

## **TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting**

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 0:18

All right, cool. Well, let's get started, because Adrienne has joined us, and has, I don't think, joined us on this group before. Does everyone mind just doing a quick round of introductions for for Addrienne's sake, and then we'll, we'll jump into the content of of our agenda. So I'll just holler at folks on the screen, and then we'll come into the room. So Val, do you want to start?

Valarie Schamper 0:29

Sure. I'm Valerie Schamper, the deputy manager in the Office of Community, correct?

Erin Crites 0:56

Awesome. Jeff.

Jeff Wise 1:02

Yeah. Good afternoon, everyone. Jeff wise, Director of grants and operations with the Denver based reentry organization, Remergé.

Erin Crites 1:11

Greg,

Greg Saiz 1:13

Hi, Addrienne, good to see you.

Erin Crites 1:18

Michael,

Michael Campbell 1:21

Hello, Adrienne . Michael Campbell, I'm a criminology professor at DU.

Addrienne Sanchez 1:26

Graduated from DU 100 years ago?

Erin Crites 1:32

Adrienne, I think you heard Michael speak during the interim committee presentations as well. Kelli

Kelli Burmeister 1:41

Kelli Burmeister with the Division of Youth Services in the Department of Human Services.

Addrienne Sanchez 1:49

If anybody doesn't know me too. Addrienne Sanchez, I'm the director for policy and legislative affairs at Department of Corrections.

Aaron Stewart 1:59

I'm Aaron Stewart. I am an Analyst within the Judicial Branch and State Court Administrators Office Division of Probation Services.

Erin Crites 2:08

And I'm Erin Crites with ORS, just facilitating this group as well.

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Jack Reed - CDPS 2:15

I'm Jack Reed, the Research Director in ORS, and I unfortunately have to leave a little early.

Erin Crites 2:23

And then Linda Harrison, also from ORS, should be joining us in a few minutes as well.

Addrienne Sanchez 2:29

I know Lindsay,

Erin Crites 2:30

yeah, perfect.

Hi, Lindsay. I believe you and Addrienne know each other.

Lindsay Compton 2:36

Sorry, I was having some zoom issues, but I'm here now. So hi, Addrienne.

Erin Crites 2:41

We just did quick introductions, for Addrienne's sake, but since you know each other, we're all set. Okay, there's Linda. Alright, okay, so let's jump in to our agenda, sent out the agenda and the minutes from our last meeting, as well as my very rough attempt at creating those kind of flow charts that we had talked about might be helpful for kind of centering our conversation. So please, once you have a chance, pick those apart and tell me where I went wrong, and I will fix my word art as well with those. So if we could real quick, does anybody have any edits to the minutes from our last meeting if you had a chance to review them. If you review them and something comes up later, just let me know, and I'll take care of those in August when I am back. Okay? All right. So then the next thing I wanted to do, I know we had a lag between our meetings due to the holiday. So folks, some folks, sent me some write ups around kind of what these the point to begin tracking and the cohort to track would mean in each of the agency's populations, and so in doing that, that highlighted a couple of areas of ambiguity. I know we feel like we've talked about these things in a lot of detail, but still, I think need clarification on a couple of things. So just wanted to do that really quickly, I think notably, Jack and I had different interpretations of the end results from our last meeting about whether we were only. Going to count the recidivism events for successful terminations or and discharges, and then report out the rates of the other types of discharge, just for context, or if we were going to report on recidivism for everyone, but then disaggregate those recidivism rates by the different types of terminations or discharges. So we think that's the first point of clarification that we we need to kind of come to, is, are we only counting convictions for successful folks, or are we counting them for everybody, but reporting them out by their discharge status? Thoughts?

Jack Reed - CDPS 5:59

Kelli, yeah.

Erin Crites 6:00

Kelli, go ahead,

Kelli Burmeister 6:04

I had thought we landed on the agreement of doing both like that rate for everyone that terminates or leaves your particular agency, and then also having a rate for however your agency defines successful. But yeah, would love to hear, [inaudible]

Erin Crites 6:28

okay, I didn't see whose hand went first, so either duke it out, or cohort, Greg, okay,

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Greg Saiz 6:34

just just to echo what Kelly said, that's how I recall it, too. I think we landed on it being very important to highlight just how difficult it is to apply this very granularly, very broadly at the same time, because I think the expectation is that we'll have a rather robust report with a lot of if/thens and caveats. So

Erin Crites 6:55

Michael,

Michael Campbell 6:57

yeah, and I was going to reiterate what Greg just said in that, you know, I think one of the points we ended on in this discussion was that, you know, what we're trying to do is provide the data for those who are interested, institutions, organizations, researchers, whatever it may be to have enough access to different types of data that they can then use the data to do some of the things that we've all talked about, and it seems like the legislature is interested in. And that to do that, we wanted to make sure that people can't cherry pick data. And the idea was, then, you know, essentially full disclosure, a broad reporting of the data, and then specific agency wide ways of you know, if you look at any of the federal data, that's how it's presented anyway, there's there's the aggregate data, there's definitions and qualifications, and then specific data. And then researchers can pick what they want to use to answer whichever research question they're they're asking that that was how I remembered it.

Erin Crites 7:57

Awesome. Great. Yeah, anybody have a different interpretation of that [laughing] cool? We will talk about who had which interpretation. So awesome. So we'll carry forward with that general understanding as we kind of move move through. The other thing I wanted to just again, confirm and reiterate, because I had some, it seems some confusion, but maybe not. Maybe it's my confusion, that the event that we are capturing is that conviction. So whenever we're talking about recidivism, we're talking about conviction. When we're talking about the cohort, and the time to begin tracking those are really about the status of a person within each of the systems. And so just wanting to make sure that that distinction is clear, and that as we work through kind of, as Michael mentioned, those specific definitions of what do we mean when we say terminated, released, or discharged? What do we mean when we say success, technical violation, new crime as a status that those are very specific to each of the agencies, and we'll want to be clear about that in our documentation around this issue. So I think as kind of a for the time between this meeting and our next one, really wanting to for all of the agencies that will be reporting these measures capture that very specific information about the definitions of the cohort and the time to begin tracking as it relates how the data are captured in each of those systems. So we've gotten some from some folks, but we just want to make sure that we have all of that information together for our final report. So we can say, you know, right, with judicial for an example, when we say that the cohort is individuals who have been terminated from probation, it means that they have been they've entered a very specific code in the case management system. And here's how these codes are broken out, to put people in each of these buckets so that it's very clear what we mean, and do the same for DYS and for community corrections and for DOC and parole, just so that there's no misunderstanding about what we mean when we say this is you know why this person from DOC is in this cohort, and why we started counting recidivism at the point in time it did. Does that make sense for the folks that we'll have to provide that information? I don't want to guess. So awesome. Okay, cool. So that'll be another kind of one of those homework pieces in between this meeting and our next one, because we'll have another lag in meeting times due to some conflicting meetings and I'll be out of the country. So we just are going to skip our next meeting and go from there. Any other pieces of the cohort or the point to begin tracking that folks need more clarity on or feel like we haven't quite talked about enough yet.

Jack Reed - CDPS 11:26

I mean, I think Val the one question, sorry, Kelli, the question from Katie regarding termination from residential versus termination from nonresidential as the point to begin tracking was probably one that we needed to discuss a little bit more.

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Valarie Schamper 11:47

Yeah, I was gonna put some stuff on paper for you guys, and we could kind of react to it. So the truth is, for our this is really irrelevant, right for diversion plans and the ways that that works for them as they move from residential to non residential. If I'm understanding our conversation correctly, we're really trying to get at in terms of our cohort, are people we're no longer responsible for in each of the agencies. So I think what it would mean is us trying to really dig into our data and I realize I'm committing to some challenging things on our side that other people in my office might not love, but um, it kind of means digging into our data and really finding the point [inaudible] in us at which they are no longer under purview, whether that's residential, and did you guys lose sound?

Erin Crites 12:47

Does that happen? We are having some connection issues. Oh, okay, we're gonna try and plug in there. [inaudible] Okay, okay, I think, I think we might be okay.

Kelli Burmeister 13:09

Okay, so

Linda Harrison 13:11

we missed what you said, Valerie,

Valarie Schamper 13:13

I'll start over. So as I was saying, I think what we're trying to get at is we contract them at the time at which our agency is no longer responsible for them in any capacity, which for diversion clients would not mean release from residential for the most part, there's a few who release, you know, sentence expired, or whatever, out of residential, but the majority are leaving out of non res in the end. So I think it would require us to maybe dig into not just that there's a termination reason in our system, but really, where did they go when we terminated them? It's a little bit harder data ask for us, but it, I think can happen. I need to dig a little bit deeper and make sure I can commit to that, but I think that we can do that so it really wouldn't be released from a service type, meaning res, non res. This happened also we have people who are in IRT and NRDT and other programs, and they terminate from those but it doesn't mean they've left community corrections supervision, and so I really want to be careful that Community Corrections is counting the same way that other agencies here are counting, which is where we're truly no longer responsible, Not just that they've changed services within community corrections. So, like I said, I think we can do it, but, I mean, you spend a little bit more time with our data just to make sure that it, I mean, it won't be perfect. We all have the like, they left us and came back two days later, kind of thing. But like, just happens. But I think we can get there and. And we'll just kind of clarify how we define that a little bit better.

Erin Crites 15:03

Yeah, I think that sounds great. And I there's also this piece, and we've talked about it a little bit, and we can kind of come back to it in the write up, if we need to, is to say, here's the intention, here's what the systems are capable of delivering, and talk about maybe what a plan might be to get to the intended definition if the system can't currently accommodate it. So that way we're being consistent, but also recognizing that there are some system limitations that can't be fixed by sheer willpower. So I think that's helpful.

Valarie Schamper 15:39

I think we're there. I think we can do it to the extent that our users are putting in data accurately. I'm just always going to make that caveat, but I think we can do it. Hopefully. [laughter]

Kelli Burmeister 15:59

This is a question in terms of cohort or the when the clock starts, but I was just reviewing the flow charts, and a couple questions popped into my head so this can be a parking lot that we can set aside for later in the meeting if we need to,

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

but I was just thinking looking at the doc flow chart, does this include YOS program youth as well? So they'll be tracked kind of the larger DOC cohort. Is that a correct assumption or not?

Jack Reed - CDPS 16:36

Yeah

Erin Crites 16:36

yeah. I know they're part of the conversation. So yes, I

Linda Harrison 16:41

believe that. Seems that because they have all the different phases, they're going to kind of have a very different model than DOC and parole differently. So

Jack Reed - CDPS 16:52

when they move from to like phase three, when they're out in the community, which status are they on? Are they on I status or P status,

Greg Saiz 17:08

Jack, they're supervised by parole officers in the community, so they're technically on parole Youth Services, parole youth offender services. It is a weird wrinkle, though, because there are all at that point over 18, clearly, and so, you know, some of her in their mid 20s by that point. So it does, it does basically track. This is from my parole officer recollection. So it's been, it's pretty dated. I'll say that much. But Addrienne, if you have any other clarification on that, that's it's my understanding of how YOS [inaudible]. And sometimes terrible way to say that, but um yeah, so it basically runs on the same tracks, structurally. So I think it makes sense to have it sort of as is.

Linda Harrison 17:51

I can verify that I have data that would indicate that where you know what I mean, okay, when they go into the different phases, if they're Is or Ps at that point, I think it is really clear. Okay.

Erin Crites 18:04

Well, then I think Lindsay, from your standpoint, when looking at the data, you can identify when they transfer from one status to another, regardless of whether they're a YOS or DOC.

Kelli Burmeister 18:21

Yeah, that's I just knew that historically, there was kind of two different recidivism rates, like one came out of the YOS program and one from DOC. And just because of the age similarities, that's where we saw a lot of people trying to compare the DYS rates versus YOS, and there was always such a huge discrepancy. I don't think a year went by where we weren't asked by the JBC or a legislative member to explain why the rates are different. But I'm speaking to the choir, so I'm just glad that [inaudible]. My other question was on juvenile diversion, and I think we've [inaudible] that we're tracking with the start date, and Will that be a separate cohort, or,

Erin Crites 19:21

sorry we are having really bad internet connections. We're going to try and see if we can figure out how to plug in. So I missed some of what you're saying around [inaudible]. Leave it to us to have the unstable internet connection.

Kelli Burmeister 19:45

So we've discussed it before, but I wasn't sure if juvenile diversion, because they also produce their recidivism report has, you know, a cohort that's aligned. And a start date and all that, but I feel like we've discussed it and my memory is failing me. Sorry,

**TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting**

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 20:07

yeah, I think the juvenile think we're going to try and get a cord here. [inaudible]

Speaker 1 20:22

It's not playing. Plugged into, I don't think that they actually these ones

Aaron Stewart 20:25

over here. Aren't either ones under

Unknown Speaker 20:29

Oh, there are ones there.

Linda Harrison 20:31

So you have

Erin Crites 20:31

just a technical time out. Okay, let's see how many, how many [inaudible]. Yay. All right, it looks like we're now plugged into the wall, and hopefully that means we have an overnight connection. Okay, so sorry about that. Are we back? Everybody's okay. So, Kelly, I know you were talking about diversion. Yes, I think we have talked about kind of their report within the juvenile space. I am still unclear about where they fit in this process from the legislation. Quite honestly,

Kelli Burmeister 21:48

there, that was the question that I had too, but it's not clear then, yeah, that's hard to talk about.

Erin Crites 21:56

It's true. And I think the upside is that, generally speaking, what they are likely doing based on our past conversations from 19-108 should be pretty consistent with what we're talking about now, maybe with some small, nuanced differences, but the event that they're counting at least is the same, and the timing would be generally similar, because it's when they are out of diversion. I think we're close.

Kelli Burmeister 22:32

Thanks.

Erin Crites 22:37

Okay, any other thoughts, comments about the time to begin tracking or the cohort

Linda Harrison 22:56

was a decision made that both prison and parole are going to be treated somewhat independently. If somebody moves out of prison, that's when their cohort starts, and then parole both,

Erin Crites 23:11

yes, yeah.

Linda Harrison 23:12

I thought so. Just wanted to

Erin Crites 23:14

make sure, yeah. So that's one of the areas of double counting potentially for a person that could occur with this, you know, slightly different context. Also same with community corrections, right when folks leave and then are still under

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

supervision with probation. So there will be some places where people will be counted multiple times at different time points, and even the same recidivism event could be technically counted twice depending on which buckets they are in, and I think that'll be a caveat to put in in the report. But our system just isn't set up to right now follow a person cleanly through their entire experience in our in our criminal and juvenile justice systems. Okay, next, the one that we think maybe won't take too terribly long, but again, we've been at this a bit. So next up is the discussion of the length of time that we will track individuals. So for how long are we going to count the recidivism events? I think there's, there's a couple of different questions that I'll throw out there to get kind of our brain started and we can bounce around. First is kind of the simple, how long do we follow people? Do we report just the rate at the end of that follow up period? Or. Are there some interim points along that that we want to also report? I think we want to consider kind of the pros and cons of various points. Specifically, if we talk about, you know, one year versus three years versus five years, what that might look like, and then, because we have a lot of our data, folks, what are those methodological considerations that we need to account for or explain when we talk about the length of time that we choose as part of this recidivism discussion. Michael,

Michael Campbell 25:42

sorry. I before I put my yellow one up, I just put my pink one up

Erin Crites 25:46

here. Honestly, it's easier for me to see than the little yellow one.

Michael Campbell 25:49

Yeah, I just before we even talk about the methodological stuff, and I this should be relatively fast, I agree, but I just wanted to say, from a research and kind of, what's the point of all this stuff we're doing, perspective, I think one of the primary questions here is, what is this data really going to be good? Good for what, you know, what's the point of having this data, and who does it serve? And so in my mind, I was trying to think of like, you know, as a researcher, but also as, say, a lawmaker or an agency person. What? What good is this data? So when I think about things like the time, some of the stuff just in the research, I've always thought this, when I read these articles, just arbitrary, right? It's like, one year three, year five, year, right? It's like, Let's do odd numbers today. And so I'm not sure with some of those things, you know, before we even talk about what's possible, you know, maybe work backward, very briefly, and just say, realistically, like, are we going to use this? Because here's what's going to happen with a lot of this stuff. AI is going to be used very soon to build risk assessment models and those sorts of things that are going to take all these inputs. Part of the question is, you know, what kind of data do we want to generate that some AI device is going to help us figure out risk assessment trajectories for different types of people and correction systems? And that, to me, seems like what this stuff that we're talking about changing or tracking is going to matter for? And then obviously it also has to be something that people can, can and will actually produce reliably over time. But I guess just one quick, and I know that that's a massive question to talk about all the AI stuff, of course, but you know, I guess before we just start picking these years that everyone's always used, you know, I understand first is, like, what's even possible, but maybe just the question is, like, what do we see? Like, who is going to use this for? What you know first? Because if we're going to do this, we might as well make, make a point of making it useful moving forward, if we can. If that's not realistic, fair enough.

Erin Crites 28:02

No, I think that's a great point. And I think for the juvenile work, we chose one two and three years. So we didn't pick just the numbers on that one. We did because we wanted the more immediate of the one year, the longer term of a three but then it felt kind of silly to not look at that second year, and it historically was what I think DYS had done as well, to kind of follow youth and not have a weird lag in between a one and a three year.

Michael Campbell 28:30

So yeah, that makes sense.

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 28:33

Yes, that was our rationale. Then Greg, What are your thoughts?

Greg Saiz 28:38

Thank you, and sort of Dr Campbell, thank you for bringing that up. And as I was reviewing the agenda earlier, it sort of dawned on me that this, I know we don't want to kind of mix threads in terms of the the working groups tasks, as far as what legislation put out, but if we're looking at time frames, and if we're looking at the rationale for measuring those, these, these events over a certain amount of time. I think it's important that we understand, if we're going to get away from a binary definition of recidivism, how long could it take to see these other pieces come into play? Right? These social determinants of health, these, these, all these pieces that make a whole life. Maybe there's some research that could be done on that that might give us more realistic time frames. Or, you know, to Dr Campbell's point. Just give it to chat GPT and let AI figure it out. But I just think it's important that, you know, they're separate issues to some degree, but they do play in and they mix, and it matters. So the the, you know, 1, 3, 5, 1, 2, 3, they are, in effect, arbitrary, so let's try to put some meaning behind them.

Erin Crites 29:49

Yeah, Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 29:52

the only time frame we're specifically tied to in statute is producing a three year rate, which is kind. Interesting, but so I wanted to mention that. But, yeah, I echo and applaud kind of what Dr Campbell said, what we've seen, you know, analyzing, doing a survival analysis of our one year rates, is we, we see that first three to six month period after an individual leaves the system, as the key points, and really that one to three month marker right after leaving a system. So we've seen, you know, even being more granular than tracking by years, the immediacy of leaving an agency in those first few months we've found are really key. So we might want to think even more granular than years.

Michael Campbell 30:49

I just want that's exactly a lot of the research is saying exactly this, that the most important moments are right after folks leave. And yet we just kind of have this legacy of these 1, 3, 5, 7, year reports that the various correctional departments have produced, and the DOJ or the Bureau of Justice Statistics stitches these together. They are useful for certain things, again, depending on your research question. But the research shows that these very short term, immediate points of departure from these systems are so important that, like, you know, the one week, one month, those might be the things that are, you know, I mean, again, if we were feeding this into something that could analyze all these data at once, it would probably say, why are you even concerned about year five or three, whenever 80% of the action is in the first few months that somebody leaves that would predict success or failure, and the degrees to which their success and failure, to Greg's point. So I think that's a great point. And you know, if we could kind of shift the lens a little bit by emphasizing these things and these in these discussions, maybe, you know, maybe that helps the legislature have a bit of a different prism as lawmakers make decisions about legislation on these things. That's,

Erin Crites 32:16

yeah, I think that's a great point. And, you know, these, we know from, Aaron can speak to this, that the data are capable right of pinpointing that timing. I think the one thing we might want to consider in this conversation and for the data folks that execute this work, is being able to separate for folks the reporting of events in maybe a monthly cadence in a report, but that the analysis might only be able to happen at once a year, and that there isn't this ability to kind of continually process and update information like on a monthly basis, yet. I mean, I think again, AI technology, data visualization and reporting tools as they are, there's there's the technical capacity for it, were our data able to play nice with those systems and not still require so much human analyst intervention to get to these final rates, but I think that will be the piece that I think will be most challenging for folks who aren't the data people to understand is, yes, we can report a survival analysis like outcome across a chunk of time. What we can't do is do that every single month, that that



## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

report will have to still only come out once every one two years, and that the data will necessarily be lagged to allow for processing time and the events to get entered into the systems by the human actors that must do those things. So Aaron thoughts on the monthly reporting, reporting out kind of a survival analysis type approach, rather than an annual, two year approach. Yeah,

Aaron Stewart 34:22

the realities you spell that are real. So I also appreciate you saying that. But yes, I don't, I don't think that that would be too difficult to try to start looking at different intervals. They're a little bit more attenuated, so like 30 day intervals, or monthly intervals, particularly for that first year, because it doesn't seem very necessary from exactly your point, the points will be made by the folks here to look at year two by a monthly interval or year three, because that's definitely what we see as a massive fall off by year two and three anyway. So for that first year, it could be a really interesting way to break that out. It won't be particularly complicated to do that annually.

Valarie Schamper 35:00

Yeah, our data shows essentially the same thing we did a long term analysis before we decided on some new recidivism metrics for performance based contracting, and it shows that about 80% of convictions happen within two years, actually even earlier. So we're capturing the majority of the events in earlier data and not data. And in truth, the longer we go, the less relevant that information is to you know what we're doing today. So maybe thoughtful about but agreed more than an annual analysis could be difficult

Erin Crites 35:46

yes, anything to kind of some of the other points is that when we pair this work on the definition with the work that will happen a little bit later this year on alternative metrics, being able to capture some of those metrics that will change much more quickly, also too, right? That we want to look at those nuanced changes in housing and health and employment and education right in these more short term time frames, and what impact that has on folk's recidivism, right? So if it pushes that right three to six month range out even further. That tells us a lot about our systems operations relative to well, our one year recidivism rate went down by three percentage points. That doesn't give us a whole lot of information, but saying that that you know, the average length until recidivism moved by six months. That gives us some really useful information to help identify what programs and services to to kind of provide people and continue to move forward. Michael,

Michael Campbell 36:57

yeah, so these are important points, and just to give you a little perspective of kind of where, you know, where I'm coming from, the technology with managing these types of data and and these sorts of issues across the board in the world we live in is changing so rapidly that I just as we're talking about these things, I just can't help but think, you know, are we are we talking about ways of managing things that are embedded in 1990s mindsets about how and what we should do with data in a world where people have real time dashboards that can show in the moment what's actually happening in an organization with all of the customers it's serving. And I know that might sound kind of crazy, but to give you an idea how much the world's changing, like I can no longer really assign papers in my classes, because AI can write papers in ways even for the specifics of my class, like here at the university, we are having to just do in class computer shut like assessments of what people can do because the technology in the last calendar year has made the last 100 years of how people assess what people can do very difficult, right? They can write a paper in an hour, because data is so quickly accessible and can be stitched together. And so I guess part of what I'm thinking about, you know, when you think of dashboards today and the things that are going on. And I know that the resource limitations in our agencies make a lot of this like something that's not realistic in the near term. But I was just trying to think, you know, about how, in the bigger picture, over time, these things are going to be used. I mean, a lot of the way we've done things seems like it's going to be obsolete very quickly. And so, you know, one question is, the things that we do in here are, have we thought them through in a way that they'll still apply if we have new new tools for organizing and accessing these data? And I think the more we can be mindful of that now, the more we can save other folks that might be in a meeting like this

## **TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting**

July 18, 2024

in three years, a bunch of headaches. That's where I was coming from. But obviously that is a very big discussion, but it doesn't hurt to at least have in the back of our minds how quickly this stuff is changing.

Erin Crites 39:09

I appreciate it when Kelli and I are having this conversation again in five years. Hopefully we have a different technology system. So I giggled, Michael, when you mentioned 1990s mentality, we actually operate with 1990s technology for a lot of our data systems. So while it's funny, it's also not so funny, given the requirements on folks. But I appreciate the the thought process and the potential of saying, once again, to our legislative partners, here's what we'd really like to do. Here's why we can't currently do that, what our interim solution is. But were we to have the technology that allowed for the court data to be married to community corrections and DYS and DOC data in a seamless manner and just fed through the technical things required to create this dashboard, these things would not require a year's lag time or two, technically, if we're waiting for convictions, for an analyst to then do a survival analysis, say, sure, this is what we know about three and six months from folks that were terminated two years ago. Because that's that's all that our systems are capable of allowing our analysts to do.

Michael Campbell 40:39

And to Greg's point, and to Greg's point that also that these people will be healthier, these people will be housed, their employment, you know, like that. We could have just a much more immediate understanding of the impact of program. It shifts, you know. I mean, maybe it wouldn't. This is a different task, but, you know, it would be pretty cool to sit down and write like in a dream world. What would Colorado's system look like? And you know, from a bunch of people who actually know how it looks to what would we want it to be and look like? You know, that's a different discussion, but if you pose that to some legislatures, maybe you'd find one crazy enough to get behind it.

Erin Crites 41:22

I think we could. I am naive enough, still, even after a decade, to think that we could use this platform as an opportunity to at least start that conversation with legislators to say we know what you really want is this dynamic, immediate feedback of information. Our systems aren't capable of doing that. Here's what they are capable of, and we're committed to doing what we can do. Are you all committed to, you know, helping get what you all want? Again, I recognize that that is in the land of rainbows and unicorns, but I'm willing to go for it if we can. Yeah, Val.

Valarie Schamper 42:09

I love rainbows and unicorns. I think we should all reach for them as often as possible, especially when it comes to data. I will, however, say one little caveat, because my providers will kill me if they find out I didn't, which is that, in the end, all of this data does come from a human being in every single system, anything we're asking for, someone had to enter it. Someone had to tell us what happened to that person. And so the more we ask for and the more quickly we ask for it, the more we're putting on the human beings who are working with our clients in these systems. So that's just something we have to be aware of, and it's something that's going to come up in our next discussion. On the community correction side, we have a lot of data. We probably don't have all of the wishful thinking data that you know want to want to measure, and we probably don't have it in the time frames you want it, but it's just something that I want to be conscientious about. When we talk about those puppies and rainbows and unicorns and all the stuff that I really want to ask for, I believe me, I've been there, I've asked for it, and they're like, yeah, no, um, so like there are really, truly human beings on the other side of all of that data, and just something we should be keeping in mind. Yeah.

Erin Crites 43:20

Thank you for reminding us of that. That's very true, Dave.

David Wolfsgruber 43:26

I just want to apologize. I'm going in and out in the western slope. I just addressed an issue, a staffing issue, in Grand Junction, so I'm heading back. So I just want to apologize for going in and out. But I want to I've missed some of the

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

conversation. So if there's anything parole related, I'm in a, I think I'm in a good zone for the next maybe two minutes that I'll still have connectivity. If there's anything that I missed that you need from parole.

Erin Crites 43:52

I think right now, we're just kind of having this broader discussion about the utility of these of the rates and reporting time frames. And really considering not talking about a 1, 2, 3, 5 year mark, but talking about reporting in some kind of monthly increments to provide context for kind of how at which point from release our folks re engaging in crime, and so that we can see those effects sooner. So you think that's kind of, if you have a chance for a couple of thoughts on that, I think we welcome, welcome that from parole perspective.

David Wolfsgruber 44:40

Yeah, I'm here. Sorry, bear with me. I think it's fantastic [pause in audio]. I'm going over old territory that you've already. Cover. I think it's ridiculous that we wait to the point that we do, because if you spend [inaudible] goals,

Erin Crites 45:17

I think you got dropped Dave

David Wolfsgruber 45:19

today, but I think we could be [pause in audio] we choose these arbitrary long term numbers at the expense of short term outcomes and I know that again, as I said this many times, I don't care that we're shooting ourselves in the foot. I want real data and real results and real outcome so we can learn from them and improve. So I'm glad that we're I'm glad that we're looking at that and not just going with the flow of, well, it's always been one year, two years, three years. The gold standard, quote, unquote, is three years, because I [inaudible] appreciate that we're having that conversation.

Erin Crites 45:59

Thanks, Dave. Okay, so it sounds like we want to move in a direction where we take more of a survival analysis approach, rather than a like straight one year two year, three year rate.

Linda Harrison 46:17

So can I throw in that that's more difficult to present to the average Joe, average legislator. So yeah, I think we just kind of need to be mindful about how we're going to couch that presented, comparing, or, you know, not with all of our systems side by side, there's just gonna have to be a lot of explanation what that looks like. Yeah, yeah

Erin Crites 46:50

I think that's fair.

Sorry, I can't do the comments while I [inaudible]

Lindsay Compton 47:02

I didn't know how to raise my hand. Oh, okay,

Erin Crites 47:05

no worries. Lindsay, I just I'm on one computer, and I'm not that talented.

Lindsay Compton 47:11

I just wanted to do a small caveat on our data, because we do track monthly but it's a bit shaky because we get back dated. Moves constantly. So it's hard to, like, capture a monthly rate and stick to it. It will be ever changing as our data gets updated, you know, in the future. So that one we do do it. We have tried it before, but it's just it's hard to replicate from month to month to capture those rates. But six months maybe, I mean, we usually, even when we do, like, end of

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

year reporting, we'll wait for a month or two to get those numbers solid. So that's the only issue, I would say, with monthly

Erin Crites 47:52

Yeah, I think that's helpful, and from a methodological standpoint, since we are having to use that conviction. Again, my simplistic statement of it, the conviction definition, there will necessarily have to be some lag time before we start talking about events, because convictions don't happen right away. And so I think kind of, and, you know, again, Kelli and I went through this conversation with the juvenile justice reform around talking about convictions, but for crimes that occurred. So when we talk about, you know, one month, we're talking about an event that occurred at one month from a crime perspective, so the offense date or the filing date, if an offense date isn't listed because data entry, so even if the conviction occurs a year later from the offense date, that offense would still be counted as having occurred one month post release. If that makes sense, as Linda said, it's hard to explain. It's easier with pictures, but that that's also kind of part of this, regardless of which time frame we choose, making sure that folks are aware that even with technology, there will necessarily be some type of lag in reporting of information. If we're saying that somebody has to have been convicted first before we then go back and see when in the time period that that crime occurred. Yeah,

Lindsay Compton 49:44

okay, that makes sense to me.

Linda Harrison 49:48

Okay, so our cohorts are going to have to have been released, you know, say, a year plus prior to the study actually happens, regardless of what our. A time point delay is to make sure wait to wait for those convictions to come in.

Erin Crites 50:06

Yeah, sorry, my computer going to die, because this is where we're at today.

Speaker 3 50:22

inaudible

Speaker 4 50:22

for need to go find a power cord. Thank you.

Linda Harrison 50:27

Is it anything in particular or just generic?

Erin Crites 50:30

I think it's generic. It's been plugged in all day, and yet still it wants to die today. Oh, Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 50:38

I was going in and did he say the gold standard for DOC is three years? I think that's what he said, so I'm wondering, just from a group perspective, like from a youth commitment perspective, we most often see other states and agencies reporting on one year rate, very easy, a two or a three. So I'm just wondering, yeah, from all the conversation we've had today with kind of those shorter term intervals, might be helpful, at least to present or have in an analysis. But I just also want to reiterate Linda's point that I do think we should have a few select solid rate that are available with the same time interval, and try to avoid, you know, calculating 5, 6, 7, different rates. I do see value in those short term and if we can do like, a six month and a one year, like I said, we're tied into a three year via statute, but we're going to do that anyway, so we're flexible. But yeah, I was curious to know if there's a gold standard for other populations out there.

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 51:57

I mean, I think in our past conversations, I have seen one and three years be more common. Michael, what have you stumbled upon?

Michael Campbell 52:09

So the the recidivism research uses many of these odd years. Like, like, I was saying there's three, five and seven years, there's a nine year. Like, obviously they're just doing every other year, because it's so much work to generate these reports. But I think, you know, I don't think you can ditch some of the longer term, like you have to retain some of that. But again, this is all partly contingent on, you know, what? What are you trying to use the data to do? And if you're trying to use the data to improve outcomes for people leading the agent our state's agencies. Everyone in the room seems to understand that the shorter term events, if you really want to know what's going on, are all of the research shows that those are the most important when you're asking a bigger research question about, for example, what it's like for specific groups of people who leave a prison and then have to go out and try to make their way through our communities in Denver and Aurora and wherever, and then and and have better life outcomes in the five and seven year stretch, then you have to have the data that you know that's traditionally been there because you're asking bigger, much broader picture Questions. I mean, in a dream world, you would have, you would have both, obviously, and it's easy for me to sit here and not have to do the work and say, let's, let's have it all. But it, you know, if the goal is to really get to some of the outcomes that were being discussed in the legislature, and that Greg is pointing to from the other committee about, you know, not just failure success, which is, you know, we've talked about the problems there, then you really want to be able to gage, like, is this new program that we're pumping a couple \$100,000 into really improving housing outcomes over the course of six months, because we know that's when it matters. And so, I guess you know, you can't ditch those gold standard, broader terms, the you know those are. So if you want to compare our state to others and whatever, which I think is a useful thing to do, you're going to have to have those. But I'm, from what I'm hearing from the people that are actually working these agencies, and from what I've read in the research, you just, if you really want to know how you're you're you, what you're doing is affecting these people's outcomes. The shorter term is so vital. And ironically, it seems that, you know, again, these things are from the 80s and 90s, these years, and I don't know that they were ever done based on, I don't know 365 days is any kind of a good unit of measure for people leaving prison. It's just a convenient way of measuring time, but I don't know that it was ever methodologically necessary or theoretically relevant to begin with. So I think that what I'm hearing is, you know what is feasible and accurate as possible matters with the acknowledgement it's not going to be perfect, and then we just have chat, GPT, identify the problems and weed them out.

Erin Crites 55:09

One of these days, I'll learn how to work that. Um, yeah. So you think, Kelli, I think I saw it pop up on the screen. Um, kind of one, one option would be, and kind of how I reframed it a little bit, is that we would follow people for three years and report out rates at six months, one year and three years. That gets us closer to this more immediate feedback cycle, and we can talk about whether there's, as we've kind of done before, a methodological agreement that we would report, like, pull that data out monthly for the first 12 months, but have those rates kind of in those bigger those bigger groupings, or that that's kind of those standard six months, 12 months, 36 months, kind of cycle, I think, gets us closer without creating so much work that this could potentially push agencies needing to ask for resources to to accommodate the added level of effort. Yeah. Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 56:23

yeah. And to clarify, I yeah, I was thinking of a retrospective like once a year, agencies calculate these rates for the set cohorts and just report the six months. I wouldn't, yeah, my team would kill me if I said we were doing this every six months. Just not possible for us from a resource perspective, either. So I know it would be difficult for others as well, until we get the data, possibility.

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 56:51

Yes, yes, right? So the cohorts would be a group of folks, for simplicity, released from each of these agencies in a given fiscal year, and then followed for the next three years with report outs happening in those annual reporting cycles. But reporting a six month rate, a 12 month rate and a 36 month rate kind of cyclically as we do. I think what that does is create some consistency with past reporting, so that there's something that's similar for folks who are used to looking at these reports, also manages the burden, and then I think, with the idea that if technology were in a position where a human analyst didn't have to do so much work to execute this analysis that additional reporting would be very straightforward, but with the matching as it is and requiring so much human interaction with the data, yeah, anything more frequently than a report each year would be really difficult to do. I mean, it takes at least one to three months to produce the report. So that alone makes it difficult to report out any more frequently than annually.

Linda Harrison 58:30

All right,

Erin Crites 58:33

maybe that wasn't so bad. We won't have to spend three meetings talking about timing. Folks that do the work. Kelli, I know you mentioned your your your folks would would not be happy with any more frequent reporting than once a year, conducting the studies more frequently than once a year. What about for for other folks? Does that, that timing work continue to follow an annual reporting cycle, but now include, I think what would be the difference for most folks, is including a six month and maybe dropping a two year is the practical change? Lindsay, Val, Aaron, Linda,

Linda Harrison 59:27

well, I think traditionally.

Val, can you verify this for me that we've always gone two years in our community corrections evaluation report we which I know is different than your performance based contracting metric.

Valarie Schamper 59:43

Yeah, you guys do two years two

Speaker 3 59:48

but yeah, [inaudible]

Erin Crites 59:56

I guess I think back to kind of Michael's point. I. Is that a third year really necessary? It sounds like from a parole standpoint, that's what people have always done, so it's become the standard practice. But is that something that we want to adopt as a state for our definition, or do we want to limit it to a two year follow up period. Do we get much out of that extra extra year?

Jeff Wise 1:00:33

So my thought on this is, how are other states doing it? Because I think a consideration is comparing, being able to compare Colorado to North Carolina, and it seems to me, like most other states are doing at least three years, right? I don't know, Michael probably knows more, but I think that's another important consideration, going back to his point about what's the purpose of this. So just a thought, I definitely like, I six months, one one year, three years, sounds awesome, especially as we're talking about, you know, like the parole population that tracking is not going to start until they're off parole. So it'd be really interesting to see what happens in that immediate six month period. So I would definitely advocate for capturing three years at minimum. I

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Erin Crites 1:01:44

yeah, I think that's a fair point, and always a piece that our legislative folks right, not not only wanting to look at what happens internally, but also how does the state compare, and finding that balance between being able to prepare ourselves to other states and also maybe moving this conversation in a direction that we think is more beneficial, which is starting to talk about those shorter term outcomes instead of always waiting further down. So I think this, this could strike a nice balance from that perspective as well

Linda Harrison 1:02:20

so for wanting to make some enable comparisons to other states, is it worth doing a bit of a survey to find out what it is that other states do track, because we're also going to be limited by misdemeanor/felony conviction. How many other states use that? And then what? Yeah. So yeah, if there's two states in the United States that do it the way we do it, it doesn't really matter.

Erin Crites 1:02:49

Yeah, Michael and I think Kelli probably has some info on the juvenile side. From that perspective,

Michael Campbell 1:02:56

I was just going to say, you know, really the discussion of what we would like to have, or what's possible or prioritize, is really a resource question, right? Because, from my perspective, I don't know what the agencies could do realistically, that wouldn't be a new major added burden to people. So some of this is kind of if we say that there's a pot of resources of time and energy that our people can invest in the various agencies in this process. It kind of depends on the size of that pot and how splitting it up would look. It may be that, because three years has traditionally been a measure, it may not be that much resources to keep and retain something like that. But I just feel like in terms of trying to focus the data and the insights from the data on the things that seem to matter most. I just know from the research on recidivism, so much of that points to the earliest points of when people leave. If you talk about the percentage of people that are going, you know that are where the outcomes, where the big things happen. It is a shorter term. That doesn't mean, though, that it's not important to know what happens to these people in the bigger picture. And if you know, obviously it would be great to retain that. And it is useful to compare, you know, to Jeff's point, to compare to other states when possible. But again, there's always going to be limitations with that as well. I do a lot of that work, and every state's kind of different the way they define things. And so everything's a little qualified. But the question is, is it doable without making everybody hate us and then essentially stop doing it? And then, if doable, then you know, within the parameters of resources, you know, what are the things that we'd have to prioritize, and then I guess, in the bigger picture, if we can have and keep them, can we still have those bigger picture things that do let us try to reference what we do in Colorado to other states within limits and knowing that that it's imperfect? Yeah.

Erin Crites 1:04:57

Thanks. Um, Addrienne,

Addrienne Sanchez 1:05:03

yeah, I just was confused, I think, by a statement that Jeff made a second ago. Did you say something about tracking people once they're not on parole?

Erin Crites 1:05:11

Yeah, so the parole cohort would happen once they're completely released from parole supervision. So kind of our our broad theme for when we kind of start tracking recidivism for each of the agencies, is when the agency is no longer responsible for that person. DOC, when they're no longer under inmate status for parole, when they are discharged from parole, for DYS when they're completely discharged from DYS, those were kind of our, our broad so okay, for as an example, somebody was, you know, right in, in DOC.

## **TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting**

July 18, 2024

Addrienne Sanchez 1:05:57

So I get it. I understand how it works. Right person discharges for parole. I understand that. So I just was clarifying, since I haven't been included, or haven't included myself up to this point, so I was trying to catch myself back up to where we were at so thank you.

Erin Crites 1:06:16

No worries. Yeah, I was we've had the conversation about how people could get counted right as recidivist as both a DOC recidivist and a parole recidivist, depending upon how that timing happens and how those two cohorts are captured. Yeah, so Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 1:06:45

yeah, sorry, I put a comment in, but yeah, it seems like the three year is pretty important, especially on the adult side. If we're wanting to do any type of comparison, although those are very tricky, I would definitely agree we only have two other states that use conviction and have a similar population and a somewhat similar methodology to what we do in Colorado. It increases to five states when we look at two year, and then like seven states when we reduce it down to one year. But I did want to say, I think just the fact that this group may entertain a six month rate is that's pretty awesome, and kind of setting the stage like just having that rate in our reporting is going to create that conversation and people and ask why this group decided that that was important, so just having that six month might, yeah, start some really good conversations about being more granular in our tracking, and why the earlier tracking might be key to putting services in place for those individuals. Yeah. So applause to this group.

Erin Crites 1:08:10

Okay, so just to kind of summarize, I think this sounds like we do want to keep kind of a that three years for those longer term comparisons, I think there's some historical comparisons too, that are, are helped by having that three year rate also having the one year rate. And then I think the signaling, the utility of it, and the signaling also to our partners, with the six month rate that you know it that more immediate feedback is is important, not just those long term, long term outcomes. So we'll go ahead and put that in as in terms of, you know, how long are we tracking three years being the outside, but reporting a six and one year rate as well for each of those cohorts. And then, since we have a little bit of time, do we want to talk about some of those methodological considerations that we want to clarify across we can start with the time, since that's what we're talking about today, or we can walk back to anything else that we feel like we we hadn't kind of adequately discussed some of those technical pieces that we want to make sure that we are as closely aligned as possible, or very clear about why we would maybe have to do things differently in different parts of our system. That makes sense, or do people want to think about, about that and come back to it in August, once we have everything kind of laid out a bit more clearly, and have time to kind of go back and talk to folks they may need to talk to about if we said this was your new definition, and this is what needed to be done, what would the process look like to execute this report, and are there things that we need to be we need to make the group aware of in that process of executing kind of under this new definition, new for some, maybe not so new for others. But do we need some pause time and time to kind of regroup and talk to folks before we dive into some of those details?

Michael Campbell 1:10:51

It seems like that would make the discussions more productive.

Jeff Wise 1:10:56

What how are we doing on our timeline, or larger timeline, we've till January, right? But are we ahead of schedule?

Erin Crites 1:11:05

Yeah, we're doing just fine on our timeline. I think Jeff, we were hoping to kind of wrap this up in September, only because the overlap between, the statutory overlap between this group and the alternative metrics, which will be a lot, I think it'll be a larger group. There will be a lot more discussion about what to include, what not to include, and the



## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

nuances of how to execute any of that. And that time frame was pretty short, so we were trying to kind of borrow some time a little bit, practically speaking, if we could get through this, like state agency, kind of technical data bit first and then move into that discussion, I think most people really want to spend a lot more time on which is those alternative metrics. But I think we are still, I feel pretty comfortable likely being the one who has to draft the first round of this committee's report, that we can finish this up by the end of September, at least our heavy work, and then maybe review the report over email and do that, you know, through October, if we need to. But I'm feeling pretty confident that we can kind of do most of our work by September, even if we, you know, have folks come back at our mid August meeting the days escaping me in this moment, but take the next few weeks to talk to folks, get the details of kind of that, and I can draft an email, if it's easier, before I leave next week, to say, here's if this were a definition, what would it take to execute it? What are the things that we need to caveat? What are the considerations that we need to make sure are clear, so that each agency has the opportunity to document those so that it's very clear in our final report what these definitions are, what they mean to each agency, and what that's going to look like from a methodological and technical perspective. Yeah, Dave,

David Wolfsgruber 1:13:20

so I always come from an inclusive space, so I had looped in Lindsay Compton because she's been living this for a number of years, and that's under Addrienne, Addrienne Sanchez's shop. So I'm really glad Adrian is able to join us as well. So the question I have for the group is, can we bring in as many people as we need so we can have this fuller conversation? I know that we're all appointed to this group by our agency. But can we have this fuller conversation with as many individuals as we can so we can resolve this during the meeting, instead of having to go back and forth and asking these questions to our internal experts, for example, we do 1, 2, 3, years [audio dropped] so [inaudible]

Erin Crites 1:14:09

yes, Dave, I appreciate that. I think that's a great idea. So maybe if folks are available, I know we have some of our data folks, and we don't have some of our data folks. So maybe for our August meeting, let me see if I can pull up our calendar here. Oh, sorry, I think it's yeah. I am not gonna be able to do that while I but our mid August meeting was like the 15th or something of that nature. Does that sound right? August 15? I think it might be that. Um, yeah. Okay, so, um, is it possible for maybe folks to see if their their data analyst folks, the ones who do the report here, Kelli for your shopping, and Val for yours and anything. Lindsay, if you can continue to come, or if there's other folks that also assist on the reporting, we can come back together again, having kind of a general sense of what it would take to execute reporting based on these new definitions and kind of parameters that we've talked about, and then we can talk directly to those, those data folks, and to

Linda Harrison 1:15:38

it strikes me this is going to be especially relevant for DOC, because all the other agencies are already pretty intimately familiar with the Judicial data. But I think it's a new spin for Department of Corrections people to incorporate that. That's fair.

Erin Crites 1:15:44

That's a good point. So we

Addrienne Sanchez 1:16:01

already have it. We already have it.

Erin Crites 1:16:04

You already have the Judicial data. Addrienne,

Addrienne Sanchez 1:16:07

yeah. Lindsay, do you want to go ahead? You can expand on that if you want. Lindsay,

## TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

July 18, 2024

Lindsay Compton 1:16:14

yeah. So we actually are already breaking down all of our recidivism rates in six months, one year two, year three, year four, year five, year and by technical parole violation. So we have it all. We just need to know which one is official kind of is where we stand.

Linda Harrison 1:16:32

Lindsay, could you speak up a bit having a really hard time hearing you?

Lindsay Compton 1:16:35

Yeah, sure. Sorry. We're already breaking ours down by six months, one year, two year, three year, four year, five year new crimes, technical parole violations. YOSers, we have it all broken down already. We just kind of need to know which one of those is going to be the official rate, so it's not a heavy lift on our side at all.

Erin Crites 1:16:58

Great. Yeah. So Lindsay, are you already reporting new convictions? Even if they don't return to DOC, we still like a new misdemeanor conviction, yeah,

Linda Harrison 1:17:08

even without a return to DOC.

Lindsay Compton 1:17:11

So we don't report them, obviously, in the cohort, but they get excluded from the cohort if they don't return, which was where we get our percentage from. So they're in the data, down however we need to. So it's not this is a huge lift for us. We just have to know exactly which parameters to follow. Okay, so we're good,

Linda Harrison 1:17:32

and you access judicial data to do that.

Lindsay Compton 1:17:38

We we get data in from, yeah, all over. So courts, yeah,

Erin Crites 1:17:44

okay, awesome. So I think what I'll do, if this sounds good for folks, I do leave the country on Tuesday, so I will get to you before then, and then I will be out for two weeks with zero access to anything. So I will get kind of like I've done before, an email out with our, like, the kind of simplified version of each of these points that we were asked to kind of decide on in the statute, and say, here's what I think we have agreed to, please, obviously, check my check my math there, but and then folks can take that back to to your data folks that are doing this work and say, here's the definition that this group has come up with. You know, what would it take to execute this definition for our agency? It sounds like for a lot of folks, not much, but just really going back and confirming those assumptions so that we make sure that we don't get a year from now and realize that we we missed something which would be, I think, heartbreaking for all of us and really frustrating for the folks being asked to do this work. So I will commit to getting that email out to you all, hopefully tomorrow, and then when we all meet back again on August 15, if folks can bring their data people or themselves, if you're the data person, we can make sure that we are all on the same page and have all of our questions answered, and then we can, from there, kind of settle this definition and some of those pieces, and if we want to then start talking about anything else we kind of have a broader and kind of what else would you all like to track? Maybe we can formalize, for those of us that like to think about rainbows and unicorns, formalize what recommendation we might have around getting at this more. Um, immediate kind of data piece and reporting that would leverage some of the technology that we can't currently leverage to provide folks with what we think they really want, but we're not able to do for them at this point. So kind of for folks that need to have the data conversations focus on that for folks that are absolved from talking

## **TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting**

July 18, 2024

to data people, maybe think about kind of that. Michael, I think you put it, it's easy to dream from the ivory tower. Spend some of that time in the ivory tower dreaming a bit so that we can also have something to provide, from a futuristic standpoint, of what we really hope our system to look like, and not just stop at what we can produce for for the legislature under this current mandate. How does it sound for folks? Good, okay, and you will not hear from me for two weeks. So enjoy that, and I if Kelli,

Kelli Burmeister 1:21:09

you and I will be out of the country at the same time, which is great. Just one last question on the flow chart. Yes, I know these were draft, so if you're amenable, I may send you just a different DYS one, so I was just curious. These aren't this was just going to this group, right?

Erin Crites 1:21:31

Yes, these were my brain trying to make sense of that conversation about what happens for people. And I thought it might be helpful to put some version of something like it in our final report to help ground folks that aren't familiar. So if you already have a better one, cool I only know how to use Word Art. If anybody knows how to use anything better than word art, Greg is giggling at me, happy to take some assistance on creating better, more accurate, prettier flow charts.

Kelli Burmeister 1:22:06

Yeah, no worries.

Erin Crites 1:22:12

Awesome. All right, folks get 35 minutes back in their day, and then we will see each other all again in August.

Michael Campbell 1:22:23

Enjoy your time out of the country. Yes, both of you, yeah, all right. Take care, everyone. See you.

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai>