

Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
November 5, 2014
Meeting Minutes

1. The Task Force met on Wednesday, November 5, 2014, from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the JTAC Training Room, 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor.
 - a. The following members were present: Julie Whitman of the Indiana Youth Institute (IYI), (Co-Chair); Cynthia Smith, Department of Child Services (DCS); Mary DePrez, Judicial Technology & Automation Committee (JTAC); Shane Hatchett, Shane Hatchett, Research & Technology, Center for Education & Career Innovation (CECI); Chris Waldron, Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH); Barbara Moser, NAMI (*ex officio*); Tom Bodin and Lynne Hammer, Indiana Attorney General's office (IAG); Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC); and, Sirrilla Blackmon, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA). Additionally, Donna Bauer, Student Employee, STAD, was in attendance. We welcomed one guest, Stephanie Quiring, who is a lecturer at the I.U. School of Social Work at IUPUI.
 - b. Joining us by teleconference were: Delia Armendariz, Casey Family Programs, and Ann Hartman, Connect2Help/211.
 - c. Not present: Mary Allen, Criminal Justice Institute (CJI); Tony Barker and Paul Baltzell, IOT; Lilia Judson, Division of State Court Administration (STAD), (Co-Chair); Doris Tolliver and Jeff Tucker, DCS; Kevin Moore, (DMHA); Sarah Schelle, Department of Correction (DOC); and, Joshua Towns, Department of Education (DOE).
 - d. The meeting was staffed by Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorney.
 - e. Julie Whitman, our Chair for the meeting, welcomed those in attendance. Henceforth, Sirrilla Blackmon will be attending our meetings for Kevin Moore; Sirrilla is the Deputy Director at DMHA at the Office of Youth Services, Critical Populations and State Opioid Treatment Authority.

2. **Approval of Minutes from September 8, 2014 Meeting:** the members reviewed the minutes of the September 8, 2014 meeting and approved those minutes by consensus. There were no additions or corrections.

3. **Information Sharing Certificate Program, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University:** Julie informed the task force that the Indiana team has been admitted to this program. Team members are: Julie Whitman and Doris Tolliver of our task force; Michael Commons of STAD, who staffs the Commission's task force on cross-system youth; and, Lisa Thompson of JTAC. The program runs from December 8-11. The team is currently working on homework assignments that must be completed before the program start. There will also be work involved after the program's conclusion, referred to as a "capstone" project. Julie will provide an update about both the program and the project at our next meeting.

4. **Update on Sharing Juvenile Court, Criminal Conviction, etc. Data via INK & Ind. Code 22-4.5-10-4 (b):** Shane reported that, in discussions with Kevin McDowell, a deputy in the Attorney General's office, they determined that the legislative intent for INK's enabling statute was very clear on the question of sharing this type of data—sharing of such data is not permitted under the law. In Shane's view, he could still collaborate with us, but at this juncture,

we agreed that we will not recommend to the Commission that DCS and STAD actively participate in INK. We do intend to monitor each other's work and keep in touch, but a formal collaboration between INK, DCS, and the juvenile justice system will need to be "on hold" for now. We may develop a new approach to this issue once the team returns from Georgetown with their report.

5. **Update on PLA Request, Survey of Service Providers, Database:** Ruth reported that, thanks to Tom Bodin's work, we received the PLA list (with emails) of licensed behavioral health counselors in October. The list contains over 13,000 names of individuals who are licensed. In comparison, our database of around 4,000 entries contains mostly entities, not individuals, and of course it includes many schools. The task force decided that we do want our student employee, Donna Bauer, to survey the PLA list members about whether they provide services to children and, if so, the types of payment they accept, their catchment areas, and the types of services they provide. Ruth, Julie, and Sirrilla will meet with Donna to formulate the survey questions. Sirrilla indicated that the DMHA would like to have this information as well. We then discussed whether there is a separate listing at PLA of psychiatrists, and Tom volunteered to follow up with the PLA. Since our meeting on Nov. 5th, Tom has obtained this additional information from Herb Price, Information Technology Director at PLA: ". . . we do not license psychiatrists as such. They are physicians who choose to specialize in psychiatry. We do have the specialty on file for some physicians but it has not probably been updated in several years. The Indiana Medical Association may be a better source for finding those physicians that specialize in psychiatry. If they do not track – then I could give you a list of those that are listed as such but it may not be very accurate for those newer licensees." Tom will follow up with the state medical association. With respect to the original database of service providers, Donna has spent the last two months contacting non-responders and filling in the blanks for those entities. She has also used her knowledge as a graduate social work student in the field of addictions to critically assess the existing information in the database and label the categories more accurately, especially in the areas of acute services, crisis services, and substance abuse-related services.

6. **Discussion of Presentation at Nov. 19th Children's Commission Meeting:** Lilly and Julie are on the agenda, for a brief presentation/update of our task force's work, at the next Children's Commission meeting, which is Wednesday, Nov. 19th from 10:00A to 2:00P in the Government Center. At our last meeting in September, we agreed that we wanted them to present maps. In the meantime, Donna and Ruth met with Julie to decide which spreadsheets to send to Chris for mapping, and Donna prepared the spreadsheets, making sure the information from the database was as accurate as possible. Chris then created the maps, which we discussed at the meeting. Delia, from Casey Family Programs, was able to view the maps remotely via a Microsoft Lync connection.
 - a. The first set of maps we considered were created from the large PLA database, showing us where the behavioral health counselors are located in the state—at least, where their addresses are for registration purposes. Delia suggested that we label the maps with the date of provider license registration (example: PLA current as of 11/2014), and also

2010 Census data notations so we could compare their location with population centers, as well as with where children live. (Note: the database we received from PLA consists of “current or active” licenses.) We also considered the value of maps showing the total counselors per 1,000 children by ZIP Code; maps of children who need mental health services; and, maps showing the median age of the population by county. Some ZIP Codes may have no (or very low numbers of) children, if they are assigned to commercial centers. We decided it was better to map by Census tracts or block groups than ZIP Codes, for that reason—in terms of numbers of children, ZIP Codes can dilute our message.

- b. We then looked at a set of maps created from our survey and from 211 data: density of providers, based on the survey; survey results showing providers per 1,000 children by ZIP Code or radius. Barbara Seitz de Martinez volunteered that her workplace uses a directory of youth-serving entities purchased from INFOUSA. We decided that we want Chris to prepare a map showing substance abuse and mental health treatment providers, not those who also offer prevention services. We also looked at maps showing payment types accepted and, more specifically, maps of providers who accept Medicaid.
- c. We also thought it would be good to compare this information with the incidence of JD and JC cases (juvenile delinquency and CHINS). It is possible to map the raw numbers of case filings and dispositions; Mary DePrez pointed out that there is normally one case filed per child. Mary will send a spreadsheet of JD filings by court/county to Chris.
- d. Barbara Seitz de Martinez (who works at the Indiana Prevention Resource Center) will send Ruth a list of substance abuse prevention services, and Donna will compare that list with our database.
- e. In the end, we decided on 6 types of maps that we want Chris to prepare, so that Lilly and Julie can present them to the Commission on the 19th:
 - i. From the PLA list, a map showing where the licensees are
 - ii. From the PLA list, a map showing the licensees per 1,000 children
 - iii. From the PLA list, a map showing the licensees’ locations and the locations of the JC & JD new case filings (Mary can get this for 2011)
 - iv. From our survey results, for substance abuse and mental health providers only, a map showing treatment providers (clinicians)—not prevention programs, etc.
 - v. From our survey results, maps showing substance abuse and mental health treatment providers (iv., above) per 1,000 children
 - vi. From our survey results, maps showing substance abuse and mental health treatment providers (iv., above) with JC & JD case filings (again, probably from 2011)
- f. As for policy recommendations—we don’t know enough yet to make any policy recommendations to the Commission. Lilly and Julie will use the presentation of maps as an update, a snapshot of where we are. We are not yet at the point where we can make recommendations for concrete, incremental policy steps. However, Mary DePrez encouraged Lilly and Julie to tell the Commission what data will be available in the

future, emphasizing that new information will be online such that next year's report may paint a more complete picture.

- g. Our task force's role—this discussion then morphed into a consideration of our role. Should we contact the other task forces and let them know the maps are available for their use? Can the Commission more clearly define our role? We need to identify what steps need to be taken to fill in the gaps we see in the existing information about service providers, and to allow for sharing of data.

7. **Report from Ann Hartman on Comparison of Databases:** In October, Lilly, Julie, and Ruth met with Ann Hartman and Lynn Engel of Connect2Help to discuss where our database should, or could, reside on a more permanent basis. We decided that first, we should compare our database with those of Connect2Help and 211 to see to what extent they overlapped. Ruth emailed Ann a spreadsheet containing our database a few weeks ago. Ann joined us by teleconference to report on the comparison, but was unfortunately disconnected before she could give her report! She sent the following information via email: "In broad strokes, it looks like about one-third of the resources that your team has collected are in our database (see chart below). Having said that, we have not completed the comparison with 269 of your resources. Elizabeth Radcliff, our Manager of Database Resources, is the best contact for questions about this information."

| Status of Commission on Vulnerable Youth Resources | | |
|--|------------|------------|
| 1,344 records from Commission against ALL IN211 Databases | | |
| Status | # | % |
| Resource in IN211 Database | 438 | 33% |
| Not In IN211 Database | 403 | 30% |
| Comparison Not Complete | 269 | 20% |
| Does Not Fit Inclusion Policy | 222 | 17% |

Updated information from Ann Hartman & Elizabeth Radcliff, December, 2014:

"It looks like about 60% of the resources in your database are NOT included in our database at this time. We probably need to discuss your timeline and whether there is any funding for the consolidation of the databases."

| Status | # | % |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Resource in IN211 Database | 545 | 41% |
| Not in IN211 Database | 570 | 42% |
| Does Not Fit Inclusion Policy | 229 | 17% |

“Of the ones that are not in the IN211 database at least 1/3 or more are sites that we do not list. For instance, in the data provided the Boys and Girls Clubs have every school where they offer programming listed as a separate site, we do not list each of these because generally these are for the kids at that school and they find out about them thru the school.

As far as where we go next with this I am not sure—for the 229 that do not fit our inclusion policy we would not add them unless we were being paid by a contract to collect that information. For the other data I did not analyze where the data that was missing is from (what 211 center)

If the goal is to have all of this data in the IN211 database then at some point there would need to be some conversations with the other centers about inclusion and timelines and probably money.”

8. **Next meeting**: the Task Force’s next meeting will be on *Wednesday, January 28, 2015*, from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor, in the JTAC Training Room. Once again, we will have a conference call set up so that task force members and personnel from Casey Family Programs can call into the meeting.