

**DATA COMMITTEE
MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2008**

SUMMARY

Attending: Betty Anson, Sandy Loomis, Pam Kuczkowski, Dan French, John Fox, Judy Buswell, Alan Robichaud. **Consultant:** John Tuell

The committee was apprised of the discussion of the Leadership Executive Committee and the preliminary targeting of the following populations for further study:

CHINS
Delinquency/Dependency
Youth in Placement (to reentry)

We need to have a better understanding of where these youth came from, how they got there and where they need to go following discharge. There will need to be decision points along the way as although both DJJS and DCFY use the Bridges system, there may be difficulties cross-referencing systems on the same youth. The committee felt that having a broad understanding of the numerous data fields in Bridges may help to focus its inquiry before going ahead and arbitrarily “fishing” for data we may not need. The committee requested that Melissa Correia be asked to supply the fields in Bridges and we would have Pam review the file for further understanding. [Note: On 10/21/08, Melissa forwarded the Bridges Data Dictionary to Alan who sent it along to Pam. Melissa cautions that “while BRIDGES may have the ability to capture a certain data element, certain data may not be entered consistently or, in some cases, at all]. We will need to take this into account when making assumptions about what data actually exists. We will want to be sure to check assumptions out with Melissa and Eric before assuming data exists simply because a field does.

There was discussion on how cases may currently be shared between DCYF and DJJS and what clearances (or absence of) exist in order to share case-specific information. Dan stated that if DCYF has a case and the youth commits an offense, the case needs to merge. Whether it’s currently able to do that is uncertain. He indicated that DJJS information may need to be tracked manually at this point. Dan is confident that he can get information on the numbers of CHINS, Delinquents, Diversion cases and placements.

A preliminary hypothesis:

Credible research suggests there are educational deficiencies, prior behavioral health and other diagnoses (e.g. trauma, substance abuse) of family members and individuals who enter placements through CHINS, delinquency/dependency and other petitions.

If:

- we have more, and improved assessment information on children and their families available at key decision points; and
- we implement best practice methodologies for the multi-disciplinary consideration of that information for case planning and case management purposes; and
- we apply targeted interventions with known efficacy, in a more collaborative, effective way;

Then:

- we will interrupt the costly human and financial toll of children, youth and family involvement in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems through:
 1. prevention of entry or deeper penetration into the systems,
 2. reduced duration of involvement in the systems, and
 3. an improved array of community resources available.

Note: This hypothesis is still forming and will be revised as the committees continue to narrow the scope.

As this initiative moves forward, some of the questions raised regarding data sharing across systems will need closer review by the Policy and Legal Subcommittee (yet to be initiated). We need to know what we can share and what may require special exceptions, waivers, and the like.

Next steps (tentative) include identifying:

- A. For the targeted populations (i.e. CHINS, Delinquent/Dependency, Youth in Placement);
 - Acquire prevalence rates and population percentages,
 - Examine key characteristics (e.g. educational, substance abuse, family and individual functioning, mental health) of the targeted population; and
 - Correlate multiple systems data and interactions with these populations, among DCYF, DJJS, Mental Health, courts, education, and other as needed.
- B. Seek involvement of education, mental health and court representatives who understand the targeted populations, data, and the benefits of working within an integrated service delivery model.

[Note: A meeting has been held with Lori Krueger of SAU 30 who is interested in serving on the Leadership Executive Committee. Lori will seek to identify a school district representative to serve on the Data Committee as well. All coded students are entered into an educational tracking system called NH Special Education System (NHSES). This system tracks special education and placement of children in the school system. Caveat: If a child is placed but not coded, the NHSES would not track this child. The NHDOE also uses a system known as I4SEE. Lori will inquire as to obtaining a data dictionary of elements contained in these two systems.] We will also seek similar participation and information from the mental health and court systems.

- C. Have the Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) begin a Process Mapping exercise to determine where in the process of service intervention, what assessments are utilized to determine what information.

[Note: John Tuell shared a process map grid that we will use to define how youth are tracked within the various systems. The PAC began this process at its meeting on October 24th with DJJS and Genesis Behavior Health presenting.]

- D. Conduct short presentations by above parties, at next Data Committee meeting on November 20th.

[Note: A conference call the first week of November will determine the final agenda for the next Leadership Executive Committee and Data Committee. Based on decisions at that time, we may either have a combined meeting of the Data and Leadership Committees or we will have Data Committee preceding the Leadership Committee. For now, please hold the following times open for further confirmation:

8:30 AM to 10:00 AM – Data Committee
10:00 AM to 12:00 Noon – Leadership Executive Committee

NEXT MEETING

DATE: Thursday, November 20, 2008

TIME: See above

PLACE: Woodside/Taylor Community, Laconia