



## COLORADO

**Department of Public Safety** 

# Agenda

### **Today's Objectives:**

- Discuss Risk Informed Outcome Options (RIO)
- Share Feedback & Ideas for PBC
- Prepare for Next Workshop (Core Security Audit on Sep 8)

Description	Time Allotted
Agenda & Introductions	10 min
Please Enter your Name & Organization in our Chat	
What Are Risk-Informed Outcomes & How does this fit with PBC Plan	15 min
How would you define success?	15 min
What are the current data points we manage?	15 min
Review of UI Recommendations	
Feedback on UI Definition of Recidivism	15 min
What are your top 2 RIOs with currently available data?	25 min
What are your top 2 RIOs regardless of available data?	15 min
Next Steps	10 min

## Our Shared Vision

### What is our objective?

PBC is an innovative, transparent & fiscally responsible strategy ensuring local, safe & accountable providers deliver services & support to community corrections clients.

### Why?

The criminal justice system and communities benefit from researched, rehabilitative sentencing options. Local boards and providers serve the diverse clientele with additional OCC support, training and technical assistance resulting in lower recidivism rates.

### How will we get there?

This program offers the opportunity to listen and collaborate with community correction stakeholders, apply established research and provide clear, concise guidance to increase the quality and quantity of help & supportive programs to our communities.

# Group Agreements



We recommend these ground rules to promote effective collaboration to reach agreement in a diverse group:

- One person speaks at a time
- Stay on mute unless engaging
- Say what you mean, ask questions to promote understanding
- Tough on problems, easy on people
- Use the past only to describe a better future

# Group Agreements Cont.



- Come prepared review materials in advance, gather & share input from your community, stakeholders, colleagues etc.
- Collaborate listen, learn and contribute patiently (be a part of the answer, not the answer)
- Focus stay focused on our scope related to PBC and not conflate other challenges we face in CC
- Public Policy Perspective favor durable, data-supported evidence & logic, over individual stories, anecdotes, or emotional appeals.
- Constructive orientation assume positive intent of other stakeholders

# Project Roadmap

### Plan

## Current State

## Future State

### Execute

- Outline the process and timeline
- Orient leaders & stakeholders to the process
- Plan
   communications
   and release
   message(s)
- Identify interviews, workshop participants and arrange logistics

- Design interview guide -
- Present to May Governor's CCA Council
- Research evidencebased practices, where warranted
- Interview stakeholders
- Facilitate 2 2-hour workshops to map current operations (contracts and audits)
- Document current state

- 1 2 hour workshops to develop consensus on Stakeholder engagement method (hopes/concerns, representatives
- 3 2 hour workshops to cover 3 PBC measures & related project scope limits. Discuss & elicit feedback on each topic to share information & prepare for final workshops
  - Risk Informed Outcomes (RIO)
  - Core Security Audit (Core)
  - Program Assessment for Correctional Excellence (PACE)
- 3 2 hour workshops to synthesize feedback on potential options
  - Metric Details, including cutoff levels
  - Payment models
  - Timeline
- Integrate data & draft plan

- Preview the plan with stakeholders (adjust based on feedback)
- Assist with concepts and elements and business requirements to be considered in the RFI.
- Develop RFI creation plan with ownership
- Draft RFI by 12/31

Logistics arranged

Current State summarized

We are here

Future State defined

Plan submitted



## Risk-Informed Outcomes Are...

Individual outcomes such as success, escape and recidivism that take into consideration the risk level of the individual being supervised by a community corrections program.

Risk level is currently measured by the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI).

Analyzing outcomes in relationship to risk mitigates concerns that jurisdictions and providers will be incentivized for accepting only low risk individuals.



## The 2015 PBC Plan

In contrast to other measures in the proposed PBC system, these measures are fully objective and are not in the direct control of the provider. Providers cannot directly impact these measures without first addressing the other two areas of the PBC model. This element is important to have a distal or more long-term outcome measure in the overall PBC model. The use of objective and long-term outcome measures such as these provide a careful balance to the performance measures that are in direct control of the provider. Generally speaking, the PBC model should have an appropriate balance of metrics that are in direct control of the provider and those that are more eventually impacted by provider practices on a long-term basis.

This area also attends to the general Vision Statement of the Council which emphasizes that community corrections will stop the cycle of recidivism by providing evidence based treatment and education to offenders according to their individual needs; by measuring success through lower recidivism and more effective integration into an informed and supportive community; encouraging success via effective assessment, supervision, and rehabilitation; and being continually focused on overall public safety and individual accountability.

The risk-informed outcome measures, as currently envisioned includes measurement of the following statistics:

#### 1. Risk-Informed Recidivism

Formula: Facility Recidivism Rate / Average LSI Score of Offenders in Facility

#### 2. Risk-Informed Success Rate

Formula: Facility Successful Completion Rate x Average LSI Score of Offenders in Facility

#### Risk-Informed New Crime Rate

Formula: Facility New Crime Rate / Average LSI Score of Offenders in Facility

#### 4. Risk-Informed Escape Rate

Formula: Facility Escape Rate / Average LSI Score of Offenders in Facility



# Activity:

## How would you define success?

If you had any data you needed available to you, how would you define success in community corrections? Answers can reference both individual and program outcomes.

Let's go to our NoteApp Board to share and discuss:



https://noteapp.com/ZS5LY8ARmH-copy-10

## Current Available Data

Data Set	Reliability of the Data Set	Limitations
Assessments (Risk/Need Data)  • LSI at Intake  • Most recent LSI at termination	High	Updated LSIs may not occur for stays less than 6 months
Termination Reasons	High	No detailed data about categories
Employment (Unemployed, Disability, Part Time, Full Time)  • Employment at Entry  • Employment at Termination  • Total Earnings	High Employment Status Moderate Earnings	Is there a difference between having a job and having a quality job? Lacking duration of employment.
<ul> <li>Education Level (Highest grade achieved)</li> <li>Education at Entry</li> <li>Education at Termination</li> </ul>	High	Many individuals already acquired desired/needed education level at entry. Time period it takes to increase education level.
Treatment Matching Specific to Substance Use Treatment  • TxRW Step 7  • TxRW Step 8	High	Limited to this one specific treatment area
<ul> <li>Treatment Services Received (Dosage)</li> <li>Therapeutic Services (6+ categories)</li> <li>Ancillary/Educational Services (3 categories)</li> </ul>	Low	Data entry expectations changed over time. Limited ability to match to assessed need, correct dosage

# Urban Institute Report

OCC requested that Urban Institute:

- Develop a Baseline outcome assessment
- Develop a method for adjusting outcomes by risk
- Develop a method for evaluating program performance against those outcomes

Using results from CCIB and the Stakeholder Survey, the Urban Institute identified and generated relevant program outcomes.

# UI - Risk Adjustment

- Used the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI)
- Analyzed 5 years of data for each outcome based on risk level to determine targets based on risk
- Reviewed the risk level of individuals in each program.
   Determined if the majority of individuals were Low/Medium Risk or High/Very High Risk for each program.
- Each program was categorized by the majority risk level
- Program level data was then analyzed by the adjustment of risk for each outcome based on the determined baseline targets

## **UI- Outcomes Evaluated**

### **Positive Outcomes**

- Successful Completions Rate
- Employment Gain/Retention

### **Negative Outcomes**

- Escape Rate
- Technical Violation Rate
- Felony Conviction 2 years from Program Start

## **UI-** Recommendations

### With Available Data

- Successful Completion
- Recidivism

### Suggested New Data

- Treatment and Programming Matching Risk and Need
- Staff Retention
- Client Progression

## Feedback

What is your feedback on the Urban Institute's definition of recidivism?

The Urban Institute defined recidivism as a new felony conviction starting from day entry into the program. They reviewed the data at both 1 and 2 years from program start date.



# Activity:

Top 2 preferred RIOs with available data?

Top 2 preferred RIOs regardless of (currently) available data?

Provide your input on what risk informed outcomes should be considered for PBC









## COLORADO

**Department of Public Safety**