Washtenaw Equity Partnership (WEP) Data Subcommittee

April 4, 2022 11:30am-1:00pm

Attendees:

MaryAnn Sarosi (co-chair)

Eli Savit (co-chair)

Grady Bridges

Linda Rexer

Angela Tripp

Trevor Bechtel

Linh Song

Meghan O'Neil

Sandhya Kajeepeta (Vera)

Alex Roth (Vera)

- Vote to approve last meeting's minutes
    - Minutes unanimously approved.
- Review of draft timeline for the subcommittee's work over the course of the year
    - Subcommittee co-chairs created a draft timeline working backward from the WEP final deadlines.
    - Subcommittee members will have more time to review the details, but we want to use some time today to talk through the overall framework of breaking out into two groups that would work on parallel tracks.
    - Those two groups would be:
        - Mapping group: map/describe the current criminal legal data landscape in Washtenaw and get stakeholder input on the kinds of questions they would like to be able to answer with the data related to racial disparities in the system.
        - Model group: analyze models/best practices for criminal legal data collection, integration, analysis, and transparency and propose a model for Washtenaw.
    - After conducting this exploratory research, the two groups would then come back together and, based on the research they've done on what exists and what models are out there, they would propose a roadmap of how it could be done.
    - Goal of this meeting is to get consensus on this overall framework for how to approach the subcommittee's work.
    - Once consensus is reached, there are two action items that we wanted to come out of this meeting:
        - The mapping group decides what questions they want to ask of data system stakeholders
        - The model group decides which models they want to explore further and whom they want to invite for a conversation in May (at May meeting or another date in May).
- Discussion from group about the proposed framework
    - Subcommittee member noted that this means we have some tasks between meetings. Question of whether, for example, Vera would finalize the list of questions for stakeholders and send it to group for their final review prior to next month's meeting:
        - Answer: Yes, we will require some review of materials and responses to questions between meetings. That will be a little bit of work between now and the next meeting.
        - Support from Vera will include revising the survey and sending it out to stakeholders.

- o Subcommittee member noted that they like the spreadsheet with contact info for criminal legal data. It may be worth thinking about other auxiliary players, in addition to Community Mental Health. The Dispute Resolution Center and other restorative justice models are involved with the criminal legal system so we should think about those along with other players to include in data mapping.
  - o Ann Arbor City Council's decision to fund unarmed response may play into our thought process around what data to collect and other data sources to consider. Unarmed response is an example of something we wouldn't have data on in time for this project, but we should keep these actors in mind when considering the entities collecting criminal justice data. Another example of an auxiliary player that gathers possible criminal justice data is schools.
  - o The Lt. Governor's Juvenile Justice Task Force will be done in July. The mapping subgroup may want to note that there may be data collection recommendations that result from the Task Force's work and include any new data collection entities that result. We may not know yet what data will be collected.
  - o Question: Are we saying to add the other players to the list of stakeholders now and send the survey to them? Or just flag them for future work?
    - ▪ In terms of listing out data sources, it makes sense to be as exhaustive as we can. For purposes of sending out our survey and collecting information, it makes sense to limit to those currently collecting criminal justice data.
  - o Conversation about how the Ann Arbor Police Dept lost their data person and they currently don't have backup support. So, noting that they may have limited capacity currently.
- • For the remainder of the meeting, the two subgroups split up into separate conversations to plan next steps.
- • Discussion within mapping subgroup:
  - o Subcommittee member noted that SCAO is collecting feedback on the data collected for the JDW. Does this group want to submit feedback?
    - ▪ It's not easy to add fields to the JDW because of the level of work required in standardization across all jurisdictions that report
    - ▪ One preliminary suggestion could be better quality of race data collection, in particular Hispanic ethnicity data
    - ▪ It's unlikely that this group could create a group comment by the April 15th deadline. Our main purpose is to understand if they are collecting race/ethnicity data. Has anyone already asked that question?
      - • Yes, we do know that race is collected.
  - o Subgroup spent remainder of the time making edits to the draft survey to be sent out to government stakeholders that hold criminal legal data. Edits included:
    - ▪ Gathering more detail on how race/ethnicity data are collected and operationalized
    - ▪ Collecting information on additional demographics (gender and age)
    - ▪ Asking if the agency reports their data to another entity and if so, what entity?
  - o Next steps:
    - ▪ Vera will update the survey with this feedback and send it to the subgroup for their review.
    - ▪ Vera will also send draft text to be sent in the body of the email with the survey.
    - ▪ Once the subgroup has approved the survey and email text, Vera will send it out to the complete list of stakeholders.
- • Discussing with the models subgroup:
  - o If the model subgroup aims to make recommendations to criminal legal agencies in the county for improving data collection, especially with regard to racial disparities, integrating criminal legal data, and analyzing it, then we need to look at what models are out there.
  - o Co-chairs are building a spreadsheet with existing models in the country and possible places to speak with. Subcommittee members will review the spreadsheet and decide on which couple of sites they would like to talk to.
  - o Question: How were these counties selected? Is it by population size?

- A: No, not by size. When searching for information about data warehouses, criminal justice collaboration, these counties kept on coming up in different reports. We could probably expand it to 30 counties, but these counties—especially Multnomah and Allegheny—kept coming up. The spreadsheet listing possible 'model' counties that will be distributed contains a tab listing county populations and budgets and comparing those to Washtenaw.
      - Some of the counties did not seem to be doing the full breadth of the work that we're aiming to do.
  - There was discussion that each county seems to have its own version of a criminal justice collaborative committee made up of the county's criminal legal agencies. It was noted that the efficacy of these county committees seems to depend on whether they are well funded and staffed. The Washtenaw version, the Criminal Justice Collaborative Council was just revived last year after 10 years, but it is still unclear if they will continue meeting.
  - The Dane County, WI version of a collaborative council has staffing and they did three main things: 1) started a triage crisis center; 2) they're working on a community justice center (based on Red Hook Community Justice Center); and 3) they're also trying to implement some evidence-based practices in pretrial work. Their collaborative council also has a full-time data analyst.
  - Question: Can we add a column to the spreadsheet about how these efforts are funded so we'd have a sense of how sustainable they are and what sort of systems need to be in place.
      - A: Yes, we will send a spreadsheet with more updated information.
  - Co-chairs will send the spreadsheet to subgroup members. They will review it and then we can all vote on what are the one or two counties that we want to interview. The co-chairs and Vera staff will then set up the meetings and will try to schedule one during our next subcommittee meeting on May 11th. The earlier we can reach out to people, the better.
  - Discussion of Johnson County, KS – their signature project is the mental health and criminal justice intercept project. We want more of a focus on data integration.
  - Discussion of Mecklenburg County, NC – we saw that they put all criminal justice agencies under a criminal justice director, but they don't seem to have central data collection, integration, and analysis within that.
      - Vera staff has worked with them a little bit and they mentioned they have a data warehouse, but we couldn't find any details.
  - Discussion of Milwaukee, WI – They have a CJCC but seems that things are still in its infancy. Could be an option to learn about challenges they've encountered so far.
  - Discussion of Allegheny and Multnomah counties – They are bigger counties. Allegheny started integrating its data collection at least ten years ago. It focuses on DHS and data sharing of those units, but then moved into jail, probation, courts, health department, six school districts, where they actually share data and they have an analytics unit for the county that does research and analysis. They definitely seem like a great place to talk to although they are much bigger than Washtenaw.
      - Multnomah has a data warehouse called Decision Support System-Justice. They did it with a voter-approved bond in 1996 which they used to develop the data warehouse. Their version of a CJCC is staffed by an executive director, project manager, data analyst, justice reinvestment project manager, and admin. asst.
  - So we need to figure out what are the questions that we want to ask model counties. For example, we can ask them about their process, who the stakeholders are, who convened them, who was the champion, who had the authority to bring people together, did they get any TA, what was the cost of the planning process, who led the implementation, what's the staffing structure to make sure ongoing work is done, what are the annual costs, what are the benefits/efficiencies of integration, what can they do now that they couldn't before.
  - Question: Could we also ask them about what their short- and long-term goals were? People always want to do everything at once, start with big ideas, but it's really the iterative processes or small steps of

success that really drive things towards the end goal. A timeline would be really interesting to look at. For example, were there points where things really sped up or slowed down due to leadership or funding or increased awareness?

- o Confirmation that Vera will set up these meetings. They already have connections with Allegheny and Multnomah.
- o Next steps
  - Co-chairs will send spreadsheet and possible interview questions to the subgroup
  - Recommendation to begin with Multnomah and Allegheny counties
  - Vera will reach out to them and set up calls