Data Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 28th at 8:30am
Courthouse Room 609

Attended: Michelle Naples (Delinquency & Court Services Division), Danny Henken (Homicide Review Commission), Erin King (DOC), Nate Holton (CJC), Nick Sayner (JusticePoint), Mallory O'Brien (Homicide Review Commission), Carmella DeLucia (CJC), Tom Reed (SPD) Ed Gordon (JusticePoint), Holly Szablewski (Courts), James Krueger (Courts)

I. Update on Data Scorecard
- Mallory updated the group on the CJC Data Scorecard. This scorecard has relevant information from Children's Court (quarterly), and monthly information from the Pretrial Database, the Courts, Forensic Unit, Department of Corrections, the District Attorney's Office, House of Correction, Milwaukee Police Department, Municipal Court, Sherriff's Department, and the State Public Defender's Office.
- Committee members have been populating this data scorecard with their relevant information, and are continuing to assess what information is needed on the data scorecard and the measures to be used to keep the data consistent. How the data is to be measured has been approved by all the listed above organizations with the exception of the Milwaukee Police Department, Municipal Court, and the Sherriff's Department.
- Mallory O'Brien noted that the rest of the Data Scorecard that currently has missing information, should be updated by the 13th of May. She noted that there is a concern with organizations pulling the data from the right variables so that we are not misinterpreting the data.
- Danny Henken had met with Brian Barkow from the Sheriff's Department and they discussed a defendant's status when they have three misdemeanors and are charged with at least one felony. The group discussed that they will interpret that information, when someone is charged with at least one felony, to place them under a felony category in the Scorecard. The group would like to put the Data Scorecard information onto graphs for people to be able to breakdown the information easier, and noted the importance of the data being updated frequently based on someone's current status within the System.
- Holly Szablewski expressed a similar concern with the status of an individual being updated in a timely manner so that information that is populated into the Data Scorecard is updated and correct. Classifying individuals under an incorrect status is a common mistake that she has encountered, about 13-15% of those who were coming into the jail should not have been classified as pretrial status since they were sentenced and could not be released. People should be able to be moved if their status changes from one point in the System to another, and those who are giving us data need to be aware of making those consistent changes.
- The group discussed their experience working with Capt. Meverdon from the Milwaukee Police Department who had worked with Jail Records staff. Meverdon had made sure that when staff was classifying 1047's

from the Court they were looking at it from where the person is currently and what is their status as of now. He was well aware that there were significant issues. The group discussed wanting to be more knowledgeable about how that system of classifying people takes place and what person they can contact for assistance with populating the data scorecard.

II. Update on Data Scorecard Definitions

- Nate Holton noted that the current definitions for the Sherriff's Department are not mutually exclusive and that in any one definition multiple people could be classified under it.
- The group discussed further action plans to tighten up the definitions that are currently being used for sharing data, and have organizations look at how they are defining their variables so that both the Council and the departments will keep the data relevant, current, and correct.
- Tom noted that once the group has the definitions worked out one of the checks against bad practice is to line up the data with three or four departments and if something does not look right, then we will be able to tell if there is a problem from there. He suggested that part of where the Council would like to be, is getting to a place where we can determine those errors in data.
- Holly mentioned that another issue with definitions is those who have a duel status. Those who are held on a felony, along with being in the Pretrial database for a VOP (violation of parole), then their status should be VOP with other charges. Once the VOP is cleared up, they should be classified as "Felony Pretrial."
- The group discussed the accuracy of the Data Scorecard as it currently stands and they should have a correct number of the average of people weekly staying in the Jail and the House of Correction.
- The group discussed how accurate the Jail population data is, if it is just a snapshot at one point in time at any given day of the week.
- The group discussed the severity of having incorrect data in the data hub. Nick Sayner noted the difficulties in making any policy decisions without the correct data. To best utilize policies and correct practices, without having an accurate number, how do you do that?
- The group discussed what would be helpful in maintaining focus moving forward and agreed that it would be best to be knowledgeable about the procedure of jail records staff and how people are being classified. The group will be reaching out to Brian Barkow to be present at the next meeting to talk more about the decision-making element and definitions for the data hub.
- Holly mentioned that moving forward she would like to see how many people are waiting to be sentenced, when did they plea, and more background information so she can better understand how our System is working.
- Tom suggested that in moving forward, another element to consider when thinking about this project is what questions can do we want answered from this data and what is the use of this data?
- The group discussed presenting where the project currently stands at the next Executive Committee Meeting on Wednesday May 21st, at 12:15pm, in the Courthouse Room 609. From now until the Executive Committee

meeting the group will focus on getting the scorecard as complete as possible and reaching out to Brian Barkow for more information to see what we are capable of doing before the next Data Committee Meeting.

- Mallory O'Brien will be sharing the data presented to the State-wide CJCC so that the committee can get an example of what the project will be able to look like. She also noted that the definitions should be completed by the 16th of May.

III. **Next Meeting will be on Monday, June 2nd, at 8:30am in the Courthouse Room 609.**

.