

## **Data Sharing and Mapping Task Force Meeting Minutes**

1. The Task Force met on Friday, November 22, 2013 from 2:30 to 4:00 p.m. in the Supreme Court Law Library. The following members were present: Lilia Judson of the Division of State Court Administration (STAD), (Co-Chair); Julie Whitman of the Indiana Youth Institute (IYI), (Co-Chair); Ann Hartman of Connect2Help/211; Chris Waldron of the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH); Cynthia Smith of the Department of Child Services (DCS); Mary DePrez of the Judicial Technology & Automation Committee (JTAC); Tom Bodin of the Indiana Attorney General's office (IAG); and, Kevin Moore of the Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA). The meeting was staffed by Mike Commons and Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorneys. Not present: Jeff Tucker, DCS; Joshua Towns, Department of Education; Paul Baltzell, Indiana Office of Technology.
  
2. The Chairs welcomed the members of the Task Force and everyone introduced themselves. The Task Force reviewed the overall structure and mission of the Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana (the Commission) and where the Task Force fits in.
  
3. Ruth Reichard briefed the Task Force members on the history, purpose, progress, and status of the mapping project to date. STAD has sent out approximately 530 letters and questionnaires and JTAC has received approximately 180. Her report started a wide-ranging yet very detailed discussion on the project's design, goals, potential audiences, and overall future.
  - a. We started discussing what data the various state agencies already had about service providers. This led to Mike handing out a chart showing what data Commission members and their agencies already collect (independently of each other, in most cases).
  - b. Some of the Task Force members mentioned maps they currently use in their day-to-day work. For example, Ann Hartman stated that Connect2Help had information about service providers for 25 counties, while 211 had some information for all 92 Indiana counties. Julie Whitman referred Task Force members to the map of mental health providers that IYI had put together for the October Commission meeting using Connect2Help and SAVI/The Polis Center. Ruth explained that she had not used SAVI/The Polis Center because she was still gathering information on service providers from state agencies and was not yet ready to turn to private-sector service providers (in other words, therapists and the like who do not accept Medicaid). Cynthia Smith mentioned that the Indiana After-School Network has a map of services; Julie Whitman noted that the Network is merging its database with that of IACCRR (Indiana Association of

Child Care Resource & Referral) to provide information and referral on services across the state. Chris Waldron recommended that the Task Force members acquaint themselves with the federal SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) online resources, including provider lists—Chris noted that SAMSHA might have private-sector providers listed. After the meeting, Chris provided the following two links to SAMHSA resources:  
<http://findtreatment.samhsa.gov/MHTreatmentLocator/faces/quickSearch.jspx>  
 and  
<http://findtreatment.samhsa.gov/MHTreatmentLocator/faces/stateSearch.jspx>

Cynthia noted that [www.findyouthinfo.gov](http://www.findyouthinfo.gov) also contains a mapping feature and is focused primarily on resources for children.

- c. We then turned to what information about each service provider that we would want to list on our own mapping resource. Ruth mentioned that she originally had a list of some 36 questions for each provider to answer (that list is attached as Appendix A, and the number of details is actually over 80). Everyone agreed that it would be helpful if each provider who wanted to be listed on our map gave us a link to their own web site, so that a user could access the service provider directly to gain more detailed information.
- d. Lilia Judson mentioned wanting to create a roadmap for our data project which among other things would set a target date of late January/February, 2014, for beginning to look for private sector service providers' information. The Task Force members then discussed means of maintaining/updating service providers' data: Julie Whitman mentioned that after we get initial contact information, we should start using email addresses to exchange information with service providers. Ruth noted that she and her colleagues had encountered some difficulty obtaining contact information for providers in less populated/more rural areas.
- e. The Task Force members agreed that the basic premise—a database of services for youth in map form—is a good idea. Mary DePrez described JTAC's preliminary efforts to identify software to use for this project. The state has software available in the executive branch that is free—there are no licensing fees. Basically, the expense to JTAC would involve the labor and technical expertise to enter in the data, build the website, and to maintain it. We then discussed where to house the database: ISDH? JTAC?
- f. The Task Force members turned to the concept of layering the data. Since we want details about each service provider, what makes sense? Chris Waldron observed that the biggest challenge will be bringing the data in and then integrating it. Mary DePrez stated that JTAC already has INCite, which is a secure application, and which would be ideal if judges and courts were the only audience for the database. The Task Force members decided that the ideal setup would be

to have a public side and a private side to the application: the publicly accessible portion could simply list the available resources in a map format, while the private application could, for example, be used by a juvenile court judge to contact a service provider immediately with a direct referral (court order) for treatment. We then discussed building a database and moving it to INcite. Mary DePrez mentioned that she believed we would need to put some kind of disclaimer language on the map.

- g. Tom Bodin, Chris Waldron, and Mary DePrez all stated that this database/map could be started immediately at a very low cost. Lilia Judson asked them to get together and work something up. While we are working on it, we agreed that the website should not be publicly accessible. Mary Kronoshek, the JTAC staffer who has been receiving the questionnaires from the service providers and entering them into a Microsoft Access database, will email Tom Bodin and Chris Waldron what she has so far. Tom Bodin would design his map via publicly accessible GIS software, while Chris Waldron's would utilize ISDH's private, in-house software.
  - h. The Task Force members directed Ruth to continue with the data collection process and Mary Kronoshek to continue entering the data into Access. Tom Bodin and Chris Waldron will work up sample databases in time for the December 11 Children's Commission meeting.
  - i. The question was raised about whether the database should "live" at 211, since that is essentially one system for the whole state. Ann Hartman noted that the database is very expensive to update and maintain. She discussed the challenges they currently encounter with their system. On a related topic, the members of the Task Force agreed that it is very important that the service providers answering Justice Rush's questionnaire know that their information will be publicly available on the Internet, as some might choose not to have their information listed (because they might not be able to handle the volume of calls, for example). We then discussed whether the information should just be accessible to those working in state government, schools, DCS, the courts, etc. Ruth mentioned that she believed the database should be accessible to legislators who are trying to make funding decisions, so perhaps it must be public in some sense. Ann Hartman suggested that updating service providers' information can be done by a web form. Tom Bodin discussed reviewing some percentage of the submissions manually to ensure cleanliness of data.
4. By this time, it was 3:50 p.m., so the Chairs moved to the next agenda item—data sharing. The Task Force members were unclear about the goal of sharing data, as well as what data to share. Lilia Judson explained why there was a pressing need to track juveniles, especially in terms of their educational work while they are in placements, because their credits do not transfer over seamlessly when they return to their "home" schools. The members of the Task Force also discussed issues concerning confidentiality

and data sharing. The Task Force decided to ask the Commission to narrow the scope and define the focus of the “data sharing” portion of the Task Force—for example, is it with respect to individual children? The Task Force also questioned whether this type of endeavor was consistent with the Commission’s statutory charge.

5. The members of the Task Force are directing the following questions to the Commission for its December 11<sup>th</sup> meeting:
  - a. To what extent should the database/map of service providers be available to the public?
  - b. Where should the database/map “live,” be maintained, etc.?
    - i. JTAC?
    - ii. ISDH?
    - iii. 211?
  - c. Of the samples mocked up by Tom Bodin and Chris Waldron, does the Commission have a preference?
  - d. Funding: the Commission is going to have to identify and invest resources in this project. We need to think now about the costs, and by February’s Commission meeting, have an overall cost estimate. By April/June, we will have a proposal for which agency should request the funds, because the agency heads must begin to prepare their biennial budgets at that time.
  - e. What is, or should be, the scope of the data sharing efforts of the Task Force?
6. Next meeting: the Task Force’s next meeting will be on Friday, January 24, 2014 from 10:00 a.m. to 12 noon, at a place to be determined.

## APPENDIX A

### What we want to know about each service provider:

#### 1. Location

- a. Address
- b. Telephone number
- c. Fax number
- d. URL
- e. Twitter handle
- f. Location information for satellite facilities, if applicable
- g. Hours of operation
- h. Do they offer services in the child's home?
  - i. Any other locations besides home/agency office?
  - ii. Is service directed primarily at the child, or at the parent/caregiver?
- i. Any days closed?
- j. Accessibility (ramps, assistive listening devices, railings, wide doorways, etc.)?
- k. Parking situation
  - i. Free? Metered? Garage? Pay lot?
- l. Does the facility offer child care?
  - i. Is it "child-friendly"?
- m. Does it allow food and/or drinks?
- n. Any restricted items?
  - i. Weapons?
  - ii. Portable electronic devices?
- o. Does the facility have a separate waiting room?
  - i. Private intake area?

#### 2. Eligibility requirements

- a. Age?
- b. Income?
- c. Gender?
- d. Language?
- e. Physical ability?
- f. Diagnosis? (e.g., won't take youths with intellectual disabilities, etc.)
- g. Legal status? (e.g., won't take sex or violent offenders, etc.)
- h. Must the child/client be court-ordered?
- i. Geographic restrictions/catchment area?
- j. Family status?
- k. Other?

#### 3. Capacity

- a. Bed space?

- b. Inpatient?
  - c. Outpatient?
  - d. Residential?
  - e. Other?
4. Cost
- a. What forms of payment do they accept?
  - b. Sliding fee scale based on income?
5. Type of service provided
- a. Crisis center?
  - b. Guardians ad litem?
  - c. CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate)?
  - d. Trauma-informed care?
  - e. What are the qualifications/certifications of professional staff?
  - f. Staffing level?
    - i. Ratio of professional staff to client/patient
    - ii. Will the youth be seen by volunteers or by professional staff?
  - g. Is there evidence that service offered is successful?
    - i. How measure success in your field?
  - h. Occupational therapy?
  - i. Vocational rehabilitation?
  - j. Substance abuse?
    - i. Inpatient
    - ii. Outpatient
    - iii. Acute withdrawal
    - iv. Addiction
    - v. Other
  - k. Mental health?
    - i. Inpatient
    - ii. Outpatient
    - iii. Psychotropic medication
    - iv. Other
  - l. Academic tutoring?
  - m. After-school programs?
  - n. Before-school programs?
  - o. Meals?
  - p. Recreation?
  - q. Mentoring?
  - r. Parenting classes?
  - s. Education?
  - t. Medical?

- u. Legal?
- v. Child care?
- w. Food stamps?
- x. Transportation?
- y. Dental?
- z. Optical?
- aa. Translation/interpreter?