Meeting Minutes March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

# MINUTES

#### ATTENDANCE

**Appointed Members:** Jon Caudill (University of Colorado, Colorado Springs), Jack Reed (Division of Criminal Justice), Aaron Stewart (Division of Probation Services at Judicial), Dave Wolfsgruber (Department of Corrections), Whitney Leeds (Above Waters Project/Growing Home), Kelli Burmeister (Division of Youth Services), Kate LeMasters (University of Colorado, Anschutz)

Absent Members: Christie Donner (Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition)

**Guests:** Linda Harrison (Division of Criminal Justice), Kaylynn Duncan (Division of Criminal Justice), Yolanda Alvarez-Montello (Division of Criminal Justice), Mike Tessan (Parole Board), Russha Knauer (MINDSOURCE Brain Injury Network)

Staff: Erin Crites (Division of Criminal Justice)

#### Overview

The Alternate Metrics Working Group meeting focused on several critical areas related to juvenile justice and behavioral health. The session opened with the approval of last meeting minutes and to send approvals via email. Jack showcased a scatterplot visualization of the utility and feasibility scores for the concepts the group previously identified. The group discussed the need for SME consultation on data collection in areas with a low feasibility score. Identification of conceptual feasibility versus practical attainability, resulted in a focused review of the short-, medium-, and long-term feasibility of measuring concepts. The group reviewed innate challenges of data collection and made recommendations to address barriers. The group identified agencies as SMEs to reach out to for data feasibility and attainability. Action items were assigned including SME outreach, metric categorization, and Jack and Erin agreeing to create measurable examples of metrics for the group to review. Overall, the meeting emphasized gaps in concept feasibility knowledge, the need for SME consultation, categorizing short term and long-term recommendations for data collection, and specifying the feasibility of measuring concepts from aspirational to attainable.

#### Notes

#### **Introductions and Meeting Setup**

- Meeting began with introductions from all participants
- Jon Caudill serving as chair but noted he'd need to leave mid-meeting with Dave taking over
- Group noted they don't have a quorum to approve previous meeting minutes

# **Meeting Minutes**

## March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

#### Initial Scoring Results Review

- Jack Reed presented visualization of the utility and feasibility scores for alternative metrics concepts
- Concepts clustered around 7-8 for utility but showed more variation in feasibility
- Success on parole/probation metrics scored high in both utility and feasibility
- Zeros in feasibility scores indicated members lacked information to assess certain concepts
- Group discussed handling zeros in scoring; they were included in averages but depressed scores
- Jack agreed to make changes to identify feasibility scores with zeros removed to identify feasibility according to those with the knowledge to assess it.

#### Analyzing Scoring Results

- Whitney Leeds noted she scored items higher on feasibility if they required only adding participant questions to existing processes
- Conversation about a metric's conceptual versus practical feasibility emerged
- Members agreed on need to identify subject matter experts (SMEs) to address knowledge gaps on feasibility
- Discussion about categorizing metrics into short, medium, and long-term aspirational goals
- Housing concept:
  - Whitney Leeds highlighted housing as critical success factor with severe systemic barriers
  - Dave Wolfsgruber noted limitations of housing resources for justice-involved individuals
  - Group discussed the need to address data system connectivity challenges between agencies, administrative burdens of updating data systems, and misunderstandings of data being hurdles in statewide data collection
  - Whitney emphasized the lack of political will to address the housing crisis despite its impact on recidivism
  - Members discussed how these metrics could help demonstrate return on investment for housing investments

#### Identifying SMEs and Data Sources (the SME conversation was moved up in the agenda)

• Jack noted that zeros in feasibility scores help identify where SMEs are needed

## **Meeting Minutes**

## March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

- Group identified needs to consult with community corrections, OBH, DOC, CDLE, and other agencies as SMEs for metric's feasibility
- Dave offered to bring in DOC staff including Lindsay Compton and transitional services representatives
- Discussion about collecting data through surveys and acknowledge implicate challenges of survey collection
- Kelli Burmeister suggested bringing in other state agencies like CDPHE and Department of Revenue
- Dave volunteered to bring in DOC prison operations and transitional services representatives
- Kelli suggested involving other state agencies and exploring survey options
- Group proposed standardized questions for agencies as part of SME outreach and participation requests
- Jon suggested having Kate LeMasters share expertise on public health data integration
- Jack and Erin agreed to lead SME outreach for agencies identified unless group members had professional relationships to agency SMEs and could make those requests

## **Systemic Integration and Perspectives**

- The group engaged in a discussion on parole release. Dave explained that people who 'max out' their sentences are entitled to reentry services, but many don't use them. All individuals who will be released have access to pre-release services while in prison.
- Whitney suggested including policy recommendations about depth of reentry services
- Group discussed data collection challenges for those no longer under supervision-they may be difficult to locate or uninterested in participating in data collection.
- Group agreed to flip agenda to discuss SME stakeholders before categorization

# Survey Methodologies and Data Collection

- Whitney suggested offering incentives for survey participation (e.g. tickets for a drawing)
- Group discussed involving database managers and line-level officers as SMEs
- Kate suggested utilizing Medicaid data as many returning citizens are enrolled
- Discussion about leveraging Colorado Lab expertise for data integration (Jack and Erin will reach out to them).

# **Meeting Minutes**

# March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

#### **Categorization Approach**

- Group decided to create both immediate and aspirational recommendations
- Agreement to note policy barriers in the final report
- Jack presented updated visualization with zeros removed from averages
- Group noted juvenile justice metrics scored lower partly due to low representation
- Discussion about identifying metrics that fell below threshold scores to start the process of identifying measures to recommend
- Decision not to eliminate low-scoring metrics yet until further analysis—feasibility scores may change with more information.

## **Categorization of Metrics**

- Discussion about what categories to create for organizing metrics
- Group agreed to maintain all metrics in the report appendix regardless of scores
- Recommendation to examine metrics from individual, system, and community perspectives
- Discussion of 'administrative success' as a category for certain measures
- Whitney suggested including focus groups to understand how participants define success

# **Discussion of Engagement in Programming or CJS Process Metrics**

- Dave discussed feasibility of measuring engagement with case managers
- Explained that while some proxy data exists (employment, housing), deeper engagement metrics require manual entry and review of narrative case notes
- Discussion around potential recommendations for DOC to modify metrics collectionother criminal-legal and supervision agencies could make changes to data systems to collect information.
- Dave offered to identify people from DOC who could provide expertise
- Explanation that some data might exist but isn't readily accessible

# **PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment

# WRAP-UP AND ACTION PLANNING

- Jack and Erin committed to creating specific measures for broader concepts
- Jack will make suggestions about categories for group to react to via spreadsheet
- Dave agreed to inquire about SME availability for the next meeting

# **Meeting Minutes**

#### March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

• Plan to continue refining alternative metrics while beginning SME outreach

#### Action items

### Jack Reed

• Update the visualization to remove zeros from feasibility scoring

## Dave Wolfsgruber

- Start making inquiries about Subject Matter Expert availability from DOC for next meeting
- Bring in Lindsay Compton to future conversations about data availability
- Identify staff from transitional services unit who can speak to engagement metrics

## **Erin Crites**

- Continue collecting email approvals for previous meeting minutes
- Create specific measures for broader concepts to focus group attention
- Make suggestions about categories for group to react to via spreadsheet
- Share updated Tableau link with the group via email
- Add column for feasibility timeframes (short/medium/long-term) to the spreadsheet
- Reach out to Colorado Action Lab regarding data integration

#### Whitney Leeds

• Help identify people with lived experience who could provide input

#### ADJOURN

- <u>Alternative Metrics Working Group website</u> houses information, agendas, minutes, and meeting links for this working group. Feel free to share this site with any interested stakeholders so they can stay informed.
- Meeting adjourned at Noon
- Next Meeting: April 10, 2025, 9am 12:00pm Future meetings, as necessary: 4/24, 5/8, 5/22, 6/12, & 6/26.

#### MANDATES

#### Pursuant to 24-33.5-535, C.R.S. (Senate Bill 2024-029) the working group shall:

- Be appointed no later than November 30, 2024.
- Convene first meeting by February 1, 2025
- Meetings shall allow for remote participation

# **Meeting Minutes**

## March 27, 2025 | 9:00am-12:00pm Hybrid: Zoom & 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room

• Submit a report by July 1, 2025, that summarizes the efforts of the working group and any recommendations

### The working group is required to:

- Study metrics and methods, other than recidivism, to:
  - Supplement current measures including those related to desistance (severity and timing) and risk reduction.
  - Comprehensively measure successful outcomes that consider various aspects of life (e.g. employment, housing, education, mental health, personal well-being, social supports, and civic and community engagement).
  - Enhance measures of criminal justice system performance and adherence to best practices in supervision program design and implementation.
- Identify methods to obtain information from those involved or recently involved in the system regarding supervision experiences.
- Identify gaps or barriers in data collection, measurement and data matching, and recommendations on addressing these gaps or barriers.
- Create an implementation timeline for these metrics and methods that addresses any data limitations and necessary resources.
- Identify customization of measures to account for age, gender, race, ethnicity, or risk of a cohort.