

# Statewide Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Steering Committee Meeting

---

October 1, 2014

10:30 AM – 2:30 PM

Cedar Shores Resort

Oacoma, SD

## **Members in Attendance**

Judge Jeff Davis	Rachel Kippley	Ken McFarland	Angel Runnels
Cindy Heiberger	Danette Cronin	Tamie McMeekin	Erin Srstka
Betty Oldenkamp	Terry Dosch	Judge Karen Jeffries	Dr. Tom Stanage
Nancy Allard	Doug Herrmann	Brian Mueller	Judd Thompson
Julie Bartling	Ross Wright	Judge Scott Myren	Stephanie Vetter
John Bentley	Patti Lyon	RJ Rylance	Liz Heidelberger

## **Members not in Attendance**

Virgena Wieseler	Carole Cochran
Don Holloway	Katie Bray
Mark Milbrandt	Tim Johns
Jessica Miller	Kent Alberty

## **Meeting Notes:**

### **Introductions and Purpose of the Meeting**

Judge Davis and Cindy Heiberger welcomed attendees to the meeting and introductions were completed. Judge Davis spoke about the purpose and goal of the Statewide Steering Committee and the meeting on this date. He noted that the expansion of JDAI in the state is a UJS-led process and the role of the Committee is to help develop alternatives and to help with the success of the JDAI process in South Dakota.

At this time, the minutes from the last meeting on July 24<sup>th</sup> were reviewed and, by consensus, members approved the minutes as written with no changes.

Cindy Heiberger and Ken McFarland spoke about the panel presentation and booth at the South Dakota Counties Convention in Pierre. They noted that there were about 80 individuals who attended the panel discussion or stopped by the booth to learn about JDAI. The information presented was very well received and there were many questions about how implementation would work. The main concern was related to the alternatives to detention programming. Cindy noted that the panelists were: Judge Doug Hoffman from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit; Brian Mueller from the Pennington County Sheriff's Office; Jim Hoekman from the Minnehaha County Sheriff's Office and Cindy Heiberger with Ken McFarland moderating the panel discussion. Ken noted that the commission members are receptive to JDAI and noted that he's been stressing that JDAI won't look the same in each jurisdiction.

An update regarding the Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JJRI) in South Dakota was provided by Nancy Allard, Doug Herrmann, Judge Myren, Julie Bartling and Angel Runnels. The initial meetings were to review the juvenile justice system and to look at the data. There is a meeting scheduled for October 2<sup>nd</sup>. It was noted that, between now and November, a discussion about policy development

will happen and there are policies in draft form at this time. To date, there hasn't been a discussion about the financial piece. It was also noted that the focus of JDAI is on pre-adjudication and the focus of the JJRI is post-adjudication. With the work of both groups, the full continuum of the juvenile justice system will be addressed. There is a desire to have collaboration and the hope is to have the funding discussion geared towards the whole continuum. The group has discussed diversion programming, implementing more services to decrease the number of youth referred to the Department of Corrections (DOC) and changing the DOC commitment process.

Brian Mueller and Betty Oldenkamp provided an update about the Reception Center and Shelter Care programming, known as the Arise Youth Center in Pennington County. Brian noted that the staff secure area has been closed for some time and the Juvenile Services Center (JSC) doesn't have an option to house CHINS (Children in Need of Supervision) or Status Offender youth. For Pennington County youth, they are referred to the Shelter Care program that is overseen by Lutheran Social Services (LSS) after an agreement was formed at the end of 2013 between Pennington County and LSS in order for LSS to operate the Reception Center and Shelter Care programming in the non-secure side of the current JSC building. Brian noted that there have been issues when other counties refer CHINS youth to the JSC because they don't have the facility to hold them other than placing the youth in their booking area. Therefore, an agreement has been completed between Pennington County and the counties using the JSC facility to allow placement of these youth in the Shelter Care facility versus the JSC. Brian noted that there is an intake process completed to decide which location is best for each youth. Brian further noted that this will open many doors to begin the implementation of the JDAI philosophy in these areas as well.

Betty noted that there was a Bennett County youth within the Shelter Care program and the Case Managers worked with the youth's local resources in Bennett County to help create a discharge plan that allowed for the youth and their family to access local resources. Betty advised that the Evening Reporting Center (ERC) will be opening up on October 20<sup>th</sup> at the Arise Youth Center. She further advised that the current Shelter Care program will be moving to a larger portion of the non-secure area of the JSC to be able to expand the number of youth that the Shelter Care program can work with. Betty informed the committee that LSS was awarded the Basic Center grant which will increase the bed capacity from 8 beds to 16 beds. She noted that this grant funding will be used to help with runaway and homeless youth without having to refer them to the juvenile justice system. She advised that LSS is currently working on ways to fund additional hours for case management services to be provided to these youth. Both Brian and Betty noted that the partnership between Pennington County and LSS is going well.

Brian advised that, because the population in detention has decreased, they not only were able to implement the LSS Arise Youth Center under the JSC roof, but will soon be moving the females from the local halfway house over to the JSC as well. He noted that last year, they were using 50% of the JSC building and after the adult female program moves over they'll be at 100% use of the building.

Betty noted that LSS was awarded funding from the Council of Juvenile Services (CJS) through the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) grant to have LSS staff trained in Functional Family Therapy (FFT). She noted that staff in Minnehaha and other staff from across the state would all be trained to build capacity statewide for FFT to be utilized. At this time, Ken McFarland and Cindy Heiberger noted that they were currently hiring for a position which would include both the DMC Coordinator and a Case Worker. They advised that they were able to re-purpose county funding to be utilized which freed up the DMC funds to be utilized by programming such as the FFT for LSS.

Tamie McMeekin and RJ Rylance provided an update regarding the Applied Leadership Network (ALN) through the Annie E. Casey Foundation. They noted that they will be traveling to Indianapolis, Indiana who has successfully implemented JDAI on a statewide basis. They advised that they've learned many helpful tools to include a focus on letting the data drive the discussion. RJ advised that South Dakota is one of several jurisdictions to expand JDAI throughout the state. He further advised that he and Tamie both hope to bring back information from ALN to help with the statewide expansion efforts. Stephanie Vetter noted that, as ALN participants, they were assigned a coach through the Foundation and the South Dakota coach was Gail D. Mumford. She advised that Gail D. traveled to Rapid City recently to observe Tamie and RJ and also toured the alternatives and detention center. Stephanie advised that both she and Gail D. were impressed with the case process and the alternatives' focus around helping kids. They also noted that the Lutheran Social Services (LSS) exemplified the best practice and deserved credit for the work that they're doing. Stephanie emphasized that Rapid City didn't get to that point overnight and advised that the implementation of the LSS Arise Youth Center took up until the end of 2013. Stephanie noted that the transition came from the Sheriff's Office willingness to transition the alternative to a community-based provider. It was advised that everyone needs to keep in mind that implementation takes time, willingness and intention.

## **JDAI Communications and Training Opportunities**

The success of the panel discussion at the South Dakota Counties Convention was revisited as there were key stakeholders talking about what has happened and how the implementation of JDAI affected their area of expertise. The committee was charged with identifying other opportunities to speak about JDAI either as a panel discussion, a meeting with the JDAI Coordinator or a combination. It was noted that the goal of distributing information about JDAI is to allow individuals from across the state to be informed on the changes that are coming up and gaining their support of the changes. At this time, a discussion was held about training opportunities that would be beneficial to attend. The list includes: school board regional meetings, county commission district meetings, sheriff's association meeting, state's attorney meeting, human services meeting, the defense attorney CLE, Department of Corrections annual training, and the association of youth care providers. The committee members were encouraged to forward over any and all opportunities where it would be beneficial for JDAI information to be presented to Liz. At this time, a question was posed regarding Tribal outreach. Judge Jeffries noted that the Tribal Chairman from each Tribe would be the individual to contact and noted that there is one week of meetings held with the Chairman and JDAI could be presented during that week of meetings. Judge Jeffries noted that there are 4 Tribes working with the MacArthur Foundation and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe is one of the 4 working on diversion programming and guidebooks.

Terry Dosch noted that there are many things going on in a variety of arenas to include the Community of Care with Parent Connections; Functional Family Therapy (FFT) kickoff in Yankton and the Systems of Care pilots in Sioux Falls, Rapid City and Pierre to name a few. He advised that the key is to let everyone know what else is going on so no one is re-inventing the wheel. He noted that he has been keeping the Mental Health and Substance Abuse directors informed on a regular basis. At this time, there is a hope to implement family support programming in the state which would help with the needs of families that would allow them to be successful. Terry emphasized that the real target is the families to help empower them and allow them to stand on their own. The need for collaboration and having a link between efforts was discussed and it was emphasized that "it takes a village."

At this time, the Statewide JDAI newsletter was discussed. Liz noted that, at the SD Counties Convention, many individuals signed up to receive the newsletter and we'll want to have a broad outreach to ensure the information is distributed to all who may have an interest in the changes

occurring within the juvenile justice system and with all agencies related to youth. A question was posed about providing the newsletter to the Legislators. Julie Bartling noted that she will check on options for distribution and will let Liz know of the outcome. Stephanie noted that Washington State had put together a brochure for the Legislators to inform them about the work that has been done.

The group continued to discuss the distribution of the newsletter and it was noted that there isn't a clearinghouse where everyone can be informed about what is going on in other realms of the youth-serving work. It was recommended that the newsletter may be a good place to inform readers of what is available and provide a place for information exchange. Liz noted that she hoped the newsletter would be sent out late 2014 or early 2015.

At this time, the opportunity to attend a JDAI Model Site Visit was referenced. She noted that there was an opportunity to visit Portland, Oregon on December 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> of 2014. It was further noted that there were individuals from the two current sites who would be attending and there were slots available for those on the Statewide Committee to attend as well, if interested. Liz asked those who were interested in attending to let her know no later than October 17<sup>th</sup> to be sure that approvals could be completed and travel arrangements could be made. The JDAI Model Site Visit is an opportunity for attendees to participate in peer-to-peer learning. The model site provides an opportunity to attendees to observe and discuss the implementation of JDAI in addition to providing examples and strategies to assist attendees with their efforts in their own state.

## **Statewide Expansion of JDAI**

Data and expansion examples were discussed. The utilization of data to drive decisions was emphasized. It was noted that the data gathered is very basic data to give the committee an idea of the utilization of detention in 2013. It was noted that the admissions in the Co-located Detention Centers included all youth intakes. In Hughes County, the number of admissions includes both youth who were held in secure and non-secure detention. All of the other Co-located Detention Centers have secure detention only. A discussion about the Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) was then discussed. It was noted that the intake authority is identified by the Presiding Judge of the circuit. Those individuals assigned to be intake staff will receive training on not only their role as an intake officer, but training on how to complete the RAI. It was noted that the RAI provides a lot of good data in order to identify any gaps in service and will assist sites in deciding next steps. It was noted that the data collected from the RAIs assisted Pennington County in getting the runaway and homeless grant as it provided pertinent information about the high number of youth coming into contact with Law Enforcement who were active runaways.

It was emphasized that the intake process is a role of the UJS as it is the Presiding Judge from each circuit to decide. A discussion was held regarding the difficulty of identifying alternatives in rural areas of the State and a recommendation was made to have members review JDAI Pathways 15: Detention Reform in Rural Jurisdictions Challenges and Opportunities. It was also noted that a list of alternatives would be developed and dispersed for individuals to review and explore. An emphasis was made to have locations review their data first as this would assist with targeting what programming may be necessary to implement in a location. It was further emphasized that JDAI implementation is a process and it takes time.

## ***Funding and Policy Discussion***

A discussion regarding the funding availability for JDAI implementation was held. Alternatives to detention programming costs money and, although less expensive than detention, the funding need is still there. At this point, there isn't an identification of what alternatives are needed for how many

youth. Therefore, it is difficult to identify how much funding is and will be needed. A handout was provided which includes examples from other jurisdictions of incentivizing alternatives to detention utilization versus secure detention. There are three arenas for funding opportunities: state appropriations, local allocation or private funds through in-kind donations. With the UJS oversight and control of JDAI, there is an opportunity to identify funds that will be utilized for alternatives to detention. For this allocation to occur the funds have to be identified for specific reasons and for a specific cost and both have to be based on the data collected. Therefore, the data collection is key to identify next steps with alternative needs.

## **Next Steps**

Judge Davis noted that we are at a point in the plan for expansion where the UJS will take steps towards the implementation across the state to include the identification of intake staff, implementation of the RAI, and an identification of how expansion will take place. A recommendation was made to have the next meeting held in late spring to allow for the implementation and changes to begin. Liz noted that she would send out information to all Committee members when a meeting timeframe is identified. If sites wish to identify alternative programming, it was emphasized that the Judges be informed of the availability so they can be aware of the full continuum of options.