

**Data Sharing Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice**

Minutes

February 3, 2015, 9:30 AM – 11:30 PM
700 Kipling, 3rd Floor Old E.D. Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Jeanne Smith (Chair), Division of Criminal Justice

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Kris Nash, for Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service

Kevin Paletta, Lakewood Police Department

Meg Williams, Juvenile Parole

Scott Turner, Attorney General's Office

ABSENT

Lang Sias, House Representative

Maureen Cain, Defense Attorney

STAFF

Christine Adams, Division of Criminal Justice

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p data-bbox="269 205 350 233">Action</p>	<p data-bbox="553 205 1479 342">Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. She stated that the group's recommendation was passed by the Commission in January (with only one opposing vote) but that now the group faced the more difficult step of implementation.</p> <ul data-bbox="602 352 1211 489" style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we suggest an executive order? • Work on voluntary participation? • Or work for legislative action? • Funding will be an issue for all of these options. <p data-bbox="553 499 1495 573">What information do we need now for our next step, whatever that may be?</p> <ul data-bbox="602 590 1455 846" style="list-style-type: none"> • Xerox is still a possibility, • Expanding CIJIS is also a possibility but there's been some resistance from the CDAC on this. They are concerned that the more we open the data the more that gets out there. • Adams County (the 17th Judicial District) is still opening their platform and that could be an option. <p data-bbox="553 856 1487 1024">It was stated that expanding CIJIS is appealing because it would not require reinventing the wheel. We could address concerns as they arise. Wouldn't it be to their (the existing CIJIS stakeholders') benefit to expand CIJIS?</p> <ul data-bbox="602 1041 1487 1434" style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that reinventing the wheel is not ideal but it may be good to first go to the key stake holders to determine what our mission is, what we want to share, and under what conditions. • The second focus is the technical issue of how we could do this. • We don't just want more and more committees but it may be necessary at first. It may take an executive order at first, or legislation, for the funding piece. • We need the stakeholders at the table to agree on a governance. <p data-bbox="553 1444 1479 1570">It may be useful to start with a draft of how we think it could look (vs bringing all of these people together to make so many decisions – there would be too much protection).</p> <ul data-bbox="602 1581 1487 1885" style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to be clear about what data we're talking about and that we're not talking about opening all data to everyone. • Ms. Smith noted that this was a route we sort of went down with the case manager focus groups that were done for this group. • The group agreed that they like starting with something they can agree on. But with something that people agree is necessary to share we may be able to get started.

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Smith will contact CML to find appropriate contact information. • Ms. Smith will also post a question on the NCJA list serve to see who else has done something similar. • Chief Paletta will call their chief judge to see who we should talk to/invite. • Ms. Williams will send information to the group (via Dr. Adams) about what Missouri did. • Dr. Adams will talk to Debbie Allen, in Adams County, about Pennsylvania. Did they include municipalities? Does she know of other states that may include municipality and state level data. • Ms. Smith and Mr. Turner will approach the CDAC about the topic. • Dr. Adams will also ask Ms. Allen what they did to get their municipal courts on board and how they agreed to the governance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some things may be more sensitive and protected than others (e.g., mental health) with little if any detail. But a pointer may be all that is needed. ○ There may be technical hesitation but that's different than conceptual hesitation. <p>The group agreed to start with municipal data since this is basically public information anyway. It's just that it's in various data systems.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Focus on funding. 2) Institutional knowledge <p>Who should we invite to the initial stakeholder conversation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Colorado Municipal League (CML) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They will have various list serves that may be useful. • Larger municipalities will have more resources, such as court administrators. • Before getting to far down the line we need to speak with the municipalities to make sure this is something they're interested in. • Ms. Williams asked if we should we reach out to the CDAC about their concerns? Ms. Smith and Mr. Turner will approach the CDAC about the topic. <p>What are the users going to want in terms of criteria? What will the technical people want in terms of criteria? People may be married to certain methods but this could be because they are unaware of other methods (e.g., Xerox).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We also have to decide if we're creating a data conduit (like Adams County/JD 17) or a new data warehouse. <p>Another issue that keeps coming up is governance. If this eventually goes into the existing CIJIS system maybe we will just need to add a municipal representative there. But the lack of central control makes it messier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When CIJIS started it was about tracking a case, now we're talking about tracking a person which is why all of this other information is important → to provide the correct services. <p>Ms. Smith asked if there was anything Judicial had to offer regarding this topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Nash stated that she will talk to ITS to see if they have any ideas. - She explained that their ICCES data system allows anyone to
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Nash stated that she will talk to ITS at Judicial to see if they have any ideas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A possible judicial contact could describe the system and the cost. 	<p>electronically file to the courts including pleas. The Courts can then serve back to the case parties without having to mail out. This system is separate from ICON and that that right now ICCES and ICON speak to each other but that eventually ICON will go away and it will all be part of jPOD and this will eventually include the eTicket system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The eTickets may be a way to bring in municipalities.
---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Next CCJJ Meeting</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Regarding updates at the next CCJJ meeting, we understand that we need some substance. Right now we need some collaborative effort but we're not ready to set up a committee and seek funding yet.</p>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Next Meeting</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>We will start meeting monthly from this point forward. It was agreed that we will meet on the first Wednesday of the month from 9:30 – 11:30 AM in the 3rd Floor Old E.D. Conference Room. The 2016 meetings are listed below.</p>
--	---

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

CCJJ Data Sharing Task Force – 2016 Meeting Dates

March 2: 9:30am -11:30am
 April 6: 9:30am -11:30am
 May 4: 9:30am -11:30am
 June 1: 9:30am -11:30am
 July 6: 9:30am -11:30am
 August 3: 9:30am -11:30am
 September 7: 9:30am -11:30am
 October 5: 9:30am -11:30am
 November 2: 9:30am -11:30am
 December 7: 9:30am -11:30am