

INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR JUVENILES
Midwest Region Meeting



March 18, 2024
Special Meeting Minutes
11:00 a.m. ET
Via Zoom

Commissioners/Designees in Attendance:

1. Charles Frieberg (SD), Commissioner, Region Representative
2. Curtis Hamstra (IA), Commissioner
3. Megan Milner (KS), Commissioner
4. Michael Tymkew (MI), Commissioner
5. Tracy Hudrlik (MN), Commissioner
6. Jacey Rader (NE), Commissioner
7. Jessica Wald (ND), Designee
8. Casey Gerber (WI), Commissioner

Commissioners/Designees not in Attendance:

1. Sasaun Lane (OH), Commissioner, Alternate Representative
2. Kellianne Torres (IA), Designee
3. Tomiko Frierson (IL), Commissioner
4. Mary Kay Hudson (IN), Commissioner
5. Lisa Bjergaard (ND), Commissioner

Compact Staff in Attendance:

1. Holly Kassube (IL)
2. Angel Jones (IL)
3. Molly Dearing (IL)
4. April Simmons (IN)
5. Nataly Sevilla (IN)
6. Nita Wright (IN)
7. Cheryl Frost (SD)
8. Kathy Christenson (SD)

Guest in Attendance:

None

National Office Staff in Attendance:

1. Jenny Adkins, Operations and Policy Specialist
2. Joe Johnson, System Project Manager
3. Amanee Cabbagestalk, Training and Administrative Specialist
4. Emma Goode, Logistics and Administrative Specialist

Call to Order

Midwest Region Representative C. Frieberg (SD) called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. ET.

Roll Call

J. Adkins, National Office Staff, called the roll, and a quorum was established.

Agenda

T. Hudrlik (MN) made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. J. Rader (NE) seconded. The motion passed.

Discussion

New Business

Explore Concerns About Juveniles Living in Receiving State Prior to the Transfer of Supervision

- Representative Frieberg (SD) briefed on the Midwest Region’s previous discussions related to the most recent failed attempt to pass a proposed amendment to Rule 4-102. The justification for the proposal lies with issues when juveniles live in the receiving state prior to acceptance of supervision. He turned the meeting over to Jacey Rader (NE) who led the members through an interactive exercise that led to a consensus on the difference between technical problems and adaptive challenges.
- J. Rader (NE) lead the discussion using a tool from the Alliance for Community and Justice Innovation (ACJI) leadership training course. She walked the Midwest Region through a process that began with first identifying the problem and ended with drafting a problem statement. The comments from the membership were summarized and captured in a PowerPoint presentation on the screen.
 - **Problem Identification**
 - What do we think the problem is?
 - What have we observed?
 - What are the challenges with kids living in receiving states before (without) supervision?
 - When a youth is already in the receiving state, supervision by the sending state is challenging and there is no defined responsibility for either the sending or the receiving states.
 - Confusion for youth regarding sending/receiving state (who is doing what).
 - Transfer investigation timeframe, no clear responsibilities defined for sending and receiving state.
 - Rules are built for kids who move; not necessarily for families who have been living in the receiving state.
 - **Evaluate**
 - Data
 - Training
 - Communication
 - Roles
 - **Problem Statement**
 - When a youth is already in the receiving state, supervision by the sending state is challenging and there is no defined responsibility for either state; importance of discussing the roles of each state with the youth and family.
 - Is the problem statement within the scope of the Commission to address?
- J. Rader (NE) explained how oftentimes leaders fail to see change due to approaching issues from a technical solution (i.e. rule proposal) versus an adaptive solution (behavioral change). She shared a slide showing a list of six (6) technical problems compared to six (6) adaptive challenges. The members provided live feedback via annotations. The interactive exercise demonstrated that the members overwhelmingly agreed the issue qualifies as an adaptive challenge.

Next Steps

- The Midwest Region agreed that the next step is to gather data in the following areas:
 - How many transfers are youth already living in the state.
 - The percentage of transfers already living in the receiving state vs. those moving to receiving state.
 - Kids living on a river/street with one side in each state.
 - Percentage of transfers who have never lived in the sending state.
 - The average time frame for acceptance.
 - Number of absconders in the first 45 days.
- The National Office will research the request for data currently in UNITY.
- The Midwest Region agreed to first focus on the sending state's responsibilities before looking at the receiving state responsibilities.
- An update on the available data will be provided in the next meeting on April 9, 2024.

Adjourn

Representative C. Frieberg adjourned the meeting by acclamation without objection at 12:06 p.m. ET.