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Juvenile justice data sharing is challenging ...

+ Involves multiple organizations across justice disciplines
+ Primary rehabilitative approach requires reliance on local and state resources for objective attainment
+ Must share information with non-justice organizations, e.g., human services, healthcare, law enforcement, education, etc.
WHY A MULTIJURISDICTIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SHARING INFORMATION PROJECT?

- Centralized (Unified) states develop data collection and sharing systems at the state level utilizing state funding.
- De-centralized states develop data collection and sharing systems at a local level utilizing local and sometimes, state dollars.
- Both are challenged with a variety of data issues.
JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SHARING BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN MICHIGAN

- Lack of aggregate, statewide data on juvenile offenders that is complete, valid and timely
- Inability to answer simple questions like, "How many juveniles are under court jurisdiction?"
- Information sharing on transferred juveniles from other jurisdictions is a manual process. May result in duplicate, ineffective services.
- Courts input data but cannot “mine” it for service improvement(s)
- Multiple case management systems are used across jurisdictions.
Lack of JJ Data Potential Impact(s):

- Reduced and inconsistent treatment for juveniles
- Reduced draw-down capability of federal dollars
- Juvenile courts and juvenile justice stakeholders vulnerable to funding source cuts
- No access to healthcare and education data to fully complete juvenile needs assessment
- Poor accountability
WHAT ARE SOME JJ DATA SHARING BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN YOUR JURISDICTION?

- No common data repository?
- Inconsistent input of the data?
- Lack of common definitions for the data?
- Lack of data input training?
- Difficulty obtaining quality data reports?
- Some jurisdictions choosing to not share data?
- Other problems...?
Michigan’s courts are locally funded; there is no state Department of Juvenile Justice, etc. Some programming is tied to state Child Care Fund, e.g., community based treatment programs, foster care and residential treatment.

Formal juvenile records are public and informal records are non-public which impacts data collection, sharing and analysis.

The juvenile courts and stakeholders developed a grassroots, volunteer organization called Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 to address the data sharing need.
2012 - Strategic planning process involved juvenile court and juvenile justice stakeholder leadership; Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey (PRAXIS Consulting) facilitated; the State Justice Institute (SJI) funded the effort.

Evaluated the juvenile justice system
+ Conducted a trends and organizational analysis
+ Surveyed over 650 professionals across the JJ system
+ 51% response rate
+ Used survey to inform strategic planning process

Strategic plan completed in fall, 2012
Collaboration and support provided by:
+ Michigan State Court Administrative Office (SCAO)
+ Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS)
+ Grand Valley State University (GVSU)
+ 20th Circuit Court (fiduciary & project management)
+ Professional organizations representing the courts and partners/stakeholders
+ Multiple state agencies and departments
+ Law enforcement
+ Prosecutors
+ Private agencies
Five strategic focus areas identified:

1) Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Court
2) Effective Outcomes for Youth, Families & Communities
3) Juvenile Court Operational Performance
4) Adequate and Sustainable Funding
5) Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce

Respective focus area Action Teams implemented work on priority projects
Governance/Organizational Structure

For more information see:
http://www.gvsu.edu/juvenilejusticevision2020/
IMMEDIATE DATA PROBLEM

+ Need aggregate and case specific data to improve effectiveness, provide accurate data for federal reporting, support needed and effective legislation, and support evidence based policies/practices
+ No common language or definitions; great need for risk assessment data
+ We need to be able to answer the questions for the sake of our kids, families and court!
October, 2013 – Datapalooza event sponsored by Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20, DHS, SCAO and funded by MCJJ (SAG) and SJI

- Pre-survey of over 60 Datapalooza invitees asked to assess the biggest challenges and concerns and offer suggestions for improvement
- Survey results informed the Datapalooza agenda
- Over 40 juvenile justice leaders participated
Datapalooza Report

* Biggest data gaps and barriers
* Future of juvenile justice data by defining next steps
* The need to seek funding for long term, successful JJ data sharing
DATAPALOOZA - NEXT STEPS

- Meet with Michigan’s CIO to seek funding and assistance to design a juvenile justice data sharing model
- Strategically plan for the development and implementation of the model
- Identify pilot courts and obtain buy-in
- Explore national funding opportunities
Simultaneously, work was being done with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) on a national level through the Global Advisory Committee and the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative

Global was created to support the broad scale exchange of justice and public safety information

Promotes standards based electronic information exchange to provide the justice community with timely, accurate, complete and accessible information in a secure and trusted environment
Global Advisory Committee
+ A Federal Advisory Committee to the US AG on justice information sharing and integration initiatives
+ A “group of groups”; >30 independent organizations
+ Supports US DOJ initiatives

2013 Investment areas identified juvenile justice data sharing across jurisdictional lines as one priority

Global Products include infrastructure supports and justice data collection standards, e.g. Global Justice Reference Architecture (GRA)
A technical assistance grant from SJI provided funds to develop a multijurisdictional JJ data sharing model using GRA and NEIM standards.

On behalf of JJV 20/20, the 20th Circuit Court received a Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Grant for a Multijurisdictional Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Information Implementation Project

Eighteen month, $500,000 award in October 2013
20th Circuit Court - fiduciary and project management

BJA Grant identified eight tasks:
1. Establishment of common Data Definitions and Data Entry Rules
2. Identification of Common Risk/Needs Assessment Data
3. Identification of Statewide Information Sharing Architecture
4. Specification of GRA (Global Reference Architecture) services
   • “Who” – Juvenile Demographic Information Availability
   • “What” – Juvenile Current Legal Status
   • Added: “Where” – Placements

5. Implementation of two GRA services in six pilot courts: Kalamazoo, Ottawa, Kent, Berrien, Macomb and Washtenaw
6. Creation of online data training modules and data training
7. Lessons learned analysis for other states
8. Support Ohio action plan
The Multijurisdictional Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Model

- Uses Global Reference Architecture (GRA) and the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)
- Identifies common data elements
- Establishes a Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Dictionary, including a glossary of terms; builds consensus on definitions.
- Establishes business rules for data entry
The Multijurisdictional Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Model

- Data collected is entered into a central repository (Judicial Data Warehouse)
- Data flows are bi-directional
- Federated query capability allows the courts to share/exchange data across jurisdictions.
- Answers questions: 1) Who do we have in the courts? 2) What have we done with the juveniles? and 3) Where have they been and are currently?
**THE MULTIJURISDICTIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SHARING MODEL**

- **Benefits to Juvenile Courts & State**
  - Increased responsivity to address specific needs of juvenile transfer cases
    - Improved ability to identify juvenile records in other jurisdictions
  - Consistent language among courts
  - Courts can mine their data for improved outcomes
  - Improved and expanded data entered into central repository
THE MULTIJURISDICTIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SHARING MODEL

+ Improved data quality for research, policy making and funding decisions
+ Improved responsivity to legislators and other stakeholders, e.g., community
+ Ability to expand the Model to include/track other elements in the future
ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

- Completed the JJ Data Sharing Model
  - Identified the common data elements to be collected
  - Developed a JJ Data Dictionary; built consensus around definitions
  - Several iterations of the Service Specification Package completed
  - Enterprise Service Bus (Open Justice Broker – SEARCH) purchased by DTMB and partially installed
  - Person authentication system at DTMB partially developed by MICAM
ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

+ Integration of two pilot courts completed; waiting to test
+ Integration contracts with two pilot courts and their CMS completed
+ Integration contracts with two pilot courts pending
+ Training on data input being developed
+ Identity management conference held on June 16, 2015; completed draft data sharing agreement
LESSONS LEARNED AND CHALLENGES

- Funding!
- Engagement with JJ community is critical
- Strong, collaborative leadership or partnership at state and local levels to remove data exchange barriers
- Strategic planning with stakeholders to develop a “blueprint” or project plan; clearly define goals
- Supported project management at local and state levels
- State’s commitment to infrastructure support is critical
- Local governments and agencies need technical support to implement Global (GRA & NIEM) standards for the first time
LESSONS LEARNED AND CHALLENGES

- CMS software vendors vary significantly in their support and capability to adopt Global standards; funding helps!
- “Technology projects” should improve governance and more consistent business processes
- Establish quality, transparent data sharing agreements
- Ongoing communication among all parties is key
- Outstanding leadership in the pilot courts is critical
- Engage national organizations, e.g., NCSC, SEARCH, to assist in technical assistance
- Celebrate the successes with all stakeholders!
NEXT STEPS

- Test the new concept outside the state infrastructure
- Seek funding through legislative efforts for ongoing infrastructure development – State Court Administrative Office & DTMB (MICAM, OJB)
- Seek to re-engage SCAO & DTMB in project through funding
- Convene juvenile courts and stakeholders for ongoing data sharing planning and discussion
- Seek funding for additional court integration
- Continue to facilitate project
- Educate others about the project
- Strive for continued success!
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