



INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR JUVENILES

Information Technology Committee Meeting

Minutes

July 17, 2018

2:00 p.m. ET

Voting Members in Attendance:

1. Tony DeJesus (CA) Chair
2. Judy Miller (AR) Designee
3. Anne Connor (ID) Designee
4. Julie Hawkins (MO) Commissioner
5. Dale Dodd (NM) Commissioner
6. Daryl Liedecke (TX) Commissioner
7. Natalie Dalton (VA) Commissioner

Voting Members Not in Attendance:

1. Pamela Leonard (NH) Commissioner
2. Joy Swantz (WI)

Non-Voting Members in Attendance:

1. Jen Baer (ID)
2. Maxine Baggett (MS)
3. Abbie Christian (NE)
4. Raymundo Gallardo (UT)

Staff in Attendance:

1. MaryLee Underwood, Executive Director
2. Emma Goode, Training and Administrative Specialist
3. Jennifer Adkins, Project Manager
4. Monica Gary, Administrative and Logistics Coordinator

Call to Order

Chair DeJesus called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. ET.

Roll Call

Director Underwood called the roll and a quorum was established.

Agenda

D. Dodd (NM) made a motion to approve the agenda. A. Connor (ID) seconded. The motion was approved.

Minutes

A. Connor (ID) made a motion to approve the June 5, 2018 meeting minutes as amended. N. Dalton (VA) seconded. The motion was approved.

Discussion

Return Workflows

- Chair DeJesus (CA) opened the floor for comments regarding the return workflow reconfigurations to correctly calculate business days for the return rather than the travel plan submission.
- J. Adkins provided an overview of the return workflows changes that would allow the workflow to calculate 5-business days from the point the home/demanding state receives the return assignment from the holding state to the point when the home/demanding state confirms that the juvenile was returned. The 5-business day extension would remain but an email notification would now go to the holding state to notify them of the application of the 5-business day extension.
- J. Adkins commented that the Travel Plan submission is removed from all proposed return workflow configurations and would occur optionally in a new Travel Plan workflow, independent from the return workflow. This ensures that the 5-business days are not interrupted within the return workflow and would put the assignment on the holding state's assignments page for review, rather than an email notification only.
- T. DeJesus (CA) inquired whether the Travel Plan workflow would require a separate workflow initiation process and if this means there will be two active workflows.
- J. Adkins replied that the new Travel Plan workflow would need to be started as a separate workflow.
- J. Miller (AR) asked for clarity on removing the Travel Plan process from the return workflow.
- J. Adkins clarified that the Travel Plan would not be part of any return workflow under the proposed configuration. It would be an optional workflow that could accompany the return file. No timers would be associated with the new Travel Plan workflow.
- T. DeJesus (CA) asked if the Travel Plan is currently optional or if it required by the ICJ Rules.
- J. Adkins said that there are no timeframes in the ICJ Rules associated with submitting a Travel Plan for a return and that the form was added to JIDS as an optional form.
- Chair DeJesus (CA) added that the Travel Plan form is useful for tracking airport surveillance. He explained that the return workflow would end when the home/demanding state confirms that the juvenile is back in their state.
- J. Miller (AR) asked if the Travel Plan would be located in the same file as the other return documents.
- J. Adkins said that the Travel Plan would need to be added to the return file, not a separate JIDS event.
- T. DeJesus (CA) asked how the workflow counts timed processes, by the day or by the hour.
- J. Adkins said that overdue steps escalate 1 minute past a step due date and will ask InStream for clarity.
- D. Dodd (NM) made the point that a workflow started on the West Coast may be after the East Coast has ended their business day. T. DeJesus questioned whether that counts against them for the 5-business day due date.
- A. Connor (ID) inquired if any returns identified as overdue on the Performance Measurement Assessment between a Pacific Time Zone state and an Eastern Time Zone had been rebutted due to the circumstance where a return timer may have been started after compact office staff left for the day, leaving essentially 4-business days to affect the return.
- J. Adkins stated that the national office would have to look at assessment records to determine if any returns had been rebutted due to a possible time zone issue. In addition, any reports that would require editing due to the workflow changes may be able to take days into

account rather than minutes, when determining due dates. The logic for the current compliance reports do not consider a return overdue unless 10-business days have passed, to allow for the 5-business day extension option in the ICJ Rules. This controls for the situation where a time zone difference may flag a return as overdue.

- A. Connor (ID) stated that the issue of 5-business days and differences in time zones for ICJ Offices was a previous topic of discussion during an ICJ Rules training. She stated that the ICJ Rules do not speak specifically to time zones in regards to business days and that the current report compensates for that issue if it is calculating based upon 10-business days.
- Chair DeJesus echoed that the spirit of the rule is to make every effort to affect a return within 5-business days.
- J. Miller (AR) inquired about how the other state would receive the notification for the travel details, especially for states that do not use the Travel Plan.
- J. Adkins reported that the Travel Plan workflow would be started within the same file but on a different workflow, using the Travel Plan form.
- A. Connor (ID) said that emails and phone calls coordinating returns aren't always noted in JIDS as it is, and that the current workflow timeframes are triggered by the assumption that a non-required form is being used; however, not all states are using that form so the workflow is representing something that may not be occurring, i.e., submission of a Travel Plan form.
- N. Dalton (VA) asked where the assignment containing the Travel Plan would appear in regards to Global Assignments.
- J. Adkins clarified that because it will be a separate workflow, the workflow title and step listed on the Global Assignments page would list Travel Plan instead of Voluntary or Non-Voluntary Return. In addition, the new workflow would have a separate assignment page located on the left-hand sub-assignment menu.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that she only uses the Travel Plan form when air surveillance is required and instead adds travel information in the workflow notes section. She asked if the proposed changes would eliminate that option.
- T. DeJesus (CA) said that the notes section could still be used and states could continue to note travel details as they currently do, but when a Travel Plan is used the new workflow would be initiated.
- D. Dodd (NM) questioned the need for the workflow changes.
- A. Christian (NE) said that she also sits on the Compliance Committee and explained the difficulty with the current Voluntary Return workflow, for example, in measuring compliance with the ICJ Rules and the 5-business day requirement because the Travel Plan step is interrupting the calculation from the Form III submission to the return confirmation. She added that assessing all returns accurately requires workflow edits.
- T. DeJesus (CA) questioned the quote received from InStream for the new Travel Plan workflow.
- J. Adkins clarified that the new Travel Plan workflow was quoted at \$125.
- T. DeJesus (CA) asked if there was anyway InStream could keep the Travel Plan as part of the Voluntary Return workflow or if it was necessary to separate the Travel Plan from the workflow.
- J. Adkins said that having the Travel Plan submission step located in between the Form III submission and the confirmation of the return results in the calculation stopping at the Travel Plan step and, as such, separating it is necessary for an accurate calculation.
- T. DeJesus (CA) asked the committee if they wanted to vote on each workflow change separately or all together.
- N. Dalton (VA) recommended voting on all return workflow changes at the same time.

- J. Miller (AR) and A. Connor (ID) concurred with the recommendation to vote on all workflow edits at the same time.

Non-Voluntary Return Workflow

- J. Adkins explained the proposed edits to the Non-Voluntary Return workflow which would add rule-based timers for the 60-calendar day home/demanding state petition hearing and the 30-calendar day holding state requisition hearing.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that one issue with non-voluntary returns is that a requisition will come in as a Non-Voluntary Return workflow assignment in an attempt to locate a juvenile and will sit on the holding state's assignments page until the juvenile is located. She explained that if the timer has already started before the juvenile is located, the holding state will appear to be out of compliance. Further, for a juvenile who is not already in custody the timers should start when the juvenile is located as opposed to when a document is received in JIDS.
- D. Dodd (NM) and J. Miller (AR) agreed.
- A. Connor (ID) inquired if InStream could build into the workflow a way to account for either scenario for a non-voluntary return: a request to locate a juvenile in the holding state and a notification that a juvenile is already in custody, such as a juvenile who refuses to sign a Form III.
- A. Christian (NE) added that the proposed workflow edit would not work for a request by a home/demanding state to locate a juvenile because the proposed workflow starts with the holding state.
- A. Connor (ID) explained that while the majority of non-voluntary returns are for juveniles who are already in custody and refuse to return, the small subset of a juveniles who haven't been located would require a separate workflow.
- J. Hawkins (MO) indicated that the non-voluntary return rules speak to the two subgroups of non-voluntary returns.
- J. Adkins asked the committee for input and suggestions on the best way to incorporate these scenarios into workflow edits.
- T. DeJesus (VA) indicated that this subset of returns cannot be excluded in the workflows.
- A. Connor (ID) clarified that the 60-calendar day requisition hearing would not apply if the juvenile was already being held in custody, but that the 30-calendar day hearing would apply, so the workflow should have options depending upon whether or not the juvenile is in custody.
- J. Hawkins (MO) suggested a separate workflow for a requisition to locate a juvenile not in custody and the timeframes wouldn't start until the juvenile is located.
- N. Dalton (VA) noted that sometimes juveniles who are in custody refuse to sign the Form III so a mechanism to transition a voluntary to a non-voluntary (or vice versa) workflow would be optimal.
- A. Christian (NE) said that the 60-calendar day timer should come into play upon the refusal of a juvenile to return.
- A. Connor (ID) explained that a voluntary return would turn into a non-voluntary return upon the juvenile's refusal to sign a Form III.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that oftentimes a juvenile who refuses to sign a Form III will later decide to sign which means a voluntary return could turn into a non-voluntary and then back to a voluntary return.
- A. Christian (NE) suggested that separate non-voluntary return workflows might best accomplish capturing each subset of returns, where the home/demanding state starts the workflow when asking the holding state to locate the juvenile. She further explained that the

30-calendar day timer would begin when the holding state confirms that they located the juvenile.

- J. Hawkins (MO) asked if we want the new workflows to capture situations when a return started as a voluntary return then became a non-voluntary return, or when a juvenile who refused to sign the Form III decides to sign.
- T. DeJesus (CA) said that he often starts a non-voluntary workflow, then the juvenile decides to sign the Form III, so he cancels the workflow and starts a voluntary workflow.
- A. Connor (ID) indicated that it would be preferred to have options that allow for the juvenile to sign the Form III without having to cancel and restart a new workflow.
- T. DeJesus (CA) asked the national office to re-evaluate the workflows in light of the committee's comments and obtain new quotes from InStream. He asked the committee if this only pertains to requisitions.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that she requests a full requisition before asking law enforcement to locate a juvenile.
- D. Dodd (NM) commented that many of these returns are dependency cases and in his state officers won't pick-up or detain a juvenile without a warrant.
- **A. Connor (ID) made a motion to table the workflow discussion until a new configuration and quote are obtained. J. Hawkins (MO) seconded the motion. The motion passed.**

Return for Failed Supervision

- J. Adkins explained that the new Return for Failed Supervision workflow would still be started by the receiving state. The sending state would either review and approve the return before the 5-business day timer starts, or the workflow would automatically start counting the 5-business days without a review period for the sending state to approve/deny the return.
- J. Miller (AR) asked how the workflow currently works.
- J. Adkins said that the workflow currently goes straight into the 5-business day timer and does not allow the sending state to review and approve/deny the return.
- A. Christian (NE) inquired as to which option is most inline with the ICJ Rules on failed supervision.
- T. DeJesus (CA) noted that in the previous Technology Committee meeting, A. Connor requested that the Compliance Committee look at ICJ Rule 5-103 as it pertains to this workflow.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that these types of returns should not be a surprise to the sending state.
- A. Christian (NE) said that maybe this matter should be referred to the Rules Committee.
- A. Connor (ID) pointed out ICJ Rule 5-103(3) which states, "The decision of the sending state to retake a juvenile shall be conclusive and not reviewable within the receiving state. If the sending state determines the violation requires retaking or retaking is mandatory..." She questioned if a timeframe should be included for the determination.
- D. Dodd (NM) commented that the period of determination should be no more than 48 or 72 hours.
- J. Miller (AR) said that it may take longer than that to get a determination from a court.
- A. Christian (NE) noted that ICJ Rule 5-103(4) points out what is required to determine if it is truly a failed supervision and said that states may disagree on that determination.
- A. Connor (ID) said this process is supposed to start with a violation report requesting revocation which requires a 10-business day response by the sending state. Then, a return for failed supervision would occur if it was determined to be a failed supervision.
- J. Hawkins (MO) said that many juveniles aren't returned because there is no parent or legal guardian remaining in the sending state.

- T. DeJesus (CA) said that it sounds like the committee considers the 10-business day response to a violation report as the review period for the determination of the return.
- A. Connor (ID) said that only after the violation report where revocation is requested is sent would the return for failed supervision be initiated.
- A. Christian (NE) commented that the Return for Failed Supervision workflow shouldn't be started until after the violation report response.
- J. Hawkins (MO) agreed that the 10-business day response timer sounds reasonable as the review period for the return for failed supervision.
- A. Connor (ID) said that the framework exists in the rules to have the return for failed supervision review period be part of the violation report process that should precede the return. She added that training would be required, perhaps even a Best Practice.
- The committee discussed whether or not the Return for Failed Supervision should only be an option after a violation report requesting revocation has been processed. They decided that it should be addressed as a training issue.
- The committee reached a consensus to retain the approve/deny return step in the Return for Failed Supervision workflow, noting that a violation report would precede a return for failed placement in most cases.
- A. Christian (NE) asked when might be the earliest we could implement the new workflows.
- J. Adkins said that InStream needs time to rebuild and test the workflows and the committee expressed interest in seeing these in the Sandbox first before going live with them.
- The committee decided to discuss the workflows again after the Annual Business Meeting.

Old Business

- A. Connor (ID) commented that the e-form process "Referral Packet" in JIDS, which generates a Form IA/VI, IV, and V, contained the previous version of the Form IA/VI until July 10 and was corrected to the July 1, 2017 version.

New Business

- There was no New Business.

Adjourn

Chair DeJesus adjourned the meeting by unanimous consent at 3:30 p.m. ET.