Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
January 19, 2016
Meeting Minutes

1. The Task Force met on Tuesday, January 19, 2016, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 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); Michael Commons, Family Law Attorney, and Leslie Dunn, State Director of GAL/CASA, 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, Cynthia Smith, and Don Travis, Department of Child Services (DCS); Mary DePrez and Lisa Thompson, Trial Court Technology (TCT); and, Tamara Weaver, Indiana Attorney General's Office.
    b. Not present: Delia Armendariz, Casey Family Programs; Julie Whitman, Indiana Youth Institute (IYI) (Co-Chair); Tony Barker, Office of Technology (IOT); Sirrilla Blackmon, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA); Devon McDonald and Christine Reynolds, ICJI; Barbara Moser, NAMI; Sarah Schelle, Department of Correction (DOC); and, Doris Tolliver (DCS).
    c. Attending by phone: Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC); Joshua Towns, Department of Education (DOE).
    d. Guests: Bob Clarke and Cynthia Degies (IOT); Lauren Savitskas (ISDH); and, Matt Hetzel (INK).
    e. The meeting was staffed by Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorney.
    f. Lilia Judson welcomed those in attendance and we all introduced ourselves.

2. **Approval of Minutes from October 20, 2015 Meeting:** the members reviewed the minutes of the October 20, 2015 meeting, suggested no additions or corrections, and approved the minutes by consensus.

3. **Cross-System Youth Task Force Update:** Don Travis, co-chair of that task force, provided a brief update. He first gave some background information about his task force's scope, and noted that the task force is divided into subcommittees based on children's age groups (going up to age 21) instead of systems. At their next meeting, the group dealing with older children will focus on substance abuse, children, and caretakers, and will use our task force's maps to determine the location of substance abuse treatment providers around the state. They will examine local coordinating councils and problem-solving courts as possible solutions. They are also working with the Department of Education to identify barriers to these youths' success. The middle-age-range group is looking into homelessness, and has found two different definitions. The subcommittee dealing with children aged 0-8 is the newest.

   Don also gave an update on the HEA 1196/dual system youth project underway (under the auspices of Casey Family Programs) in juvenile courts Tippecanoe, Elkhart, Allen, Clark, and Henry counties. A kickoff event is scheduled for January 29th at the State House, and will also include Marion County's program (under the aegis of the RFK Center). To qualify for these pilot programs, children must be on probation and be involved in DCS. Don said his task force is collecting data from all six programs; each county is doing something different. Matt

Hagenbush is assisting with the data collection and analysis, which will focus on each decision point in the cases, whether the judge follows the team's recommendation, etc.

4. **Update on Capstone Project:** Lilia Judson first offered some background on the reason for the capstone project (an outgrowth of Indiana sending a team to an information-sharing certificate program at the RFK Center at Georgetown University). Next, Leslie Dunn introduced herself and mentioned that Chanelle Fox had been staffing this project, but had recently moved on and taken a job in South Carolina. Leslie gave an update on the survey that Michael Commons and Raj Patel administered in August, which heard from nearly 1,600 respondents. Our task force then contracted with Molly Chamberlin to analyze the survey results; Molly has issued a 30-page report and a 2-page executive summary. Leslie reviewed Molly's key findings, including: up to 25% of respondents indicated they shared information based on informal relationships (as opposed to agency protocols and practices); many respondents felt that confidentiality laws formed the main barrier to receiving information; and, many respondents recognized the benefits of sharing information, but cited a need for increased training about what was "shareable." Molly's recommendations included formal training and published guidelines on information sharing, and incentivizing agencies to provide that training; creating state-level MOU's for information sharing that would streamline the exchange of data (and make sharing more consistent and less subject to individual judgment); create a central repository for record storage; and, explore the possibility of a universal consent form. Leslie mentioned that one possibility for training could entail using the existing partnership between CASA, DCS, and IUPUI for online modules. Leslie and Mike Commons then reviewed a visual summary of Molly's analysis that Bryan Orander prepared, which underscores the fact that 87% of the time, information is being shared. Lilly remarked that it would be helpful to know the response rate for each class of responders.

   Leslie stated that, as someone who has worked in the field, the survey results were not surprising. The survey will be foundational to the information-sharing guidebook. A lack of knowledge about what to share (and when to share it) causes delays in cases. Leslie told the task force that Chanelle had researched the applicable laws for the guidebook. Mike told the group about a November meeting with agency heads or their attorneys to get their feedback on Chanelle's work. The guide is meant to be practical, so the format needs to be user-friendly and accessible to non-lawyers. To further that goal, Mike and Leslie created a template for the agency attorneys to complete and are currently revising the guide's content based on the answers they received on the templates. The look and organization of each section will be standardized across the chapters. The guide will be a PDF, but because the laws change regularly, publishing a paper version—and constantly updating and distributing it—would be cost-prohibitive. For that reason, they ask the task force to consider emulating the injury prevention app designed by IOT and the Indiana State Health Department. Leslie introduced Lauren Savitskas of the health department, who explained that the ISDH wanted a resource guide for stakeholders that would be easy to update as needed. Lauren gave a brief background talk about the app's development, and then we heard from Bob Clarke of IOT, who demonstrated the app and explained its features. The app is free and may be downloaded for iOS devices here:

   https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/preventing-injuries-in-indiana/id1037435460?mt=8

   And for Android devices here:

https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=doh.in.gov.indianaprevention&hl=en

Bob said that the app could work on laptop and desktop computers as well as mobile devices. He also told the group how the analytics function works and demonstrated that, too. Lilly thanked Bob for coming to the meeting.

5. **Report from Subcommittee on Data Collection from Juvenile Cases/Exploring the Need for an Abstract:** Lisa Thompson distributed a compilation of all of the data collection projects currently underway. Data collection is a part of cases dealing with delinquency, JDAI, CHINS, IV-D, dual status youth, and also occurs within and between case management systems. Lisa and her colleagues (Mike, Matt, and Don) identified 12 different initiatives in all that collected or displayed data in juvenile cases. Lisa's document lists the data collected for each initiative in case our task force ever wants to compare data across applications. The case plan initiative can track outcomes. Lilly asked whether there was a way to cross-reference or interface between the different initiatives to find or track a child? Lisa answered that it depends on whether the user has Quest; with Quest, that type of inquiry is more streamlined. Without it, the data are very fragmented. In Indiana, we do not have one single unique identifier assigned to children in these systems, so it is difficult for people to be sure they are dealing with the same child. This is a gap. Do we want to make the data collection look similar between CHINS and JD cases, in case we ever have a repository for all case data? Lilly asked Lisa if she and her colleagues wished to make any recommendations. Lisa proposed the idea of a unique identifier that follows the child, much like that used by the Department of Education. She noted DCS can have several identifiers for each child. Quest also has duplicate numbers (e.g., 1234 could be used in every county, but refers to different children). A unique identifier would enable de-identification and tracking of outcomes.

   Lilly asked the subcommittee to write 2-3 recommendations, which will be to be circulated to task force members by January 29th for members to vote on whether to adopt them for our February 17th report. The recommendations should discuss whether the unique identifier should be the same one used by DOE (although that might mean we would have to wait until the child was school-aged, which is not practical). Lilly asked: if the goal is to share information across systems, what needs to happen? Jeff Hudnall talked about the work of the early learning advisory committee and noted they are struggling with the same issues (although they are tracking people from pre-K through grade 12 and higher, then into the workforce). Don stated that the only number that is consistent across all systems is the Social Security Number. Jeff noted that some states use SSNs to track pre-K through the workforce. Lisa said we could require an SSN for all of these different data collection apps, but people don't often know their children's numbers by heart and may need 1-2 days to find the information.

6. **February 17th Children's Commission Meeting—A Task Force Report is Due:** Lilly asked Ruth to review the minutes from 2015 and identify the issues we worked on, determine the status of assignments we received (if applicable), and draft an action plan for 2016 that will include the capstone project and recommendations for a judicial database (building off of Lisa's subcommittee). Ruth will send a draft report to task force members by February 5th, and asks that everyone respond by February 10th. The report is due February 12th.

7. **Next meeting date & time**: our next meeting will be on ***Thursday, April 14, 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.