators, mental health professionals, developmental disabilities and restoration providers. |
| Evaluate facility and program capacity for inpatient and community-based restoration. |
| **Recommendation 2: Review of Juvenile Statute I.C. 20-519** |
| 1. **Gather and Analyze Statewide Data on Competency Evaluations and Restoration**
 |
| Engaging representatives from juvenile courts, public defenders, prosecutors, child psychiatrists, social workers, developmental disabilities professionals, and advocacy groups. |
| Ensuring diverse perspectives, including families and youth with lived experience. |
| 1. **Data Collection and Analysis**
 |
| Assessing how often the statute is applied, regional differences, and case outcomes. |
| Identifying trends in detention rates, access to evaluations, and length of time in the system. |
| 1. **Stakeholder Feedback**
 |
| Conducting focus groups and surveys with legal professionals, families, and service providers. |
| Identifying challenges in applying the statute and concerns around due process and fairness. |
| 1. **Reviewing National Best Practices**
 |
| Analyzing developmentally appropriate alternatives to detention-based competency evaluations. |
| Exploring community-based interventions and early diversion strategies for juveniles. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION ITEM #1** |
| **Gather and Analyze Statewide Data on Competency Evaluations & Restoration.**  |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Form a Sub-Team to collect and assess statewide data on competency to stand trial (CST) evaluations and restoration processes, examining each stage from referral to restoration outcomes.1. Gather and Analyze Statewide Data on Competency Evaluations & Restoration - *Compile and analyze data for each phase of the CST process, including referral patterns, wait times, restoration completion rates, and service gaps in different regions.*
2. Evaluate each phase of the process to identify barriers, issues with timelines, and procedural concerns. - *Assess inefficiencies and delays in each phase of the competency evaluation and restoration process to determine barriers and procedural issues impacting system performance.*
 |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Develop a comprehensive data set that provides a clear picture of current CST procedures, timelines, and service gaps. |
| **2.** | Ensure an accurate, statewide dataset that reflects the current trends and gaps in competency evaluations and restoration. |
| **3.** | Identify specific barriers and inefficiencies in the CST process and recommend potential solutions. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #1 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | Form a Sub-Team to collect and assess statewide data on competency to stand trial (CST) evaluations and restoration processes, examining each stage from referral to restoration outcomes. | Sub-team developed. | 7/31/2025 |  |
| 1. | A detailed report outlining trends, delays, barriers, and inefficiencies in the competency process, with identified opportunities for reform. | Completion of a statewide CST data report, including statistical trends and identified system challenges. | 2/28/2026 |  |
| 2. | A data report providing a clear view of statewide competency evaluation and restoration performance. | Finalization of a comprehensive dataset covering all aspects of the competency evaluation and restoration process. | 11/30/2025 |  |
| 3. | A summary of systemic barriers, procedural concerns, and proposed solutions for CST improvements. | Completion of a process analysis identifying at least five key barriers or inefficiencies. | 12/25/2025 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION ITEM #2** |
| **Identify and Review Best Practices from Other States** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Conduct a comparative analysis of competency restoration models used in other states, focusing on those with demonstrated success in reducing wait times and improving outcomes.a. Conduct a comparative analysis of states with successful competency restoration reforms. - *Examine and document effective competency restoration reforms implemented in at least five states, including legal frameworks and funding models.*b. Evaluate alternative models such as community-based restoration and outpatient competency programs. - *Assess the effectiveness of alternative competency restoration models, such as outpatient and community-based programs, to determine their applicability in our  state.* |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Identify and recommend alternative CST restoration models that could be adapted to improve efficiency and outcomes in our state. |
| **2.** | Document and analyze successful reforms in at least five states to inform local policy development. |
| **3.** | Evaluate the feasibility of implementing community-based and outpatient competency restoration programs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #2 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A best practices report highlighting alternative models and key strategies for competency restoration reform. | Completion of a policy analysis comparing at least five states with successful competency restoration programs by December 2025.  | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 2. | A policy brief detailing best practices and successful competency restoration reforms from other states. | A completed comparative analysis documenting best practices from at least five states by December 2025.  | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 3. | A feasibility analysis on implementing community-based and outpatient competency restoration programs. | A finalized feasibility study on alternative competency restoration models by February 2026. | 02/28/2026 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ACTION ITEM #3 |
| **Engage Stakeholders in Policy and System Review** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Facilitate discussions with legal and behavioral health, and developmental *disabilities professionals to assess the current CST system's challenges and explore policy reforms***.**1. Convene legal, behavioral health, developmental disabilities and correctional system experts to assess challenges. - *Organize working groups with experts in law, behavioral health, developmental disabilities and corrections to review and analyze challenges in the CST process.*
2. Gather input from public defenders, judges, prosecutors, and forensic evaluators. - *Conduct stakeholder engagement sessions with public defenders, judges, prosecutors, and forensic evaluators to gather insights on procedural inefficiencies and legal concerns.*
 |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Gather comprehensive input from diverse stakeholders to develop policy recommendations that address identified system inefficiencies. |
| **2.** | Engage key stakeholders to collaboratively assess challenges and develop actionable recommendations for system reform. |
| **3.** | Ensure broad representation of legal and behavioral health professionals in the policy review process to guide competency restoration improvements. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #3 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A stakeholder-informed policy recommendation report detailing proposed reforms and system improvements. | At least three stakeholder engagement sessions conducted with participation from key sectors (legal, mental health, correctional, and forensic experts). | 11/30/2025 |  |
| 2. | A report summarizing key stakeholder insights and recommendations for competency restoration reform. | Completion of at least two working group sessions with legal, behavioral health, developmental disabilities and correctional experts.  | 11/30/2025 |  |
| 3. |  A stakeholder feedback report outlining legal, procedural, and policy concerns in the CST system. | Documentation of stakeholder feedback from at least three consultation sessions. | 12/31/2025 |  |
| **ACTION ITEM #4** |
| **Assess Workforce and Infrastructure Capacity** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Evaluate the availability of forensic evaluators, mental health professionals, developmental disabilities professionals and restoration providers, as well as the physical capacity of inpatient and community-based restoration programs.1. Identify shortages in forensic evaluators, mental health professionals, developmental disabilities and restoration providers. *Conduct a workforce assessment to determine shortages in forensic evaluators, mental health professionals, developmental disabilities professionals and competency restoration providers across the state.*
2. Evaluate facility and program capacity for inpatient and community-based restoration. *Assess jail, and inpatient, community-based restoration facilities to identify capacity limitations and develop recommendations for expansion or reallocation of resources.*
 |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Develop a workforce and infrastructure improvement plan to address shortages and capacity limitations. |
| **2.** | Quantify workforce gaps in competency restoration services and develop strategies for recruitment and training |
| **3.** | Identify facility and service limitations and propose recommendations for expansion or enhancement. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #4 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET COMPLETION DATE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A workforce and facility capacity assessment report with recommendations for expanding CST resources. | Identification of specific workforce and infrastructure shortages, with a proposed plan for addressing deficiencies by December 2026. | 12/31/2026 |  |
| 2. | A workforce assessment report detailing shortages and strategies for increasing forensic evaluation and restoration service capacity. | Completion of a workforce assessment report with specific recommendations by December 2026. | 12/31/2026 |  |
| 3. | A facility and infrastructure report identifying capacity gaps and outlining strategies for expansion and resource reallocation. | Completion of an infrastructure capacity report with expansion recommendations by December 2026. | 12/31/2026 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **CONSULTING STAKEHOLDERS FOR ACTION ITEMS #1-4** |
|  |
| **RESOURCES, RISKS, AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR ACTION ITEMS #1-4** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TEAM LEADS FOR ACTION ITEMS #1-4** |
| Sarah Bickford-Thorpe  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Kristen Green | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| **OTHER KEY IMPLEMENTATION STAFF FOR ACTION ITEMS #1-4** |
| Mary Wurtz | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Dea Hibdon  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Chelsea Blackstone  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Gabe Carrillo  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Kasey Abercrombie | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Kat McIntosh  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Gayla Smutny  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Brian Wixom  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Chris Freeburne  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, State Hospital South |
| Judge Karin Seubert | Nez Perce County Magistrate |
| Chad Christensen  | Psychologist |
| Leah York | Psychologist |
| Todd Hurt  | Intermountain Hospital |
| Kathy Windom  | Intermountain Hospital |

|  |
| --- |
| ACTION ITEM #5 |
| **Form a Juvenile Competency Review Workgroup** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Establish a multidisciplinary workgroup to review the application and impact of I.C. 20-519 This group will include key stakeholders to ensure a comprehensive approach. *A comprehensive review and a set of recommendations addressing the strengths and weaknesses of I.C. 20-519.*1. Include representatives from juvenile courts, public defenders, prosecutors, child psychiatrists, social workers, developmental disabilities and advocacy organizations

*Diverse collaboration will facilitate a comprehensive evaluation of the statute’s effectiveness, identify gaps in its application, and develop recommendations for improvement.*1. Ensure diverse perspectives, including families and youth with lived experience.

*Actively recruit and engage families and youth who have experience with the juvenile justice system to provide input.* |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Form a fully staffed and operational workgroup by June 2025. |
| **2.** | Ensure the full participation of representatives from all identified stakeholder groups in the Juvenile Competency Review Workgroup. |
| **3.** | Ensure at least 25% of workgroup members include individuals with lived experience. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #5 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET COMPLETION DATE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | Form a fully staffed and operational workgroup by June 2025. Sub-Team formed by July 2025.  | At least 12 documented meetings with participation from all identified stakeholder groups and a final report produced by January 2026. | 1/31/2026 |  |
| 2. | A well-balanced workgroup representing all key disciplines, working collaboratively to assess I.C. 20-519 and develop policy recommendations. | Recruitment and documented participation of representatives from at least six identified stakeholder groups. | 10/31/2025 |  |
| 3. | Increased representation of affected populations in policy discussions. | Documentation of participation from at least 10 youth and family members in workgroup discussions. | 12/31/2025 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ACTION ITEM #6 |
| **Collect and Analyze Data on the Use of I.C. 20-519** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Conduct a thorough analysis of I.C. 20-519 application across different jurisdictions.1. Assess how often the statute is applied, regional differences, and case outcomes.*Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the application of I.C. 20-519 across different jurisdictions to determine its frequency of use, regional disparities, and case outcomes.*
2. Identify trends in detention rates, access to evaluations, and length of time in the system. *Examine how detention rates vary based on access to competency evaluations and the duration of juvenile cases.*
 |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Compile and analyze comprehensive data on I.C. 20-519 application by December 2025. |
| **2.** | Gather and analyze data on the frequency and regional application of I.C. 20-519 by September 2025. |
| **3.** | Identify key trends that inform policy recommendations. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #6 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET COMPLETION DATE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A detailed data report highlighting key findings, regional differences, and systemic trends. | Completion of a data report with at least five key insights and identified areas for policy improvement | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 2. | A detailed report outlining the frequency of the statute’s use, regional disparities, and key trends in case outcomes. | Data collection from at least 70% of juvenile courts statewide. Identification of at least five key trends or disparities in case outcomes by October 2025.  | 10/31/2025 |  |
| 3. | A refined dataset that supports evidence-based policy adjustments. | At least three policy recommendations developed based on data analysis. | 12/31/2025 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ACTION ITEM #7 |
| **Gather Stakeholder Feedback** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Engage stakeholders to collect qualitative insights on the application and impact of I.C. 20-519.1. Conduct focus groups and surveys with legal professionals, families, and service providers.

*Organize and conduct focus groups and surveys to gather qualitative insights from key stakeholders, including legal professionals (judges, public defenders, and prosecutors), families of juveniles involved in the justice system, and service providers.*1. Identify challenges in applying the statute and concerns regarding due process.

*Identify systemic barriers to fair and effective implementation of the statute.* |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Complete stakeholder engagement and feedback. |
| **2.** | Complete stakeholder engagement and data collection through focus groups and surveys. |
| **3.** | Develop a report outlining key legal and procedural concerns.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #7 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET COMPLETION DATE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A stakeholder feedback report summarizing key themes, concerns, and suggestions. | Engagement of at least 100 stakeholders across focus groups and surveys. | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 2. | A stakeholder feedback report summarizing key themes, concerns, and recommendations for improving the application of I.C. 20-519. | Documentation of at least 10 common themes or concerns identified from stakeholder input.  | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 3. | Improved understanding of due process concerns and fairness challenges. | At least five proposed improvements to address identified concerns. | 12/31/2025 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ACTION ITEM #8 |
| **Review National Best Practices for Juvenile Competency & Diversion** |
| **FULL DESCRIPTION** |
| Research and evaluate community-based approaches that prioritize developmentally appropriate assessments.1. Analyze developmentally appropriate alternatives to detention-based competency evaluation.

*Conduct a comprehensive review of developmentally appropriate alternatives to detention-based competency evaluations for juveniles.*1. Explore community-based interventions and early diversion strategies for juveniles.*Investigate existing “best practice” diversion programs and their effectiveness in reducing juvenile justice involvement.*
 |
| **TARGET OBJECTIVES** |
| **1.** | Complete a comprehensive review of national best practices.  |
| **2.** | Complete a comprehensive review of alternative competency evaluation models.  |
| **3.** | Identify feasible diversion strategies suitable for Idaho’s juvenile justice system |

|  |
| --- |
| **SMART GOALS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION ITEM #8 OBJECTIVES** |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **SPECIFIC OUTCOME** | **METRIC FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT** | **TARGET COMPLETION DATE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| 1. | A best practice report with actionable recommendations for adapting successful models to Idaho’s context. | Identification of at least five effective models or strategies. | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 2. | A best practices report outlining feasible, developmentally appropriate alternatives to detention-based competency evaluations. | Identification and analysis of at least five alternative models used in other jurisdictions. Evaluation of the effectiveness, costs, and feasibility of implementing alternatives in Idaho. | 12/31/2025 |  |
| 3. | Increased focus on prevention and early intervention. | At least three diversion models evaluated with implementation feasibility analysis with a report for recommendation. | 12/31/2025 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **CONSULTING STAKEHOLDERS FOR ACTION ITEMS #5-8** |
| Guadalupe Ayala | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Amanda Goldston  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| **OTHER KEY IMPLEMENTATION STAFF FOR ACTION ITEMS #5-8** |
| Cindy Harris-Lindauer  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Lindsay Harrington  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Krista Edge  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Courtney Inman  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Brook Heath  | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| Judge Victoria Olds | Nez Perce County Magistrate  |
| Blanca Valadez | Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Behavioral Health |
| **CONSULTING STAKEHOLDERS FOR ACTION ITEMS #5-8** |
|  |
| **RESOURCES, RISKS, AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR ACTION ITEMS #5-8** |
|  |