

Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
May 6, 2015
Meeting Minutes

1. The Task Force met on Wednesday, May 6, 2015, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Training Room, 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor.
 - a. The following members were present: Lilia Judson, Indiana Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration (INSTAD) (Co-Chair); Julie Whitman of the Indiana Youth Institute (IYI), (Co-Chair); Tony Barker, Office of Technology (IOT); Michael Commons, INSTAD; Mary DePrez, Court Technology, INSTAD; Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC); Cynthia Smith, Department of Child Services (DCS); Joshua Towns, Department of Education (DOE); and, Tamara Weaver, Indiana Attorney General's Office.
 - b. Not present: Delia Armendariz, Casey Family Programs; Serrilla Blackmon, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA); Ann Hartman, 211/Connect2Help; Jeff Hudnall, Indiana Network of Knowledge (INK); Barbara Moser, NAMI (*ex officio*); Joshua Ross, Criminal Justice Institute (CJI); Sarah Schelle, Department of Correction (DOC); Lisa Thompson, Court Technology; Doris Tolliver, Don Travis, and Jeff Tucker, DCS; and, Chris Waldron, Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH).
 - c. Guests: We were joined by Karen Conroy via teleconference. Karen is an Evaluation Assistant at Community Health Network, Zero Suicide for Indiana Youth Project. Janetta McKenzie, MS, LSW, Grant Coordinator, Indiana Association of Resources and Child Advocacy (IARCA), and Amy Karozos, Youth Law T.E.A.M., also attended the meeting.
 - d. Dave Williams of Court Technology staffed the meeting for a demonstration of INcite apps, including the MAYSI-2.
 - e. The meeting was staffed by Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorney.
 - f. Lilly Judson and Julie Whitman welcomed those in attendance.

2. **Approval of Minutes from March 18, 2015 Meeting:** the members reviewed the minutes of the March 18, 2015 meeting and suggested no additions or corrections. The group approved the minutes by consensus. As a reminder, once minutes are approved, Ruth sends them in a PDF to Angela Reid-Brown, who posts them on the Commission's web site here: <http://www.in.gov/children/2344.htm>

3. **IDOE Opportunities for Data Sharing (Educational Outcomes) & Possible SLDS Grant Funding—Josh Towns:** (*this was agenda item no. 4*) The SLDS grants are distributed by the federal Department of Education, and the applications for the second round of funding are due June 10th. "SLDS" (pronounced "sleds") is an acronym for Statewide Longitudinal Data System. This round of funding emphasizes at-risk students, and there are two categories for funding: early learning and instructional support. Josh has been brainstorming with his colleagues about some sort of early warning system (among other ideas); he would like a small working group from our task force to help him write the grant and figure out ways to use data that is collected. The grant amounts cannot exceed \$7 million (\$3.5 million in each category), and the grant term is four years. At least 48 states will apply for this money, which amounts to \$110 million for the entire United States. The Indiana DOE has received this grant money for about six years now; the agency used it to build K-12 data collection and to support INK. The existing systems are already generating reports and are working as designed. Josh noted that we can design whatever type of system we want for purposes of the grant application. One idea could involve an app that pushes information to parents/students, or that extracts information from them. Josh would like the working group to

attend a whiteboard session to design the grant request. The fit might end up being between an early warning system and the instructional support category. From the perspective of the Children's Commission and its focus on vulnerable youth, our task force can advise the DOE on what is needed. Julie stated that she felt that the involvement of DCS would be critical; Cynthia Smith agreed to follow up with Doris Tolliver to see who from DCS should be assigned to the working group. Lilly assigned Mike Commons to represent the courts on the working group, and Julie said to count her in as a tentative yes.

Julie then observed that Mike is supervising the work of a law student (Chanelle Fox) who is compiling the laws on privacy and data-sharing. This is relevant because we need to know that what we design for SLDS will be legally permissible, for example with FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, passed by Congress in 1974). FERPA is the most restrictive of all federal privacy laws.

Josh stated that whatever we design, we will need to keep INK and the governance council informed. Barbara Seitz de Martinez shared that the Indiana Prevention Resource Center can also provide data down to the block level, including educational attainment. They also have regional data on substance abuse. Josh is interested in this information.

4. **Discussion of MAYSI-2 Data Sharing & Other Relevant Court Technology Apps (Risk Assessment, Juvenile Reports, & Case Plans)—Amy Karozos & Mary DePrez:** *(this was agenda item no. 3)* Mary DePrez gave an overview of INcite in general. It originated as a portal for courts to get judgment and conviction information to the BMV electronically, instead of by mail. Over time, INcite has grown as Court Technology has developed more apps in-house on an ad hoc basis. Mary and Dave Williams demonstrated the risk assessment app used by the Department of Correction, DCS, and adult and juvenile probation officers (there are 6 tools for juveniles and 6 for adults). This tool, developed for Indiana by staff at the University of Cincinnati, enables professionals to both assess risk and to share the information. The assessments follow the person.

Amy Karozos then explained the MAYSI-2's purpose and use. It is meant to be administered to children ages 12-18, in detention centers and also to probationers. There are 22 detention centers in Indiana; this is a voluntary statewide process, to screen the youth entering the centers using a standardized tool. There are protections on how the data can be used and shared. It is now web-based, which is a very good development because the survey will no longer be dependent on one single operating system (changes in operating systems, like Windows XP, had rendered previous surveys obsolete). Amy noted that they have performed over 40,000 screens since the start of the project (one youth can be screened multiple times). Marion County probation will be the first INcite MAYSI-2 user.

Dave then walked us through a survey. The survey contains 52 questions, and the child completes it him- or herself. The software also reads the questions aloud to the youth, and the youth can choose to repeat the question as needed. They are all yes/no questions, and the child can skip questions. If skip a total of 7, or 2 in one category, the survey will be marked as invalid. If the screener sees a "caution" or warning indicator, there is a second set of questions which enable the screener to go deeper with the child in that category. By phone, Karen Conroy asked Dave if someone assesses the results beyond the person who administers the testing. Amy replied that certain scores requires follow-up or a response such as placing the child on suicide watch, or referring him or her to a mental health counselor. Amy noted that the test was developed to inform detention center staff and to set up the youths with needed services, not to diagnose or to make dispositional decisions. It can

be used to trigger a mental health evaluation. Amy informed us that many children do not follow up with their appointments once they are released.

Lilly asked whether the project leadership had thought to make this screening mandatory? Amy shared that new DOC rules will require the MAYSI-2 for all detention centers, most likely later this year. Amy will email a copy of the new DOC standards to Ruth, who will distribute to task force members. Currently, only two are not using the MAYSI-2 at all; 5 centers are not part of Amy's project, but 3 of those 5 do use the MAYSI-2.

Julie noted that some counties are using aggregate MAYSI-2 data to get more mental health services (to demonstrate the need for same); could this be done at the statewide level as well? Amy said that they are working with personnel on this question. She said that the MAYSI-2 is not used outside of the juvenile justice system and was not developed for other systems. The MAYSI-2 results are not part of the court file; the data are treated as protected mental health records. On an aggregate basis, though, they do have Excel spreadsheets with years' worth of answers to the questions (data).

Janetta McKenzie asked Amy what would happen if the child taking the survey had an intellectual disability. Amy said the questions are written at a 5th-grade level, and the software reads the questions to the child aloud. If the child is below age 12, they either won't administer the MAYSI-2 or rely on its results.

Dave showed us the juvenile reports section of INCite: preliminary inquiry, predispositional report, modification report, and case plans; he noted that there was a lot of crossover with CHINS cases. Julie asked Dave if we collect all of this—including information on educational status—could it be deidentified and analyzed? We recalled that the INK enabling statute expressly excluded juvenile court records.

5. **Can MPH Assist the HWS/Hannah Maxey?—Tony Barker:** Tony stated the answer is currently, “not right now; there are not enough resources or time.” However, he plans to follow up with Hannah Maxey to determine who she spoke with at the state, and then approach that person. We will revisit this agenda item at our next meeting.
6. **Cross-System Youth Task Force Update—Michael Commons:** Since Don Travis was not present, Mike (who staffs that task force for STAD) gave a quick update. That task force has not met since Don spoke with us in March. Lilly asked Mike to please update us at our next meeting about the youth court symposium being held in July in Plainfield.
7. **Update on Information Sharing Certificate Program, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University—Julie Whitman:** Julie asked Mike to update us on Chanelle Fox's work. Mike said that Chanelle is preparing a table, organized into agencies holding information and agencies/entities seeking information. They want to have a draft by sometime next month, in order to provide it to attorneys from each affected agency and to give them one month to review and respond. In the final month of Chanelle's employment here, then, she and Mike will combine the attorneys' responses with Chanelle's research to produce a manual/white paper. The Georgetown team has a year to complete their capstone project, but Chanelle's deadline is early August due to her graduation from law school and plans to take the California bar exam. ***Mike and Chanelle need a list of the attorneys in each agency who would be the most appropriate individuals to review her table. Task force members, please share this***

information with Mike at michael.commonsoncourts.in.gov. Thank you. Tamara Weaver, Deputy Attorney General, will contact her office's advisory group to learn who from the Attorney General's office should collaborate on this project.

We all reached a consensus that an authority figure (Lilly and Julie? The Executive Committee?) should send a memo to each agency attorney, and copy the agency head who sits on the Children's Commission, to mention that the table will be coming and that we need their cooperation in reviewing its contents. This memo could also alert them that a survey will be coming to their employees, asking about data sharing practices, that we would like them to complete.

Julie outlined the other project for the summer, for which we are hiring a graduate student, involving the survey. The purpose is to determine current data sharing practices and also to identify what problems we might be able to solve if certain data were being shared appropriately. At this point, the team expects to survey: juvenile prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers; DCS family case managers; school principals, and maybe also school guidance counselors. Cynthia recommended that the team clear the survey with Doris because the family case managers receive a lot of surveys already; Lilly mentioned the same is true for probation and the courts, and related personnel. She recommended making it very short and noted that we will need the Chief Justice's approval before sending the survey to judicial branch employees.

8. **Criminal Background Checks for Volunteers Who Work with Youth: Centralize the Process?—Julie Whitman:** Julie described the issue this way: if a person is involved with separate agencies/entities—for example, she is a CASA who also volunteers at her child's school—she will currently undergo separate background checks, perhaps even on a repeating basis. She may also have to pay for some of them, and they will certainly take up time. Julie was wondering if we could have a centralized system which would allow any agency wishing to use a volunteer (or to hire an employee) for positions that involve contact with children to run a records check on the person in one place. Lilly raised the issue of timing: if a person is screened in June, but picks up an arrest/conviction 6 months later in December, how would that be flagged? Currently, no *one* database exists which collects all possible records. DCS employees and teachers must be screened; Cynthia said this screening repeats annually. Lilly also mentioned the issue of records' accuracy now that we have our new expungement laws in place (these laws essentially remove records of criminal conduct from public view). Josh said a centralized system would have to allow for different levels of severity; in other words, some bad behavior might disqualify a person from one assignment but not from another. Tamara also pointed out that different agencies need different kinds of information about people, such as arrests and credit checks. All of these issues raise feasibility questions. Josh noted that we may want to revisit this with the SLDS grant proposal. Julie asked that we keep this on the agenda for next time, because she anticipated getting a paper outlining model practices.

9. **Next meeting:** the Task Force's next meeting will be on *Wednesday, August 12, 2015*, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at 30 South Meridian Street, 5th floor, in the 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.