Oversight Subcommittee on Re-entry
Date/Time: March 13, 2009 11:00am-1:00pm
State Patrol Training Academy

Attendees:
Paul Herman
Peter Weir
Tom Quinn
Grayson Robinson
Jeanne Smith
Jeaneene Miller
Christie Donner
Regi Huerter
Judge Gil Martinez
Mike Reide
Kim English
Christine Adams
Germaine Miera

Absent:
Michelle Sykes
Louise Boris
Regis Groff
David Kaplan

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome and Introductions **Action:**	Regi Huerter welcomes the group

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Remaining Critical Issues Strategy • Data **Action**	Paul leads the group in an exercise to examine the Data priorities provided by each task force and narrow those down to the top 3 or 4 most pressing issues. **<u>Data</u>** What are the commonalities and concerns? 1. Exchange of Information between agencies 2. Cost of pulling information systems together 3. Process to pull information systems together 4. Access to data for research 5. What are the fundamental items that will be exchanged 6. What do we want to know and why? 7. No common identifiers 8. Denver General Sessions Court is difficult to work with 9. Confidentiality 10. Respect for Agency protocols Discussion points- • There is no one way to track a person entirely throughout the system • There is no way to access the info needed because of barriers in different departments • There is not searchable data • System related data and client based data (i.e. LSIR across system)is a different conversation than accessing data for research purposes • As far as 'Exchange of info 'above, need to know the who/what/when/where/why • As far as 'Cost' above, we need to talk about the issue of cost as it relates to data issues and process as far as tracking this issue • Data starts locally, then goes to the state system, but then the locals can't access their own data • Research gets back to a cost issue • Do we want a special category for **what** we want to know? We don't want to just be exchanging junk • Do we need an assessment of what are the fundamental items needed to be shared and how is it going to be used • What do you want to (need to) know and why? • Is the outcome worth the cost? • What do we have, what's missing, how do we share • There is no agreed single identifier for everyone. No common identifier. CJIS wrestles with this but doesn't cover it. • There is cooperation between agencies except for Denver general sessions court

	• Should we invite someone from CJIS to come and present? Chris Walner? • Confidentiality • Respect for agency protocol • Specialty courts to agree on what kind of data they want • As far as cost, who picks up the tab for tapping into the different systems? • There is a difference between system data and client data Top Priorities- 1. Exchange of Information between agencies 2. Cost of pulling information systems together 3. Process to pull information systems together and respect for agencies 4. No common identifier

Issue/Topic:	**Discussion:**
Critical Issues Strategy/Next steps **Action**	Now that the top issues and priorities have been defined for each 'Critical Issue' area, what are our next steps to move these issues forward? • Minority Over-representation • Data • Gender • Behavioral Health Discussion points- • Let's pick one critical issue at a time to work on • Can we hand off the 'Data' issue to OIT? • Statutorily we should tackle Minority Over-rep first • You can't tackle Minority Over-representation without good data • Minority Over-rep should be addressed in the same way as Behavioral Health. MOR issues are not specific to CJ issues. The issue is MUCH bigger • Are we going to find a silver bullet on MOR? It's a socio-economic issue • We can't fix all of the social ills • Do we have culturally appropriate treatment? <u>Minority Over-Representation</u> The group decides MOR is the most pressing Critical Issue to address. Within MOR the group wants to focus its efforts on the following: • Failure rates among minority populations on probation and parole • The law enforcement component • How are different communities policed? What is driving MOR? We need to look at this from the broader perspective, beyond criminal justice Denver JV is seriously studying this issue currently Let's focus on what changes we can make within the criminal justice system in

	regards to culturally appropriate treatment. There is a high rate of failure in drug courts for African American males , but without the data we can't address any of these issues. MOR is a much broader sociological issue. What other impactful groups in Colorado are looking at MOR? • Colorado Minority Quality group • Denver adult and juvenile • El Paso JV group • Statewide mostly juveniles are being studied Latino and African American cultures face the same issues. There are socio-economic factor regarding both fathers not being in the picture and education. This is NOT a cultural issue. Who carries the ball when it comes to this piece of work? Probation and Parole could individually see what's do-able. Can probation and parole work together on this? They could let us know what is achievable?
Action Probation (Tom Quinn) and Parole (Tim Hand or Jeaneene Miller) will work together on the Gender issue along with MOR to see what is achievable. • Step 1 – articulate the scope of work • Step 2 – Work together on a solution/lay out a joint work plan and timeline	<u>Gender and Data</u> We're going to target MOR first and come back to Data and Gender at a later date. Data- State OIT Judicial IT Local (Jefferson County model) – Inventory each jurisdictions data sharing process Let's roll Gender in with the MOR work

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
June report **Action**	The Task Forces will have their recommendations by April to bring back to the Oversight Committee in May **Incarceration-** Should be able to produce a product by April **Probation-** Should be able to produce a product by April **Transition-** Will be able to deliver at 70% rate **PIS-** Will be running for a significant length of time. A definitive PIS product may not be ready for the report as the scope of work is vast. The PIS task force is looking at Parole release decision making and revocation decision making. Several of the recommendations out of PIS clearly impact DOC and Parole **OSPB-** Recommendations that have a fiscal implication need to be presented by May. Written recommendations need to be endorsed by the Commission to move forward. DOC's focus is on the implementation of recommendations

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Requests of Information **Action**	Ari wants a more structured approach for data requests. If a Task Force member has a question they have to ask the DOC representative of the group to get the information for them. Task Force members cannot go directly to an outside DOC source.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Escape **Action**	The PIS Task Force has requested the Oversight committee's approval to pursue issues surrounding escape. Oversight members agreed that the issue of escape should be addressed alongside sentencing issues whenever the group decides to head that direction. Meeting adjourned