



Youth Justice Oversight Committee

Data Workgroup

Minutes from July 9, 2024 Data Work Group Meeting

The Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) Data Work Group met on July 9, 2024, from 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. at the Indiana Office of Court Technology. Dr. Matt Aalsma and Chris Biehn chaired the meeting.

1. Attendance

Members present:

- Dr. Matt Aalsma, Indiana University School of Medicine, Chair
- Chris Biehn, Indiana Office of Court Services, Co-Chair
- Christine Reynolds, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
- Kaitlyn Christian, Management Performance Hub
- Nancy Wever, Indiana Office of Court Services, JDAI
- Olga Volokhova, Indiana Youth Institute
- Colleen Saylor, Indiana Office of Court Services*

Members Present Electronically via Zoom:

- Sarah Schelle, Indiana Department of Correction
- Judge Paul Felix, Indiana Court of Appeals
- Kristi Bruther, Johnson County Juvenile Detention Center

Members Absent:

- Judge Sarah Mullican, Vigo Circuit/Superior Court 3
- Melanie Pitstick, Marion County Juvenile Probation
- Traci Lane, Madison County Juvenile Probation
- Nikki Ford, Indiana Department of Child Services

Guests Presents:

- Amanda Bullock, Indiana Department of Child Services

Staff Present:

- Lisa Thompson, Indiana Office of Court Technology
- April Dubree, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Leslie Dunn, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Bob Rath, Office of Judicial Administration

*Judge Kenworthy has approved the appointment of Colleen Saylor to the YJOC Data Work Group.

2. Approval of Minutes from March 12, 2024 Meeting:

Committee members were provided a copy of the March 12, 2024 meeting Minutes prior to today's meeting. Nancy Wever made a motion to approve the Minutes; Christine Reynolds seconded the motion. The work group members unanimously approved the March 12, 2024 meeting Minutes.

3. Update on Grant Application vs. MOU

Chris Biehn provided an update on the OJA grant application. Prior to Mary Kay Hudson's departure, OJA applied for \$800,000 from the YJOC grants to support the work of the Data Work Group, including technology changes, data analysis, technical support, and research and evaluation for the next two years. The Task and Time Plan for this work was slated to start July 1, 2024. The grant application was discussed at the June YJOC meeting and was tabled at that time. Since then, OJA and ICJI have agreed to pursue an MOU for the \$800,000 instead of the grant application process. An MOU is still being developed and likely won't be final until September or October.

This delay has created concerns for IOCT, as developers are on standby ready to begin working on technology changes that support statutory requirements. Rather than take the risk that developers won't be available in September or October, IOCT has agreed to begin the work now in hopes that the MOU can be backdated to July 1, 2024 to cover all of the work that will be completed during the interim period.

4. Update from Screening & Assessment Work Group

Lisa Thompson provided an update from the YJOC Screening & Assessment Work Group. Although not included in the YJOC Data Work Group Report or the ICJI grant application, the YJOC Screening & Assessment Work Group has identified technology modifications necessary in both INcite and Quest to support changes in statute for reporting assessment information to the court. Since these changes are pertinent to the HEA1359 work and are data/technology related, Lisa wanted to inform this committee of the status of that work.

A sub-committee has been formed from the Probation Officer Advisory Board and the Screening & Assessment Work Group, and that group has begun to draft requirements for the technology changes. Lisa explained that the changes affect the "Juvenile Reports" in INcite, specifically the Preliminary Inquiry, Predispositional Report and Modification Report. Currently, a probation officer can prepare both the Preliminary Inquiry and the Predispositional Report without completing a Risk Assessment of any sort. Statute now requires the Diversion Tool and Disposition Tool to be completed to help inform decision making, and the Juvenile Reports may be the first opportunity the probation office has to communicate the assessment results with the court. There could be other situations that would prompt the use of other IYAS tools, so the probation officer needs to be able to address multiple IYAS assessments within the body of the report. Space will also be made to pull in Complementary Assessments from INcite, including the MAYSI-2 and Human Trafficking Screening Tool. The Screening & Assessment Work Group also proposed the use of a "Cover Sheet" as a document that will allow the probation officer to deliver the results of the assessments to the court in the event that a Preliminary Inquiry has not yet been completed. All of this work will be done in both INcite as well as Quest with a nightly feed of Quest data into INcite.

Since these work items are well established and are a priority due to statute, and other items in the Work Plan still need discussion and planning, Lisa received approval to begin the work for the Juvenile Reports now. There is a possibility that the MOU could be backdated to cover some of the work, but this is currently unfunded. Lisa is targeting a 7/1/2025 rollout date for this work,

with the intent to present at the Justice Services Conference in May 2025 to help probation officers prepare for the July start date.

Nancy Wever posed some questions regarding the changes to the Juvenile Reports and the requirement to include the Diversion and Detention Tool in every Preliminary Inquiry or Predispositional Report. Nancy cited that there is a requirement to use the IYAS Detention Tool prior to making a detention decision. Lisa explained that the request was to pull that tool into the Preliminary Inquiry if it was completed, and if it wasn't, the user would be prompted to indicate why. The Preliminary Inquiry is an opportunity for the probation officer to provide this information to the court if any of the tools had been completed thus far. Nancy is concerned that there are situations where an IYAS Detention Tool is completed, but a Preliminary Inquiry is never prepared for one reason or another. If that same youth has a paper referral for an unrelated offense in the near future, the Preliminary Inquiry will pull in the Detention Tool that was for something prior to the instant offense.

Lisa offered for Nancy to join the next sub-committee meeting so these concerns can be addressed before the development begins. Colleen Saylor, Chris Biehn and Kristi Bruther also volunteered to participate if needed. The sub-committee has met a few times already and will continue to meet throughout the development process. This group will review the work, continue to establish requirements, and help manage the rollout and messaging of the changes in 2025.

5. Naming of 20 Counties

Dr. Aalsma explained that one of the tasks in the YJOC Data Plan is to pull data from 20 counties to perform a data quantity/quality analysis. This will allow us to see who is collecting good data, who is struggling, where there are gaps, and identify best practices. Ideally, the counties would represent a mixture of sites from SRS and Quest, as well as JDAI and non-JDAI sites. 5 of those counties will be selected to adopt the best practices and commit to entering/collecting data in the preferred manner to help establish a protocol moving forward.

Judge Felix volunteered Hamilton County for the project. Dr. Aalsma mentioned that the eight (8) counties that he is working with on his ADAPT project might be a good fit because they have already done a deep dive of their systems. They are all JDAI counties: Bartholomew, Porter, Delaware, Hendricks, Pulaski, Madison, Monroe and Wabash Counties. Nancy Wever recommended Hancock, Miami, Shelby, and Vanderburgh Counties as non-JDAI sites. Kristi Bruther volunteered Johnson County to participate. Chris Biehn recommended Blackford County, as they have applied for grant funds and state that they "don't do juvenile probation". Lisa Thompson suggested looking at the probation quarterly reports to see who is not doing Preliminary Inquiry or Predispositional Reports, as it may be interesting to learn what they are doing if they aren't using the required forms.

Discussion was held as to how to solicit interest. Dr. Aalsma indicated that with his J-Equip project 10-15 years ago, they sent a letter to the counties to encourage involvement in the process. This group needs to decide how to approach the counties. Lisa Thompson asked if Judge Kenworthy would be willing to write a letter that could be sent with the solicitation. It could be included as part of the Wednesday weekly message to Judges and Chief Probation Officers and would allow us to determine a level of interest. If there is enough interest, the Data Work Group could narrow down the list to 20.

Chris Biehn volunteered to write up the Wednesday message and to create a Wufoo survey to include. This has been done in the past with various other initiatives. The goal is to have the solicitation included in the next Wednesday message (July 17) and give the counties until the

following Friday (July 26) to respond. An update will be provided at the next YJOC Data Work Group meeting in August. If more than 20 counties express an interest, the Data Work Group can narrow the list. If 20 haven't responded yet, then we can discuss doing a personal reach-out.

6. Next Steps and Prioritization of Work

Nancy Wever requested a formal Work Plan for the YJOC Data Work Group to track the progress of the work outlined in the plan. Lisa Thompson mentioned that if we pull the task and time plan out of the ICJI grant proposal, that will support the creation of a Work Plan. It was recommended to create a sub-group of this Data Work Group to meet virtually: Nancy Wever, Chris Biehn, Lisa Thompson and Dr. Aalsma will participate. Dr. Aalsma suggested a Gantt chart and will facilitate getting the first meeting scheduled. Leslie Dunn also suggested putting together a more detailed timeline for the 20 counties/pilots as part of this process as well.

Kaitlyn Christian mentioned that MPH recently contracted with Purdue through 2027 and may be able to provide support and data analysis activities with Purdue students if needed.

Discussion was held regarding the Juvenile Abstract of Disposition, and it was mentioned that another sub-committee may be needed to evaluate that work. Lisa Thompson explained that the Abstract of Disposition does not exist today but would be developed as a way for the courts to document the disposition of juvenile cases in a standardized format. There is currently a form that the courts use to summarize the court's disposition when a youth is committed to the Department of Correction, so that form might be a good starting point. From a research perspective, it is really hard to make sense of what happens to a youth and assumptions are made based on where the youth appears in the data next. It will be important to articulate who the Abstract of Disposition is for and how the courts will be incentivized to use it. There might be ways to use existing technology to collect the data without having to create something new. Judge Felix commented that it is critical to ensure court staff are coding things properly and that users know why this information is important.

Lisa Thompson brought up other OJA responsibilities that are outlined in HEA1359 regarding juvenile detention policies, detention overrides, and diversion outcomes. Those three reports are due December 1st, and no further progress has been made toward being able to sufficiently collect and report this data. Last year, Chris Biehn, Mary Kay Hudson and Leslie Dunn worked on the reports. The detention policy communication went out to counties on 9/6/2023 with a response due back by 10/4/2023. Regarding the detention override report, there is still confusion as to what should be reported; Lisa wondered if we could seek clarification as to what is intended in the statute. Leslie Dunn indicated that Judge Kenworthy is having regular meetings with the legislators, so it may be possible to have this discussion and to bring Lisa in to help facilitate a discussion regarding the current challenges.

7. September Meeting

Chris Biehn and Lisa Thompson are unable to attend the September meeting. Dr. Aalsma suggested that we wait and see what progress has been made at the August meeting and decide then whether to hold the September meeting in their absence, reschedule to a different date in August or cancel the August meeting entirely.

8. Next Meeting:

The next Data Work Group Meeting is scheduled for August 13, 2024 from 3:00 pm to 4:30 pm at the Indiana Office of Court Technology.

The next Youth Justice Oversight Committee Meeting is **October 3, 2024 at 10:00 am** at Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room C, 402 W. Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN. There will be a live webcast of this meeting available on the Youth Justice Oversight Committee website: www.in.gov/youthjustice.