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Introduction

The third annual data providers meeting was sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and took place at the National Corrections Academy in Aurora, Colorado on April 23rd and April 24th, 2014. Participants included data suppliers to the National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP), members of the Institutional Corrections Research Network (ICRN), and staff from Abt Associates (Abt), BJS, NIC and the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI). This document provides a detailed summary of what transpired during the meeting, a list of participants, and the meeting agenda. All presentations and meeting materials can also be found on the meeting website, http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3.

The meeting began on the morning of April 23, 2014 with a presentation from Dr. John Pfaff (Professor of Law, Fordham Law School) that highlighted the importance of looking at the county level when trying to understand prison growth and examined how researchers can better gather and disseminate county level data. During the afternoon of the 23rd, there were presentations on state specific initiatives as well as four breakout sessions where attendees spoke in smaller groups about various topics related to NCRP and research, including: NCRP updates, research exchange, and Performance Based Measures System. Throughout the day, participants had the opportunity to discuss the dynamic relationship between criminal justice policy and data, informally network, and participate in discussions on research and performance management efforts across states.

The second day began by repeating four of the breakout sessions from Day 1 to give attendees the opportunity to revisit topics that were of interest. Participants also had an opportunity to discuss improving measurement in the corrections system and other matters of reflection. The meeting ended with a review of the key points discussed, lessons learned during the meeting, and a summary of plans for the future.
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Wednesday, April 23, 2014

I. Welcome and introductions

- **Christopher Innes**, Chief of Research and Information Services, NIC
  - The National Institute of Corrections is proud to co-sponsor this meeting with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Over the past decade, the number of attendees has increased and we are happy to bring together a group that covers the entire nation.
  - With continued support from BJS, an interagency agreement is in place for the 2015 meeting.
  - Please network as much as possible with peers; based on recommendations from years past, time has been built into the agenda to increase the sharing of knowledge.

- **Daniela Golinelli**, Corrections Statistics Chief, BJS
  - BJS is committed to improving data collection through this meeting.
  - BJS is happy to answer questions or help improve state-specific data collection efforts to further improve NCRP reports, to better analyze your data needs, and make sure the data serves your department’s purpose and mission.
  - NCRP has quickly become the best data collection unit within BJS and is a model for other collection units and BJS is appreciative for your attendance and continued partnership.

- **Tom Rich**, Abt Associates
  - Abt Associates has been working with BJS for four years which has been a wonderful opportunity to make improvements to NCRP data and reporting.
  - Last year, a total of 49 states submitted NCRP data.
  - There is room for improvement and Abt is welcome to hearing ideas for improving NCRP.

- **Kristy Pierce-Danford**, Associate, Crime and Justice Institute at CRJ
  - Based upon recommendations from previous meetings, longer breaks have been incorporated for networking and breakout sessions will be repeated to ensure you can catch the information you want.
  - For those traveling directly to Denver international Airport Thursday afternoon, one of the Grey Line busses will transport participants there while the other will travel to the Double Tree.
  - Folders contain the meeting agenda and pertinent information and the meeting website will have all presentation materials.
  - Please remember to complete your reimbursement forms within the next month.
II. Keynote Speaker

- **John Pfaff**, Professor of Law, Fordham Law School: State Prisons but County Prisoners: Why State-Level Data Cannot Determine the Causes of Prison Growth
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
- State corrections cannot solve all issues, but state data can give us more insight.
  - Models for prison growth are incorrect because they focus on the wrong unit of population and suffer from endogeneity bias, poorly defined treatment/control populations and unconvincing proxies.
    - All models use state level data and prisons are state institutions but the prisoners come from the county.
  - Two reasons to focus on county-level data:
    - The main source of prison growth is the county prosecutor; and
    - State correctional data is extremely useful but is scattered and/or inaccessible/unusable.
  - Where does prison growth come from when crime is down 20%, arrests are down 10% and prison admission and time served per admission is flat?
    - The driver is the prosecutor: felony filings per arrest are up 36% and felony filings per admission are up 60%.
  - There is a lack of a unified criminal justice system; each actor has different roles and stakeholders.
  - County – level variation plays a major role, including:
    - Low versus high population;
    - Rural versus urban geographic location;
    - Punitiveness (arrests per crimes, filings per arrest, admissions per filing; and
    - Causal factors, such as conservatism of political parties.
  - Q: If a state’s population is spread out or concentrated in a few cities, how is your research affected?
    - A: By looking at punitiveness, there is something different longitudinally and over time, variation becomes evident.
  - Q: What is the difference between rural and urban?
    - A: There are spikes that account for rural and urban demographics, but other states don’t show punitive levels. Population plays a role, but is not the sole source.
  - Q: Is there is relation to staffing levels and admission rates?
    - A: Two things: the UCR data perfectly misses the financial crisis of 2008 on the counties that report staffing levels and smaller, rural counties do not have the data capabilities to gather financial data.
  - Q: Can workload weight have an impact on the efficiency of the data?
    - A: State and correctional data can help work through the efficiency rate.
  - Q: Punitive counties and less punitive...are there factors that matter more than others?
    - A: More punitive counties have a higher number of arrests, are more aggressive on the prosecutorial side across the board.
State level decision-makers are driven by county level decisions; there are 50 states and 3,144 counties. County importance is almost unheard of in academic literature and points to the need for more communication and room for collaboration between academics and government employees who don’t have research flexibility or capability.

There is no UCR/NCRP data for prosecutors.

A solution would be to collect prosecutorial data (arrest, arraignment, bail, plea/trial charge, conviction) with a wide range of offender and prosecutor detail which will identify the actions of the most important actor.

A centralized, state database of county data with machine-readable data in usable formats can aid in county-level research.

Q: Wouldn’t the drivers be legislative changes to “widen the net” and access to alternatives to incarceration?

A: Legislators pass these laws, but the District Attorneys are the ones who decide to enforce those laws. While legislators set the rules, the prosecutors and county DA’s decide what to use.

Q: The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is focused on state-level modifications to law. Would you be willing to assign the blame to state legislators passing laws and county level officials deciding whether to do it or not?

A: DAs are wielding a much larger hammer. Take for example the three strikes laws for example. The law gives the DA a much larger role and can choose to opt out of law. Realignment in California is another example which gives the counties the culpability to pay for the offenders they admit. With JRI, the focus on the counties is where it needs to be.

Q: Would it be better if a prosecutor toured a facility? We are at the end of the spectrum by taking the offenders; what can we do to be more proactive?

A: You cannot do too much. Bridging the gap between the county and state requires incentives of the county official. State level should gather county level data as to what is going on to get an understanding to help create ways of getting their attention.

III. State Research Exchange

Resource Management

- Abby Vandenberg, Research Manager, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)

Nebraska started to shift from counts of inmates to obligations to provide services to particular inmates.

Department of Correctional Services started to employ the following inmate sentences:

- **Fixed** (portion needed to spend in a facility): If a 365 day sentence, inmate is not eligible for parole or good time = 365 day fixed sentence; and
- **Variable Portion**: If a 365 day sentence, eligible after 6 months (182 days, DCS is obligated to provide services while rest of the days are variable – potential bed days to protect for the department).
Constant assessment of how well they protect institution days and resources and community resources.
Aggregated metrics show performance of the department (e.g. how many days are they freeing?)
Resource management requires asking tough questions:
- Why do we want to measure resources?
- How well are we managing the institution?
- Are people staying longer than needed?
- What should be our efficiency level?
- Are parole officers efficient?
- What programs are working for inmates?

Departments need to account for variability:
- Decide what the best and worst case scenarios will be;
- Look to assume new admissions will be identical to those in the prior year; and
- Determine the theoretical maximum and minimum.

Resources management can answer important questions:
- Average daily population was at 5000 inmates and had an institution with a design capacity of 3300 beds; and
- Management allows departments to assign dollar amounts to various aspects that can draw attention to needs or areas of improvement.

What are the incentives for inmates?
- Earned good time as a tool for institutional management; all inmates have credits applied at beginning, can lose time based on negative behavior and earn back time as well; and
- Parole eligibility date is statutorily defined (50% of min. sentence) and they can earn additional time off while on parole (10 days for every 30 days).

Projections and a communications plan (e.g. charts and graphs of resources) are crucial in thinking about institutional resource management.

What were the lessons learned?
- We found and cut out deficiencies in the hearing process; we were losing a lot of beds per day because eligibility hearing was held after the eligibility date so we started to move up parole hearings;
- Start implementing new programs (ramp up programming in-house to prepare for release); and
- Developed an inmate readiness inventory which helps to maintain consistency from point of entry to release.

What role did the legislature play in this process?
- The legislature wants to know the return on investment on institutional programming and in a few years, DCS will have the ability to look at what happens to folks that get “x” or “y” before or after release to see what/if any investments were made and what the outcomes were; and
- There was a recommendation to do Results First with Pew to assign recidivism rates to the money you spent (e.g. $1.00 on cognitive behavior thinking saves $18.00 by calendar year) which can be presented to show the value.
Performance Management

- Fred Klunk, Director, Statistical Reporting and Evidence-Based Program Evaluation Office, Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
- See meeting handouts on the meeting website: http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3
- The Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole receives more funding year after year because there is a link between agency performance and the work. By asking the question: “What can we do with what we got?”, it can help an agency grow and plan to get performance measures on one piece of paper.
  - Q: How is it connected to planning?
  - A: Performance reviews with 23 measures are conducted on a quarterly basis to see how we are doing and if we are hitting goals.
  - Q: Why is data important?
  - A: Data relays key information to key people. My role is to explain the numbers in a consistent manner help strategic planning.
  - Q: Why performance management?
  - A: By providing data, you can justify actions.
  - Q: Does performance management data go to the legislature?
  - A: Yes; from a platform perspective, it gets the point across but can be a tough sell. Most important role is to make the sell to the budget office.
  - Q: Do field officers actually put in data?
  - A: For 10 district offices, the administrative support staff input offender records, which feed into a centralized system using multiple platforms that will get consolidated within the DOC.
    ▪ Massachusetts requires agents enter data in real-time.
  - Pennsylvania district offices set goals that are preliminary ideas for measures. Regional directors discuss with the director of Pennsylvania and then with district directors to create buy-in at all levels. It also incorporates feedback from those in the county that know the specific issues that may affect their county.
  - Q: How do you come up with the most relevant measures?
  - A: Any measures Pennsylvania has that took time to figure out what the best things are to look at. We chose what was consistently being asked by our agency, the DOC, and the legislature.
  - Getting the right offenders out from the DOC and into the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole was critical. For those granted parole, we asked if we are getting them out on time and what the, minimum date to release date was. These days can be saved from incarceration to supervision.
  - Performance management is not just having the numbers and doing the analysis, but also communicating what is occurring; answering why and how the measures work.
  - Q: Have you conducted a cost-benefit analysis?
  - A: Pennsylvania created the simple way to take information to the budget office without the dollars/cents of a cost-benefit. By stating “given these trends, here is what the body count outcomes would be.”
Massachusetts provides data from the various agencies in a collaborative way to show the most cost-effective programs to reduce recidivism. By using meta-analytical data, it can show how it will impact state dollars.

Virginia is looking at various investment models for cost-benefit.

Colorado is tying performance measures and strategic planning to budgets.

- Q: Do you do any assessments on the offenders/programs and the success/failure?
  - A: Yes; Pennsylvania’s major risk-assessment is LSIR that used revalidated scores. When it comes to evaluation, can look at risk scores and sub domains that are program specific. Everything is risk-based and data-driven.

Program Evaluation

- Steve Van Dine, Chief, Bureau of Research and Evaluation, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- See meeting handouts on the meeting website: [http://www.cri.org/cjj/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.cri.org/cjj/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)

Ohio conducted an evaluation of our Thinking for a Change (T4C) program.

- Q: How do you develop a need for cognitive skills?
  - A: Ohio is using the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS).
- Q: Did the assessment tool measuring responsivity?
  - A: No, it does not factor in responsivity.
- Q: Do institutional staff run the program (e.g. are institutional staff trained)?
  - A: Yes.
  - During the roll-out of the program, metrics were being collected so that we could then ensure the fidelity of the program.
  - In Phase II, we noticed that many offenders were completing T4C but they had limited resources to follow up.

- Group discussion about types of programs and assessment tools that states have adopted.
  - Maryland uses a modified pre and post scale, we use a criminal sentiment scale to see if there has been a change in criminal behavior.
  - Indiana is looking at recidivism as their outcome measure, evaluating methadone and substance abuse programs and utilizing faith-based programming.
  - Hawaii developed the HOPE (Hawaii’s Opportunity Probation with Enforcement) model.
  - In Virginia, they are working on improving data quality and quality assuring programs. When programs think about validating a program, the DOC/ researchers should be involved so that correct metrics are in place and data collection efforts are available for effective and reliable data use.
  - Ohio is working on certifying programs but needs to include a plan on how the program will get evaluated in the future as an incentive to get researchers involved in the front end.
  - Arkansas is working on validating their programming needs assessment tool and trying to decide what program outcomes to use to validate the instrument.
  - Connecticut is looking to implement the ORAS; however, it has been difficult to connect it to the DOC’s database.
The ORAS in Ohio is a multijurisdictional effort so their database is separate from DOC database.

- Indiana has a validated tool but were told that they cannot use tool to measure changes in risk.
- It would be useful to use the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) results and then go back and link them to the T4C evaluations.
- Rhode Island uses information learned in the CPC training and building those principles into contracts to ensure accurate service application to the correct population.

**Recidivism**

- **Megan Jones**, Research and Policy Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Wisconsin Department of Corrections
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
- Recidivism is defined as a criminal offense resulting in new conviction and sentence to Wisconsin Department of Corrections, which includes either probation or prison.
  - Within the follow up window, the first new conviction and sentence is counted as the recidivism event, regardless of subsequent new convictions.
  - Recidivism does not include out-of-state offenses, jail sentences, fines, or return to prison on parole violation.
  - Offense date is counted as recidivism date, not conviction date. As long as the offense falls within the follow-up period, it does not matter when conviction occurs.
  - Because sentencing can occur much later than the crime, historical recidivism rates can change with new calculations (e.g. someone sentenced in 2014 for a crime committed in 2004 will change the 2004 rate).
  - Three year follow up begins on release from prison confinement. (Any additional temporary holds are not counted as confinement).
  - If an offender has more than one release in a year, only the last release is included in the release cohort.
  - Deceased offenders are removed from release cohort.
  - For each cohort, there is a three-year follow up period, and then a one-year lag to account for time to sentencing.
  - Parolees and direct discharges are included in release cohort. Direct discharges tend to be individuals with discipline issues in prison who are not released to parole.
- DOC is providing community-based programs with data to calculate their recidivism rates in the same way as DOC.
- To study community corrections, Wisconsin is going to add cohorts for admissions to supervision and discharge from supervision.

- **Brent Bucklen**, Director, Bureau of Planning, Research, and Statistics, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
- The Pennsylvania DOC measures recidivism as first incidence of re-arrest after release from prison; first incidence of re-incarceration; and overall incarceration, which includes both re-arrest and re-incarceration; violations are included.
• The Pennsylvania DOC developed a comprehensive recidivism report for 2000-2006, but also did an info-graphic for executives and legislators to increase attention to the results.
  o Overall recidivism rate has remained flat, as have arrest rates; incarceration has gone down possibly due to alternatives for violators.
  o Report includes breakdown by offense types and county.
  o Saw trends in original crime types and re-arrest crime type for violent, drug, and property crime.
  o Overall, about 10% of new arrests are of released inmates. Ratio of arrests for released inmates to general population was 12 to 1.
  o Report also includes “what if” scenarios for cost savings and bed day savings if recidivism is reduced. Marginal costs are used, though calculations included bed closures for large recidivism reductions.

• For Community Corrections, Latessa et al. study in 2009 showed that individuals in Pennsylvania halfway houses had higher recidivism rates than those who were paroled to street.
  o The Latessa study was replicated by the DOC; the model tried to control for selection bias of parole board and increased supervision in the halfway house, but that did not change the outcome.
  o As a result of the study, contracts for community corrections centers were rebid and include performance requirements.

• Joan Schwartz, Director, Office of Planning and Research New Hampshire Department of Corrections
• See presentation on meeting website: http://www.cri.org/cij/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3
• The definition of recidivism includes re-incarceration for new offense, new charge, or new sentence. Definition does not include county or federal holds, and the DOC does not follow offenders who go out of state or to federal custody.
  o New Hampshire collects recidivism data for individuals released from a state felony sentence, and they are tracked for three years.
  o DOC releases about 50% of incarcerated population every year.
  o If an individual has multiple offenses, DOC tracks by the crime with the longest sentence.
  o DOC is conducting new research on reasons for return to prison; mental illness and recidivism (including definitions, measurement of treatment, and determining factors); and also new study of mental health, substance abuse, and co-occurring disorders.
  o As part of the return to prison study, this presentation included demonstration of recidivism collection tool in CORIS system; screen shots are available on the meeting website.
IV. State-specific Initiatives

- **Abby Vandenberg**, Research Manager, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services: Convergent Forecasting
  - See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
  - Convergent forecasting is a standardized way to measure current and future population and resource use, including trends for upcoming year.
    - At the beginning of the year, Nebraska creates a best and worst case scenario for the upcoming year in terms of obligated bed days:
      - Best case scenario includes no returns for those on parole or in a supervised release program; admissions flat from previous year; and institutional population released as soon as eligible; and
      - Worst case includes returns from parole or community release, and incarcerated individuals not released on parole.
    - To project new admissions, Nebraska uses the number and type of offenders from the previous years:
      - Average daily population is calculated from sentence days/365.
    - DOC has shifted away from thinking about inmate counts to inmate sentence days, and divides into fixed sentence days and variable sentence days.
    - Throughout the year, actuals are tracked, including days saved due to early releases (i.e. “protected days”), and days of incarceration.
    - This information is used to project resource need, and is also combined with other data sources to identify system issues, such as parole hearings set after eligibility dates that lead to unnecessary incarceration days.

- **Alison Lawrence**, Senior Policy Specialist, NCLS Criminal Justice Program, National Conference of State Legislatures: Sentencing and Corrections: Legislative Trends and Budgets
  - See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
  - Sentencing and corrections are areas of interest to legislators, especially because of the associated cost.
    - On average nationally, corrections is five to six percent of state general fund spending.
    - Sentencing and Corrections is frequently amongst the top ten issues important to legislators; trends include:
      - States are adjusting who is going to prison and sentencing policy, including adjusting drug crime classification and penalties, and raising mandatory minimums;
      - States are improving community supervision through policies and practices proven to reduce recidivism; graduated sanctions; specialized diversion for individuals with substance abuse and mental health needs; and validated risk and needs instruments;
      - States are bolstering reentry interventions, including providing offenders with skills, services, supervision; mandatory post-release supervision; and earned time credit;
• Legislative changes are frequently the result of large-scale reform initiatives that include data analysis, cross-governmental task forces, and the measurement of results;
• States are decreasing prison admissions through increased use of community sentences and alternatives for violations;
• Lengths of stay are decreasing due to earned time credit, accelerated release, and more attention to reentry and parole;
• To manage costs, states are looking at facility closure, more efficient facilities, and reduced health care costs;
• States are reallocating resources to correctional treatment programs, performance incentive funding, and training and risk assessment; and
• Each policy may have a modest impact, but collectively they are helping to lower costs and improve outcomes.

• Steve Van Dine, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction: Using recidivism to measure prison-specific performance and determining what makes a good jail and how to measure it
• See meeting handouts on meeting website: http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3
• DRC wants to look at recidivism at the county level and examine the community programs that the state funds.
  o Many of the programs are pre-prison and DRC measures if they show up to prison in the same time frame.
  o At this time, DRC is starting to produce technical reports and looking to expand the data on recidivism by prison.
  o Part of this process is also increasing the evidence that recidivism can be changed and that all organizations can the evaluated.
  o Why don’t you want to look at this?
    ▪ Historically it has been very difficult;
    ▪ Lag time in feedback; and
    ▪ Switched to a 1 year recidivism rate.
  o Can it be done fairly?
    ▪ There are many variations and differences in population; and
    ▪ We also need to take into account several variables to be successful.
  o Using a static risk instrument, DRC found that younger offenders were more likely to recidivate (only about half of offenders were released under supervision).
  o It is useful to have the institutions thinking about operational concerns and how this may affect recidivism rates.
    ▪ As an example, there has been some good research in Minnesota about changing visitation practices and if this is shown to be helpful then prisons should change their practices.
• What makes a good jail and how do you decide?
  o The Jail Bureau has over 200 jail standards and is constantly reexamining them.
Researchers had an opportunity to speak with the Jail Advisory Board to establish goals of research such as:

- Identify jails that are high-functioning and low-functioning;
- Establish the correlates of high-functioning jails;
- Identify a set of best practices for jails that are grounded in empirical research; and
- Help in the development of revised and improved jail standards and inspections.

There proved to be very little EBP on what makes a good jail.

The research team decided to start the first effort to decide what makes a good jail and twelve (12) focus groups were held.

There was a consensus on what makes a good jail and what data can be collected easily to show this and then be used as a blueprint for each jail.

Key findings of outcome measures for traits/characteristics of what makes a good jail included:

- High/low compliance, jail capacity, and facility design and layout;
- Available resources make a difference, especially having enough staff;
- Designated space for suicide watch and mental health services is necessary;
- Style of supervision and interaction with the inmates; and
- Jail population composition makes a difference in that a larger pre-trial population is more troublesome.

Standards for jails have been rewritten and currently being studied in a review of DRC prison facilities.

Q: When looking at recidivism rates for specific prisons, are you looking at where the inmate was before being released, or are you looking at where the inmate spent most of their time?

A: This was a problem when trying to measure recidivism specific to each facility. We are using the 70% or 85% standard (time spent in that facility) for that prison or leaving from that prison and the recidivism measure does include technical violations.

Q: What happens for those cases that do not meet the criteria?

A: That data is discarded.

The problem seems to be at intake and we need to rethink a new approach given that a large majority of offenders at intake have neurological disorders and do not benefit from the programming provided in the facility.

- In New Hampshire is conducting research on recidivism and looking at the role of mental illness and substance abuse.

Q: Given that you probably have quantitative audits, is there any type of qualitative audit when evaluating what makes a good jail?

A: In Ohio, the new standards try to capture issues impacting inmates.

Q: Was CPC or CPAI applied?

A: Probably not; the evaluation focused more on particular programs.

- **Ryan King**, The Urban Institute: Challenges of Measuring Performance in Justice Reinvestment States
- See meeting handouts on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
What is the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI)?

- Funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the state needs to acknowledge that there is a problem and recognize the need for technical assistance.
- JRI is a partnership between the state and the TA provider using a data driven approach to identify correctional drivers.
- The state assembles a working group to oversee the JRI process which helps to develop policies and strategies to address the correctional drivers identified and then introduce those policies as legislation.
- Bottom line of JRI to date:
  - Policies get passed and there is a reinvestment component to them (e.g. reinvestment of cost savings);
  - There has been 4.6 billion in savings (e.g. averted savings) and approximately $400 million in planned reinvestment;
  - There has been an expanded use of Evidence Based Practices (EBP) and a cultural shift toward using a data-driven approach; and
  - There have been numerous policy responses with the implementation of risk and need assessments being the largest policy response followed by accountability measures, good time and earned credits, and intermediate and graduated sanctions.

Challenges and Strategies:

- During implementation of Phase II, the core facilitator is lost so the partners tend to go back to old/separate ways; and
- It is difficult to sustain the forward momentum because of several reasons: policymaker turnover, high-profile criminal incidents, lack of public education, funding constraints, and a lack of immediate results.

Challenges in tracking performance measures in these states:

- States are not collecting the right data (e.g. do we have data to reflect revocations); and
- Need to find ways to make the findings meaningful performance measures to impact the audience (e.g. policy makers).

To move forward in the right direction and to measure the effects of these policies, we have to:

- Provide a continuum of data services to include: assessing existing projections and establish ‘real time’ performance tracking and data, isolate the drivers of the correctional population, and develop system-level dashboards to describe why these policies were successes or failures (e.g. stock population, trends in admissions, LOS, recidivism);
- Set out to build a matrix to identify variable measures that will track the impact of policy reform and build the data tracking in a way that is “simple” and specific to the reform;
- Have protocols to sustain the JRI efforts when the TA provider leaves the state, provide follow-up data assistance for at least 12 months, and establish meaningful performance measures; and
• Ask the right questions when measuring recidivism and look at what is expected versus observed and utilize underlying trend data (e.g. current offense, LOS, risk score, release type).
  o Remaining Challenges:
    ▪ States often have a lack of capacity and prioritization to complete work; and
    ▪ There is an existing bias against performance measures; think about performance measures as something that can build a system, provided a diagnosis to find out what is going to, and to see if the data that is being collected is helping/useful.
• Question and answer discussion
  o Q: Has any state shown a policy impact on the population?
  o A: Not yet in terms of what was just presented.
  o Q: How are you going to isolate the policy issue and subsequent impact? It would be very helpful to better understand what the specific policy is and provide specific feedback to the state
  o A: For example, Ohio has an underlying commitment rate issue that is driving up their populations numbers but so far their projections are accurate.
  o A: In Rhode Island, since 2008, commitments have decreased and there has been a reduction in reduced jail population but the length of stay also increased.
  o Q: How do you get a counterfactual?
  o A: We are looking at pre and post reform, but the results are not at that level of empiricism yet.

V. Breakout Session #1
• Bill Rhodes & Gerry Gaes, Abt Associates: Results from Abt’s time served and recidivism papers
• Recidivism Study:
  o National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) data has advantages for studying recidivism and because of the ability to use data across multiple years; the cohort of study does not need to be a release-based cohort.
  o NCRP has less data than most state data systems do (e.g. it does not contain risk and needs information on offenders, and it cannot identify recidivism across state lines).
  o Recidivism is defined as return to the prison system from which the person was released for a violation, revocation, or new crime.
  o This study utilizes an alternate view of recidivism: it looks at rate of return based on:
    ▪ A population cohort, rather than release cohort;
    ▪ Number of times offender returns after first release;
    ▪ Prison burden (number of bed days taken up by recidivists in observation window); and
    ▪ Percent who never return (desistence).
  o Release cohorts, followed for three years, make it appear that most offenders return, and that prison is a revolving door.
  o However, high risk offenders accumulate in release cohorts because they are returned and released multiple times. Using a population cohort only counts an individual the
first time that they are released within an observation window (the length of time over which the population is being observed).
- Relative burden on prisons over a twelve year observation window (in North Carolina)—seventy-two percent of bed days are used by twenty-five percent of the population.
- Using the NCRP data, a multi-state analysis (17 states) yielded similar differences between release and population cohorts.
- The release cohort reflects the level of risk posed by people exiting prison, and resources needed in the community (though it is important to have risk assessment information for the release cohort).
- The population cohort reflects the long term likelihood of returning to prison.
- Looking at return to prison in four states over a twelve year period, 60-70% of released offenders never return.

- **Time Served:**
  - It's easier to measure time served on release cohorts, but that confounds those with long and short sentences.
  - Researchers have developed methodology to use an admissions cohort instead. However, this presents several challenges:
    - There is a great deal of complexity to flow of calculating time served—determinate and indeterminate sentencing, revocations for new crimes and violations, detention while awaiting violation hearings, etc.
  - For indeterminate sentencing, a violation of a split sentence is often treated like a new commitment.
  - In some states, revocations are to jail and if the system is not unified, then revocations may not appear in NCRP data.
  - If a person is detained awaiting a hearing on a revocation, we don’t know at admission if there will ultimately be a revocation for a new crime or technical violation, or both, and time served could reflect either or consecutive sentence and revocation, or concurrent sentence and revocation.
  - States with longer periods of post-confinement supervision have more opportunity for revocation returns.
  - Recommend in-state comparisons over time to better pinpoint policy changes and other variables that impact sentencing rather than comparing states to each other; model gets too complicated to account for the policy variations.
  - Comment from the audience: we should focus on success rates in the community rather than recidivism.
  - NCRP data has not been used to look at relationship between supervision type and intensity of supervision; the data is not available.

- **Matt Durose**, Statistician, BJS: Adapting BJS web-based recidivism analysis tool for state-level queries
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
- BJS Criminal History Records Research Program
o Typically this has placed a lot of burden on states (e.g. manual processing of data, building datasets, variation in data extracts across states).

o In 2008, BJS entered into a data sharing agreement with the FBI and were granted direct access to criminal history records.

o Between 2008-2009 BJS partnered with Nlets, The International Justice and Public Safety Network, to develop:
  ▪ Automated system to retrieve large data sets of criminal records on study cohorts; and
  ▪ Develop software programs to parse key data elements from rap sheets in every state.

o BJS wanted to look at the Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 2005.
  ▪ Thirty (30) states were included in this recidivism study and excluded some of the sample (including 1600 sampled prisoners who died during the 5-year recidivism period);
  ▪ Prisoners were matched by key identifier (e.g. SSN#, DOB);
  ▪ Data was matched with data in NCRP records and used to verify correct criminal history records (e.g. looked for some evidence that the person was sent to prison); and
  ▪ Software converted state rap sheet data into database with common codes.

o With assistance from NORC at the University of Chicago, BJS developed software to convert the criminal history data into research databases with nationally standardized codes (i.e. State-to-State crosswalk tables that convert each state-specific RAP sheet).
  ▪ Result was an efficient, relational database with common structure and no hand coding that creates both a criminal history flat file and a summary file that can be analyzed with common statistical software.

• New BJS Recidivism Analysis Tool
  o BJS is close to finalizing the Recidivism Analysis Tool, which will be able to generate a variety of recidivism measures for recidivism of Prisoners released in 2005.
  o The Recidivism Analysis Tool has tabs on the screen for easy navigation along with data definitions and methodology.
    ▪ Users are able to look at the Annual Failure rate reports (e.g. what percentage of offenders recidivated by Year 1, Year 2, Year3, Year4, Year5);
    ▪ Denominator: those who have not recidivated in the year; and
    ▪ Numerator: percentage of those who recidivated that year.
  o Functionality of the tool allows users to download, print, and manipulate the data that is queried by the tool.

• Question and answer discussion
  o Q: Will anyone have access to it? (e.g. newspapers?)
  o A: Yes, the data will be public because it is summary level data.
  o Q/Comment: It would be helpful for BJS to get input from states before the tool and the data is released to the public.
  o A: The anticipated plan is that Bill would like to first release his report to describe different state estimates and then release the tool to the public.
Q: Will there be a technical manual to describe how the coding took place because only 30 states were included in the 2005 recidivism study?
A: Yes, BJS is going to reach out to those states that have these cross-walk tables.
Q: Is there any way to provide desegregated data to allow individual users to “parse” data for state specific use?
A: It is difficult because each time BJS has to get approval from FBI to make sure data is being used securely, but it is something that BJS is currently working on.
Q/Comment: Perhaps make the “Most Serious Offenses” options cleaner where user can drill down into offenses.
A: BJS will provide a definition page to give context to ‘Most Serious Offense” types.
Q: Why lump offenders with an age of 65+ or 55+ and over into a single group when there have been inquiries about segments of that older population?
A: The tool parses out age 40+. This was done because of sample size.
Q/Comment: Perhaps it would be helpful/ BJS may want to think about using a confidence rather than point estimates because of the small sample size.
A: BJS did build out the confidence intervals below the standard error and noted if based on 10 or fewer sample size.
Q: Was substance abuse and mental health data collected?
A: Those were not included in this tool.
Q/Comment: When reporting on offenders Race/Ethnicity, it would be helpful to include “Native Americans” as an option rather than lumped in with “other” because there are some groups that would like to report on them.
A: We found that Native Americans are most likely to identify as Hispanic and/or Latino and per OMB, they are to be considered as Latino/Hispanic and many of the Native American’s will be in the federal system because the federal government has jurisdiction.
Q: Are federal arrests included as “new arrests’ too?
A: Yes.

Michael Shively, Abt Associates: How to increase DOC/Parole senior management use of correctional data while not adding burden to research departments
Working in a correctional unit, everyone is asked to do more than capable; researchers need to make choices on what can get done.
- The more capacity you have, the better a research unit.
There is a cycle: Research infrastructure/resources -> products/services -> utilization/value.
- Is the work you are producing being used and are people happy with it?
When departments do not have enough resources, it can catalyze “circling the drain” where work is less timely, products are less valued and/or are low quality.
Discussion question to audience: How can your services and products (e.g. periodicals, statistical reports, special one-off projects, providing to data requests from the media, governor, or legislature), outside projects such as NCRP) be less burdensome?
Discussion question to audience: What sort of things do you get asked to do but can’t?
A: Important to understand your limitations but know what you can do right now. Ask officials what do you want to see that you do not currently have. Use templates from other states to help produce things you currently do not have.

Discussion question to audience: Do you get asked to do population forecasts?
A: South Carolina finds them unreliable because of the many factors do not take into account things that have not happened yet (e.g. legislation).

   - Massachusetts is doing it in house because of available resources (software, personnel) Projections are ten years out.

Discussion question to audience: How are these projections are getting used?
A: State decision makers need to understand it is not a crystal ball. Use forecasting for planning sessions and budgets. Research divisions are usually diverse, strong academically and close with the commissioner. There needs to be constant communication to show the limitations.

   - In Colorado, outsourcing projections can be very helpful; and
   - In Virginia, in-house was the best move to go to develop the model.

Discussion question to audience: Is there a forum where there is communication that is not a conference? Or is ICRN it?
A: ICRN is the only outlet to discuss these topics.

Discussion question to audience: In the spirit of getting on top of things, are there any good success stories?
A: Georgia had dialogue at the top and gained decision makers trust through the use of graphics to gain their trust and understanding.

   - By looking at routine data requests, we can produce reports based on those that are high frequency.

Discussion question to audience: Has anyone thought of creating a website to measure baseline data using Google analytics to know how often reports are being looked at?
A: No.

As data demands become more aggressive, the public needs to understand it takes time and not a push of a button; sometimes you need to say no. Be careful how much you give to legislatures, budget leaders...the more you give, the more they will ask.

- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
- The purpose of this discussion is to talk about what we have learned to date from a substantial expansion of the NCRP that happened one year ago. We are asking for more complete information about Post Confinement Community Supervision (PCCS) and we would like to cover what information is available and how it has been analyzed.

   - The history of the NCRP: In 1983, the NCRP started to adjust the prison term record file to show lines that represented one offender. With the additional of the PCCS term, we now want to have a more complete file that also tracks folks out into the community (and back).
Q: Is the old part C exactly part E now?
A: For some states it is part F because they may not get the community supervision sentence so now under that is what is being asked under part F. It really depends on the state and what they have submitted.
Q: Are you interested in any community supervision that is not tied to a prison sentence?
A: The NCRP is not authorized to collect probation data or other alternatives to prison. Everything needs to start as an extension of prison. Perhaps maybe someday though.

What we've been able to do with PCCS records to date:
- If parole were the only form of PCCS, then they'd always collected them. The problem is that there are additional forms of PCCS.
- We are currently collecting PCCS records from twenty-five states, including transitions from to prison to PCCS and from PCCS back to prison. Sequences are run on the data to judge if we can understand the data and we typically find the data to be reliable. Prison and PCCS terms often begin and end on the same day.
- Sometimes there is overlap that is a bit ambiguous but these gaps are identified as problematic and then clarified (e.g. things such as delays between parole grant and release dates as well as when someone seems to serve a term of PCCS while serving entire term of incarceration).

Lessons learned
- States are able to supply PCCS records and they have the ability to go back in time to find the needed data.
- PCCS is often a story of admission records and what is happening is really nuanced:
  - Abt will ID some phenomena and the go back to states to seek clarification.
- The goal is to impose a set of rules on a PCCS file to then create an analysis file.
- When building term histories we are able to build term records and also make decisions about discrepancies in the data.
- PCCS records allow them to visit the decisions and improve the quality of the prison term records.
  - Abt are able to use different sequences and ways to merge data together; after they merge the data based on their methodology they are able to start using the data.

Examples of how the data is used:
- Track prison releases over years to PCCS in various states and show characteristics of those that are released to PCCS and those that are not (age, offense, race, gender, etc.).
- Start to look at meatier questions such as what are the experiences on PCCS and when/do they reduce recidivism?
- Look at the distribution of time on PCCS (e.g., 70% spend less than 3 yrs on supervision).
- Q/comment: Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will not take custody of individuals until they are established as Parolees. Those persons are then deported but they are still on the state’s record as a parolee. This is a growing population that will distort time on parole.
- A: Any term of supervision that is less than five days is removed. If they are on parole indefinitely and conditioned never to return to the state, that would be removed from the data processing piece because they are not actually part of the longitudinal data set.
Q: What about those who are supervised under their state but compacted to another state?
A: This needs to be worked out and we need to decide whether they need to be included in the data or not.
Q: Is this something to be taken care of at the data processing stage and what is the policy impact?
A: Failure rates for those under supervision, etc, are able to be tracked as are hazards on PCCS by admission year (e.g. probability of coming back on any given day and how it changes over time). Experiences after PCCS are also tracked which brings the full longitude throttle to the discussion and we can ask of those that successfully completed PCCS and came back within one year or more, who were they (e.g. younger, male, property)? Time spent in the system and how are they spending that time is examined (e.g. new admissions that completed PCCS successfully in 2012- was this their 1st time in NCRP and what was the division of time in prison vs. PCCS?).
Discussion question to audience: What analysis would you use this data for and what is the policy significance?
A: In California, they changed to the 3rd strike law and could petition the court to be resentenced to go to 5 days. This would be a blip in the data that would be very specific to the change in the law.
Abt Associates does not want fifty different standards for putting together these term records;
At the construction stage, we may deal with special cases from the start and then draw an informed line to figure out which ones get which treatment based on what they know about what states are doing/have done; and
States get to keep original data, but Abt Associates cleans it the way they need it.
Q: Can Abt Associates redo data if they need to make changes at a later point to old data and do they flag the imputations?
A: Yes. There is documentation to show if something was dropped or changed in the data. This is done with prison term records and similarly with PCCS data. The final step is to tie them all together and then create decision rules to allow others to tie them together to use them as needed.
Q: Do you make this information about what you have done and how you did it available? Is an old paper now invalid? How do you know?
A: Abt Associates keep fact sheets for all the states to see if something strange happens and if so, we can go back and see what is in the fact sheets (available on Abt website). Term file notes are also available to identify what users of the state data need to know and they also inform users what data sources would be appropriate and what kind of analysis the data can be used for, etc. Old records are also kept so third parties can replicate old studies if needed.
Q: If Abt Associates identifies an inconsistency in the data, how do others get that information?
A: When something weird in the data is identified, the first thought is it is a data problem. It is not as likely that there was a significant enough law change to visibly see it
in the data. The anomaly could be data issue from states or the way Abt has processed the data.
  o Q: Have you done any work with dosage?
  o A: Not yet for PCCS records. It is still too recent. They still have methodological issues to work through to find comparable comparison groups, etc. It is on the radar for future work though.

VI. Breakout Session #2
  • Jeremy Luallen & Bill Rhodes, Abt Associates: Aging in Prison: Understanding the Causes
  • See presentation on meeting website: http://www.crj.org/cjj/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3
  • Looking at the elderly in prison is to motivate and understand the topic while also looking at the analytic approach and the results.
  • Motivating the topic:
    o The prison population is getting older—historically this is a new problem and known as the graying of prisons.
    o Older inmates are more costly—usually two to three times more to house than younger inmates; healthcare costs/needs of inmates 50 or 55 years old and this is the point at which healthcare needs tend to excel rapidly and become vulnerable to assault and exploitation in prison by younger inmates.
    o Those inmates who are 50 years old in prison generally equates to someone who is 60 years old in the general population.
  • What are the drivers of growth for the elderly population in prison?
    o A recent study has emphasized the drivers of prison growth (contextual—poverty, etc.) and more direct (admission and time served).
  • New contributions:
    o NCRP data was used to offer a new methodology.
    o A rising admission age and falling admission rates have played the greatest role over last thirteen years.
  • Analytic approach focuses on four drivers of change (in age composition):
    o Age at admission (older when they come in) – direct, although this can be argued why this is.
    o Number of admissions – direct.
    o Length of Stay – direct.
    o Mix of offense types – indirect (people of different ages commit different crimes):
      ▪ Is it related to sentencing changes or not?; and
      ▪ There is an interaction for the types of offenses which apply age at admission and length of stay.
  • What are the ways to make straight forward inferences to isolate the impacts and show the interaction of those qualities?
    o Four states were analyzed (SC, NC, NY, CA*):
      ▪ California does not include 2012 because of Realignment.
From 2000-2012, proportional change and growth was shown in three states, average length of stay was stable though not by offense type.

Approach is to start at the first year of data using the NCRP data from 2000, we pretend nothing changes to estimate a counter factual and then replicate the 2000 admission cohort over time. Then, we can introduce weights to simulate dimensions (e.g. how much change would we expect if we change various factors) and see what actually happened and see how the conditions impacted the populations.

Through simulation we are able to show true change and a steady state by altering the weights to look at how the volume of change impacts the admissions (e.g. if I changed only the admission rate over time I would have had X population). In other words, how much of this can be changed by this single factor; what’s the difference; and what was the impact of each factor.

Results:
- In South Carolina:
  - From 2000 to 2012, the proportion of inmates in South Carolina grew from steady state by 54%;
  - In South Carolina, 100% of the observed change can be explained by an observed factor. Admission rate, time served and offense mix do not have much explained power but admission age does; and
  - The same is true for all four states and admission rates are actually doing the opposite.

Conclusions
- NCRP presents a novel approach whereby the analysis and information will only get better as time goes on (it is already 13 years old).
  - Results suggest the impact of sentencing length over time is marginal.
- Challenges/limitations:
  - What is causing the admission to change?
  - Is it new admissions or supervision policies?
  - Abt does not have the ability to go back to see what happened before 2000.
- Future uses:
  - National simulations;
  - Ability to extend analysis; and
  - Ability to simulate policy impacts.

Question and answer discussion
- Q: Can you discuss your findings in relation to the motivation for the topic?
  - A: The problem is that states have compassionate release laws but they are underutilized (e.g. political pressures); there is more to the problem beyond the factors they covered in the study (e.g. not going to let lifer out).
  - A: There are also lots of different avenues that lead to this problem and it is not just sentencing reform-there are multiple points in the process to make changes.
- Q: Can you really separate age from crime?
  - A: People who come in younger for heinous crimes will grey, but what got older people there (as new offenders)? It is the difference between time served and admission age.
Q: Seeing that the average age and median ages are getting older, how is this taken into account?
A: Age at admission is not being altered, just how that composition changes based on the conditions applied.
- The data only goes back to 2000, so a 85 year olds that were sentenced in 1982 are not in the data;
- In Virginia, when you see their over 60 population, over half have come in recently and they are coming in older and for very serious offenses (e.g. rape or other violent);
- We cannot make inferences about people in data we do not have.

Discussion questions to the audience:
Q: You see the population of people getting larger, why?
Q: Is it that people coming into prison are coming into prison older? Why?
Q: Is it because of the census issue? Is it just because the pool of folks available are getting older in general?
Q: Is it a changing of society (e.g. reporting sex offenses may have been taboo decades ago and now folks may be more apt to come forward as well as differences in how they are now monitored and supervised)?
Q: Need to look at difference between states with three strike laws vs. those that do not have them.

Ryan Kling & Tom Rich, Abt Associates: How to develop and maintain computer programs for extracting and reporting NCRP data that can be adjusted for other purposes (PBMS, other BJS data collections, etc.)
This is an open ended discussion about what has worked well and what has not worked as well when trying to extract and report NCRP data.
Q: Does anyone have a common problem along the lines of maintaining computer programs year to year?
A: Yes, we have a problem of staff turnover and difficulty transferring knowledge. Often, staff had their own way of organizing and tracking data/information that was not communicated/tracked for information sharing purposes within the agency.
- To address this, all of the data/information is dropped into shared folders so everyone has access to it. For example, NCRP information is now communally shared.
Abt ensures that there are guidelines followed so that information, especially data manipulation, can be reproduced. Participant suggestion: it might be useful to have every state submit how they go about extracting and processing the data For example, if you have SAS sequence files to pull form SEQUENCE, then it’s more user friendly).
- Utah has a library of routines that can be shared.
In addition to software limitations, states may also have staff limitations in using and understanding the software, depending on what your database is and whether or not it is split between the research department and/or IT personnel.
• An important part of the documentation process is the need to track when data mining problems are discovered and when it was fixed so then they can better account for data accuracy.
  ▪ Documenting the process is also important because if one person is responsible for sophisticated extractions then that knowledge is lost when they leave.
• It may be helpful for Abt Associates to create a library on the NCRP website to house the different methods of manipulating the data and how states are using and submitting NCRP data.
• When Abt Associates adds/changes the NCRP reporting elements, internal agency staff may be unable to know how to make that adjustment.
• In Nebraska, there have been some issues with the existing logic but they are working on building the necessary logic features to pull the correct information from the right sources and ensuring that they document all the manipulations to the data to produce accurate data.
• Implementing some type of version control is important.
  ▪ The process that Abt Associates uses is that sometimes they do it by hand so that they are able to reproduce whatever public file they make; and
  ▪ Abt Associates also set up a directory structure to track documents.
• One state reported that they use Microsoft Outlook to track conversations about a project while another state said that they have created a forum to house conversations about a topic (e.g. wiki pages so that all staff can read up on the project).
• Reporting to PBMS is especially difficult because of the confines for submitting and uploading the data.
• The NCRP requirements are such that we build term files and then use other codes to extract the necessary information from that one term file.
  ▪ At Abt Associates, we build a common structure, document a program, and then ask RA’s if they can get to the same end result following the original users documentation as a way to make sure that documentation is appropriate.
• Abt Associates has documentation in place that prompts users of new information to make sure to check to see if anything has changed/different in the file from the last time they have received the data file.

• **Michael Shively & Gerry Gaes**, Abt Associates: How to increase DOC/Parole senior management use of correctional data while not adding burden to research departments
• This session is a repeat from Breakout Session #1; notes from the earlier session on this topic can be found on page 21. The following session emphasizes information and questions/answers that were not discussed in the previous session.
  o Researchers are always bumping up against data requests; it is about finding what you can do in a limited amount of time that is valuable.
  o By cutting down reports and making them pretty by adding graphs (but not losing meaningful data), your work can become more valuable for decision-makers.
Most state research departments do not do true research of measuring the efficacy of what is happening inside a facility; the responsibility lies in providing data and reports for outside researchers.

- Maryland wants to increase their data capabilities, but are understaffed, has a lame duck governor, new upper echelon management, and a new data system in place;
- Need to leverage grant capabilities and connect data and research needs with academic centers to collaborate;
- California had a research shop, but when staff was cut the data requests were overwhelming. High-level staff need to understand the difference between outputs and outcomes (which is where research is needed).

Q: If key players understand data and research, and then they retire or are removed from office, what happens to the new folks to maintain the knowledge?

A: Need to develop an agency culture to ensure the value of research. Agency cultures perpetuate over time, but you also need to build the culture to permeate throughout the system. If you want to build the culture, you have to build up so those that replace the old guard, the same culture exists. Also, need to create buy-in to show the importance of data.

Q: How do you manage expectations?

A: It is all about prioritization; creating an A-list, a B-list, and a C-list. Staff need to understand the business practice and the process of data requests and involving people in the decision making process is very important.

- Try to observe patterns and find what is predictable;
- Be proactive and prepackage material to make it easier to get out information. Or post information online; and
- MD created a standard request form for this very reason.

Consider creating an email distribution list for just peers to help not reinvent the wheel and act as a discussion platform for data issues or questions.

- **George Camp**, Association of State Correctional Administrators: The Association of State Correctional Administrator’s Performance Based Management System (PBMS) report
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
  o PBMS originated in the mid-90’s to address the different definitions and formats of data reported by each state.
  o After many years of populating the database, focus is shifting to reporting out. The system was developed for directors, and there was not enough focus on information for the agencies.
  o ASCA is trying to increase access so that information is useful to practitioners within states.
  o ASCA will no longer have federal funding for PBMS in 2016; membership dues will be increased to fund the project.
  o Between 2009-2014, participation in PBMS has continued to increase, but some states have regressed.
PBMS system has rules documented in the manual and on the ASCA website and PBMS staff do regular check-ups on rule adherence and report back to agencies.

Directors are competitive about data quality.

From audience: some concerns about pressure to complete PBMS data when issues are beyond researchers’ control.

Q: Why are there nine states that don’t participate?
   A: Lack of capacity to gather the data, and concern about being compared to other states.

Even states that are not putting data in can get data out of the system, and ASCA is committed to getting full participation over the long haul.

PBMS reports are available to compare facilities within or across jurisdictions.

PBMS dashboard is available through the ASCA website for real-time reporting.

Thursday, April 24, 2014

VII. Breakout Session #3


See presentation on meeting website: http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project.ICRN_datameeting3

This session is a repeat from Breakout Session #1; notes from the earlier session on this topic can be found on page 22. The following session emphasizes information and questions/answers that were not discussed in the previous session.

Post Confinement Community Supervision (PCCS) encompasses any type of supervision following time spent in prison; this does not include “probation”.

The goal is to turn NCRP data into a long time series that looks at the offender, their prison term and period of time spent post conviction.

When a prison term record file is created, each entry represents an individual period that the offender was incarcerated. This allows us to put together offender histories (Typically spanning January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2013).

Abt’s goal is to merge the PCCS Terms into those offender histories and prison terms.

For example, we want to be able to show that an offender was sentenced to prison, then spent time on PCCS, then was re-incarcerated.

Q: Do they have a common identifier in the data to link both the prison and PCCS records together?
   A: Yes, a common identifier is available so that the data can be merged and aggregated.

Q: Is there any provision to give each state a copy of the file back?
   A: Yes.

Q: Will there be a randomly assigned identifier?
   A: Yes, users will be able to pull individual term records but you cannot connect it back to the original individual.
When users are granted access to data, they can request the data file and Abt - are able to have statistical files to send states and users.

- Definitions for NCRP elements can be found on the NCRP website.

Q: Will there be additional data requests? Part G?
A: Yes, if that is data available.
Q: Do they differentiate if someone has been in federal prison?
A: Technically, E and F records are those prisoners who are under the state’s custody.

What have we learned from E and F records to date? What happens once Abt receives the data? How are we going to look at it? What have we learned? What do we plan to use the data for-how can we best use NCRP data moving forward?

- To process and understand the data better, diagnoses are run on the data and then go back to the states with questions for clarification.
- There is a focus on the transitions from prison to PCCS, then back to prison.
- There is good alignment in the data when we look at the transition from prison to PCCS.
- Other transitions are also examined such as when an offender is in prison but starts PCCS before released and then PCCS term ends (overlap).
- Transition from PCCS to Prison is most problematic when a PCCS term is served while incarcerated.
- After analyzing data, then ask the question on how to look at the data and what questions we want to answer using the data.
Q: What if there are some general problematic areas or individual discrepancies with data?
A: There is variation between states but generally the transitions in the data have been good but we (Abt) will investigate any problems in the data before going back to the state to find out the driver for the challenges with the data.
Q: Can Abt share the data and problem with the state?
A: Yes.
Q: How do you reach out to the jurisdiction if there is a problem with the data?
A: We will reach out directly to the person/point of contact who gave us the data. This would be the role of the state liaison.

Lessons learned:
- Many states have been able to supply pre 2012 records and PCCS records.
- We are able to use of identifiers common to prison data (a matching process is used if needed) and there has been good agreement between the prison and PCCS data.
- Transitions in PCCS to prison can be highly nuanced and might be difficult to ascertain from NCRP data elements alone (e.g. absconders, deportations).

What do we do with the data?
- Formal decision rules for building term histories were adopted and predicated on understanding the data.
- These rules create total transparency about how the data was manipulated and allows for imperfections when creating prison terms to be corrected.
- There are additional term file notes that provide information to describe and explain the data if being used for analysis.
- Scenario #1: We see that a prison term overlaps a PCCCS term. So, what is happening?
  - A rule was created to observe E and F and then move the PCCS terms to the end of the prison term.
- Scenario #2: Two prison terms overlapping one another?
  - This is called an A-B-B ambiguous record and the intervening B record is dropped and the drop of the B record is then flagged in the prison term.

- How are we going to exploit a longitudinal file?
  - We are going to look at characteristics of offenders on PCCS vs. those with no PCCS and examine who is being represented when going to PCCS.

- How are we going to look at who recidivates?
  - The distribution of Time Served on PCCS does not distinguish between successful/not successful PCCS
  - Q: Can we look at revocation rates for offenders who are being supervised?
  - A: We are able to look at time trends in the data.

- We also want to examine and look at what are offenders’ experiences post PCCS and who comes back to prison for comparisons and potential policy implications.

- How do you define violent offense and how do you classify which offense is the most serious?
  - Each state has unique “cross walks” that say what an offense is and this is how it translates to a BJS code.
  - Q: Can they share BJS cross walk?
  - A: Yes, they are archived and they also include the original offense code. BJS plans to revisit the cross walk data because they are becoming dated.

- Division of Time Across Terms:
  - When looking at the proportion of time spent in prison (X axis) vs. proportion of offenders (Y axis), we are able to look at the 1st offense vs. 2nd offense and how much time spent in prison versus time spend on PCCS
  - Only uses PCCS information since 2006 for comparison and analysis

- Imputations in the prison and PCCS records have been flagged and there are guidelines that can be applied to the data to account for this.

- Ryan King, Abt Associates: How to develop and maintain computer programs for extracting and reporting NCRP data can be adjusted for other purposes

- See presentation on meeting website:
  http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3

- This session is a repeat from Breakout Session #2; notes from the earlier session on this topic can be found on page 27. The following session emphasizes information and questions/answers that were not discussed in the previous session.
  - Abt has created a set of guidelines to follow for reproducing information derived from data so a method can be passed on to other people when people leave so requests and NCRP data can be managed.
Q: What enforcement mechanisms do you have at Abt to ensure the guidelines are followed?
A: If you make policies, then you need to have someone manage them. There is not a formal mechanism and the enforcement is loose, but it is part of the first guideline: assigning someone as a data manager to lead the process.

Q: How do you either maintain or store multi-purpose files?
A: There is an internal file for BJS, a public use file, and a web file. Try to build one thing that can serve many uses. For state reports, there are similar questions, try to set up directories.

Q: How do you maintain data across years for a series?
A: Create a final directory that no one can touch and have a parameter to change without copying everything over to the new year.

Q: When you do special projects (time served, prison population) and special coding needs to be written, how do you verify the code and verify results for topical reports?
A: Abt’s guidelines speak to reproducibility. For validation, best way is getting content experts and asking “does this make sense?” For validation of NCRP data, we look at past data files (back to 2000) and keep counts to see if they are off.

Q: Does it make sense to replicate results by reading code and going through all the lines to see if it produced the right thing?
A: It is difficult and tough to ask people to do that. An option is to flush the old code if there are errors and write your own code to ensure things are correct.

Q: Is there a way to simplify the NCRP process? What do you think the pros and cons of transmitting the data are?
A: Sometimes all you need to do is change the data but the code is so large and if there is an error, figuring out where that it is time consuming. A solution could be breaking down the code into smaller sections to manage the extracts. Having comments and a road map for the code is extremely helpful.

Q: How many have modeable software to work with? What are the translation issues? Any skills sets needed?
- Modeable software is not the issue but the need for multiple programs to ensure when the programs go away, there is a backup;
- Arkansas relies on the IT department for more complicated reports to get the code but they don’t have the content expertise. There is a disconnect between DOC and IT; IT needs to understand in programming speak; and
- Programmers have very little knowledge in the field, but writing very specific specs for the programmers can help give them a framework to work from when dependent on IT.

Q: How can BJS help bridge gaps and facilitate?
A: For separate shops, you are not dependent on the programmers for content analysis and you can make the decision. High turnover rates and retirements are also problematic.
- Rhode Island IT provides data tables and then uses Crystal Reports to grab the fields they need for the reports; the intermediary software program works;
- South Carolina had a programmer, knows content, data, and they can extract what they need. When she retired, she was contracted to teach everyone in the department; and
- Arkansas and North Dakota cannot rely on the IT department and getting simple things is difficult.

Q: Would it be possible for there to be a supplement with the spec-type language to mediate IT and research departments?
A: Yes, Abt can help with that.
Q: For those submitting to PBSM, is there any overlap? Are there ways to unify and minimize?
A: It would help to have Abt/BJS get one large data file and pull out what they need for the specific reports. The more you can do out of the NCRP, the better for the states. Integration of the PBMS and NCRP is coming along as there are some common variables.
From the BJS perspective, the challenge is for all 50 states to submit NCRP data in a timely manner. Next year, Abt will handle NPS data. This is worthwhile for BJS to start sifting across the data to explain and simplify the overall burden from PBMS, NCRP, and BJS.
PBMS has been funded externally and there has been a mandate where ASCA now needs to pay for it with their resources and jurisdictions will now be required to pay $2,000.00 to use the system.

- **George Camp**, Association of State Correctional Administrators: The Association of State Correctional Administrator’s Performance Based Management System (PBMS) report
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
- This session is a repeat from Breakout Session #2; notes from the earlier session on this topic can be found on page 29. The following session emphasizes information and questions/answers that were not discussed in the previous session.
  - The Performance Based Management Systems allows you to see if your data is reliable and accurate and how are you doing.
  - Q: Who keeps the rules and where do you find them? It is confusing to know where to go for what as some measures are on PBMS and others are on ASCA.
  - A: [www.asca.net](http://www.asca.net).
  - History of PBMS: The criminal justice administrators got tired of being held accountable by people who do not know corrections data and research. We know our profession and we should be able to measure our performance. Then decided to measure performance every month – to know what’s going on in our own organization and to also benchmark ourselves to others.
  - The number of state and federal prisons is somewhere between 1,200-1,500.
  - Friendly regional rivalry (e.g. which meetings are the best, reporting accurate data) exists:
    - The Midwest and the South are leading the pack.
PBMS needs to work for you; you only want data to be in there that are important and provides value.

ASCA has implemented a Performance-Based Measures Committee focusing on various topics including (e.g. executive, reentry, policy and resolutions, programming and training).

- **Bill Rhodes & Gerry Gaes**, Abt Associates: Results from Abt’s time served and recidivism papers
- This session is a repeat from Breakout Session #1; notes from the earlier session on this topic can be found on page 20.

**VIII. Panel: Improving Measurement of Correctional Systems**

- **Ann Carson**, Statistician, BJS: BJS Visiting Fellowship
  - When nominating individuals, the main criteria for consideration are competent research, policy implications, and quality of the material. Deadline of Aug 1st, 2014 for consideration and there will be a $500 stipend to attend American Society of Criminology conference located in San Francisco.

- **Ann Carson**, Statistician, BJS: Supplements to National Prisoner Statistics Program (NPS)
  - See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
  - BJS is currently creating supplements of the NCRP form and rotating surveys every three to five years to capture snapshots of target areas that are important to track national statistics on, including use of administrative segregation, sex offenders and types of diversion programs.

- Infectious Disease Testing:
  - NPS currently produce statistics on HIV/AIDS but NPS supplements will look to capture more infectious diseases such as Hepatitis B, C and sexually transmitted diseases (STD’s).

  - Goals of the NSPHC were:
    - Determine how health care information is maintained within prisons;
    - Gather data on structure and capacity of health care delivery; and
    - Determine appropriate methods for future data collection.
  - BJS convened health care and prison officials and asked what they wanted to know about prison health care.
  - The survey was modified so that it could be administered in-person, in semi-structured interviews to capture information such as:
    - Number and type of contracted services;
    - Number of employees per type of health care;
    - Record keeping procedures; and
    - Screening procedures for TBI, mental health, suicides, lipids, Hepatitis, tuberculosis, and EKG.
Initial Results:
- 45 states responded;
- 50% of states contracted at least some mental health service while 22% contracted all mental health services;
- More than 50% of states contracted all laboratory and pharmacy services; and
- All states screened for mental health issues and suicidality at intake, more than 66% for each strain of Hepatitis, and 50% for TBI.

**Ryan Kling**, Abt Associates: New Insights from the NCRP
- Merging of Post Custody Community Supervision (PCCS) with prison terms.
- Now starting to look at the very first instance of criminality in an offender’s term record.
- Moving forward with NCRP:
  - Some states want to know how many offenders appear in their state and in a neighboring state(s). For example, Pennsylvania and New Jersey wanted to look to see how many offenders appear in both states and the result was about 2%. This equates to a fewer than 100 people a year;
  - To the extent that they have common identifiers across the states allows a PCCS term record to track where offenders are going from state to state;
  - Looked into 2012 federal pretrial system and between 1-4% are crossing between state and federal systems; and
  - The hope is that NCRP data at the county level can be used to answer questions and that the NCRP data can be used to look at county level issues.

**Daniela Golinelli**, Corrections Statistics Chief, BJS: Prison facility census
- See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_JCRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cji/pages/project_JCRN_datameeting3)
  - The last prison facility census was conducted in 2005 and a new census is overdue.
  - In 2012, BJS conducted Part A with the goal of developing a complete facility frame for the Survey of Prison Inmates (SPI) that will be released in early 2015.
  - Part B of the Prison Facility Census will begin in July 2016 and will look at changes to the prison facility as well as facility practices.
  - BJS would like input from the states participating in the census so that they can better capture targeted domains (e.g. facility characteristics, inmate counts, facility programs).
  - There will also be a Mental Health Addendum as part of the Prison Facility Census:
    - Survey will not go to the same person who completes the main core instrument so BJS will need help from the facilities regarding who they should contact as the POC for the addendum.
  - Timeline:
    - Hope to hold focus groups to determine if states are able to provide the data with larger pilot testing in August 2015; and
    - National implementation is anticipated for July 2016.
• **Ann Carson**, Statistician, BJS: Developing a program to measure health care costs and services

• See presentation on meeting website: [http://www.crj.org/cjj/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3](http://www.crj.org/cjj/pages/project_ICRN_datameeting3)
  
  o Between 2001 and 2008, growth on money spent on health care in correctional setting significantly increased/
  
  o The Vera Institute distributed a Correctional Health Care Spending Project Survey and looked at items such as:
    • Total counts;
    • Costs;
    • Cost per inmate calculation; and
    • The depth of the analysis for this survey was very limited, mostly due to the challenges of collecting health care data.
  
  o Some of the challenges to collecting health care data are:
    • Some states are unable to provide the data, may not have access to the data, or are unable to capture the data.
  
  o BJS is working to troubleshoot the data burden placed on states and looking to balance the level of detail of the data with the burden of collecting and reporting on it.
  
  o BJS is also looking at policies involved in addition to actual costs as well as costs inside and outside of the prison system; states are getting ranked by cost of health care and the cost of health care in the wider community is being examined.
    • One question that arises with this comparison is whether or not you can really rank two states when the cost in the wider community is highly variable between states.
  
  o BJS is looking into ways to deal with differential reporting abilities across states:
    • The hope is to have the system adjust to the capacity of the jurisdiction to provide the data.

IX. **Intersection of Criminal Justice Data and Policy**

• **Christopher Innes, Ph.D.**, Chief, Research and Information Services Division, NIC

• As researchers, you do not get the answers you always want, but you get to ask the important questions.

• **Question #1**: Is there an intersection between criminal justice policy and data?
  
  o They intersect, but it is complicated and there has been a true change in what it means to be a data/research person today because the field has accepted the value of data and research and that was not always the case.
  
  o People are using the language of data and Evidence Based Practices (EBP) and the acceptance of the value of data and research has been the easy part.
  
  o The next challenge is to help the field know what it (i.e. research and EBP) really means and to use it properly.
  
  o The advice we should be giving to the field is that we need to start thinking more like a researcher and apply critical thinking, be skeptical, and ask questions.
  
  o Over time we need to start to open dialogue with decision makers to allow for research and data to be looked at more critically.
• Question #2: Can recidivism rates be too low?
  o Four states have recidivism rates of less than 25%.
  o The research says that the main predictor for recidivism is criminal history.
  o Low recidivism rates can suggest the overuse of incarceration but we need to ask ourselves: a) when it is driven down to low? And b) are we using our resources properly?

• Is EBP becoming a pseudoscience?
  o If yes, should we tell anyone? A pseudoscience is a claim, belief or practice that is presented as scientific, but cannot be tested and lacks supporting evidence.
  o The EBP research is not pseudoscience.
  o Do people understand the language of EBP and the terms they are using?
    ▪ Very often, they are not; people cite meta-analysis and do it incorrectly; and
    ▪ There needs to be a systematic process to advance new theories.

• Definition of scientism:
  o The scientific method can answer all questions.
  o An exaggerated faith in science and scientific resolve to solve human problems.
    ▪ One things that is important in effect sizes are groups.
  o There is a fallacy of reification: the treatment of something abstract as a material or concrete thing.

• Has actuarial risk become reified?
  o Does it mean anything on the individual level?
  o Often practitioners and researcher are looking at offenders who are classified as high, medium, or low risk as though it is a trait of the individual. The score on an assessment is not perfect.

• Got dialogue?-the group was asked to take 10 minutes to discuss in small groups at their tables if the points made about EBP and the direction of research struck a nerve.

X. Closeout

• Kristy Pierce-Danford, Associate, CJI
  o Reviewed end of the day logistics, access to the meeting website, and completing meeting evaluations.
    ▪ Closing remarks thanking everyone for coming and Chris for his many years of service.

• Tom Rich, Abt Associates
  o On behalf of the Abt team, we would like to extend our appreciation to everyone who attended.
  o These conferences are helpful to know you and get comments on the work that we are collaborating on.
  o Reminder to submit NCRP data from 2013. Twenty-six (26) states have submitted so far.

• Daniela Golinelli, Corrections Statistics Chief, BJS
  o It was great to meet everyone and I appreciate your time.
- Our goal is to streamline data from the NPS 2014 data collection and reduce burden on you.
- Another change is to conduct a pilot study using the NCRP to collect social security numbers of inmates to see if it feasible.

- **Christopher Innes**, Chief, Research and Information Services Division, NIC
  - Thank you for coming.
  - The point of this meeting is bringing people together to talk and I urge you to hold onto the participant list to continue discussions and to return next year.
  - Thanks to Kristy and her team.
  - Thank you Ann for being a part of all of the planning.
  - The partnership with BJS has been productive and helps NIC do what we are supposed to be doing which is bringing national and state agencies together.
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Appendix B: Third Annual ICRN/NCRP Agenda
THIRD ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS RESEARCH NETWORK (ICRN)/ NATIONCORRECTIONS REPORTING PROGRAM (NCRP) DATA PROVIDERS MEETING AGENDA

April 23rd 8:30am-5:00pm and April 24th 8:15am-11:45am
National Corrections Academy (NCA), 11900 E. Cornell Ave, Aurora, Colorado 80014

Tuesday April 22nd
7:00-9:00pm Informal gathering in DoubleTree Hotel lobby area

Wednesday April 23rd
6:00-8:00 Breakfast at DoubleTree Hotel (provided)
7:30-8:00 Bus transfers to NCA meeting facility
8:30-9:00 Welcome and introductions
  • Christopher A. Innes, Ph. D., Chief, Research and Information Services Division, National Institute of Corrections (NIC)
  • Daniela Golinelli, Ph.D., Corrections Statistics Chief, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS)
  • Tom Rich, Senior Associate, Abt Associates
  • Kristy Pierce-Danford, MPA, Associate, Crime and Justice Institute at CRJ
9:00-9:45 Keynote speaker
  • John Pfaff, Ph.D., Professor of Law, Fordham Law School
    “State Prisons but County Prisoners: Why State-Level Data Cannot Determine the Causes of Prison Growth”
9:45-10:15 Break
10:15-11:00 State Research Exchange
  • Discussion areas: Resource Management, Performance Management, Program Evaluation, Recidivism
11:00-11:45 Bureau of Justice Statistics Initiative on National-and State-Level Recidivism Estimates
  • William Sabol, Acting Director, BJS
12:00-1:00 Lunch (provided)
12:30-2:00 State-Specific Initiatives (starts during lunch)
  • Performance-based measures in corrections systems versus flows (Abby Vandenberg, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services)
  • National Conference of State Legislators (Alison Lawrence, National Conference of State Legislatures)
• Using recidivism to measure prison-specific performance and determining what make a good jail and how to measure it (Steve Van Dine, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Correction)
• Challenges of measuring performance in Justice Reinvestment states and a discussion of potential solutions (Ryan King, The Urban Institute)

2:00-2:30 Break/reconfiguration of room

2:30-3:30 Breakout Session #1:
A) Results from Abt’s time served and recidivism papers (Bill Rhodes and Gerry Gaes, Abt Associates)
B) Adapting BJS web-based recidivism analysis tool for state-level queries (Matt Durose, BJS)
C) How to increase DOC/Parole senior management use of correctional data while not adding burden to research departments (Michael Shively, Abt Associates)

3:30-4:00 – Break

4:00-5:00 – Breakout Session #2
A) Aging in Prison: Understanding the Causes (Jeremy Luallen and Bill Rhodes, Abt Associates)
B) How to develop and maintain computer programs for extracting and reporting NCRP data that can be adjusted for other purposes (PBMS, other BJS data collections, etc.) (Ryan Kling and Tom Rich, Abt Associates)
C) How to increase DOC/Parole senior management use of correctional data while not adding burden to research departments (Michael Shively and Gerry Gaes, Abt Associates)
D) The Association of State Correctional Administrator’s Performance Based Management System (PBMS) report (George Camp, Association of State Correctional Administrators)

5:00-5:30 Bus transfers to DoubleTree Hotel

6:00-7:30 Dinner at DoubleTree Hotel (provided)
Thursday April 24th

6:00-8:00 Breakfast at DoubleTree Hotel (provided)

7:30-8:00 Bus transfers to NCA meeting facility

8:15-9:15 Breakout Session #3
   B) How to develop and maintain computer programs for extracting and reporting NCRP data that can be adjusted for other purposes (PBMS, other BJS data collections, etc) (Ryan Kling, Abt Associates)
   C) The Association of State Correctional Administrator’s Performance Based Management System (PBMS) report (George Camp, Association of State Correctional Administrators)
   D) Results from Abt’s time served and recidivism papers (Bill Rhodes and Gerry Gaes, Abt Associates)

9:15-9:30 – Break/reconfiguration of room

9:30-10:00 Panel: Improving Measurement of Correctional Systems
   • Supplements to NPS (Ann Carson, BJS)
   • National Survey of Prison HealthCare (Ann Carson, BJS)
   • New Insights from the NCRP (Ryan Kling, Abt Associates)
   • Prison facility census (Daniela Golinelli, BJS)
   • Developing a program to measure health care costs and services (Ann Carson, BJS)

10:00-10:45 Intersection of Criminal Justice Data and Policy
   • Christopher A. Innes, Ph. D., Chief, Research and Information Services Division, NIC

10:45-11:30 – Guided Discussion
   • Opportunities to discuss participant reflections and ideas not necessarily addressed during the meeting

11:30-11:45 Closeout
   • Christopher A. Innes, Ph. D., Chief, Research and Information Services Division, NIC
   • Tom Rich, Senior Associate, Abt Associates
   • Daniela Golinelli, Ph.D., Corrections Statistics Chief, BJS
   • Kristy Pierce-Danford, MPA, Associate, Crime and Justice Institute at CRJ

11:45-12:00 Bus transfers to hotel/airport

Thereafter, transportation between the hotel and airport will be provided each half hour.