

Statewide Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Steering Committee Meeting

July 27, 2016

10:00 AM Central Time

9:00 AM Mountain Time

Digital Dakota Network (DDN) Video Conference

Members in Attendance

Cindy Heiberger

Judge Jeff Davis

Nancy Allard

Judge Scott Myren

Dr. Tom Stanage

Carole Cochran

Ross Wright

Terry Dosch

Angel Runnels

Tamie McMeekin

Jessica Miller

Judd Thompson

Virgena Wieseler

David Osterquist

Kristi Bunkers

Sarah Morrison

Carol Muller

Chad Seidel

Erin Srstka

Stephanie Vetter

Liz Heidelberger

Members not in Attendance

Representative Julie Bartling

Brian Mueller

Kent Alberty

Judge Karen Jeffries

Betty Oldenkamp

Representative Tim Johns

Rachel Kippley

Mark Milbrandt

John Bentley

Katie Bray

Other Members in Attendance

Amy Lake-Harmon,

Brown County Detention Center

Meeting Notes:

Welcome and Introductions

Cindy Heiberger began the meeting and went through a roll-call to ensure that all sites were connected to the meeting group. Cindy advised that at the last meeting, Judge Myren had made the suggestion to read the mission statement at the start of each meeting to set the context for the meeting and remind all members of the mission of the committee. The mission of the meeting is located on two of the handouts – the 2016 work plan and the 3 year work plan.

Nancy Allard and Judge Jeff Davis then welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked all for their attendance.

Cindy acknowledged that it has been almost a year since this committee had met and a lot had been happening in that timeframe. She advised that the Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) had been implemented across the state, that data has been collected to assist with decision-making.

Cindy advised that the focus of today's meeting is to review and discuss the materials provided, answer any questions that members may have, and to check in with each site to see if they're ready to come to consensus on next steps.

At this time, Liz provided an overview of the handouts. She then inquired about any questions or changes from the minutes for the meeting that was held on May 20, 2015. There were no suggested changes regarding these minutes and, by consensus, all were approved.

UJS/JDAI Update

Liz provided an overview of what has been happening with JDAI since the last meeting on May 20, 2015. Liz advised that the South Dakota Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) “went live” on July 15, 2015 in all counties across the state. She advised that Intake Officer and RAI training has occurred with each of the appointed Intake Officers across the state. There are six Intake Center locations across the state: Beadle County (Huron), Brown County (Aberdeen), Codington County (Watertown), Hughes County (Pierre), Minnehaha County (Sioux Falls), and Pennington County (Rapid City). Intake Officer training was held in June and July to prepare Intake Officers for “going live” and subsequent trainings have been held since then to ensure all Intake Staff feel comfortable and confident in their role as an Intake Officer. In addition to training of Intake Officers, other statewide trainings have been held to ensure that other stakeholders such as Law Enforcement, State’s Attorneys, Judges, Court Services, etc. are aware of the changes with the juvenile intake process as well.

Liz advised that the Intake Center Staff have done a great job of taking on the function of Intake Officer. They have taken the appointment seriously and have excelled in their trainings. Liz then noted that she receives and corrects all RAIs from across the state outside of those completed for youth who reside in Lincoln County, Minnehaha County or Pennington County. She further noted that the corrections now are very few and far between due to the Intake Officers across the state being more comfortable with completing the RAI and utilizing the override option only when necessary. She commended their hard work and dedication to their appointed role.

With the implementation of the RAI across the state, also came the ability to have data that wasn’t previously available. This data will be presented on today’s call and was sent out to all parties prior to today’s meeting. The delay with meeting was due mainly on wanting to ensure that the Committee had ample data available in order to come to consensus on next steps and base that consensus on what the data showed.

At this time, Nancy Allard provided an overview of the Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JJRI) or also known as Senate Bill 73 (SB73). Nancy advised that SB73 compliments JDAI. She further advised that SB73 went before the 2015 Legislature and was passed with part of the implementations to go into effect in July 2015 and the rest to go into effect in January 2016. Nancy noted that the areas that went into effect in July 2015 included the mandate to increase the utilization of juvenile diversions. She noted that the charging decisions remained with the State’s Attorneys. However, the recommendation is to have a large number of youth referred to a juvenile diversion versus formal court.

As of July 1st, 2015, multiple implementations occurred to include:

- The implementation of a treatment and referral process to ensure utilization of evidence-based programming and treatment. Nancy advised that this referral process is through the Department of Social Services.
 - Implementation of Functional Family Therapy (FFT) as an evidence-based program. The FFT kickoff was held in January 2016
 - In August 2015, the Juvenile Corrections Agents (JCAs) with the Department of Corrections (DOC) and the Court Services Officers (CSOs) with the Unified Judicial System (UJS) began the referral process based on the Y-LSI (Youth Level of Service Inventory) which both DOC and UJS already utilized for initial assessments. The early referral process was to gather data to identify treatment needs.

- The Global Appraisal of Individual Needs Short Screener (GAIN-SS) screening tool was also implemented to assess substance abuse and mental health
- Nancy advised that the youth who are medium or high risk based on the screening tools are the youth who are referred to the programming versus the youth who score low on the screening tools
- A Native American focus group was formed to discuss and create recommendations for youth across the State of South Dakota. This focus group will compile recommendations that will be presented to the 2017 Legislative Session.
- Community Response Teams (CRTs) have been established in areas where the Presiding Judge approves the implementation. The CRTs are spearheaded by the Courts and involve key stakeholders such as Department of Social Services (DSS), Department of Corrections (DOC), schools, treatment providers, Court Services Officers (CSOs), Judges, etc. The goal of the CRT is to identify new options for youth prior to placement with DOC.
- After January 1st, a graduated response and incentives grid went into effect for use by Court Services Officers with youth on probation. Nancy advised that there is an emphasis on the use of more incentives and fewer sanctions based on research and best practice.
- Another implementation based on SB73 includes shorter probation terms. There is now a four month cap on regular probation and up to eight months for youth on JIPP (intensive probation). Extensions to the aforementioned terms are only approved in order for youth to complete evidence-based treatment.
- SB 73 limits when youth can be placed with DOC with the emphasis on keeping youth in the community versus in placement.
- A juvenile citation process has been implemented for youth who commit the following offenses: Petty Theft 2nd Degree (\$400 or less), Intentional Damage to Private/Public Property (\$400 or less), Minor in Consumption or Truancy. If a citation is filed, it will be handled through the juvenile proceedings and those proceedings remain confidential. With the citations, there is a limit on what the Judge can order to include only a fine, ordering the youth to pay court costs and/or restitution. In some cases, a Judge can order a youth to serve community service hours in lieu of the fine, court costs and/or restitution. With a citation, a youth cannot be ordered to serve time in detention or be placed on probation. The youth who receive only a citation shouldn't be placed in detention prior to their court appearance for the citation.

At this time, everything regarding SB73 is in place. A 20 person oversight committee is in place to review the data from SB73 implementations to ensure the best interest of children and to keep children in the community.

RAI Data Analysis Review and Discussion

Liz then provided an overview of the first 15 slides of the RAI PowerPoint. She advised that this information was collected from July 15, 2015 and January 15, 2016 to ensure that a full 6 months of data was included. She advised that the first 15 slides provided an overview of the content within the PowerPoint, the timeline of RAI implementation, combined data from each of the Intake Centers, and data based on each Intake Center.

This data is helpful not only to this committee, but locally as well. The outcome of the data is very telling in that there are 27 Counties in South Dakota that had zero RAIs completed in the 6-month timeframe. Liz further discussed that there are jurisdictions that have set themselves apart from others due to the higher number of RAIs and would therefore point to the need to begin implementing the JDAI strategies first. She advised that these counties included: Hughes County, Brown County, Codington County and Roberts County. She advised that Beadle County would also be included due to having a juvenile-specific detention center with juvenile-specific staff.

South Dakota JDAI Site Roll-Out Guidebook Review and Discussion

Liz advised that a roll-out guidebook is currently being compiled to ensure that any jurisdiction interested and willing to implement the eight core strategies of JDAI will have the assistance needed to ensure effective

implementation occurs. Liz advised that all implementations will not be a “self-guided tour” and advised that technical assistance will be provided just as was provided for Minnehaha County and Pennington County.

JDAI Work Plan Review and Discussion

Liz advised that the 2016 JDAI Work Plan and the 3-Year Work Plan were sent out with the materials that provide a framework for the work ahead. Liz advised that, in the interest of time, we wouldn't go into detail regarding the documents but asked that if anyone had any questions or comments to pass those comments on to her.

Questions, Next Steps and Updates

Cindy acknowledged that the committee received a lot of information on today's video-conference and noted that she was then going to ask each site to advise whether or not they were ready to provide their thoughts on next steps in order for consensus to be reached. At that time, Cindy asked for feedback from each of the jurisdictions.

The comments and suggestions included:

- **Brown County**
 - They encouraged to not have a cookie cutter approach to the implementation and to ensure that there was an individualized process to the work
- **Hughes County**
 - Advised that implementation in Pierre would be a logical choice
- **Pennington County**
 - Inquired about how many jurisdictions could be implemented at a time. Liz advised that there isn't a “limit” to how many sites to reach out to as there may be some areas that are not interested in implementation initially and that is okay.
 - The recommendation was then to reach out to the five counties in green (Hughes, Beadle, Brown, Roberts, and Codington Counties) and then reach out to the counties in yellow (Meade, Charles Mix, Davison, and Brookings Counties). If some of the counties who are involved in the first cohort of counties, then we would approach the next cohort of counties.
- **Minnehaha County**
 - A suggestion was made to begin reach-out with the counties with the largest number of RAIs first and then begin to reach out to the counties with the smaller numbers
 - A question was posed regarding reaching out to the Tribes in areas that are close to a reservation. Discussion ensued and agreement was reached that there would be a benefit to looking at the data and ensure that all key stakeholders are around the table and align with the population of youth who are receiving the RAI
- Carole Cochran and Dr. Stanage both advised that it would be beneficial to reach out to the areas with the largest population first.
- Judge Davis advised that he was in agreement that reach out should begin with the areas with the largest population of youth and RAIs first. Representative Tim Johns advised that he agreed with all comments as well.

At this point, Liz advised that it appeared as if consensus had been reached to begin the reach out to the areas with the largest number of RAIs first. Liz advised that the next steps would be to create a plan of action regarding the best approach to reaching out to individuals within each of those sites. She further advised that she would be in contact with individuals within those areas and others who may have peers in that area as well.

Once reach out occurs and feedback is received, this committee will reconvene to discuss the outcome and to reach consensus on next steps.

Due to the video conference ending within the minute, committee members were thanked for their participation and were advised that any information regarding next steps would be provided via email.

Meeting was adjourned.