

## **TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting**

November 18, 2024

**Attendance:** Kelli Burmeister (Division of Youth Services), Jon Caudill (University of Colorado, Colorado Springs), Erin Crites (Division of Criminal Justice), Christy Donner (Colorado Criminal Justice Coalition), Whitney Leeds (Growing Home), Kate LeMasters (University of Colorado, Anschutz), Jack Reed (Division of Criminal Justice), Aaron Stewart (State Judicial), Dave Wolfsgruber (Department of Corrections)

Pursuant to Senate Bill 2024-029, this is a meeting of the Alternative Metrics Working Group held on November 18, 2024. This initial meeting is facilitated by Working Group member, Jack Reed and DCJ Staff person, Erin Crites.

Jack Reed 00:15

Hello, everyone. I would like to welcome you to the Alternative Metrics to Criminal Justice Success working group, or the Alternative Metrics Working Group, for short, we just thought we would start off. I will share the agenda really quickly. Okay, so this is kind of what we were planning on. We sent it out, but, you know, we just thought we'd start off by by doing welcomes. So since I'm off mute, I will start I am Jack Reed. I am the and so if you can just say your name, and your title and your organization, that would be, that would be great. So Jack Reed, I'm the Research Director in the Office of Research and Statistics in the Division of Criminal Justice in the Department of Public Safety. I am the appointed public safety member of this group, and I will pass it off to Erin so that then she can take back over.

Erin Crites 01:30

Thanks, Jack. Apologies having some work done. It was supposed to happen at 1030 and clearly they are early. So I'm Erin. I am in the Office of Research and Statistics as a policy advisor. I will be kind of helping to organize, coordinate and serve as staff to this group, not officially an appointed member, but will be here and available to assist this group in its efforts moving forward. So I will just keep passing it down, and then once we finish introductions, we'll move into some other pieces of the agenda. So just go down the row with people that I see. So Aaron Stewart,

Aaron Stewart 02:16

Morning, everyone. My name is Aaron Stewart. I'm with the Division of Probation Services in the State Court Administrator's Office in the Judicial Branch, and I'm an analyst three there. And apologies for my informal attire. Today, I am assisting with a self defense tactics training all week. So good to be here.

Erin Crites 02:31

Thank you, Jon.

Jon Caudill 02:41

Hi. I'm Jon Caudill. I am a Professor of Criminal Justice and currently the interim dean for the College of Public Service at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs.

Dave Wolfsgruber 02:57

Good morning. Dave Wolfsgruber, Director of Parole Colorado Department of Corrections, and I was appointed by Executive Director Stancil to represent the Colorado DOC.

Kelli Burmeister 03:12

Good morning group. Kelli Burmeister, I'm the Director of Data Management and Analysis for the Division of Youth

## **TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting**

November 18, 2024

Services, which is under the Department of Human Services,

Erin Crites 03:28

Will you just introduce yourself really quickly. Sorry, Kate,

Kate Lemasters 03:44

Sorry, I think I heard someone else and I'm here. Sorry. I'm Kate LeMasters. I'm an assistant professor in Public Health at the University of Colorado Anschutz medical campus. I work at the intersection of the justice and legal system and health, just to clarify,

Erin Crites 04:00

and so Kate and Jon are appointed representatives of, I think, institutes of higher learning, is how it's phrased in the statute. So for context for folks, great Whitney,

Whitney Leeds 04:13

good morning. My name is Whitney Leeds. I use she, her pronouns. I'm a program manager with Growing Home, which is a local community based organization out of south Westminster, but I'm also on the board of Above Waters Project, which is an organization that works with folks in halfway houses.

Erin Crites 04:28

Thank you, Whitney. And Whitney is one of the appointed members for our community based organizations that serve justice involved populations and work for reform. Christy Donner is also an appointed member, but she wasn't able to make it, or maybe will join us a little bit later this morning. Okay, so let's jump. We have a few I think that's probably good with the rest of the ORS folks that are here, kind of just listening in. US and serving as staff, put your intros in the chat for me, so that we can jump into the rest of our agenda, just for reference for this working group. And again, we'll talk about who will be chairing this endeavor later in our agenda, but the idea will probably be is to have the appointed members of the group do introductions at the start of every meeting, because these meetings are open to the public. And then we'll have any of our staff or any of the public folks that are sitting in on the meeting introduce themselves in the chat. We have a very large agenda for this whole working group and will for each of the meetings. So we'll try and stay focused on the tasks and use the chat function for as much as we can moving forward, unless anyone has objections, so that you can certainly discuss those okay. So appreciate you all for introducing yourselves as I think you noticed, the meetings will be recorded, and we, in the past, have posted transcripts and the recordings on the website, which I think I sent you all a link to, and as well as minutes, so that just helps us keep our obligation to the open meeting laws in check and make sure that we have information available to members of the public who are interested in the work of this group, and also hope that that will be used by some of our other stakeholders that we will bring into this meeting, as you all choose, to help them stay up to date on the work that's happening. So again, we don't spend too much time going backwards and focus our energies moving forward with the charge of this group. Any questions, comments thus far, I promise I will not talk the whole meeting every single meeting. I was just hoping to get us all settled today and then moving forward, it will be the working group members for our largely kind of driving us forward. Okay, so the next thing we'd like to do as part of our agenda, really moving along so we could go is to talk about the prior working groups work so a few members of this working group were on the previous one. These were kind of a paired set of recidivism pieces of legislation. The first one that we finished up just about a month ago was looking at a

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

standardized definition of recidivism. So Aaron and Kelly and Dave were also on that group, as well as Jack and myself sitting in and then we had some folks from community corrections. We had somebody from the parole board as well as academic participating, Michael Campbell in that group, anybody? We had a lot of data folks also,

Jack Reed 08:32

did you? Jeff wise from emerge?

Erin Crites 08:34

Thank you. Jeff Wise from Rmerge was our community based re entry organization representative and provided some great insight into what things look like on the ground, for those of us that get stuck in data, most of our work. So so that group did come up with a standardized definition. In charge of that group was to use the event that was set in statute, which was a new deferred agreement, adjudication or conviction for a felony misdemeanor offense. So that was the event that we were working with, and this group needed to come up with at which point we started capturing that event for how long and what that target population was that we were, we were counting recidivism events on, so that group did end up coming up with that decision. So we have our events be looking at that for folks who are our broader definition, no longer under the control of the criminal justice agency. So for DOC once they are released from inmate status DOC will start tracking; for parole, once they are entirely discharged from parole, same for DYS and for probation. And so on. Each of those agencies no longer has control over that individual we'll start counting recidivism. That recidivism will be measured for two years,

Jack Reed 10:16

up to three years is the outside so reporting at six months one year and three years are the three time periods.

Erin Crites 10:28

So we had a lot of conversations about how long we ought to do this for, recognizing that the earlier we start talking about folks to moving towards success is better, since we had to talk about kind of that failure definition, and that was sort of the definition of that group, we wanted to report at six months as well, just so we can start kind of seeing that early engagement or disengagement in the reentry success process, so that report is still in the approval process, but a draft is ready, so if anyone would like to see that, who hasn't already seen Yeah, Jon,

Jon Caudill 11:15

oh, I was just saying I'd like a copy of that report. I don't know if you've shared it with me, and if you have, I apologize. I don't think I've seen it, though.

Erin Crites 11:22

No, the folks who've seen it are those who were on that working group in the past, but I will make sure it gets out to this entire group, this and brevity was our friend. So it shouldn't take you all long to get through that. Anything from the folks who sat on that standardized definition working group that I missed, that she'd like to add for our colleagues who are not there.

Jack Reed 11:53

So the one thing so it also applies to the Office of Community Corrections. So the new definition applies to any state

## **TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting**

November 18, 2024

agency that is using recidivism as a measure. So you know, since juvenile diversion also has funding from the state, juvenile diversion is also kind of beholden to that new definition. And really any criminal justice agency or entity that is doing recidivism has to use this new definition, starting July 1, 2025 so and for purposes of you know, what is the data set that we're matching against? It's going to be one single data set that judicial provides for for how many, how many years

Erin Crites 12:47

it ends up being,

Aaron Stewart 12:50

I think, for what we've been doing, it's been seven years of data that we've been providing, so that'll be continued.

Jack Reed 13:00

And one of the things that we didn't really settle and we, after this group is done, we're we're definitely, I think, going to try to revisit, is the matching methodology to try to make that consistent across agencies. Because, you know, we've used different definitions, we've also used different methodologies for matching, they're similar, but there are some, some differences. And so that's another piece where it was not part of the legislative mandate for the recidivism definition working group, but it is something that we think that would be really valuable to do, just because, you know, I think getting to a consistent methodology for matching would be valuable. And I think our State Office of Information Technology is actually working on getting some more resources for data matching for state agencies, which is positive and may allow us to create a methodology that has a, to a certain extent, possibly a trusted, a trusted broker or the data so that each individual agency, who may or may not have like, huge data science capacity, won't be tasked with doing all the matching that there might be that trusted data scientist in the middle that can, you know, we can get the data use agreements, data sharing agreements, MOUs, in place, so that they would be able to do the matching. Again. No, that is will come after this group. This group has a lot to get done, and there's a lot of crossover with the data folks between the two. So that's, that's one thing that we decided to put on hold for now, but we would like to revisit it.

Erin Crites 14:48

Oh, welcome Christy. I know this is not the best time for you, so appreciate you.

Christy Donner 14:53

Yeah, I only, I can only be on for about 10 minutes, so I'll do that. I have other meetings at 930 but my apologies. Nice to be in the circle with you all.

Erin Crites 15:02

Thank you. Do you want to do a quick introduction, Christy, while you're here?

Christy Donner 15:07

Sure. I'm Christine Donner Executive Director of the Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Erin Crites 15:11

Thank you, Christy. Just to catch you up, we were talking a little bit about a summary of the definition working group,

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

and also getting that report out to everybody, so you can see kind of those decisions on paper as well as the recommendations for kind of moving that work forward in the future. Okay, so, and we can come back to that conversation about that definition if folks want a little bit more information at one of our longer meetings as well we can do that. So kind of, as we started off with, we have a really ambitious charge for this working group, so we're going to have to really, kind of stay focused as well as probably have some work and some conversations that happen outside of this meeting. So one thing I want to bring your attention to at the bottom of the agenda, and I'm just going to keep this in the bottom of every agenda, so that we we have it at our fingertips are the mandates that were put in statute for this working group. We all found it really helpful in that last meeting to constantly be able to refer back to those as we were doing our work. So we're going to maintain kind of that process moving forward. So kind of the administrative stuff everybody needed to be appointed by November 30. So yay, already ahead of schedule on that one convene our first meeting by February 1. So again, getting that one going meetings must allow for remote participation. So you will see in the invites that there will always be an option to join these meetings on Zoom. We use the zoom platform so that you can record them easier and have transcripts and closed captioning if needed. So we'll do that. There will also be meeting space currently available at the DCJ offices. We would like to expand and have meetings in different locations, because the DCJ offices are not all that easily accessible by public transit, and if we want to increase kind of the capacity for folks to participate, we'd like to use other locations as well as allow for transportation for our working group members. So if folks have recommendations and places you'd like, or your agency or organization would like to host, just let me know, and we will work together to pull an in person meeting together at your location, and then we can sort out the zoom for everyone. So just so that folks know that remote participation is always an option. But after this meeting, we will also have an in person gathering space for us as well. The last part of the kind of our timeline stuff is that we have to submit a report by July one. So yeah, that's tight, real tight for those of you familiar with this kind of work. So we will be really kind of diving right in, pulling in stakeholders as appropriate, and getting moving on on this work. Just so you all know, the DCJ are staffed to this working group and will take responsibility for kind of organizing the draft of the report. But that report will not be final until you all approve of it and say that it is final. But just when we get to that chair conversation later, know that the chair responsibility does not require you to draft for anyone who might be concerned, that will be something that will we'll get started, but obviously it will be done once you all questions on that initial and then I'll move into more concerned about the timeline. Makes me nervous. Okay, um, so the kind of general requirements of this working group, and I'm going to read these so that they're consistent with the statute. So bear with me, but our responsibility is in this group is to study the metrics and methods other than recidivism, to supplement current measures, including those related to desistance and Jack's going to share this with everyone to study those metrics and measures and methods to comprehensively measure successful outcomes that consider various aspects of life. So when we were in the definition of recidivism working group, we kept wanting to go back to but we don't want to talk about this like failure definition. We want to talk about people being successful and re engaging in their communities and finding those things that give them stability in re entry and so that's what this group gets to do. This group gets to do, do that fun work of identifying these things and how to measure them. So some examples were climate, housing, education, mental health and well being, social support and civic and community engagement. So just some things that kind of get us started, but obviously the details of those will be up to the support number to identify. The other piece is to look at those metrics and methods to enhance measures of criminal justice system performance and adherence to best practices and supervision program design and implementation. So, big charge from those metrics and methods standpoint, looking at kind of our desistance framework, as well as, how do we assess the effectiveness of the system from kind of this non recidivism as our only metric standpoint. The next piece is to identify methods to obtain information from those folks involved or recently involved in the system regarding their supervision experiences.

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

So not only we talking about looking at kind of system data or administrative data, but also looking at folks perceptions and their experiences of their involvement in our systems. Want to identify gaps or barriers in data collection, measurement, data matching, and make recommendations to address those gaps and barriers. So we'll talk about all the things everybody wants to measure. We'll talk about all the ways we don't actually know how to get to that data, or can't get to that data we know where it is and what are our recommendations for how to solve those problems, and we'll put those in the report which will help those solutions forward in future legislative sessions, the Bill asks us to create an implementation timeline for those metrics and methods and addressing any data limitations and resources inside of that timeline. So once we decide what to measure, how to measure it, what are the things that are going to get in the way? What would that timeline look like to be able to execute those those methods for chances, and then also to identify any customization of those measures to account for age, gender, race, ethnicity or risk, so making sure that we're considering all of those other individual factors as well. And finally, and it's not listed here, but one of the things listed in the statute is that this group consults with stakeholders. So the intent, while we have kind of a fairly small working group of folks that were appointed, the intent is that this group reaches out to and includes stakeholders from all of the affected groups and agencies as part of this conversation. And I think you'll see, if I didn't put it specifically on the agenda, it's a part of kind of our discussion that's a lot.

Jack Reed 24:04

And one thing. And, you know, obviously we'll get into this in more detail later, but especially when we start getting into measures and timelines. You know, there will be the, you know, the question of the practical versus the ideal that we're going to obviously have to wrestle with on a fairly regular basis, I think, and so we'll, you know, that that is something that I think we're going to continually bump up against. And then, you know, questions about legislation, requirements, MOUs, like, there's going to be a lot of details that will go into you know those last three pieces definitely,

Christy Donner 24:59

so that. Point. I'm sorry, should just raise my hand, Hey, Jack, to that point, because I know being on the interim working group right that discusses some of it, and some of the bigger limitations were around what data we could capture and what we couldn't capture at what time intervals, and things like that. And so will that be something that you'll be able to share with us in terms of, like, what data can we kind of, and methodology, so then we can be to your point, being practical as well, as you know, it's kind of, it's got to be implementable. It's got to be operational, but, but I know that we ran into a lot of questions about not knowing all what data was available that we could draw on or from. So I don't know even very top line if that's a possibility.

Jack Reed 25:52

Yeah, no. And I think that that's this, this one the identifying the the gaps and barriers. So to be able to identify gaps and barriers, we need to know, like, what is available. And I think, you know, within our own systems, we have a pretty good grasp, I mean, the the data people from judicial and, you know, we kind of cover DCJ, which covers OCC, and I know folks from community corrections will also be joining. They're not the official members from DPS, but obviously they are stakeholders. And then, you know, do see we have Dave wolf scooter here, so we've got the data folks within the justice systems that I think are here, that we can speak to those pieces. It's the pieces outside of our agencies that I think will be more challenging. And that, though, is, I think, where the the charge for us to bring in additional outside stakeholders becomes important. So we bring in, you know, potentially, you know, Behavioral Health Administration. We bring in, you know, department and, you know, CDLE, so Department of Labor and Employment, we potentially bring in revenue. You

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

know, there's, there's a much, I think, broader group of folks that we can identify to bring in that will be able to give us a sense, I think of you know, this is the information we have available. You know, this is what is easily available. This is what's more challenging. This is what might require legislative changes for us to be able to share it with you because of other legal requirements around privacy. So we really want to bring in those additional people that can give us that broader, that broader scope, and you know, especially something like obtaining information for those involved in the system, you know, that's that's a completely different kind of data collection. That's not administrative data at all. But which will, you know, we we need to figure out how we can collect it, or if it's feasible, you know, timelines, all of the different things around some of these are going to be challenging, but the just because they're challenging doesn't mean they're impossible. And, you know, I think we always need to, you know, even we've got the practical and we have the ideal, to the extent that the ideal is something that we can conceptualize and operationalize and put, you know, good suggestions forward, you know, then even though it's the ideal, it's going to be harder to get to, we can still strive for it and strive for it in our recommendations to in our report.

Erin Crites 28:37

Okay, so going to because we actually have everybody here for now until Christy has to jump off. Um,

Christy Donner 28:44

yeah, and I was just putting some in the chat. I gotta go now. I'm sorry, so just fill me in on what you need from me. I'm looking forward to working with everyone.

Erin Crites 28:52

Sounds good. Thanks.

Jack Reed 28:53

We're going to make you chair. Yeah,

Erin Crites 28:56

better not. I will be highly disappointing in that role, just to share be well everyone, okay, so Any other kind of initial thoughts on on those statutory specific statutory charge here. All right, so then kind of wanted to just move into a bit of discussion about how we're going to get all this done. It's big, it's a lot. So again, like part of as you saw, that kind of recap of the timeline in the statute, because this is such a large charge, and it really was a very truncated amount of time to do all that in we did work to kind of pull everyone together a little bit earlier than the staff. Two initially required. So thank you all for moving quickly on these appointments and getting this group started. I think everyone will appreciate that as we move forward and we'll give a chance for this working group to make the most of its time here before that July deadline. So one of the things I think, to kind of start off with is the discussion of kind of a standing meeting schedule. So we sent out, that was the Google survey. All of my electronic means to get this stuff pulled together, to set kind of a recurring, twice monthly meeting for this group. And given the work that needs to get done, those meetings are going to be three hours in length, and then we'll take a break in the middle of that for folks to kind of step away for a minute. And so from looking at everyone's responses, it looks like the second and fourth Thursday at 9am was the best time for everyone. I'd say best loosely. It was the least disliked time, maybe for folks. So if that still works, and there's not huge dissension, I will go ahead and get those invites sent out to everybody. We will already sorry the canceling meeting. Before we even started the meetings, we will probably cancel the meeting on December 26 I

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

assume that it would be so sparsely attended, it wouldn't be worth people's time and energy. Yeah, so we'll go ahead and just pre cancel that one, but otherwise, really try and stay on that meeting cadence so that we can power through and again, you'll get an invite that will say zoom and the DCJ conference room optically, but we will hopefully try and diversify our in person meeting with patients throughout the next few months as we get those figured out. Okay? Hi. So that's kind of the big overarching thought on how to kind of keep this group moving forward, getting those twice monthly, kind of longish meetings. Just kind of wanted to open it up to folks on on the working group for any other suggestions or thoughts on kind of how to keep this agenda moving forward for you all. Jon, moving forward.

Jon Caudill 33:00

good observation. I think, you know, having a central location for this information, that people can go in and look at work at the as their time allows, will be important. I can't I know that my schedule would will conflict with our plan meetings. I just know that's just, that's just the case and the role I'm in right now. But, but having that stuff to where I can look at what happened during the meeting that I missed, and then be able to contribute to that conversation, maybe, you know, asynchronously, I think, is always a good thing to keep every you know for inclusivity. So,

Jon Caudill 33:38

so I appreciate it.

Erin Crites 33:41

Sorry, Jack.

Jack Reed 33:42

Oh, no, just kind of one important piece in regards to that is, you know, there's the requirement that we comply with Colorado's, you know, Sunshine Law, and so that's, you know, that is where we make sure that all of the information that we're discussing and making decisions on is public and so, and this is where, you know, to what you just what you just said, that interaction with email, you know, those are things that we're going to need to make sure also become public. You know, like in our minutes, they may need to be included. And so that's, you know, that's you know, that's obviously another really important piece is our compliance with open meeting laws.

Erin Crites 34:28

Thanks Jack, that website that will be up where we post all of our meeting information and minutes and things like that available. So we'll just keep pointing people there so no one person is responsible for ensuring the same information gets to everybody through email sources or otherwise, and we can send emails around and documents. We will just need to summarize those conversations that happen in a public forum. So there, I have found that using Google Docs is not always super helpful, because if you don't have Gmail, they don't share nicely, and it's really challenging. I think y'all saw that Google form. And so we'll try and avoid working inside of Google Docs or things like that, just because of the nature of sharing those outside of the Google Platform participation.

Kelli Burmeister 35:34

And I know you said, Thursdays, Erin, was it the first and third? Thursdays,

Whitney Leeds 35:49



## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

second and fourth? Was what you said, second

Kelli Burmeister 35:51

and fourth. Okay,

Jack Reed 36:03

Erin, you're not muted, but we can't hear you. There we go.

Erin Crites 36:10

better now,

Jack Reed 36:11

yes,

Erin Crites 36:13

my mic takes a second to connect. Okay, yeah, so it is the second and fourth Thursdays, yeah, and I will get those sent out right away after this meeting. I just wanted to verbally communicate that before spamming you all with invites and then having folks go, "No," that was not what I intended. Folks are busy, it was very hard to find a time that even kind of worked for anyone. So we will work on keep engagement going, even with folks have to miss parts of meetings or whatever. Any other so Jon mentioned having some space with the outside of direct meetings to collaborate, just with a recognition that we'll need to make sure all that information is made public before decisions are made on it. Any other thoughts on ways to keep us moving forward?

Jack Reed 37:33

One thing I think I'd like to talk to the group about, sometimes they put specific rules, meeting rules in legislation, around how they have to be conducted, what's a quorum, all of those things this legislation did not necessarily do that, which I mean, personally, I'm under favor of, but it does mean that we need to to figure that out. So I know we'll be figuring out who a working group chair is in a minute. But I don't know if this is something that folks want to discuss. You know, I guess the first question from a decision making point of view is, do we want to do it by just kind of like a consensus model, or do we want to have formal Roberts Rules of Order, type of voting? Or will it depend on the nature of the decision being made? I throw that out to the group. What are your preferences?

Jon Caudill 38:35

Jack, I appreciate a question from very important for our process and how we move forward. I I'm kind of a favor of the flexible Roberts Rules Model, which is somewhere in between the the, you know, the, I think, or maybe just a minimum, right, if we're going to make decisions on things, I mean, if we're, if we're, I think we can, I think this, in my mind, the threshold standard could be lower if we're working through things, but if we're making decisions that will have an impact on the direction of or the inclusion or exclusion or whatever, then it seems like to me, we want to have the voice of the work group, I think, because at the end of the day, what we produce will be only as good as the support of it, of the work group. And you know, the belief that this was a process, a fair process for government. So that's just my I don't have an answer for you necessarily, but that's kind of where I was flying at.

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

Jack Reed 39:32

Okay, so then to that point when we do have formal meetings, I mean, kind of one of the standards is 50% plus one for quorum, and that's, I mean, that's kind of, that's a, you know, unless there's a need to do some kind of super majority, I'm generally in favor of that. Does anybody have any objections to that for a quorum? I.

Whitney Leeds 39:59

Yeah, I would maybe put in a caveat. So I agree with Jon's point. I think the to have the conversation, you know, sort of like the conversations and the discussions. I think, in my mind, a quorum of 50% plus one makes sense, I think, for the issues that we need to vote on, though, and looking at the sort of statutory makeup of the work group, you know, we have to have representatives from four different sort of divisions from within the state. And then there are essentially four different roles for folks, either from higher education or from community based organizations. I don't have much of an opinion on a what a quorum would be for the state representatives. For perhaps y'all might have some opinions on that, but I think for the the sort of, like community side, coming from community based organizations or institutes of higher learning, I would say for for voting, for those issues that, like, really, really require a vote, I would say we would need three out of four of those people for that. I think that that's how we should maybe consider a quorum for just for the voting for discussions. I would be okay with just like 50% plus one of the general group without more sort of delineation. Yeah.

Jon Caudill 41:23

It may be really hard for us to get a 75% vote on within that sub population. I think a super majority is two thirds and generally standing so I would, I would hate for us to get in a situation where we create a hurdle that we can't balance. So I do, I do appreciate the sentiment. I'm not sure about the numbers,

Whitney Leeds 41:47

though, and to be clear, I didn't mean for a super majority on the vote itself. I just mean in terms of how many people we would need to be present. Oh, okay, I think still a regular volume would be okay, as long as we have at least three out of four of those community folks in the room. Okay,

Jon Caudill 42:04

Sorry, I misunderstood, so you're talking about the core measure,

Whitney Leeds 42:08

exactly? Yeah. Okay,

Jon Caudill 42:09

thanks for clarifying.

Erin Crites 42:12

One of the things we can do to help with that, and we've used this approach in the past group is to be very clear about which meetings will be voting meetings versus informational meetings, and to make sure that people who really need to be present at certain meetings or portions of meetings know when that is, to try and schedule that as best as possible, even if it means kind of some flexibility in other spaces and I don't know, and I think the group can talk about this,

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

because, again, it wasn't clear in the statute, if there's an opportunity for remote voting, as long as we capture it in writing. I know we've done that on other task forces and working groups in the past as well. So I don't know where that fits. Well,

Jon Caudill 43:05

I know that this is kind of off the topic of quorum and measures, but maybe I don't know what the agenda will look like for work group meetings, but being specific about time. So if we're voting on stuff to allow people to if they can't make the whole meeting to I think you're making that point. Aaron, so I support that idea.

Erin Crites 43:23

Yeah, and that would be something as bad the staff to this group work. I will end up working with the chair to create those agendas and put some time stamps on, on those meetings so that it's very clear when we have presentations from outside stakeholders, when it's group discussion, and when there's a formal vote. And I think as the group moves forward, we need to kind of pack a lot of that formal voting into one meeting that everyone commits to attending. We could do that. That's exhausting, I know that. But if that's, if that's the way it needs to work to ensure that we have all of the voices at the table, I think this group can work together to make sure that those things happen and that give ourselves some cushion at the end, so that if we need to kind of push a vote back by a meeting or so, that that's an option as well, until we get to the very end, and then it might not be an option, but then we might use remote voting.

Jack Reed 44:25

One other piece we could consider for the purposes of both the Quorum of a quorum for voting would be allowing for proxies. And you know, I think that from from my perspective, from both, from an Open Meetings perspective, I I honestly think proxies do a better job making it clear what the organization is saying on the matter. Email is great, and you can make it public, but I think that probably proxy votes actually give the public a better sense of how a given agency stands in the context of the meeting in the time the meeting is occurring. So I also kind of, and then the next piece is also, and this is, I guess, for the state folks. Do we want to make it three out of four state agencies who are also present to be able to vote. So that would actually get us to three quarters for for a quorum, which, I mean, there's only eight of us, so it shouldn't be that hard, especially if we allow proxies. So I guess those are my two questions about proxies, and then about three out of four for state members.

Aaron Stewart 45:46

I think the proxy concept makes sense to me for all the reasons you mentioned Jack and at great risk of elevating the importance of state agencies in this conversation, unintentionally, I know that, for example, myself being a sole representative of the entire judicial branch, feels a little bit difficult. If, say, I was unable to make a meeting, and we'd have three out of four of us around to be able, I mean, the proxy might resolve that to an extent anyway. So as long as if we're talking about proxies counting within that three quarters, then I suppose that that might ameliorate that issue to some extent. But yeah, certainly would love to anytime we're coming to a vote that's going to be impactful. Would love to be able to have myself or representative present, and would hate to have a vote that comes up without at least myself or someone able to attend.

Erin Crites 46:46

It sounds like there's some consensus here on this part, right, but with such a small group of single representatives from

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

very large parts of organizations and representing quite large groups of individuals and safeguards, but having everyone be as available as possible to be present, which requires some organization and advanced planning from a group. From a structural standpoint, I can help facilitate that for folks as best as possible.

Kelli Burmeister 47:24

I also support what Jack suggested, too, with the state agencies, and having three of the four there and present to be able to counter any of those conversations. I think that's a smart idea.

Dave Wolfsgruber 47:48

I concur as well, especially for consistency with the community based and higher education institutions as well. So three out of four, in my opinion, is very reasonable.

Erin Crites 48:04

Thanks, Jack for bringing up that decision making conversation. We'll make sure we write all of that down and get that in the minutes to kind of memorialize some of those and just for folks reference, obviously all minutes will get sent out to you all for review. Mistakes get made, things get mischaracterized. Please provide feedback and edits to those before we post them, so that anything that's posted really does reflect the happenings of the meeting and the decisions made by you all of the working group. So that will that will happen, ideally, a week of the meeting, so that wait for review before the next meeting.

Kate Lemasters 48:44

I've a quick question on the proxy voting. I don't know if maybe it's different for Jon, but in the higher education space, I'm not sure quite what a proxy vote would be, because I'm not really in an organization in the same way, maybe of people that do similar work of what, how that would look, but maybe I'm just missing something.

Jon Caudill 49:16

I have several ideas around how we would process a proxy vote, but I'd like to hear from Erin or Jack or someone that is kind of more in tune with what the expectations of a committee, how that would work. Could, for example, someone else on the committee carry someone's proxy vote, as opposed to someone from the organization for which they represent, because I think that's more common in our environment, where somebody else in the meeting would carry a proxy vote for someone.

Erin Crites 49:50

That's what I've seen it happen. Jack, I don't know if you have a different understanding of how it works. That's how I've seen it happen in other working groups and task forces, or they'll send a representative. But I know that's different in some of the organizations that are small, a little bit harder to do.

Jack Reed 50:10

I mean, I think, I think what, what I would recommend, is that we, we give a preference for sending a proxy from that organization, if that's possible, if it's not possible, then allowing for a proxy vote to be carried by another member of the group. So I think, you know, framing it that way gives flexibility to it. So, I mean, you know, So Aaron, I mean, I know the the state folks on the line, you know, we represent very large organizations and that are either in the executive branch

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

or the judicial branch, and you know, are, you know, answer to a whole lot of folks. So I don't think any of us would probably not have a person there, but I totally understand for for you as well as you know, for Christy and potentially Whitney. I don't know how big your organizations are. Whitney, if you know, identify another person to do it would be, would be easy, but I think that's how I would frame it, a preference for a person, but then the ability to just send it as, send your vote to someone else on the group.

Erin Crites 51:25

Yeah. Perfect. Okay, so, yeah, we'll get that kind of memorialized in the notes and have that be our preference. And I think we have a small enough group, which is a challenge. It's also can be helpful where we can, I think, work together to ensure folks availability for those really important voting meetings or portions. I guess I'm still going to live in the land of hopeful. We don't have to get too far down the proxy vote path that will be able to work a lot of it out with scheduling. Okay, now we're off our agenda real quick. We'd like to have the conversation about a chair for the working group. We'd like for you all to pick someone to chair these meetings. I think, kind of the thought on that chair role, which is always open for discussion and adjustment, is that this individual would help, kind of facilitate meetings, obviously, would meet with me to help kind of craft an agenda for that meeting And the timing of things on that agenda. And those types of pieces DCJ will be staff, so we will do all the administrative side of this meeting organization, but really want to chair someone from the working group to help facilitate the conversation, and we can talk about different ways that that might go that might be helpful for whoever selected as chair to facilitate those and then they also kind of obviously facilitate a voting process when that comes up with the meeting. But again, we will take on all the administrative stuff, so that shouldn't be a concern for anyone who might be interested in chairing this group. So, self nominations, nominations volunteering to others. Christy has already said, No, thank you, although she wouldn't be the first to be voted on in her absence.

Jon Caudill 53:39

Erin, I'll volunteer to do it as long as nobody else wants to do it, and the there's the group is good with it. I do have to be very open and transparent that I have a pretty hectic schedule and and so, you know, there may be times that I may not be able to be there for the whole meeting. If, if that's been so happy to fall on the sword on this one for folks. But I don't want anyone to feel like that. I that, you know, I really want to do this, and I would really rather support somebody else and be in a cheer roll. But if, if it works out this way, then I'm willing to do it.

Erin Crites 54:22

And, you can always talk about a vice chair. It's a small group, so wasn't initially planning on one. But if that's something that would be helpful for anyone else on here who would like or somebody who would like to chair but isn't quite sure about taking it on wholly, taking another vice chair role could be helpful as well for both balancing

Jack Reed 54:47

and one thing too is, you know, when, when this bill came forward, one of the reasons we put no fiscal note, no fiscal impact on it, is because, you know, oftentimes the fiscal impact is hiring a formal facilitator with expertise in the topic. Erin has that expertise in this topic, and so, you know, when we, when we kind of envisioned this working group, you know, I think that it's her, one of her roles in this is also to assist in facilitation. You know, obviously she's a member of DCJ, but I also think that you know, to Whitney's point about making sure that this isn't overwhelmed by state, state folks and, you know, making sure that our community members and our higher education members, you know, are

## TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting

November 18, 2024

always, you know, equally as impactful, that there's not going to be any overwhelming state, you know. And I know that because I know that that's been an issue that's been raised in other groups. And so, you know, I think that while you would be the chair that there's all, there would also be the the, you know, assistance from DCJ for for facilitation.

Dave Wolfsgruber 56:10

So I would absolutely support Jon. And if it's necessary, be happy to support you Jon. And if it's a, if it's necessary, in a vice chair or just a support role doesn't have to be a formal designation, but I'd be happy to support you. Thanks,

Jon Caudill 56:25

David, appreciate that.

Jack Reed 56:36

Do we want to do a vote really quick?

Erin Crites 56:40

Anybody else wrote before jumping want to, want to give some folks some time to respond and process information. Okay,

Jon Caudill 57:00

Erin, I'm happy to jump off the call too, that way that people can have a frank conversation about, you know, all those decisions as well. So let me know if that's what you prefer. I think.

Erin Crites 57:13

I think this group, knowing what I know about everyone on here, can have a conversation in your presence if they needed to.

Jon Caudill 57:20

Very good,

Erin Crites 57:22

yeah.

Jack Reed 57:25

So I'll make the motion so then we can have conversation. So I move Dr Jon Caudill as chair of the Alternative Metrics Working Group.

Whitney Leeds 57:34

Second.

Jack Reed 57:42

I mean, I mean, I don't know, as the person who moved it, I don't know if I can say anything at the beginning, but I'm in very much in favor of of Dr Caudill as the the chair. I think having a non state person as the Chair has has some real value

## **TRANSCRIPT: Alternative Metrics Working Group Meeting**

November 18, 2024

and and he's also, you know, a really smart person who could do a great job. So there's that too.

Jon Caudill 58:05

No need to oversell it now, Jack,

Kelli Burmeister 58:09

thank you for putting your name in the hat. That's really appreciated, and I want to echo what Jack said as well. It's nice to have a chair from a higher ed perspective. I think that'll be really beneficial for the group. So thank you. I know schedules are hectic, so it's hard to throw your name in the hat, so I appreciate that. Thanks.

Erin Crites 58:55

I'm terrible with Robert's Rules

Jack Reed 59:00

Okay, so I'll I will call, if discussion is ended, I will call a vote to appoint Dr Jon Caudill as chair of the alternative metrics to Criminal Justice success working group. Raise your hands, or your virtual hands if the answer is yes. I have a quorum, and we have a unanimous vote in favor.

Erin Crites 59:32

Thank you, Jon. Appreciate it. We'll let Christy know that she wasn't volunteered in her absence. She will be appreciative of that. I just realized we are overdue on our time. I don't think we have anybody on here for public comment, but that will always be a stand in in our meeting, everyone on is from ORS, so I think we're okay there any last comments for the good of the cause?

Jon Caudill 1:00:01

Thank you all for the faith. I hope I live up to it. I appreciate being on this work group. It's important to me, so I appreciate everybody else's work on it too,

Erin Crites 1:00:15

and you'll get sick of hearing from me, because we'll coordinate administrative details.

Jon Caudill 1:00:21

Awesome.

Erin Crites 1:00:23

All right, thanks everyone. Appreciate your time. Apologies for going over and I will get more information sent out to you in the mix a little bit.