

# **Criminal Justice Collaborative Council (Data Systems Subcommittee)**

## **Meeting Minutes**

March 4, 2005

Annex First Floor Conference Room

Ann Arbor, MI

2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Paul Bunten (Chief of Police, City of Saline), Karen Edman (Chief Deputy Clerk/Register), Steve Hiller (Deputy Chief Assistant Prosecutor), David Behen (Director, Information and Technology Division), Andy Brush (Knowledge Manager, ITD), Scot Cannell (Systems Manager, Courts), Jan Nelson (Supervisor, Probation), Herb Mahony (Undersheriff, Sheriff's Department), Julie Chaffee (Director, Community Corrections)

**Members Absent:** Scott Patton (CJCC Staff), Mark Ptaszek (14A Court Administrator)

**Others Present:** George Siasoco (CJCC Intern), Sheila Blakney (Senior Assistant, Public Defender), Delphia Simpson (Public Defender Manager), Mary O'Hare (Director of Organizational Development)

**Convened:** 2:04 p.m.

### **I. Supporting Documents**

Attendees were given the following supporting documents:

- CJCC Data Systems Subcommittee Agenda
- CJCC Data Systems Subcommittee February 1, 2005 Minutes

### **II. Discussion on CJCC April Report**

Mary O'Hare indicated that since there is a potential to produce a lot of static data, the report format should consider context: how data should be presented so the CJCC will be able to make good decisions. David Behen indicated that the previous meeting had produced a list of data items that selected members were to research and report back to the group. He said that the CJCC needs to review this information and indicate their preference on format and context, perhaps at the CJCC retreat.

Discussion ensued on elements that complicate the generation of a standard monthly report:

- Unclear definition of the information the report was attempting to collect and what this data may mean for the public, e.g. "crime", "cases adjudicated", "arrests filed" (different definitions exist among the different agencies)
- Lack of standardized format for this data, as a result of limited integration of multiple data systems
- Current technology limits the facility in retrieving real time data in a timely and cost-effective manner
- Planning is affected by unreliable or incomplete data
- External sources for the report, such as JPIS, do not consider front-end information (from law enforcement and prosecution/public defender departments), which may become necessary for planning purposes, or studies of root causes
- Available reports that go out to the state, such as court case numbers, may not be in a readable format that is easily explainable to the general public

## **Criminal Justice Collaborative Council (Data Systems Subcommittee)**

- Lack of direction from the CJCC influences a report that the subcommittee develops but the CJCC does not want/need

Julie Chaffee suggested producing a report that would build on the work already done by Community Corrections in its January 24<sup>th</sup> jail snapshot. This report answers a lot of the questions that were on the list. She clarified that this information does not include elements from the court systems side. She also advised using the State of Michigan 2003 and 2004 Jail Population Information Systems (JPIS) reports (which provide information on the numbers of sentenced, un-sentenced felons and misdemeanants, prior records, boarded in and out). This could be supplemented by 9 years of reporting for the state's JPIS reports.

Steve Hiller advised focusing discussion on how the subcommittee should respond to what the CJCC needs and wants on a timely basis. As the agenda of the CJCC changes (depending on what issues are before the committee), the report will also contain different formats. Sheila Blakney noted that with the failure of the millage proposal, the CJCC will need different information as well. She therefore suggested that the subcommittee focus on making a common system with available resources and funds, since a flawed data system will not be a workable solution in the short term.

### **III. Redirection of Focus**

Given the above discussion, Mary O'Hare suggested redirecting focus not on producing a report, but on looking at what the CJCC would consider meaningful. She asked members to consider what the subcommittee should give the CJCC (at their retreat or April meeting) as discussion points. The suggested list of indicators could still be helpful in showing the CJCC what is tracked and the rationale behind tracking. In doing so, it may help the CJCC clarify definition of terms. This would also clarify for members what is helpful to track and what not to track.

Sheila Blakney advised that the subcommittee identify the goal, before taking steps to get to the goal. So if "reducing the incarcerated pre-trial population" is the objective, the CJCC can propose the necessary steps towards this goal. With the previous jail millage, CJCC members don't need to be educated about the need for more jail beds, etc. However, the subcommittee should listen to the CJCC's main goals, and map out how it can assist the CJCC in getting towards those goals in terms of data systems integration.

Herb Mahony reiterated that currently the system has to evaluate its limited resources with the goal of impacting jail bed space with least amount of money and most amount of programs. Julie Chaffee noted that these strategies could include disincentives to going to jail. She also advised instituting district court jail bond reform for selected offenders who may not be able to qualify for PA511 funding, but can be moved out of the jail through an alternate program.

Mary O'Hare indicated that the subcommittee may be able to facilitate this discussion, but posing questions or some categories of data that could provide some direction to the CJCC. Sheila Blakney suggested that Julie Chaffee could initiate this discussion by informing the CJCC on the latest snapshot. She could then talk about the areas where a significant impact can be made.

Herb Mahoney noted that there is anywhere between 150-200 pre-sentenced individuals that don't qualify for Community Corrections services. The judges don't have the information to allow for a lower bond decision or use alternative sentencing to jail. Julie Chaffee also said that the judges don't also want to add to probation officers case loads. However, if judges had some alternative program for pre-trial misdemeanants, jail overcrowding would be relieved at the present time.

## **Criminal Justice Collaborative Council (Data Systems Subcommittee)**

Sheila Blakney added that in domestic violence and stalking cases, judges give these individuals a maximum term in jail in order to maintain intensive supervision. She concluded that the key question is: what can the community do to reduce this jailed pre-trial population? Strategies could include pre-trial programming, or summons sentence for certain categories of sentencing instead of bench warrant system.

Steve Hiller suggested that the subcommittee report on the types of information available to the various departments and how easy or difficult it is to find. The JPIS reports could supplement this process. Based on the given information, the CJCC could then identify what it needs, and then the subcommittee will find a way to obtain it. Herb Mahony agreed that the subcommittee could focus on providing information to begin discussion on short-term goals. Steve Hiller added that this process could also reveal the limitations of the data systems integration, which could be a focus for further discussion by the subcommittee.

### **IV. Suggested Action Points**

Subcommittee members agreed on the following action points:

- Present JPIS report and most current jail snapshot conducted by Community Corrections to the CJCC
- Request CJCC review of their goals (given the failure of the millage proposal)
- Present an example of process wherein a suggested goal (e.g. reduce pre-trial population to address jail overcrowding) can be tackled with available data (JPIS and jail snapshot)
- Match data sets that are available through the various data systems to meet CJCC goals
- Review how quickly this data can be obtained and study how efficiencies can be performed (e.g. automation, data systems integration, work flow processes to avoid duplication of effort)

Julie Chaffee offered to present the snapshot and JPIS report to the CJCC as an example, but not as an ongoing process due to the time and cost constraints.

### **V. Next Steps**

- Julie Chaffee offered to present the snapshot and JPIS report to the CJCC as an example, but not as an ongoing process due to the time and cost constraints.
- George Siasoco will talk to Scott Patton about putting the subcommittee's concerns and action points on the CJCC retreat agenda.
- Paul Bunten asked that Scott Patton contact him if he needed validation from a subcommittee member of the importance of the issue.
- Julie Chaffee will circulate the JPIS and snapshot reports to members through the G-drive and send an email identifying the link.
- Andy Brush offered to assist in posting a pdf version of these reports for sending to individuals outside the county system.

**Adjourned** 3:16 p.m.

Next Data Systems Subcommittee meeting will be on 4/1/05, **2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.**, at Annex First Floor Large Conference Room.