

Statewide Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Steering Committee Meeting

April 15, 2014

10:30 AM - 2:30 PM

AmericInn Lodge & Suites

Members in Attendance

Judge Jeff Davis	Judge Scott Myren	Doug Herrmann	Danette Cronin
Cindy Heiberger	Patti Lyon	Ross Wright	Terry Dosch
RJ Rylance	Virgena Wieseler	Angel Runnels	Betty Oldenkamp
Judd Thompson	Kent Alberty	Katie Bray	Dr. Tom Stanage
Judge Karen Jeffries	John Bentley	Brian Mueller	Carole Cochran
Tamie McMeekin	Nancy Allard	Ken McFarland	Stephanie Vetter
Erin Srstka	Liz Heidelberger		

Members not in Attendance

Katie Bray	Rachel Kippley
Jessica Miller	Julie Bartling
Don Holloway	Tim Johns
Mark Milbrandt	

Meeting Notes:

1. Welcome and Introductions

- a. Chief Justice Gilbertson welcomed all attendees to the meeting and thanked them for their willingness to be part of the JDAI statewide process. Nancy Allard introduced Judge Davis and Cindy Heiberger as the Statewide Chair and Vice Chair who were both appointed by the Chief Justice. Nancy then introduced Liz Heidelberger as the JDAI Statewide Coordinator. Introductions then began of all attendees.

2. Overview of the JDAI

- a. Liz Heidelberger provided an introduction of Stephanie Vetter who is the Technical Assistance/Team Leader for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Stephanie has provided technical assistance to South Dakota since JDAI was sought out by the Governor's Council of Juvenile Services in 2009.
- b. Stephanie provided an overview of the JDAI and discussed that the JDAI began roughly 20 years ago and has been implemented in over 250 jurisdictions in 41 states and the District of Columbia to date. Stephanie discussed that JDAI is a peer to peer learning model and there has been demonstrated success due to sites having fidelity to the model.
- c. Stephanie provided an overview of how JDAI was brought to South Dakota. She noted that the Governor's Council of Juvenile Services sought out JDAI due to South Dakota having the highest incarceration rate of youth in the nation and because there is a disproportionate number of minority youth who are coming into contact with the juvenile justice system. Stephanie indicated that JDAI was implemented in the two largest jurisdictions in South Dakota and have

experienced positive results. Stephanie stressed the importance of collaboration and ensuring that the right people are involved in the JDAI process.

3. The Local Perspective

- a. Erin Srstka provided an overview of the data from the current JDAI sites, Minnehaha County and Pennington County. She noted that both sites have experienced a reduction in the number of admissions, average daily population and the number of youth committed to the Department of Corrections.
- b. Ken McFarland, Cindy Heiberger and Judge Jeff Davis then presented on the local perspective as all three were currently JDAI Co-Chairs in the two pilot sites. An emphasis was provided to the fact that JDAI was not a program, it was a process. It was further emphasized that it was a philosophy switch as well. JDAI was not a cookie cutter option and was actually implemented differently in the two pilot sites of Minnehaha County and Pennington County. It was noted that one of the benefits of JDAI was the ability to have different approaches to JDAI implementation while still ensuring fidelity to the JDAI model. All three Co-Chairs emphasized that the JDAI is a collaborative model and it is about the process of moving towards a more effective and efficient case process. One of the lessons learned in the pilot sites was that the simple changes/ implementations make or create the biggest results and that not every change is the implementation of a new program or a new FTE.
- c. The Co-Chairs then discussed the ability of both sites re-allocate detention funding due to the drop in detention numbers towards detention alternative programming such as electronic monitoring, an evening reporting center and shelter care beds. It was noted that, because the numbers weren't as high in smaller jurisdictions, there would be more creativity involved in regards to the alternatives that were needed that was based on the data in order to implement JDAI effectively.

4. "Scaling Up"

- a. Stephanie Vetter provided an overview of what "scaling up" meant and how the process would be rolled out. Stephanie noted that the JDAI was a data driven process and explained that the Detention Utilization Study was the first step. This study would inform the local committee who the youth were who were currently being referred to detention and would help inform the appropriate next steps the committee would take.
- b. Stephanie noted that the JDAI model wasn't for an entire state to take on at first, but the recommendation was to implement in one or two sites first in order to gain success then begin the process of expanding the current success to other sites around the state. Stephanie noted that the two current pilot sites weren't perfect, but were model sites no less due to the great things that have been happening in both sites and the demonstrated results that they've experienced. She further noted that there were 20 states who were beginning the expansion process or who were already moving forward with expansion activities.
- c. Stephanie stressed that expansion happens incrementally and that readiness was the key. She noted that there was a process to expanding to new sites and emphasized that training needed to happen. Stephanie stated that the first steps have already occurred because there was a statewide committee formed and a site visit to the New Jersey State Model Site was already

scheduled for the end of April which included individuals from the statewide committee to help inform the next steps for statewide expansion.

- d. One of the keys to effective implementation is to develop key messages and coming to consensus regarding what the roll out of JDAI across the state will look like in addition to identifying what becoming the next site looks like. Stephanie noted that there are multiple ways other sites have gone through the expansion process and it was up to the statewide committee to determine the best route for expansion.

5. Mission Statement, Vision and Goals of the Committee

- a. It was decided that, due to the interest of time, examples of the mission statement, vision and goals would be sent out to the committee members for review and recommendations. The recommendations would then be sent out to the entire committee for discussion and final approval at the next meeting in July.

6. Meeting schedule for 2014 and next steps

- a. A recommendation was made to gather data from each county regarding their placements in detention, probation numbers, DOC numbers and alternative options in addition to noting the youth population. A recommendation was made to check on the work of the behavioral health group as well to discuss at the next meeting.
- b. A discussion was held regarding how the objective Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI), which is an objective instrument and assists in the intake decision, would be implemented in the new sites. It was noted that the new sites will need to be provided with access to the Court and Law Enforcement data systems in order to complete the instrument. Discussion ensued and it was agreed that this has occurred in the current sites and would definitely need to happen in any new site using the RAI.
- c. The next two meetings were then scheduled for July 24th and October 16th both from 10:30am to 2:30pm at Cedar Shores.