

Data Sharing & Mapping Task Force
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
August 12, 2015
Meeting Minutes

1. The Task Force met on Wednesday, August 12, 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, Trial Court Technology, INSTAD (TCT); Jeff Hudnall, Indiana Network of Knowledge (INK); Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC); Devon McDonald, General Counsel, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI); 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); Barbara Moser, NAMI); Sarah Schelle, Department of Correction (DOC); Lisa Thompson, Court Technology; and, Doris Tolliver and Don Travis (DCS).
 - c. Guests: We were joined by Karen Conroy via teleconference. Karen works at the Community Health Network Zero Suicide for Indiana Youth Project. Chanelle Fox and Raj Patel, public analyst interns working on the information-sharing project funded by Casey Family Programs, also joined us (Chanelle via phone, Raj in person).
 - d. The meeting was staffed by Ruth Reichard, STAD staff attorney.
 - e. Lilly Judson and Julie Whitman welcomed those in attendance, and since we had first-time attendees in Chanelle Fox, Jeff Hudnall, Devon McDonald, and Raj Patel, we all introduced ourselves.

2. **Approval of Minutes from May 6, 2015 Meeting:** the members reviewed the minutes of the May 6, 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. **Review of Original Task Force Priorities—Are We on Track?—Lilia Judson & Julie Whitman:** Lilly and Julie summarized the history of our task force—where we've been and where we are going. We feel we've completed the mapping tasks and would like to drop the word "mapping" from our task force name, now that we are focusing on data sharing. As part of the data sharing discussion, Josh reported that he did meet with DCS to develop the SLDS grant proposal (see May 6th meeting minutes for a deeper discussion). He is still waiting to receive word from the federal government on whether our DOE has received the grant. DOE and DCS have been working for quite a while to try to draft an MOU on data sharing so that DCS can track student outcomes. Josh discussed an idea he had for an agreement between DOE and other state agencies involving the sharing of data by DOE in exchange for deidentified data that would enable the research and development of profiles of at-risk students, to be used by educators to flag students for wraparound services. We spent some time discussing possible information exchanges between DOE and various agencies/the courts, and evaluating whether those data sharing efforts would be worthwhile. Josh mentioned that, with other agencies' data, the DOE could also create heat maps indicating where in the state certain issues/problems are concentrated. Barbara noted that her office (the Indiana Prevention Resource Center) could really use suspension, expulsion, and dropout data from the DOE. She is currently preparing a report for the Substance Abuse and Child Safety Task Force

outlining substance abuse prevention efforts from around the state. We then discussed the possibility of health department involvement in data sharing, and Barbara listed other resources that the DOE could access now (such as the Indiana Youth Survey) to create the risk profiles.

The consensus that emerged from this lengthy discussion was that people are interested in getting DOE's data; we need very detailed MOUs/legal agreements with terms that are agreeable to both parties; and, we need funding. MPH may be able to process the data gratis and it is possible their data architects could develop a risk profile. Josh mentioned that DOE has a data dictionary (a list of the types of data DOE collects) that he will share with interested parties. Finally, we discussed how FERPA could pose an obstacle to state-level data sharing efforts. Josh promised to send Lilly and Mary the data dictionary so that Mary could determine whether those data elements could be analyzed in some way relevant to the courts' work.

4. **Update on Information Sharing Certificate Program, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University—Julie Whitman:** (*this was agenda item no. 6*) Julie introduced Raj Patel, who gave a brief summary of the survey that he developed and is administering. He distributed the survey to nine different agencies, including DCS, DMHA, probation, CASA, detention centers, and schools. The survey seeks to determine who shares information and how they obtain it; the survey asks about two contexts—requesting information and supplying information. The deadline for survey responses is August 31st. Chanelle Fox informed the group that she has completed the educational records portion of the information-sharing guidebook and summarized the rest of her work to date. The two critical takeaways so far on whether data is “shareable” involve the importance of context: who houses the data, and for what purposes the data will be used. Chanelle is researching federal and state laws, as well as the Indiana Administrative Code. She reviewed her timeline with us and plans to complete the first draft by late October. Mike then shared that not all agency heads have replied with suggestions for which attorneys would be best suited to work on this project with us; in fact, only DCS and DMHA have responded so far. Devon volunteered to serve for the ICJI, his agency. Mike still needs attorneys from DOE, ISDH, DOC and the prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers. He believes Leslie Dunn can represent CASA, and we determined that Laurie Elliott, from the Youth Law T.E.A.M., could help with detention centers. Once the team of attorneys has reviewed the draft, we can distribute it statewide. We may seek advice from the Attorney General's office (Tamara said the Advisory Section would be our contact) regarding language about how to characterize the guidebook's information (reliable, authoritative, etc.). We may need to add boilerplate about the information not constituting legal advice, for example. Julie shared that ultimately, it would be good to conduct a follow-up survey to learn whether professionals' information-sharing behavior changed as a result of the guidebook.
5. **Can MPH Assist the HWS/Hannah Maxey?—Tony Barker:** (*this was agenda item no. 4*) Tony stated that he talked with Sarah Marshall of OMB who had an earlier meeting with Hannah, and learned that Sarah is leaving—her last day is Friday. However, Josh Marshall, Deputy CIO at MPH (Management & Performance Hub) has agreed to meet with Hannah and representatives of our task force to understand the intertwining goals/efforts of each group and how MPH staff may be able to assist with those goals/efforts. Tony will set up a meeting with Josh, himself, and Hannah; either Julie or Lilly will attend as our task force representatives.
6. **Cross-System Youth Task Force Update—Michael Commons:** (*this was agenda item no. 5*) 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 our last meeting. The Cross-System Youth Task Force does partner with Casey Family Programs for judicial engagement plans, and there are currently pilot programs underway in five counties to better coordinate efforts when the child crosses into two

different systems. The pilot programs use a very broad definition of “cross-system youth.” Additionally, the task force is engaged with Marion County’s dual-status youth initiative, which is operating with support from the RFK Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. The task force is thus involved with a total of six demonstration projects that are seeking to devise model strategies for handling dually adjudicated youth. Mike also gave an update from the youth court symposium held on July 24th in Plainfield. Some 40 counties sent teams of four to six professionals, including DCS employees, court staff, probation officers, prosecutions and public defenders, GAL/CASAs, educators, and mental health providers.

7. **Juvenile Database: Should There be a Juvenile Abstract, & What Kind of Information Should It Contain?**—**Mary DePrez:** Mary observed that INcite contains many different applications for juveniles: risk assessment, preliminary inquiry, predispositional reports, and modification reports. What is lacking is any systematic report of outcomes for each individual child. On the adult side, TCT worked with DOC officials to use the risk assessment and presentence investigation apps to develop an abstract of judgment that is built-in for the courts. In 2012, the scope of the app was expanded to require an abstract for any felony, not just those in which the defendant was going to the DOC. This has enabled us to collect data statewide on felony offenders, which is extremely useful for researchers and policy makers. There is nothing comparable on the juvenile side, because no abstract is required. The Judicial Center’s DMC (disproportionate minority contact) staff members are also looking into whether an abstract would be helpful for their evaluations. INcite also needs detention center data, so there are two missing pieces: an abstract and data from the detention centers (which are not run by the state). The abstract would be created for juvenile delinquency cases, not DCS cases (JC, JT, etc.). One obstacle to developing an abstract involves questions about the staff and resources needed to complete the abstract in INcite. In response to Lilly’s question about how our task force could assist with this situation, Mary replied that if our group recommended it—because the data would be so useful—it would be helpful. Barbara stated that we should go on the record and state that we recognize the need for and value of this project.

Resolution Vote: Lilly moved that we recommend, as a task force, that the judiciary develop a system to gather information on the disposition of JD cases and expand, if possible, to CHINS cases, too. Julie seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

8. **Criminal Background Checks for Volunteers Who Work with Youth: Centralize the Process?**—**Julie Whitman:** *This agenda item was tabled until our next task force meeting.*
9. **Next meeting:** the Task Force’s next meeting will be on *Tuesday, October 20, 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.