



Youth Justice Oversight Committee

Data Workgroup

Minutes from October 8, 2024 Data Work Group Meeting

The Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) Data Work Group met on October 8, 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
- Melanie Pitstick, Marion County Juvenile Probation
- Nancy Wever, Indiana Office of Court Services, JDAI
- Kristi Bruther, Johnson County Juvenile Detention Center
- Traci Lane, Madison County Juvenile Probation
- Morgan Leever, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Todd Albin, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Christine Reynolds, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
- Kaitlyn Christian, Management Performance Hub
- Colleen Saylor, Indiana Office of Court Services

Members Present Electronically via Zoom:

- Judge Sarah Mullican, Vigo Circuit/Superior Court 3
- Sarah Schelle, Indiana Department of Correction
- Olga Volokhova, Indiana Youth Institute

Members Absent:

- Judge Paul Felix, Indiana Court of Appeals

OJA Staff Present:

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

Guests Present:

- Melvin Wao, Indiana University School of Medicine

2. Approval of Minutes from August 13, 2024 Meeting:

Committee members were provided with a copy of the August 13, 2024 meeting minutes prior to today's meeting. Melanie Pitstick made a motion to approve the minutes; Kristi Bruther seconded the motion. The work group members unanimously approved the August 13, 2024 meeting minutes.

3. Update on MOU Between ICJI and OJA

Chris Biehn provided an update on the status of the MOU between the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and the Office of Judicial Administration. The MOU has been executed, although they are making some slight revisions to the allocation of money to ensure the proper entities receive the correct share of the funding. The initial contract had the distribution of funds mixed up. This correction should not cause any delays, and the project is able to move forward.

4. Update on Data Evaluation Project

Dr. Aalsma provided an update on the Data Evaluation Project. After a solicitation for volunteers was sent out, 24 counties volunteered to participate. And although we had anticipated only looking at 20 counties, we have decided to include all 24 counties. A new map of the volunteers was presented to the work group, which highlights a mix based on rurality and population size, as well as a second map that identifies the case management system in use. Nancy Wever added that 19 of the counties are JDAI counties, one additional county has submitted a letter of intent to join JDAI, while another county in the list is "thinking about" joining JDAI.

For the new members of the work group, Nancy provided a summary of the JDAI initiative, its role, and how technical assistance has expanded in response to HEA 1359.

The work group then reviewed the Gantt chart that was created for the Work Plan to outline the timeline of activities. Dr. Aalsma commented that we may be a little behind schedule based on the chart, although the contract with Indiana University is in process. Chris Biehn commented that we are just finalizing the budget and scope of work, and then we will be able to move forward.

Dr. Aalsma discussed with the group a similar Data Evaluation project (called J-EQUIP) that was conducted about 10 years ago for the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) initiative, when there were even more database systems in use across the state. That project looked for missing data, data inconsistencies and data entry errors in the youth justice systems. It may be beneficial to review that methodology to see if a similar analysis would work for the YJOC Data Evaluation project. Lisa Thompson has prepared an Excel spreadsheet of the YJOC Data Elements that address youth characteristics, case events, current status, and programming/services that were listed in the YJOC Report

Plan. It was suggested that a subcommittee be formed to review the list of data elements that are being proposed for evaluation in conjunction with the J-EQUIP project. Traci Lane, Kristi Bruther, Melanie Pitstick, Lisa Thompson, Nancy Wever, and Colleen Saylor volunteered to participate in the subcommittee. Lisa will work to schedule a virtual meeting in the coming weeks so that an update from the subcommittee can be provided at the work group's November meeting.

Lisa Thompson advised the work group that Bill Gottlieb with Quest has been informed of the Data Evaluation initiative and that seven Quest counties have volunteered to participate. Once the Professional Services Agreement is in place with Indiana University and an Administrative Rule 9 request has been submitted and approved, we will be able to ask for Bill's assistance in gathering the data from the Quest sites. It is anticipated that the Data Evaluation phase of the project will last until March 2025.

Nancy Wever mentioned the JDAI Data Dictionary as an important resource to ensure that we fully understand what data we are pulling and what that data means.

After the initial Data Evaluation has concluded, the next step will be to select five counties who are willing to do a deeper dive into the data, focused on quality improvement. They will correct their errors, continue to pull data to see improvement, and help us establish best practices for the rest of the state to adopt.

5. Update on Juvenile Reports Changes

Lisa Thompson provided an update on the changes that are being made to the standardized Juvenile Reports (Preliminary Inquiry Report, Predispositional Report, and Modification Report). These changes, guided by the YJOC Screening & Assessment Work Group, are to ensure the relevant validated risk assessment tool results are provided to decision makers in advance of key decision-making opportunities. Most of the changes impact the Preliminary Inquiry Report to ensure that the IYAS-Diversion Tool is completed on every referral, and that when a youth is taken into custody, the IYAS-Detention Tool is also being completed. If either tool is not done, the user will be required to document the reason why. The JDAI Detention Screening Tool (if applicable), as well as other complementary assessments will also be captured in the report. These changes will allow for improved data collection regarding detention decisions and overrides. The goal is to have these changes complete by April 2025 to present at the Justice Services Conference, with a final implementation date of July 1, 2025.

Discussion was held regarding OJA's three annual reporting obligations to the Legislative Council: (1) Detention Policies; (2) Diversion; and (3) Detention Tool Results and Overrides. OJA prepared two reports last year (Diversion and Detention Tool Results/Overrides were combined into one report), and this year's report will be due in December 2024. Although the type of data available for these reports may not have changed much since last year, the progress we are making with the technological enhancements will provide for a new narrative outlining the upcoming changes. Further

discussion was held regarding the misconception of overrides on the IRAS tools. Many believe that an override of the IYAS-Detention Tool means an override of the detention recommendation, but that is not accurate. Within the Risk Assessment application, the only opportunity for an override is to the calculated risk level. What this really translates to is an override to the response or supervision strategy based on department policy or other complementary assessment information. It was noted that in Probation, the supervision level corresponds with the contact standards, which have not been updated since 2003. These require so many face-to-face, collateral, and phone contacts per month. Users will often override of the supervision level as a way to impact the contacts being made with the youth. For example, sex offenders are seen more often, even if they score low risk. Again, overriding the response, not the risk level.

It was also noted that the changes in statute under HEA1359 imply a connection between risk score and detention decision, and that isn't correct. JDAI sites who have a Detention Screening Tool have a scoring system that corresponds with a detention recommendation, and the legislature seems to think that the same applies to the IYAS-Detention Tool.

Lisa Thompson and Leslie Dunn shared that questions and concerns have been communicated with Representative McNamara to ensure we are properly interpreting the intent behind the legislation. Leslie clarified that a Judge does not override; they make an informed decision. We are left wondering if the legislation was focused on the intake officer's decision or the Judge's decision. Unfortunately, we aren't able to adequately track what the Judge does, as it is only documented in an Order. Representative McNamara seemed to agree and understands what is being tracked, but also wants to know the timing of all of the steps around the detention decision. We will be providing another response to explain that the "time" of events have not been within the scope of this work, but we will do our best to provide what has been asked. The goal is to show that the essential risk assessment tools are being completed and shared with decision-makers at critical stages in the youth justice system. If the tools are not being completed, technical assistance can be provided.

In addition to the changes to the Juvenile Reports, the Screening & Assessment Work Group also developed a sample "Cover Sheet" as another opportunity to submit Risk Assessment results and other critical information to the court, in the event a Preliminary Inquiry has not yet been prepared.

Unfortunately, even with these upcoming changes, we still won't have a snapshot for the number of youth in detention on a given day. The detention piece is a known data gap, as some detention centers have their own case management system for detention. The Log of Juveniles Held, managed by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, may be closer to having this information, although it isn't in real time. Agencies have up to 30 days to report a detention stay. Christine Reynolds can provide a demonstration at the next meeting, as there are likely enhancements this group would like to see made to the

application. For example, youth's name is not provided in the data to ICJI. Discussion held regarding unique identifiers for kids and whether there was a system available to generate one. Duplicate records are also a significant issue in all systems. Kaitlyn Christian discussed how MPH addresses duplicates with their record linkage methodology. MPH matches name and other demographic data, and their process yields a 97% match rate. Each week, their process assigns a number to a person, but then the next week a new number is generated for security purposes. Although the Department of Education (DOE) does have a unique Student ID number that might be reliable, MPH isn't able to release that data without DOE approval, and it may not be accessible due to FERPA.

6. Other Discussion Items

Lisa Thompson will arrange a time for the subcommittee to meet remotely before the next work group meeting to review the J-EQUIP project in relation to the data elements from the proposed Data Evaluation.

The work group agreed to continue to meet monthly (on the second Tuesday of the month) in 2025, but will move the meeting time up to 2:30 pm – 4:00 pm. The November and December meetings of 2024 will also be moved to a 2:30 pm start time.

7. Next Meeting

The next YJOC Data Work Group meeting will be on **November 12, 2024 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm** at the Indiana Office of Court Technology.

The next Youth Justice Oversight Committee Meeting is **December 5, 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.