



Youth Justice Oversight Committee

Data Work Group

Minutes from September 8, 2026 Data Work Group Meeting

The Youth Justice Oversight Committee (YJOC) Data Work Group met on September 8, 2026 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.

1. Attendance

Members Present:

- Dr. Matt Aalsma, Indiana University School of Medicine, Co-Chair
- Chris Biehn, Indiana Office of Court Services, Co-Chair
- Kristi Bruther, Johnson County Juvenile Detention Center
- Morgan Leuner, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Melanie Pitstick, Marion County Juvenile Probation
- Beca Stockman, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
- Kaitlyn Christian, Management Performance Hub
- Colleen Saylor, Indiana Office of Court Services
- Traci Lane, Madison County Juvenile Probation
- Corajean Medina, Department of Child Services
- Nancy Wever, Indiana Office of Court Services, JDAI

Members Absent:

- Hon. Sarah Mullican, Vigo Circuit/Superior Court 3
- Hon. Paul Felix, Indiana Court of Appeals
- Bri Youn, Indiana Youth Institute

OJA Staff Present:

- Lisa Thompson, Indiana Office of Court Technology
- Nick Ackerman, Indiana Office of Court Services, JDAI
- Catheryne Pully, Indiana Office of Court Services

2. Approval of Minutes from August 11, 2026 Meeting

Committee members were provided with a copy of the August 11, 2026 meeting minutes prior to today's meeting. Traci Lane made a motion to approve the minutes; Colleen Saylor seconded the motion. The work group members unanimously approved the August 11, 2026 meeting minutes.

3. Review of YJOC Priorities & IUSM Recommendations

Chris Biehn reviewed the top three priorities identified by each YJOC work group at the June meeting. Of those priorities, approximately five to six were identified as priorities for the Data Work Group. Legislative change tracking was included; however, YJOC has determined that tracking legislation would not fall solely under the Data Work Group. Instead, each work group should identify existing legislation that may not be working as intended and make recommendations for potential changes. Other Data Work Group priorities identified include case information and early assessment tools, data quality and system alignment, and expungement and data access. Judge Kenworthy assigned ownership of these priorities to the Data Work Group, and the group will need to coordinate on the best path forward.

The group also discussed the recommendations that emerged from Phase 2 of the IUSM Data Evaluation Project. Dr. Matt Aalsma advised members that the Phase 2 findings and recommendations were presented at the most recent YJOC meeting. While some members indicated that they would like additional clarification regarding certain recommendations before moving forward, the YJOC as a whole approved receipt of the report. This approval allows the group to begin implementation. Dr. Aalsma provided a brief PowerPoint presentation highlighting the four broad recommendations: (1) revise Referral Recommendation options, which also affects Referral Outcome; (2) operationalize the use of Referral Outcome and the addition of "Prosecutor Action/State Decision"; (3) develop a common data model that reflects each stage of the justice system; and (4) improve training and technical support. Initial focus will be on Recommendations One and Two.

Since changes to Referral Recommendations directly impact the data reported in the Juvenile Probation Quarterly Report, Lisa Thompson reviewed the steps involved in executing any proposed updates to the report. OJA will host an internal meeting on September 28th to discuss proposed changes to all quarterly reports in ICOR. The group believes Recommendation One can be addressed at the September 28th meeting, as it will only require tracking updates on the paper version of the report at this time. Corresponding updates will also be needed in the Instruction Guide; however, Nancy Wever began making necessary changes when this issue was discussed last year.

Discussion was held regarding possible statutory requirements that must be considered before making changes to the quarterly report and whether judicial committees or others need to review or approve the changes. Traci Lane noted that the group had previously discussed relabeling "Dismiss" as "Take No Action," but she found that the statute outlining the recommendations probation may make specifically uses the term "Dismiss." As a result, the group questioned whether the terminology should be changed and whether a recommendation to the larger YJOC should be made regarding a potential statutory amendment. Chris Biehn agreed to take the lead in determining whether additional approval or review is required.

Recommendation Two involves not only operationalizing the Referral Outcome field but also proposes adding a new field for "Prosecutor Action/State Decision". This new data point will require development work in SRS and possibly Quest. The group discussed whether INcite and Quest could use conditional decision-making to guide users through the referral process by helping them understand what information is required at each point and when they can proceed to the next decision point. This level of functionality may be too significant to address by the end of the year. Discussion was held whether these additional data points even belong in the Juvenile Probation Quarterly Report. The consensus was that Referral Outcome and the new field for Prosecutor Action would not be captured through the Juvenile Probation Quarterly Report. Training and technical assistance will be important to operationalize these new fields into local practices. The group will continue refining the language and definitions as the implementation work progresses.

The group discussed the distinction between Referral Outcome and Prosecutor Action. It was determined that "Court Action on Referral" would be the same as "Referral Outcome" in OMS currently. The tool tip in OMS may need to be updated with more clarity around the definition. The group also discussed situations in which probation refers a matter to the Prosecutor, but the Prosecutor elects not to file a petition. Traci explained that this is referred to as "Information Only" in her jurisdiction. Melanie Pitstick noted that her county handles these situations differently by filing a preliminary inquiry report on every referral. Even when the Prosecutor makes a recommendation, her county may not receive a response and instead considers the matter to be a Prosecutor "no file." These differences highlighted the need for clearer definitions and guidance to ensure that the data is captured consistently across jurisdictions.

4. Next Steps and Scope of Work

As for next steps, Lisa will obtain a Word version of the Juvenile Probation Quarterly Report so that edits can be made as soon as possible. Nancy will circulate the Juvenile Probation Quarterly Report Instruction Guide and the edits she began last year so that the group can continue working on the necessary changes. Chris will inquire whether any further statutory considerations or committee approvals are needed before moving forward.

5. Next Meeting

The next YJOC Data Work Group meeting will be on **October 13, 2026 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm** via Zoom.

The next Youth Justice Oversight Committee Meeting is **October 8, 2026 at 10:00 am** at the 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.