

AAICPC/ICJ
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
Work Group Fourth Meeting
Minutes

Wednesday, July 13, 2011
2:00 p.m. EDT

I. Members in Attendance:

1. Thomas Brinton (IL) AAICPC Co-Chair
2. Rose Ann Bisch (MN) ICJ Co-Chair
3. Barbara Murray (AK) ICJ
4. Rosalind Hyde (CA) AAICPC
5. Maria Genca (CT) ICJ/AAICPC
6. Caryl Jefferson (FL) AAICPC
7. Sharon F. Curry (MA) AAICPC
8. Julie Hawkins (MO) ICJ
9. Michael Reddish (NE) ICJ
10. Donna Bonner (TX) ICJ

Members Not in attendance:

1. Judy Miller (AR) ICJ
2. Shannon Foster (NV) AAICPC
3. Cheri Stewart (TN) AAICPC
4. Gina Gelnett (TX) AAICPC

II. Ex-Officios and Staff in Attendance:

1. Stephen Pennypacker (FL) AAICPC Ex-Officio
2. Ashley Lippert, ICJ Executive Director
3. Jimmy Frazier, ICJ MIS Project Manager
4. Emma Goode, ICJ Administrative and Logistics Coordinator

Ex-Officios and Staff Not in Attendance:

1. Carla Fults (DC) AAICPC, Ex-Officio
2. Terry Clark (PA) ICJ Ex-Officio

III. Guests in Attendance:

1. Kathy Letourneau (RI) AAICPC
 2. Bruce Rudberg (CA) AAICPC
-

Call to Order

T. Brinton, Co-Chair, called to order the fourth meeting of the AAICPC/ICJ Work Group at 2:03 p.m. EDT.

Roll Call

A. Lippert, ICJ Executive Director, called the roll. Ten of the fourteen *voting* members were in attendance, establishing a quorum.

Agenda

D. Bonner made the motion to approve the agenda as presented, M. Reddish seconded. The motion passed.

Minutes

D. Bonner made the motion to approve the June 27, 2011 meeting minutes as presented, J. Hawkins seconded. The motion passed.

Housekeeping

Co-Chair Brinton noted the meeting time allotted to be 90 minutes and all guests would be provided the opportunity to comment under new business.

Review Draft of Proposed MOU

Co-Chair Brinton thanked the members from both Compacts for their suggestions and contributions.

Co-Chairs T. Brinton and R. Bisch presented a modified draft of the Memorandum of Understanding which included the recent suggestions from both compacts and the previous consensus reached by the work group. The Co-Chairs composed the rough draft as a broad and general overview of the AAICPC/ICJ relationship with emphasis in the following areas:

I. Purpose

- Foster communication, education, and training between the two compacts
- Focus on how to clarify issues and resolve confusion with overlapping jurisdictions
- Coordinate roles and responsibilities at the local, state, and national levels

II. Defining AAICPC and ICJ

- Role of AAICPC
- Role of ICJ
- Common categories: runaway, residential, and family setting

III. Collaboration

- Communication
- Education and Training
- Collaboration in specific cases

The Work Group concurred with the direction of the modified rough draft agreement and agreed to dissect each section for consideration. The Work Group debated the first paragraph, Sections I & II, and agreed to propose the following:

- **Introductory Paragraph 1**

Delete the last sentence and end the paragraph after the date.

- **I. Purpose of MOU**

The language was amended to read: *The purpose of this MOU is to foster communication, collaboration, education, and training, to clarify issues and to resolve confusion on the local, state and national levels in the handling of those cases when both compacts may apply or in other cases when only one compact is to be used. Further, this MOU is intended to coordinate, to the extent possible, the roles and responsibilities of each party at the local, state, and national levels to determine: 1) the best plan of action regarding public safety and what is in the best interest and safety of the juvenile, and 2) when it may be necessary to modify rules,*

regulations, procedures and forms to further enhance communication and improve delivery of services.

- **II. Defining ICPC and ICJ:**

- A. ICJ

- B. ICPC

- The Work Group did not reach a consensus and determined that each compact would meet separately to formulate the language for their respective compact and present at the next meeting for consideration.

- C. **Cases where both compacts may be involved:**

- 1. Runaways...

- 2. Residential placements...

- 3. Family settings...

- The Work Group agreed with the proposed three categories included as items 1, 2, and 3.
 - Additionally they agreed that the formatting throughout the document should be consistent.
 - The Work Group favored the language proposed in the last sentence and agreed it would be more applicable in Section III. C. (see below)

- **III. This collaboration shall include:**

- C. **Collaboration in Specific Cases:** Promoting Collaboration at a Local, State, and National levels. *On occasion, both ICJ and ICPC may have joint responsibility for these juveniles and agree to collaborate in their case management efforts.*

At the request of the Work Group, the ICJ National Office forwarded the amended MOU draft to the co-chairs for review.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjourn

M. Reddish made the motion that the Work Group meet again on Wednesday, August 3 at 2:00 p.m. D. Bonner seconded. The motion passed.

Co-Chair Brinton adjourned by acclamation at 3:26 p.m. EDT.