

COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE MEETING NOTES - EUGENE

21 November 2019 / 10:00am - 12:00pm / Eugene AOC & OACCD

ATTENDEES

Multnomah County Research & Planning Presenters:

Miranda Sitney - Grant Coordinator

Kevin Nyberg - Business Systems Analyst

Wende Jackson - Research and Planning Manager

Community of Practice Members:

Eric Guyer - Jackson

Maureen Robb - Linn

Todd McKinley - Grant

Jeff Wood - Marion

Dale Primmer - Umatilla

Malcolm McDonald - Clackamas

Jodi Merritt - Polk

Steve Berger - Washington

Aaron Hartman - Klamath

Joe Garcia - Douglas

Jessica Beach - Yamhill

Tanner Wark - Deschutes

Other Attendees:

Rachel Frederick - Lake

Mark Royal - Umatilla LPSCC

Zach Hall - Lake

Denise Sitter - DOC

Dennis Holes - Klamath

Donovan Dumire - Lane

Crystal Miller - Klamath

Scott Noble - Lane

Jenice Zupah - Klamath

Mike Finch - Lane

Jay Bergman - Marion

Jay Scroggin - Multnomah

Kevin Kavandi - Marion

AGENDA

Updates

- Current accomplishments
- Dashboard Rollout in Spring

Individual County Dashboard Review

- Population Statistics
- Risk Assessments
- Conviction Rates
- Workload
- Sanctions
- Field Contacts

Statewide Dashboard Planning

- Statewide Dashboard 1: Revocations
- Statewide Dashboard 2: Racial Disparities
- Statewide Dashboard 3: Success on Supervision
- Statewide Dashboard 4: Dosage

Defining Regions

- Geographic Regions
- Economic Regions

IGAs

- Amendment

MEETING NOTES

UPDATES SINCE SEPTEMBER'S MEETING

- This is our second Community of Practice meeting for the Oregon Statewide Data Dashboard Initiative.
- We are currently in Quarter 2 of the grant, which goes from Oct 1st to December 31st. We have already completed all of our First quarter goals and are making timely progress on our goals for this quarter.
- Some notable accomplishments since we last met in September include that we now have onboarded a complete IT team dedicated to working on this project (an IT Manager, IT Architect, IT Developer, Database Administrator, and a Business Systems Analyst).
 - This team has been onboarding and now are working daily on project goals.
- Currently, their task mostly involve building and testing a system to integrate both CIS and OMS data from all of the participating counties into a single data source.
 - At this moment, CIS data is done, and they are working out the final kinks with the OMS data integration.
- IT feels confident that we can release our first dashboard to all of the counties this upcoming spring.
 - Based on the vote we took at the last communities of practice meeting, that first dashboard will be the **workload** dashboard, which provides a snapshot of the current caseload for each officer or team.

INDIVIDUAL DASHBOARD REVIEW (6)

- Six dashboards will be released to each county. These dashboards DO NOT aggregate to the state / region level. They are only for individual county use. They include:
 - **Population Statistics**
 - Provides counties with a snapshot of the supervisee population they are currently serving. It will also allow the user to track population trends over time.
 - **Risk Assessments**
 - Provides an in-depth look at the risk assessments administered to justice-involved individuals.
 - **Conviction Rates**
 - Tracks rates of convictions and absconds over time.
 - **Workload**
 - provides a snapshot of the current caseload for each officer.
 - **Sanctions**
 - Allows for easy comparison of rates of various sanction types (e.g. jail days, revocations, electric monitoring).
 - **Field Contacts**
 - Demographic information is reported for each justice-involved individual, alongside dates of the most recent and upcoming visits, their phone number, address, and risk level.
- Representatives from Washington and Multnomah County (who currently have all six of these dashboards were asked to comment on what they find most useful).
 - General consensus that the **Sanctions** dashboard is used weekly to stay on top of jail costs / PO activities

- **Workload** is also used weekly to make sure that efforts are distributed equitably.
- Both Wash and Mult counties feel that these dashboards have improved their performance as managers.
 - Steve Berger also points out that they are great options for showing stakeholders information in a way they can understand.
 - Also uses it for real-time answering of common questions (how many days in jail did your clients serve last month?)

STATEWIDE DASHBOARD PLANNING (4)

- In addition to the six dashboards that will be available to the individual counties, four new dashboards are being created that will be available to view at the county, regional, and statewide levels. Planning the specifics of these dashboards is the main focus of this Community of Practice Meeting.

STATEWIDE DASHBOARD 1: REVOCATIONS

- The first of our statewide dashboards is one that will display current revocation rates. These rates will be compared to a performance benchmark that is going to be decided by this group.
 - Coming to consensus on what that benchmark will be is going to be a primary topic at the next OACCD meeting, so we ask now that you all consider what revocation rate you would find acceptable as a statewide marker.
- In addition to just simple revocation rates, this dashboard will be able to filter by LS/CMI score, client demographics, and units or POs.
- CoP Members are asked if there is anything in particular that they would want to see in a revocations dashboard. Responses include:
 - Revocations by number of prior sanctions
 - Distinguishing prison revocation vs. local revocation
 - Assessed leveed risk at the time of revocation
 - Court recommended revocations vs. PO recommended revocations
 - Comparison of prison entry while on supervision vs. not
 - Downward departures
 - There is a flag for downward departures but it may not be consistently used across counties.
 - some people flag where they start some people flag where they end

STATEWIDE DASHBOARD 2: RACIAL DISPARITIES

- The second of our statewide dashboards is one that will display racial disparities in community corrections. This view can show discrete moments when race might come into play with regards to corrections decisions. It will identify racial disparities in things like the decision to sanction or reward a client, conviction rates, or length of time on supervision.
- Again, this data could be further divided by risk score or other demographics like gender.

- CoP Members are asked if there is anything in particular that they would want to see in a racial disparities dashboard. Responses include:
 - Concerns that the data could easily be misinterpreted due to the low numbers of racial or ethnic minorities in some of the smaller counties.
 - We can make the dashboard display no results if there are too few clients to aggregate meaningfully
 - Would like to be able to compare to the PO demographics of the department
 - Potentially show a match between PO and client demographics

STATEWIDE DASHBOARD 3: SUCCESS ON SUPERVISION

- The third dashboard is one that is intended to be positively valenced, rather than focusing on all the negative aspects of community corrections. This could include highlighting clients who received early discharges, identified the percentage of clients who received no violations or sanctions, no new convictions, and no absconds.
- Again, those variables could be looked at in more detail through the use of LS/CMI Score, Gender, Age, Race/Ethnicity
- Community of Practice Members were asked how they would define client success. Responses include:
 - Earned Discharge
 - Deescalation of crime type (violent to nonviolent etc)
 - No absconds
 - Reduced number of sanctions over time
 - Received incentives (new system tracks BCPs completed)
 - Risk reduction (tracking LS/CMI over time)
 - Transfer to a lower-risk caseload
 - Paying restitution
 - make sure to add trend lines. Large interest in seeing trends over time.

STATEWIDE DASHBOARD 4: DOSAGE

- The fourth and final dashboard is currently the least formed. The intent of this dashboard is to visualize treatment dosage relative to the RNR profiles of the clients. In a perfect world, we would use the treatment module to map who is going to treatment, what kind of treatment they are getting, how long they are in treatment for, etc. But we know that the treatment module is not being consistently used by POs.
- The Community of Practice members were presented with four potential options for a modified dosage dashboard. These include:
 - (1) Building a skeleton dashboard using the current treatment module and hoping that data entry improves.
 - As data improves, this dashboard would become more useful
 - (2) Building a dashboard that only maps treatment referrals
 - Could see who was being referred to treatment, could map where clients were going
 - (3) Building a dashboard that only tracks one unit's dosage.
 - Sex offender, mental health, or DV
 - Units which already have a statewide meeting in place to discuss data entry consistency
 - (4) Redefine "dosage" to mean the amount of supervision that a client receives

- Amount of PO contacts by some benchmark, are high risk individuals getting more time with their POs than low risk individuals?
 - The members were in almost 100% agreement to move forward with option 4.
 - Members comments about the dosage dashboard:
 - We really need to come to a consensus about what is and isn't dosage
 - Lane county is doing their own study on tx dosage. Their materials may help in that endeavor
 - The Treatment Module is a really iffy place to pull data from.
 - Both over and under-reporting in places
 - OMS treatment is better than CIS for Option 2
 - Dosage is not being tracked at all for case bank clients
 - Maybe is captured a bit in the closing summary
 - The key question that could be answered with option 4 is “are high-risk clients getting more of our resources than medium-risk, and are medium-risk clients getting more than low-risk?”
 - The crux of the RNR model.
 - We know how time consuming and effortful doing the Time Study was.
 - Trying to get all the POs on board to fix the treatment module will be just as much of a pain
 - Grant is only two years, not enough time to get that work done.
 - But, this idea does highlight the need for OACCD to begin discussions about how data gets measured.
 - Increase consistency across counties.

DEFINING REGIONS

- Each of these four statewide dashboards will have three views
 - Individual county
 - State of Oregon
 - “Region”
- The Community of Practice is tasked with deciding how we should divide the counties into regions.
 - Presented with three geographic options with varying levels of specificity.
 - Regions must be 3 or more counties combined in order to properly mask individual counties data.
- **Overwhelmingly, Community of Practice members voted to use the CJC economic/population comparable regions rather than geography.**
 - Want to be able to compare to other large or small counties, not to neighboring counties.

IGAS

- As we get into the weeds of this project, Multnomah IT has asked for more IT security measures to be written into the IGAs.
- Therefore, we are asking all counties to resign an updated IGA with more specific protections for data breaches and with updated language about what IT software we are using.
 - No changes have been made to costs for counties.
- Multnomah will be sending out new IGAs via email next week.