

Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
October 20, 2015
Meeting Minutes

1. The Task Force met on Tuesday, October 20, 2015, from 2:00 p.m. to 3:03 p.m. in the Trial Court Technology Training Room, 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor.
 - a. The following members were present: Lilia Judson, Indiana Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration (STAD) (Co-Chair); Julie Whitman, Indiana Youth Institute (IYI) (Co-Chair); Tony Barker, Office of Technology (IOT); Sirrilla Blackmon, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA); Michael Commons, Family Law Attorney, STAD; Matt Hagenbush, Court Improvement Program, Indiana Judicial Center (IJC); Jeff Hudnall, Indiana Network of Knowledge (INK); David Murtaugh, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI); Adam Novotney, Department of Child Services (DCS); Christine Reynolds, ICJI; Cynthia Smith, DCS; Lisa Thompson, Trial Court Technology (TCT); and, Tamara Weaver, Indiana Attorney General's Office.
 - b. Not present: Delia Armendariz, Casey Family Programs; Mary DePrez, TCT; Devon McDonald, ICJI; Barbara Moser, NAMI; Sarah Schelle, Department of Correction (DOC); Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC); Joshua Towns, Department of Education (DOE); and, Doris Tolliver and Don Travis (DCS).
 - c. The meeting was staffed by Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorney.
 - d. Lilly Judson and Julie Whitman welcomed those in attendance, and since we had first-time attendees in David Murtaugh, Christine Reynolds, and Adam Novotney, we all introduced ourselves.

2. **Approval of Minutes from August 12, 2015 Meeting**: the members reviewed the minutes of the August 12, 2015 meeting, suggested no additions or corrections, and generally approved the minutes. We then engaged in an in-depth discussion concerning the status of the resolution we had passed at the August 12th meeting concerning the development of a juvenile abstract (the resolution appears as item #7 on the minutes from that meeting). Lilly Judson reminded us that, unlike adults in felony criminal cases, there is currently no single database for juvenile offenders—nothing to track their paths through the system, nothing to track outcomes. Lisa Thompson updated the task force about the work of the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Committee of the Indiana Judicial Center with respect to capturing data. While a juvenile abstract would be useful for many reasons, it would not be especially helpful for capturing DMC data. Indiana is years behind in reporting DMC data to the federal government (OJJDP), and that committee believes that something more like the CIP dashboard, or using courts' existing CMS and probation records, would help catch us up. The DMC figures would not capture dual-status youth, but *would* capture those children who are not formally adjudicated as well as those against whom a delinquency case is never filed (they are dealt with via diversion, warnings, or other informal means). In response to Lilly's question about whether the DMC work could be expanded to pick up CHINS cases, Lisa answered that yes, they could design an open-ended interface that would pull whatever data we wanted.

We then had a more general policy discussion about who would access such a database, and for what purposes. Lisa stated that DMC is considering a system that uses a county-specific upload to a central database, and not a system that would be searchable by court staff from other counties. Our sense was that we would want a *searchable* statewide database, instead of one from which we could “only” gather reports (although that data, in deidentified form, would be

useful for research). Adam Novotney and Cynthia Smith remarked that DCS mainly collects information on services, not dispositions. Matt Hagenbush wondered if DCS could modify KidTracks to incorporate JD and dual-status youth. Serrilla Blackmon noted that Marion County and the five pilot courts are certainly exploring this process, and developing protocols for delinquency and DCS teams to follow in order to identify and track dual-status children.

The bottom line at which we arrived was this: there is a lot of overlap of data gathering and tracking efforts at the moment. However, we don't know who (if anyone) is collecting dispositional data, even for informal adjustments—and if it is being collected, whether it is all in one place. This is a problem; Jeff Hudnall asked to us to consider whether it was a policy problem, or a technology problem.

Who puts data into the system? Who can access the data? Who can take data out? And, what data do we want to collect? Lisa reminded us that an abstract would not collect data on all of the informal actions that occur in the juvenile setting (with a goal of keeping kids out of the delinquency process). She also said that even the definitions vary between groups (e.g., DMC defines “detention” differently than JDAI).

Julie suggested that we need a subcommittee to conduct additional research to identify what is currently happening on juvenile data collection: for each project, we need to know its goals and what data it collects, and whether it is accomplishing anything we want to do regarding data collection. Our goals are: statewide data collection on JD and JC cases (to include informal dispositions of all types); the data should be useful for researchers and policy makers; the data should include DMC statistics; and, the database should also be useful on the individual case level so that judges, probation officers, etc. can research a youth's prior involvement with the system on a statewide basis. The members of this subcommittee are: Lisa Thompson, Mike Commons, Don Travis, and Matt Hagenbush.

With that, the task force voted to table the resolution until the subcommittee is able to look more closely at the status quo and give us more information.

3. **Cross-System Youth Task Force Update:** Since Don Travis was not present, Matt provided a brief update. Juvenile courts in the five pilot counties (Allen, Clark, Elkhart, Henry, and Tippecanoe) are set to go live in December. The plan is to be able to approach all of the state's juvenile judges in June about taking the reforms statewide. Specifically, for all dual-status cases, the approach entails first accurately identifying the cases through the use of a dual status screening tool (Ind. Code 31-41-1-3); then, as required by HEA 1196, a dual status assessment team (Ind. Code 31-41-1-5) will analyze the child's cases and make recommendations for both the delinquency and the CHINS case which are specifically tailored to that individual. Mike added that the Cross-System Youth Task Force is also exploring the use of the systems of care approach to these youths' cases.
4. **Update on Information Sharing Certificate Program, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University—Julie Whitman:** Julie reminded everyone that the team's capstone project consists of two parts: a survey and a guidebook/toolkit. The survey has been completed and the data are being analyzed. The information-sharing toolkit covers both state and federal laws. The first draft will be formally presented on November 5th to lawyers/general counsel from the affected agencies as well as to other stakeholders. Mike is releasing the introduction and the first three sections to the invitees today so that they have time to study the contents before meeting on the 5th. After the November meeting, everyone will reconvene one more time

in December to examine the revised copy. Ultimately, the team plans to distribute the guidebook by the end of this year.

5. **Query from Substance Abuse & Child Safety Task Force: Trauma-Informed Services:** Mike Brown, who staffs the Substance Abuse and Child Safety Task Force for Senator Randall Head, posed this question to us: how many service providers offer trauma-informed services? Sirrilla and Cynthia responded that both DMHA and DCS certify service providers in trauma-informed care (they certify individuals, not agencies). Sirrilla and Cynthia also clarified that, while a person can be trained to provide trauma-informed care, that does not necessarily mean that he or she will actually provide the services. Another important distinction exists between certification and training; although many providers have been trained, not all have gone on to become certified to provide this type of care (certification takes time and costs money). Sirrilla noted that DCS's list of providers would probably indicate who is actively using their training and providing the services, whereas DMHA's list might not.

Sirrilla and Lisa Rich (of DCS) both sit on the Substance Abuse and Child Safety Task Force, and they would be willing to help Mike Brown with this research. DMHA contracts with Aspen for training, while the DCS staff development team is responsible for the training under that agency's umbrella. Each agency (DMHA and DCS) would have lists of people who have undergone the training.

Julie noted that she inferred from Mike Brown's query that his task force would like to know where these providers are located throughout the state; if this is the case, she mentioned following up with Chris Waldron of ISDH to map the services. Ruth explained that Chris would need Excel spreadsheets from DMHA and DCS in order to generate the maps, and that our task force would need to decide whether to locate the providers by county, ZIP Code, or other geographic indicator. We all agreed that if we did generate maps, they would likely reflect the providers' offices and not necessarily their catchment areas.

Ruth will email Mike Brown with all of this information, and ask if his task force wants a map.

6. **Next meeting date & time:** our next meeting will be on *Tuesday, January 19, 2016*, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor, in the Trial Court Technology Training Room (our usual location). Once again, we will have a conference call set up so that task force members can call into the meeting.