

Alternatives to Detention Planning Committee

October Update

The sub groups all met to continue work around identifying changes to the tool, discussing the process of the tool, and identifying what needs there are for additional alternatives to detention services. The subgroup on changes to the tool identified the need to connect with Iowa to learn from their validation study as well as look at other examples of states with validated tools. Representatives from CSG and the sub group met with staff from Iowa to discuss their tool and changes that have been made as a result of the validation study and will be reporting back to sub group this week. For the process subgroup, potential options for structure changes to ensure that the correct information was available at the time of the tool being conducted were discussed, including the staffing of a full time position from the courts that law enforcement could call at any time for information or the development of assessment centers. To better understand the potential of an assessment structure system the working group will be meeting with representatives from Lucas county Ohio. For the services subgroup, to better understand the current youth being held in detention, data was collected and discussed. The data revealed that nearly 60% of youth in detention did not meet the 13 points that led to automatic detention, though the reasons for overrides were often mandatory such as a pick up and hold order. The group will continue to review data to better understand the current population of youth being placed in detention to better identify needed alternative services.