TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

August 15, 2024

Attendance: Dave Wolfgruber (DOC-Parole), Michael Campbell (University of Denver), Kelli Burmeister (CDHS-DYS), Jeff Wise (Remerg), Greg Saiz (DOC-Parole board), Katie Ruske (CDPS-DCJ-OCC), Aaron Stewart (State Judicial)
DCJ Staff: Erin Crites, Linda Harrison, Jack Reed, Laurence Lucero, Kaylynn Duncan
Guests: Sally Hill (CDHS-DYS), Matthew Olah (State Judicial), Mark Allison (El Paso County Justice Services)

Key Abbreviations:
42-CFR-Part 2—portion of federal law protecting information related to treatment for substance use disorders
CC-Community Corrections
CDOC-Colorado Department of Corrections (see also DOC)
CJI-Criminal Justice Information
ComCor-Community Corrections
DA-District Attorney
DCJ-Division of Criminal Justice
DOC-Department of Corrections
DYS-Division of Youth Services
HIPAA-Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
IRT-Intensive Residential Treatment
MOU-Memorandum of Understanding
SB19-108 (also 19-108)-Juvenile Justice Reform Bill
WAGEES-Work and Gain Education & Employment Skills (https://wageesco.org/)

Erin Crites 0:00
Awesome. All right, welcome everybody to our meeting. It looks like we have quite a number of folks, new and visiting, to our meeting. So once again, we'll run through and do quick introductions, just so everybody knows who everyone is. And then, if you'll just say whether you're on this working group officially or a guest. That way we can keep track, and then we will jump into our agenda. I'll run through one in the room first, and then we'll go through online. I'm Erin Crites. I am policy advisor here in the Office of Research and Statistics, and I'm helping to facilitate this working group with Jack.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:06
I'm Jack Reed. I'm the Research Director in the Office of Research and Statistics, and I am here to help Erin facilitate this working group, and I will pass it on to Aaron.

Aaron Stewart 1:13
Aaron, Hi, I'm Aaron Stewart. I'm with the judicial branch of the State Board of Administrators Office and Division of Probation Services. I'm an analyst there, and I am on this working group.

Kelli Burmeister 1:27
I'm Kelli Burmeister, Director of Data Management Analysis with DYS and I am on the working group. I'll pass it over to Sally.

Sally Hill 1:37
Hi. I'm Sally Hill. I'm a senior, excuse me, a senior analyst with the Data Management and Analysis team with DYS, and I've been the principal investigator of the DYS recidivism report for, I think this will be my eighth year. I'm not on anything else, I was told to be here.

Erin Crites 2:01
I'm just going to call names across the top of our, of our Zoom here. So Kaylynn, why don't you go first?

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting
August 15, 2024

Kaylynn Duncan 2:13
So Kaylynn Duncan, I'm the new PA over at ORS just joining.

Erin Crites 2:21
All right? Matthew,

Matthew Olah 2:23
Yeah, hi. My name is Matthew. I am also with the Colorado Judicial Branch, with Division of Probation Services, also under the Un- or the Evaluation Unit and Aaron Stewart. Aaron Stewart is my supervisor. I'm also a guest.

Erin Crites 2:40
I'm sorry. Dave.

David Wolfsgruber 2:48
Dave Wolfsgruber, Director of Adult Parole, Colorado Department of Corrections, member of the working group.
Erin Crites 2:54
Thanks, Dave. Oh, Laurence.

Laurence Lucero 2:58
Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Laurence Lucero. I'm a research analyst working with, with Jack and Erin, and I'm just listening in today. Thank you.

Erin Crites 3:09
Valerie.

Valerie Schamper 3:13
Hi, I'm Valerie Schamper. I'm the Deputy Manager in the Office of Community Corrections and lifelong data nerd. I also think I'm technically like a recurring guest, but I'm here a lot.

Erin Crites 3:28
Yes, and are you standing in for Katie today?

Valerie Schamper 3:32
Katie is here, but she's a little unwell, so you'll probably hear mostly from me, and she'll ping me in the background and tell me the things that I was supposed to say that I missed; most likely, what will happen.

Erin Crites 3:42
Awesome. She might be on page two of our list. Mark.

Mark Allison 3:49
Mark Allison with El Paso County Justice Services,

Erin Crites 3:52
I'm sorry, Mark, we cannot hear you very well.

Mark Allison 3:56
Can you hear me now?

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting

August 15, 2024

Erin Crites 3:57
Better.

Mark Allison 3:58
Okay, sorry. Mark Allison El Paso County Justice Services and just a guest.

Erin Crites 4:03
Awesome. Nice to have you, and let's see, Jeff.

Jeff Wise 4:11
Afternoon, everyone. Jeff Wise, I'm the Director of Grants and Operations with the community based re-entry organization, Remerg.

Erin Crites 4:22
Greg.

Jeff Wise 4:23
And I'm a committee member.

Erin Crites 4:25
Thank you.

Greg Saiz 4:28
Greg Saiz, I'm a member of the Colorado Board of Parole, and I'm a member for the working group.

Erin Crites 4:37
Katie.

Katie Ruske 4:40
Hi everyone. I'm Katie Ruske. I'm the Manager of the Office of Community Corrections. Sorry for being on off of video. I'm not feeling my best today, but Valerie has been filling in for me anyways, because I've been so busy so but I'm happy to be here today to listen.

Erin Crites 4:59
Thanks. Katie, did I - Oh, Michael. We have a long list today.

Michael Campbell 5:06
Hello, everyone. Michael Campbell, I'm a professor of Criminology at the University of Denver, and I too am on the working group.

Erin Crites 5:16
Jack, did I get everybody?

Jack Reed - CDPS 5:19
I believe so, yes.

Erin Crites 5:22
Okay perfect. We have a nice group today, so welcome to those of you who are joining us for this meeting and for doing those introductions. So normally, we have minutes. I haven't been able to clean up the minutes from the last meeting. So, I will get those out via email in the next week or so, so that the members of the working group can review those, and

then we'll get all of that posted once those minutes have been approved. So, look for an email from me in the next week or so with those minutes for approval, and we will get those posted on the website for this working group. Okay, so for those of you who haven't had a chance to look at the agenda, the main first portion of our agenda is to have kind of a discussion around the technical execution for the state agencies of the definition that we've agreed upon. So at our last meeting, we were having some conversation around what it would look like for each of the state agencies to implement this new definition, and wanting to have that conversation with the data analyst present, if possible, so that we could make sure that we've thought through as many of the caveats as possible related to this definition, as well as addressing any kind of outstanding technical or methodological considerations that we want to make sure we agree upon, document, and make sure consistent across our agencies, or at least the inconsistencies are well documented and appropriate for, for each of the entities. So hopefully, that's what you all are expecting for this first part of our meeting, and I think this was something that was of most interest to Parole as well. So, I want to make sure that we address any of the concerns that Parole had around executing the definition as well. So, with that, that was also one of the tasks for folks, while we had our little bit of break in meetings, was to go back to, to agency folk and talk to analysts about what it would look like to execute this definition and what, what you would need to do that. So why don't we start with DYS because Sally has joined us. So, we will start with them and go through some of this, and then work our way through each of the other entities and see where that takes us. After we do that, we'll discuss some of the ideal future states, which I think we talked about as kind of a fun way to end our conversation here, and make sure that those are things that we document as well in our report. And so, we will do that at the end of our meeting and leave space for public comment for those of you who are joining us if there's anything you'd like to add. This is also fairly informal meeting, so if there's something you would like to add as we're talking, please feel free to raise your hand on Zoom, and we will incorporate questions and comments throughout the meeting. All right, DYS, take it away.

Kelli Burmeister 9:02
Happy to start. Yeah, that works. I think we're one of the maybe agencies that have it easier than most. So, we've kind of discussed the decisions and agreements that we've come to so far, and the point to begin tracking is what we already do, so that's business as usual for us. There's a, we'll be producing a couple new rates, but other than that, not a whole lot of changes for our agencies. So, the couple of changes would be that we would, that we would produce our normal, a regular one-year rate, or whatever we decide the cadence will be for the rates, and then we'll also show a rate of successful youth that have discharged from our system. So, we would have both of those to share in our reporting. And then the six-month rate would be a new calculation for us as well, but talked it over with Sally, and it doesn't seem to be workload intensive, neither is the calculating rate for our successful youth at discharge. So, those are the two changes for our agency, and they're not super impactful or burdensome, so we didn't have a whole lot of questions to bring to the group, but yeah, as far as the technical application of some of this stuff, it'll be great to have Sally, Sally here to inform us, and maybe there's things that she's thought of that we haven't as we continue to discuss but yeah, anything you want to add to that is great.

Sally Hill 10:46
And stop me if you guys, if you've already discussed this in previous meetings, I'm kind of playing catch up. But when we include successful completers, it's going to only include those youth that actually did go on parole. So, we will, that's the measure that we capture, is the referral rating at discharge. So, we do have some youth, it's not a large portion, but there will be some youth that won't be captured in that so just as long as everyone's aware. And I think my only other question really revolves around the definition, when it was the under the working group is required, 123, the fourth bullet, where it mentions, "the recidivism event is a new deferred agreement or adjudication or conviction for felony or misdemeanor events, including Victim Rights Act." Victim Rights Act are included in felonies and misdemeanors, so I was just curious if we are still going to be required to report out how many kids were committed on a Victim Right Act, how many kids were felony and misdemeanors, etc. Because to me, the way I read it, it just means you can't leave those out and they would be captured. So, there's no need to parse it out is where my brain is going, but I wanted to hear what other people's thoughts were.

Erin Crites 11:59
That's a good question. I think we can ask the folks that wrote the legislation, because it might be ambiguity in there. I would tend to agree with you on not disaggregating it. I know that was part of the conversation, because even one point was part of DYS statute, that it had to be -

Kelli Burmeister 12:20
Yeah, I -

Erin Crites 12:21
- and that'd be where the confusion came for the drafter.

Kelli Burmeister 12:24
We brought this up during the drafting process, that it was kind of duplicative and unnecessary to be in there because it would be covered by the felony misdemeanor, but the governor's office took a stance that they wanted that to remain in and maybe we specifically point out that group? But I think they were gonna leave it up to this working group to determine that they didn't want that language removed.

Erin Crites 12:50
Okay.

Kelli Burmeister 12:50
Because, yeah, they wanted to keep any victims' rights specific analysis in there and verbiage, is what I took away.

Erin Crites 13:07
Thoughts on that particular piece? So, for your current report, do you report those like as a subset, or they're just included in misdemeanors and felonies as they are?

Sally Hill 13:28
It's a separate, separate section of the report that we look at. And I think the way the statute was written, we had to look at how many youth were committed on VRA offenses, then how many recidivist acts were VRA offenses, and they wanted that broken out by misdemeanors and felonies as well. So, it's just a separate chapter in the report that we put together. It was, the first year, a bit of a lift to be able to identify all those cases, but once we sort of nailed that down, it's just another chapter. It's not one of the more labor-intensive bits, but I will say it has not been particularly informative to us in any meaningful way. So, I'd be happy to jettison it if possible, but if it needs to stay, and then we're okay with that.

Erin Crites 14:13
Correct me, for Parole and other and other folks, because again, I'm only most familiar with Judicial's report, the DYS' report, I think you all are the only ones that separate those crimes out in a separate chapter of our report. I don't believe judicial does, and then I don't, Jack's shaking his head, that those are separated out for ComCor or for Parole or DOC in current reporting. I'm not seeing - okay -

David Wolfsgruber 14:50
That's correct. They are not separated.

Erin Crites 14:52
Okay. So, I would say, let's go with the simple version.

Sally Hill 14:58
Works for us.

Kelli Burmeister 15:03
DYS would like that.

Erin Crites 15:05
This is fine. Yeah. Okay, simplify the report. Okay. I mean, unless somebody has a strong opposition to that, it seems that that makes sense. Okay, awesome. All right, any other -

Sally Hill 15:22
I don't have anything else. If you do, Kelli -

Kelli Burmeister 15:25
I don't. I'll have to see if we're still, we might still be tied to it for our statute, but we'll review that. I don't have anything else.

Erin Crites 15:36
Might be able to tackle that next week.

Kelli Burmeister 15:38
Yeah.

Erin Crites 15:40
Awesome. Um, oh, okay, Aaron, do you want to talk about Judicial's report and the technical aspects of it, and then maybe also, if you can, while you're doing that, talk about some of the data sharing implications if we're, since we're going down the path of using Judicial's data to define the recidivism event, what that might look like for folks who don't currently have access to those data?

Aaron Stewart 16:07
Sure. Yeah. So, from the actual definition standpoint, we're in a similar boat, I would say, as DYS. We don't have a whole lot that we need to change. We're already tracking the event as it is. The point to begin tracking is already what we're looking at. The cohort that we're tracking is already pretty much the same. We've already disaggregated the different outcomes, so that already fits in with the way that this is looking. And similarly, the six months is due to us, but it shouldn't be too much of a hardship, I can probably get that done for $200 a year, from your own pocket of course.

Erin Crites 16:42
Just to jump ahead.

Aaron Stewart 16:42
Okay, yeah, so that would be easy enough. [inaudible]. So that's not difficult at all. As for the implications for different agencies we are already sharing data with DYS and how that's working in at least for the simplicity on our end, we try to, if I remember correctly, produce about seven years' worth of data that goes backwards. Is that correct? And try to clean it up once. And it is a gigantic data file of basically every conviction that exists in the State of Colorado for the past seven years that we're looking at, and we have been working with SPSS for that because it's such a large data set. So, to be able to share that with folks, the most ideal way for us to be able to continue to do that, is to be able to share that same data set, if people have access to SPSS within their agencies, to be able to utilize that. Otherwise it, it's technically shareable in Excel, but it becomes quite untenable, I will say. So that's something we might need to discuss a little bit

further. But we could, I think, set up similar data agreements with other agencies if necessary, to send this data set and share it in a way that's meaningful.

Jack Reed - CDPS 17:55
Aaron, does the data set you provide to DYS include Denver misdemeanor convictions?

Aaron Stewart 18:01
Yes. So, we also have data agreement with Denver where once a year, we get that information, so we're able to synthesize that as well, and it's included with them. So -

Jack Reed - CDPS 18:10
Great.

Erin Crites 18:11
And the ability to share Denver County data with other entities for this purpose is included in the MOU with Denver County. So, for those tracking the legal permissions they're covered under the two agreements.

Linda Harrison 18:28
Can I just ask if those data could be shareable, say, in a text or CSV file for those people who don't have access to or don't like to use SPSS? They're out there, I hear, I don't know who they are.

Aaron Stewart 18:47
I'm certain that's something that we can do, that it just gets to be a lot, at least with as far as Excel is concerned, you can only fit something like 1.2million rows -

Linda Harrison 18:59
Yeah, it's definitely a limited -

Aaron Stewart 19:01
- looking at quite a few million rows that get sent out, but I think it could be put into a CSV and, yeah, how that's navigated for others is their choice.

Erin Crites 19:10
And I think that's for our later conversation, something we might want to talk about what the future of that data matching process might look like knowing that the judicial data that sending is a current option, but we might all want to put our collective brains together to figure out what some other alternatives might be, so that the process isn't so labor intensive for analysts at Judicial and everywhere else who has to kind of manually match or use, kind of some crude syntax programming to match the data and then check it manually to make sure nothing got missed. Awesome. So, what about Parole?

David Wolfsgruber 20:04
So of course, I'm the guy who advocates for our IT folks, IT and policy analysts to be present, and I'm flying solo today. They have indicated to me that they had no concerns with being able to retool the system that we currently produce recidivism statistics on to meet the new objective of, of our, of our team and what, what ultimately, we produce and recommend that the recidivism definition entails. So, they indicated that they had no issues or concerns with the items that were being discussed and addressed by this team.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting
August 15, 2024

Erin Crites 20:42
Great Dave. One of the things I wonder about confirming with them is the use of judicial data, because I think that will be a new piece, from my understanding, is using the court data for capturing events, rather than data that they currently use to capture recidivism events. So, and then, from a practical standpoint, figuring out those agreements and data sharing components that would be, need to be in place for, for that data transfer to occur.

David Wolfsgruber 21:27
Yeah, no problem. I will definitely ask them.

Erin Crites 21:29
Okay, awesome. I just don't want to overlook that for you all, since that is a component that the lawyers get involved in, we want to make sure we've got our bases covered there.

David Wolfsgruber 21:41
Understood.

Erin Crites 21:45
All right. Linda?

Linda Harrison 21:47
Yeah, I just have a question. When judicial, say, gives data to DYS, do you just give them the whole download of convictions and they do the matching? Judicial, data doesn't come to Judicial, and you guys -
Aaron Stewart 22:06
Yeah, that's correct.

Linda Harrison 22:07
I mean, you guys, the representative from Judicial isn't; it's not done on your end.

Aaron Stewart 22:15
Correct. Yeah. So, we just send it over and they do their magic, which is lovely.

Sally Hill 22:19
Well...

Kelli Burmeister 22:21
You too.

Aaron Stewart 22:21
It's more lovely for me.

Erin Crites 22:32
Yes, each agency historically has matched their own data, yeah, using that one standard file. That's been three years, four years now that that process has been followed?

Kelli Burmeister 22:45
I think this will be the fourth year?

Sally Hill 22:47
The fourth year of using that data.

Erin Crites 22:49
Yeah, all right, what about let's see, DOC, I'm assuming, Dave, we're in the same boat as Parole on that one.

David Wolfsgruber 23:05
Yes, yes, nothing, nothing's changed, nothing different, still, still capable of producing recidivism numbers to meet the group's recidivism definition, and I will get back to you with respect to the use of judicial data. So same answer as Parole.

Erin Crites 23:22
Okay, great. All right.

Jack Reed - CDPS 23:26
Community Corrections.

Erin Crites 23:27
Yeah. Let's do, how about Community Corrections?

Valerie Schamper 23:35
Yes, we can do it. Fast question. We, this is probably our fourth definition of recidivism that we will be running. So, it is, it is different than any of the current ones, but it's totally doable. It'll take a little bit different filtering for us. We have some pretty, like, detailed technical questions about who to include and who to exclude based on termination reason. We have, like, interesting nuances, we all do, but we have some things we kind of want to clarify, just to make sure we're in alignment with what the expectation is. And I can go into those, or we can do those in a different place and time, but overall, it's manageable for us, for sure.

Erin Crites 24:19
For the sake of consistency and while we have folks here. Why don't we talk a little bit about some of those nuances? I think that's part of the conversation we want to have today to make sure that we're kind of all on the same page with the practical application of the definition. Yeah.

Valerie Schamper 24:39
So, we have a number of specialized programs, and so we just wanted to clarify that, you know, this definition of having left our supervision would apply across the board for us. Just to be sure, we see some folks like condition and probation clients that come in for just the 90-day ERT program. I assume we would still be classifying those in our sort of population for those purposes. In other words, do specialized count? Assuming yes, but I just want to make sure we're looking across all of our services to be sure that that's appropriate for these purposes.
Erin Crites 25:18
Yeah. So, my understanding from our conversations is, yes, yes, you - those would be included. I'll just open it up if anybody has a different understanding of that.

Valerie Schamper 25:36
The other thing that we just sort of want to sort through a little bit as we have a couple interesting ways people leave us, one of which is unique to us, which is called reject after accept. Sorry, this gets weird in the weeds. For those of you who are bored by things, I'm sorry about this, but reject after accept in Community Corrections is basically we've taken a client and Community Corrections, we realize after they've entered that they are in an inappropriate placement, we cannot provide services to them. It's not their fault. They didn't fail or succeed. We just simply send them back to their referring agency. It happens relatively quickly. We're inclined to remove those from our data set because they're really not clients that were appropriate to be served in Community Corrections, but we wanted to clarify that removing that particular subgroup would be in alignment with the expectations of this group and our definition.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting
August 15, 2024

Erin Crites 26:31
Similar to closed for probation?

Aaron Stewart 26:35
Close, I think, is a little bit, if I remember correct is slightly different than that, right? Because closed is for specifically, when people, trying to remember what closed -

Erin Crites 26:49
- similar kind of a thing like the case got triggered to probation, but it actually shouldn't be there, so it gets -

Aaron Stewart 26:57
Uh-huh.

Erin Crites 26:57
- closed.

Aaron Stewart 26:58
Yeah, that's yeah, probably pretty close then.
Erin Crites 27:00
Does DYS have something similar that you all handle?

Kelli Burmeister 27:04
We have commitments that are vacated or terminated, and usually it's within the first few months of a commitment. So, I think it's somewhat similar, but it's not a huge number or percentage for sure, but we do have a few each year that are adjudicated.

Erin Crites 27:24
Do you remove them from your cohort for analysis? No, you keep them in -

Kelli Burmeister 27:27
No, we keep them in.

We keep them in as a (inaudible) charge.

Erin Crites 27:29
Okay.

Linda Harrison 27:31
Because what happens at DOC with those people?

Aaron Stewart 27:34
I think we do.

Linda Harrison 27:35
Were they ever included in the existing recidivism stuff?

Erin Crites 27:40
So, it sounds like DYS does include their vacated. Probation typically does not, if I recall. I think that's one of like four codes that's excluded because they never received "the program", is typically how it's thought of.

Sally Hill 28:02
It's kind of, similar to ICJs that we get where they never received services, but they have a discharge date, but they were never committed, so they don't. We just supervise them off here while they were on parole from another state. We can't really speak to how we didn't provide services.

Kelli Burmeister 28:21
Colorado didn't.

Erin Crites 28:23
Okay, the Interstate Compact?

Sally Hill 28:27
Yeah.

Erin Crites 28:28
Okay.

Valerie Schamper 28:31
it's a small subset for us too. We just wanted to be thoughtful about how we're, you know, working with our data.

Erin Crites 28:38
I think that's exactly why we set this time to have this discussion to get down to the nuances. Greg.

Greg Saiz 28:47
Thanks, Erin. And if you can't hear me, please let me know I'm in a weird echoey room. I'm curious about numbers, because this question about how DOC handles the reject after accepts and, and generally, those happen pretty quickly. Generally, not always. But I'm just curious, kind of, Dave, I don't know if you'd have this off the top of your head. Mark, you'd obviously have some institutional knowledge from, from a previous iteration of career. So, I'm just curious, kind of, what sort of anecdotally we're looking at in terms of numbers and time frames. Because while it's important, I don't know that it changes the measurements appreciably.

David Wolfsgruber 29:25
I'd have to get back to you, Greg, on specific numbers, but it really depends on the type of the case. I mean, if the Parole Board only will parole to a Community Corrections facility, and then they're, they're an inmate in a Community Corrections facility, before there's a determination, we've got to really take a look at that particular case and find out. What are we going to do? Are we going to return that person to the parent facility? Are they a parolee? Are they an inmate? It really depends on the type of case that's going to a Community Corrections facility. If the Parole Board has already granted release and now they're a parolee, we then have to find placement for them, whether it be in a Community Corrections facility or another residential placement. If it's an inmate, they could be pulled back into either; they could be pulled back to the parent institution. So, it really depends on the type of case. I don't have numbers on those. I'd have to find out if we even track that specific, you know, case where it's a reject after accept, I really have to, to find out with our data analyst as to whether or not that's a population they can they can track. I'll get back to you on that.

Greg Saiz 30:31
Yeah, no worries. Sorry to put you on the spot.

David Wolfsgruber 30:33
That's okay.

Greg Saiz 30:33
But it seems, in my experience, that that would be a relatively small number. Of course, the transition folks, right? That's easier to track because they're still inmates regardless. But there would be, of course, kind of a cup of tea, as it were, in community, the COP folks become a little bit different, because then it's almost easier, I would think, because they're also tracking parole and community, right? We talked a lot about overlap and how we'll have some stream crossing, and so that piece seems a little bit easier. We tend to see, my experience in the past, we tended to see fewer of those folks come back on, reject after accepts. Not that it doesn't happen, but fewer.

Valerie Schamper 31:07
Really, it's a really small number overall.

David Wolfsgruber 31:08
Yeah, and they would still remain as a I'm sorry. They would still remain, obviously, in the inmate realm. So, you're not tracking those individuals until they ultimately are released to parole supervision. And of course, what we're proposing to track is, once they've completed parole supervision, then we start the tracking. So as far as our population, yeah, it won't, it won't matter, as far as our tracking. But there are, I just wanted to make sure that the group is, is fully aware that there's several tracks when we talk about Community Corrections, the cases that the Parole Board wants in a Community Corrections facility as a step down prior to release to the community as parolee. And then we've got the inmates, as most of you know, that are in Community Corrections facilities as well. So, I would like to get numbers on the entire cohort of those cases to see if we even we even track it. My gut feeling is we don't, but I'll definitely dig in and get an answer for the group.

Linda Harrison 32:02
I do know that OPA can identify those people.

Jack Reed - CDPS 32:08
Valerie really quick, so reject after accept from a direct sentence. Does that, I mean is there, like, does one happen more frequently than another? Like diversion versus transition?

Valerie Schamper 32:24
I'd have to dig into our reports to give you that answer. I don't know it, off the top of my head, does happen, though, we will send them back to reports for re-sentencing. But the frequency of one versus the other, I'm not entirely certain about. It is ultimately still in the grand scheme things a lower number within our population. I mean, we're looking at, like, I don't know, maybe 60 a year, or something small in terms of actual numbers. So, it, it's not huge, it to Greg's point. It's not the end of the world to track them or not track them. They will ultimately get picked up by the agencies they're going back to, right? So, DOC, Parole, Judicial, but it's just, you know, in knowing what we're picking and what we're not picking, we wanted to have conversations.

Erin Crites 33:14
Thoughts from others on the merits of including those folks in the cohorts capture?

Linda Harrison 33:30
I personally, I don't think it makes any sense. I don't think it makes any sense to include them because they are going back to some other agency that will be resentenced to probation, you know. And if they're coming out of DOC and get rejected, they'll just be still an inmate going back to DOC or Parole.

Erin Crites 33:48
I think from some of our earlier conversations, right? That's one of those counts that will balloon that denominator a little bit, but really not be eligible in a lot of ways for recidivism, necessarily and certainly didn't receive programming. It

might be neutrals actually in Judicial's data, so they're there, but the reporting on that is looked at differently now that I think about it. Okay.

Michael Campbell 34:22
Yeah, Erin, I would, I would agree with what you just said. I mean, from a research standpoint, and trying to think about assessing and evaluating effectiveness, if that's what people are interested in, and trying to assess the, you know, characteristics of people going through the system and how things are affected, if they don't receive the treatment, then there's no, there's no point in trying to include them in a, in a population. It's just, it would actually just be a burden to people trying to use the data for the types of things that the legislature asked us to essentially get it to do.

Erin Crites 34:52
Thank you. All right, so I think, Val, the short answer is, don't worry about them.

Valerie Schamper 35:03
Perfect, fantastic. I think we have a few others like that. We'll have to, unfortunately. So, our data system is dependent on the accuracy of the data from our programs. I feel like I've made that caveat every time I showed up at this meeting. I'm going to make it several more times, but one of them is this is their ability to use "other" as a termination reason, which, as data analysts, I think we all hate "other" in general. So, I'm going to say that that potentially could be a burden for us in terms of cleaning that in a way that is reasonable to determine what stays in and what goes out, because "other" also includes "deceased," which of course, should probably not be included, although I'm going to can- But there are other things, like INS holds, or something like that, that could end up in there. So, it might be when we dive in, we may have to have some, some conversations and questions about what "other" looks like and how much manual cleaning of that we're going to do to determine what stays in and what goes out. A fun adventure for us. Maybe it's not as much for you guys, but for us so.

Erin Crites 36:18
Val, can I hang on the "other" for a minute?

Valerie Schamper 36:22
Yeah.

Erin Crites 36:22
So, I know that there are neutral terminations that exist in some of the systems, which is how "death," "supported," things like that get captured. So, I think recidivism still gets looked for, but the expectation is that it's not meaningful, really, because the person's not going to be found, or unlikely to be found, I guess in the data.

Valerie Schamper 36:57
Okay.

Erin Crites 36:56
In terms of "other" I think, to your point, sounds like some of them may fit in that category of "neutral," which might be consistent with what other folks do. Some of them maybe are, I don't know what else to check, so I check "other." Every data analyst's nightmare. And kind of, what are your thoughts on those distinctions between what's a true "other" and what's kind of it a more easily flagged, kind of neutral "other"?

Valerie Schamper 37:33
Yeah, so we do require them to, like, give us the reason, they have to type out what the "other" is. It's just a manual process to then clean and determine whether it was an appropriate use of "other," whether there was an actual termination reason that should have been associated with that and make that change, or if it's truly an "other." And

truly an "other" can I think, in my opinion, either land in "neutral" or be inclusive or fully exclusive. I think you could land in any of the three categories, though, the majority are probably "neutral." We use "neutral" a little bit differently in Community Corrections, because they move through our programming, and so it's a termination when they move from one program to another program. But technically, that's not a termination, right? They're just moving through the Community Correction system. So, we use the term neutral for those which is slightly different than the way you're using it, but those would be excluded automatically. We're really looking at trying to only grab those folks we truly like, released out into the world in some way or shape or form, or released, at least, from our, our supervision in some way, shape or form. So, I don't know yet what the burden will be on that. But again, there are some that I think are truly exclusive, like, like, again, these just would be in that category. It doesn't make sense to include them. Some of the others will be much like many of our negative terminations, just to say they're going to someone else's custody. (Dogs barking)

Erin Crites 37:40
The dogs. No, the dogs have decided that those are a problem. Okay, so it sounds like that one we might have to wait a little bit on, because that discussion will have to happen when, the data are, are kind of pulled and looked at to produce the report, but I think sounds like we might generally be on the same page around the scheme to follow for these general types of termination. There's always going to be those weird, wonky things that get footnoted, I think, in the reports, but don't overall change the rates, which I think, to Michael's point is, what are we using, ultimately, using these data for, and what's the purpose of the reporting? A few cases here and there that are caveated in a footnote don't diminish the impact the rest of the reporting and the decisions that have been thoughtfully made by this group. So.

Valerie Schamper 40:08
And then we just had some clarifying questions. So, one, I believe we talked about last time that this would be in a report that's produced annually, is that the decision that we came to? Just in terms of our workload, we were trying to understand that a little bit better. And I don't know if any of these decisions have been made, but there was a question that came to me whether these would be independent agency reports or if we'd all be submitting for a centralized report, and kind of how that structure would go. I don't know it's an important question to answer right now, but I wanted to put it out there to say that I asked it.

Jack Reed - CDPS 40:42
I mean, looking at the statute, it's just it affects how we report, how each individual agency reports on their recidivism. And that was a discussion we had in the committee meetings. Was about really working to not compare the recidivism rates to each other. We actually, on our dashboard have a recidivism tab where we bring it all together in one place for all of the different you know from, from everyone's reports. So, to a certain extent, it already exists. It's just we kind of collect it in ORS from all the other agency reports. So as long as we continue doing that, then yes, it will be done that way. It's just not in any particular report. Just exists on a dashboard, and we have no obligation in statute to do that, I don't think. And other than including -

Valerie Schamper 41:47
Yet.

Jack Reed - CDPS 41:48
Other than including, there's no obligation to have a single source of recidivism truth.

Valerie Schamper 42:00
Roger that.

Erin Crites 42:00
Yeah, really, the legislators' goal was when, you know, everyone submits their reports and are testifying, you know, smart act hearings, and are using the word recidivism, everybody knows that that means the same thing, versus trying to

remember, oh, when I'm, you know, at DYS or Judicial's meetings, it's this definition. When I'm at DOC, it's, you know, hearings, it's this definition. And so, I think that was one of the, the intentions still distinct reports, but using the same, having the word mean the same thing in all of the reports.

Valerie Schamper 42:34
Makes sense. Okay. And last but not least, this came up, and Erin, I believe you've already addressed this in the committee, but I decided not to make an assumption and think I remembered something that maybe I didn't remember. So, the question was the timing of the event. So, we know that it's at conviction, that definition, that Sally read earlier, but I believe we talked about it actually being the date of the crime, not the date of the conviction. Is that accurate? So, we look for the conviction, but the time to occurrence is the time to the date of the crime, right? Okay, just making sure.

Erin Crites 43:11
Yeah, and I think, to be fair, some of those dates are missing in the judicial data, and what it is filing date is that what default to?

Sally Hill 43:22
Arrest date first and then file -

Erin Crites 43:24
Okay.

Sally Hill 43:24
Second.

Erin Crites 43:25
Okay.

Sally Hill 43:25
It's very rare. I've never seen in eight years where all three were missing.

Erin Crites 43:29
Oh yeah.

Sally Hill 43:30
So, if, if, then.

Erin Crites 43:33
Okay, yeah, I couldn't remember which one so arrest then filing is the solution for when an offense date isn't included in the judicial data, at least that's -

Valerie Schamper 43:43
Yeah.

Erin Crites 43:43
- how it's currently done.

Valerie Schamper 43:45
Yeah. I think it would help just to have that like documented, so that, you know, our analyses are in alignment with those if then rules everybody else's. It's newer for us to do it that way.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting
August 15, 2024

Linda Harrison 43:57
Yeah, I've done that. Well, we've historically done the same, you know, with offense date, filing date. And I can tell you Valerie, when I've extracted or used, done recidivism work for OCC, we've done it that way.

Erin Crites 44:13
All have similar minds when it comes to problem solving imperfect data.

Katie Ruske 44:21
I think what, sorry guys to chime in a little bit. I think what Valerie is asking for, though, is sort of a technical manual so that when there is turnover, any new data analyst knows exactly the answers to these questions and is doing it consistently the same way.

Linda Harrison 44:41
That's a great idea, or great observation, Katie, that we really do need to have a user's manual. Or, you know, some documentation about all of these very specific things.

Erin Crites 44:53
Not to throw Aaron under the bus, but I know he has one.

Linda Harrison 44:58
Perfect.

Erin Crites 45:00
Its' rough but it's there. Sally, I imagine you probably have your own version of something somewhere.

Sally Hill 45:09
It's not official, yeah.

Erin Crites 45:11
Yeah, okay.

Sally Hill 45:12
Yes, we do.

Erin Crites 45:13
So, would it make sense then for the technical folk to maybe get together on the side, over email, maybe, and work through what would be kind of a technical manual for, for this? So that it's very clear how the data set is constructed from Judicial in that sense, so that folks know exactly what data they're matching to, and then what the kind of broad analytical process, and given that everybody will have some slight nuances of how they write their code. But otherwise, kind of have, have a technical manual. Okay, I will put that on my to do list to kind of facilitate that collaboration. And maybe we can get them together.

Kelli Burmeister 46:04
I have a question. I don't think we want to go here, but I'm going to put it out there, because it could impact how different agencies are reporting. But do we need a similar approach to how individuals are matched?

Linda Harrison 46:18
I was thinking the same Kelli, was wondering about everybody's process for doing that. I think there's lots and lots of approaches.

TRANSCRIPT: Recidivism Definition Working Group Meeting
August 15, 2024

Sally Hill 46:26
The bandwidth that people are going to have to dedicate the time to do it as a consideration.

Jack Reed - CDPS 46:31
Yes.

Kelli Burmeister 46:31
We can automize and have, you know, an error rate that's acceptable for everyone. But I know a lot of agencies do a lot of manual matching as well when the automation doesn't come through, more data is missing. So yeah, the more accurate your match, the more likely you are to catch more recidivist matches.

Sally Hill 46:58
Expunged records are becoming much more prevalent, and that's going to be a bigger thing then for us to kind of figure out a path through. Especially for us for commitment offense that were expunged years later. We have to have that for specific data points and to know that we've matched everything correctly. So, with getting seven years, you can go back and find a file from the date that they were adjudicated and committed, but it's going to the problem is going to snowball as more and more cases are expunged over time.

Kelli Burmeister 47:22
Our files contain expunged. Yeah.

Erin Crites 47:37
So, you, yes, they're better thankfully because it was, that was a huge issue for those in the juvenile world. It when they did the cleanup, everything disappeared. The juvenile recidivism rate was laughable, because nothing existed in the, in the data system anymore. So, we did, I think we did work through the legal process to say that we could share it for research purposes, because everybody who was accessing the data actually had a way to get it generally and knew who the people were regardless. So, it that, that worked out for that. So, that will continue unless the legal interpretation changes. But going back, going back to the conversation about data matching, and I think that also kind of goes back to the judicial data set conversation is, kind of that process, and is there an opportunity for this group to make a recommendation, that there be another path for data matching that isn't Judicial creating a data set, and everybody kind of having to do the process internally? I think there are a few different options. The one that I think we're all most familiar with, and Jack can talk about more specifically, is through the Link Project. And then I think there's, I'm certain, a number of other alternatives that I don't know about for data matching and creating either a very strict process that has a certain match rate that we're up front about that I know for DYS you often have to go manually look up everyone just to make sure, versus some kind of fuzzy matching protocol that has a slightly better match rate between kind of a first name or last name, first name, date of birth, kind of situation. So, all that to say, thoughts?

Kelli Burmeister 49:52
Or that's a recommendation -

Erin Crites 49:53
Yeah.

Kelli Burmeister 49:53
- that we make at the last part of the report, is that maybe that's the next phase that we look into making our matching process more similar, or putting minimums in there, or something. So maybe something that we don't need to officially report on, but a recommendation for future.

Jack Reed - CDPS 50:16
Yeah, I think that would be good, because then I mean, if we were to use something like the Link Project, there's, you know, certain costs involved joining it and then using it. So, I think that it would be valuable to look at it and to make a recommendation, just to get support for spending a relatively nominal amount of money in the big picture to match that. Yeah, yeah, all the staff time that is required across all of our agencies, having one group of data scientists significant, you know, computational capacity and data science knowledge would be, I think, really valuable, and it was something I recommended at the working group, but it didn't. Yeah.

Erin Crites 51:11
Well, and do you think - I think while this group, right, has a set of analysts who are familiar with this work and have found ways to execute it when we're talking about the alternative metrics group, which I know is not our place, but will certainly be coming down the road and connected. Integrating all of the data that will be necessary to capture alternative measures of outcomes will require a process other than the one that the folks, kind of in this group are using to execute recidivism studies, just because of the sheer quantity of data from different sources that are likely to need to be integrated to do that work. So, I think that's a great kind of putting this on in our report as something that this group obviously couldn't tackle in our short time period, but it's something that needs to be considered, particularly as we talk about expanding reporting beyond recidivism and moving forward. Yeah. I made a note so that I don't forget to put that in the report. All right, Val, did we get through your list? I know we went down a twisty path there.

Valerie Schamper 52:44
Yep, that was my list.

Erin Crites 52:47
Thank you for bringing those questions. I think they helped us clarify some, some little details that we hadn't gotten to. Okay, any other technical pieces? Jack's giving me the thinking face.

Jack Reed - CDPS 53:01
Well, no, I'm what. I guess I wasn't here for a lot of the last one. I'm just wondering what Parole has in regards to those kind of, like, more edge case termination reasons that I don't know. I don't know if we need to talk about them, but I think just making it clear that those exist. I don't know Greg or Dave, if you have a sense of some of those other termination reasons that it might be useful to discuss or not.

David Wolfsgruber 53:31
I don't know if Greg wants to answer. I don't want to jump in, but I will. If Greg doesn't want to add anything, I want to give him the opportunity, if he'd like.

Greg Saiz 53:44
Yeah, I only have one thing that sort of comes to mind, David, Jack. It's early parole discharges for folks who've been deported. Those would technically be successful. It's not a very high number at all. We see maybe 15 to 20 of those a month, which I guess if you add it up, it becomes a number, but it's, in the grand scheme, it's not going to budge the needle too much. So that's just kind of one subset that pops out immediately, but, but there are probably others that Dave will be able to better identify.

David Wolfsgruber 54:14
Yeah, honestly, completion of parole, Jack, there there's not a whole lot of subcategories. I mean, obviously individuals are deceased, you know, they recidivate while they're under supervision, whether it be a technical parole violation or a new conviction. But as far as when they get to the end of parole, other than the early parole discharges for deportation purposes, there aren't a whole lot of other subsets to that to answer your question Jack.

Jack Reed - CDPS 54:46
Great, thank you.

Linda Harrison 54:48
I mean, there's death, you know, that's gotta be one of them.

David Wolfsgruber 54:53
yeah, I mentioned death. We -

Linda Harrison 54:54
Oh you did? Sorry, I missed it.

David Wolfsgruber 54:56
That's okay.

Linda Harrison 54:57
So, does it happen by the time somebody gets to Parole, that the vacated sentences happen? You know, by, by the time they're on parole, has that stuff gotten worked out? But, you know, court order discharges or appeal bond kinds of things occur as well?

David Wolfsgruber 55:16
Then I guess the question would be, would that be a parole completion under the terms of what we're proposing as a group that a person that's re-sentenced, we're considering that as someone that's success, that's completed parole.

Linda Harrison 55:30
Well, I guess what I was thinking is somebody who's court ordered discharge because their sentence got vacated, for example. And I know there's some that happens in DOC. I'm just not, I don't know about parole.

David Wolfsgruber 55:45
It does happen on occasion that a person, you know that it's rare, it's much more common when someone's in DOC. But yeah, there are those cases rare, rarely, but they do occur that parole supervision ends because of a sentence recalculation or a re-sentence. But I guess the question for the group is. Would we then, in those rare circumstances, would we begin tracking recidivism events at the con- once that termination occurs where they didn't necessarily complete parole, but their sentence was modified so that they are no longer under parole supervision? That's a larger discussion for the group.

Erin Crites 56:29
So, I -

Greg Saiz 56:29
So, it seems to fit, yeah, so I was gonna say it would seem to fit that, that that way, Dave, just given the kind of whether no longer under the supervising agencies kind of purview, but I could be way off. One other thing popped in mind this is this will be a way smaller number than the early pool discharges for those who've been deported. We do have some lifetime, indeterminate sex offenders who do on occasion, we'll see probably anywhere between two to five a month who have met their standard, their minimum requirement of parole time either 10 or 20 years, depending upon class of felony, and have completed often specific treatments. So those folks can discharge from parole, just a small number, but one of those other things you may need to caveat so -

Linda Harrison 57:15
It is kind of a -

Greg Saiz 57:15
- that just popped -

Linda Harrison 57:16
it it's an expanding number. We're seeing more and more of those.

Greg Saiz 57:20
It is, and it's going to continue to increase, because there, there are some structural changes to the treatment inside right now that are, will be positive.

Linda Harrison 57:30
They've been in prison long enough, and they've been on parole long enough, finally, after since 1998 you know, it's taken a really long time to see those people.

Erin Crites 57:41
Yeah. Jeff.

Jeff Wise 57:44
So that's a good lead in to my question. I have two questions, first, kind of related to what we're talking about. I want to make sure I understand, how are dual people who are on both parole and probation being treated or have we? Have we talked about that? So that's my first question.

Erin Crites 58:09
That's a good question. Historically, they're captured in each population, as if they're only in each of those independently. So, I, Parole would capture them as parolees and start their tracking per the definition under their group. And then Probation would do the same once the individual is, is released from supervision.

Valerie Schamper 58:37
Same in Community Corrections, we will also have parolees in probation or in our data.

Jeff Wise 58:46
So, in this, and I don't want to backtrack, I know we've kind of covered this already, I want to make sure that I understand. This came up in a conversation I had last week. So, for some, so DOC's time to begin tracking starts at the release from the facility, for three years. For an individual who is released from DOC who has an indeterminate say, 10-year parole sentence. There's a four-year gap, if I understand correctly, between that person leaving DOC being tracked and then his parole sentence terminating. Some people have 20, 20 to life. And so, then it's also a question of like there are indeterminate sentence clients in Community Corrections and some that have probation, you know, 10 to life probation. So, like, I just want to, how are we treating the indeterminate sentences? How are we capturing them? Because I know, I think in one of our previous discussions about this, it was sort of, I guess the idea was that, well, it's a really small number. But I think it's, Greg pointed out that the number is increasing, it will increase. And I don't think it's an insig- insignificant number.

Linda Harrison 1:00:13
No it's not.

Jeff Wise 1:00:15

Yeah, help, help me understand that.

Erin Crites 1:00:18
Make it make sense. So, I think from the conceptual standpoint, right, we for this definition, I think every single one of the agencies here also tracks, kind of how people are doing while they're under supervision, kind of separately. But for recidivism definition, the counting doesn't start until the person is no longer under the jurisdiction of that agency. So, for like lifetime probation, they would start counting recidivism when the court has determined that they are done with their probation sentence. And again, I think kind of like with parole, those are starting to happen more often because people are hitting those 20-year marks and the court's like you haven't committed a new crime in 20 years in the community. Maybe we can be done. And so that's the point at which the recidivism tracking would start. For example, about, you know, DOC and Parole right in that lag year for recidivism, yes, there would be a bit of a lag from the last time that DOC would track recidivism to the first point at which Parole might start tracking recidivism. But that's not to say that Parole isn't going to report on that parolee's behavior. Were they to be technically revoked back to DOC, right? It might not fit under this definition of recidivism for the purposes defined here, but it would still be reported as kind of a revocation or a failure or concise language in a, in a report that would already be produced. Does that muddy the waters more or clear it up?

Jeff Wise 1:02:16
No, I think that was kind of so these people, you know, we're everyone's being tracked regardless, right? So, I guess that's it. As I explained this to community re-entry, there's a lot of confusion, I think. But what's important to maybe communicate is that people are still being tracked. It's just not this very specific definition of recidivism. They don't - they're not impacted by that so that, you know, for that four-year period, that person is still being, they're still being tracked. They're still going to be reported on some way, right?

Erin Crites 1:02:57
Yeah, they're still under supervision. The agency supervising them will report if some type of negative termination happens, and then again, if a negative termination happens and they're completely released from that agency as supervision, then that recidivism tracking point will start then. So, I think, one of the things I hope to put in our report, if I can figure out how to do it, because you all have seen my word art, and it's not pretty. Is kind of a timeline type of a graphic, so that it helps folks understand this concept. Because I think without - if you don't work in the data to produce the report, and you don't see it kind of written out, I see the whiteboard behind you there, Dave, I just want to write on a whiteboard. So that we can really kind of explain in a graphic what we mean when we say, you know, this is where we start tracking recidivism, and what those time points look like, so that it's a bit more clear. And I will send that to you, because I think you are going to be one of my best sources for, does this make sense? Because my data folks are so used to seeing it that -

Jeff Wise 1:04:14
Yeah, I'm the, I'm the layman of the group, for sure, I - You guys are all like data wonks.

Erin Crites 1:04:20
You were pointing out where we all miss everything because we're too in the weeds of the data. Very.

Jeff Wise 1:04:28
Okay. Well, that kind of clarifies that. That was, those were my two, two big questions. So.

Erin Crites 1:04:34
Awesome. Thank you. Those are good points of clarification for all of us. Yeah. Okay.

Kelli Burmeister 1:04:48

just going back to the exceptions, like we pointed out, like five or six general exceptions, of, you know, deportation, death, accepts, and rejects, all that stuff. So, are we saying that they're going to be included and we'll caveat all that, or are we trying to exclude those types of scenarios?

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:05:15
I mean, personally, I think it makes more sense to exclude them from the data sets, because to, you know, kind of what we've been discussing, they really didn't receive DYS or Probation or Community Correction. You know, to Michael's point, we're not measuring the success of those programs if we include people who didn't actually get them in the cohort for tracking.

Linda Harrison 1:05:43
Where they did receive the services, but they're not at risk to be picked up.

Erin Crites 1:05:50
Yeah, I think that's the other side, particularly with that deported, questionable but -

Kelli Burmeister 1:05:56
Vacated sentences. Yeah, we'll have to, I don't know ours are a little bit different, because a kid could be with us three months, six months, and then their sentence is vacated, but if they weren't meant to be there in the first place, yeah.

Erin Crites 1:05:56
Right.
Kelli Burmeister 1:06:12
So yeah.

Linda Harrison 1:06:13
And that occurs in ComCor and DOC, with some frequency too.

Erin Crites 1:06:23
Yes, anything kind of going back to that, you know, including death and deported in that denominator, knowing that the odds for some and zero or near zero of having a new crime in the Colorado kind of misrepresents, potentially the, the recidivism rates that that are reported. So again, could be one of those, if there's pressure to report on everybody, to disaggregate that so that it's clear that when we say there's a 5% recidivism rate for this group of you know, folks who are deported, which is very good reason for that, that's probably more about the data capture of behavior than it is about system effectiveness or individual behavior in general, as best we know.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:07:15
And I -

Linda Harrison 1:07:15
That would be interesting.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:07:18
- bet it's going to be to a certain, up to the individual agencies with a smaller you know, do they get included or excluded, and then noted in that report. Rather than just saying, we're all going to do it the same way. I just think, as long as it's clear.

Erin Crites 1:07:35
Some of these nuances [inaudible] distinct. Okay. What other technical bits have we not yet covered? I anticipate we'll have at least one more meeting where we have some additional pieces come up, particularly as we draft the report that documents these conversations very clearly and articulate some of these nuances for folks who haven't been in these conversations that that might bring up a few more things that we'll, we'll want to discuss. So, if there's nothing coming to mind right now, I anticipate we'll have Jack every time.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:08:44
No, I just think that the biggest question that we will have from outside is dealing with indeterminate sets. I still think that that's going to be a large question. And you know, Dave brought it up, and Greg brought it up that it's difficult for us to really answer that kind of conceptually, how we've dealt with recidivism and dealt with our kind of words, and so I think it's just really important to explain really why we made this choice about indeterminate sentencing.

Erin Crites 1:09:20
Decision Which decision about indeterminate sentencing?

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:09:23
How we're defining whether they're at risk or not to actually recidivate, even though they're going to be in the cohort of like -

Erin Crites 1:09:30
Okay.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:09:30
- they're under Parole.

Erin Crites 1:09:32
Okay.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:09:33
And so, they're, you know, they're still under supervision of Parole. Will be captured there, but why they're not captured, as recidivism per our definition.

Erin Crites 1:09:44
Okay, that's fair. Yeah. We - correcting that recommendation.

Kelli Burmeister 1:09:56
The recommendation section too. We can also say that some agencies do also track pre-discharge recidivism, which is still recidivism, right? But it's just not what this group decided as a whole to focus on at this point.

Erin Crites 1:10:13
Yeah, I think. Thank you. That's a great way to phrase that is that they're likely included, or could be included in a pre-discharge recidivism rate within the agency where their supervision is. All right. Okay, are we ready to transition to some kind of fun, ideal future conversations? I'm looking at you Michael, because, like, what you've been waiting for, for months.

Michael Campbell 1:10:58
I think, I think I saw every agency person grimace at the same time. Oh, here we go. Here we go.

Erin Crites 1:11:05
The floor is yours. No, truly. I think this is I think a lot of us are really interested in this conversation because we know the limitations of our current processes and want to have it be more straightforward, more accurate, and better meet the needs of the state and the folks that use this information. So, let's talk about what we'd like this to look like, and then we'll figure out how we ask for what we need to get there. So, who wants to kick us off?

Michael Campbell 1:11:52
I guess since I'm on the spot a bit here. The question might be when you say this, which part of this discussion are we talking about in a dream world, what it would look like, right? So today we're talking about, you know, the challenges of the technical consistencies across different agencies for thinking about how to categorize people and, and whether or not those things are even compatible or not. Makes a question. I guess part of what from, like my perspective, thinking of as a researcher or someone that the Legislature might ask to look at outcomes for from either perspective, from how it affects clients, or how agencies are going about doing what they do. You know, I think the best thing we can do is try to for all the agencies, for the committee, is to make sure that whatever we do, that there's a way that it's very clear and transparent just for people on a committee to see, or, you know, not our committee, but like in the future, to see the logic behind the decisions that we make, and maybe even just do a good job of, kind of outlining the obstacles that that made it difficult. So, transparency first, because if you can, if we could do, you know, bring all of the expertise in this, in this group together to show like, what those problems are, and kind of put them on a table. I think that's part of what's going on in our discussions is just for me, it's kind of interesting to hear some of the similarities and differences across the agencies with these issues. And if those are all on the table, rather than you all maybe just talking to each other at some gathering where you actually just like, oh yeah, we're dealing with that as well, then maybe it just creates kind of an ongoing platform where people can more readily identify common problems, common and potentially common solutions. I think, in terms of a systemic approach to managing correctional agencies in the state, that would be a good first step that people could see where there's common issues and common problems. And you know, like we talked about with some of these, this idea of thinking of dream solutions, it just doesn't seem that far off that technology is going to provide us with some tools that might overcome some things that historically just weren't realistic to overcome. And I think, you know, for those of you who don't know why the dream scenario is on the table here, that's part of the discussion is just that, you know, I think, I think part of what we're trying to think about is, how can the things that come out of this be forward looking and not just rooted in kind of the way things have always been done? And that's kind of a tip of the hat to the fact that things are changing quickly. You know, if we were a, you know, if we were a corporation or a private business, and we were trying to think about how we can be more efficient and generate data that's more useful for a variety of purposes, then I think we'd be thinking about where things may go in our one-, three-, and five-year plans, and how these different technologies that are emerging align with what this committee hands to the Legislature here in a few months. And, so one would simply be, you know, where is there a way that these, you know, that we can see points of consistency and connection across agencies? And then, are there ways that we can, you know, help identify problems that are that are fixable without big budget adjustments or, or burdening people in various agencies to do new things. I think that's the logic to be applied. And hearing you all talk, I, you know, I can't really connect with a lot of your discussions about these technical things in your agencies, but I do. I can hear some consistencies across of simply, for one, there should be essentially, from my perspective, what I kept thinking of is like a pie chart of like, here's just for Parole or for Probation or Youth here, here is or Community Corrections. Here is just a pool or a bucket of like, their very standard clients. And then help somebody like me or somebody in the Legislature understand that there's other buckets, because these things aren't obvious to everybody else. You know, people don't fully understand those and I'd say by the time some legislatures start to dig into those details, they probably lost their, their interest in the technical ways these things are managed. So even just consistency in the ways that agency leads and people with experience like all of you talk about these things and what these buckets look like. You know, that would be very helpful if I were generating a research report on corrections in Colorado. You know, if I, if I got a grant to help assess kind of what's going on, the things that you all are talking about here that seem obvious to you, not everybody understands those. So, for one, it's just a little more transparency and almost like a Colorado Corrections for Dummies, way of, you know, understanding the, you know, the basic challenges of trying to provide, it's not like you're hiding, I

don't think people in this room are hiding a bunch of data, but trying to provide it while also contextualizing it. If we can get that stuff on the table, it just seems like some of those dream things that might make life a little bit easier are more realistic, and that's kind of what I heard today. So, there's my long-winded response. Sorry.

Erin Crites 1:17:12
No, I think that's, that's really helpful. I think your observation is, I would say, from my experience, very accurate. We talk a lot about the challenges in one offs when we're asking each other for help to solve a problem, but don't necessarily air that publicly, probably for a number of reasons, but I think that's -

Michael Campbell 1:17:39
Yeah, and I certainly wouldn't advocate for, you know, every agency putting its problems on their websites for the public to peruse. You know, I, I'm not a fool in that I know what kind of problems that could lead to. But again, I think, you know, sometimes the work of this committee one of my, I guess, one of the things that I try to really think about here is, who are we, who are the recommendations that come out of this, like, who's really going to use it and what are they going to use it for? And you know, I don't think that internet trolls or people just looking to have a bone to pick with a person in an agency or an agency itself. I try not to let that, you know, I know that everybody, all of you, have to deal with that more. But, you know, the question is, you know, what are, what are these data, or what's going to make them useful in making things work better in the state of Colorado over the long haul, and to do that, you know, I think hearing the way that you all have these commonalities, like, if that were, you know, more transparent in the way that you all present data, that would help everybody.

Erin Crites 1:18:52
Really helpful. And I know it came up when we were doing the juvenile work. I don't know where it ever landed. I think it kind of dropped off with the pandemic. Was kind of this idea of a kind of symposium for all of the juvenile justice entities to come together to share the outcomes of their now consistent recidivism reports on the juvenile side, and so maybe that's something we think about again, is the idea of some type of public forum for the presentation of some of these data, whether it's in a dashboard with the appropriate button notes, or a combination of some other types of webinar presentations or whatever that provide that transparency, plus that information in a consistent format.

Michael Campbell 1:19:49
Yeah, I'm glad you mentioned dashboards, because that's a good example of kind of what I'm talking about. You know, three to five years ago, these dashboards were really not accessible for most people. Sure, they were happening in, you know, San Francisco, but not here and now, this is what people want. Like people don't even want research reports. They want dashboards that provide quick, easy, flexible access to data. And you know, we're sitting here talking about these things and these definitions to generate useful data. Well, you know, there's going to be the next dashboard is part what we have to kind of consider as we, we think about defining these things. And, you know, the prosecutorial dashboard, for example, you know, here in Colorado was a big, you know, a big thing, but I feel like trying to anticipate the ways that, you know, for all of you, it doesn't cause too many problems, but at the same time, provides readily accessible data for a lawmaker who's got to do a vote on, you know, on which priorities to vote and approve for in a legislative session. You know if a staffer can find those things or go to a member of the research team, and those things can be up to date versus based on a report that that seems like a more likely scenario in the very near future for how data gets shared, more so than these old PDFs that I used, you know, but that I'm always trying to find, you know, even my undergrad students like, you know, there's a dashboard for that. I'm like, oh, yeah, okay, I better, better start. I mean, my wife works on evaluating the prosecutorial dashboard. You think I'd know more about these things, but it changes fast, is what I'm saying.

Erin Crites 1:21:30
Yes, it does. And so, I think that was one of the things that I think triggered this conversation at our last meeting, was this idea of, will there be a day where AI kind of makes some of our jobs obsolete, which is kind of the long, the long

game there. But I think what it led to was this idea of, and it goes back to the other conversations about the data matching too. Is we in this, the way it's been done, and the resources that we have, we rely on human expertise and human intelligence to do a lot of work that could be done with, you know, computer assistance, if we had data structured in a way that would allow for it, as well as structuring dashboards off of those potential kind of underlying databases or data structures that would do the matching and would provide up to date recidivism without it having to come in these lagged reports, but really because of their time, the, the time they take to produce can't be done more than once a year. And even now, you think for analysts, and I look to Aaron and Sally, but I and Linda, I think, could talk about this too. Take three to six months to produce, from start to finish, between prepping the data and all the way through to a report being approved for publication. And so, kind of thinking about from a usefulness standpoint, having more up to date, more immediate data feedback will be pretty beneficial. That is doable, just not with the way our data are currently structured and organized.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:23:28
And for me, and this is, I think, something that's come up in the Legislature, is just, we've talked about how many systems a person is in one time, you know, being able to say, you know, this is the person who recidivated with one event across three different cohorts. And I think being able to actually identify that, identify, you know, how many systems a person was under at the time that they recidivated, I think would be really valuable, and would require a lot more collaboration, and, you know, kind of putting the data into one large pool that that can be used, but that that, for me, is something that I think a lot of people would really like to be able to see, and that's another large data exercise.

Valerie Schamper 1:24:20
Yeah, Jack, I love that, because I do think in some ways, if you started to take all, you know, despite the fact that we all agreed on the same definition, right, if you take our recidivism rates independently, and then you do what some people will do, which is, like, add them up, like, you know, like, I would never do that, but I know there will be people out there who will do weird stuff like that, right? Um, it's not true, right? Because a lot of us are counting the same people, um, and that's really hard to communicate effectively, you know, when we're each independently reporting, no matter what our definition looks like, so that that systems approach and look at this stuff could be profound, truly. Yeah.

Erin Crites 1:25:02
Well, that was hadn't even thought of that Val that somebody would try and add all the denominators and add all the numerators and do math.

Valerie Schamper 1:25:10
And I've seen people do weird stuff with statistics, and Erin can attest it will make my brain explode angry. I get real angry. But, yeah.

Erin Crites 1:25:23
There's a new nightmare for tonight. Thanks for that. Dave.

David Wolfsgruber 1:25:30
So ironically, I just had lunch with the Provost of Rutgers University on the East Coast, and her frustration was the 85-page report, and people only read the two-page executive summary. So that's a frustration of the researchers that I've dealt with across the board and a former colleague, Maria Paparozi, who was our chairman for a short period of time and now is very involved with APPA and goes on national speaking tours. A friend of mine has the same concern. So, I think the more we can simplify the process that's become unnecessarily convoluted and complicated for non-researchers or practitioners, the better. So that I think our ultimate goal should be simplicity and not get into the, the weeds of how do we handle cases that are deceased? How do we handle cases that are deported? So, I agree with Jack that those cases should be taken off the table, because if we then start adding all these footnotes of different circumstances, people are going to be even more confused for the small number of cases that this impacts. So, my

strong recommendation is that we not get into the weeds, because we all do that already. And Jeff, you're, you're doing yourself a disservice. I appreciate some of the questions you've asked me, and I appreciate the "layman's perspective." I don't consider you a layman at all, because the questions you asked for very fulsome in terms of, how do we handle an indeterminate sentence that they do either 10 years or 20 years, then they're eligible for release by the Parole Board and be discharged. So those cases, we're not even going to begin tracking them for another 10 years or 20 years. So as far as what we're proposing, so I think your questions are spot on, and I appreciate your perspective, Jeff, that you bring, but simplicity has to be the key in everything we do. We, in my opinion, we have to look at it from a, from a public perspective, that the people that are digesting and interpreting this, yes, the Legislature, as we all know, the Legislature thinks they know. They don't really know until they ask the questions, if we just hope that they ask the questions before they impose legislation. But I think we need to look at it as really from the common citizen's perspective of here's a, here's a universally identified recidivism report that is going to be easily digested. You don't need a PhD. You don't need to be director, parole, or practitioner. How do we, how do we get how do we present that to the public so it's easily understood, and we always talk about self-serving recidivism reports as well, that they don't talk about the term that they're, they're studying, they don't mention that? Well, we're really only studying the 60 days that they're on our residential program and couldn't leave. Great job. You had a 2% recidivism rate for those folks. So, the cynicism that's also present in the public with, with recidivism studies can't be discounted either. So, I'll get off the - I'll get off the soapbox. I

Erin Crites 1:28:47
I think there's, sounds like I'm hearing a couple of different things, one identifying and moving towards more straightforward and accessible reporting of recidivism and a lot of that, I think, to many of your points, is moving away from the static PDF reports and moving towards more dynamic, technologically savvy options for data reporting, which I think would meet a lot of the needs of those end users. To get there, what's needed is some struc- restructuring of the data that goes into these systems that make these more dynamic dashboards, which, even if the analysts, the agency still have to produce those lengthy PDF reports for whatever reason, because we are state employees and we still do things the way we've always done them. Those processes would be simplified, if the data were structured differently and, in a way, that if, if a business intelligence tool can report it out in a dynamic way, then certainly data analysts with the experience that a lot of folks here have could produce the reports that are necessary even easier and with a much better accuracy rate, I think, which folks would enjoy as well. So I think kind of that's one of those where there'd be kind of a mutual benefit making the information more accessible while also reducing some of that burden on state staff so that they can do other work that can't be done by a business intelligence tool, but that does require the human intelligence and educational background that a lot of our folks have, so I think that would be a cool advancement for, for our state. Katie.

Katie Ruske 1:31:06
This is not on the, the end of the dream spectrum you all are, are talking about currently, which is fabulous and wonderful and great. But you know, in line with some of Michael's comments and Dave's, my hope has always been that from the beginning, we could also find a way to plainly and understandably explain the limitations with full transparency, so that in the future, whether it's me or a new director, nobody comes and says, well you intentionally picked this definition because it looks very favorable for you and because it will look favorable for us in Community Corrections. Just to be honest, I think we've been pretty open and honest about that here, and trying to be really transparent about that. And you know, I sort of want that on record for, for myself and for her, for whoever in the future, so that you know, it can be clear we came together for this goal, and that we understand there are limitations, and that's why we're going to continue to look at recidivism many other ways as well, and look at many other outcomes. But you know that we did, we did collaborate on this and come up with a definition that we will definitely continue to report on, but that we didn't do so with the intent to make ourselves look awesome.

Erin Crites 1:32:23
Thank you, Katie. We'll make sure that makes it into, particularly this working group's, report. I think this is where a lot of that process pieces will be kind of memorialized, and where we will, you know, write out some of the nuances and limitations and changes that we are likely to see as a result of using this one definition. And I think it's fair to also include the notation that most agencies will continue to report on other outcome measures so that they are able to provide a well-rounded representation of their organization's work. That is, you know, beyond this one metric that we've been asked to, to work with here, Greg.

Greg Saiz 1:33:22
Thanks, yeah, Erin. And sort of, to Katie's point about us having some cover on that, obviously, the folks who have kind of pushed these measures, Senator Gonzalez, they won't be around forever. However, I do know that sort of the intent was that this wasn't to be used as a legend or comparison. It was strictly to identify what can work if we come together on these what are the areas for continued growth and development? So, I think that's your sort of dovetail with what Dave and Dr. Campbell were saying about clarity and purpose being extra clear that that will help us in the long run, ensuring that everybody is sort of satisfied, recognizing that this is never going to be perfect, but we can at least try to get it polished and functional. Sorry about the noise. If you don't hear a bunch of noise when I'm talking I'm at an ax and wing joint for a retreat today, skip out on half the retreat.

Erin Crites 1:34:22
Sounds like a fun retreat. Any other thoughts on an ideal future?

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:34:38
I would love to include more local partners, like especially jails and county pre-trial. I think that you know, allowing them, especially if we're effectively working off of a definition and a data set that you know can really add value to, to jails, to pre-trial and other locals who are doing this kind of research, just because the data they have access to, to what they can define as recidivism. And that would allow, you know, Denver Jail and Jeffco Jail to compare, compare themselves to each other. And I think that that would have value for long term for not just state agencies, but allowing counties and cities to use the report.

Erin Crites 1:35:26
I think that's great, Greg, I thought you were leaving, so excuse my awkward waving.

Greg Saiz 1:35:30
I was just really quickly. I wanted to point out to Jack's point that Denver County Jail kind of is tracking where we're going with this, or they're keeping an eye on stuff they're already are moving toward a six-month reporting period. So, they're, they're trying to stay sort of ahead of the curve. So, I know, I can tell you, they were hoping to have somebody here today, a representative and analyst from the Sheriff's Department. Didn't quite happen, but hopefully perhaps next month, and I'll reach back out to my contacts at the Sheriff's Department and just encourage them to be a part of this conversation too. And kind of to Jack's point, these are big, big holders and big stakeholders in the community, so it's nice that we're on the same page, or as much as we can be.

Erin Crites 1:36:09
Yeah, absolutely. And I think from the practical standpoint, figuring out more efficient ways to share the outcome data that folks you know would use to be in alignment with this shared definition. Is a critical component of making sure that local partners are able to participate in this kind of collective process and figuring out what that might look like, I think, would be really helpful for, for local folks who, in many instances, you know, our larger departments, you know, particularly sheriff's departments, may have data analysts on staff. The small ones certainly don't have that resource. And then what would it look like to provide that service for, for folks, or give them access to resources to, to do that work, so that I, for me, I think in alignment with Jack's comment, that would be another thing to kind of think about in

our ideal future. Is, how do we make this definition and executing this definition accessible to, to all of the local partners who would be interested in reporting it. Any more hopes and dreams to throw on the table?

Kelli Burmeister 1:37:42
Common identifier across distance?

Erin Crites 1:37:44
I was waiting, Kelli, somebody had to say it.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:37:50
I was picturing a representative model way.

Linda Harrison 1:37:54
You just -

Erin Crites 1:37:56
What do you mean you can't track somebody?

Sally Hill 1:37:58
Everyone gets a social security number at the hospital when they're born for a state ID.

Erin Crites 1:38:08
Yes, I see a few people joking or laughing online too. So yes, then that came up in our juvenile conversation; it kind of died on the vine because we couldn't, we couldn't figure out how to do it, and then the pandemic kind of limited our work.

Kelli Burmeister 1:38:26
It's a dream. It's -

Erin Crites 1:38:27
Yes.

Kelli Burmeister 1:38:27
Pie in the sky ideal scenario.

Erin Crites 1:38:30
Yes, yes. It seems so simple. Yeah. But do you think that does that fits in this broader conversation about if we're going to have this universal definition, but people aren't discreetly in just one bucket or another, back to others' points, and Jeff and Michael in particular. And then when we talk about other outcome measures, that means looking into other systems in the state where we don't, where their name is about the closest thing, and that's not reliable for a lot of our data matching. And so, I think that also is another kind of conversation to put, I think kind of going back to the way Michael framed it, is kind of transparency, and some of the obstacles, and our biggest obstacle, being clear about tracking a person across the system is that they could be reflected differently in different parts of the system, and identifying that person is a challenge.

Kelli Burmeister 1:39:37
And kind of today's point. I think there's a lot of people like in the legislature and the public that don't understand that we don't have that common identifier and that we cannot track people through all these state systems, even though they're all government systems. So even making that really clear to people, because we get the question all the time and

people are astounded that we have to do an algorithm to match individuals, so just, yeah, putting it out there so it's available and people understand that. Still, maybe you won't, but at least we can do our best to show that as a challenge.

Michael Campbell 1:40:17
Yeah, I would. I think that that's an incredibly important point. I think it's very easy for especially folks like you all who work in the agencies to understand that those things aren't realistic. But, you know, I bring my students to talk to lawmakers, and I hear lawmakers say, well, why can't we just do X? And I just, I know, I don't say anything because I'm just glad they're hosting my class or whatever, but I know when they ask those questions, it's a very reasonable, sensible thing to ask, but it's just not realistic, right? And let alone to think about sharing data about people across local correctional agencies versus state agencies or federal you know, when we think about interagency data, not just, you know, in terms of the state agencies, but once you start layering the complexities, I think it's, it's reasonable that people would think, well, if I were just, you know, managing my home or my business, I could, here's the question that of what I need, I get that information and then I make a decision. I think it's very important that people are making, who are making decisions understand that those things aren't realistic for many of the things that we're all talking about here. And again, kind of back to the point here that Dave was saying about, you know, making these things accessible, outlining some of those things may not be what people want to hear, because everybody wants the data to answer their questions. But I think it's essential to explain those things in plain terms, so that a lawmaker five years from now who thinks that they've got all the answers to fix Parole or Probation or Youth Services, whatever it may be, understands that certain things we can't know from our data. But you know some things we can, and that without those limitations in mind they shouldn't be going about coming up with grand solutions without understanding the limitations to what we actually can say that we know, you know.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:42:11
And, and I really think that that the third bill that had the significant fiscal note that really said, you know, we want to look at the entire system and map it and, you know, look at data schemas as just, you know, was going to be. I mean, I think we put $800,000 on in DOC the year, two years before, put over a million dollars on fiscal note. And I think that that is really what it takes to make it, you know, really clear. Like, these are all of the systems. These are all limitations, you know, it's just given how everything is structured. It's an ex- it's a more expensive undertaking than you would hope. I think, to do it in a really, you know, full way, but it would be, I mean, it would be fantastic to do just would require significant fiscal resources from the Legislature.

Erin Crites 1:43:04
And but what we can do, I think, in the interim is to talk about the implications of not doing that work and make those very clear. So, Michael, to your point when they come back and say, why is this so hard? We have a very consistent message to point to, to say, it's this hard because of all of these things that we've documented. And we would love for it not to be this hard, but here's what it would take to get you what you're asking for, and maybe someday.

Michael Campbell 1:43:43
And, you know, I this, this just makes me think back to, you know, the conversation I had with the guy from Michigan that that Greg put me in contact with, you know, Michigan had done a lot of these things before us, and I remember it keeps sticking the back of my mind. One of the main things he said was that, you know, some of the things that came out of these committees weren't particularly useful some the Legislature came up with or even misguided and problematic. But he said the most important positive development was that there was an ongoing conversation and a growing pool of shared understanding and knowledge across agencies that help, that helped various people, variously situated, lawmakers, researchers, agency actors, simply understand, have a better overall understanding of these problems. And, you know, to that point, Erin, I feel like this, you know, to try to be positive about things here. You know, just generating that kind of an approach where we have this documentation, we've done the work, and we can set it on the table and say, you know, if you really want those things and think they're important, and many of us do, here are the

obstacles, and here is a very clear map of what it would take to get from where we are today to where that might be. Um. And you know, then it's up to you, who have control the purse strings to decide, you know, when do you think that payoff is there? You know.

Erin Crites 1:45:08
Yes. And I think our next working group on the other kind of companion bill will provide us yet another opportunity to reinforce kind of this point around data collection, matching, reporting, and in a space where there is, kind of, there are fewer solutions that already exist to do the work. And so, I'm hopeful that that gives us yet another opportunity, pretty closely tied to this recidivism work to kind of reinforce the limitations of how we are able to kind of follow people in our state and kind of understand how the systems interplay together and report that out.

Jack Reed - CDPS 1:45:59
Michael, to piggyback on what you just said. Would you put a recommendation in that, you know, like, right now we can't meet after, like, February 1 or something? It's actually in statute that we're to stop meeting at a certain point. That perhaps that be revisited as a way to keep this conversation and the people at the table, so that we do continue to work on this a little bit more.

Michael Campbell 1:46:30
I mean, I, I don't see, you know, besides, obviously, it does take up time, and all of you have pressure on, on time and meetings. But I mean, the things that I'm hearing and the knowledge, I just feel like, I feel like there, there should be a more stable and formalized forum where these sorts of things shift. And you know, one thing that, when you study like historically, changes in institutions and departments and agencies, one of the most important things is, is the culture of those agencies, expectations, culture and leadership, you know, are really the drivers if you really want to make institutions shift the needle on a variety of things, and when it comes to culture, you know, these types of conversations, getting the State's correctional problems on the table and formalized and mapping them with the people who actually know what those problems are, and who actually know like all the problems, or at least, can anticipate many of the problems, from A to Z of addressing those. I mean, I just don't see much negative that can come out of that. You know, as long as the people at the table are, you know, have kind of a shared commitment to that I hear, or hear from what people are saying about transparency is not a problem. Well, not everybody really wants transparency. You know, I tried to study the prison system in Texas, and they're not as interested in transparency as some other correctional agencies in the country are. And so, you know, I think it's important to acknowledge that, you know, maybe not all the actors are going to be there, but if you formalize kind of a sharing of knowledge and a sharing of obstacles and bring people the table, I mean, it's, it's, it's hard to see how that wouldn't create a better correctional culture of leadership and management in the State of Colorado. You know, it's, I mean, in the long run, I think that's going to make the clients lives better, because we're not going to do things the wrong way across a bunch of agencies when we already know that there's problems with it. And I think it's going to save taxpayers money, because it's going to, you know, people that can anticipate problems can. So, yeah, I mean, I see that as a positive, but I don't know, you know, I think some of that's contingent on, you know, what types of leadership that you have and what types of kind of attitudes that you get from people in the department. So otherwise, could just be seen as a nuisance and a burden, you know, to have to do these kinds of things. It kind of depends, again, kind of where, where the winds are shifting sometimes with these things. And right now, I think it makes good sense. Oh, and I'm not picking a fight with Texas. There's lots of other states. There's, there's, there's plenty of other states that are very problematic. Just so, you know, and Missouri is at the top of my list, you know, there's plenty of states that have problems. It's just, I was studying Texas at the time. California is hardly any better. Just, so, you know.

Erin Crites 1:49:40
I've worked in California too. All right, so before we wrap up quick kind of conversation on next steps, if it's amenable to the group, I. I'm thinking maybe we cancel the meeting two weeks from now, leave the one about a month from now, and with the goal of having kind of a draft report of our position to kind of review together at that meeting, if not a draft

a very detailed outline that has the important parts, if not all the pretty language in it. And that way, we can hopefully give that to you in enough time to have a little bit of review and then talk at that meeting about kind of what's wrong, what's missing, and, and go from there, but have a little bit of space to work on that. Have a little bit of time for Dave to talk to his folks for some of those outstanding questions. And feel free to follow up with the group day via email, if you don't want to wait a full month, if there's stuff that needs to be kind of worked through, I think we can probably do some of that over email and then kind of finalize any discussions a month from now, and go kind of from there again. I think our hope was to have this pretty much buttoned up by the end of September. I think we're in a pretty good place for that, assuming we can get this report going in the next few weeks. If, if that works for folks, I think that will be our plan, and look forward to seeing everybody in the mid-September. Awesome. All right, thanks, folks, good to see you all.

David Wolfsgruber 1:51:52
Thank you. Take care, folks.

Linda Harrison 1:51:56
Bye, everybody.

Transcribed by https://otter.ai