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4. Strategic Priority: Child Safety & Services
   • Sarah Sailors: DCS Data Update
DCS update to the Commission on Improving the Status of Children

May 8, 2019

Sarah Sailors, MSW
Deputy director, field operations
Indiana children will live in safe, healthy and supportive families and communities

Child Abuse & Neglect Hotline

• Reports to the hotline are stable:
  • 242,994 reports in 2018 (20% increase since 2015)

**Hotline reports by Calendar Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>202,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>225,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>244,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>242,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MaGIK Hotline data
Indiana children will live in safe, healthy and supportive families and communities.
Case Numbers

• At the end of April 2019, DCS had:
  • 23,263 open cases

• Of those 23,263 open cases:
  • 19,094 Child in Need of Service (CHINS) cases
  • 3,375 Informal Adjustments (IAs)
  • 794 Collaborative Care cases

• 11,295 new assessments assigned in April 2019
Indiana children will live in safe, healthy and supportive families and communities.
CHINS Cases & Placement

- 19,094 open CHINS cases at the end of April 2019
- 14,434 (76%) were placed in out-of-home care

Source: MaGIK Monthly Data

Indiana children will live in safe, healthy and supportive families and communities
Absence of repeat maltreatment

• 94.6% is the national standard for absence of repeat maltreatment within six months.

Source: MaGIK Monthly Data
Re-entry into the DCS system

Percentage of children who re-entered foster care within 12 months of removal ending/case closure

- NOTE: This data is for cases that closed specifically with closure type of guardianship, permanent placement with relative or reunification. It is not all case closures.

Source: MaGIK Monthly Data
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5. Strategic Priority: Educational Outcomes
   • Valerie Beard, IDOE
     • Educational Outcomes of Homeless Youth
Educational Outcomes for Indiana’s Homeless Youth

Valerie Beard
Assistant Director of English Learner & Migrant Education Programs

@EducateIN

Working Together for Student Success
In 2018, the Indiana legislature passed House Enrolled Act 1314, which requires the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), the State Board of Education (SBOE), and the Department of Child Services (DCS) to work collaboratively to prepare an annual report on the educational outcomes of homeless children and youth in our state.

The first Annual Report on Homeless Youth Educational Outcomes was reviewed and approved by SBOE on April 10.
Defining Homelessness

Homeless students are those who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. This includes students who are:

- Sharing housing due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason (i.e., “doubled up”).
- Living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to lack of alternative housing
- Staying in emergency and transitional shelters
Homeless students are those who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. This includes students who are:

- Living in public or private places not designed for humans to live
- Living in cars, parks, or bus or train stations
- Living in abandoned buildings or substandard housing
- Migratory children or unaccompanied youth living in any of the above situations
National Homeless Youth Statistics

- Each year, over 700,000 youth aged 13-17 experience homelessness in the United States.
- The prevalence of homelessness is comparable across rural and urban contexts.
- Between 20-40% of homeless youth identify as LGBTQ.
- 46% of “runaway” and homeless youth report having been physically abused, and 17% report having been forced into unwanted sexual activity by a family or household member.
## Homeless Youth in Indiana

### School Enrollment (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeless Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public Schools</td>
<td>16,723</td>
<td>1,006,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>47,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Run Schools (Blind, Deaf, Corrections)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Homeless Youth in Indiana

### Graduation Rate (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeless Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort Size</strong></td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>82,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Graduates</strong></td>
<td>895</td>
<td>72,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Rate</strong></td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disciplinary Incidents (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeless Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Suspended</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>96,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population Suspended</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Expelled</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population Expelled</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Homeless Youth in Indiana

### Grades 3-8 ISTEP+ Proficiency (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeless Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts Pass Rate</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Pass Rate</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Homeless Youth in Indiana

## Grade 10 ISTEP+ Proficiency (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeless Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English/Language Arts Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

@EducateIN

Indiana Department of Education
IDOE is consulting with DCS and other stakeholders to develop and finalize the remediation plan for Indiana’s homeless youth by August 31.

Interested in providing input? Please let me know!

Valerie Beard
Assistant Director of EL and Migrant Education Programs
vbeard@doe.in.gov
(317)232-0558
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5. Strategic Priority: Educational Outcomes
   • Jeff Wittman, IDOE and Melaina Gant, DCS
     • Educational Outcomes of Foster Youth
HEA1314-2018: Annual Report on Foster Care Youth Educational Outcomes
Melaina Gant, DCS and Jeff Wittman, IDOE
Statutory Authority (IC 20-19-3-18)

- HEA 1314-2018 required:
  - Report of foster youth educational outcomes
  - Remediation plan
  - Annual updates
- Mandated data sharing procedures between DOE and DCS
Report Development Timeline

- January 15, 2019: Graduation Rate
- January 31, 2019: DOE staff to send SBOE staff data
- March 12, 2019: SBOE staff to review DOE data; DOE and DCS to prepare Foster Care Youth Report and send report to SBOE for review
- April 1, 2019, and each year thereafter: DOE shall submit the Homeless Youth Care Report to DCS and the Legislative Council
- June 30, 2019: Remediation plan
The Unique Academic Challenges of Foster Care Population

- More likely to:
  - change schools during the school year
  - be in special education classes
  - fail to receive passing grades

- Dropout rates = 3x higher for foster youth than other low-income children
- Only about 50% graduate from high school.
- > 40% of school-aged children in foster care have educational difficulties
The Unique Academic Challenges of Foster Care Population

- Medical, mental, oral, and psychosocial health issues
- Especially trauma
- Compounded by a lack of adequate access to health services
National Foster Youth Statistics

- 34% of 17-18-year-olds have experienced 5 or more school changes
- 3x more likely to be expelled
- 2x more likely to have out-of-school suspension
- Average reading level of 17-18-year-old foster youth is 7th grade
- 35%-47% are receiving special education services
- 63% in the Midwest complete high school by age 18
National Foster Youth Statistics

- 437,465 youth were in foster care as of September 30, 2016 with 65% experiencing more than one home placement while in care
- Foster children are categorically eligible for free meal benefits per the USDA Food and Nutrition Services Eligibility Manual
Indiana’s Foster Youth Statistics

- 31,042 Indiana students foster care in 2017
- First time collecting this data at the state level
  - Local DCS offices notified schools of a child’s foster status by submission of a form via email to the LEA’s identified Point of Contact.
  - LEAs reported their foster youth data at the end of the academic year to IDOE.
- Majority (8,335) in traditional public schools, small percentage attending charters.
- Nonpublic schools do not report foster care status to the state, so the enrollment of foster care students is currently unknown.
## Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type (Enrollment Count)</th>
<th>Foster Care Student Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Public</td>
<td>8335</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>1006278</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>47089</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Run (Blind, Deaf, Corrections)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-public*</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>85634</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-public schools do not report foster care status
## Graduation Rates and Waivers

### Overall Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>82234</td>
<td>72466</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waivers for Graduation Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waiver Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Waiver Rate</th>
<th>Non-Waiver Graduates</th>
<th>Non-Waiver Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>6029</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>66437</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diploma Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma Type</th>
<th>Foster Care</th>
<th>% Diploma (Foster)</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>% Diploma (All)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>6862</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 40</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>36740</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 40 - Academic Honors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>23770</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 40 - Technical Honors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 40 - Academic and Technical Honors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Grade Promotion and Retention Rates**

### 2017-18 Total Grade Promotion/Retention (PreK-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained %</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promotion %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>8019</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7704</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>1009855</td>
<td>18464</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>991391</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017-18 and 2018-19 Total Grade Promotion/Retention Disaggregated by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained %</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promotion %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prekindergarten</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grade Promotion and Retention Rates - Delineated by Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained %</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promotion %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4852</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (two or more races)</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3851</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4168</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3980</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>2709</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Lunch</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5164</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disciplinary Actions

### Discipline (Public Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Suspended</th>
<th>Suspension %</th>
<th>Students Expelled</th>
<th>Expulsion %</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>9145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>96370</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>1075466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discipline Disaggregated by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students Suspended</th>
<th>Students Expelled</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Kindergarten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disciplinary Actions – Delineated by Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Disaggregated by Subgroup</th>
<th>Students Suspended</th>
<th>Students Expelled</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (two or more races)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Lunch</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Standardized Testing Results – ISTEP Grades 3-8

## Total ISTEP Passage Rates (Grade 3-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English/Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tested Students</td>
<td>Students Passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>3820</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>503181</td>
<td>322541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ISTEP Passage Rates (Grade 3-8) Disaggregated by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Students Passing</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Students Passing</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Standardized Testing Results – ISTEP Grades 3-8 – Delineated by Subgroups

## ISTEP Passage Rates (Grade 3-8) Disaggregated by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English/Language Arts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Math</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tested Students</td>
<td>Students Passing</td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Tested Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian/Alaskan Native</strong></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>726</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>2459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiracial (two or more races)</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education</strong></td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education</strong></td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>2719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standardized Testing Results – ISTEP Grades 10 (First Time)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English/Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tested Students</td>
<td>Students Passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>80265</td>
<td>47240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISTEP Grade 10 Disaggregated by Subgroups (First Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Students Passing</th>
<th>Pass Rate (%)</th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Students Passing</th>
<th>Pass Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial (two or more races)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standardized Testing Results - IREAD Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tested Students</th>
<th>Students Passing</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>84405</td>
<td>73547</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School Accountability Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>No Grade/Appeal Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Student</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>522 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count and %</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(37.6%)</td>
<td>(22.5%)</td>
<td>(10.5%)</td>
<td>(7.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Count</td>
<td>348952</td>
<td>413636</td>
<td>205648</td>
<td>91659</td>
<td>40137</td>
<td>32394 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and %</td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(37.6%)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>(8.1%)</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Kindergarten Pilot Program

- IDOE and DCS did not receive any data from the LEAs regarding the number and percentage of eligible foster care youth enrolled in the prekindergarten program under IC 12-17.2-7.2
- The On My Way Pre-K (OMW) program is also required to gather this information per the federal Child Care Development Block Grant reauthorization
- Further collaboration with OMW Pre-K staff is planned to provide a more comprehensive and informed picture
What now?

- Remediation plan due June 30, 2019
- IDOE working with DCS, SBOE, local stakeholders, and foster youth to identify known barriers, develop plans and research available interventions
What now?

- Guiding principles for successful interventions include:
  - Immediate accessibility
  - Individualized, flexible, and choice-based
  - Developmentally appropriate for youth
  - Culturally competent
  - Trauma-informed
  - Housing First approach
  - Positive Youth Development
  - Family reunification and resiliency strategies

Education is a Path to Permanency
Agenda

5. Strategic Priority: Educational Outcomes
   • Christy Berger, IDOE
     • Resilience Film Screening
     • Trailer
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5. Strategic Priority: Educational Outcomes
   • Dr. Theresa Ochoa, Indiana University, and Derek Grubbs, IDOC
   • Educational Passport Findings, Phase I
Education Outcomes Taskforce: Educational Passport Subcommittee

Theresa A. Ochoa, Indiana University & Derek Grubbs, Department of Correction
Susan Lightfoot, Henry County Probation
Mary Beth Buzzard, Department of Correction
Jesse Cooperman, Indiana University

May 2019 Report Summary
Subcommittee’s Charge

• **Charge 1**: Describe the history of vulnerable children and youth and how they move from place to place and from school to school.

• **Charge 2**: Identify best-practice transition models at the state and national levels.
Approach to Study

Used a cross-sectional approach of three different student cases to develop a composite picture of vulnerable children

1. Thomas, a student in elementary school (Jesse Cooperman)
2. Joe, a student in probation (Susan Lightfoot)
3. Terry, a student in juvenile corrections (Mary Beth Buzzard)

Characteristics of vulnerable children in Indiana

- Persistent behavioral challenges
- Poor academic performance
- Diagnosis of a behavioral disorder or/and learning disability
- Low IQ but no reported special education services provided
- History of neglect, abuse, exposure to violence and drugs

Characteristics of vulnerable children in Indiana are consistent with those of vulnerable children in the rest of the country
Findings for Charge #1: Children and youth who are not in school are frequently lost in the transition process

1. Student misbehaves in class
2. Teacher refers to office
3. Principal suspends child from school
4. Child is unsupervised at home
5. Child gets involved in delinquent acts
6. Child is arrested by police
7. Judge sends child to confinement
8. Child is placed in correctional or mental health confinement
9. Unclear where child returns after release from confinement
Findings for Charge 2: Describe transition best-practices at the national level

Review of Literature on Transition from Correctional Programs

1. Natural Bridge Transition Program
2. Youth Reentry Specialist Program
3. Achieving Rehabilitation Individualized Education, and Employment Success (ARIES)
4. Intensive Aftercare Program
5. Nashua Youth Reentry Project
6. Service Utilization to Promote the Positive Rehabilitation and Community Transition of Incarcerated Youth with Disabilities (SUPPORT)
7. Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Student Transition Program
8. Transition Services for Juvenile Detainees with Disabilities
Findings for Charge 2: Describe transition best-practices at the national level

• Transition planning should begin as soon as the youth enters confinement (Baltodano, Mathur, & Rutherford 2005; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
• Conduct a comprehensive assessment of academic, vocational, and mental health needs (Gies, 2000; Hogan, Bullock, & Fritsch, 2010; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009; Stephens & Arnette, 2000)
• Contact community school to request records (e.g., IEP, school transcripts) as soon as possible (Gemignani, 1994; Hogan, Bullock, & Fritsch, 2010; Muller, 2011; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009; Sheldon-Sherman, 2012)
• Use assessment results to design and implement a comprehensive individualized program (Gies, 2000; Muller, 2011; Nellis & Wayman, 2009; Osher, Amos, & Gonsoulin, 2012)
• Establish who among the staff personnel will be responsible for transition (Clark & Unruh, 2010; Gies, 2000)
Transition back to the community should drive educational programming while in confinement (Baltodano, Mather, & Rutherford, 2005; Ingersol & LeBoueff, 1997)

- Involve the youth and his or her family to the extent possible (Geddes & Keenan, 2006; Risler & O-Rourke, 2009; Sheldon-Sherman, 2010)
- Create a transition portfolio (Clark & Unruh, 2010; Osher, Amos, & Gonsoulin, 2012; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
- Form a multi-disciplinary interagency transition team (Ingersol & LeBoueff, 1997; Muller, 2011; Nellis & Wayman, 2009; Osher, Amos, & Gonsoulin, 2012; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
- Indicate each service provider’s responsibilities and create a system of accountability for transition goals (Clark & Uhruh, 2010; Geddes & Keenan, 2006; Sheldon-Sherman, 2010)
- Monitor progress in the individual learning plan and/or IEP and modify goals as needed (Clark & Uhruh, 2010; Hogan, Bullock, & Fritsch, 2010; Osher, Amos, & Gonsoulin, Risler & O-Rourke, 2009)
Determine the most appropriate educational placement in the community for each youth (Geddes & Keenan, 2006; Gemignani, 1994)

- Conduct pre-release meeting 60 days prior to release to review portfolio and discuss plans for return to community (Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
- Visit the community school with the youth (Sheldon-Sherman, 2010; Stephens & Arnette, 2000)
- Finalize educational plan from facility to school prior to release (Gemignani, 1994; Sheldon-Sherman, 2010)
- Conduct formal exit interview at least 10 days prior to release (Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
- Finalize portfolio noting achievements, growth and accomplishments during confinement (Risler & O’Rourke, 2009)
- Send records from confinement facility to community school (Clark & Unruh, 2010; Hogan, Bullock, & Fritsch, 2010; Risler & O’Rourke, 2009; Roy-Stevens, 2004; Stephens & Arnette, 2000)
Information Models in Indiana

- CHIRPS – immunization records: https://chirp.in.gov/main.jsp
- INSPECT – drug monitoring program: https://www.in.gov/pla/inspect/
- Oddysey Public Access (MyCase) https://secure.in.gov/judiciary/2984.htm
- Indiana Health Information Exchange: https://www.himss.org/indiana-health-information-exchange-ihie
Conclusions

• Children who are not in school get lost in the transition process as they move between different child-serving providers. Agencies and institutions treat vulnerable children as best they can but when children move from one institution or agency to another, their records do not consistently follow them.

• Currently, there is an institutional barrier around communication and information sharing between child-serving stakeholders. Addressing the need to share information between the various child-serving agencies and institutions is a critical first step in improving the lives of vulnerable children.
Recommendations for Indiana

• Children who are not in school have a higher risk of getting lost in the system. We recommend that the state
  1. Expand training to improve classroom behavior management techniques used by teachers to keep students in the classroom
  2. Have schools adopt positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) frameworks
  3. Focus on student engagement not punishment
  4. Minimize suspensions and expulsions from school

• Transitioning out of an agency or program poses the most challenges. Once the youth exits a program agencies struggle to keep track of the youth’s whereabouts. We recommend:
  1. Add transition experts within schools, programs, and agencies charged with the sole responsibility to transition children in and out of agencies and programs
  2. Require a multi-disciplinary team to monitor when children transition into and out of programs
  3. Expect the multi-disciplinary transition team delineate transition needs and goals with specific names of the individual accountable for monitoring progress of each goal
  4. Appoint a team and allocate the resources for the team to establish a unified multi-agency information gathering and data sharing system
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6. Strategic Priority: Mental Health & Substance Abuse

• Sirrilla Blackmon, DMHA
Division of Mental Health and Addiction
Overview of School and Community Based Services

Substance Abuse Mental Health and Services Administration
  • Substance Abuse Prevention Treatment Block Grant
  • Strategic Planning Framework-Partnerships for Success

State of Indiana
  • Child Psychiatric Services Fund
The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention developed and recognizes the delivery of prevention services through a comprehensive, multi-strategic prevention approach. Using as many or all six of the following strategies has the greatest potential to reduce and prevent substance misuse and use by reducing risk and increasing protective factors:

1. Information Dissemination
2. Prevention Education
3. Alternative Activities
4. Community Based Processes
5. Environmental Approaches, and
6. Problem Identification and Referral.
Strategy #1  Information Dissemination

This strategy provides information about the nature of drug use, abuse, addiction and the effects on individuals, families and communities. It also provides information of available prevention programs and services.

Strategy #2  Prevention Education

This strategy involves two way communication and its distinguished from merely disseminating information by the fact that it is based on interaction between educator and the participants. Activities under this strategy aim to effect critical life and social skills, including decision making, refusal skills and critical analysis (e.g. of media messages)
Strategy #3  Alternative Activities

This strategy provides for the participation of the target populations in activities that exclude alcohol, tobacco and other drug use. The assumption is the constructive and healthy activities offset the attraction to, or otherwise meet the need usually filled by alcohol, tobacco and others drugs and therefore, minimize or prevent use.

Strategy #4  Community Based Processes

This strategy aims to enhance the ability of the community to more effectively provide prevention and treatment services for drug abuse disorders. Activities in this strategy include organizing, planning, enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of service implementation, building coalitions and networking.
Strategy #5 Environment Approaches

This strategy seeks to establish or change community standards, codes, and attitudes, thereby influencing the incidence and prevalence of drug abuse in the general populations.

Strategy #6 Problem Identification

This strategy aims to identify those who have indulged in the illegal use of drugs in order to assess if their behavior can be reversed through education. It should be noted, however, that this strategy does not include any activity designed to determine if an individual is in need of treatment.
Substance Abuse Prevention & Treatment Block Grant

- 14 Counties
- 14 Grantees
- 143 Schools
- Estimated Reach -17,298
Partnership for Success is a discretionary grant. The purpose of this grant program is to address two of the nation’s top substance abuse prevention priorities:

1) Underage drinking among persons aged 12-20; and
2) Prescription drug misuse among persons aged 12 to 25

The grant program is intended to prevent the onset and reduce the progression of substance misuse and its related problems while strengthening prevention capacity and infrastructure at the state and community levels.
SPF-Partnership for Success Grant

- 10 Counties
- 10 Grantees
- 47 Schools
- Estimated Reach – 3,200 students
Child Psychiatric Services Fund

The Child Psychiatric Services Fund is a state budget allocation that designates a portion of the funding $3,500,000 to implement evidence-based program that partners with school corporations, and accredited nonpublic schools to provide social work services and evidence-based prevention programs to children, parents, caregivers, teachers, and the community to prevent substance abuse, promote healthy behaviors, and maximize student success.

The remainder of the funds are designated to support the operation of services and programs for:

- Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children
- Child Assessment Needs Survey CANS
Child Psychiatric Services Fund

- 14 Grantees
- 26 Counties
- 171 School
- Over 32,000 students served
- Over 3,500 School Staff trained
- At least 3,500 parents engaged
The appropriation of $3,500,000 in both FY 2020 and FY 2021 for the Family and Social Services Administration to contract with no more than three regionally diverse social services providers to implement an evidence-based program that partners with school corporations, charter schools, and accredited nonpublic schools to provide social work services and evidence-based prevention programs to children, parents, caregivers, teachers, and the community to prevent substance abuse, promote healthy behaviors, and maximize student success. In making contracts for FY 2020 and FY 2021, the Family and Social Services Administration shall require the contracted social services providers to secure matching funds that obligates the state to no more than sixty-five percent (65%) of the total program cost and require the contracted social services providers to have experience in providing similar services including independent evaluation of those services.
Certified Community Mental Health Centers
School-Based Services Assessment

Assessment of current CMHC School-Based Services was conducted in the Fall of 2018. The following information was requested from the centers.

• Agency Name
• County/Counties Served
• School District/Corporation
• School Name
• Number of Masters and Bachelors Level Providers
• Frequency of Service Provided and
• Funding Source
Community Mental Health Center

Mental health services in schools reported by CMHCs include alternative, charter, pre-K, public, non-public and private schools.
Next Steps

- Workforce
- Categorize funding sources
- Formal vs informal relationships between the school and CMHC
- Frequency and type of services provided by group
Substance Abuse Prevention Block Grant
Partnership for Success Grant—School-Based
Child Psychiatric Services Fund
Certified Community Mental Health Center: School-Based Services

Mental health services in schools reported by CMHCs include alternative, charter, pre-K, public, non-public and private schools.

Number indicates the number of schools in the county with services.
May is Mental Awareness Month
May 9th is Children Mental Health Awareness Day

We Support Mental Health Awareness
Agenda

7. Committee Updates
   - Tamara Weaver and Tyler Brown, Data Sharing and Mapping Committee
Agenda

7. Committee Updates
   • Kathryn Dolan: Communications Committee
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8. Equity, Inclusion and Cultural Competence
   • Jane Seigel and Brenda Graves-Croom
   • Gina Peralta, W. Haywood Burns Institute
ADVANCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC EQUITY TO IMPROVE CHILD-WELL BEING

May 8, 2019
Gina Peralta, Director of Site Management
W. Haywood Burns Institute
THE W. HAYWOOD BURNS INSTITUTE (BI)

- Promotes equity by working with stakeholders in youth and adult criminal justice agencies to deconstruct their decision-making and its impact on people of color.

- Strongly encourages a collaborative and inclusive process that engages people and communities directly and deeply impacted by the justice apparatus, in partnership with system stakeholders.

- Facilitates community and system stakeholders through a data-driven process to improve justice system decision-making.

- Focuses on a structural analysis of the problem (and structural solutions) rather than on individual beliefs and behavior.
FRAMING THE CONVERSATION

Why do we start our analysis with race and ethnicity?

Key terms and concepts
WHY DO WE START WITH RACE & ETHNICITY?

NATIONAL RACE FOR RESULTS INDEX SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Racial and Hispanic origin categories are mutually exclusive.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS:
PERCENT OF PEOPLE OF COLOR BY COUNTY

NATIONAL DETENTION RATES (2015)
PER 100,000 YOUTH IN POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Detention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History of Disparities in Youth Justice

- New York House of Refuge (1825)
  - A pattern of exclusion manifested itself from the beginning: “colored section” not opened until 1834.
  - Slavery abolished in 1865 and commenced the black codes

- First Juvenile Court Established (1899)
  - Vast differences in the administration of justice for youth of color versus white youth.
  - By 1925, 48 states had created their own JJ systems
  - Services for youth of color was not a priority

- Whitter State School (1891-2004)
  - Latino Spanish-speaking boys subject to IQ testing in English and sterilization

- Indian Boarding Schools (1860)
  - “Kill the Indian, save the man”
  - Focus on assimilation
  - Severe punishment leading
Detention of youth of color has increased since 1985. By 2013, 71% of detained youth nationwide were youth of color.

1930-1950, 3 out of 5 homes bought were financed by FHA. Only 2% of FHA loans were made to non-White buyers.

1/5 of 100,000 Black vets who applied for educational benefits went to college. 67,000 mortgages were insured by GI Bill. Fewer than 100 were by Non-Whites.
EQUALITY, EQUITY & STRUCTURAL CHANGE
Dismantling the Justice Maze

Justice Maze: Complex
- Too easy to get in
- Too hard to get out

Too many entries:
- Criminalizing age-appropriate behavior
- Disparate enforcement and treatment

Not enough exits:
- Need for alternative to detentions
- Diversion
- Age-appropriate services and response
- Pro-social activities

Need practical and effective responses to ensure future generations are productive members of society.
FUNDAMENTALS OF BI WORK TO PROMOTE EQUITY AND REDUCE DISPARITY

- Collaboration and Facilitation
- Using Data
- Meaningful Community Engagement
Considerations for Building & Sustaining Collaborative Structures

- **Composition**
  - Justice and Community Partnership
  - Involvement of Supervisors/Line Staff

- **Authority**
  - Collaborative must have the sufficient authority to implement the policy/practice/programmatic changes

- **Structure**
  - Ensure oversight and direction (Meeting Chairs)
  - Institute a process for decision-making
  - Clear communication strategy (i.e. internal and external)

- **Leadership and Coordination**
  - Taking ownership over the work (Serve as an Ambassador)
  - Willing to share decision making and resources
  - Consistent Representation
USES FOR DATA

- Grant applications
- Reporting requirements (federal or state law)
- Academic studies (testing a hypothesis)
- To Inform and Drive Department Policy
  - To understand your system
  - To define and refine the problem
  - To establish reform goals
  - To select effective strategies
  - To track progress
WHY INVOLVE THE COMMUNITY/IMPACTED INDIVIDUALS?

- Insight
- Unique Resources
- Added Capacity
- Urgency
- Credibility
- Repair & Strengthen Relationships
HOLDING TWO “OPPOSING” NOTIONS AT THE SAME TIME

Harm reduction
- “Right sizing” the maze/apparatus
- Restructuring
- Accountability for the agencies & entire apparatus

A new vision for youth justice
- Community centered
- Culturally appropriate, strength-based
- Child well-being
- Recidivism is not the only or key measure
CONTACT US

W. Haywood Burns Institute
475 14th St., Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 321-4100
http://www.burnsinstitute.org
http://data.burnsinstitute.org/

Gina Peralta, Director of Site Management – gperalta@burnsinstitute.org, xt.108
Agenda

9. Future Meeting Topics or other Items from Commission Members

10. Next Meeting: May 8, 2019, Indiana State Library, Author’s Room
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana

Contact Information
Julie.Whitman@courts.in.gov; 317-232-1945; www.in.gov/children
ADVANCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC EQUITY TO IMPROVE CHILD-WELL BEING

May 8, 2019

W. Haywood Burns Institute
THE W. HAYWOOD BURNS INSTITUTE (BI)

- Promotes equity by working with stakeholders in youth and adult criminal justice agencies to deconstruct their decision-making and its impact on people of color.

- Strongly encourages a collaborative and inclusive process that engages people and communities directly and deeply impacted by the justice apparatus, in partnership with system stakeholders.

- Facilitates community and system stakeholders through a data-driven process to improve justice system decision-making.

- Focuses on a structural analysis of the problem (and structural solutions) rather than on individual beliefs and behavior.
KEY TERMS: OUR DEFINITIONS

- **Equity** is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential.

- **Inclusion** is an action or state of including or of being included within a group or structure. More than simply diversity and numerical representation, inclusion involves authentic and empowered participation and a true sense of belonging.

- **Disparity** is the difference in level of system involvement as expressed by a rate, proportion, average or some other quantitative measure. (i.e., *disproportionality and overrepresentation*)

- **Disparate Treatment** is being treated differently than someone else who is similarly situated when the outcome is avoidable and unjust.

- **Interpersonal Prejudice or Bias** (often called Racism, Interpersonal Racism or “Reverse Racism”) are how private beliefs about race and ethnicity become public when we interact with others.

- **Discrimination** is a form of interpersonal bias and means unfairly treating a person or group of persons.

- **Systemic and Structural Racism** is a system in which public policies, institutional practices, cultural representations, and other norms work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial/ethnic inequity.

Sources: BI drew upon and modified key terms being used by other thought leaders in the field, including the Aspen Institute, Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Race Equity Inclusion work, Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Government Alliance on Race and Equity (G.A.R.E.), and PolicyLink.
FRAMING THE CONVERSATION

Why do we start our analysis with race and ethnicity?
WHY DO WE START WITH RACE & ETHNICITY?

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS:
PERCENT OF PEOPLE OF COLOR BY COUNTY

NATIONAL RACE FOR RESULTS INDEX SCORES

NATIONAL DETENTION RATES (2015)
PER 100,000 YOUTH IN POPULATION

NOTE: Racial and Hispanic origin categories are mutually exclusive.

Source: Muck & Race/Economic pressures. Data adjusted using the 2010 Census, Census TIGER/Line, RADD, and CBI.
JIM CROW JUVENILE JUSTICE
History of the Youth Justice System: Puritans to Early Youth Court: 1600-1900s

Puritans, 1600-1800
- Family unit of social control
- Children viewed as property
- Children presumed born with sin
- Stubborn Child Law, Death Penalty

Enlightenment Period, 1800-1900
- Agrarian to Industrial Revolution
- New York House of Refuge (1825)
- Probation Created, Augustus (1848)
- Emancipation Proclamation (1863)
- Chicago Hull House, Addams (1889)

Early Juvenile Court, 1900-1950
- Protections from law enforcement
- Justice system expands to 48 states
- Crowded facilities; Limited services
History of the Youth Justice System:
African American Youth (1914)

White Juvenile Court and Detention Facility

Black Juvenile Court and Detention Facility
History of the Youth Justice System: Native American Youth

“Kill the Indian, Save the Man”

Lakota boys before boarding school

Lakota boys after boarding school
History of the Youth Justice System: Mexican-American Youth

“Aztec blood was present in Mexicans and because of these roots, Mexicans were more prone to violence and were blood-seeking people.”
History of the Youth Justice System: From Children’s Rights to “Super-Predator”

- Re Gault – Due Process (1967)
- Central Park Jogger Case (1989)
- DMC elevated to Core Req. (1992)
- Media and Legislative Frenzy

From 20/20:

“These children are fatherless, godless and without conscience.”

“They have no hope, no direction and no future.”
Detention of youth of color has increased since 1985. By 2013, 71% of detained youth nationwide were youth of color.

NATIONAL DETENTION RATES BY R/E
ONE DAY COUNT 1997-2015

**National One Day Count**
Detention Rates (per 100,000 youth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a one day count of detention in the US in 2015:

- Latino youth were **twice as likely** as White youth to be detained.
- Native American youth were nearly **3 times as likely** as White youth to be detained.
- Black youth were more than **6 times as likely** as White youth to be detained.

In a one day count of detention in the State of Indiana in 2015:
• Black youth were more than 6 times as likely as White youth to be detained.
EQUALITY, EQUITY & STRUCTURAL CHANGE

EQUALITY

EQUITY

LIBERATION
Dismantling the Justice Maze

Justice Maze: Complex
- Too easy to get in
- Too hard to get out

To many entries:
- Criminalizing age-appropriate behavior
- Disparate enforcement and treatment

Not enough exits:
- Need for alternative to detentions
- Diversion
- Age-appropriate services and response
- Pro-social activities

Need practical and effective responses to ensure future generations are productive members of society.
FUNDAMENTALS OF BI WORK TO PROMOTE EQUITY AND REDUCE DISPARITY

- Collaboration and Facilitation
- Using Data
- Meaningful Community Engagement
Considerations for Building & Sustaining Collaborative Structures

- **Composition**
  - Justice and Community Partnership
  - Involvement of Supervisors/Line Staff

- **Authority**
  - Collaborative must have the sufficient authority to implement the policy/practice/programmatic changes

- **Structure**
  - Ensure oversight and direction (Meeting Chairs)
  - Institute a process for decision-making
  - Clear communication strategy (i.e. internal and external)

- **Leadership and Coordination**
  - Taking ownership over the work (Serve as an Ambassador)
  - Willing to share decision making and resources
  - Consistent Representation
BARRIERS TO THE WORK: GETTING DISTRACTED BY FACTORS THAT ARE OUT OF YOUR CONTROL

DRIVERS

Out of your control

- Poverty
- Red Lining
- Interpersonal Bias/Racism
- Family Dynamics

In your control

- Differential Enforcement
- Administrative/Technical Violations
- Differential Processing
- Detention/Sentencing
USES FOR DATA

- Grant applications
- Reporting requirements (federal or state law)
- Academic studies (testing a hypothesis)
- To Inform and Drive Department Policy
  - To understand your system
  - To define and refine the problem
  - To establish reform goals
  - To select effective strategies
  - To track progress
1. **Identify Disparities**
   - Identify whether and to what extent racial and ethnic disparities exist

2. **Identify, Analyze and Strategize around a “Target Population”**
   - Identify target population to focus the work
   - “Dig deeper” into target population to learn more about policy, practice, and/or procedure and other factors contributing to disparities.
   - Strategize
   - Pilot or adopt policy change

3. **Measure Progress**
   - Monitor Effectiveness of Policy Change
   - Document changes in disparities
DEFINING THE PROBLEM:
WHETHER DISPARITIES EXIST VS. WHY DISPARITIES EXIST.

1. **Whether Disparities exist:**

   **Over-representation of youth of color in the justice system**
   - Example: Black youth are more than four times as likely to be admitted to detention than White youth.

2. **Why Disparities exist:**

   **The unnecessary and inappropriate entry and deeper “advancement” of Youth of Color into the justice system**
   - Example: Youth of color are involved in the justice system for low level and/or technical reasons.

   **Disparate Treatment of Youth of Color**
   - Example: Youth of color who are “similarly situated” to White youth are nevertheless treated more harshly.
STEP 2: IDENTIFY TARGET POPULATION

1. WHY youth are in detention: Is there Inappropriate or Unnecessary Detention of Youth of Color?
   - Probation Violations, Failing to Appear in Court
   - Lower level offenses
   - Status Offenses

2. Is Decision Making Consistent?
   - Between agencies
   - Within an agency

3. Different Treatment of Similarly Situated Youth
   - Risk Assessment data: override rates, override reasons
   - Lengths of stay for specific offenses charged
Peeling Back the Onion...

1. **What** more do we need to know about this target population to reduce system involvement for youth of color?

2. **Why** is answering this question key to reducing disparities?

3. **How** will we answer this question? (Data Source)

Where will you find answers?

- Regularly Reported Data
- Detention Utilization Studies
- Case Management System Query
- Other Research & Analysis
  - Case File Review
  - Prospective Data Collection
  - Interviews or Focus Groups
  - Surveys (Online, Phone, Hard Copy)
STEP 3: MEASURE PROGRESS

- **Regular reporting on program data**
  - Decide on key indicators to monitor monthly or quarterly

- **Evaluation**
  - Conduct an evaluation if possible after 6 months or one year, can partner with local university

- **Develop process for making adjustments to policies/interventions**
  - Lessons learned
  - What is working? What is not working?
  - Get input from staff and participants
WHY INVOLVE THE COMMUNITY?

- Insight
- Unique Resources
- Added Capacity
- Urgency
- Credibility
- Repair & Strengthen Relationships
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Increase/Maintain Community Awareness
- Inform/Engage broader community of the local reform
  - Community Forums

Data Collection
- Utilize qualitative methods of data collection
  - Focus groups/Interviews/Surveys
  - Community-based Participatory Research

Community Stakeholders
- Equitable membership/participation at the decision-making table
  - Serve an advisory function (i.e. advisory councils)

Formal Partnership with Community Based Organization
- Serve as a formal partner maintain community-based alternatives to formal system involvement
Community Based Alternatives are:

- Less Expensive
- More Effective in:
  - Reducing Recidivism
  - Engaging Youth
  - Ensuring Family Focus
  - Offering Culturally relevant service and rehabilitation
  - Cultivating long-term connection to community
HOLDING TWO “OPPOSING” NOTIONS AT THE SAME TIME

**Harm reduction**
- “Right sizing” the maze/apparatus
- Restructuring
- Accountability for the agencies & entire apparatus

**A new vision for youth justice**
- Community centered
- Culturally appropriate, strength-based
- Child well-being
- Recidivism is not the only or key measure
CONTACT US

W. Haywood Burns Institute
475 14th St., Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 321-4100
http://www.burnsinstitute.org
http://data.burnsinstitute.org/

Gina Peralta, Director of Site Management – gperalta@burnsinstitute.org, xt.108