

INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR JUVENILES

Training, Education, and Public Relations Committee Meeting Minutes

June 6, 2024

2:00 p.m. EDT

Via Zoom



Preliminary Business

Call to Order

Training Committee Chair C. Copeland (TN) called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. EDT.

Roll Call

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

Voting Commissioners/Designees in Attendance:

1. Corrie Copeland (TN), Commissioner, Chair
2. Robert Heide (AK), Commissioner, Vice Chair
3. Brooke Montelongo (CO), Commissioner
4. Jean Hall (FL), Commissioner
5. Jessica Wald (ND), Designee
6. Natalie Dalton (VA), Commissioner
7. Felicia Dauway (SC), Designee

Non-Voting Members in Attendance:

1. Cecily Rexach (CT)
2. Tracy Cassell (GA)
3. Shirleen Cadiz (HI)
4. Holly Kassube (IL)
5. Latoya Oliver (MD)
6. Daryl Liedecke (TX)
7. Susan Frankel, Ex Officio, National Runaway Safeline (NRS)

Members Not in Attendance:

1. Chanda Leshoure (AL)
2. Latosha Mallory (AL)
3. Nataly Sevilla (IN)
4. Lisa Bjergaard (ND), Commissioner
5. William Dolan (RI)

National Office Staff in Attendance:

1. Amanee Cabbagestalk, Training and Administrative Specialist
2. Jenny Adkins, Operations and Policy Specialist
3. Joe Johnson, Systems Project Manager

Agenda

J. Hall (FL) made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. F. Dauway (SC) seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Minutes

F. Dauway (SC) made a motion to approve the May 2, 2024, meeting minutes. J. Hall (FL) seconded the motion. N. Dalton abstained. The motion passed.

Check-ins

Training Committee Chair Copeland (TN) asked members to share their summer plans or a favorite summer memory as a check-in question.

Unfinished Business

Review Training Resources

- Training Committee Chair Copeland (TN) thanked J. Wald and H. Kassube for reviewing the Commission's bench cards and added that the committee will focus on making minor edits now and will review the resources in more depth in the future.

Bench Card of Transfer of Supervision

- H. Kassube (IL) explained that the suggested edits include updating paragraph titles and adding information specific to courts.

Bench Card on Return of Runaways, Probation/Parole Absconders, Escapees, & Accused Delinquents

- S. Frankel (NRS) explained that there is a lot of movement, especially at the federal level, toward using more person-centered language, including acknowledging how youth self-identify. She explained that instead of calling youth "runaway," the phrase "young people who have run away" or "young people who have been asked to leave home" is preferred. She asked if the committee has considered altering the language.
- Chair Copeland (TN) explained that the bench cards are rule-driven documents, and the language mirrors the rule.
- S. Frankel (NRS) also suggested using the opportunity to use gender neutral language.
- Chair Copeland (TN) said that the UNITY system does allow to indicate how juveniles identify. She thanked S. Frankel for the suggestions and said that the committee will consider the feedback.
- Chair Copeland (TN) explained that the suggested edits prepared by J. Wald and H. Kassube will be circulated to the committee and will be tabled until the next meeting.

Discuss 2024 Annual Business Meeting (ABM) Training Sessions

OJJDP

- Chair Copeland (TN) reported that Liz Ryan, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), will attend the ABM and provide a presentation on Tuesday on the past, present, and future of the OJJDP.

Returns of Non-Delinquent Juveniles

- Vice Chair Heide (AK) reported that the subcommittee narrowed down the categories of non-delinquent runaway scenarios for the ABM training session and explained that the subcommittee wishes to solicit volunteers from the committee to contribute to and present each scenario. The four scenario categories are:
 - Requisition – Runaway refuses to return; Alleged abuse/neglect
 - Return of a juvenile within 24 hours (Entered into UNITY or not?)
 - Problem solving around difficult situations (Hospitalization, etc.)
 - Returns when the juvenile has a child involved

Scenario 1: Requisition – Runaway refuses to return; Alleged abuse/neglect

- F. Dauway (SC) shared a scenario of a runaway who alleged abuse and neglect. The youth was put into emergency custody and the locals worked with the youth's mother for the requisition. The holding state then took her out of custody and placed her into detention. At the holding state hearing, the youth told the judge that she would rather stay in detention than return home. Both state's child welfare agencies opened a case, but the youth still refused to return home. The judge asked the home state to secure alternative housing. The child welfare case is still open. She

shared a second case where a youth who alleged abuse/neglect went to the holding state to visit their other parent and then refused to return home. The holding state judge did not honor the requisition, and the youth never returned to the home state.

- B. Montelongo (CO) shared a non-delinquent runaway case where the youth was adopted due to the termination of parent rights and was considered a “youth in conflict.” The youth ran away from the placement in the home state and ran to another state where the biological parents lived. The youth alleged abuse/neglect by the adoptive family. The holding state judge ordered the child welfare agency in the holding state to place the youth outside of detention. That court determined that the biological family was where the youth belonged, even though the biological family’s rights had been terminated. Colorado had to start a requisition with the adoptive parent and worked with the court to bring the youth home. The juvenile stayed in the holding state due to being a flight risk and risk of danger to self. The adoptive parent and biological family decided to allow the biological family to pursue guardianship so the youth could remain in the holding state.
- J. Wald (ND) suggested that the training should address how state laws prohibit detention of runaways, yet the Compact does allow this. She shared a scenario where the home and holding states worked together to find the youth a foster placement in the holding state. She said that this case had a positive outcome. She suggested addressing how states can follow ICJ Rules while ensuring that youth are not put in a more difficult situation, such detention. She praised the holding state for acting quickly to find an alternative to detention, which was in the best interest of the youth.
- R. Heide (AK) suggested including the question in such a scenario: “*How did you navigate the conflict between the JJDPa and the Compact?*” He asked F. Dauway, B. Montelongo, and J. Wald to prepare write-ups of these three scenarios to present as part of the training. He asked that the scenario include an explanation of how the case was navigated and a description of the outcome.
- N. Dalton (VA) suggested addressing the issue of “best interest” and how holding state judges may violate the Compact.
- Chair Copeland (TN) agreed and said that we need to ensure that we are communicating with the judges to explain that “best interest” is a home-state determination. She reminded the committee of the resources that the Commission has already prepared and published on the website which can be used for in-state training purposes and utilized for the ABM training session.

Scenario 2: Return of a juvenile within 24 hours (Entered into UNITY or not?)

- R. Heide (AK) asked for feedback on a scenario related to returning juveniles under 24-hours.
- F. Dauway (SC) explained that the juveniles are not subject the Compact until that 24-hours period expires, unless they have a pending pick-up order.
- R. Heide (AK) asked if the Rules Committee should be asked to help explain this type of scenario to provide guidance to the Commission.
- F. Dauway (SC) supported sending the scenario to the Rules Committee for review.
- D. Liedecke (TX) said that it is important to consider, but it may not fit within the current training format.
- A. Cabbagestalk cautioned that if this scenario is included, it may lead to open debate which could detract from the training.

Scenario 3: Problem solving around difficult situations

- R. Heide (AK) asked for feedback on a scenario related to problem solving around difficult situations.
- D. Liedecke (TX) shared a scenario of a youth who ran to another state, spent time in a mental health hospital, and had to complete treatment before they could be returned.
- R. Heide (AK) said that Alaska is seeing more youth who are deemed incompetent, which means the court does not have jurisdiction since the youth is not held accountable for their actions.

There is an avenue to restore competency based upon treatment and a new evaluation. He said that while this hasn't yet occurred for an ICJ return with Alaska, it could be used for a scenario.

- N. Dalton (VA) said that she has seen return scenarios where a youth was ordered to competency restoration, but a secure custody order was still issued. She said that sometimes other states' judges refuse to return the youth because they are deemed incompetent. She agreed to prepare a scenario based on this issue.
- R. Heide (AK) asked the committee to consider other scenarios where a youth had to be hospitalized prior to return.

Scenario 4: Returns when the juvenile has a child involved

- F. Dauway (SC) shared a scenario of a probation absconder who had a dependent child. In this case, child protective services got involved and determined that the living situation was acceptable. The holding state refused to assist with the return. She ended up staying in the holding state and is doing well, according to the probation officer.
- Chair Copeland (TN) shared a scenario of a minor who ran out of state with her child. She explained that authorities detained the mother, and the child went into foster care. The juvenile signed the Form III, and arrangements were made for the youth's legal guardian to meet the child welfare agency at the detention center, where the youth was reunited with her child and taken back to the home state by her legal guardian. The case required collaboration and cooperation.
- R. Heide (AK) said that all the scenarios would be reviewed, and a determination would be made whether to add more.

ICJ vs. ICPC

- A. Cabbagestalk shared that a meeting is scheduled between Executive Director Underwood, ICPC Executive Director Carla Fults Rutherford, and herself. The training will explain similarities and differences between the two Compacts. They are thinking about adding ICPC staff to the live-stream and may utilize a "world café" model for the session.

First-Time Attendee Orientation

- R. Heide (AK) reported that the first-time attendee orientation will be for anyone who is attending the ABM for the first time. He met with A. Cabbagestalk and N. Sevilla (IN), where the format of the orientation was determined. The National Office will present the history of ICJ, including the purpose and overview of the Compact, and then committee chairs, or vice chairs, will explain what each committee does and how people can be involved.

New Business

There was no new business.

Next Steps

- Chair Copeland (TN) explained that most of the ABM training session preparation work will occur in subcommittees and invited the members to provide feedback and suggestions. Committee members were asked to provide return scenarios to A. Cabbagestalk by Friday, June 21.
- The next step related to the first-time attendee orientation is to reach out to the committee chairs.
- The next Training Committee meeting is Thursday, July 11 at 2:00 p.m. ET.

Adjourn

F. Dauway (SC) made a motion to adjourn. Training Committee Chair Copeland (TN) adjourned the meeting by acclamation without objection at 3:01 p.m. ET.