

**Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force**  
**Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana**  
**January 24, 2014**  
**Meeting Minutes**

*Note:* Consensus points/terms of agreement are in ***bold italics*** throughout the Minutes. There is also a Task List at the end of the Minutes—if you have homework, it will be listed there!

1. The Task Force met on Friday, January 24, 2014 from 10:00 a.m. to 12 noon in the Supreme Court Law Library. The following members were present: Lilia Judson of the Division of State Court Administration (STAD), (Co-Chair); Julie Whitman of the Indiana Youth Institute (IYI), (Co-Chair); Ann Hartman of Connect2Help/211; Chris Waldron of the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH); Cynthia Smith of the Department of Child Services (DCS); Mary DePrez of the Judicial Technology & Automation Committee (JTAC); Tom Bodin of the Indiana Attorney General's office (IAG); Kevin Moore of the Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA); and, Joshua Towns, Department of Education (DOE). The meeting was staffed by Mike Commons and Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorneys. Not present: Mary Allen, Criminal Justice Institute (CJI); Jeff Tucker, DCS; Paul Baltzell, Indiana Office of Technology (IOT); Barry Salovitz, Casey Family Programs.
2. The Chairs welcomed those in attendance and everyone introduced themselves.
3. The members considered the minutes of the November 22, 2013 meeting. While we were discussing the minutes, Tom Bodin mentioned that Justice Rush spoke to the Attorney General's entire staff on January 23, and that she focused on the work of this task force. Kevin Moore moved to approve the minutes as drafted, the motion was seconded, and the members approved the minutes unanimously.
4. Ruth Reichard gave an update on the status of the data collection project for substance abuse and mental health services to vulnerable youth. As of January 17, STAD had sent out 2,091 letters and questionnaires, and JTAC had received approximately 549 responses.
  - a. There is a significant backlog with respect to entering the information from the responses, especially those from the school social workers and guidance counselors, because in many cases they send JTAC a brochure or other response listing all of the services they provide (child care, financial literacy, emergency food and clothing, etc.). Ruth asked the task force for guidance about whether JTAC should add fields/categories/columns in the Microsoft Access database now, because we might want to add these layers at some point, or set the information aside and deal with it later. She brought examples of these types of responses for the members to peruse.
  - b. Ann Hartman mentioned that AIRS, the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems, has a taxonomy of terms/codes that would be very helpful to JTAC in classifying the information in the various responses. Ann will see about sharing

the terms and codes with JTAC. The question was raised if Connect2Help/211 already had this information: are we in danger of duplicating effort? Ann did not think that was likely, and said that 211 would love to have access to the information in this database. Lilly stated that if 211 gives JTAC the categories, they should plug the responses into those categories and, if there are any responses that don't fit the taxonomy, keep them for later.

- c. Tom noted that lengthy responses like these will help us guide future survey questions, and that these types of responses also support moving to a short survey format. ***The consensus of the group was to digitize the responses (scan them and put them in PDFs), and assign a unique Microsoft Access number to each one. Then, use the taxonomy terms as the fields into which we enter data from the responses (to the extent possible).***
  - d. The discussion then turned to the staff needed for this type of project. We talked about possibly two or more smart social work or SPEA students who could figure out the responses, do the data entry, and scan everything. We need people who took research methods/statistics classes and who liked it. Julie will share her contact at SPEA with Ruth.
  - e. Finally, we discussed whether to begin surveying private-sector service providers. ***We all agreed to wait and get the responses we do have organized; and then, perhaps in a period of months, we will see about identifying and surveying private-sector providers.***
5. We discussed the existing resource information available on 211's website. There are 25 counties' information available on 211's website. Outside of those 25 counties, the information available from 211 varies county-by-county. It was mentioned that there should be a clear link between the map and 211's information. Tom suggested that we could use the Access database to support two different "portals"—one for public consumption, one for private consumption. The public portal would have a certain number of "layers" (sets of viewable data), and the private portal would contain the same layers as the public portal along with additional layers that contain more confidential information. 211 would not be required to change its system/database in order to fit this project. Rather, the map could allow for 211's database to be included as a layer.
  6. We then held a discussion concerning both agenda items 4 & 6: our questions and recommended answers to the Executive Committee about the mapping project and database design issues. Justice Rush asked Lilly and Julie to give the Executive Committee a list of questions and our recommended answers in advance of the February 11 meeting, at which Julie and Lilly will be available to discuss the same.
    - a. Where should the database/map "live"? Tom noted that 211 does a lot of outreach already, and it would not be as cost-effective to do duplicate outreach to the public for a JTAC-based map. Chris Waldron explained that the map application does not have to reside in the same location as the data. Tom offered that 211

could host the public portal to the map at its URL, but JTAC could administer and host the private portal via an INCite application. The computers that host the back-end database would be at IOT. Mary DePrez agreed with this concept. Tom agreed to prepare a flowchart for Julie and Lilly to present to the Executive Committee with this framework. This discussion also covered the question of the audience for the map (both public and private audiences with different types of access).

- b. Concerns about liability, vetting providers, implied warranties? The task force members agreed that we need some type of disclaimer: Ann shared that 211 has a disclaimer on its web site and in its printed materials. She will bring sample language to the next task force meeting. Tom agreed to convey our questions to the Attorney General's office for a formal legal opinion, but cautioned that the AG could not respond quickly as we are in the midst of a legislative session. Tom also opined that we might want to invite the Attorney General (or one of his legal staff) to attend the next task force meeting. With respect to how the providers will update their information on the database, Ann stated that it is a good idea to require providers to periodically edit/update their basic information in order to keep it current. She remarked that vetting the information does come with a cost—we will need staff to follow up with providers, make calls, etc.
- c. What should we do with the information we receive from the providers, in terms of advancing the mission of the Commission? And, how will we fund our work? The enabling statute requires the Commission to study access to services; duplication, availability, and consolidation of services; and, barriers to services for vulnerable youth. The database and map will enable the Commission to accomplish much of that work, but it will take financial resources to hire staff, pay for the technology, and maintain everything. Tom observed that academics are hungry for this data, and so there might be grant money to fund some of the analytical work; others wondered if the Criminal Justice Institute might be aware of grant funds. ***The task force members also felt strongly that state funds should be directed toward this project in order for it to be sustainable.*** Lilly tasked Tom, Mary DePrez, Chris, and Ann with coming up with a cost estimate for the work we want to do. The cost estimate should include 211 hosting the public portal. Ann offered to share the budget for what it costs 211 to operate their 25-county database. Lilly observed that maybe the task force needs a subcommittee to identify a cost estimate. Julie said that IYI frequently works with academics to analyze data, but that it is too early to know the cost yet for analyzing the data that we have not yet finished collecting. Lilly tasked Mike Commons with researching whether the Commission as an entity can seek state funding, or if one of the Commission's agency members needs to make the request for funds in its budget. Lilly also proposed that we consider bringing a budget proposal for this project to the Commission on Courts. Kevin remarked that we need to nail down our state funding request by July. Julie and Tom both stated that these data will be worth a lot, and they should be free to researchers, if they agree to share their work with us/the Children's Commission. The Commission will gain additional insights by

making the data available to universities around the state—with confidentiality agreements, of course.

- d. Other observations about the database: Josh Towns suggested that we build the database mindful of API developers (Application Programming Interface). Julie said that we should try to find a way to match providers with those already listed in 211. Mary observed that providers should only have to update their information once for all portals. Lilly suggested that we accomplish this by assigning a unique ID number to each provider. Kevin noted that various agencies' websites should link to the main "front door" (the public portal website).
7. The members next turned to the proposed timelines (3 pages in all) that Lilly put forth for discussion.
    - a. Timeline #1, Building the Database, page 1, Decision-Making: *we decided that we need to arrive at answers to the questions on that timeline—and, more importantly, projected costs—by April 1, 2014.* We asked Lilly and Julie to ask the members of the Executive Committee if they were even inclined to seek state funding at the February 11 meeting. *The task force recommends the Commission seek funding before July 1;* this recommendation could possibly take the form of a presentation by Lilly and Julie at the April 16 meeting of the full Commission.
    - b. Timeline #1, Building the Database, page 2, Execution and Maintenance: Lilly tasked Tom, Julie, Chris, and Mary DePrez with working on this page once funding is available. Elements of this timeline should include: (1) following up with service providers to have them opt into the public portal (otherwise their information will be available privately, to the judges, academics, etc.)—Ann can give the group a framework for this; and, (2) identifying requirements for software development.
    - c. Timeline #2, Collecting Information, page 3: we did not discuss this page.
  8. The task force briefly discussed item 7 on the agenda. Regarding 7 b., partnering with the Youth Law T.E.A.M. and Laurie Elliott to include MAYSI (a mental health screening tool) in the Juvenile Database, Mary reported that JTAC is building the capability in-house to expand the use of the tool statewide. With respect to 7 c., disproportionate minority contact, Mary reported that 3 pilot counties (Hendricks, Henry, and Tipton) are pulling data from Odyssey (one type of case management system) and that 10-11 counties with more diverse communities are pulling data from Quest (another type of case management system). JTAC is working with researchers on this project.
  9. By this time, it was 12:00 noon. The members agreed to table the discussion of the questions listed under #2 for the Executive Committee (these largely concerned the data sharing aspects of the task force). We will consider those at the next meeting.

10. **Next meeting:** the Task Force's next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 18, 2014 from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at 30 South Meridian Street. We will have a conference call set-up for the next meeting so that Barry Salovitz, or other personnel from Casey Family Programs, can call in.

### TASK LIST

#### Lilly & Julie

1. At February 11 meeting, ask members of Executive Committee if they are inclined to seek state funding.

#### Ann Hartman

1. Find out about sharing the AIRS taxonomy, terms, and codes with JTAC. (done via email on January 28, 2014; the annual cost would be \$250)
2. Share disclaimer language. (done via email on January 28, 2014)
3. Share budget with Mary, Chris, and Tom for the operation of 211's 25-county database.

#### Mike Commons

1. Research whether the Commission as an entity can seek state funding, or if one of the Commission's agency members needs to make the request for funds in its budget.

#### Tom Bodin

1. Design flowchart for Lilly and Julie to present to Executive Committee. (done via email on January 27, 2014)
2. Convey our questions about liability, vetting providers, implied warranties, etc. to the Attorney General for a formal legal opinion. Alternatively, invite the Attorney General (or one of his deputies) to our next task force meeting to discuss our concerns in person.

#### Technical Sub-Committee: Mary DePrez, Ann Hartman, Chris Waldron, Josh Towns, & Tom Bodin

1. Arrive at a cost estimate for the layered database/map. We need a budget proposal by the next task force meeting on March 10<sup>th</sup>.
2. Work on Timeline #1, page 2, Execution and Maintenance of database. See item 7.b. in these Minutes for elements to include.

#### Ruth Reichard

1. Work with JTAC and STAD staff to hire social work or SPEA student(s) to build database.