Attendees:

MaryAnn Sarosi (Co-chair)

Eli Savit (Co-Chair)

Truly Render

Grady Bridges

Trevor Bechtel

Linda Rexer

Sandhya Kajeepeta (Vera)

Alex Roth (Vera

- Those present voted on minutes from January and February meetings
  - Everyone unanimously approved the minutes
  - Those who did not attend the meeting will vote via email
- Subcommittee reviewed and discussed the concept paper, which presents a proposal of the scope of work for the subcommittee.
  - The four major priority areas discussed at the last meeting (improving data collection, data analysis, data integration, and data transparency) are very broad and implementing them across both adult and juvenile systems would be a substantial undertaking.
  - The co-chairs took a step back and thought about what is feasible. They then put together some ideas for what it would look like if the subcommittee did the foundational work for these four priority areas:
    - This would look like taking the following 3 steps:
      - 1. Identify the current data landscape and what is missing to allow meaningful information about racial disparities.
      - 2. Identify best practices/models in data collection, integration, analysis, and transparency.
      - 3. Develop a blueprint for future data collection, integration, analysis, and transparency and roadmap to achieve it.
  - Question posed to the group: does this seem like a good approach?
- Reactions to the concept paper:
  - Agreement that the scope of what we could do is huge. So it's helpful to start with these 3 steps. The 3rd step would be coming up with a blueprint - likely comes after the first two steps. It helps to have the example methods to envision what those two steps would entail. In terms of the conceptual piece of what knowledge do we need to

produce recommendations at the end, this seems like a fine framework. Does anyone think this is not a good framework to start with?

- o Agree that it is a good approach. Some of the work with the Prosecution Transparency Project gives us a good jump start on a lot of this. Understanding what data collection exists and where the data would come from is the first step. Hope that we could use the formation of this larger group (WEP) to name that early on in the process. We have time as a whole group to advocate to the people who have the data to share it.
- o The concept paper was shaped in light of some of the issues illuminated through the Prosecution Transparency Project. On a parallel track, we would be looking at models in other counties and we could ask them the benefits of having integrated data. What were the challenges? At the end of our work, we would be able to say yes, there were these challenges in other counties, but they got this benefit. We would also be able to layout a clear roadmap for implementation, not just that we recommend that this be implemented.
- o The group discussed terminology concerning types of data vs. individual data fields. If we get into the nitty gritty of all the individual data fields, it will be an overwhelming amount of information to sift through. It is good to keep things at a high level (i.e., what types of data does this agency collect), but at some point if we want to get into the specifics about the data fields, it will be cumbersome.
- o The group discussed how this subcommittee may not be the ones getting into that level of detail. Instead, whatever entity takes up the implementation phase of the recommendations may be spearheading this work.
- o Proposal to divide the work into two smaller subcommittees working on step 1 (current landscape in Washtenaw County) and step 2 (learning from existing models in other jurisdictions). The question of what level of detail we get to could be determined by this smaller step 1 subcommittee. We probably can't decide that in the large group today.
- o Even people who work at the agencies aren't immediately aware of all the data fields, they know about how the data system serves their needs. They may not be aware that they're not recording certain pieces of information or certain circumstances. However, it's not a new observation to say that the data don't talk to each other well. We're constantly making that observation and kicking the can down the road. It behooves us to try to do what this concept paper says. Let's actually get as detailed a map as possible on what's being collected with specificity. Let's figure out who knows that information for each agency.
- o This is an interesting and novel partnership because we're trying to look at trends and retrospective views of the criminal legal system. One member commented that if we ask people working in the system they will probably care about what will make their day-to-day job easier. But now we're prioritizing this question of using data to look back at trends and evaluate racial disparities on an ongoing basis.
- o Sometimes you need to get into the details to understand what you need to survey. We can't remove ourselves from attention to that. We don't want to reinvent the wheel because we are replicating what's done in other counties. However, some things don't exist already. Prosecutor dashboards across the country all present different data fields; this is not just because the systems are different but because there are different

priorities/interests. I'm not sure if a best practice exists in this space because the data has been so opaque for so long in criminal legal systems. When the Prosecution Transparency Project did a comprehensive survey of this across the country, they found many different prosecutor, court, and police dashboards that all report different things.

- o There's only a certain amount we can learn from different jurisdictions because different jurisdictions have different criminal legal structure, different laws, charging decision structure, etc.
- o Is it useful to ask people what they want to know from the data? Not necessarily specific fields. One of our jobs could be to figure out, if we tracked X, then here are the things we would learn from it and this is how it would benefit agencies.
- o The subcommittee discussed the issue of determining what the end goal is first in order to guide best practices. For example, if the end game is a centralized database that holds criminal legal data from all agencies, then there's the problem that that's not what the individual contributors need from their own data. They use their data for something other than public dashboards or retrospective analysis, they use it for case management functionality. We need to know what the end product is in order to look for best practices.
- o What is meant by centralized database? The Judicial Data Warehouse (JDW) is an example overseen by SCAO. Most courts in the state feed data into that system. Not all the courts use the same management software, it just requires more work on the back end to integrate and standardize the data from the different systems. The different agencies have completely different needs so it's probably not realistic for them to all use the same system. We just want a central repository that links the data together. A lot of our questions require data that span multiple silos. Disparities present in one area may be more reflective of data in another area. The challenge is getting people to share data and then piecing it together.

- Subcommittee reached general agreement on the concept paper and starting with steps 1 and 2 and dividing up the work
  - o Member noted: If we went to a funder, even just having a map representing what data our system has would go a long way.
  - o One early step is to reach out to all the law enforcement agencies about how they collect their data and what data they collect.
  - o It is much easier to ask how they store their data than to ask to access it so maybe they will be receptive.
  - o Vera will help support with these asks as an external party.
- Plan is to split up into 2 groups: internal looking and external looking. We will send an email out to everyone to ask people to decide which group they want to be in.
  - o Grady already decided to be in the internal looking group
  - o Trevor already has a catalogue of best practices across the country
- Work structure: Subcommittee decided to use existing subcommittee meetings and break up into 2 groups during those meetings
- Next meeting: Monday, April 4 11:30am-1pm