



Youth Justice Oversight Committee

Data Work Group

Minutes from December 10, 2024 Data Work Group Meeting

The Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) Data Work Group met on December 10, 2024, from 2:30 p.m. - 4:00 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
- 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
- Judge Paul Felix, Indiana Court of Appeals

Members Present Electronically via Zoom:

- Kristi Bruther, Johnson County Juvenile Detention Center

Members Absent:

- Traci Lane, Madison County Juvenile Probation
- Judge Sarah Mullican, Vigo Circuit/Superior Court 3
- Sarah Schelle, Indiana Department of Correction
- Olga Volokhova, Indiana Youth Institute

OJA Staff Present:

- Lisa Thompson, Indiana Office of Court Technology
- Leslie Dunn, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Brendan O'Connor, Office of Judicial Administration

Guests Present:

- Melvin Wao, Indiana University School of Medicine

2. Approval of Minutes from October 8, 2024 Meeting:

Committee members were provided with a copy of the October 8, 2024 meeting minutes prior to today's meeting. Upon review, Kaitlyn Christian provided clarification on page 5 that MPH *does* receive and use a unique identifier, and they *do* provide it back to the customer. Nancy Wever also clarified that on page 4, the statement, "IYAS-Detention Tool detains more youth than Marion County's local JDAI-Detention screening Tool" was an inaccurate statement. Committee members agreed to strike that statement from the minutes altogether. Melanie Pitstick made a motion to approve the minutes with these requested changes; Todd Albin seconded the motion. The work group members unanimously approved the modified October 8, 2024 meeting minutes.

3. Update on Data Evaluation Project and Contract Between OJA and IU

Chris Biehn provided an update on the contract between the Office of Judicial Administration and Indiana University for the Data Evaluation Project. He explained that IU's legal department is reviewing proposed changes made by OJA and is hopeful that the contract will be executed soon.

4. Demo of Log of Juveniles Held

Christine Reynolds provided a demonstration of the Log of Juveniles Held, which is used to document any youth placed in a secure facility in Indiana, and is one of four core requirements that must be met in order for the state to receive federal funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Gottlieb and Wertz is the development team for the Log of Juveniles Held, which allows Quest counties to link their data automatically from Quest to the Log. Non-Quest sites must manually enter the data into the Log. Kristi Bruther explained that Johnson County does not automatically link Quest to the Log because of their secure RSR process. By coding their RSR area as a secure area, the link between Quest and the Log creates duplicate detention stays if the youth is actually detained. Other counties have their RSR center coded as a non-secure facility to avoid this issue. It is also important to note that any law enforcement agency with the ability to detain a young person is required to enter detention stays and releases in the Log within 30 days.

Christine walked through the data fields captured in a detention stay, as well as some of the reporting capabilities in the system. It was noted that while there are fields for First Name, Middle Name and Last Name, they are not required fields, and the Last Name could be substituted with an ID Number. Other identifying information, such as Race, Ethnicity, Sex, and DOB can also be collected. For the detention stay, information regarding the start date/time, end date/time, type of confinement, residence and admitting county names, reason for detention, violation status, charges, court dates, and legal status are captured.

There are a variety of reports ICJI staff can run from the data. Since some facilities use ID numbers instead of the youth's name, they often get a mixture of some records with

identifying names and others with just ID numbers. Christine noted that blank fields represent missing data because there are not many requirements or standards, and each facility can determine what data they are going to enter.

Lisa Thompson stated that if we wish to make use of this data as part of our youth data repository, name and other identifying information will need to be required and the data will need to be updated in a timelier fashion. Those changes would allow for a more real-time utility of the data and allow detention data to be matched to other youth justice data sets. Kaitlyn Christian commented that there may be a concern with data security if ICJI is getting identifiable youth information. She suggested that this be explored further before any changes are suggested to ensure data can be adequately protected, especially if CJIS requirements must be met. CJIS stands for Criminal Justice Information Services, which encompasses a framework of policies, procedures, and technical precautions to protect criminal justice information shared among authorized entities.

5. Diversion Survey Discussion

Dr. Aalsma shared a survey that is intended to be sent to the 24 volunteer counties for the Data Evaluation Project to learn more about diversion practices.

Discussion was held regarding whether pre-arranged “carte blanche” permission for law enforcement or schools to divert youth to programs without referring each individual to the prosecutor for a decision meets the statutory definition for diversion. Nancy Wever clarified that it does. Rather than citing the statutory language in the survey question, which can be confusing, it was recommended to simply ask about diversion opportunities in each county and then ask clarifying questions that would allow for a deeper dive. Brendan O’Connor recommended identifying diversion categories to help provide clarity around the information being requested. Katelyn Christian recommended convening focus groups as a more collaborative approach for information discovery.

Nancy Wever pointed out that the Juvenile Justice and Cross System Youth Task Force under the Commission on Improving the Status of Children (CISC) did a similar survey a few years ago, so it may be beneficial to review its findings. Nancy later followed up with the following link to a [PowerPoint Presentation](#) from that survey.

Dr. Aalsma will take these suggestions back to his team to further refine the questions on the survey.

6. Other Discussion Items

Lisa Thompson briefly reviewed the Gantt chart and pointed out an action item lingering from Year 1, Quarter 1 regarding convening stakeholder meetings to plan the development of a juvenile diversion module in SRS and Quest. A proposal was made to move this task to Year 1 Quarter 3 to allow time to review the results from the Diversion Survey and the Data Evaluation initiative. An updated Gantt chart will be shared with members once this update has been made.

7. Next Meeting

The next YJOC Data Work Group meeting will be on **January 14, 2025 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm** at the Indiana Office of Court Technology.

The next Youth Justice Oversight Committee Meeting is **February 13, 2025 at 10:00 am** at Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room A, 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.