

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL

CJCC STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 9th, 2011, 7:30 a.m.-8:30 a.m.

County Administrative Building, Lower Level Conference Room 220 N. Main, Ann Arbor, MI 48107

Members in Attendance: Verna McDaniel (County Administrator), Mike Fried (Vice Chair of CJCC Full Council – chaired meeting in Sheriff Clayton’s absence)

Members Absent: Donald Shelton (Circuit Court Presiding Judge), Sheriff Jerry Clayton (Chair), Lloyd Powell (County Public Defender), Brian Mackie (County Prosecutor)

Others in Attendance: Conan Smith (BOC Chair), Robert Ciolek (District Court Administrator), Barbara Bergman (Comm. Corr. Advisory Board), Sheila Blakney (County Public Defender’s Office), John Shea (Bar Association), Steve Hiller (Prosecutor’s Office)

Regular Attendees Absent: Kirk Tabbey (District Court Presiding Judge), Dan Dwyer (Trial Court Administrator), Rick Kaledas (Jail Commander), Kristin Judge (MAC Jud. & Public Safety Comm.), Greg Dill (Sheriff Administration)

1. CALL TO ORDER:

7:40 a.m. by Mike Fried, CJCC Full Council Vice Chair (in place of Sheriff Clayton’s absence)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

By Committee Members

3. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Data Sub-Committee Status**

- Met with Cmdr. Kaledas to discuss the CJCC’s need for reports and the new JMS system at the Sheriff’s Office. Would like to discuss with the full council to find out what the Judges want to see in terms of reports.
- The main measurement issue is how we define sentenced inmates vs. non-sentenced inmates. The default is if you are serving a sentence on one charge... you are sentenced, as opposed to 25 charges of not being able to post bond.

- The jail does not want to track in that way – understandably and for a good reason. We have to try to figure out some way to measure both. Some are eligible for classes, etc. They would want to know if there’s an uptick of inmates who can’t make bond, serving misdemeanors, etc. Will tend to skew upward if we don’t track effectively. Evaluating how jail is utilizing its space with un-sentenced people and sentenced people. Need a way to track both. Probation violators should be tracked separately as well as residents/non-residents.
 - Is there a way to find out how Judges are utilizing time served?
 - There are statues that govern this, usually without discretion.
 - How do you define the mission of the Data Sub-Committee?
 - To interface with WCSO to add generated quarterly and annual reports containing data the CJCC feels useful to track.
 - The Data Sub-Committee has been in existence as long as CJCC – lately has been on hiatus because reporting system was cumbersome. Now that the new JMS is being implemented committee has come back together to assist WCSO in knowing what types of reports the CJCC wants.
 - Should we refocus on the criminal justice system as a whole?
 - We’ve already done a mapping of the whole criminal justice system some time ago. Tracking the jail information gives us information about utilization of Community Corrections, jail programs, etc. Looking at whole system is a very difficult thing to do – Pre trial risk assessment will make huge strides for many reasons. There are topics to work on with just the little part of the pie to work with.
 - Mental Health system is something we should also consider tracking, however we should consider asking mental health/CSTS folks for assistance, this isn’t a topic we should track on our own.
 - Verna will speak with Donna to find someone to assist with this committee to discuss mental health issues.
- **Other Committee Status Reports**
 - Would it be useful to bring up the other committees at the full council meeting (i.e. IT Sub-Committee)?

- This is a good idea so leadership knows what committees exist, what their mission/charge is, any progress they want to share and/or their current status.
 - An overall picture of the IT Data Sub-Committee and if it's working was requested. Are we able to get the data the state asks for? Seems data/IT Sub-Committee has been quiet.
- Would like to regroup to know what our purpose is and the goals of the committee as a whole.
 - Discussed lack of Circuit Court engagement. We need to know a function and purpose of this committee. Need BOC to give direction. Leadership needs to meet to realign goals.
 - Remaining interest is what is the misdemeanor use of the jail is.
 - Things have evolved since the beginning of the CJCC– need leadership to get back together to create a new focus/direction.
 - There is a lot of activity going on – not sure how much communication takes place between all the different agencies.
 - Chief's Meeting, Prosecutors meeting and 800 Mhz are just three examples of how all the various agencies communicate. There are many times when all the agencies come together and meet.
 - A question was raised about whether we have a means of communicating to the public.
 - If the BOC charges us with that – then we will. It just hasn't been our charge. There are however, areas of collaboration that are lacking. In order for this to work we need people on the council to buy in to collaborative efforts.
 - Court scheduling may be changing – very early in the process – no meetings have been scheduled yet – but it is in the works.
 - General consensus about what our charge/purpose is now that some of the original charges/projects are complete.
 - Is there a need to schedule a longer meeting and possibly a working session (not until people in the Criminal Justice System have some idea of where they want to go and what the needs are) about mental health reports.

- We need to find a way to get them out of jail and allow them to understand their errors, behaviors etc. Would want to make sure it was very facilitated and some examination of ideas.
 - Discussed the Data Sub-Committee communicating with Court and Jail and making sure we get useful information. So how do we proceed – next action steps:
 - Present at full meeting the set of goals from March
 - Start setting up a joint meeting of CJCC and the BOC, in order to discuss/create a clear direction for the group.
 - We would be more accountable if the BOC set up report out expectations – tell us what BOC needs to hear back from us.
 - The word “accountability to the BOC” is not the appropriate verbiage, prefers this to be looked at as a collaborative effort.
 - Idea is to honor suggestions, interest, and don’t get down to a series of demands.
 - We just need purpose, direction, and set expectations. We really need to get the court engaged.
 - Next week we will bring up this issue – and possibly schedule a special meeting for the Steering Committee.

4. Updates by Steering Committee Attendees (Round Robin)

- Prosecutor’s Office
 - The most recent goal is to take the office paperless by October. For now we’ve put aside the idea of paperless communication between WCSO and Prosecutor’s Office because of some road blocks. Scanning system will eliminate need of making multiple copies of police reports, etc. Road blocks are technology between CLEMIS and Onbase. Using system as completely as they can and will continue moving forward. Discovery will mostly be done by email, CD, DVD.

- Public Defender’s Office
 - In terms of IT – we do have a new public defender system through ENACT. Used to be an issue and has now been resolved by IT. Not going digital, but this is a significant move in the right direction.
 - Is the system adaptable to other people, outside of county employees? (Private attorneys)
 - Not certain how it would work, but there are contract attorney’s who use it.

5. Full Council Agenda for 9/16/11

- **Revisit goals from previous meeting**
 - Referral to a special steering committee meeting with the main players
- **Criminal Justice “Systems” Update**
- **Budget Impact Status**
- **Pre-Trial Risk Assessment Instrument (30 minutes)**
 - Would like to extent this presentation time of 15 minutes at the full council meeting to 30 minutes.
 - New pre-trial risk assessment instrument – State is mandating implementing this particular model. Funding is determined by the use of this model.
 - Brief discussion about the instrument and what the instrument will do. It will tell you who needs what services to and how not to put money in to those criminals who won’t benefit from services. Allocating resources to those people who truly need them.
 - It’s a points system, the problem with it is judges already use these types of instruments – they don’t need a fill in the blank survey form that spits out a recommendation. This system only looks at aggravators, not successors. There is belief that assessment instruments should look at both negative and positive.
 - The real issue is it’s here to stay. How can all the agencies get access to it? Doubt it will affect judges – but may affect magistrates. Will definitely effect Community corrections.
 - Will Community Corrections make a recommendation of bond?

- They don't do it now, currently they just present information about the person. Community Corrections will be making recommendations, bond, programming, etc. under new plan. Jails may use it with classification as well. It will only be used for in-custody's/pre-arraignment basis.
- Shea may put together a statement of concerns about the instrument since he will not be at the full council meeting.
 - Other's feel there are confidentiality issues and access issues.

6. NEW BUSINESS

None.

7. ADJOURN

8: 54 a.m. by Mike Fried

NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING: December 9th, 2011 at 7:30 a.m. in the BOC Conference Room (basement) at 220 N. Main St. in Ann Arbor.

APPROVAL OF September 9th, 2011 CJCC STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES BY STEERING COMMITTEE: December 9th, 2011