

Office of the Child Advocate  
Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board  
Data Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, July 23, 2020  
2pm – 3:30pm  
**Meeting held virtually due to COVID 19 emergency response**

**Subcommittees Members or Designees Present:**

- Maria Mossaides (OCA)
- Josh Dohan (CPCS)
- Nicholas Campolettano (DCF)
- Patricia Bergin (EOPSS)
- David Chandler (DYS)
- Lydia Todd (CLM)
- Laura Lempicki (Probation)

**Other Attendees:**

- Melissa Threadgill (OCA)
- Kristine Polizzano (OCA)
- Alix Rivière (OCA)
- Noor Toraif (OCA)
- Jordan Meehan (MA Commission on LGBTQ Youth)
- Kathleen Bitetti (SAO)
- Other members of the public

**Meeting Commenced:** 2:05pm

**Welcome and Introductions:**

Ms. Threadgill welcomed the attendees to the Data subcommittee meeting. The nature of this meeting is different due to COVID-19 emergency response shifting the meeting to a virtual WebEx platform. She explained some general guidelines for the virtual meeting and then introduced all the individuals in the WebEx video conference. Individuals on the phone introduced themselves.

**Review and Approval of the June Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Threadgill asked if anyone had any questions or feedback regarding the June 30, 2020 meeting minutes. The group did not have any additions or corrections. The minutes were approved.

**Review of Draft Race & Ethnicity Reporting Standards Recommendation**

Ms. Threadgill went over the race and ethnicity reporting standards recommendation document page by page, asking subcommittee members if they had any comments or questions. She discussed the five-level system with varying details of reporting on a youth's race and ethnicity. She explained

that the Data Subcommittee is hoping for agencies to report at the fourth level (including White, Hispanic/Latinx, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Other). Ms. Threadgill explained that members will have a last chance to review the document before it is presented to the Full Board (JJPAD).

### **Review of Draft SOGIE Reporting Standards Recommendation**

Ms. Threadgill introduced the need for reporting standards on Sexual Orientation Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) as they don't yet exist. She explained that, just as for race and ethnicity, there are many different levels of reporting on a youth's birth sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression. She subsequently presented three levels of reporting standards. She noted that certain agencies (such as law enforcement) follow federal guidelines, which makes the task of this subcommittee more complicated. She then discussed the reporting practices of state agencies.

One group member asked if, in addition to developing these standards, the group was going to develop training to ensure data reporting is uniform throughout the state. Ms. Threadgill replied that this is a future project that would necessitate input from different agencies. Ms. Threadgill explained that members could provide feedback to this document before the final draft presented in the fall.

### **Presentation/Discussion of Reporting Standards for Offense Types & Geography**

Ms. Threadgill explained that there are not a lot of opportunities for alignment among state agencies. Offense reporting includes offense name (charge name and MGL chapter), offense type (a summary level of the law violation, or alleged law violation, associated with an event), and offense severity (the legal severity of the law violation, or alleged law violation, defined in statute associated with the event).

Ms. Threadgill presented the categorization of offense types by agencies (Juvenile Court, Trial Court, DYS, and EOPSS and NIBRS (state and federal data systems). She then moved on to presenting the ways in which the courts, NIBRS and DYS describe offense type. Next, Ms. Threadgill presented the different categorization of offense severity. For instance, NIBRS has only two categories: Level B crimes and Level A crimes, whereas DYS has 7 grid levels.

She asked the group if any information is missing and if group members believed alignment would be possible among agencies (or if only documentation of various practices should be anticipated). One member asked about the categorization of offense severity used by Massachusetts Probation Services and suggested some changes in the presentation of these categories. Members of the subcommittee discussed some of the long-standing issues faced by different agencies within the juvenile justice system in reporting on charges.

Ms. Threadgill proposed two next steps for the subcommittee. First, the OCA will develop a master list of (common) juvenile offenses, agency offense type categorization and agency offense severity categorization. Second, the Data subcommittee will review and reconcile any differences between juvenile justice agencies. One member of the group noted that he had already begun to categorize offense types in a table that might be of use for the group.

Next, Ms. Threadgill presented categorization of offenses by geography and noted important differences in reporting by agency. For instance, NIBRS reports towns and municipalities (using local police departments data), whereas EOPSS reports 14 counties and DCF reports 5 area offices.

She suggested that the OCA would work on a table with all different groupings and special considerations. She presented an example of a table they could model their work on.

**Concluding remarks:**

Ms. Threadgill reminded the group that the next meeting will be held via WebEx on September 18, 2020 between from 1 to 2:30pm. Most members should have received the Fiscal Year 2020 data requests. She presented the subcommittee's objectives for fall, including finalizing draft recommendations, reviewing data trends and producing a Data subcommittee report for November 2020.

**Adjournment:** 2:55pm