

Washtenaw Equity Partnership (WEP) Data Subcommittee

July 27, 2022, 11:00am-12:30pm

- **Present:**
 - Eli Savit
 - Linda Rexer
 - Grady Bridges
 - Trevor Bechtel
 - Jeff Rose
 - Angela Tripp
 - Judge O'Brien
 - Meghan O'Neil
 - Shahd Elbushra (Vera)
 - Alex Roth (Vera)
- **Co-chair asks about including data warehouse checklist in report.**
 - Members say they think it would be good to include, with some minor modifications.
 - One member noted that the subcommittee should probably include something about technical and personnel capabilities within organization, e.g., something about the front-end work required to clean and match data and something about data visualization platforms.
 - The checklist can be tailored to include some of the features supported by the subcommittee, e.g., focus on equity issues, and who should be part of a local governance group.
- **Discussion about August 1st and September 14th meetings.**
 - The subcommittee will start discussing draft recommendations at the August meeting. Co-chairs will send out materials for that later today.
 - Co-chairs will work on writing up draft report after the August 1st meeting to share with subcommittee well before the September meeting when the subcommittee will vote on draft recommendations.
- **Member presents on criminal legal dashboards.**
 - The member shared an Airtable document with information about different public dashboards from across the country that he and his team did as part of their work to research and create a dashboard for the Washtenaw County Prosecutor's Office.
 - Explains Prosecutorial Performance Indicators project and how he and his team used those to evaluate prosecutor dashboards from other jurisdictions.
 - When looking at these dashboards, his team looked at user accessibility issues. In recommending dashboard(s) for Washtenaw, he suggested that the subcommittee needs to think about how to make things easy to understand for people not familiar with legal system or jargon.

- The member then discussed court dashboards and national court data standards (National Open Data Standards).
- There are no common accepted standards for police dashboards (though Measures for Justice is working on this). They looked at police dashboards and developed list of common important elements. The member reviewed Measures for Justice’s system-wide list of core metrics, companion, and contextual measures. Also explains some of the issues with the way they report race/ethnicity.
- A co-chair explained that the Models Subgroup met and felt that a dashboard should include information on equity and emerging approaches such as restorative justice and unarmed response when the latter effort is launched.
- A member noted that restorative justice metrics will be included in Washtenaw prosecutor dashboard. It might be a challenge to measure restorative justice because it is more focused on process and substantive outcomes, not just about tracking numbers. At the very least, a dashboard could track cases deflected/diverted, whether restorative justice plans were developed/complied with, etc., even if specific outcomes are hard to track because will vary so much by what survivor wants in each case.
- Tracking racial disparities with restorative justice cases could also be problematic, because these cases are totally voluntary, will depend on whether survivor agrees and don’t know if there will be major variations in that by race.
- Question about timing for prosecutor’s dashboard—probably won’t have anything done in next few months to share with subcommittee so should probably just reference in report that this is happening.
- Discussion about how to make dashboards more accessible. Example of NYC Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice dashboard that shows the flow of cases through system and has info about key points – helps general public to understand things.
- Question about whether the subcommittee should recommend creation of both public facing and internal dashboards. Member thinks should start with focus on public dashboards. Another member talks about how data warehouse would play into this – could be used both to generate data for public dashboard but could also be used by different agencies to run internal reports on specific areas. The latter could be good incentive for agencies to participate in data warehouse because it could help them answer questions they have.
- The subcommittee discussed the importance of having analyst capacity for putting data in public dashboard and running more specific queries. The two are not necessarily the same. A data warehouse needs personnel who understand data models and how to query system but also people who can make public info accessible.

- There was some discussion about whether the subcommittee should include dashboard features in the checklist. There was some agreement to include general areas that dashboard should cover and not list all the elements.
- Could keep recommendations fairly generic to leave room to determine things during implementation process but still provide guiderails for process.
- **Vera provides brief update about data mapping survey follow up**
 - Alex explained what agencies he has followed up with and the status of his other outreach.
 - Discuss how to overcome reluctance of some agencies to participate. He noted that the subcommittee might consider building out the data warehouse in stages, maybe start with 4 or 5 key agencies who are willing to participate to then have something substantive to be able to show others and illustrate benefits.
- **Co-chair reviews next steps**

The co-chairs reminded members that the subcommittee will begin discussions about its recommendations at the August 1st meeting. The co-chairs will then take the guidance from that meeting to draft a report and the checklist which will be circulated at the end of August in advance of the September 14th meeting. It is the goal to discuss and adopt the report and checklist at the September meeting.