



**UNIFORM STATEWIDE PROBATION
OUTCOME MEASURES WORKGROUP
1998 REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**

**UNIFORM STATEWIDE PROBATION
OUTCOME MEASURES WORKGROUP
1998 REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**

**Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219
612/642-0200
TTY 612/643-3589
January 15, 1998**

This information will be provided in alternative format upon request.

Printed on recycled paper with at least 10 percent post-consumer waste,

*The total cost of salaries, printing and supplies
incurred in development and preparation of
this report was \$10,250 (reported as
required by M.S. 3.197).*

INTRODUCTION:

Minnesota's community-based correctional services have a national reputation of being progressive and effective. However, few outcome measures have been developed or reported, particularly on a statewide basis. The reasons for this are varied. The most significant has been a lack of a comprehensive central data collection system. In light of this and other obstacles, community corrections practitioners from various agencies joined efforts and, with technical assistance from the American Probation and Parole Association, formed a task force to formulate proposed initial outcome data for statewide collection. This group met the latter part of 1996. The effort was voluntary and occurred prior to the current mandate. Their report (see Appendix A) is included with this document.

Minnesota Laws 1997, Chapter 239 (Senate File 1880, Article 9, section 48) directed the commissioner of corrections to establish a work group of individuals with demonstrated experience in the probation field to develop uniform statewide probation outcome measures. The legislature directed the work group to submit its recommendations on outcome measures to the criminal and juvenile justice information policy group for review. The work group was also mandated to report its findings and recommendations to the legislature by January 15, 1998. The report must indicate what comments or modifications, if any, were made or suggested by the criminal and juvenile justice information policy group and whether the work group altered its recommendations because of this (see Appendix B).

The work group, individuals with experience in the probation field, appointed by the commissioner of corrections (see Appendix C), met six times from September through December of 1997. It reviewed the work of the previous task force and met with representatives from the Legislative Auditors' Office and the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group. The Information Policy Group, of which Daniel Storkamp, Director of Planning and Research for the Minnesota Department of Corrections is a member, reviewed the recommendations of the work group. No modifications or changes were suggested. They did, however, suggest working together to ensure consistency in the efforts of both groups (see Appendix D).

FINDINGS:

Outcome evaluation and measurement are part of the process of planning, managing and improving service programs. The development of outcome measures involves a number of steps:

1. Determining what outcomes to measure.
2. Selecting indicators to measure those outcomes.
3. Gathering information for the indicators.
4. Reviewing the results.

With the first two steps in mind, the work group expanded on the efforts of the previous task force who proposed four core areas as follows:

RECEIVED

MAR 19 1998

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ST. PAUL, MN 55155

- **Protection of the Public** is a key state goal; it is also a primary goal of the Criminal Justice System. Probation services further this goal. Recidivism tends to be the measure most often used as a means of determining whether the criminal justice system meets this goal. It has value and can be measured.
- **Enforcing Orders of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice System** is a primary goal of probation. However, the work group felt that the suggested measures did not fit this goal. Though much discussion took place, no consensus was reached on what appropriate indicators would be.
- **Assisting the Offender to Change** is also a primary goal of probation. The indicator suggested for the offender to be law-abiding after supervision discharge was deemed to have value and is possible to measure.
- **Restoring the Crime Victim**, while perhaps not recognized by all correction's agencies as a primary goal, is recognized as such by agencies delivering corrections in the community. The indicators have value, and it is possible to measure them.

In addition, the work group felt that it was important to have an outcome measure which addressed **Community Restoration and Community Involvement**. Community work service and Sentencing to Service crews operate statewide. They provide a valuable service, and their results can be measured.

The third step in the development of outcome measures is the gathering of the information.

Outcome measures generally rely on information found in data systems. At this time, the only statewide data available is on adult felons. For probation, there is no central location for this data. The information is available but must be drawn from a number of data bases.

While the collection of the data should occur at the agency level, the tabulation of data is a large job. It is likely too large for most probation agencies to accomplish. It would seem to make sense to tabulate and report on the data annually from a centralized location.

The fourth step is reviewing the results. To be most relevant to decision-makers, both locally and at the state, and in order that the value of the services provided is clear to the public, outcomes must be placed in context. They must gauge efficiency, quality and effectiveness relative to some meaningful performance target or benchmark. It is suggested that the recidivism study recently completed by the Legislative Auditor and presented to the legislature during the 1997 session could serve as the benchmark from which to begin.

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Outcome evaluation is part of a process that includes planning. Currently no statewide planning for community-based corrections takes place. It is recommended that the Minnesota Department of Corrections develop a process for the development of a statewide plan that would include but not be limited to the development of minimum standards for the delivery of these services and statewide goals from which future measures would result. It is also recommended that local agencies be a part of this planning process and report annually on progress toward meeting the statewide goals.
- The work group developed four outcome measures for the legislature's consideration. The consensus was to develop a small number of core outcomes that could be used for both juvenile and adult community-based correctional services. All delivery systems would be asked to report on an annual basis. These measures could then be used to analyze the effectiveness of correctional services and to assist policy-makers in making decisions.
- Recognizing the lack of a centralized statewide data system, only the first of these measures, recidivism of adult offenders, is recommended for implementation at this time. At the time that statewide databases exist for misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, juvenile offenders, and victims, outcome measures for all of the proposed core areas could be accomplished.
- It is recommended that the tabulation and reporting of recidivism should be done annually, on a statewide basis, by the Minnesota Department of Corrections. After tabulation, individual agency information should be returned to the reporting agencies for the purpose of measuring the effectiveness of programs being operated by the agency.

OUTCOME 1: COMMUNITY SAFETY

DESCRIPTION: The goal is to employ supervision techniques to improve the likelihood that the public will not be victimized by an offender under supervision.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT:

OBJECTIVE: For the offender to be law-abiding while under supervision.

MEASURED BY:

1. During the first three years of probation, parole or supervised release supervision, the percent of felony offenders who are rearrested, reconvicted, or incarcerated for a new felony offense.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Data collection will occur at the county level. The names of adult felony level offenders will be forwarded to the Minnesota Department of Corrections.
2. On an annual basis, the Minnesota Department of Corrections will check the names for rearrests, reconvictions, and incarceration.
3. The Minnesota Department of Corrections will return the tabulated data back to the counties.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

The majority of the information needed is already available in most counties. This measure could be implemented immediately.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

The Minnesota Department of Corrections in cooperation with local correctional agencies.

Recommended for immediate implementation.

OUTCOME 2: RESTORE THE CRIME VICTIM

DESCRIPTION: The goal is for the victim to gain a sense of satisfaction that their needs were addressed, that they were given the opportunity to provide input, that they received communication about their case, and that they were financially restored whenever possible.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT A:

OBJECTIVE: For the victim to be financially restored.

MEASURED BY:

1. Financial restoration:
 - Number of cases with restitution ordered
 - Number of cases with restitution paid in full
 - Percentage of cases where restitution is collected when ordered

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Develop the capacity to pass financial data from Trial Court Information System (TCIS) to create an electronic file(s) for probation departments statewide.
2. Probation departments with management information systems (MIS) will need to develop the capacity to upload the financial information from TCIS into their information system, in order to track:
 - Total restitution cases ordered
 - Date restitution was ordered
 - Individual payments
 - Dates of payment
 - Balance owed

RESOURCES REQUIRED: Not known.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY: State Court Administrator in cooperation with local corrections agencies.

Recommended for future implementation.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT B:

OBJECTIVE: For crime victims to be satisfied with the services provided to them by corrections agencies.

MEASURED BY:

1. Victim satisfaction through survey:
 - Percent of victims responding to a survey who indicated satisfaction with the manner in which their cases were handled by the supervising agency.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Convene a group consisting of probation agencies and advocacy groups to develop a standardized satisfaction survey to be used statewide.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

The ability to collect and maintain survey data and survey results.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

Each corrections agency will be responsible for data collection and data analysis. The Minnesota Department of Corrections should provide collective data as supplied by counties.

NOTE: Minnesota Laws 1997, Chapter 239, requires a report to the legislature by February, 1998, regarding establishing and funding statewide services for victims. If it is determined that a separate agency be established for victim services, the work group recommends that agency be jointly responsible with reporting agencies and the Minnesota Department of Corrections for this outcome measurement.

NOTE: Work is already underway with a group of county representatives in conjunction with the University of Minnesota to develop a victim satisfaction survey format as well as a system for data collection and data analysis.

Recommended for future implementation.

OUTCOME 3: COMMUNITY RESTORATION

DESCRIPTION: To ensure that the offender participates in programs where appropriate that restore the harm done to the community through community-based programs.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT A:

OBJECTIVE: That all offenders who are court-ordered to perform certain community program obligations abide by the court order.

MEASURED BY:

1. Number of Sentencing to Service (STS) hours ordered.
2. Number of STS hours completed.
3. Number and value (\$) of STS projects completed.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Data collection will occur at the local level and will be submitted to the Minnesota Department of Corrections on an annual basis.
2. The Minnesota Department of Corrections will send tabulated results back to the local agencies for their evaluation of effectiveness.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

The majority of the information needed is available in most counties and the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

The Minnesota Department of Corrections in cooperation with local corrections agencies.

Recommended for future implementation.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT B:

OBJECTIVE: That all offenders who are court-ordered to perform certain community program obligations, abide by the court order.

MEASURED BY:

1. Community work service (CWS) compliance:
 - Number and proportion of offender cases with CWS ordered.
 - Number and proportion of offender cases who have completed CWS upon discharge.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Convene a group of stakeholders to develop the format for the collection of CWS data.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

Agencies will need to develop the ability to collect and maintain CWS data.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

Local correction's agencies in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

Recommended for future implementation.

OUTCOME MEASURE 4: DEVELOP OFFENDER COMPETENCIES AND ASSIST THE OFFENDER TO CHANGE

DESCRIPTION: The goal is to provide opportunities for the offender to become law-abiding. This will be done by providing services which address factors relating to criminal behaviors.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT A:

OBJECTIVE: Through the use of effective assessment, to identify and provide appropriate services to offenders in order to modify their behavior.

MEASURED BY:

1. The number of offender assessment and reassessments completed.
2. The number of case plans developed that address factors relating to criminal behavior.
3. The number of offenders obtaining/maintaining employment while under supervision.
4. The number of offenders obtaining education while under supervision.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

Local corrections agencies will need to develop the capacity to collect and tabulate the data.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: Not known.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

Local corrections agencies.

Recommended for future implementation.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT B:

OBJECTIVE: For the offender to be law-abiding after supervision discharge

MEASURED BY:

1. The percent of felony offenders who are reconvicted of a new felony offense within one year of supervision discharge.

ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT:

1. Data collection will occur at the county level. The names of adult felony level offenders will be forwarded to the Minnesota Department of Corrections.
2. On an annual basis, the Minnesota Department of Corrections will check the names for rearrests, reconvictions, and incarceration.
3. The Minnesota Department of Corrections will return the tabulated data back to the counties.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

The majority of the information needed is already available in most counties.

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

The Minnesota Department of Corrections in cooperation with local corrections agencies.

Recommended for future implementation.

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIONAL OUTCOME MEASURES

FEBRUARY, 1997

FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION:

Minnesota's community based correctional services has a national reputation of being progressive and effective. These services include probation/parole/supervised release, treatment and educational programming, and alternatives to jail/prison. However, scant few outcome measures have been developed or reported particularly on a statewide basis. While the reasons for this are many and varied, the most significant is the lack of a comprehensive and central data collection system. In light of this and other obstacles, practitioners from the various community based correctional service agencies have joined efforts to formulate and propose initial outcome data for statewide collection and dissemination. This effort is voluntary; there is no legislative mandate requiring this at the present time. Full participation by all correctional service agencies including Department of Corrections, county probation offices, and Community Corrections Act counties is urged.

An Outcome Measurement Task Force was jointly created by the Minnesota Department of Corrections, Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers, Minnesota Corrections Association, and the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties. The purpose of the Task Force was to develop a small number of core outcomes for both the juvenile and adult community-based correctional services that all delivery systems would be asked to report on an annual basis. The outcomes would be used to analyze the effectiveness of correctional services and to assist policy makers in making decisions.

It is recognized that each jurisdiction has unique barriers to reporting the data. The intent was to start small with just a few (albeit core) outcomes. It is assumed that some jurisdictions may not be able to report on all of the outcomes immediately. With technical assistance, the Task Force is hopeful that, over time, the data can be reported statewide and that additional outcomes can be added. In order for the data to be meaningful, assistance is needed to define the data fields, provide protocols, provide a central depository, and analyze the data provided. The Task Force suggests that the Minnesota Department of Corrections serve this role.

MEMBERS: The Outcome Measurement Task Force consisted of representatives from the Minnesota Department of Corrections, the Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers, the Minnesota Corrections Association, and the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties. The Task Force met through the fall of 1996. Members included:

Chris Bray, MACCAC (Ramsey Co.)
Mark Carey, MACCAC (Dakota Co.) - Chairperson
Bob Gielow, MCA (Dodge-Fillmore-Olmsted)
Bill Guelker, DOC (St. Paul)
Don Ilse, MACCAC (Anoka Co.)
Steve Kley, MACPO (Nicollet Co.)
Sarah Lewandowski, MCA (DOC, Bemidji)
Michael MacMillan, MACPO (Wright Co.)
Therese McCoy, MACPO (Scott Co.)
Mary Ann Mowatt, MCA (DOC, Elk River)
Greg Potvin, DOC (Detroit Lakes)
Russ Reetz, MACCAC (Washington Co.)
Carole Smith, MCA
James Sop, DOC (North Mankato)

The Task Force distributed a draft of the report to the Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA), Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers (MACPO), Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC), and the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC). Each association/agency reviewed it, proposed changes, and/or supported the document.

Two actions are recommended:

1. That the Minnesota Department of Corrections form an implementation committee, similar in make-up to the Outcome Measurement Task Force, to develop data standards, definitions, methodology, and means of collection; and
2. That a Data Advisory Committee be set up in order to review the information submitted as a result of this effort, and interpret the data for possible policy implications and data enhancements. Any outcome data such as these proposed for collection should be examined with other data made available. Unique local factors should be taken into account, and additional process measures reviewed. This effort would improve the knowledge gained as a result of the collected data, and to avoid misinterpretation or errant conclusions.

OUTCOME MEASURE: #1 of 4

TITLE: PROTECT THE PUBLIC

SHORT DESCRIPTION: The goal is to employ supervision techniques to improve the likelihood that the public will not be victimized by an offender under supervision.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT(S):

OBJECTIVE: For the offender to be law abiding while under supervision

MEASURED BY:

1. Upon supervision termination, percent of felony offenders under probation, parole or supervised release supervision who are reconvicted of a new felony offense while under supervision.

COMMENTS:

- A. Due to difficulty in getting data on misdemeanors and gross misdemeanors, the proposal is to start with felony reconviction only. This will be done through NCIC, BCA, and local record checks.
- B. Since there is no statewide data system for juveniles, it is proposed that agencies only count those juvenile offenders known to have been adjudicated for another felony offense while under supervision.
- C. All jurisdictions will record and report basic criminological and demographic data to a central database. A stratified random sample of these offenders will be selected for data collection, to include new offenses (if any), type and frequency of supervision contacts, and application and duration of other criminal/juvenile justice interventions.
- D. These data are to be for those offenders under supervision. Although diversion is a form of supervision, it is not part of the data collection as no conviction occurred. This data restriction applies to all of the objectives.

OUTCOME MEASURE: #2 of 4

TITLE: RESTORE THE CRIME VICTIM

SHORT DESCRIPTION: The goal is for the victim to gain a sense of satisfaction that his/her needs were addressed, provide input, receive communication about their case, and be financially restored whenever possible.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT(S):

OBJECTIVE: For the victim to be financially restored.

MEASURED BY:

1. Financial restoration:

- * Number of victims with restitution ordered
- * Number of victims with restitution paid (ie, significant compliance)
- * Total \$ ordered and collected

OBJECTIVE: For the victim to be satisfied with services provided.

MEASURED BY:

1. Victim satisfaction:

- * Percent of victims responding to a survey who indicated satisfaction with the manner in which their case were handled by the supervising agency.

COMMENTS:

- A. "Significant compliance" for restitution needs definition.
- B. The proposed survey would be compiled with the help of victim advocates.
- C. Because some cases do not have a direct victim (eg, some drunk driving, drug offenses, etc.) cases will need to be flagged as appropriate for the survey.
- D. Due to the potential size of the subject pool, some form of random surveying should be administered.

OUTCOME MEASURE: #3 of 4

TITLE: ENFORCE ORDERS OF CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS

SHORT DESCRIPTION: The goal is to ensure that the public, victims, and offenders retain trust that the criminal and juvenile justice system's intervention will be enforced and that the courts provide viable solutions to addressing harmful, criminal behavior.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT(S):

OBJECTIVE: For all offenders (M, GM, F) who are court ordered to perform certain obligations to abide by the court order.

MEASURED BY:

1. Community work service (CWS) compliance:

- * Number and proportion of cases with CWS ordered
- * Number and proportion of offender cases upon discharge who have 100% CWS completed
- * Total hours ordered
- * Total hours completed

2. Treatment related programming compliance:

- * Number and proportion of cases with treatment related conditions ordered
- * Number and proportion of offender cases upon discharge who complete treatment conditions
- * Type of programs ordered

COMMENTS:

- A. Note:** community service work and treatment-related programs need further definition.
- B. All jurisdictions will record and report basic criminological and demographic data to a central database. A stratified random sample of these offenders will be selected for data collection, to include new offenses (if any), type and frequency of supervision contacts and application and duration of other criminal/juvenile justice interventions.**

OUTCOME MEASURE: #4 of 4

TITLE: ASSIST THE OFFENDER TO CHANGE

SHORT DESCRIPTION: The goal is to provide opportunities for the offender to become law abiding. This will be done by providing services which address those needs that are criminogenic in nature and will be measured by whether the offender is convicted of a future crime after discharge from supervision.

OUTCOME MEASUREMENT(S):

OBJECTIVE: For the offender to be law abiding years after supervision discharge.

MEASURED BY:

1. Upon supervision termination, percent of felony offenders under probation, parole or supervised release supervision who are reconvicted of a new felony offense within three years of supervision discharge.

COMMENTS:

- A. Due to difficulty in getting data on misdemeanors and gross misdemeanors, the proposal is to start with felony reconviction only.
- B. Since there is no statewide data system for juveniles, it is proposed that agencies only count those juvenile offenders known to have been adjudicated for another felony offense upon three years after discharge. This will be done by checking the NCIC, BCA, and local records in the event the juvenile has turned 18 years of age.
- C. All jurisdictions will record and report basic criminological and demographic data to a central database. A stratified random sample of these offenders will be selected for data collection, to include new offenses (if any), type and frequency of supervision contacts, and application and duration of other criminal/juvenile justice interventions.
- D. The outcome description contains language that is both outcome based (ie, reduction in recidivism), and process based (ie, provide opportunities). Additional process measures are recommended to identify services made available to offenders to promote change in future legal behavior.

05/19/97

[REVISOR] 1 :/KK CCRSF1880

1 juvenile sex offenders, chemically dependent juveniles, and
2 female offenders;

3 (5) an evaluation of available federal funding for
4 placement of juvenile offenders;

5 (6) an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of state,
6 regional, and private facilities; and

7 (7) any other issues that may affect juvenile placements.

8 If the commission directs the auditor to conduct this
9 study, the auditor shall report findings to the chairs of the
10 house and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over
11 criminal justice policy and funding issued by January 15, 1998.

12 Sec. 48. [PROBATION OUTCOME MEASUREMENT WORK GROUP.]

13 Subdivision 1. [WORK GROUP ESTABLISHED; PURPOSE.] The
14 commissioner of corrections shall establish a work group to
15 develop uniform statewide probation outcome measures. The
16 outcome measures must focus primarily on adult offenders but, to
17 the extent possible, may also address juvenile offenders.² The
18 work group shall develop definitions that may be used by all
19 state and local probation service providers to report outcome
20 information for probation services. The work group shall
21 recommend a method by which probation service providers may
22 measure and report recidivism of adult felons in a uniform
23 manner.

24 Subd. 2. [MEMBERSHIP.] The commissioner of corrections
25 shall appoint individuals who have demonstrated experience in
26 the probation field to serve as members of the work group. The
27 commissioner shall ensure that community corrections act
28 counties and noncommunity corrections act counties are equally
29 represented on the work group. The commissioner, or the
30 commissioner's designee, shall serve on the work group and act
31 as its chair.

32 Subd. 3. [REVIEW OF OUTCOME MEASURES.] By November 1,
33 1997, the work group shall submit its recommendations on outcome
34 measures to the criminal and juvenile justice information policy
35 group for review.

36 Subd. 4. [REPORT REQUIRED.] The work group shall report

1 its findings and recommendations to the chairs of the senate and
2 house of representatives committees having jurisdiction over
3 criminal justice policy by January 15, 1998. The report must
4 indicate what comments or modifications, if any, were made or
5 suggested by the criminal and juvenile justice information
6 policy group and whether the work group altered its
7 recommendations because of this.

8 Sec. 49. [DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS BIENNIAL PERFORMANCE
9 REPORT.]

10 The department of corrections must include in its agency
11 performance report for the year 2000 a summary of statewide
12 information on the reoffense rates of adult felons on probation.

13 Sec. 50. [AMENDMENT TO RULES DIRECTED.]

14 By July 1, 1998, the department of corrections shall amend
15 Minnesota Rules, part 2940.3500, subpart 2, to require that a
16 revocation hearing occur within 12 working days of the
17 releasee's availability to the department. This amendment must
18 be done in the manner specified in Minnesota Statutes, section
19 14.388, under authority of clause (3) of that section. This
20 section does not restrict a hearing officer's authority to grant
21 a continuance.

22 Sec. 51. [INSTRUCTION TO REVISOR.]

23 The revisor of statutes shall renumber Minnesota Statutes,
24 section 260.311, as 244.19. The revisor shall also make
25 necessary cross-reference changes consistent with the
26 renumbering.

27 Sec. 52. [REPEALER.]

28 Minnesota Statutes 1996, section 244.06, is repealed.

29 Sec. 53. [EFFECTIVE DATES.]

30 Sections 15, 19, and 35 to 37 are effective August 1, 1997,
31 and apply to crimes committed on or after that date. Sections
32 16 and 33 are effective January 1, 1999. Sections 27, 29, 30,
33 32, 34, and 43 to 48 are effective the day following final
34 enactment. Section 28 is effective January 1, 1998.

35 ARTICLE 10

36 DOMESTIC ABUSE PERPETRATED BY A MINOR

APPENDIX C

PROBATION OUTCOME WORKGROUP

Russell Reetz, CHAIR
Washington County CCA Director
Washington County Court Services
14900 - 61st Street North
Stillwater, MN 55082
(Office) 612/430-6902
(FAX) 612/430-6947

Jill Carlson, District Supervisor
Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA)
Minnesota Department of Corrections
601 Hwy. 59 North
Marshall, MN 56258
(Office) 507/537-7104
(FAX) 507/537-7111

Bill Guelker, Director
Minnesota Department of Corrections
Field Services Unit
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108-5219
(Office) 612/603-0181
(FAX) 612/642-0457

Tom Roy, Chief Probation Officer
Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA)
Region 3, Arrowhead Regional Corrections
Court and Field Services
100 North Fifth Avenue West, #319
Duluth, MN 55802-1202
(Office) 218/726-2644
(FAX) 218/726-2338

Greg Potvin, STS Supervisor
Minnesota Department of Corrections
Region 7
P. O. Box 823
Detroit Lakes, MN 56502
(Office) 218/846-0736
(FAX) 218/847-1588

Sarah Welter, Interim Research Director
Minnesota Citizens Council
822 South Third Street, Suite 100
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(Office) 612/340-5432
(FAX) 612/348-9272

Tom Adkins, Deputy Director
Minnesota Association Community
Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC)
Dakota County Community Corrections
Concord Exchange Building
201 Concord Exchange North
South St. Paul, MN 55075
(Office) 612/552-3065
(FAX) 612/552-3070

STAFF

Chris Bray
10050 Keswick Avenue North
Stillwater, MN 55082
612/429-8248

Barb Illsley
Washington County Court Services
14900 - 61st Street North
P. O. Box 6
Stillwater, MN 55082
(Office) 612/430-6905
(FAX) 612/430-6941

Michael J. MacMillan, Director
Minnesota Association of County
Probation Officers (MACPO)
Wright County Gov't. Center, Room 141
10 Second Street N.W.
Buffalo, MN 55313-2154
(Office) 612/682-7303
(FAX) 612/682-7943

Ken Merz, Director
Community Support Services Unit
MN Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108-5219
(Office) 612/642-0348
(FAX) 612/603-6768

Therese McCoy, Supervisor
Minnesota Association of County
Probation Officers (MACPO)
Court Services
Courthouse, Room 207
428 South Holmes
Shakopee, MN 55379-1397
(Office) 612/496-8267
(FAX) 612/496-8469

APPENDIX D

State of Minnesota

Department of Corrections

Office of Planning and Research

Date: December 17, 1997

To: Ken Merz

cc: Probation Outcomes Measures Committee Members

From:  Daniel R. Storkamp, Director Office of Planning and Research

Subject: Probation Outcome Measures Task Force

As discussions at the last outcomes measures meeting, attached is a copy of the master projects plan for Criminal Justice Information Task Force, Data Group and TRACE Group. During the committee meeting, I informed the group that there are several other efforts relating to probation, outcome and data architecture which will be dependent and/or have an impact on implementing probation outcomes. The Data Group feels it important that our efforts are consistent with the outcome measures committee and we are willing to work with you and the committee to develop the best possible probation system. Please give me a call if you have any questions.

Master Project Plan

Executive Summary

Information Technology Projects for the Criminal & Juvenile Justice Community

Revised
October 28, 1997

Prepared by:

The Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information Data Group:

Karen Buskey, Supreme Court, RITO

Deb Dailey, Sentencing Guidelines Commission

Dale Good, Supreme Court, RITO

Karen McDonald, Department of Public Safety, BCA

Dan Storkamp, Department of Corrections

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS</u>	<u>2</u>
I. IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM PROJECTS	2
AUTOMATED FINGERPRINT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AFIS) EXPANSION	2
CARDHANDLER – BCA ELECTRONIC INTERFACE	2
LIVESCAN-CARDSCAN FINGERPRINT TECHNOLOGY PROJECT	2
II. CRIMINAL HISTORY IMPROVEMENT & EXPANSION PROJECTS	3
JUVENILE CRIMINAL HISTORY	3
SUSPENSE FILE	3
TARGETED MISDEMEANOR CRIMINAL HISTORY	3
COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY (CCH) STANDARDIZATION	3
DIVERSION	3
PROSECUTION	3
III. NEW OPERATIONAL SYSTEM PROJECTS	4
GANG FILE	4
NATIONAL INSTANT CHECK SYSTEM (NICS)	4
ORDERS FOR PROTECTION (OFP) SYSTEM	4
JAIL	4
PROBATION	4
IV. POLICY/ACCESS FRAMEWORK PROJECTS	5
DATA POLICY	5
IMPROVED ACCESS TO INTEGRATED CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION	5
DATA WAREHOUSE	5
STATEWIDE ARCHITECTURE	5

INTRODUCTION

The projects described in this plan are information technology projects designed to benefit the Minnesota criminal and juvenile justice community. They share a common goal: *the timely, accurate collection and dissemination of statewide criminal justice data for use by the criminal and juvenile justice community*. More specifically, they strive for improvements in data collection and storage, and data distribution to state, county, district, and local agencies that require such data to effectively perform their duties.

These projects are considered high priority by the criminal justice community. They are funded by the Minnesota Legislature and directed by the Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group ("Policy Group"), which includes, by statute, the following:

Commissioner of Public Safety
State Court Administrator
Chair of the Sentencing Guidelines Commission
Commissioner of Corrections

(See Minnesota Statute Section 299C.65.)

This project plan and the individual projects are managed by the Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information Data Group, which is comprised of operational managers who report to the Policy Group:

Karen Buskey, Supreme Court, RITO
Deb Dailey, Sentencing Guidelines Commission
Dale Good, Supreme Court, RITO
Karen McDonald, Department of Public Safety, BCA
Dan Storkamp, Department of Corrections

OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS

The following projects, listed by category, are currently in progress and being managed by the Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information Data Group, under the direction of the Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group:

I. Identification System Projects

Project Name & Description	Start Date	Percent Done	Projected Due Date
<u>Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) Expansion</u> This project will upgrade the BCA's current MAFIN system to meet increasing usage demands and take advantage of technology advances.	July 1996	100%	Completed July 1997
<u>Cardhandler – BCA Electronic Interface</u> This project will develop a new computer interface at the BCA to receive electronic fingerprint card data and link this data to the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system, thereby automating much of the current manual fingerprint card processing.	Jan 96	40%	Jan 1998
<u>Livescan-Cardscan Fingerprint Technology Project</u> This project will identify court and law enforcement requirements for Livescan and Cardscan equipment, and will acquire and install such equipment at certain booking agencies. The new Livescan and Cardscan equipment will electronically capture fingerprint images and arrest identification data. It will replace the existing process of inking and rolling prints and typing arrest/identification data on fingerprint cards.			
Phase I: Includes analysis of agency readiness and volume of work, developing RFP and state contract, and purchase of equipment for larger volume sites.	Mar 1995	40%	June 1998
Phase II: Includes purchase and installation of equipment in lower volume sites.	Mar 1995	30%	June 1999

II. Criminal History Improvement & Expansion Projects

Project Name & Description	Start Date	Percent Done	Projected Due Date
<u>Juvenile Criminal History</u> This project will develop a statewide criminal history database, within the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system, for juveniles prosecuted for felony and gross misdemeanors, including those prosecuted as an Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile. It will require fingerprinting juveniles, at the time of arrest or conviction, in order to create a criminal history record.	Apr 1995	95%	Dec 1997
<u>Suspense File</u> This project will investigate and identify reasons why court data remains in the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) Suspense File, with the ultimate goal of reducing the suspense file to less than 1% of documents received.	July 1997	25%	June 1998
<u>Targeted Misdemeanor Criminal History</u> This project will develop a statewide criminal history database, within the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system, for a subset of misdemeanor offenses, called "targeted misdemeanors." It will require fingerprinting of all such offenders, at the time of arrest or conviction, in order to create a criminal history record. The "targeted misdemeanors" include: Assault in the Fifth Degree, Domestic Assault, Harassment: Violation of Restraining Order, Interference with Privacy (Stalking), Indecent Exposure, OFP, and DWI violations.	May 1995	20%	Open
<u>Computerized Criminal History (CCH) Standardization</u> This project will standardize the CCH report and screen formats to comply with FBI standards and address issues raised by the criminal justice community.	Sept 1996	5%	Open
<u>Diversion</u> This project will improve the quality of certain diversion information in the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system by allowing for the electronic transmission of such information. It will replace the current manual reporting system.	July 1997	20%	Open
<u>Prosecution</u> This project will improve the quality of certain prosecution information in the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system by allowing for the electronic transmission of such information. It will replace the current manual reporting system.	July 1997	5%	Open

III. New Operational System Projects

Project Name & Description	Start Date	Percent Done	Projected Due Date
<u>Gang File</u> This project will create a statewide pointer system for gang and gang member identification, according to legislative criteria.	July 1997	85%	Nov 1997
<u>National Instant Check System (NICS)</u> The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, Public Law 103-159, dated November 30, 1993, calls for the implementation of a national instant check of criminal backgrounds for transferees of handguns and long guns, by Nov 30, 1998. This project will automate the background checks at the state level and develop the interface to the federal segment.	June 1995	40%	Nov 1998
<u>Orders For Protection (OFP) System</u> This project will produce a statewide database to track domestic orders for protection, for use by law enforcement officers, judges, and policy makers.			
Phase I: Includes design, development, and beta testing. . .	Jan 1995	95%	Jan 1998
Phase II: Includes statewide implementation.	Jan 1998	0%	Dec 1998
<u>Jail</u> This project will provide an operational and policy database to track information on individuals in jail. Data from this system will populate the Criminal Justice Data Warehouse, discussed in Section IV, below.	July 1997	5%	June 1999
<u>Probation</u> This project will provide an operational and policy database to track information on individuals on probation, and make such information available to law enforcement, judges, and probation officers. Data from this system will populate the Criminal Justice Data Warehouse, discussed in Section IV, below.	July 1997	15%	June 1999

IV. Policy/Access Framework Projects

Project Name & Description	Start Date	Percent Done	Projected Due Date
<u>Data Policy</u> This project is designed to address the data policy and practices issues raised by other projects. Phase I: Includes data policy decisions surrounding juvenile criminal histories for criminal justice agencies	Mar 1995	N/A	Ongoing
Phase II: Includes data policy decisions surrounding non-criminal justice use of computerized criminal histories. . . .	Mar 1996	100%	Completed May 1997
	July 1997	20%	May 1998
<u>Improved Access to Integrated Criminal Justice Information</u> This project will review issues concerning access to statewide criminal justice information and plan for improvements. It will Phase I: Includes upgrading the LEMS message switch at DPS.	July 1997	60%	Mar 1998
Phase II: Will improve availability of critical information to practitioners in the criminal justice system by pursuing the concept of an integrated "CJIS workstation"—i.e., one desktop computer to provide access to all criminal justice information.	Jan 1997		Open
<u>Data Warehouse</u> This project will provide cross-agency criminal justice policy-making and management information to the criminal justice community. The data warehouse will be populated by various criminal justice operational systems. Phase I: Includes Criminal & Juvenile Court Data.	July 1997	N/A	Ongoing
Phase II: Includes "Outcome Tracking" data to track and study defendants as they complete various sanctions. It will get its data from the jail and probation systems discussed in Section III, above, as well as other systems.	July 1997	5 %	July 1999
Phase III: Includes continuous assesment of data needed to support policy and analysis.	July 1997	5%	Open
Phase IV: Includes continuous assesment of data needed to support policy and analysis.	July 1997	N/A	Open
<u>Statewide Architecture</u> This project will develop a "blueprint" for all criminal justice agencies to follow when modifying or developing criminal justice data systems. Phase I: Includes the creation of a Logical Data Model. . .	Mar 1994	N/A	Ongoing
Phase II: Includes the creation of a Physical Data Model. . .	Mar 1994	100%	Completed June 1995
Phase III: Includes the creation of a Technology Model. . .	Open		
Phase IV: Includes the creation of a Process Model.	Open		