



---

# Youth Justice Oversight Committee

## Data Work Group

---

### **Minutes from May 12, 2026 Data Work Group Meeting**

The Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) Data Work Group met on May 12, 2026 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom. Dr. Matt Aalsma chaired the meeting.

#### **1. Attendance**

##### **Members Present:**

- Dr. Matt Aalsma, Indiana University School of Medicine, Co-Chair
- Chris Biehn, Indiana Office of Court Services, Co-Chair
- Kristi Bruther, Johnson County Juvenile Detention Center
- Hon. Paul Felix, Indiana Court of Appeals
- Melanie Pitstick, Marion County Juvenile Probation
- Colleen Saylor, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Corajeon Medina, Department of Child Services
- Kaitlyn Christian, Management Performance Hub

##### **Members Absent:**

- Traci Lane, Madison County Juvenile Probation
- Hon. Sarah Mullican, Vigo Circuit/Superior Court 3
- Morgan Leuner, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Bri Youn, Indiana Youth Institute

##### **OJA Staff Present:**

- Lisa Thompson, Indiana Office of Court Technology
- Nick Ackerman, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Beca Stockman, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Catheryne Pully, Indiana Office of Court Services

##### **Guests Present:**

- Katie Schwartz, Indiana University School of Medicine

#### **2. Approval of Minutes from March 10, 2026 Meeting**

Committee members were provided with a copy of the March 10, 2026 meeting minutes prior to today's meeting. Melanie Pitstick made a motion to approve the minutes; Hon. Paul Felix seconded the motion. The work group members unanimously approved the March 10, 2026 meeting minutes.

### **3. Phase 2 Update & Definitions Discussion**

Katie Schwartz from the IU School of Medicine provided an update on Phase 2 of the Data Quality Initiative. She reported that the pilot county work has been both helpful and informative. The IU team has reviewed data entry instructions and definitions, transcribed pilot county meetings, and organized findings into research matrices. The team has also worked closely with Nick Ackerman and Beca Stockman from IOCS to ensure that interpretations and findings align with real-world probation practices. Current efforts are focused on identifying elements for a common data model, particularly around diversion practices across systems, as well as conducting a deeper review of "Referral Recommendation" and "Referral Outcome" options related to early system involvement.

Katie then shared several observations from discussions with pilot counties. Counties reported very little local documentation or training materials available for new staff and indicated they often rely on Probation Quarterly Report requirements, OMS/SRS tool tips, and existing cheatsheets for guidance. Counties also expressed difficulty ensuring that data entry practices consistently align with reporting outputs. While counties indicated a willingness to adapt to future changes, many expressed concern about moving away from long-standing practices and procedures.

The discussion then focused on the overall "life of a referral," beginning with the Referral Recommendation made by Probation and followed by the Referral Outcome. Katie explained that two new options, "Divert by Prosecutor" and "Divert by Policy," had recently been added, but some pilot counties were unaware of those additions. Counties generally understood "Divert by Prosecutor," as similar situations had previously been entered as "Refer to Another Agency," "Informal Adjustment," or "Other." However, "Divert by Policy" created confusion in counties where probation and prosecutors jointly review referrals and collaboratively make diversion decisions. Previously developed definitions and whether they had been adequately communicated to counties at the time the additions were implemented were discussed. The work group members agreed that future materials may need additional real-world examples and scenarios. Discussion was also held regarding whether "Divert by Prosecutor" should include Dual Status considerations. Colleen Saylor noted that "Informal Adjustment" and "Diversion" may not apply in Dual Status matters because those actions require court involvement while also avoiding formal court processing. Katie further emphasized the importance of ensuring that Referral Recommendation options remain mutually exclusive.

Discussion was held regarding statutory limitations preventing probation departments from recommending "Waiver," and the group considered removing "Waiver" as a Referral Recommendation because such matters would already fall within "File Petition." Katie noted that some counties they met with were in favor of eliminating "Waiver." Data reviewed during the meeting showed that "Waiver" was used relatively infrequently statewide during 2025, with only 29 referrals utilizing the option.

Work group members also discussed the inconsistent use of "Other", and identified that there should be a more appropriate and specific Referral Recommendation and Referral

Outcome for every referral. The use of "Refer to Other Agency" for diversion-related matters was also reviewed. Members recommended limiting the category to transfers between probation departments and renaming it to "Refer to Other Jurisdiction."

Katie summarized several preliminary recommendations, including removing "Waiver" and "Other" altogether, renaming "Refer to Other Agency" to "Refer to Other Jurisdiction," incorporating Dual Status considerations into "Divert by Prosecutor," and replacing "Dismissal" terminology with "No Action."

The relationship between Referral Recommendation and Referral Outcome was also discussed in greater detail. The IU team recommends creating two separate Referral Outcome variables to distinguish Prosecutor/State decisions from Court decisions. For Referral Recommendation from Probation, the process would conclude with "Divert by Policy," "Refer to Other Jurisdiction," or "Dismiss/No Action." All remaining recommendations would proceed to the Prosecutor for additional action. Similarly, Prosecutor decisions would conclude with "Divert by Prosecutor," "Refer to Other Jurisdiction," or "Dismiss/No Action," while all other actions would proceed to the court for a final decision or action.

Additional recommendations included identifying which agency initially reviewed the referral (Prosecutor or Probation), clarifying that the Referral Date field should reflect when probation begins reviewing the referral, and adding a "Waiting" or "Pending" status for matters where decisions cannot yet be made.

The work group briefly reviewed probation reporting obligations for diversion programs under IC 31-37-8.5-6 and discussed ongoing efforts by ICJI to collect diversion data for YJOC-funded programs. It was noted that alternative methods for measuring diversion program effectiveness could eventually create an opportunity to revisit or reduce current reporting requirements. In the meantime, Informal Adjustment data is used to fulfill the OJA reporting obligation.

The IU team will continue discussions with pilot counties and will prepare a final report containing recommendations based on the findings and feedback gathered throughout the initiative.

#### **4. Next Meeting**

The next YJOC Data Work Group meeting will be on **June 9, 2026 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm** via Zoom.

The next Youth Justice Oversight Committee Meeting is **June 11, 2026 at 10:00 am** at the Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room A, 402 W. Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN. There will be a live webcast of this meeting available on the Youth Justice Oversight Committee website: [www.in.gov/youthjustice](http://www.in.gov/youthjustice).