Virginia Pretrial Services Stakeholder Group Work Group C: Defining and Measuring Data Outcomes <u>Meeting Summary</u>

Date of Meeting: March 26, 2018

In attendance

| Christina | Arrington | Virginia State Crime Commission |
|----------------|-----------------------|---|
| Leon | Baker | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| Baron | Blakley | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| David | Bourne | 1-800-FOR-BAIL/Virginia Bail Association |
| | | Legislative Chair |
| Andreas | Brielmaier | Culpeper County Criminal Justice Services |
| Ross | Carew | OAR/Jefferson Area Community Corrections |
| Jane Sherman | Chambers ¹ | Commonwealth's Attorneys' Services Council |
| Dave | Eber | Prince William Office of Criminal Justice Services |
| Meredith | Farrar-Owens | Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission |
| Thomas | Fitzpatrick | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| Neal | Goodloe | OAR/Jefferson Area Community Corrections |
| Liz | Greenwood | Virginia State Crime Commission |
| Jody | Hess | Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme |
| | | Court of Virginia |
| Jack | Irvin | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| Kari | Jackson | Virginia State Compensation Board |
| Maria | Jankowski | Indigent Defense Commission |
| Lt. Mandy | Lambert | Prince William Detention Center |
| Jim | McDonough | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| Captain Tricia | Powers | Virginia State Police |
| Kenneth | Rose | Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services |
| Judge | Thorne-Begland | Judge, 13th Judicial District of Virginia, General |
| | | District Court |
| Kristi | Wright | Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme |
| | | Court of Virginia |

Meeting overview 3/26/2018

I. Compare pretrial outcomes in jurisdictions with pretrial services and jurisdictions without pretrial services.

Questions that need answering:

¹ Jane Sherman Chambers has moved to Workgroup B: Pretrial Investigations, Supervision, Training, and Resources.

- 1. How should this study be conducted and how to track data in the future?
 - a. Would it be more meaningful to complete statistical analysis on outcomes by release types rather than the limitation of by jurisdictions with pretrial services compared to those without pretrial services?
 - b. Should the study be prospective or retrospective?
 - c. Are there other approaches to the methodology that should be considered?
 - i. Could a weighted time survey, similar to the studies where judges would track their time on the bench for a certain period, be used to collect data on case outcomes?
 - d. If by release type, what are the release types that should be measured?
 - i. Summons
 - ii. Recognizance
 - iii. Recognizance and pretrial supervision
 - iv. Recognizance and other condition (GPS, SCRAM, etc.)
 - v. Unsecured bond
 - vi. Unsecured bond and pretrial supervision
 - vii. Unsecured bond and other condition (GPS, SCRAM, etc.)
 - viii. Secured bond
 - ix. Secured bond and pretrial supervision
 - x. Secured bond and condition (GPS, SCRAM, etc.)
 - xi. Secured bond by type:
 - 1. Private surety
 - a. Property bondsman
 - b. Surety bondsman
 - 2. Personal surety
 - 3. Full cash
 - 4. Property
 - e. What data sources would be needed?
 - i. Could the magistrate database be the source of the initial data set?
 - f. Is there data available to determine how many cases are disposed in a given court in a given time period?
 - i. If so, how many cases are disposed in General District Courts, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts, and Circuit Courts in the time frame under examination?
 - ii. Of this total, what percentage of defendants in cases disposed in General District Courts, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts, and Circuit Courts is released prior to case adjudication?
 - g. What issues should be considered with the potential sample size or other issues with the data?

II. Ascertaining methods to better define and track statewide appearance, public safety, and success rates.

Questions that need answering:

1. How are appearance, failure to appear, public safety, and new arrest rates **currently being captured** across various data sources.

- a. What are the strengths and limitation of how these outcomes are measured and/or calculated?
- 2. How **should** appearance rate be measured or calculated?
 - a. This will require a reliable way to measure the documented instance when a defendant fails to appear in court, how a failure to appear is defined, and the data sources to be used.
 - b. One possible measure could be, the percentage of defendants admitted to bail and released who attend all pretrial court appearances.
 - c. Appearance Rate = Total number of released defendants without failure to appear/number of released defendants that reach case conclusion X 100.
- 3. How **should** failure to appear be defined and measured?
 - a. Failure to appear could be measured by any instance of failure to appear for a court date, regardless of court action (show cause summons, capias, or held in contempt).
- 4. What data sources could be used to capture failure to appear in court?
 - a. Court records maintained by the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia.
- 5. How should public safety rate be measured or calculated?
 - a. One possible measure could be, the percentage of defendants admitted to bail and released who are not charged with a new offense during the time on release.
 - b. Public Safety Rate = Total number of released defendants without new alleged criminal activity/number of released defendants that reach case conclusion X 100.
- 6. How should new alleged criminal activity be defined and measured?
 - a. Any new arrest during the period of release on bail.
 - b. Should there be a distinction of new alleged criminal activity by categories, e.g., violent, drug, theft, etc.? (Measure the dangerousness of the new alleged criminal activity)
- 7. What data sources will be used to capture alleged new criminal activity?
 - a. Possible data sources could be criminal history records maintained by the Virginia State Police (VCIN/NCIC).
 - b. Court records maintained by the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia.
- 8. How should the success rate be measured or calculated?
 - a. One possible measure could be, the percentage of defendants admitted to bail and released who (1) appear for all scheduled court appearances, and (2) are not charged with a new criminal offense during the period of release.

III. Analyze the impact of pretrial services programs on local jail populations.

Questions that need answering:

- 1. What is the primary data source for all jails in Virginia?
 - a. LIDS
 - b. Local jail systems
- 2. What data should be examined to determine the impact of pretrial services on jails?

- a. Release rate and detention rates
- b. Number of commitments to jail
- c. Number of releases by release type
- d. Average Length of Stay in jail for those released by release type
- e. Number detained entire period awaiting trial
 - i. On secured bond
 - ii. Denied bail
 - iii. On other hold
- f. Awaiting Trial Average Daily Population

IV. Establishing uniform vocabulary and definitions for data entry and tracking

Questions that need answering:

- 1. What terms need uniform definitions for data entry and tracking?
- 2. Will the vocabulary and definitions be adopted among other criminal justice databases?

| Study Methodology for Comparison of Release Mechanism Outcomes | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------|--|
| Action | Assigned To | Due | |
| Create plan for a prospective, retrospective, and/or | Christina | May 21, 2018 | |
| combined study(s). | Arrington/Baron | | |
| | Blakely/Meredith | | |
| | Farrar-Owens | | |
| Identify all release types that will be used for the study. | Christina | May 21, 2018 | |
| | Arrington/Ken | | |
| | Rose/Kristi Wright | | |
| Identify the data sources that will be used for the study. | Meredith Farrar- | May 21, 2018 | |
| | Owens/Christina | _ | |
| | Arrington/Kristi | | |
| | Wright/Ken Rose | | |
| Determine the type of cases to be study, e.g., any | Christina | May 21, 2018 | |
| criminal defendant (misdemeanor or felony) released | Arrington/Baron | | |
| during a period of time under examination. | Blakely | | |
| Determine the optimal size of the cohort to be used for | Christina | May 21, 2018 | |
| this study. | Arrington/Baron | | |
| | Blakely | | |
| For the prospective study, determine the cut off point | Christina | May 21, 2018 | |
| for cases not reaching final case conclusion (length of | Arrington/Baron | | |
| time). | Blakely/Meredith | | |
| | Farrar-Owens | | |

| Impact on Jail Populations | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| Action | Assigned To | Due |
| Determine if there is a valid and reliable approach to | Baron | June 18, 2018 |
| determining variances between local and regional jails that | Blakely/Christina | |
| serve localities with pretrial services versus those that do | Arrington/Ken | |
| not. | Rose | |
| Develop methodology to determine the impact of pretrial | Christina | June 18, 2018 |
| services on jails. | Arrington/Baron | |

Updated 4/12/2018

| | Blakely/Ken Rose | |
|---|---|---------------|
| Determine data sources of jail data (LIDS, local jail management systems). | Kari Jackson/Baron Blakely | June 18, 2018 |
| Determine measures to be used to best analyze impact of pretrial services on jails. | Christina Arrington/Baron Blakely/Ken Rose | June 18, 2018 |

| Defining Outcome Measures | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Action | Assigned To | Due |
| Define appearance rate | Ken Rose/ | June 18, 2018 |
| | Christina | |
| | Arrington/Meredith | |
| | Farrar-Owens | |
| Define failure to appear | Ken Rose/ | June 18, 2018 |
| | Christina | |
| | Arrington/Meredith | |
| | Farrar-Owens | |
| Define public safety rate | Ken Rose/ | June 18, 2018 |
| | Christina | |
| | Arrington/Meredith | |
| | Farrar-Owens | |
| Define new alleged criminal activity | Ken Rose/ | June 18, 2018 |
| | Christina | |
| | Arrington/Meredith | |
| | Farrar-Owens | |
| Define success rate | Ken Rose/ | June 18, 2018 |
| | Christina | |
| | Arrington/Meredith | |
| | Farrar-Owens | |

| Vocabulary and definitions for data entry and tracking | | | |
|--|------------------|------|-----|
| Action | Assigned To | Due | |
| Identify terms that will need uniform definitions for data | Ken | June | 18, |
| entry and tracking. | Rose/Christina | 2018 | |
| | Arrington/Kristi | | |
| | Wright/ Kari | | |
| | Jackson/Meredith | | |
| | Farrar-Owens | | |
| Develop definitions for terms that have been identified as | Ken | June | 18, |

| needing uniformity. | Rose/Christina Arrington/Kristi Wright/ Kari Jackson/Meredith Farrar-Owens | 2018 | |
|--|---|--------------|-----|
| Develop a strategy to implement definitions if those terms are shared among other criminal justice databases. | Ken Rose/Christina Arrington/Kristi Wright/ Kari Jackson/Meredith Farrar-Owens | June 2018 | 18, |

| Next Meeting | | |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date | Time | Location |
| May 21, 2018 | 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 | Patrick Henry Building- Richmond, VA |
| | p.m. | |
| June 18, 2018 | 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 | Patrick Henry Building- Richmond, VA |
| | p.m. | Possibly a WebEx |