



Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Minutes

(Retreat: Day 1)

March 13, 2014

Boettcher Mansion
900 Colorow Road
Golden, CO 80401

Commission Members Attending:

James H. Davis, Chair	Kate Horn-Murphy	Rick Raemisch
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair	Julie Krow	Brandon Shaffer
Jennifer Bradford	Evelyn Leslie	Alaurice Tafoya-Modi
Theresa Cisneros	Jeff McDonald	Peter Weir
Sallie Clark	Norm Mueller	Meg Williams
Matthew Durkin	Joe Pelle	Dave Young
Kelly Friesen	Eric Philp	Jeanne Smith, <i>Ex Officio</i>

Absent: Charles Garcia, Steve King, Beth McCann, Kevin Paletta, Pat Steadman, Mark Waller

Guest Facilitator: Richard Stroker, *The Center for Effective Public Policy*.

WELCOME

James Davis, Chair of the Commission called the meeting to order at 12:12 p.m. and reviewed the day's agenda. Mr. Davis introduced the newest member to the Commission, Dr. Jennifer Bradford.

Eric Philp moved to approve the CCJJ Minutes from the January 10, 2014 meeting and the February 14, 2014 electronic meeting. Sallie Clark seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved unanimously.

RETREAT OVERVIEW

Paul Herman presented an overview of the goals for the retreat and introduced Richard Stroker, as the facilitator for the retreat. The retreat will provide information on national trends in the criminal justice arena, examine current evidence-based practices and will provide an opportunity for Commission members to collaborate and develop a work plan for the remainder of 2014 and potentially beyond.

NATIONAL TRENDS - POLICY INITIATIVES

Thomas MacLellan, from the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices, was the first presenter. This organization conducts research nationally on some of the most pressing public policy challenges faced by the nation's governors. Mr. MacLellan provided an overview of the larger trends in criminal justice.

Nationally, violent crime rates have declined since peaking in the 1990s. This trend has allowed states, and groups like the Commission, some flexibility in addressing aspects of criminal justice other than the necessity to devote all funds to add more prison beds. After years of growth, corrections populations are declining while spending in this area is increasing. The increase in funding for incarceration is only second to the increases seen in Medicaid funding.

Several governors have heightened their focus on criminal justice and public safety issues. In several State of the State Addresses, governors have referenced initiatives such as bipartisan task forces to address corrections and criminal justice, funding for drug and veterans courts, developing task forces to study violent crime, long-term prison capacity strategies, and/or supervised release programs to improve reentry outcomes. Across the board, states are taking action to reduce their corrections populations and corrections expenditures while increasing public safety by using risk assessment to tailor sentencing, using real-time, shared data to improve decision-making, and adopting evidence-based practices.

Some major trends across the nation include:

1. Justice information sharing: States are recognizing the need for integrated information sharing through the criminal justice system. Information sharing helps make systems more efficient and effective.
2. Pre-trial reform: At midyear 2012 there were nearly 750,000 individuals in jail, with 61% serving time pre-trial. Fifty-three percent of felony defendants cannot pay their financial bond and stay in jail. Pre-trial incarceration costs cities and counties \$9 billion per year, nationally.
3. Prescription drug abuse: Drug overdoses are currently the leading cause of unintentional death, which now surpasses deaths resulting from traffic accidents. Approximately 6.1 million Americans abuse or misuse prescription drugs regularly.
4. Alternative method to fund services: *Social impact bonds* are a recent way to conceptualize the payment for services that result in improved social outcomes. States only pay for services if certain performance measures are met. Funds are raised to provide the services and investors assume the risk instead of the state, investors only have a return on their investment if the state makes a payment. [See Endnote 1]
5. Public Safety Broadband - First Net: The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 created the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) to provide emergency responders with the first high-speed, nationwide network dedicated to public safety. NGA coordinated six regional meetings, attended by teams from every state, to update high level advisors on FirstNet and facilitate feedback between the states and FirstNet board members.

6. Some concepts in criminal justice that are currently trending from state to state are:
 - a. Evidence-Based
There must be a balance between choosing programs that are evidence-based, while still being open to innovation. There are “clearinghouses” to review evidence and identify effective programs, for example, the Blueprints project by Del Elliott at UC-Boulder and the Campbell Collaboration.
 - b. Data-Driven
The identification and collection of performance metrics are becoming a standard why of making decisions.
 - c. High-Risk
Given the limited resources available, resources for treatment and services should be targeted to those who are high risk (and more likely to recidivate, based on risk assessment) and not inefficiently used on those who are low risk.
 - d. Performance Metrics (see Data-Drive)
 - e. Information Sharing
States are looking at how their practices are driven by the availability of “good” data to conduct evaluations of practices. The Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (U.S Dept. of Justice) was created to support the exchange of criminal justice and public safety information.
 - f. Recidivism Reduction
Council of State Governments, the Bureau of Justice Assistance and NGA are working in conjunction to assist government officials regarding the use of recidivism information and dashboards to make more informed policy decisions. This effort will pull together justice reinvestment, correctional reform, and sentencing reform information to aid in decision-making.
 - g. Cross Governmental
States are creating opportunities to include all branches of government and all levels of government (local to state) to participate in problem solving and planning.
 - h. Partnerships (see Cross Governmental)
7. The contextual factors in which the above trends are occurring include:
 - a. Low crime
As mentioned before, there are opportunities for reform presented by the shift in priorities made possible when the crime rates decline.
 - b. Big data
There are large-scale changes on the horizon in data, for example, the update to FBI/UCR crime reporting
 - c. Changing drug laws
Some states’ changes in drug sentencing and the legalization of marijuana will have impacts that are as yet unknown.
 - d. Opioid abuse
There has been an increase in the use of heroin and how states respond will have impacts on the criminal justice system (the choice between incarceration vs. treatment).
 - e. Mental Health

High profile cases with mental health problems at their core have resulted in renewed emphasis on the way our country has and will address mental health services. The Affordable Health Care Act in regard to mental health and health services in general is another broad contextual factor.

- f. Public safety broadband
Referenced previously regarding the FirstNet initiative.

The Governor's office is looking to the Commission to reenergize its work, to explore innovative solutions, to provide leadership, and to prioritize the many opportunities with an eye to impact on the criminal justice systems.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

Is NGA working toward clearly and specifically defining "recidivism?" Different entities, like state and national corrections agencies, define the term, but the definition varies across the nation. The term can have different meanings depending on the type of recidivism outcome that is of interest (e.g., return to prison, new conviction, new charges filed, etc.)

It is also important to develop a clear definition of what constitutes "evidence-based practices" and to recognize the differences in implementation required by prisons and county jails.

When individuals are sentenced to a county jail, the offender loses his/her Medicaid benefits. This places a burden on local municipalities. There are inefficient lag times in offenders having to re-apply for benefits. This is especially deleterious for those with severe medical conditions and mental health issues. The Affordable Care Act has not changed this.

What are some of the major issues other states are dealing with regarding juvenile justice? Interest in sentencing and correctional reforms in adult populations is now beginning to trickle down to those dealing with juveniles.

Mr. Stroker led the Commission members in summarizing some take-away points from Mr. MacLellan's presentation:

1. Growing pre-trial population
Sixty-one percent of the population in local jails is the pre-trial subpopulation (the remaining being the sentenced population). Traditionally, this hovered at a 50/50 percent split. Some days, the pre-trial subpopulation can be as much as 80%.
2. Growing population of offenders with mental illness in prison and jails
There is a large proportion of individuals with substance abuse disorders and mental health issues. For example, the percentage of individuals in the Boulder County Jail who are suffering from a mental illness has grown from 12% to 30% and sometimes reaches 40%. These offenders with mental illness will have pre-trial stays that are 3 times longer than those who do not suffer from mental illness. Although the number of violent crimes and filings are down, the pre-trial jail subpopulation continues to grow. These proportions are also large in prison (4% with major mental illness; 34% seek mental health services and 70% with substance abuse issues).
3. Eligibility of offenders in jail and prison for medical benefits is a significant issue.

4. Identify data that would determine whether what we are doing works.
5. Objective review of sentencing practices by an outside party to assess impacts on prison. It would be advantageous, rather than to contract with an outside party, to conduct such efficacy studies with an in-state entity, like the Statistical Analysis Center (housed in Division of Criminal Justice), to build the intrinsic capability of a state to conduct such studies.
6. Juveniles systems are also challenged by the mental health and substance abuse issues mentioned previously.
7. Data sharing across systems is important to determine effectiveness, but it also allows a synergistic view of problems not possible when separate systems analyze their data trends individually.
8. Offender re-entry and evidence-based practices to enhance offender success, effectively use resources and enhance public safety.

NATIONAL TRENDS - JUVENILE POLICY INITIATIVES

For nearly 30 years, Roger Przybylski has conducted applied research in the criminal justice community. For the past 18 years, Mr. Przybylski has worked as a private consultant who helps governmental entities evaluate programs and engage in evidence-based practices.

The national trend is for entities to use evidence-based practices, but there's confusion about what that actually means.

1. Evidence-based programs and practices are based on sound theory and are deemed to be effective based on rigorous scientific evaluation. Policy decisions should rely on the best available data-driven evidence and people should look at the return on investment for a policy option.
2. Why is it important to be evidence-based? Funding is tight. More and more policy makers are basing decisions on funding programs and practices that are proven to be effective and cost-beneficial.
3. What constitutes credible evidence? Some studies are more "trustworthy" than others. No single study can provide definitive evidence about effectiveness. The quality and consistency of evidence must be taken into account.
4. Being evidence-based has limitations though. Not every crime problem has an identified evidence-based intervention and not every evidence-based solution will work on every crime.

The history of juvenile justice can be traced back to 1899 when the first juvenile court was created. In the mid-1960s, due process rights for a juvenile accused of a crime were introduced. The 1990s placed a greater emphasis on confinement and control. Currently, we are in a transition / reform period. We are beginning to recognize the impact of the developmental stages of juveniles, both socially and physiologically, and how these factors impact the disposition of juvenile crime.

How should the juvenile justice system adapt its practices in recognition of the information regarding adolescent development? This question is addressed in a 2013 report from the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences (*Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*)

1. Adolescence is a distinct developmental period characterized by risk-taking, short-sightedness and heightened sensitivity to peers and other social influences.
2. Parent involvement, pro-social peer groups and activities that contribute to autonomous decision making are important for healthy, pro-social development.
3. Juveniles must be held accountable for their acts. The criminal justice system must have clear consequences. Parents need to participate in holding the juvenile accountable. The law must be applied fairly.

Prevention and intervention programs can and do work. There are effective delinquency prevention programs for every stage of a child's development. Examples of evidence-based programs are prenatal and early life nurse visits, preschool enrichment and parent management training. The strongest juvenile justice systems include prevention services.

Mark Lipsey, of Vanderbilt University, conducted an analysis of 548 juvenile offender programs. Across all programs, the average reduction in recidivism was 6%. The most effective programs reduced recidivism by 20% to 40%. The researchers found the factor that had the largest impact on recidivism was the approach used, and that therapeutic approaches are restorative and include skill building, counseling and multiple services. Those in criminal justice should not dismiss single-digit impacts on recidivism. In the medical community, a 5% reduction in the mortality rate would be considered a huge accomplishment.

Juvenile offenders with a low risk to reoffend should be diverted from the juvenile justice system. Offenders with a moderate or high risk to reoffend should be subject to the minimal level of supervision and control consistent with public safety. It is best to use interventions with a therapeutic orientation and to avoid those with a deterrence- or discipline-based philosophy. Programs should provide an adequate amount of service to ensure quality implementation while still maintaining public safety.

Effective interventions are those that keep juveniles in the education system, for example, family-based programs, mentoring, after school programs, restorative justice programs, school-centric programs that focus on self-control and social competency and truancy reduction programs that keep youths in the school. Schools that use zero-tolerance policies such as suspension, expulsion or arrest, are not effective. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges supports keeping children in school rather than relying on policies that lead to suspension and expulsion.

The juvenile justice system should be better informed regarding the effects of trauma on the behavior of juveniles. Many juvenile offenders in the system have experienced trauma at some point in their lives. There are a number of tools that can be used to identify needs and to assist in obtaining positive outcomes.

Juveniles transferred to adult criminal court typically receive longer sentences than those sentenced in juvenile court for similar crimes. Research on the general deterrent effect of charging a juvenile as an adult is inconclusive. Evidence does suggest that juveniles who have been transferred were unaware of the concept of transfer to adult court and do not consider the potential long-term consequences of their actions when behaving criminally.

Having a criminal conviction and spending time in prison has long-term consequences. It reduces both employment potential and earnings. Half of black males and 40% of white males have been arrested by age 23. However, young people who have been arrested but remain crime-free for an extended period of time are no more likely to commit crimes than people of a similar age who have never been arrested.

How do we take what we know from this research to make changes to the juvenile justice system without increasing the risk to public safety and not damaging the juvenile? This is the question being asked across the country.

Scientific studies have been done on the maturation of the brain. These neurological studies have found that the brain matures at a much later age than previously believed. Different brain systems mature at different points in time and at different rates. Cognitive abilities improve during pre- and early-adolescence; the limbic system (where emotions are processed) develops in early adolescence; the prefrontal cortex (where the executive functions are controlled) matures more gradually and is still maturing well into an individual's 20s. Adolescents have heightened vulnerability to sensation seeking and risk taking. That is why this age group is more likely to attempt suicide, commit more crimes and have more accidents. There is also a heightened sensitivity and attraction to immediate rewards. Adolescents are less able to control impulses and less able to consider rewards and risks simultaneously. They are also less apt to plan ahead and consider future consequences.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

The discussions surrounding policy decisions should consider carefully the distinction between evidence-based practices and those labeled "best practices." Regarding the way we address juvenile offenders, we should keep the distinctions clear between the juvenile justice system and the criminal justice system. We must acknowledge the fundamental differences behaviorally, socially, and neurologically between juveniles and adults.

While acknowledging these general differences, the challenge is that developmental and neurological considerations do not absolve specific juveniles for the responsibility for their actions. For specific cases, these factors may be mitigating in some circumstances and of no consequence in other cases.

In regard to transfers (to adult court), one must also take into consideration non-offender related factors. Of the several purposes of sentencing, one cannot ignore that sometimes punishment is a legitimate factor for the most egregious of offenses. We must also take into consideration the community expectations for the appropriate consequences of certain actions and the consequences to victims and their expectation regarding the response to egregious offenses. Yes, the community's values regarding punishment and retribution can vary from location to location and should be reflected in our sentencing policy.

With 70% of offenders in adult criminal justice who suffer from substance abuse problems, is there information relevant to juveniles of which we should be aware, given the brain development factor. Are there neuroscience consequences for marijuana that are different from other substances? Research is underway at the National Institute of Drug Abuse and other research circles regarding marijuana and the impact on brain development. As with all illegal substances and marijuana, there are detrimental effects to the adolescent brain.

Take-away points from Mr. Przybylski's presentation:

1. We should carefully consider the distinction between different types of evidence: evidence-based practices vs. "best practices" vs. other practices.
2. We should keep the distinctions clear between the juvenile justice and the (adult) criminal justice system.
 - a. We must acknowledge the fundamental differences behaviorally, socially, and neurologically between juveniles and adults.
 - b. We must find the balance between this knowledge and that, although there are general differences, these considerations do not absolve specific juveniles for the responsibility for their actions.

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: COLORADO EXAMPLES

Mesa County and the Evidence-Based Decision-Making Project (EBDM)

Pete Hautzinger (District Attorney, 21st Judicial District), Dennis Berry (Mesa County Community Corrections) and Stan Hilkey (Sheriff, Mesa County) presented information on how Mesa County is using an evidence-based program to streamline its criminal process (arrest through final disposition). Mesa County applied for and became one of seven pilot sites in the National Institute of Correction's Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM) Initiative. The Executive Team for the pilot included law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges and criminal justice professionals.

The goal of the EBDM Initiative is to test the framework for evidence-based decision making at the local level. Mesa County asked the following questions to help develop its focus: Who is being arrested? Who is in jail? Why are they in our jail? What information is used during sentencing? What sentencing options are evidence-based? What are the outcomes of local criminal justice and treatment programs?

The Mesa County team focused its work on medium to high risk offenders and developed a system-wide logic model to chart desired outcomes. Members of the group identified key areas where decisions are made and then looked for evidence-based practices that would increase desired outcomes. Those key areas are:

1. Arrest: The arresting officer should be given tools to assess risk the arrestee.
2. Pretrial: The entire pre-trial process was changed, including bond practices, supervision, responses to supervision violations, and the implementation of the Colorado Pretrial

Assessment Tool (CPAT). Exploring the development of in-house pre-trial assessment tool.

3. Pre-Sentence Investigation Reports: Changed and simplified the form of the report to enhance its use by all those in the system.
4. Sentencing Decisions: A sentencing alternative guide was developed to list alternative sentences and what outcomes could be expected when using those sentences.
5. Evidence-based court-room: Chief judge is implementing a variety of evidence based practices and involved in the above system reforms.

As a result of this project, Mesa County now makes fair and consistent bonding decisions. Before the project, the risk levels of offenders in the jail were not known. Now, the Sheriff's Office has staff to identify low risk offenders and to find alternative options for handling them. The project is currently in the implementation phase and results are being studied.

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) would like to take this project statewide, and will assist new participants (five or six additional jurisdictions) in developing their own models. However NIC needs a letter of interest from Colorado by March 31st.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

The question now is does the Commission support endorsing such a letter? Deciding to be a signatory does not mean Colorado will be selected for this expansion. NIC is receiving competitive bids from several locations around the country.

A factor to consider, even when just expressing interest, is to understand that the effort does require an awareness of the increased resources to provide supervision to the pre-trial clients. The amount of resources may not be as large as expected, given that the supervision level is determined by risk assessment (only the higher risk clients would require supervision). Some of the pre-trial programs may be "self-funded."

How does this affect the pre-trial population? The more relevant concern is that the pre-trial population comprises those who are higher risk. In Mesa County, the jail population trendline has finally leveled off after years of steep (45 degree angle) growth.

Denver Community Corrections: Community Corrections Decision Tool

The city of Denver has also created an evidence-based program to assist in its development of a Community Corrections Risk Assessment tool. Greg Mauro gave a presentation on Denver's work.

In the fall of 2011, the Denver Community Corrections Board had a retreat where national speakers were brought in to educate the Board on trends in criminal justice. A working group was formed to look at developing a decision making tool that could be used by the Community Corrections Board to decide who should and should not be accepted.

A pilot study was then conducted, and it was found that the few low/moderate risk offenders that came before the Board were not often approved for placement. Additionally, there were a relatively large number of high risk cases that were accepted by the Board. The ultimate goal is to have the right offender in the right bed at the right time.

The Board asked why a structured decision making tool should be used. It was explained that such a tool can organize information that is already available so that an objective scoring system could be used. The tool alone is not the sole answer; however, the best outcomes come from combining outcomes from the assessment with along with professional judgment.

The working group focused on identifying and agreeing upon the most important considerations when making a decision. It determined how the considerations would be defined, how they would be designed into the decision structure, and how they would be weighed. The Board agreed that the most important factors when reviewing a case and making a decision are: risk of a new offense, prior violence, steps the offender has taken to prepare for release, and length of time remaining on one's sentence.

The Community Corrections Board applied this newly created decision tool to 399 referrals between September 13, 2013 and January 14, 2014. Of these, 41% of the applicants fell into the green category (Acceptance recommended); 44% fell into the yellow category (Acceptance recommended, unless the offender's risk and needs cannot be addressed in community corrections); and 15% fell into the red category (Acceptance NOT recommend unless a special consideration is present).

The Board is now evaluating the tool's effectiveness by measuring the number of times individual Board members agree with the tool; tracking how offenders fit into the matrix; tracking performance in Community Corrections programs (e.g., number of successful terminations); and ensuring that the tool does not have a race or gender bias.

Mr. Mauro concluded his presentation by referring to some data on the use of the CPAT in Denver. The CPAT categories do seem to accurately relate to the risk levels and appearance rates of the pre-trial population in Denver.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

Has there been any follow-up regarding recidivism rates for those individuals, based on the tool, who were accepted versus those who were not accepted into community corrections? The implementation was very recent and those analyses have not yet been conducted.

Although recidivism is an important measure, a lot of variables come into play after an offender is released from community corrections. The factors that contribute to recidivism after an offender moves to parole or discharges their parole period may have little to do with that earlier decision to accept an offender into community corrections or with offenders' experiences in community corrections. Some of the shorter term measures are just as important. For example, other important factors include how the offenders perform in programs and treatment during their community corrections stay or measuring the impact of risk reduction while an offender was in a residential community corrections setting.

Do individual members get feedback on their decisions? Yes, last month that feedback process began. This will not only provide board members with feedback, but these individual conversations can potentially help identify potential issues with the assessment factors or help identify missing decision elements.

A different way of thinking about these assessments is to look at them as measurements of change. The dynamic factors in assessment are responsive to interventions, experiences and treatment. With re-assessment, one can track offender improvement as another way to assess the impact on risk reduction.

The decision-making tool gives the Denver Community Corrections Board a starting point to measure the board's decision-making. Historically, it's been a challenge to identify how to measure board performance and this is a good beginning. From a county commission viewpoint, more data is helpful in determining how to identify cost-effective and cost-saving opportunities.

There was general discussion of the pre-trial population in Denver and the use of bond schedules and PR (personal recognizance) bonds in Denver.

Take-away points from the Mesa County and Denver presentations:

1. The Commission should engage in further discussion about the letter of support for the expansion of the EBDM Initiative in Colorado.
2. Mesa County did not include victims when it conducted the planning process for its initiative. Whenever talking about changes to the criminal justice system, one should include victim input.
3. When undertaking such projects, one must carefully identify the goal. Denver quickly identified its goal and that is why buy-in was easy.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

Roger Przybylski provided a presentation on "what works" in policing and evidence-based practices in policing.

Incarceration may impact crime in three ways: Incapacitation (crime cannot be committed because the offender is in jail); specific deterrence (the experience was so bad that the offender does not want to reoffend); and general deterrence (incarcerating one person prevents others from committing a similar crime). However, it's been found that incarceration does not prevent some crimes from occurring and can actually increase recidivism. The certainty of punishment is a far greater deterrent than the severity of punishment. Hawaii has developed a program known as the HOPE Probation (Hawaii's Opportunity Probation with Enforcement) which incorporates sanctions that are swift and sure. The sanction may be an administrative one and does not have to be severe, but it occurs close to the time of the offense.

Actual decreases in crime are not due to incarceration. Two thirds of the reduction is due to other factors. One of those factors is changes in policing. There are five things law enforcement executives can do to make a significant difference.

1. Crime is rarely random - patrols should not be either. How do you weigh this against the racial disparity in criminal justice? Law enforcement is looking at data regarding where crime is occurring and deploying police to those locations. The focus of police patrolling areas with a new proactive frame of reference informed by new approaches variously labeled, problem-oriented, SMART, community collaboration and hot spots policing and intervention paradigms is different than the previous styles of “community policing.”
2. Quality is more important than speed. Using empirical evidence and criminogenic conditions to inform policing will have a greater impact on crime than simply measuring 911 response times.
3. DNA collection can work for property crimes, too.
4. In police work, perceptions matter. People abide by the law because they believe the law is fair and is being applied fairly.
5. It is important to make officer safety and wellness a priority.

Evidence on the impact of more police officers suggests more police presence can reduce crime. The key is to increase the probability of apprehension. What the police do matters the most. Proactive and highly focused deployment strategies are far more effective than reactive strategies.

Researchers at the George Mason University, Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy, developed an evidence-based policing matrix. What they found was that the most effective strategy was highly proactive and highly focused. There is little evidence that “Broken Windows” policing is effective. However, there is a difference between the intentions and goals of “broken windows” policing and what actually has occurred on the street.

There has been a great deal of research done on community policing, but the findings are inconclusive. When the approach is implemented correctly, it can be effective. Even though most implementations fall short, positive outcomes have been found in improvements in the relationship between the police and the public. These improved relationships can result in enhanced perceptions of fairness of law enforcement which can, in turn, encourage lawful behavior.

Take-away points from the first part of Przybylski’s second presentation:

1. The concept of the immediate and proportional sanction. Parole is looking into this concept.
2. The role law enforcement can play in reducing recidivism is often overlooked. Considerations regarding policies to reduce recidivism typically bring to mind the post-conviction experiences of offenders.
3. Simply selecting an evidence-based practice does not mean one automatically will accrue the predicted outcomes. The actual implementation of such programs and the ongoing program evaluation and modification is just as important, if not more so.

4. Culture and ethnicity must be considered.

[Mr. Przybylski's presentation was not completed. He continued and completed the presentation on Day 2 of the Retreat, March 14, 2014.]

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Endnote 1: Social Impact Bond. "SIBs—also known as "social innovation financing" or "pay for success"—offer governments a risk-free way of pursuing creative social programs that may take years to yield results. Usually, governments decide what problems they want to address and then enter a contractual agreement with an intermediary (or bond-issuing organization) that is responsible for raising capital from independent investors including banks, foundations, and individuals, and for hiring and managing nonprofit service providers. If the project achieves its stated objectives, the government repays the investors with returns based on the savings the government accrues as a result of the program's success. (Taxpayers also receive a portion of the budget gains in the form of freed-up public resources, though the investors may need to be fully paid first.) A neutral evaluator, agreed on by both parties, is hired to measure the outcomes and resolve any disputes that arise."

[Quote from <http://harvardmagazine.com/2013/07/social-impact-bonds>]