

## SB24-030 Recidivism Definition Working Group

### Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2024 | 1:00-3:00pm

Location: Hybrid - 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room / Zoom

**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, Morgan Jacobson, Yolanda Alvarez-Montello

Guests: Lindsey Compton (DOC)

The meeting focused on finalizing the recidivism report and determining the lag time for data collection.

### Action Items

- [ ] Confirm the 12-month lag time for reporting recidivism data using more recent court data.
- [ ] Incorporate the discussion on lag time and reporting timelines into the final report.
- [ ] Schedule a final 30-45-minute virtual meeting in October for the group to formally approve the final report.

### Meeting Minutes

- The group discusses the concept of lagging reports and the need to count events that occur within a certain time window but are not identified until later.
  - Department of Corrections explains their lagging process, tracking events for one to five years and reporting recidivism at three years while the Division of Youth Services has a two-year lag for reporting, with a four-month gap for adjudications to land in the system. Judicial reports a one-year lag for their data, with the report being finalized around July of the following year. Community Corrections explains their performance-based contracting process, which involves a two-year lag for reporting.
  - The group then discusses the importance of waiting for convictions to be processed before reporting recidivism rates and the need for a uniform methodology for lagging reports to ensure consistency across different agencies.
  - The average time it takes for court processing is a median of 13.2 months for adult cases.
  - A 12-month lag for reporting is suggested to account for court processing time and ensure accurate data and a discussion ensues around the implications of this lag on the timing of reports and the need for consistent data reporting.
  - The importance of balancing accuracy and timeliness in data reporting is added.
  - Participants agree to use court data to determine the median time for processing cases and adjust the lag accordingly.

## SB24-030 Recidivism Definition Working Group

### Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2024 | 1:00-3:00pm

Location: Hybrid - 700 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor DCJ Conference Room / Zoom

- The group then responds with feedback in reference to the report by those who had had a chance to read the draft.
  - Positive feedback on the report draft is provided, appreciating its succinct nature and clarity.
  - A suggestion is made to change the example in the report to focus on technical violations rather than new offenses.
  - The importance of including information on the lag for pulling court data in the report is also discussed.
  - Participants agree to add a section on the lag for pulling court data and the timing of reports based on statutory or operational requirements.
- The next steps for finalizing the report are outlined, including incorporating feedback and adding additional sections.
  - Participants agree to have a final meeting in October to approve the report and ensure all changes are documented.
- The importance of including county partners in future discussions to create consistency in data reporting is discussed.
- The meeting concludes with participants expressing their appreciation for the progress made and looking forward to the final report.

### Statutory Mandates

Pursuant to 24-33.5-536, C.R.S. (Senate Bill 2024-030) the working group shall:

- Be appointed no later than September 15, 2024.
- Develop a definition of recidivism no later than January 15, 2025.
- Provide a definition of recidivism to each state entity identified by DCJ and the working group pursuant to 24-33.5-536(1)(b) CRS no later than January 31, 2025.
- Conclude its meetings by January 31, 2025

**The working group is required** to develop a definition of recidivism consistent with statute that includes:

- A clearly defined measurement point to begin tracking the recidivism event defined in 24-33.5-536(2)(4)(c).
- A clear description of the cohort to be tracked.
- A clearly defined time period during which an event is considered a recidivism event that is consistent with best practices for measuring recidivism.
- The recidivism event is a new deferred agreement or adjudication or conviction for a felony or misdemeanor offense, including "Victim Rights Act" crimes.
- In order to promote the use of consistent definitions by various state entities, the working group may develop definitions or data points related to recidivism or the desistance from crime that state entities may use as applicable.