

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

---

July 24, 2014

10:30 AM – 2:30 PM

Cedar Shores Resort

Oacoma, SD

## **Members in Attendance**

Judge Jeff Davis	Katie Bray	Ken McFarland	Erin Srstka
Cindy Heiberger	Carole Cochran	Tamie McMeekin	Dr. Tom Stanage
Kent Alberty	Terry Dosch	Jessica Miller	Judd Thompson
Nancy Allard	Doug Herrmann	Brian Mueller	Stephanie Vetter
Julie Bartling	Liz Heidelberger	Judge Scott Myren – by phone	
John Bentley	Patti Lyon	RJ Rylance	

## **Members not in Attendance**

Judge Karen Jeffries	Rachel Kippley	Virgena Wieseler
Don Holloway	Betty Oldenkamp	Angel Runnels
Mark Milbrandt	Tim Johns	Ross Wright
Danette Cronin		

## **Other members in attendance:**

Amy Iversen-Pollreisz; Deputy Secretary of Social Services

## **Meeting Notes:**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Judge Davis and Cindy Heiberger welcomed attendees to the meeting and introductions were completed.

### **Behavioral Health Workgroup Presentation**

Nancy Allard provided an introduction of Amy Iversen-Pollreisz, the Deputy Secretary of Social Services. Ms. Iversen-Pollreisz completed an overview of the Behavioral Health Workgroup. A PowerPoint handout was provided to the group with specifics regarding the work of the group. Ms. Iversen-Pollreisz noted that, in South Dakota, the highest numbers of people in this system have alcohol-related issues, and many have co-occurring substance abuse and mental illness. She noted that some of the recommendations were to have an integration of services and increase the effectiveness of service delivery. Discussion ensued regarding the relation of the work of the Behavioral Health work group and the JDAI process. It was noted that there were gaps in service delivery as far as an out of home shelter option for homeless youth who were under the age of 18. Ms. Iversen-Pollreisz noted that there were programming options for youth in need of housing and mental health/substance abuse services. She further noted that they are currently in the Request for Proposal (RFP) phase for these services and are looking at an initial pilot first before expanding the services across the state. At this time, it was noted that the Minnehaha County Reception Center had expanded their focus from just youth who had a charge to adding in other referral sources such as youth who are straight runaways. It

was noted that, in smaller jurisdictions, there will be an importance to expanding the focus of programming to reach all youth.

A discussion was also held regarding the family support arena that was recommended at the Behavioral Health Workgroup. It was noted that the fund would be similar to the disability flex funding and would be utilized for daily needs such as transportation, housing, etc. Flex funds are targeted to assist with the daily needs of the youth and their families in order to allow them to focus on the mental health/substance abuse issues.

The group was informed of a Functional Family Therapy (FFT) training opportunity in Yankton, SD on August 22<sup>nd</sup> which will be the pilot location. Dr. Stanage noted that he would provide an updated invitation to Liz Heidelberger and she would in turn send out the invitation to the entire JDAI Statewide Steering Committee group.

A question was posed regarding the school presence on the Behavioral Health Workgroup. It was noted that the schools weren't part of the discussion as the focus wasn't only on youth, but adults as well. It was noted that there was input from the schools on the subgroup level.

## **Statewide Expansion of JDAI**

A discussion was held regarding the mission, vision and goals of the Statewide Steering Committee. Recommended changes were made and the group agreed with the final document by consensus. Liz noted that she would send out the updated document to all members and reminded the group that this was a living document and could be updated and/or changed as needed.

A discussion was held regarding the educational opportunities offered by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Erin Srstka provided an overview of the opportunities for local and state stakeholders to attend a JDAI model site visit and/or the national conference. Peer-to-peer educational opportunities and networking with individuals from other jurisdictions provides insight into how other systems have made improvements, what outcomes to expect and strategies to overcome common challenges. Many other juvenile justice systems (250 local jurisdictions in 39 states) have made dramatic public safety improvements while improving the outcomes for youth in their systems. Committee members who attended the recent model site or conference shared these thoughts:

Julie Bartling noted that she attended the JDAI National Conference and felt that the JDAI fundamentals workshop was beneficial in that she learned what other states have done to align with the right youth, right place, right time philosophy of JDAI. She further noted that she attended a workshop about policy change which she took away the goal of re-allocating funding more towards the front end of the system to help youth to not get to the deep end of the system by providing the needed services earlier on in the system. Another takeaway was the process of leveraging funds through the appropriations process and her role as a Legislator.

Tamie McMeekin attended both the New Jersey Model Site visit and the JDAI National Conference. Tamie noted that one of her takeaways from New Jersey was the importance of a probation violation response grid and the necessary focus on "change versus compliance". Another takeaway was the need to have everyone frame the reform message in a similar way in addition to emphasizing fidelity to the JDAI model for both current and future sites. In both educational opportunities, there was an emphasis on collaboration. Tamie noted that a major takeaway was that the adults had to examine their behaviors versus just examining the youth's behaviors.

RJ Rylance noted that he attended both educational opportunities. He stressed that being purposeful and intentional in the words and messages we use to describe our work is key and emphasized the need to know our audience. RJ referenced the passion of the New Jersey team and how energizing that passion was in regard to building momentum. He encouraged the group to have the same passion for the JDAI work in South Dakota and noted that, by expressing the passion, it would assist with the momentum of a successful expansion of JDAI. RJ also noted that it was beneficial to hear from other sites about not only their successes, but their struggles and barriers too. He noted that it was good to hear that other jurisdictions, no matter the size, had similar struggles. RJ further stated that, while in New Jersey, a key takeaway was that South Dakota couldn't just copy the work done in NJ. The recommendation from New Jersey was that the Statewide JDAI Committee had to have the discussion about how JDAI will look in South Dakota and emphasized that there has to be a balance between state and local authority in planning and implementation that is based on the core strategies.

Ken McFarland noted that he attended the National Conference and shared information on sustaining the JDAI movement, pointing out that the definition of success may be different in each jurisdiction. He also noted that, after hearing about the JDAI work in other JDAI jurisdictions, he realized that the work that has been done in South Dakota outpaces sites that have been embracing the JDAI model much longer than South Dakota.

Stephanie Vetter discussed that there are 20 or more other states that are currently "taking JDAI to scale" across the country and noted that South Dakota is in good company. She noted that there will be a meeting in November convened by the Casey Foundation for those states who are interested in examining sustainability strategies. Stephanie noted that, while in New Jersey, the South Dakota group heard about the New Jersey staffing model, their data collection efforts, and the need to have a plan for both arenas while going through the expansion process.

Judge Davis noted that, in regards to the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) work, he attended a judicial workshop and it was beneficial to hear that it's not just South Dakota that struggles with this area and that it's an ongoing process to work through and identify what will work for a community.

Cindy Heiberger noted that one of her key takeaway from both educational opportunities was the importance of a local coordinator. She further explained that some structure for statewide coordination will have to be identified whether it's local or regional. Cindy noted she learned about the emphasis in keeping youth in school and out of the juvenile justice system in addition to utilizing a message relating to the gears on a bicycle by noting that you need to use all of the gears on a bicycle instead of being stuck in 1st gear to get somewhere.

### ***JDAI Readiness Outreach***

Liz and Stephanie provided an overview of their detention center readiness visits, (See handout for a complete list of stakeholder names.) noting an overall interest and understanding of the JDAI work, and a general concern about how JDAI would work in smaller jurisdictions. Liz noted that local and state stakeholders were presented with information about the JDAI work and how it's had an impact on the two current sites in addition to discussing the Facility Inspection process and the intake process. During the discussions with detention centers across the state, there was an interest in developing a statewide detention center professional network to provide support to each other and to bring training to JDC staff in an organized way. It was also emphasized that many of the juvenile detention staff were cross-trained to work in the jail due to many times in a year having no youth in the detention centers. It was noted in some of the detention centers that there was an interest in training for their detention center staff above and beyond their current training protocols.

An issue was raised in regards to the fact that there are two detention centers in the process of building new facilities to include more beds for juveniles. Discussion centered on how the JDAI work could influence the local decision making process related to how many beds will be built.

### ***South Dakota Data by Circuit and Counties***

To kick-off the discussion on how to expand JDAI, Liz presented demographic data in the form of a PowerPoint and a map of South Dakota in regards to population of each county, each circuit, and the average daily population within the detention centers. During this discussion, the recommendation was made to look at the top offenses within the detention centers and to provide more information on which counties use detention the most. It was noted that this information could be gathered for the next meeting.

Committee members began to identify other local and state stakeholders groups that would benefit from JDAI-related education. The two groups that were mentioned include the South Dakota Association of County Commissioners and the Associated School Board of South Dakota. Ken McFarland advised that he would reach out to the South Dakota Association of County Commissioners and Kent Alberty advised that he would reach out to the Associated School Board of South Dakota. A recommendation was then made to have all information for any future presentation opportunities forwarded on to Liz so she can record the presentations and assist with identifying the most appropriate individuals to present the information.

Doug Herrmann provided background regarding the co-location of the detention centers with the jails. He noted that, under Governor Rounds, the Council of Juvenile Services was formed and was staffed by the Department of Corrections. The Council of Juvenile Services was tasked with coming back into compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act which began in 2003. He noted that, one of the requirements of compliance was to have a separate juvenile area that was sight and sound separated from the adult jail. Therefore, many of the facilities don't have a new juvenile detention center, but in many locations have an area that they were able to make work due to the distance of a regional detention center option.

### ***JDAI Expansion Milestones and Timeline Discussion***

Stephanie Vetter provided an overview of the expansion milestones and timeline. Stephanie emphasized that the Statewide Steering Committee will want to be intentional in the plan for expansion and noted that there needed to be a readiness assessment as to a site's willingness to take on the eight core strategies of JDAI. Stephanie noted that, during the conversations in each of the detention center jurisdictions, the questions were geared more towards the operationalization of the implementation versus basic questions regarding why JDAI would be implemented which emphasized their readiness for the JDAI work and displayed their basic understanding of the core concept behind JDAI.

Committee members discussed the JDAI expansion proposal which is to expand initially to circuits that operate juvenile detention centers. This proposal was put forward based upon the following criteria:

- 1) The counties that operate the JDC's use the most beds
- 2) The counties that operate JDC's have the highest youth populations.
- 3) There was interest expressed by stakeholders during these visits to engage in JDAI
- 4) A general familiarity was expressed JDAI's tools and activities.

Stephanie noted that some states, such as New Jersey, required interested jurisdictions to go through an application process to become a JDAI site. She further noted that examples of these applications could be provided at the next meeting, if this approach appealed to the Committee. At this time, a concern was brought up about a site applying to be the next JDAI site because they didn't know what they didn't know. It was further noted that it would be difficult for a site to have the ability to fill out an application if they weren't sure what they were applying for and recommendation was made to have a road map that would guide the local and state work and provide information as to what the next steps would look like.

John Bentley encouraged a discussion around what the capacity for expansion was at this time. He further noted that, if there was a capacity to move forward with all of the sites, then we should do so, but not before the capacity was evaluated. In regards to the messaging of the JDAI work to the expansion areas, it was noted that there shouldn't be a conversation relating to a "cost-savings", but there should be a conversation about being cost neutral. It's about how much a site is currently allocating funds towards detention costs and how some of that funding could be re-allocated towards alternatives that would be identified based on the data.

Towards the end of the discussion, it was agreed upon by consensus that a finalized plan for expansion would not be able to be reached at this meeting. It was noted that, at the next meeting, additional data would be presented in addition to a road map and there would be a discussion around the capacity for expansion, the level of interest and the impact that could be made.

At that time, an update regarding the Juvenile Justice Taskforce work was provided. It was noted that there had been two meetings to date and the second meeting had been on July 23, 2014. It was noted that the discussion revolved around the process on how the juvenile justice system works and a discussion about the cost of residential treatment. There has not been a discussion about policy changes at this time. It was noted that there have been stakeholder meetings held regarding the work of the committee and at many of the meetings, the JDAI work has been referenced and recognition about the success of the JDAI work has been presented in addition to the emphasis that the work of the Juvenile Justice Taskforce would not conflict with the work of the JDAI Statewide Committee.

The committee was informed that the original date of the next meeting, October 16th, wouldn't work and the meeting would be rescheduled for late September or early October. Liz noted that she would send out a scheduler to all attendees as soon as a date was identified. In the interim, work would be done to get a JDAI presentation on the agenda for the statewide commission meeting and the statewide school board meeting.