Data Sharing Task Force **Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice** **Minutes** August 25, 2015, 10:00AM - 12:00PM 700 Kipling, 4th floor conference room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Jeanne Smith (Chair), Division of Criminal Justice

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Kevin Paletta, Lakewood Police Department
Maureen Cain, Defense Attorney (phone)
Meg Williams, Juvenile Parole
Scott Turner, Attorney General's office

ABSENT

Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service
Jeff McDonald, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center

STAFF

Christine Adams, Division of Criminal Justice
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice
Peg Flick, Division of Criminal Justice
Peggy Heil, Division of Criminal Justice

Other Attendees

Jesse Jensen, Jensen Public Affairs

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome and Introductions	Ms. Smith introduced the group and each person's position.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Review of Purpose **Action**	Mr. Jensen stated that it feels like there are multiple conversations about data sharing happening. The Governor is going to be requesting money for this but it seems like it's difficult to make progress when so many conversations are happening at once. And everyone seems to be working on narrowly focused areas. • It's so big that you almost have to have a small focus but need to have a larger goal. Ms. Smith stated that she would like to use this group to go over what was found with the focus groups this summer as well as bring together the various efforts that are happening around the state.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:

Jails/Mental Health
Peggy Heil
 	
Action
	Ms. Heil was brought onto our staff to focus on the mental health side of criminal justice and to bring groups together.
	- She is involved in the Mental Illness in the Criminal Justice System (MICJS) group.
	   o They have an oversight committee that can help introduce legislation.
	- In addition, the Mental Health Transformation Council is working on medication consistency across formularies.
	   o There are problems with continuity of care which plays into destabilizing individuals. Continuity would help reduce recidivism.
	   o They are working to create a general formulary to help continuity. It has been distributed widely and they have received feedback. This formulary has been accepted by the majority but they now need to work on the pricing.
	      ▪ Working on getting everyone involved now.
	      ▪ Possibly establish a pilot.
	      ▪ DOC did participate as well as DYC, HICPF, and CDHS
	      ▪ They've mapped out all of the facilities to work out proximity to help with making the meds on this list available.

	- They need an electronic health information exchange to get everyone in criminal justice and the non-criminal justice mental health worlds "speaking" to one another about the medications offenders are taking.
	o We've applied for a grant. Only 7 are being given out but there are other opportunities for state-wide planning if we don't receive the grant.
	o We are working to get groups together to come up with consistent definitions of mental illness and recidivism.
	o Right now CICJIS doesn't connect directly to jails but DOC and DYC do. So maybe there's a way to connect through each other.
	o Jails are the ones that need the most help getting connected.
	o Need to connect with CoRHIO/QHN (Note: QHN is only in the northwest part of state).
	o The way the health world and CJ world exchange info is completely different. Consulting group working on helping these groups exchange info with one another.
	- Ideally would have multiple levels of data available depending on who is seeing the information.
	- One goal is to keep people out of the criminal justice system who don't belong there to avoid repeat treatments and bookings.
	o If it's appropriate for them to go into CJ system that's fine, but it would be good to refer them to the correct people later to reduce recidivism.
	- How would you get this information into the court system? We don't want violate confidentiality rights but we do want to improve care.
	- With HIPPA it doesn't violate confidentiality of care if treatment information is shared with another treatment provider. But we couldn't share with prosecutors.
	- This is where the grant would be useful because part of it would be used to work out who gets what data and when.
	- In the juvenile systems we've found that kids are getting pushed into the juvenile justice system as a way to obtain treatment. We need the ability to refer them to someone that can refer appropriately and timely but we also need to figure out capacity.
	o Where can they be taken where they'll receive real help. We don't want to stop at crisis intervention just for it all to start again tomorrow.
	o We need more people to be willing to share information. We have a common consent form but people are still afraid that information will get out there and be misused.
	o Progress in the adult system will help the juvenile system later. But we need to always be looking at capacity. Even

	if the information can be shared, it doesn't matter if no one will serve them.
	- That raises the issues that people have used an inability to share as an excuse to not be responsible. Sharing data will not be an immediate cure but it will be a start to say that without this barrier we now need to work on the capacity issue. Getting people to agree about privileges, etc.
	- Ms. Heil stated that she is working with the Office of Behavioral Health (OBH) on capacity issues. They get information from treatment providers. But only those that are receiving funds from OBH. Private treatment providers aren't necessarily reporting. Emergency rooms do report to CoRHIO.
	- What percent of psychiatric providers are public/private? Not sure of exact numbers but across the state there is a shortage, especially in rural areas.
	As an adjunct to this, Christine Adams has been attending the Adams County CJCC. They are working on creating a data sharing system in the 17th Judicial district for a small list of criminal justice items.
	- They've received federal and JAG money.
	- They're making definite progress.
	- One of the big things they're doing is working with their municipalities to connect information across the judicial district.
	- They are staying small to be successful at this point.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Focus Group Results **Action**	Ms. Smith went over the focus group summary slides (attached at end of the minutes). A question for us today is whether or not there are there pieces of this issue that seem to be the most addressable? - Obviously the municipal data is the most wanted, but what else? - Pretrial issues – the pretrial folks receive very little information. The problems they have with the individuals at pre-trial doesn't move on to the next step. - Mr. Paletta stated that we're trying to connect existing data silos with bridges. But maybe it would be better to create a new system with all of the needed data. Build a state-wide criminal justice data system using different tabs to organize the data and who has access. - But would local law enforcement be willing to give up their record management systems (RMS) to do this? 　　o It would be difficult to get everyone to agree but we need

to get past this because the public expects that we're all communicating with one another.
- o The system isn't the problem it's the people.
- Not all of this is criminal justice though → education, mental health, and medical are also included.
- Do we as a task force want to address this overarching system?
  - o It may help divert people from the criminal justice system, which is a benefit.
- Ms. Cain stated that accessing medication information is a strong need from each side.
  - o Privacy may be less of an issue regarding medication than with specific diagnosis.
  - o Everyone has different systems so it's really hard to tell who is where. This system would help with this and with obtaining an accurate criminal history.
- Maybe we could start with the data we're willing to share and use place holders for other info?
- Would it be useful to do a survey of police chiefs and sheriffs to determine how many RMS systems we're talking about? Even if there aren't that many main systems (plus a few home grown systems) it would be useful to determine what we're dealing with.
- Adams County's (17th Judicial District) success may our best argument to build a state system. So, maybe for now, we should wait and see how they do.
- Ms. Heil noted that DOC also has an offender portal that may be a good model to look at.
  - o Everyone is updating their own systems, but they're not all using the same systems nor are they talking them.
  - o The Office of Information Technology (OIT) supposedly spans all of the state system.
- The technology may be there but we need IT people that know what they're doing to build a system to pull from each other.
  - o Ms. Flick pointed out that all modern and not-so modern systems can be formatted to meet the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and be able to export data.
- It was stated that this will take political will at the state level and it may have to grow over time.

Possible next steps:
- One of our recommendations could be that everyone follows some criteria (NIEM)to start .
- Maybe we should start on the governance side.
- We need to identify what it is that we want to see. Don't worry about the implementation right now.
  - o What are the common themes among the cohorts we

	spoke to (focus groups). What are the most important things we could take back to the commission to say that if we could build this it would have the biggest impact?
	- What do you want to hear more about? What do we want to report to the Commission? o Most glaring gap is municipal court data. o Our utopia is a centralized system to report all of the data we agree to share. But we should also watch Adams and the jail programs. o Do we want to talk to CIJIS? Our new Deputy Executive Director, Rebecca Spiess, feels that CIJIS will be receptive to this work. o Maybe we need to talk to a few municipalities to hear what they have and what they need?

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Next Meeting **Action**	What would we like to discuss and/or have presented at our next meeting? - Municipal presenters and the barriers to sharing their data. - Hopefully progress with the jail work can be presented. - Staff will speak to Debbie Allen from Adams County about speaking to the group about their progress (governance, etc.) OIT - They've had huge involvement in the marijuana data so they may be interested to see this work as well. But we may need to go to top right away to obtain a response. Next meeting – Date and time are yet to be determined but it will probably be in October or early November - A Doodle request will be emailed to the group to determine the best time.

Adjourned at 11:45 AM

Data Sharing Task Force

Summary of Focus Group Results

Groups We Spoke To

- Focus groups across the criminal justice system (front end) and across the state:
  - Pretrial Case Managers
    - 3 counties: Denver, Boulder, Jefferson
  - Community Corrections Case Managers
    - 3 counties: Jefferson, Larimer, Mesa
  - Community Corrections Board Directors
  - Probation Supervisors

What We Wanted to Know

- What data is missing that would help case managers do their jobs better?
- How would this data improve offender outcome?
- How would a data portal improve case manager work ability?
- How would a data portal improve offender outcome?

Excitement Everywhere!

- All of the groups we spoke to were excited about the idea of a data portal.
  - They were excited about having access to useful, but currently unavailable data. And,
  - They were excited about a central display for data they can already obtain.
- They understood that this was still a dream but were hopeful that progress will be made.

Data Gaps

- Municipal data
  - Court cases (active and past)
  - Jail data (programs, treatment, assessments)
- Tattoo photos and gang affiliations they may represent.
- Victim (or victim advocate) and co-defendant information
  - This info can help with better case plans including needs and housing (e.g., housing restrictions).
- Other active cases and warrants in all jurisdictions
  - This information could reduce unnecessary FTA filings.
- All assessment information, especially from juvenile time period.
  - Would be good to track over time and reduce repetition.
    - Adult assessments
    - DYC data
    - Relevant medical and medication information
    - Mental health needs
    - Urine analysis results from other agencies.
- Money owed – fines, fees, child support, etc.
  - Bail bond conditions and bondsman contact information.
  - Affidavits from other counties to better track if any condition has been broken.
- Immigration and federal holds

Accessible Data that Would be More Useful on a Central Screen

- General offender/client information
  - Known aliases
  - Drivers license status
  - Demographics (race, gender, age)
  - Photographs over time would be useful
- Some DOC data is included but would like it to be more comprehensive, such as:
  - Program involvement and outcome
  - Assessments and treatment needs, treatments provided.
- Criminal history – could be improved/made more all inclusive
  - Including FTA history
  - Information on non-compliance – what was the behavior and how was it handled.
- All assessment information, especially from juvenile world.
  - Would be good to track over time and reduce repetition.
    - DYC data on individuals
    - Relevant medical and medication information.
    - Mental health needs
- Employment and education information
  - Currently based on self-report. Could be improved/more useful if verified (would help with appropriate programming and job placement).

***Although available, some of this data requires multiple steps to obtain. A data portal would reduce work time and allow for a more efficient and possibly more accurate case plan.

Answers/Achievements
this would provide

- Central source for all relevant/needed data.
- Efficient and accurate data.
  - More quickly obtained
  - Less reliance on self-report data
- Better able to track person through the system:
  - Successes, failures
  - Individual recidivism
  - Technical violations
    - What were the behaviors?
      - Finding trends may help improve case plans.
    - What was the result of the technical violation?

How this would help you do
your job better

- Quicker access to data
  - Some data may already be accessible but it may take multiple steps.
- More comprehensive picture of the offender.
  - Will help create a better and more accurate case plan.
- Other active case information (current and past) would help prevent unnecessary FTA filings.
  - If they're being held in another jail, or in court in another jurisdiction there is no need to file an FTA.
- Efficiency - Will reduce repetition (e.g., everyone does their own assessments but often it's the same one multiple times).
- Currently a lot of data is obtained via self-report and then validated later (if at all). If multiple systems fed into a portal it would help data be more accurate an up to date.

How this would improve offender outcomes

- Better understanding of who the whole person is.
- Will help the address needs more quickly, obtain most appropriate job, continue with education at the most appropriate level.
- Better case/treatment plan will end with better outcomes.
- The offender will trust the system more if we don't have to ask them to do the same thing multiple times (they don't understand that agencies are not already "talking" to each other).
- This would also accelerate the offender's ability to be released from jail (and placed on a docket) because the needed information would be available more quickly.

Adams County Update

- Adams County has continued working with their national partners, SEARCH and NCJA, to develop both the technical requirements and the governance structure, including an Interagency Agreement.
- On June 30, 2015, they hosted a jurisdiction wide governance forum that included key stakeholders from both justice and health. Local, state and our national partners, NCJA and SEARCH, were in attendance.
- On August 14th, they combined their CJCC Behavioral Health Subcommittee and the CJCC Information Sharing Governance Subcommittee to begin the process of developing and implementing our governance framework, and the related Interagency Agreement.
  – The framework will address both justice and health requirements and regulations. Their hope is to have the Agreement developed by November 2015, and implementation by the beginning of 2016.
- They have completed their initial local outreach and education effort to our municipal courts, and as a result of these meetings, they have been able to determine—based on resources and capacity of the municipal IT units, in which order they would like to work with the municipalities.
  – They will use municipal data dictionaries to build the data system and extract data into the portal.
  – Activities include things like building store procedures to query the data, translating data to NIEM, and then aggregating the data for presentation within the portal.
  – They are simultaneously working with the Sheriff's Office and the Community Reach Center to do the same.
- They recently received a JAG grant and will now take their current high level plan and develop a more formal outline, which will provide specific and granular project goals, objectives and deliverables. I
  – Two types of plans, one for policy makers (high level) and one for the project team (granular) will be created.