Forecast/Research Workgroup Meeting
CVH, Room 217
Page Hall, Middletown
July 09, 2008
10:00 AM to 12:00 Noon

Chair: Linda DeConti, Research Unit Manager (OPM)

Present: John Forbes, Assistant Division Director, Ivan Kuzyk, Research Unit Assistant Manager, Kyle Chaffee, Intern, CJPPD, (OPM); Aileen Keays, Research Specialist; Institute for the Study of Crime and Justice (CCSU); Fred Levesque, Director of Offender Classification & Population Management, Cheryl Cepelak, Director of Organizational Developments and Strategic Planning, Jody Barry, Associate Research Analyst in the MIS/Research Unit (DOC); Richard Sparaco, Parole/Community Services Mgr, Jerry Stowell, Consultant (BOPP); Al Bidorini, Director of Planning, (DMHAS); Gary Lopez, Planning Specialist, Crime Analysis Unit, (DPS).

Excused: Kelly Sinko, Intern, Cody Hyman, Intern, CJPPD, (OPM); Steve Cox, Connecticut SAC Director; Lyndsay Ruffolo, Research Specialist, Institute for the Study of Crime and Justice (CCSU); Brian Hill, Manager, Susan C. Glass, Program Manager, Center for Research, Program Analysis and Quality Improvements (CSSD); Judith P. Lee, Esq., Caseflow Management Specialist; (Court Operations); Mary Lansing, MIS/Research Unit (DOC); John Lahda, Executive Director (BOPP); Lois Desmarais, Planning Specialist, Tom Myers, IT Analyst 2, Crime Analysis Unit (DPS)

Guest: Chris Reinhart, Esq., Senior Attorney, Pat Hynes, Director of Offender Programs, Michelle Altomare, Associate Research Analyst (DOC)

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS and DELIVERABLES	DATE
Acceptance of Minutes:	The Minutes from the June meeting were accepted as written.		
Announcements/ OPM Presentation:	John and Linda began the meeting by reviewing OPM's Data Analysis and Trends presentation for Thursday's cross training conference at SCSU. John explained that their goal is to focus on educating other agencies on the three reports the division is statutorily required to produce as well as providing an overview of the their various functions. The presentation therefore was divided into two parts: 1) Organization and Collaboration 2) Data Analysis and Trends. The first part highlights where specific reports and information can be found on the OPM website, division responsibilities, and collaborative working groups and their functions such as CJPAC, FRW, and SAC. The second part focuses on the three main reports required by statute: the monthly report, the annual forecast report, and the annual recidivism report. During this period, the		

criminal justice flow model was introduced to the group for their review. Fred and Pat suggested adding an additional box highlighting jail re-interview and jail diversion that will be another exit from the unsentenced population. Fred will get us reports on these numbers. Fred also suggested graying out the box for re-entry furlough since it is no longer used (however it is relevant for previous months in this 12 month period and therefore still important).

John continued to explain the presentation stating that during the forecasting report section he will stress that there are current events such as Cheshire that can and do invalidate forecasts. He also emphasized that we are working towards obtaining a greater understanding of the flows and drivers of the criminal justice system and how a change in one area affects another. Lastly, he brought up that he will reiterate Steve Cox's analysis of facility population and how statutes and policy decisions are the major drivers of prison population.

In regards to the recidivism section, John stated that he will address our definition of recidivism as well as the methodology, demographics, and findings of the study. It was suggested that some of the data be disaggregated in an effort to produce more accurate results. However, the concern with this suggestion is that this could lead to disproportionate results as well as results that are less significant. Ultimately, we will have to make a decision with the data as to what is concerning to us.

John continued his overview of the presentation with the 'next steps.' Specifically for recidivism he highlighted that we need to do a better job of defining groups, we need to compare results of our methodology with past studies, and we need to develop program outcomes and evaluation measures. In regards to the latter, Pat emphasized that we need to understand the difference between outcome study and impact analysis. Outcome studies, as he defined,

	measures the results of different kinds of community programs while impact analyses attempt to demonstrate that placement in a specific program caused a reduction in recidivism. However, it was also noted that we can have outcome studies that are good enough to lead to policy decisions. A major point that was brought up through this presentation is that we want to emphasize that all our data analysis is intended to drive/assist policy making so that we can ultimately increase public safety.		
Agency Updates:	**OPM**: Further OPM updates involve the forecast methodology survey responses and the recidivism syntax file. Currently, Ivan is receiving all state responses to our survey regarding forecasting. He reported that there are no consistent answers across parties. Every state has their own system/methodology ranging from fairly basic to extremely intricate (some use consulting firms). However, no one is convinced nor can they demonstrate that their system is the best. Ivan will continue to collect and organize responses for our future review. In regards to the recidivism syntax, Ivan is attempting to dissect Steve's methodology in order to better understand it. Ivan will work with Steve on the upcoming report and start to formulate questions to ask to find the best way to educate everyone. Lastly, Ivan will be reviewing the violence codes in the report and present his recommendations in this area at the next FRW meeting on August 13 at the State Library.		

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS and DELIVERABLES	DATE
Agency Updates Continued:	**BOPP:** Rich explained that they did not hear as many cases as they would have liked to in the month of June because of three main obstacles: staffing issues, information issues, and board issues. Beginning this month, AR's are no longer available for use which will add to the backlog of case hearings. There is also a limit to the amount of full panel hearings per months: they are restricted to the number of cases heard per day and the number of officers they have. The Board now consists of 5 full time members; however, one recent hire will not begin until the end of July. Currently, they have only 3 part time members. This means that there are still 4 vacant part time positions that need to be filled. In addition to these issues, Rich stressed that there will be a large training/learning curve for these new board members. Due to pension issues, the candidate pool is not ideal. Applicants tend to be older state government employees who are not familiar with current methodologies. Therefore, the time to train and educate these new board members will create additional backlog. Rich also made a note that the cases that are slow to process /adding to the backlog are those prior to 8/1/07. That is because these are the cases that lack the necessary information to be reviewed by the board. Those cases after this date were processed with the proper transcripts, etc. that are now required. Because of this, cases after 8/1/07 are being reviewed and granted parole before those older cases. Rich expects overall CS population to decline and for CT to see a facility increase of about 600 in the next three months. Rich and Jerry also provided violation rate updates for CS programs, comparing second quarter 2007 numbers to second quarter 2008 numbers. For parole, technical violation rates decreased 9% from 2.3 in the second quarter		

	of 2007 to 2.1 in the second quarter of 2008. Criminal violation rates decreased 18% from 1.7 to 1.4. TS technical violation rates increased 10% from 4.8 to 5.3; however, criminal violation rates decreased 26% from 2.7 to 2.0. HWH technical violation rates decreased 10% from 3.1 to 2.8, and criminal violation rates decreased 50% from 0.3 to 0.6. Lastly, special parole technical violation rates increased 13% from 3.2 to 3.6, while criminal violation rates decreased 46% from 2.8 to 1.5. Overall, criminal violation rates have declined significantly in all programs from 2007 to 2008.		
	CSSD:		

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS and DELIVERABLES	DATE
Agency Updates Continued:	**DPS**: There was discussion on how larceny makes up the largest part of crime rates. Therefore, it may be necessary to reevaluate how our crime rates are determined and what the numbers are actually telling us. DPS is currently working with the chief statistician at the FBI in an effort to come up with suggestions for improvement. In regards to the recidivism study, it was suggested that we utilize the consultant help of BJS. It is expected that the 2005 UCR report will be completed by the end of the month and the 2006 UCR report should be		

	finished by October. UCR/NNIBRS training is coming up this month.		
	DOC: Director Levesque reported no significant changes with the DOC incarcerated population. There were slight increases and decreases in the sentenced and pre-trial population but nothing that seriously impacted the agency. Brooklyn C I closed their overflow area in the Gym and CRCI continues to add community release technical violators to their new Tech/violators unit. DOC continues to work closely with CSSD Jail-reinterview program to manage the male pre-trial population as it begins to rise through the summer months.		
AGENDA ITEM	**DISCUSSION**	**ACTION ITEMS and DELIVERABLES**	**DATE**
Agency Updates Continued:	**CCSU:**		
	DMHAS: The Alcohol and Drug Policy Council's (ADPC) Information Sharing Committee and the CJ-PAC Behavioral Health Subcommittee will work together on developing an approach to sharing client-level clinical information cross state agencies and the Judicial Branch. These committees had been charged separately with reviewing and determining		

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS and DELIVERABLES	DATE
	ways to overcome confidentiality issues in order to promote better access to behavioral healthcare information. In combining these efforts, a unified and comprehensive approach will be crafted that will be based on a clear understanding of the purpose, scope, and mechanism for accomplishing improved access to clinical information. The discussion will also include assessing what clinical information is most beneficial and ways to enhance communication of such, for example through electronic health records. A draft recommendation will be ready for joint review by both the ADPC and CJ-PAC in fall 2008.		
Agency Updates Continued:	**Court Ops:**		
Meeting Schedule:	**August 13**, 2008 – State Library September 10, 2008 – CVH, Page Hall, Rm. 217 Middletown October 8, 2008 – CSSD, 4th Floor Conference Room, Wethersfield November 12, 2008 – CSSD, 4th Floor Conference Room, Wethersfield December 10, 2008 – CSSD, 4th Floor Conference Room, Wethersfield		