

Rock County
Evidence-Based Decision Making Ad Hoc Committee
Wednesday, June 15, 2016 minutes
Conference Room N-1/N-2

- 1) Call to Order. Chair Nelson called the meeting to order at 9:53 A.M.
- 2) Committee Members Present. Chair Eric Nelson, Josh Smith, Chief David Moore, Chief David Zibolski, Troy Enger, Judge Alan Bates, Kate Flanagan, Vice Chair Sandra Kraft, Stephen Meyer, and David O’Leary.
- 3) Committee Members Absent. Larry Barton, Commander Erik Chellefold, Judge James Daley, Dorothy Harrell, Elizabeth Krueger, Angela Moore, Sheriff Robert Spoden and Judge Richard Werner.
- 4) Staff Members Present. Elizabeth Pohlman McQuillen, Criminal Justice System Planner/Analyst; Tracey VanZandt, HR Secretary; Gina Koehl, Deferred Prosecution Director; and Dara Mosley, Public Safety Systems Manager.
- 5) Others Present. Tommy Gubbin, EBDM State Coordinator and Mimi Carter, CEPP Technical Assistance Provider
- 6) Approval of Agenda. Judge Bates moved approval of the agenda, second by Chief Zibolski. ADOPTED.
- 7) Approval of Minutes of May 18, 2016. Mr. Meyer moved approval of the minutes of May 18, 2016, second by Chief Zibolski. ADOPTED.
- 8) Discussion with Mimi Carter. Ms. Pohlman McQuillen handed out a working agenda.

Feedback on State-Local Workshop meeting

Chief Zibolski said that he is excited about the new bail system that is being proposed. Ms. Flanagan said the workshop was her first exposure to EBDM and she found it very informative. Ms. Koehl made the observation that not every county is on the same page. Ms. Pohlman McQuillen said part of this may be due to the fact that some counties that participated in the workshop brought some brand new participants. Chief Moore has questions about how the new proposed bail system will work, especially with medium risk offenders.

Workgroup Report-Outs

Today groups will walk through what their plan is, based on their logic model and ask the question: “What is needed from the Committee as far as support or information?” Logic models should be in positive statement formats. We should use footnotes on logic models when further explanation is needed. Some revisions have been made to the logic models that are not yet reflected on the handouts. Logic models will be merged and submitted with the Phase VI application.

Risk Assessment – Handout was reviewed. Some discussion points in regards to the handout were:

- We have no data starting point. Numbers on the logic model are best guesses until we are able to do a pilot.
- PR bonds have never been collected upon. We could eliminate money on PR bond immediately.
- There should be a footnote that states 2015 appearance rate equals.
- Add box under activities “collect data on risk assessments”
- Ensure that high risk individuals don’t get bail. This is a state issue. Not sure where to include this on logic model. Suggestion to put under outcomes as “increase high risk population at jail” with asterisk stating pending state statute.
- A flow chart to show how assessments will occur would be helpful.
- Dashboard results will be published down the road to collect data and monitor if goals are being met.

Pre-Charge Diversion – Handout was reviewed. Some discussion points in regards to the handout were:

- The workgroup had a lengthy discussion on the last outcome. (Historically disadvantaged populations will complete the program at at least the same rate as other populations.) The committee asked because of diversion admission rules how can we guarantee who is being admitted.
- There are some barriers such as Rock County Municipal Courts not yet being on board.
- The workgroup struggled with the definition of recidivism. Proper wording is needed so we don’t have false outcomes.
- There may be racial disparity if Beloit Municipal Courts are not on board.
- We need to be cognizant of data we have access to so we can measure.
Another meeting is needed to discuss data
- Under outcomes-(80% of program participants will not be convicted of committing crimes within 3 years of program completion) The committee questioned whether the percent is high enough. It was also discussed to remove the word ‘not’ and replace with ‘remain arrest free’. This outcome should have a footnote in regards to acknowledging and collecting data. Mr. O’Leary likes the 3 year timeline.

Deferred Prosecution – Handout was reviewed. Some discussion points in regards to the hand out were:

- Under outcomes-(60% of participants will successfully complete DPP) The committee felt the percentage was too low. Ms. Carter suggested looking at data that Milwaukee County has on this.
- Collect data on number of participants based on who would choose the program versus a fine.
- We currently only offer Deferred Prosecution to first time offenders. We need to collect data on how many individuals would be interested in the program.
- Under outputs-(90% of staff will be trained). It was suggested that a footnote be used as to why this number is not 100%.

Behavioral Health Information Sharing – Handout was reviewed. Some discussion points in regards to the hand out were:

- Define ‘use of force’
- More discussion is needed on who would activate the flag in Spillman. It was suggested that possibly only the CIT officer would have this capability.
- Under outcomes-(Reduce the number of psychiatric hospitalization days by 10%) The committee suggested to add wording of ‘through Human Services’. The County does have data on this.
- Under activities-add box that states “Development of MOU’s and Policies”

Criminogenic Screen – Hand out was reviewed. Some discussion points in regards to the hand out were:

- The workgroup had established a couple more ‘outcomes’ but handout was not updated yet. Added were: “Percentage of people that successfully complete program” and “include other programmatic interventions that are in place.
- Additional activities box should be added: “collect data on risk assessments”

Scorecard. The committee broke out into four teams to establish sample scorecards. Ms. Carter provided the guidelines of: 1) agree on language of each impact 2) Identify 2 to 3 measures and 3) develop an engaging document. The four sample scorecards were reviewed by the committee to see which ideas would be used in the final scorecard. Some comments on the sample scorecards were:

- Team 1-The committee liked the survey used for the public perception of public safety.
- Team 2-The committee liked the flow chart example and budget offset chart.
- Team 3-The committee liked the public defender measurement of poverty.
- Team 4-The committee liked positives on the chart and that it was easy to read.

Ms. Carter assisted the committee in deciding what aspects of the sample scorecards they wanted to use in the final scorecard. Ms. Pohlman McQuillen will put the final scorecard together from the recommendations of the committee.

Communication Strategies. The committee needs to develop a one minute video presentation that could possibly go along with the scorecard which explains the purpose of EBDM.

Phase VI application. Our next meeting is on July 20th and the application is due July 22nd. The policy team needs to make the decision on what will be included in the Phase VI application. Ms. Carter said that other teams have sent out surveys on team questions. The committee agreed that a survey should be distributed first and then a meeting to follow to prioritize.

July 26, 2016 State CJCC meeting. Chairs and Coordinators from all sites will be attending to share the work of the committees.

9) Citizen Participation and Announcements. None.

10) Future Meeting Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2016, 9:15 A.M., Conference Room N1-N2, 5th Floor Courthouse East

11) Adjournment. Adjourned by acclimation at 1:43 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracey VanZandt, HR Secretary

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.