

**Iowa Girls Justice Initiative  
Meeting Summary  
December 20, 2016  
2:30 pm  
Conference Call**



**Work Group Members**

Ashley Artzer, *Juvenile Court Services*  
Terri Bailey, *Achieving Maximum Potential*  
LaTasha DeLoach, *Johnson County Social Services*  
Andrea Dickerson, *YSS*  
Jeremy Kaiser, *Scott County Juvenile Detention*  
Julie Martin, *Juvenile Court Services*  
Steve Michael, *Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning*  
Kristie Oliver, *Coalition for Family & Children Services in Iowa*  
Lori Rinehart, *Juvenile Court Services*  
Monica Stone, *Iowa Department of Human Rights*  
Jennifer Tibbetts, *ITFYW Chair and Catherine McAuley Center*  
Julie Walton, *Scott County Attorney's Office*

**Guests**

Janee Harvey, *Iowa Department of Human Services*

**Staff**

Gracie Brandsgard, *SPPG*  
Arlinda McKeen, *SPPG*  
Kathy Nesteby, *Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning*

**Introductions**

McKeen thanked the working group members for joining the call to approve the final report and recommendations from the Iowa Girls Justice Initiative Working Group. The group members looked at the version of the report with changes highlighted in red. The group moved through the marked changes to approve each change with explanation given by McKeen and Nesteby.

**Discussion of Changes**

On page 5 a paragraph was added that includes additional language for explanation purposes on the process the group took to prepare its recommendations and an additional sentence about technical assistance.

- Some of those community-based, evidence-based services are for a middle-risk or high-risk girls. The sentence makes it seem like these services are only for no risk girls.
- Our recommendations are not in conflict with those community-based or evidence-based practices for moderate- or high-risk girls. There is a lot of research and evidence that show that they are not only designed for low-risk kids, but they can be helpful to higher-risk youth.
- Change to “that are a threat to public safety.”

- Add “There are community-based and family foster care options that may be appropriate for high-risk girls, but we don’t have them sufficiently in Iowa.”
- Does the Code necessitate that a kid was high-risk? Or would moderate-risk kids be included in this?
  - No, the Code relates specifically to the serious, violent, and chronic youth. But the last part of the Code states that if they meet additional requirements they could be including moderate-risk youth.
- In the table showing female vs males at major decision points, the information in the table was updated using more recent data from CJJP.
  - Can we look at where girls are coming from geographically? Would help to know where programs and services need to be concentrated.

On page 10 in Jane’s story, the introduction of the story was changed and the explanatory comment was moved from the bottom to the top of the page. Language was also added in the story to more accurately reflect a girl’s experience with human trafficking and in detention.

On page 11

- Thinking of potential opposition to this, including threat to public safety is an important distinction, especially comparing it to the earlier sentence. Instead of “no public threat” it says “serious public threat.” There are a lot of kids who are released into the community who do pose a public threat to the community. Just like the earlier sentence states, we don’t want to make it seem like we aren’t serving youth who are a public threat through community-based services because we are.
- Change the sentence to “Supports this for girls who pose less than the most significant threat to public safety and who can adequately and safely be served by those interventions.”
  - We are looking at serious, violent, and chronic girls who pose the most significant threat to public safety.
- There can be more language about the intersectionality of race, gender, and sexual orientation. It’s in the report right now, but the data indicates that the discrepancy is very apparent. Electing it to a side one pager will only continue the problem.
  - The task force will continue to work on this issue.

On page 15, PMIC stands for psychiatric medical institution for children.

On page 17 five new paragraphs were added to the report.

- Take out “that follow” in the second sentence

On page 18 make the language strong enough to show them that these placements need to be for those the highest risk and those that are the highest risk to public safety.

Those remaining on the call were asked whether, with changed identified here, you accept this report as finalized.

- Jennifer Tibbetts – Yes
- Terri Bailey – Yes
- Latasha DeLoach – Yes
- Andrea Dickerson – Yes
- Jeremy Kaiser – Yes

- Julie Martin – Yes
- Kristie Oliver – Yes
- Lori Rinehart – Yes
- Ashley Artzer – Yes
- Monica Stone – Yes
- Kristin Corey – Yes
- Julie Walton – Yes

**Closing**

McKeen thanked the working group members again for their participation in this process from the beginning. Nesteby invited all working group members to join the Iowa Taskforce for Young Women to continue moving this work forward.