

Criminal Justice Capable Core Team

November 19, 2014

Attendees: Mark Ames, Kim Bushey, Kristin Chandler, Laura Dolgin, Tony Folland, Emily Hawes, Jane Helmstetter, Deborah Hopkins, Annie Ramniceanu, AJ Ruben, Carl Stewart, Julie Tessler and Mark Young

Discussion Notes

I: Field Directors and the SIM Chart

The group has heard that most of the responses have been submitted to Monica and they are being compiled. Everything seems to be progressing on schedule.

We will revisit this item at the December meeting

II: Elements Work Group and the ACE Survey

To recap, the Elements Work Group was formed as the state-wide mapping project started development, and tasked with defining the key elements that should be included in the mapping surveys being done by the field directors.

The Work Group discovered that George Mason University has simulation tools that analyze different data in different ways. Some of the questions were adapted for our survey to the Field Directors.

As a next step, the Work Group explored the other tools and have been focusing on the Provider survey. Kim took a survey to “Assess Jurisdiction Capacity” to see how long the survey takes to complete and what the final report looks like.

The survey took about 20 minutes to complete.

The handout Kim provided shows questions and answers (fabricated data) and then the results in both graph and summary form. The Work Group found this to be a valuable exercise and feel it is a good next step to help identify gaps in services and to give a snapshot of capacity and capabilities county-by-county.

While many providers may not understand the complexities of “evidence-based” programs, the results provided by the survey can open a nonjudgmental conversation.

Downside: Since we are not paying customers, providers can complete the survey and print the results, but they cannot save them nor have any continued data aggregated.

Next Steps: The Work Group asked the CJC Group whether they should continue dialog with George Mason U and to try to work out a “data for services” barter plan. The CJC group agrees that this is a useful process. The Work Group will now confirm this decision with Monica and then all participate on a conference call with George Mason. They will report back at the next meeting.

III: Pre-Trial Services update - Annie Ramniceanu

1. Upcoming Deadlines

A) December 5th – mandatory training for all Judicial Officers, Public Defenders and States Attorneys. Led by the University of Cincinnati, the three groups will learn the basics of the pre-trial screening tool and procedures, what information will be generated and provided, and how this information will compliment what they are already receiving.

The three groups will train together for the first hour, and then the groups will split off for additional training sessions, with the Judicial Officers remaining with the U of Cincinnati staff for the remainder of the morning.

B) December 15 – a written plan for evaluating the Pre-Trial services program, with samples of performance measures, to be presented to the Legislature. Annie is working with DOC, the Judiciary, the Crime Research Group and AHS to prepare this report.

Other mandated deadlines, such as defining the roll-out plan, were met in October.

2. Steering Committee

Annie has called together representatives from Public Defenders, States Attorneys, Association of States Attorneys and the Judiciary to help organize the pre-trial work going forward.

Police Chiefs have been invited to participate as well, but have not yet come forward. Annie is waiting for a response to her request to present to the Joint Chiefs Meeting in December. Kristin and AJ gave recommendations of people to contact to move that request forward. All agree that Police “buy-in” is critical.

3. Police Issued Citations

With the help of Judge Davenport and Bobby Sand, the Citation to Appear is being re-written to include pre-trial options. This will ensure that a unified message will be given to all those cited and that outreach will happen at the earliest intercept point.

4. Meetings

Meetings have been held with:

The States Attorney in Bennington County. Five Chiefs from that jurisdiction were also present and very receptive to the program.

Meetings are still being scheduled and held with other key players to guarantee Pre-Trial Services success.

Support at this intercept point is new to all involved.

Key points are:

- Identify and explain the differences between Pre-TRIAL and Pre-CHARGE services

- What assessments are given and how the results are distributed and used
- Fear of massive surge in numbers to treatment providers
- The role of the Pre-Trial Service Monitors

Suggestion: Offer basic training about this program at the Police Academy

Has there been resistance to the pre-trial services model?

Once properly explained, there has been a growing excitement about the project and that has helped increase interest from previous or potential naysayers.

5. Pre-Trial Services Monitors

- Participation in the assessment is voluntary
- The Monitor does not prescribe services or treatments. If additional screening is indicated, the monitor provides information about resources to the individual
- Monitors will be expected to have in-depth jurisdictional resource knowledge
- The Monitor's boundaries and scope of work will be clearly and concisely defined

The Department of Public Safety to arrange for Monitors to have access to real-time arrest information to assist with early outreach

RFP Process:

An RFP was sent to existing provider entities as well as to individuals. Response could be for full-state, regional or partial coverage areas

A panel of three was appointed. They defined an evaluation metric and then reviewed each response individually. They reconvened and compared results. They now have authorization to continue the negotiation and hiring process and hope to have Monitors in place for the beginning of the new year.

6. As We Begin

Roll out

A controlled roll out is necessary for accuracy of data

Because some counties have more resources in place and ready to move more quickly, the program will begin there.

A very short time is anticipated for full-state roll out (statutes mandate by 10-15-15, but believe it will be much sooner)

Results

We will see "real time" data return

It is anticipated that data may need to be nuanced from community to community

DOC anticipates feeding data to the U of Cincinnati in June to begin analysis and the process of validating the assessment tool for Vermont.

IV: Meeting with Practical Steps Work Group re: SIM Chart & Survey

No one was in attendance that could speak on this topic. Tabled until next meeting.

V:Other

	<p>Kristin provided an update on the Team 2 trainings. They are still going strong with trainings scheduled through May, 2015. DMH has confirmed they are fully committed to the program and indicate continued funding will be available.</p> <p>Suggestion: Add dispatchers to the training, perhaps as a separate training.</p>
What's Next?	<p>Suggested December 17 meeting agenda items:</p> <p>I: Field Directors and the SIM Chart</p> <p>II: Elements Work Group – Update of Conversations with George Mason U.</p> <p>III: Meeting with Practical Steps Work Group re: SIM Chart & Survey</p>
Attachments – Meeting handouts	
Links	

NEXT MEETING:
 Wednesday, December 17, 2014
 1:30 – 3:30

ALL 2015 MEETINGS HAVE BEEN SET – they will remain on the 3rd Wednesday of each month in the Basement Conference Room of the Supreme Court Building, from 1:30 to 3:30.

The dates are:

January 21	May 20	September 16
February 18	June 17	October 21
March 18	July 15	November 18
April 14	August 19	December 16

All 2015 meetings are scheduled for the 3rd Wednesday of each month in the Basement Conference Room of the Supreme Court Building. Meetings will run from 1:30 to 3:30.