Data Silos Don't Float

Sarah Schelle and Aaron Garner | June 19, 2023



23RD ANNUAL TECHNOLOGY SUMMIT **RIDING THE WAVE** of Technology JUNE 18-21 FT. MYERS

cta Speakers



Aaron Garner Project Director - Data Transformation Solution Director of Analytics - Moser Consulting

Sarah Schelle Chief Digital Officer/Executive Sponsor Indiana Department of Correction

Need for Solution



Problem Statement -- Project Goals

- Problem:
 - There are currently two systems in place, which are aging; one of those is not currently under contract and not able to be supported.
- Goals:
 - To have a single, unified system that consumes data from all JMSs and DOC:
 - To more efficiently and accurately meet stakeholder needs;
 - Reduce confusion associated with messages/notifications initiating out of disparate systems;
 - Reduce solution maintenance costs;
 - Facilitate easier integration with local JMS systems;

What is the Data Transformation Solution?

- Indiana SAVIN stands for Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification.
 - automated service that provides crime victims with vital information
- The Data Transformation Solution
 - Ingests, transforms, and provides data from Jail Management Systems to SAVIN



CEA Victim Notification

- Provide efficient and accurate notifications in compliance with SOI statutes § 35-40
- 2 systems
- Lack of standardized process for notification

IC 35-40	ARTICLE 40. VICTIM RIGHTS
Ch. 1.	Legislative Intent
Ch. 2.	Applicability; Standing to Invoke Rights
Ch. 3.	Statutory Construction
Ch. 4.	Definitions
Ch. 5.	Victim Rights
Ch. 6.	Prosecuting Attorney Duties and Victim Assistance Programs
Ch. 7.	Notice of Release on Bond or Escape
Ch. 8.	Notice of Probation Modification, Revocation, or Termination
Ch. 9.	Notice of Release, Discharge, or Escape From a Mental Health Treatment Agency
Ch. 10.	Request for Notice
Ch. 11.	Victim's Discretion; Form of Statement
Ch. 12.	Procedures Related to Notices and Consultations
Ch. 13.	Inability to Exercise Rights; Designation of Others; Representative of a Minor
Ch. 14.	Rights of Victims of Identity Deception
Ch. 15.	Right to Request a New Investigation
IC 35-40-1	Chapter 1. Legislative Intent
35-40-1-1	Intent to protect rights of victims

Cta Jail Data

- Need for jail census
- Bail Reform
- Need to update VNS



C Process Improvement

- Better for victims
 - Multiple registration centers
- State owns the data
 - Continuous availability
- Not held captive by vendor
- Added data means more flexibility



Setting the Project Up for Success



Cta Generating BuyIn

- Talking to sheriffs before start of project
- Funding all costs covered by the State
- Future value to Sheriffs
 - Making data available to local counties via portal or direct consumption



GIA Gathering Requirements

- Formal Capture of Requirements
 - Preparation from RFS (DTS) and RFP (VNS)
- Survey Sheriffs
 - Web-based surveys
 - Data Landscape



Multiple Agency Partnership

• Vendor Selection

- Day to Day Work
- Oversight and Key Decisions
 - SteeringCommittee
 - IDOC Leadership
 - IOT IVV and PM



Governing bodies– Post-Implementation

- Post implementation
 - Contract/MOU
 - Why IDOC ownership is not a good idea



Technology



Cipe Scope and Overview

92 Counties → 10 JMS Vendors

Each county is a separate instance, regardless of JMS



• Blue vs. Blu vs. BL vs. Bl vs. B = 'BLUE'

cto Architecture Diagram

- Hosted by Indiana Office of Technology
 - Azure Government Cloud



Data Acquisition and Transformation

- Data Acquisition Methods
 - SFTP (push) vs. REST (pull)
 - File extension agnostic (.xml; .json; .tab)
 - File Types

CFA

- Event-based
 - Arrivals; Departures/Transfers
- Profile Updates
- Nightly Full Pop
- Data Discovery and Data Mapping
- Transformers
 - Base vs. Sub



Cha Data Structure

- ~160 data points requested
 - Depending on JMS, 60 100 provided
 - 35 provided to SAVIN (NIEM)
 - 25 data tables



Lessons Learned



Challenges

- RFP Requirements for DTS partner
 - Very thin, by design
 - Getting counties to assist with data availability
- JMS Vendor Issues
 - DSA counties
 - State did not want to contract with the vendors
 - Development Delays

- DTS and VNS have different vendors
- Elections (45% new sheriffs in year 2 of the project)
- Variability in how Counties use Release/Transfer Codes
- No unique ID tracked

Cta Successes

- Agile Project Management
 - Data Validation
 - County Code Meetings
 - End to End Testing
 - Especially important because multiple vendors
- Keeping Sheriffs/Stakeholders informed
 - Status update presentations at Sheriff conferences
 - Routine updates via newsletters
 - Establishing relationships/rapport with county technical contact and operational SME

Circ Successes

- Strong Governing body (steering committee)useful for escalation
 - ISA, ICJI, Commissioner of DOC
- IOT Oversight through Risk and Project Management



Alternative Data Use



Alternative Data Usage

- Originally intended for VNS
 - Collect data for more if you can
- What else does the State want to focus on?
 - Bond
 - Equity
 - Census/Overcrowding
 - Reason for detention
 - Recidivism
- Helpful for State-wide data-informed decision making

Cta Questions?

- Contact Information:
 - Aaron Garner
 - 317-339-2522
 - <u>aaron.garner@moserit.com</u>
 - Sarah Schelle
 - 317-741-6314 (cell)
 - <u>sschelle@idoc.in.gov</u>