

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Attendance: Dave Wolfgruber (DOC-Parole), Michael Campbell (University of Denver), Kellie Burmeister (CDHS-DYS), Jeff Wise (Remerg), Greg Saiz (DOC-Parole board), Aaron Stewart (State Judicial)

Absent: Katie Ruske (CDPS-DCJ-OCC)

DCJ Staff: Erin Crites, Linda Harrison, Jack Reed

Guests: Valarie Schamper (CDPS-DJ-OCC)

Erin Crites 00:14

We are going to just jump right in. I sent out an email last week, end of the week before, with some kind of general summaries. Thank you, Kelli for following up with some additional information and feedback on that. So you think what we will do we can forego introductions, because it's the usual suspects here, and everybody's names are on their zoom so it'll catch up with our transcription. And then the minutes from last meeting. I need to do one more review of those before they're finalized. If anybody has anything from those. The minutes are similar to what I sent out in that email, which is kind of where we landed at the end of last meeting around kind of the points to begin tracking and the cohorts to track feel like those are a bit more solidified for DOC and parole from a conceptual standpoint, Com Cor is tricky. DYS is tricky. Probation is tricky. We still need to kind of do a little bit more conversation around those points. So just wanted to check in see if there's anything right at the top of folks' brains about DOC and parole before we kind of put those to bed for the time being, and really spend the first part of our meeting kind of talking with probation in particular, um, around their points to begin tracking, and the cohort to track. And then circle back to DYS, because we really didn't get to have those conversations last week. So anything kind of burning in people's brains about DOC and parole as it relates to the points to begin tracking and the cohort to track. Yeah, Greg

Greg Saiz 02:30

There. Thank you for bringing this all together, and apologies to everybody for not being able to make last meeting. I just, this is kind of a maybe slicing hairs, but as far as at risk in the community. There is sort of a wrinkle with inmates in community corrections. They're technically in community and technically at risk for possibly committing a new offense. So I don't know if that got discussed. I just would didn't see the kind of delineation. Everything else looks perfect as far as DOC goes, but that's such a weird middle ground for inmates to be in two worlds at once.

Erin Crites 03:06

Yes, and we did talk about that at the last meeting a little bit. And I think kind of, and again, please correct me if I misunderstood, kind of where we landed on this. The conversation was really around the easiest way, from a technological standpoint, because of the way the data are captured, is to look at that "I" versus "P" distinction in those in those numbers. So who, who do we start to follow? We follow people who are out, are no longer in, DOC's custody at that point, and so I think that's where we landed. However, we had a long and lengthy discussion, and I could have missed it, Michael, I know you wanted to talk about this a little bit more too

Michael Campbell 04:05

Well I, before I guess, one thing that might help with the context here. Can we get an idea of how many people we're talking about in these populations. Are we talking about, and I don't mean exact, I'm just talking about, are we talking about hundreds or a couple of thousand people, or are we really talking about 150 people in this relatively unique space? Because if we are I guess slicing the hairs seems less relevant.

Erin Crites 04:06

I'm going to pull up my notes and see if I put some numbers in there. If not, I think we have Val on from Com Cor. She could probably ballpark it for us, for the number of folks roughly, that are on inmate status in the Com Cor, we don't have our DOC data person today.

Valarie Schamper 05:07

Yeah, I can pull up numbers here in just a second for you.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

David Wolfsgruber 05:12

Yeah, Lindsay's on annual leave, just so everyone's aware she's who was on last time from OPA.

Michael Campbell 05:21

I just also, I had sent an email to Erin about this, just saying, I also appreciate Dave made the point when we were having this discussion about this. This, you know, this could be a real bag of worms, a can of worms that, when you open it up and start slicing into status and levels of status. So I certainly don't want to, I don't know, stop the process of discussing these things by, you know, over complicating things. But I do think that at the end of the day, you know, making sure we don't leave some strange gap where, you know, a critic of these efforts could review what we did and say, look, there this, these people approved a redefinition of recidivism, and they don't even count people who they claim are inmates who are out and able to do things and and then it could undermine all this, and that that's really, you know, something I think we just have to be conscious of. And but again, if we're talking about very small numbers, you know, maybe it has its own, its own pot.

Erin Crites 06:23

I mean, while Val's looking for those numbers. I think the other part that we talked about as well is that a lot of those folks will get captured in recidivism at some point, maybe just not in DOC's numbers. And so that's, I think, where our system gets tricky. And we had talked about creating a flow chart. I started it. It reinforces how complex the system is. For as long as I've been around, I struggled, and I hit DYS and was like, oh boy, this is where my knowledge isn't very deep, but it gets complicated. But I think one of the things that was highlighted at our last meeting is that we will end up capturing recidivism for everybody at some point. It's just trying to if we start right, pulling these populations out, they may not count from DOC but they might show up in Com Cor's population, or they'll show up in parole's recidivism numbers, but maybe not in kind of that one DOC tracking cohort. And how do we then explain that to to folks who don't have that intimate knowledge of the system and how people move in between all of these populations where the lines aren't so clear. Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 07:58

I also have a clear realization that we may be double counting individuals as well, depending upon kind of the follow up period that we agree on. Yeah, an individual may recidivate and it'll be a hit on two different systems, so to speak. So I think, yeah, it's just so complex that we have to just accept that we will capture individuals, and we may also double count individuals depending on, like I said, the other methodology decisions that this group goes with, yeah,

Jack Reed - CDPS 08:37

I think we're likely to triple count anybody who's transitioning, really, because it's going to be DOC, Com Cor, or parole.

Erin Crites 08:51

So I think this, this conversation in particular. I know it's centered around the DOC versus parolee issue, but it will become relevant, I think, for other parts of our conversation as well, is what limitations do we state right, like documenting this decision making process, the reasons for making certain decisions that this group makes, what the limitations of those are? And then, you know, if we, if we choose to, I think we still could vet them with some other folks and say, hey, if this were the decision that were made, what would be some of the criticisms that would come and see if there's space then to circle back and either address those by tweaking some decisions or finding ways to describe those limitations so that it at least meets the needs of the critics. By saying, this isn't perfect, we recognize the limitation of it does this justification and description of the process. So the decision kind of suffice to calm that concern. Yeah, Greg,

Greg Saiz 10:13

thanks and thanks for the level set here. I think still have flashbacks to recidivism data being used as a bludgeon, not a description. So the as of December 31, 2023 so I don't know how obviously, it's a little bit of a moving target, but as far as end of 2023, DOC had a combined, combined male female of 976 clients in community corrections and other inmate

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

location, and that could be jails, that can be hospitals, that can be everything, 320 and then 116 ISPI inmates, so those are folks who are in the community, living in their own homes or with families who have transitioned through community corrections yet not to parole. So pretty good chunk. There almost 1000 bodies.

Linda Harrison 11:19

How many in ISPI?

Greg Saiz 11:20

Uh according to and this might be somewhat dated, Valarie might have more up to date info, but I show 116 that was as of December, 31 2023, so kind of wiggles around a little bit.

Jack Reed - CDPS 11:37

Yeah. So the there are a lot of people who are, you know, at risk in the community of recidivating while they're still on inmate status and, and this was, I think, an issue we talked about Michael and, you know, it kind of think conceptually came to the, you know, are they our responsibility anymore? You know, as one way to to explain it. And you know, while a person's on inmate status, regardless of where they're physically at, there's still, you know, the responsibility of DOC. And so that was kind of how we got to that. And you know, we actually, we did talk about the issue he raised, and the concerns about having someone in the community who is at risk but who would not who would still be considered a DOC inmate.

Valarie Schamper 12:36

And just from my side, those numbers match up. We have a average length of stay around six months in community corrections, very ballpark average. But what that means is we tend to see about 1800 transition clients and community corrections in a year. That number fluctuates, but the last couple years it's been around that

Greg Saiz 13:12

Valarie, the majority of those folks are inmate status, Not condition of parole placement, right? The overwhelming majority

Valarie Schamper 13:23

That's correct.

Erin Crites 13:25

so because I know we had some folks who weren't here last week, I kind of want to confirm, are we generally as a group, comfortable with this idea that the point to begin tracking is centered on, as Jack mentioned, this idea about when the agency is no longer responsible for the individual, that that's the point at which tracking for recidivism would begin. I see some head nods. We had to draw the line somewhere that felt the cleanest conceptually. Practically might still be a different situation, but from a conceptual standpoint, that felt like the most easily explained, as well as relevant for the conversation around this one type of outcome measure, which is why we landed for DOC on when the individual was moved from inmate to parole status. For parole, we talked about when they're discharged from parole supervision. Kind of as of that broad kind of, when would we when could we start counting community corrections, when they're discharged from Community Corrections is when Com Cor is no longer responsible for them. DYS, I know initially we had just barely started that conversation. Kelli, at the end of our meeting last time, and we had talked about discharge, but I think again, similar to Com Cor, there are some nuances to that that maybe we want to talk about for your population in a bit more detail this time. So do you want to jump in and kind of start with your your thoughts on that. I know you put them in the email, but if you'll kind of walk through them for us verbally, and then we can kind of discuss in more detail

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Kelli Burmeister 15:35

when, when we start tracking recidivism. Think that is the cleanest point for us as well. It's what we have been doing traditionally, is our clock starts right at discharge, and that is when our agency's responsibility is over. There is a period of parole right before that, so they are in the community and at risk. But that's similar to our adult parolees as well. So I think it makes it consistent for us as well to start at agency discharge. So I don't want to switch over to the cohort to track until we're ready, but I can start us off, if you'd like me to,

Erin Crites 16:21

let's Oh, was somebody else talking out? Okay, I want to see if we can jump in to probation for that point to begin tracking. Because if we can just settle this bit, it will be helpful, and then we can move into that cohort piece, because that's, I think, where the nuances start to come into play a bit more than that point to begin subject,

Jack Reed - CDPS 16:52

this is, I think, to Michael's question. So there were about, I think, roughly in 2023 think about 950 or so people who terminated from community corrections, who were transition clients, and 27 of those committed a new crime while they were in Com Cor. So the population is pretty big, but the number of people we would be missing by not including them while they were in, in a facility is actually relatively small.

Erin Crites 17:32

Thank you, Jack, that's helpful. Does that help? Michael, from your your data standpoint, yeah, how big of an impact are we missing? Yeah,

Michael Campbell 17:41

yeah, it does. Because, you know, if, from my perspective, as somebody who doesn't understand how the the agencies and the populations, what they look like, what they do, and what's happening with them, you know, obviously populations have different propensities. So if you were telling me that 900 is a big number, if 40% of them are committing new crimes, but if you're saying, I mean, I just assumed, and part of what I said, I think, in the email to Erin, was that, you know, I don't understand exactly what this is, but this space, I'm guessing the folks that are running these agencies have good reasons for having it where it's at, and doing what it does. I and so I suspect that people that are probably less likely to mess things up and cause a bunch of problems for people than other groups, or they wouldn't be there. And so that was, kind of my question. Was not just the number of folks there, but also, kind of, you know, if we are comfortable leaving them in this not precisely defined space, but I also don't want to rob the agencies of successful discharges, either, right? Like, if that's such a low number, there's some degree here that our numbers are, you know, they're never going to be perfect, but you don't want to strip away like a select, you know, cream, creaming the data and taking away the best group, either. So, but I don't want to split hairs over 27 offenses. You know, that sounds to me like a totally acceptable level of gray area in a system and process set of processes that aren't going to be perfect, but those were my concerns. You know, are these high these? It seemed like I could easily infer that they were low risk, but I want to make sure that that was the case, that that was minimum

Erin Crites 19:21

anything real quick, Dave, before we go to you, there's also the piece around the level of kind of containment while in the community at the Com Cor facility is also higher than if they were just at home, so there's a little bit more of that kind of protection as well. They're not in in prison, but they're also not totally kind of in a in a standard community setting, either. So I think there's kind of that balance there as well. All right, Dave.

David Wolfsgruber 20:00

So I'm usually from the realm of smoothing out wrinkles, not adding them. But I just want to make sure we're all crystal clear on the decision to wait until the individual is off parole for just to use a general in this most general sense, completed parole supervision, whether the return to DOC on a new crime, or they've successfully completed parole. In

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

the community, we have individuals that are on Lifetime supervision. So if we're waiting on those individuals, we're never going to capture them until the parole board potentially discharges them, whether it's a sex offender, a parolee on parole under supervision for a commission of habitual crime or the offense of murder. So just wanted to make sure everyone's crystal clear that those individuals would not be counted until such time as they cross the threshold of no longer being under supervision, which in the in a three-year recidivism study, we're not going to capture them, or whatever point in time we decide to use those individuals wouldn't be captured. Just wanted to point that out.

Erin Crites 21:01

Yeah, so Dave, I'm going to throw that on our kind of parking lot conversation, because that's a smaller subset right of parolees. And so I'm wondering if we don't make some of these broader decisions that account for the majority of the populations, and then talk about maybe how we address some of these more specific nuances, particularly around that lifetime parole, probation, has something similar that we'd also need to address for them. And maybe, instead of making it part of the definition and Kelli or we, we did this with the juvenile justice reform and Kelli will recall this, we made some methodological agreements around things that we would report or how we would address different types of nuances in the populations that can cleanly fit in a standardized definition, and how we address those lifetime supervision folks could be one of those things. So if we can kind of put a pin in that for for the time being, and circle back to it at the end, once we've made some general decisions, that might help us a little bit if that's if that works for you,

David Wolfsgruber 22:25

it's just it's a larger number than the community corrections realm we just discussed. It's 1100 out of 9500 individuals we have under supervision. So it is a larger number than the community corrections cases. So just to you know, you certainly put a pin in it. Don't want to further, you know, go down another rabbit hole. But just want to mention that those, those individuals, won't be part of this definition, because we're not going to be tracking them, because they're not going to complete parole supervision, either for 10 years, 20 years, or some of them for the rest of their lives. So that's fine. Just wanted to, just wanted to bring that issue to the forefront.

Linda Harrison 23:06

We would capture them from the DOC cohort. However, we're still going to be looking at them while they're on parole. They'll have been discharged for DOC still, if there's interest in examining it, recidivism rates with that population, we'd be able to capture them there.

Erin Crites 23:25

Yes, they would technically be DOC recidivists if they were convicted of a new crime, even while on parole after serving a prison sentence for three years. Yeah, and during that three year period, if that's the term that we decide to use, the other piece that, and we can talk about this in more detail, is right now, we're kind of talking about a post release recidivism rate. We also started down the path, but it muddled, I think our conversation up too much, so we kind of stepped away from it, but we didn't come back to it about a pre release recidivism rate. So what happens while in the program that would be those 27 people that Jack talked about for that one part of Com Cor's population? So maybe less relevant there, but much more relevant if we want to talk about parole and probation in particular, because folks spend a longer time in the community while under supervision at risk to commit a new crime. So those, I think, are the like that's part of that conversation day that we can have after we solidify this kind of when the system is no longer responsible for them. What what new convictions do we see? And then we can come back and talk about what happens kind of while they're in the program or while they're under supervision, if we want to have that be part of this broader definition. As well, which is exactly what we did in the juvenile justice so if that helps as well,

David Wolfsgruber 25:07

yeah, no doubt we're capturing them through CDOC. That's not the tone and tenor of this conversation. We are capturing those. It's just our narrow focus of whether we're counting them or not, and if we're not, just realize there's a

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

pretty substantial number that we're not so they are being captured absolutely, as are Max outs. So just for this narrow focus, I just wanted to raise that [inaudible].

Linda Harrison 25:35
lifetime supervision

Greg Saiz 25:37

to Dave's point, and I'll stop talking after this, that number is going to increase there. There are some changes to the SOTP inside. It's going to start pushing more and more clients out the door onto the LSA aspect of their supervision in the community. So that's, that's probably, I'd say, three to six months out, when we start seeing those numbers really bump up. So just a heads up for folks

Erin Crites 26:02

that's helpful, Greg, because that will be squarely when this starts to take effect, and we will want to make sure that either we have a really good answer for why we're not capturing recidivism during that timeframe for that particular agency, right for parole and for probation, or what the approach is going to be to capture that while folks are under supervision. So we'll make sure we circle back to that conversation as well. Okay, I am going to put Aaron the hot seat now to talk about from probation standpoint this point to begin tracking, kind of like at what point is judicial no longer responsible?

Aaron Stewart 26:47

It feels a little bit more straightforward for our agency than most. This is a nice part of this conversation, more so than the next one, but yeah, I think termination from supervision is a pretty clean cut point for probation, which is how we've been doing it. I think kind of what we talked about originally, and I think our first or second meeting, so that's that's honestly pretty fitting for us, and seems to match with the ethos behind what we're going for as well.

Erin Crites 27:10

Okay, awesome. [inaudible] Okay, so sounds like we're all on the same page. Then around this point to begin tracking so we can put mark that as done and consider that a win. And now move on to what are likely the much more challenging areas of this and in particular this cohort to track piece. So let's start. I know we talked about this last meeting, and we had some kind of general agreements on the cohorts to track, but we didn't get a chance to have DYS talk in any detail or probation talk in any detail about which cohort to use. So I would like to start there and have those conversations with DYS and probation, and then we can circle back at the end and confirm our kind of general agreements about each of the the agencies, if that works. So Kelli, if you're ready, like to jump into that more nuanced which cohort are we tracking?

Kelli Burmeister 28:37

And yeah, from the last conversation that we had, we kind of went down a couple of different routes and discussing whether we look at people that are in the community and at risk for recidivism, or we look at successfully discharged individuals or individuals that leave an agency's responsibility kind of with that positive or successful outcome, and tracking those, and I just wanted to point out either way, either way works for us. We can implement any of those two decisions, but they are not equivalent, from from our standpoint right now we we track everyone that discharges from our system. There are there are pros and cons to that. We love it because it's very simple. We don't exclude anyone. When we look nationally, around the country, there's so many states that exclude a ton of individuals for various reasons, and a lot of people do just track successful but yeah, it's just nice and clean. It's easy to do all so that's what we've been doing. We do have a fair amount of youth that discharge unsuccessfully from our system. So. But they don't, you know, pick up a new adjudication or conviction. So they do go into the community, and they're done with our done with our supervision. So I just want to make the distinction. Does the group want to track only those successful individuals, or any individual that is in the community and at risk for committing any crime, because it'll be a we'll slice our pie a little bit

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

differently depending on what's chosen here. Like I said, Either way is doable on our end. I just want to be clear on that front

Erin Crites 30:43

Yeah, and so I think Kelli, what happens there again, we're reliving some conversations from a few years back is, how do we necessarily determine which of those unsuccessful discharges are in the community, or are no longer in the community because they went to a new placement. For from the DYS standpoint, from the data, is that a distinction that's available so you know that if they discharge unsuccessfully, whether they are still in the community, whether they're in jail, whether they're in DOC, what those distinctions look like.

Kelli Burmeister 31:29

So yeah, that is a little bit complex. We do know at time of discharge, so on their exact discharge, the where they are, and so there are some youth or adults. They're a fair amount or over 18, but are in an adult jail awaiting, you know, awaiting the process to see what is found out on those new charges that they're being held for. So we know on that day where they are, that doesn't mean two days later that they're acquitted on those new charges, and then they are in the community at risk of committing another crime. So that that's a little tricky for us. We do know, like I said, right at the point of discharge, where they are, and is that a community setting? Is it not? But shortly thereafter we would not know.

Jack Reed - CDPS 32:30

And I think this is where the idea to your point. Michael of like creaming the crop of who we're tracking becomes difficult because, you know, if we include people who we know aren't going into the community because they failed, right, then we're not like creaming our population, but we're improving our recidivism rates because those people are no longer at risk to recidivate, right? And so, I mean, I think, you know, it's it's something that it sounds like we're trying to make things look better if we're only looking at successful discharges. But perhaps when we explain that, that also means that this person can be in jail or in prison, we don't know. And if they're in jail or prison, the likelihood of them recidivating for that period of time is much lower, so it would artificially, you know, decrease our rates. And I actually, I'd really like to hear from, from your perspective, what's your opinion on that kind of balance? Michael,

Michael Campbell 33:39

well, I, I mean, we have to accept some imperfections with the data, that, you know, there are no perfect data, and we're not, we're not going to get to that again. I guess that you know, when I'm thinking methodologically about what these data are going to mean and how to collect, how to collect them for, you know, from from a rigorous perspective of being able to trust the conclusions you might draw from recidivism data based on various agencies, you partly depends on the numbers, right? So what is the volume and how much are those numbers of people that fit this very specific criteria? Are they really adequate? Or, I guess it's two things. It's not just the volume. It's also like, is this population especially prone to certain things, right? Or because we don't want to omit a group of people who are very highly likely to to reoffend or commit serious offenses, or whatever it may be, if, if that's the case, it would be, it would really matter. But also, part of this is we accept that it isn't going to be perfect, but we have to justify what these are. And I think you know all of us, it's clear. You all know this better than me, but there's just going to be a lot of caveats. Because across all these agencies and across all these different types of populations and all the different ways that they're handled, we're going to have a pretty long list of those things. And I think that's fine, because this is a complex thing we're trying to do. But I guess as long as Kelli can say, you know that, because I can't see the data over time and understand it, but I would say that, you know, as long as we can look at this and say there's no better way to handle it, or we know that, you know, we're not deliberately excluding numbers, and we're trying to include it, but we can't. Those kinds of justifications are the best you're going to get. And anybody who tells you their data don't have things like that in them, across these you don't trust that person.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Erin Crites 35:40

Well, and I think what this brings up to is that the third bill that was part of this broader recidivism conversation that really didn't go anywhere because of the cost, is the idea of we can't fully track our various populations' time at risk in the community, because it's a challenge to identify when people go in and come out of various settings, particularly our county jails, and what that really looks like from a time at risk perspective. And so it's this is where we kind of get into the data concerns of you know, do we create a definition that we know we can answer with the way that our data are currently structured, with the caveats that we may miss some time when people are at risk, or some time when people aren't at risk, because we don't know that flow in and out of some of our facilities and institutions and jails. Or do we create a definition that is more conceptually sound, but is always going to be imperfectly, you know, produced because we aren't capable of capturing the data in the way that a more perfect definition would require.

Linda Harrison 37:08

And I think there's lots of reasons somebody would drop out of at risk cohort, you know, besides jail and get deported, detained, die, there's the things that we just don't know.

Erin Crites 37:24

Move out of state, I think is one of the biggest ones too, for us.

Michael Campbell 37:27

Yeah, a bunch of these people move.

Linda Harrison 37:32

That's huge.

Erin Crites 37:33

Yeah. So I think, which is why I think we end up landing on, here's the definition that we can capture with all of its caveats. But I also think that this group has the opportunity to say, here's the decision we came to based on the way that the data are currently captured and what's available to report if we really wanted to improve this from where we're at to a better reflection of recidivism that we can capture in our state, we need to talk about some interoperability between the data systems that exist so that it's more accessible for the data analyst to identify the flow in and flow out of time at risk, at least with the systems we have available. Obviously, moving out of state is a bit more challenging, unless we really go down the rabbit hole of, you know, paying taxes, but even that has its own limitations or driver's licenses, registrations and things like that.

Linda Harrison 38:37

We did do a study that looked at people going out of state and track all of our people. And if somebody wasn't identified as being at state, they were not going out there.

Michael Campbell 38:49

That was the next thing I was going to ask there. I'm guessing there are estimates that could be used to make estimates about the numbers or proportions that we have to assume are probably out because of that, and incorporate that into any sort of, you know, validity data, validity concerns, and just state, you know, openly and just directly. That, to some degree, it's not perfect, but we do know, we've done a study X years ago, and we, you know, we know that X percent, 22% of left, then we can guess in the ballpark that that's probably going to keep happening. And to Erin's point, I would add, this reminds me of the conversation I had with the guy from Michigan again. This that, you know, he said exactly what you just said. This is a chance to make sure that the people collecting the data, when there are places that these things can speak to each other that improve it now, while you can, but make sure that, you know, I sure as hell don't want to be the academic back here that doesn't have to do any this work and be like, Oh no, you should do, not you

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

know that that's not going to serve anything, any positive purpose. But certainly, if, where these opportunities exist right now, if it isn't going to happen right now, when's it going to happen? Yeah.

Erin Crites 40:07

Do you want to talk Aaron about your cohort to track, and then we'll again, circle back around and try and come to some agreements with the recognition of the limitations, but hear from probation first,

Aaron Stewart 40:21

sure, yeah, I think very similar things that have been said thus far, conceptually, fantastic idea to want to look at time at risk, operationally, rather difficult for us to accomplish. For similar reasons. We do have people that terminate unsuccessfully, that do end up immediately in the community. Others end up in jail. Others, depending on what is, might even end up in prison. So we have people going to a lot of different places. Successful is very easy. Those are the ones that we know are going into the community. Beyond that, it becomes very difficult for us to track for similar reasons, where people are going when they're coming out, and what that looks like. With the current timing of our report, we already have quite a few people that end up getting a new conviction, adjudication or deferred agreement, that still are not sentenced by the time the one year mark comes up. So we mark them as having recidivated but we can't report on where they're at yet because they just have not been sentenced. And some of those people waiting sentencing are undoubtedly in the community. Others are undoubtedly not in the community, and knowing where they are is also quite difficult. Yeah, so it is a challenge for us to understand where people are at at any given point with a great deal of certainty, and to try to track that down would be impossible. Is a strong word, but extraordinarily difficult.

Erin Crites 41:48

Okay, so that's the tangled web that we need to partially untangle to come to an agreement about how we're going to determine which cohort of individuals who have left the jurisdiction of our agencies we are going to track. So Michael,

Michael Campbell 42:13

I don't know if this is a proper thing to say to people who do have agencies that do very different things, but I'm less concerned about the probation slippage, I guess, in terms of measurement with these because we're generally talking about way lower level offenders. And probably, you know, like, I feel like a you could justify that you have such larger numbers and a large number of those people are also such lower level offenders that I feel like when we have our list of caveats with data collection, it's valid to say it's not realistic with the large volume, and it also isn't worth the resources to to attain that level of precision, and just accept that we can live with that. Shoplifters, guess what? They're probably going to shoplift again. And, you know, no offense, if that's offensive, to say things about the some of the people, because I know many probationers are much more serious. But if there are 20% or 25% and we're missing a little bit of that group that really isn't, realistically the group that people are most concerned about understanding when it comes to how agencies affect people re entering the community and being less likely to commit serious crimes, I think that's again, when it comes to justifying your decisions. Some of that with probation, I would have to think people can just live with that when we're talking about populations that you know, this would be very different. We're talking about serious sex offenders, obviously, right?

Aaron Stewart 43:47

Yeah, I tend to agree. And one of the things that I think also helps with this is the recidivism report that we produce is somewhat robust. It does utilize not unlike Kelli's everyone that discharges we track, and we're able to break out who's in which categories, in terms of the way that they discharge. We have a lot of different data, so we're we try to be as fully transparent as possible around those components of here. Here's everybody. And you want to know about successful who are the ones we know for sure are at risk. Here are some. Here are numbers for successful folks. Here are folks that have a new misdemeanor, felony. Here are folks that terminated unsuccessfully, otherwise, or absconded so that, I think that also helps to mitigate to some extent, like you're talking about

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Erin Crites 44:28
and by risk level,

Aaron Stewart 44:29
yes, by risk level.

Erin Crites 44:32

So again, that's, I think, part of the that other conversation around, what is the definition, and then what are those methodological agreements that the agencies make to try and offset some of the limitations of the definition, and I think that's kind of where we have landed in previous times around. This is going to be our definition, but we will report on the populations in all these different ways to help provide a more well rounded picture of recidivism, even if the definition may leave a bit to be desired in the end.

Jack Reed - CDPS 45:13

Would I mean? Would part of that if we, if we at least in the recidivism presentation said, you know, 30% of probationers terminated unsuccessfully, even if we didn't include them in the cohort to track, that would at least give a sense of the scope of people who we don't know realistically if they're at risk or not. So while it would, it would, it would become a requirement for the reporting for this particular definition, it would allow us to limit ourselves to successful terminations while also acknowledging the number the percent of people unsuccessful. And I think that goes across like all of the all of the agencies, really.

Erin Crites 46:11

Yeah, so from a cohort to track standpoint, the emphasis would be on folks that were successful. Again, DOC, being slightly different people who have left inmate status, but for for the others, the cohort to track would be those who were successfully discharged from those those agencies with the also requirement that there is a reporting of the percentage who were discharged negatively, and we can talk about, if there's more information that we want to provide from that standpoint, and really talking about, I think then would be this conversation of this is the starting point of talking about outcomes when the system works as it as intended, right when people successfully complete their criminal justice program, here's the the kind of the big the big ticket outcome that everybody wants to talk about, and we at least know that. And then for those folks who are not successful, that, in and of itself, is one type of outcome, and then we could consider what that might look like moving forward. Valerie,

Valarie Schamper 47:32

yeah, sorry, forgive me. I was in the last meeting, and I can't even remember it, so this was on me. But so in we talked about how in community corrections, you can successfully discharge, but you're still you're guaranteed to still be on supervision, right? So unless your diversion, your release, is still going to be to probation, parole or ISPI, and we were going to keep those in the cohort just right, and then they would kind of slowly transition what cohort they end up with when they successfully did those things? Is that accurate?

Erin Crites 48:05

Yeah, so I think I'm going to restate it to check my first I think what we talked about for you all is that right, your responsibility ends when they leave community corrections. Those who successfully leave are likely to be in the community, even if they are under some type of supervision, they're still in the community. That would be your cohort to track are those who successfully leave your facilities, and then the other right then parole would still have their timeframe for after they completed parole, if they went to probation, probation would still have their recidivism. But again, this is where that same person could conceivably have DOC recidivism, com cor recidivism and parole. And if we really want to get crazy, some of them do have dual supervision with probation, but we'll for the sake of complexity, go with those three Yes,

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Valarie Schamper 49:06

just confirming my understanding. Thank you.

Erin Crites 49:09

Sure. Okay, so how do people feel? What do people think? Whichever way you'd like to discuss about having success be the cohort for this one particular definitional purpose, with the recognition that it won't capture all the things at all the times

Kelli Burmeister 49:42

from a DYS perspective, it works from a numbers perspective, it just depends on if we continue to see our population shrinking. We do have, I mean, just as for an example, last year, we had 203 youth discharge. From our supervision, and about 40% of those were successful discharges, so right at 80 youth would be in this cohort to track. I think that's okay, but yeah, the "Ns" are getting quite small when we start, you know, dividing them up in between risk levels and other demographics. You know, starting to analyze some of those factors, if we do that. So just, I think it's, we definitely have a method for capturing those successful discharges and following them. So we're on board with that approach. Sounds pretty consistent and defensible from our from our group wide standpoint, but we do have, you know, small ends in that regard.

David Wolfsgruber 50:59

So everything is in the weeds with recidivism, as we all know. So I'm going to, I try to stay out of the weeds, but I don't think I'm successful, but I have to raise a couple just basic operational questions so I fully understand what we're tracking with respect to parolees. I'll use the most simplistic example, the individual gets paroled with a max date of 2026, January 1, 2026, in 2025 the individual was returned as a technical parole violator. Greg revokes them for a term of 90 days. They come back out to us, and then they end their supervision in January 1, 2026 is that a successful parole? Are we looking at folks that don't have any technical parole violations, misdemeanors or new felonies. What are we what are we indicating as success for parolees? What's our benchmark?

Jack Reed - CDPS 51:52

So in the example you just gave, the person did successfully discharge from parole, eventually, right?

David Wolfsgruber 51:59

Well define success. They had a parole violation. The Parole Board decided not to revoke them for the remainder, so they were returned to DOC custody. I mean, we're really patting ourselves in the back for something we shouldn't be personally, but they successfully completed parole in the community after being revoked. So how we define that's my question is, how are we defining success? Or someone, I'll give you another example, someone that's parole is revoked, and they max out while in doc custody. Their term of supervision ends before their parole is revoked. They're back on the new crime. They're not convicted of that new crime. They hit their January 1, 26 max date, so then they're not revoked, but would we consider that to be success, or is it simply someone that serves their entire term of supervision in the community does not have any intersection with the criminal justice system, nor are they returned as a technical parole violator. Is that success? Because I really need to know how we're defining success for parolee

Erin Crites 53:08

so when Lindsay was on last week, because I think she we talked to her about what the data codes look like in the system, and she had mentioned that there is a successful and an early discharge, and that those, from a data standpoint, are likely the way that successful individuals would be defined, and it's suggested kind of that as something to consider for the cohort. How does that fit for your examples?

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

David Wolfsgruber 53:43

I guess I need to have a conversation with Lindsay to see how OPA defines success. Is that again, someone that's revoked comes back out to supervision, doesn't commit a crime. How do we internally? I guess I need to have a sidebar with Lindsay when she returns. But I'm asking my question is to this group, not the way CDOC traditionally defines success, because, just like everyone has their own term and benchmark for how they measure recidivism, rightly or wrongly, we may have a difference of opinion within this group and the way CDOC terms success,

Erin Crites 54:25

yeah, and I think to kind of circle back a bit to Michael's point, one of the challenges that we're trying to address here is what are, what's available in the data systems, and so when right somebody is, you know, terminated from supervision which box gets checked for the reason that that person is being terminated from supervision? And so I think that was kind of where this, that conversation came with Lindsay, was that, you know, there's a successful box, and there's an early discharge box, there's also a revoked for new crime or revoked on a technical and that for the purposes of a cohort to track, we might consider those where the successful or the early discharge box was checked as the reason for the person being done with parole supervision

Linda Harrison 55:16

and just the fact is their revocation, return on a new crime, that box doesn't get checked, and if they did get revoked on a TV that's kind of still part of their parole period. And ultimately, they'll they will be successfully discharged from parole, whether they want to be or not. It's just, I and

Erin Crites 55:43

so I don't know if that helped it all Dave or muddied it more. Because, yeah, I think there's the what happens with the person and what box gets checked in the database.

David Wolfsgruber 55:58

Yeah, maybe I'm asking for, like, trying to grasp a puff of smoke that's impossible to grasp as well. I'm just trying to, for our purposes, narrow down, what are we defining as success? Is it a complete I'm on parole for three years. I don't have a technical parole violation. I don't have an arrest for a new crime, whether it be a misdemeanor a felony. My parole is not revoked. Is that success, or is it success driven by I'm revoked, I come back out and then I complete parole, or I'm revoked, and Greg revokes me for the remainder? You know, that's not a successful case. I, I don't want to take up too much more time. I'm still cloudy on how we're going to define a success for a parolee.

Erin Crites 56:44

Michael, do you want to jump in?

Michael Campbell 56:47

Yeah, I think to Dave's point here, you know, he's asking, Is this, you know, are we trying to identify perfection or, you know, we there's a lot of messiness that's going to be a part of this whole process, and I think this kind of circles all the way back around to the really big picture. Picture here about the way that recidivism is used in a lot of ways that you know, it's going to be used to bash people. It's going to be used to make claims that are probably unfair and unrealistic, both negative and positive. But I, I don't think that the legislature tasked us with this to expect us to have a definition or a measure of success. That would just be that people did everything perfectly. I mean, part of this, I think, is to accept, I think again, coming from the public's perspective, you know, which is not, obviously not, also very imperfect. But in terms of that, I don't think that people are as concerned about some of, you know, some of the things that don't land somebody in trouble. But to Dave's point, you can't omit people who are screwing up in a big way, from the perspective of a parole officer who get revoked repeatedly, and then are simply out of time based on their original charge, and then from a parole officer say, yeah, that was what a client you know, what a you know, that went great. So I guess some of this is always going to be a little bit of murkiness between the perspective of the parole officer and the perspective of

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

what we're being tasked to do, from the legislature's viewpoint, in terms of kind of what good are these numbers in general, knowing that they're likely to be politicized in ways that, you know, we never intended, but that's usually how they get used. That's my thoughts on that.

Jack Reed - CDPS 58:34

And I think to probably Dave's example, the person would still be included in the DOC release cohort. So we would still be tracking, you know, that person's risk and, you know, new criminality in the community. It just they wouldn't count as a successful parolee, but they would count as somebody who's released from DOC. So rather than tracking them in two cohorts, we'd only be tracking them one, but they would still be tracked. So we're even, even, if we're, you know, letting some of them drop off from certain cohorts, they're still, you know, staying as a person in in one of the cohorts.

David Wolfsgruber 59:21

Yeah, I'm not asking for, I completely understand. I'm not asking for an accountability standpoint, because, like the prior conversation, when I said we are tracking them regardless, it's not an accountability standpoint is, what is our definition of success? What do we consider for this group to be a successful parolee? What are we counting? Are we counting the person that's revoked for a technical, great job, eating, committed a crime, or we can't tracking someone that has had a an unremarkable in a good way, parole trial, and they hit the end of the parole trial while they're under supervision, they're no longer under supervision, which is a true great job. Because they didn't commit a technical violation. I understand the whole other bucket. I'm not talking about that bucket just for our group. We keep saying success. What do we mean by success?

Erin Crites 1:00:13

Jeff and then Kelli, I think, is the order I saw,

Jeff Wise 1:00:19

yeah, and I think just add on to what Michael was talking about. I know you made the point about the you know, low level offense might not be as relevant or a community safety concern, but the other consideration when we're talking about recidivism is system accountability. So, you know, we have people maybe, you know, I think it's really important to know, if we have a bunch of people going back to prison on technical violations, maybe that is something to look at as a, as a, as part of the system, so that that would be the other, the other, You know, just to play devil's advocate, I guess,

Kelli Burmeister 1:01:01

yeah, respond to the definition of success. And we did this again, referring back to the juvenile groups that went through this. But we did have to leave kind of those types of decisions up to the individual agencies to define. So I feel like some of the agencies already have a method and a definition of what success is. So I would feel comfortable within this group, like just agreeing to let those agencies decide what success looks like when an individual leaves your system? Because, yeah, it's it's so complex that I think we have to leave some of that nuance to the agencies themselves, but just to throw that out there. And then just responding to Jeff, so were you suggesting that maybe you know, as devil's advocate, tracking everybody? Is that what you were, you were thinking like not not slicing and and choosing a cohort to follow, but just everybody?

Jeff Wise 1:02:17

I think, you know, I talked about this last time in a perfect world. Yeah, I think to me, it's like when you leave custody, that's when that tracking should start. But I understand it's super complex. But I do want to you know Dave shared this New Jersey recidivism report or report, release report, and it's really interesting. I don't know if anyone else took a look at it, but I actually had some questions for Dave on it. But you know why? Why? Why can't we do it like that? You know what? In I don't have as much context or background, I guess. But you know why? What's wrong with how it's currently being done or defined on the DOC side,

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

David Wolfsgruber 1:03:14

it's not that there's something wrong with it, but this group is tasked with a unique assignment that differs from the individual agencies. So if we're going to fall back on how the individual agencies calculate recidivism, whether what's a success, what's not a success, then we might as well just keep doing what we're doing. You don't need a legislative edict to do that is my perspective. So that that's where I'm coming from, is if we're coming up with a universal definition of recidivism, and that's what we're taking this is the recidivism definition for the entire state. Why would we then fall back on three, four agencies to decide what a successful case is or not? Because it could be, I'll just use my example. I could be very self serving and say, I don't care how many times Wolfsgruber revoked in his five years under parole supervision, he didn't commit a new crime. So that's a success. I thought we were I thought one of the charges of this group was to make a singular determination of how we're measuring recidivism across all agencies and departments. So that's where I that. That's what I would respond to, that Jeff is then we're back to where we were prior to this task force, that it's each agency's determination you determine success differently than I do so that we're measuring different elements and putting different benchmarks on what we determined to be successful, which I didn't think was part of this group. I thought this group was to develop a universal schematic for all things recidivism.

Erin Crites 1:04:38

Yeah, so I'm going to jump to Greg and then Dave, I'll, I've got some thoughts that's all right, but I want to make sure Greg gets to speak first.

Greg Saiz 1:04:50

Yeah, yeah. Thank you, Erin, yeah. I think it's a little more nuanced than that. I think we kind of wiggled some some blue, gray areas into the work we're doing today. But Dave, I think it was, I forget who it was, perhaps. Dr Campbell, you know, progress not perfection, right? If it was perfection in terms of what success looks like, nobody would ever be released to parole, at least on any of my agendas, which are full and plentiful. That being said, you know, I think this kind of second half of the work we're doing where we're identifying some alternative metrics to recidivism, I think that might help sort of create some of those avenues where we don't have to look at it as strictly the binary recidivism of pass-fail, right? We can celebrate jobs, we can celebrate healthcare providers, we can celebrate, you know, birthdays, Christmases, whatever holidays are important to people lived right? So those things, it's hard to sell that to the public, because it's not something you can just put on paper and say, Look, everybody's good. Or if you do put it on paper, half the people are going to say, well, we're coddling everybody. It's terrible system. We're not going to win. But I think that in the end, we do win if we're creating situations that allow for better outcomes. So I hear what you're saying loud and clear, and I don't know if we'll ever land on other than like, kind of 1-2-3, years, but within that space, I think we have a lot of opportunity to better define what we're hoping to see, and to just point that would be effectiveness of the systems that we're all working in.

Erin Crites 1:06:19

Thanks for that, Greg, I think that's that's part of kind of the this group is really the charge is to take that event, right that the legislature set for us, the new conviction again for ease, just the same conviction, and then defining kind of that cohort, when we start tracking and how long we track folks for counting that conviction event. So already a very limited definition of recidivism when it's one event, right? We have that one event that we're capturing. I think when we talk about this, cohort issue, and can use success as our example, since that's what we've been talking about, each agency already has to define what success means within their population. So DYS already has to say to terminate successfully from DYS, this is what a youth has to do or has to not do, or a combination of those two things to be considered successful. Similarly for probation and similarly, I would guess, although less familiar with parole, and so I think that's and only because Kelli and I have been having these conversations for years. That's when we talk about the agencies having to determine what success means. It's the policy decision that happens to determine when a person is successfully discharged from that agency's supervision. It's not a for the purposes of this recidivism report, we get to redefine what we mean by success to rig the stats, it really is that policy decision that likely already exists in all of the agencies for determining what it means to successfully complete that supervision program. So at least that's where I'm coming from

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

when I'm considering success. And so if that's different, I think that's an important conversation to have. But so when I think of the agencies determining that it's those policy decisions that already exist for an individual to be considered successful in in that supervision term.

David Wolfsgruber 1:08:47

So, this group is not looking to disturb those individual agency determinations, whether they be too harsh or too self serving. We're gonna leave we're not going to disturb that when we say success, it's the agency's definition of success, not our is that, is that where we're at, where we are,

Erin Crites 1:09:06

that is my understanding, because I think we would need a particular again, I'm mostly familiar with Judicial having worked there that would be a different level of decision Making than anyone in this room could agree to to change probation's definition of successful completion of probation supervision, that would be something completely different from what is that metric of recidivism that we are reporting and who do we report that on? Because it's a whole legal thing about what it means to be successful, right in a lot of these agencies. So that's my understanding, is that we are messing with current policy around when people successfully terminate supervision or terminate from a program. For good or bad, but that's my understanding.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:10:09

I think the legislation would have gotten a lot more pushback had that been one of our tasks to tweak anybody's definition of success.

Erin Crites 1:10:20

Michael,

Michael Campbell 1:10:22

yeah, I agree. I think had, if we had the authority to do that, I probably wouldn't be here. It'd be somebody way more important who could make those definitions and make probation, parole, and all the other agencies adhere to those. But I also have concerns along Jeff's line, and I think Dave saying some of these things as well that you know there what, what use, what good is a recidivism number? Why collect all these data and look at it if the individual agencies can cook the books in certain ways and simply shape things in ways that ignore the real needs of the clients, bury the failures of the agencies, you know, or like I was saying earlier, potentially, cream these things and say, Oh, look how great our program's doing. Because, you know, you can, you can selectively incorporate certain groups and exclude others. But I think the task here, if I if I understand it correctly, and I'm thinking, Erin, I agree with where you're going. I do think that there is a lot of value, though, to us developing a definition of recidivism that isn't binary about success or failure. And I think that was the complexity of the discussion in terms of, I don't think it should simply be success or failure, for being the definition of recidivism for the individual who is on parole, probation or youth services or community corrections, I think it should also be, you know, a consideration that for the agency's assessments of whether things have been a success, to Dave's point, I think we have to accept, and it would be naive to suggest that that it's either success or failure with many parolees, there's going to be a spectrum. There's there's no we don't have the authority or the resources to create a robust assessment kit or tool or process, even if we wanted to, to capture all of those fine grained differences in when things go well or don't, but I think that part of the idea here is that what we're trying to get to is a more usable reflection of agency interaction with clients, and a better way of trying to understand how that relates to broader efforts to improve public safety, Like I think that that's kind of the big picture view of these things. I know, for people like Dave, that's not very helpful, because they have to figure out how this works on the ground. But I think there's going to have to be some trust. But I do think that it's a good point here, that there has to be some scrutiny and some understanding that agencies, you know, in reporting this, our definition should consider that not everyone's going to be as great as the people in this room and as honest and pure of soul as you know all of us. There could be people that are very self interested or politically motivated in the way they collect data, the way they use data. This is going to be a real possibility.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

So to Dave's point. I do think we have to be, you know, as much as we can, a little skeptical about, uh, you know, just saying success. But I also think we have to avoid the binaries, or assuming that we might be able to impose these definitions on the agencies. So that's just kind of how I see this. I don't, there's not going to be a simple answer that one.

Erin Crites 1:13:44

Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 1:13:47

I appreciate that discussion very much, and I think the only way that we avoid that is we check for everybody, and we don't take a sub cohort, we just calculate a rate on everyone the respective agencies. From a from a personal standpoint, I was weary of just focusing on our successful clients. There's other states that do that, and we absolutely see that as creaming the recidivism rate. And I believe each of our agencies are charged with, you know, improving public safety, and yes, we probably did well with those youth and individuals that leave a system successfully, but we're also charged with improving public safety for those that didn't do so well in our system. So I think that, I mean, it's just a very clean way to do it is to include everyone in those cohorts that goes along with a lot of limitations that we would need to spell out for each agency, I know, but we may be, you know, seen as more transparent if we track and calculate on everybody, that leads the systems

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:15:06

And the however, I think the one thing that the flip side of that is, then we're tracking people who are not at risk in the community. And I think that that's the that's the balance that we have to strike, is if we track everybody, then we're also tracking people who, frankly, in many cases, we know aren't going to be at risk in the community, versus if we're only looking at successes, at least we do know that they're in the community. So you know it can I don't know how that would balance the recidivism rate. But either way, you're going to be can be criticized for either, you know, creaming the population or defining it in such a way that people who aren't at risk are in the population.

Erin Crites 1:15:57

And I think, yeah, what that does to Jack's point is, you know, inflates our denominator, right? So our percentage goes down because we're including in that division people who actually are not at risk of being in our in our numerator. And so the math then kind of gets in our way from from that perspective, a potential solution to that which I think DYS and probation, again, only because I'm most familiar with their reports, kind of helps get around that is by talking about the nuances of each of those different types of releases and presenting data on, you know, new convictions for successful folks versus those who had a technical violation or for a new crime, and disaggregating that population. So while that broad definition is looking at the total population, there's kind of this methodological agreement that, you know, we'll talk about what that looks like for different types of termination. So again, that kind of soft approach to the definition of making it very clean definition and population, but then agreeing to discuss the nuances in reports so that we're not missing out on what Jack's talking about, or some of the other nuances that Dave's bringing up around, you know, technical violations and what that looks like. Yeah, Michael,

Michael Campbell 1:17:41

so I think maybe, and maybe the idea here is, are can, is it possible for us to require the agencies, if they already have the data, to report both the big number, the everybody released, but then also, are we, then, potentially, do we have the ability, like, I don't know, you know, we don't want to write a four single space page document here about, you know, the the sub points of what the the means, but at the same time, are, do we have the authority, and as part of The project here, to anticipate some of the self serving ways that the data could be reported by the agencies, and then stipulate how some of those numbers must be compiled that can then be brought together and then used for the broader purpose of public safety, because that's not violating any of those things where we need the judges and the lawyers in the room. That's more about ensuring that our data and the definitions that we're requiring of the agencies, the things that many people in here are quite qualified to do, and that is to specify what a pot means and what its definition is when we get

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

those are, I mean, what would would our definition then mandate that these agencies follow precisely if we had very precise explanations of what kind of data they had to produce and report? I mean, obviously you'd have to walk a fine line to not make it too onerous and to put put a big, heavy burden on the agencies. But it's possible here that what we're saying is that we could potentially define this in a way that's specific enough that you know, would make fudging the numbers much more difficult. And so I don't know if maybe that's part of where Dave was going, but I if that's part of our charge, I think that's doable to a degree, as long as it's realistic for the people that are responsible for producing and submitting the data.

Erin Crites 1:19:49

Yeah, so Dave, let's go to you, and then we'll pop in to talk to the folks that do the data work and see if that would be a reasonable approach to our charge. So Dave, yeah, thanks,

David Wolfsgruber 1:20:03

Michael. I appreciate that. I appreciate everyone's perspective, and I'm not looking to change every individual agency in the way they define recidivism, not looking to the judiciary and the judges involved in that. Trust me, I'm not trying to do that, but I also look at anyone paying attention to recidivism, can't be a little or a lot cynical. So my concern is this group is charged with universal determination as the recidivism, but then what is the baseline for each agency, and then you look at disparities as how other agencies determine success. So my only point in this is that if our narrow focus, irrespective of how agencies define success, if we could determine that for the basis of our cohort, that might be helpful to allay some of the we're always going to there's always going to be cynics in every realm, with with parole, with recidivism across all disciplines, but could we, for the purposes of our charge, make it a little closer? As far as you know, I may determine recidivism, as you know, guys been a parole violator three times in the parole board just doesn't revoke for remainder. That's really not a success. We can pat ourselves in the back and say, great job. You didn't pick up a new felony conviction. That's a success. I'm just looking to standardize it to the greatest extent we can, to have that baseline for the not to tread on the other agencies and how they report their individual numbers outside of our charge, just if we can get to a point where we can allay some of the criticism and the cynicism by the fox watching a hen house in every way that we measure recidivism, that's that's my only point in all of this.

Erin Crites 1:21:53

Thanks, Dave.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:21:54

And really quickly, Michael, to your to your question, yeah, we can do that. You know, since you know, while we don't get to define the event, everything around it, we can. And so then I think it to Erin's point, becomes more question of what's feasible for the for the data folks to be able to do. But yeah, no, we can, you know, to your point, we could say, you know, track this for every single release, and then also track it for people who successfully release. And that, that's, that's, I mean, from my perspective, that's highly feasible, and then people would be able to see both definitions. And then, you know, I do think that the question of making, how your agency defines success very explicit when you present that data becomes, you know, critical, because then that can, you know, to Dave's point, you know, if we can get away from the you know, this person you know, revoked and then terminated and then left, Doc, so, you know, are they a success? You can make that clear in the definitions that you provide. We can, I mean, I think we can say in that, you know, as we're looking at cohort to be tracked, that one of the requirements for agencies is being explicit in how they're defining something like success.

Michael Campbell 1:23:27

I think that sounds I think that's very important. And I guess to my from a researcher's perspective, from the social science perspective of what I would use these data for, to try to make conclusions or assertions about things that are best for public safety, and a recommendation, should a lawmaker ask me to get one? I would like to know from the people who are the experts on parole, like Dave. I would like for them to give me the, you know, to divide the data up.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Do you have different baskets? And if so, we have the experts right here. Maybe, you know, we have the people here to say, you know, in this agency, it's realistic to have different measures of degrees of success, right? The people who don't do anything wrong have jobs or or whatever. This is the ideal. We have a certain, you know, we can, we can measure this. The people who were real pain in the ass, but didn't, you know, didn't commit a new felony, or in this pot, etc, etc. I mean, if that's part of our charge, I mean, and you're saying that can be done from a from a data perspective, if it's not too onerous to think that it's unrealistic, or the agencies are just going to slot numbers in to fulfill the legislative requirement that would be way more useful if there were ways that the agencies could prevent present data that were a little more complex without getting, you know, too fine grained, but that maybe had a better reflection of the realities, of what happens to clients in those agencies that that we could use to try to relate those outcomes to the bigger picture of public safety.

Erin Crites 1:25:08

So let's just real quick. So Aaron for the probation data doing this disaggregation is possible.

Aaron Stewart 1:25:19

It's basically already done. Yeah, so with the way the report is structured, that is the case.

Erin Crites 1:25:24

And then Kelli, for DYS this level of disaggregation is possible in your in your data,

Kelli Burmeister 1:25:34

absolutely, I think we would continue to report [inaudible]. And then we could inside that overall divided the folks we deemed successful or unsuccessful,

Erin Crites 1:25:50

great, Val or Linda, whoever is best to respond on the Com Cor data piece, is that a possibility for for those data as well.

Valarie Schamper 1:26:03

Yeah, in think we can definitely tell you how they discharged and compare that to recidivism. What I will say is that in program, performance component that's being discussed that's a little bit more problematic for us

Erin Crites 1:26:19

we will save that can of worms program for now,

Valarie Schamper 1:26:26

perfect

Erin Crites 1:26:27

can of worms at a time, cool and then for parole.

David Wolfsgruber 1:26:36

Yes, most definitely, we can report on those numbers.

Erin Crites 1:26:40

And DOC,

David Wolfsgruber 1:26:42

that's me too. Yep, yeah,

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Greg Saiz 1:26:47

I just speak sometimes on the DOC's been happy, because I don't work for them. Just was there a long time. So I feel like an honorary member.

David Wolfsgruber 1:26:54

You're still here. You're still with us. You can always, you can always speak on our behalf.

Erin Crites 1:26:59

I do that to judicial, which is not fair either to Aaron. Okay, so sounds like we might have come to some of an agreement around our cohort. So we are talking about tracking everyone who's left, basically anyone who's hit that, they're no longer agency's responsibility. The point of time to begin tracking, we are going to track all of those folks and make the agreement to report data separately or you know that total number plus disaggregated to those different types of discharges, particularly successful and unsuccessful. And from what I know about reports, those differing levels of technical violation, new crimes, and such exist for most, if not all, of our our agencies to kind of report, which I think gives some of that context to recidivism, right? If we have people who revoked for a new felony, not having recidivism, pretty easy to put a caveat on that that the potential for them to commit a new crime having been revoked for new felony likely means that they were in either jail or prison for at least some portion of our time. So I think there are some caveats that could be easily drafted to help present the context around why those numbers would be so low relative to others, and those percents low relative to others. How does that sit for folks? Getting some head nods and some thumbs up, all right, two of them, and I will, like I did last I've all re redo that list that I sent out in email and trying to craft some language for us to agree on around what we mean when we talk about disaggregating those data, and have folks kind of respond with what that looks like for each of their agencies, from that very technical standpoint of success, technical violation, new crime, if that's possible, what that might mean. I feel like we could do that over email and then kind of just inform at our next meeting, so that folks kind of have a sense of what that all looks like from a data standpoint, and have our data people fill in that information from the systems. Okay? And with that, do you think that it would be useful, since we have the data people to actually maybe put in some numbers indicating like these, the number of people terminated successfully, by escape, by new crime, so that, you know, I think, to Michael's to Michael's earlier point, like, what's the scope, right? What volume of people are each different kind of termination category. I think that would actually be really helpful to have too. Yeah, so maybe from the last completed report that in from just, you know, hey, it was our 2022 or 2024 whatever report is complete, just to provide that, I think that would be helpful if possible. But no, no crazy data gymnastics needs to happen, but just you know from the last available report, here's what we know, if we were to report the data out, from that standpoint, at least the numbers of people who would fit in each of those buckets of the cohort, and then obviously if folks have the recidivism numbers, that would be amusing, but I think not necessary if they're not available. Awesome. Okay, I will put that on my to do list to get out.

Linda Harrison 1:31:10

I just wanted to mention to parole people that I do have those figures sent to me by OPA regarding parole termination types, whether that's revocation successful, yada yada, early. So yeah, I can provide those. If they're not at your fingertips. They're kind of like, if you choose to utilize those,

David Wolfsgruber 1:31:33

sure, yeah, that'd be great, awesome.

Erin Crites 1:31:40

Okay, do we have brain power for more or

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:31:44

I mean, so our discussion of options for length of time to track is our next task. So to Erin's point, do we want to dive into that? Do we just want to stay up to three years and then just wipe our hands of it? [inaudible multiple people talking]

Unknown Speaker 1:32:10

a fatigued pass. Sometimes I have students pass my class because I'm tired of stuck around long enough,

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:32:24

it's better than failing because you're tired, because that happens too.

Erin Crites 1:32:31

So here's my thought, feel free to to change my mind. Is that I think the timing, the timeframe of saying, yep, let's count for three years sounds straightforward. I thought a lot of other things were going to be straightforward, and here we are. What I think, though will open up, so maybe this is something for our kind of thought process is kind of, how do we go about discussing what happens when that three years isn't clean? Because I think Dave's brought up a number of examples of when it's easy to say three years, but what do we mean by three years? And I think that's where when I when I talk about fatigue, I think that's the part of the conversation that we want to give ourselves space and mental energy for. And I think we've done a lot today, and that may be a step too far for us in this moment.

Greg Saiz 1:33:40

Reason to try to change your mind.

Michael Campbell 1:33:44

I think you've read the room,

Erin Crites 1:33:48

Aaron, it is one of my skill sets some days, 20 minutes back in your day. Sounds good. All right. Thanks, folks. I appreciate it. This was this was a slog, but I think we've gone to a really good place. I will send stuff out in writing, so feel free to send back any errors that I have made. There will likely be at least two. So look for those and otherwise enjoy. Oh, sorry, Kelly,

Kelli Burmeister 1:34:22

just one more quick question. So on those numbers, do you want us to come ready to present those? Or should we just send you, like a one pager or something?

Erin Crites 1:34:33

Yeah, we're just a table with them in it, and then we can talk about them generally at the next meeting, briefly for context, but yeah, nothing. Don't redo any work. Just send the table, yeah, send it to you, yeah, just send it to me, and I'll pull everything together, and then I'll finish working on the diagrams that I started of the flow of our system, because I think those are going to be helpful contexts. Is for folks that are trying to understand why we made the decisions we made, so I'll try and get those done and sent out for folks again to correct because they're based on my best understanding, which is likely incorrect in a number of areas. So all right, thanks. All appreciate it. We will see you in two weeks.

Michael Campbell 1:35:20

All right, take care, everybody. Oh, is it the Fourth of July.

Erin Crites 1:35:24

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

June 20, 2024

Oh, let me confirm and send it by email, because it will take me longer than anybody wants to sit and stare at me to find

Michael Campbell 1:35:31

Yep, sounds good. All right. Thank you.

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai>