



Justice Center

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

INDIANA JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM TASK FORCE

January 15, 2021

About the CSG Justice Center



Justice Center

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

National nonprofit, nonpartisan, membership association of state government officials that engages members of all three branches of state government

Provides practical, nonpartisan research-driven strategies and tools to increase public safety and strengthen communities

Preliminary Assessment Process

Indiana established a task force chaired by Rep. McNamara and Sen. Crider to oversee and guide the preliminary assessment.

- **Representative Wendy McNamara, Co-chair, Indiana General Assembly**
- **Senator Mike Crider, Co-chair, Indiana General Assembly**
- Chris Ball, Marion County Juvenile Probation
- Parri Black, Youth First, Inc.
- Serrilla Blackmon, Division of Mental Health and Addiction
- Hon. Jason Cichowicz, St. Joseph Probate Court
- Alison Cox, Porter County Juvenile Detention
- Hon. Steve David, Indiana Supreme Court
- Terrie Decker, Division of Youth Services , Indiana Department of Corrections
- Katy Elmer, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation
- James Garrett, Jr., Indiana Commission on the Social Status of Black Males
- Hon. Dana Kenworthy, Grant Superior Court 2
- Hon. Kenton Kiracofe, Wells Circuit Court
- Susan Lightfoot, Henry County
- Chase Lyday, Avon Community School Corporation
- Rep. Robin Shackelford, Indiana General Assembly
- Senator Eddie Melton, Indiana General Assembly
- Rudy Monterrosa, Notre Dame Law School
- Chris Naylor, Indiana Prosecuting Attorney's Council
- Angela Reid-Brown, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Dave Reynolds, Porter County
- Mark Russel, Indianapolis Urban League
- Tami Silverman, Indiana Youth Institute
- James Taylor, MSD of Warren Township
- Don Travis, Deputy Director of Juvenile Justice Initiatives & Support, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Lisa Truitt, Indiana Department of Education
- Nancy Wever, JDAI
- William "Russ" Whelan, Sellersburg Police Department
- Joel Wieneke, Staff Attorney, Indiana Public Defender Council

We are employing a range of methods to facilitate a preliminary assessment of IN's juvenile justice system.

GOAL: Position Indiana to develop a consensus-based, data-driven statewide plan that ensures that the juvenile justice system more effectively protects public safety, reduces disparities, and improve outcomes for youth.

- Identify opportunities to leverage and build upon past and current juvenile justice reform efforts for development of the statewide plan.
- Evaluate Indiana's current capacity to collect, analyze, report, and use key juvenile justice data critical for developing a data-driven statewide plan and for positioning system stakeholders to measure system performance and progress and make data-driven decisions.
- Establish initial priorities for system improvement by conducting interviews and focus groups with critical stakeholders across the juvenile justice system.
- Assess alignment of Indiana's legislative code and statewide funding approach with research and national best practice.



Since October, we conducted over 30 interviews and focus groups with ~ 100 stakeholders across the juvenile justice system in Indiana to identify challenges, opportunities, and priorities for improvement.



- Additional conversations to be scheduled with:**
- Law enforcement
 - Behavioral health
 - Legislators
 - Researchers

We also conducted over 20 interviews with multiple state and local agencies to better understand Indiana's capacity to collect and track juvenile justice data.

Indiana Criminal
Justice Institute

Indiana Supreme
Court, Office of
Court Technology

Department of
Corrections

Management
Performance Hub

Department of
Children and
Families

Indiana
Prosecuting
Attorneys Council

12 County Probation Departments:

- Allen
- Bartholomew
- Grant
- Hamilton
- Henry
- Lake
- Lawrence
- Madison
- Marion
- Owen
- Steuben
- Vanderburgh
- Wabash
- Wayne

Initial Takeaways and Emerging Themes

Over the last several years, Indiana has adopted several changes to improve outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system.

- 32 counties now participate in the Juvenile Detentions Alternative Initiative (JDAI) to create alternatives to detention in the community for low risk youth.
- Participating JDAI counties (and the state) developed processes for collecting, reviewing, and using JDAI data to understand aspects of the juvenile justice system.
- Indiana created a dual status statutory framework to support youth involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Indiana's capacity to collect and track juvenile justice system data and youth outcome data is limited.

- Multiple data systems are used by state and local agencies to collect and track data on youth in the juvenile justice system.
- Indiana also does not use a unique identifier to follow youth across these data systems and the juvenile justice continuum, therefore youth cannot be tracked from point of referral through adjudication, disposition, supervision, and outcomes.
- Key data points are not collected and cannot be analyzed in Indiana:
 - There is no single source of juvenile arrest data
 - Most data cannot be disaggregated by offense history/prior referrals or adjudications, risk level, and in some cases, demographics
 - No flag/code exists in court data for direct files/waivers
 - There is no automated match or flag in data sets for child welfare involvement

Multiple data systems are used by state and local agencies to collect and track data on youth in the juvenile justice system.

6 case management systems are currently being used by local juvenile probation departments across the state.

- 35 counties use Odyssey
- 38 counties use SRS
- 4 counties use CSI
- 2 counties use PBS
- 12 counties use Quest
- 1 county uses another system

Other state and local agencies use different data systems, that are not linked together.

- DOC uses CCMS and Data Management System
- DCS uses MaGIK – KidTraks
- Detention data is captured in INcite and JDMS
- Juvenile courts use Odyssey or Quest, but not always the same system as used in probation
- INcite has additional modules to capture data, include IYAS information

Indiana is also unable to answer key questions about the juvenile justice system due to the lack of coordination for the collection and use of data.

- Even within current data collection processes, quality control issues exist in many counties. For example, demographic information, supervision end dates, and supervision outcomes may not be entered across the board.
- Minimal outcome data is collected, tracked, or analyzed in Indiana
 - Recidivism rates are calculated and reported by DOC, however, the only event being used is re-incarceration
 - Most probation departments do not produce recidivism reports, and have to do hand matching of data in order to calculate
 - Very little, if any, analyzable service outcome information is available

In general, conversations with stakeholders revealed inconsistency and variability across the state with regard to how youth interact with the juvenile justice system, including the extent to which policies and practices are aligned with research and best practices.

- While a few counties provide opportunities for youth to be diverted pre-arrest, most counties utilize informal adjustments as their only diversion option.
- Approaches to youth with status offenses differs considerably across the state – while some counties use detention as a sanction and place truant youth on formal probation, other counties rarely refer status offenders to juvenile court.
- In some counties, a detention risk screening instrument is used to inform secure detention decisions, while in other counties no such tool is in place.
- Depending on the originating county, some local probation departments support youth reentering the community from DOC while in other jurisdictions youth have limited transition support.

Key concerns and priorities for improvement emerged from conversations with stakeholders across the state of Indiana.

- Most stakeholders expressed the need for **additional opportunities to divert lower risk youth** from the juvenile justice system prior to court/probation involvement and to support youth with status offenses outside of juvenile court.
- Participants agreed that **minimal weight is being given to the results of the IYAS risk assessment** in supervision and service matching decisions, in part due to validity concerns, but also as a result of inconsistent training and the timing of when the assessment is conducted.
- **Probation supervision was often described as a one-size-fits-all approach** rather than tailored to each youth.
- Youth are not always being matched to the most appropriate services based upon risk and needs, and there is sentiment across the state that **residential placement is overused** compared to community-based services.

Key challenges and priorities for improvement have emerged from conversations with stakeholders across the state of Indiana (cont.).

- Stakeholders raised issues with **community-based service gaps** in rural jurisdictions, as well as a lack of more intensive behavioral health and substance use services and services for families; Additionally, concerns were raised about the **lack of services tailored specifically for juvenile justice populations**.
- **Limited outcome data** exists about the effectiveness of community-based and residential services, and as a result service referrals are made based on relationships, geography, and anecdotal evidence.
- While the dual status statutory framework is considered a strength of the system, there are challenges with **implementation fidelity across the state and transparency in information sharing**.
- Providing **transition and reentry supports to youth released from DOC** was identified as a priority by the majority of stakeholders.
- Concerns were raised around **matching the highest risk youth/youth with the most serious offenses with the most developmentally appropriate supervision**, while also promoting public safety and accountability.

Next Steps and Key Questions

Next Steps

- Conduct additional conversations with stakeholders
- Draft detailed summary report with findings and initial recommendations from preliminary assessment (based on conversations, data review, statutory review, and examination of other materials)
- Present findings and recommendations to the Task Force in April
- Engage in discussions with leadership around priorities for improvement and next steps to conduct an in-depth assessment and build consensus for policy priorities

Priorities

1

Do these challenges resonate? Are there additional priorities or themes that are missing?

Assessment Process

2

How can we continue to secure buy-in and engagement from critical stakeholder groups?