

Alameda County Public Safety Realignment (AB 109) Evaluation: Data Gap Analysis



Prepared by:

Resource Development Associates

May 2018





Introduction

The purpose of this document is to assess Alameda County's current AB 109-related data capacity and infrastructure, including systems and methods for data collection, monitoring, reporting, and sharing, across various partners that hold justice and service data. These entities include the Probation Department, Sheriff's Office, District Attorney's Office, Behavioral Health Care Services, and the Community Development Agency. The goal of this effort is to understand the types and quality of data each department are collecting, the format in which data are stored, and how data can be extracted for analysis. This will help identify data-specific strengths and challenges as Resource Development Associates (RDA) continues to work with County departments to develop data collection, management, and reporting strategies around public safety realignment.

In order to assess the AB 109-related data capacity and infrastructure in Alameda County, RDA received, collected, and analyzed data, as well as conducted key informant interviews with leadership and IT staff from the following departments:

- ❖ Probation Department
- ❖ Sheriff's Office
- ❖ District Attorney's Office
- ❖ Behavioral Health Care Services
- ❖ Community Development Agency

This report focuses on the AB 109-related data capacity of County departments that RDA worked with to pull data for the AB 109 Client Overview Report. As such, this report does not directly assess the AB 109-related data capacity of the Superior Court or the County's Information Technology Department (ITD). Alameda County's Superior Court expressed concerns about a conflict of interest participating in an AB 109 evaluation in any capacity, while RDA did not work directly with ITD because staff expressed a lack of capacity to identify the realigned population given the County's unique definition of realignment.

That said, it is noteworthy that ITD, as a part of the eCRIMS Modernization Project, has developed the CRIMS web-based platform, which integrates data from the juvenile and adult probation case management systems (PRSIM and APS respectively), as well as from the Superior Court's case management system (Odyssey) and the Sheriff's Office Jail Management System (JMS). While this report does not provide a deep assessment of the AB 109-related data capacity of ITD, the role of CRIMS to support data sharing and integration should not be overlooked, and is highlighted where relevant for the evaluation.

Organization of this Memo

This memo begins with an overview of each County department's data system, as well as an assessment of the availability and quality of their AB 109-related data and the implications of each department's data capacity on AB 109 reporting and evaluation. The department-level findings are followed by an



assessment of the County's strengths and challenges around interagency data sharing. The memo concludes with a set of recommendations for the County to consider for improving their AB 109-related data capacity.

Probation Department

Overview of Data System

Since 1973, the Alameda County Probation Department has utilized a mainframe database as their case management system where they record basic caseload information, such as probation start and end dates, revocation dates, etc. Probation built two additional Microsoft Access databases in 2013, one called PROPS and another called PRCS, to capture more detailed data on the transitional age youth and post-release community supervision (PRCS) populations respectively. These databases are able to track data elements such as referrals to services. However, according to probation staff, probation officers do not always input these data. Finally, in September of 2016, the Probation Department implemented the TriBridge database to replace the PRCS and PROPS databases. This database can track the risk and needs of probation clients as well as service referrals, attendance, and program outcomes for all individuals on probation, however implementation remains a work in progress.

The County is also currently in the process of purchasing the CaseloadPRO Probation Case Management System to replace APS and provide the Department with a more sophisticated operational system that can capture additional data elements and better integrate with other data systems, such as the TriBridge system being used to track service referrals and outcomes. In addition to the databases described above, Probation also tracks TDRC service receipt in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet, and also receives Microsoft Excel Spreadsheets from contracted employment service providers including Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS), Oakland Private Industry Council, Inc. (OPIC), Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), and Acts Full Gospel (ACTS) to track their service provision.

AB 109 Data Availability and Quality

The Alameda County Probation Department provided RDA with an extract of all felony probation dockets for individuals on felony probation from October 1, 2011, through November 30, 2016. These data clearly identified the Mandatory Supervision, PRCS, and interstate compact populations, and for each docket provided the following data elements:

- ❖ Court Docket Number
- ❖ Person ID (PFN)
- ❖ Name
- ❖ Date of Birth
- ❖ Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Gender
- ❖ Zip code
- ❖ Supervision Start Date
- ❖ Probation Type
- ❖ Revocation Date
- ❖ Date of Static Risk Assessment
- ❖ Risk Assessment Score
- ❖ Supervision End Date
- ❖ Category of Termination



Supervision start and end dates, as well as probation types (e.g., felony probation, PRCS, mandatory supervision) are reliably recorded for each probation docket, as are most demographic data (although nearly 20% of dockets are missing zip code). However, risk assessment, revocation, and termination data appear to be less reliable, and are described in greater detail below:

- ❖ **Risk assessment** data are held in three different Probation Department databases: APS, PRCS Database, and PRISM and require separate data pulls and matching processes. Because the data come from disparate places for different clients, the evaluation was only able to obtain this information for less than half of individuals on probation during the evaluation period. It is unclear whether these data are not reliably input into the data system, or whether the majority of probation clients were never assessed. Because Alameda County has not implemented a validated risk and needs assessment (the Department is currently in the process of implementing the COMPAS, a validated risk and needs assessment), the current risk assessment data should not be considered valid.

- ❖ **Revocation** data are available; however there is no information to document whether revocations are a result of a technical violation or a new criminal offense. In addition, the extent to which revocations are reliably recorded is unclear, because these data are not pushed to Probation from the court system. Instead probation officers must enter these data manually, using ad hoc reports from ITD. Preliminary analyses indicate that these data may not accurately represent revocations across the County since the start of Realignment. RDA will triangulate these data with data from the District Attorney's office in order to verify their accuracy prior to analyses.

- ❖ **Termination** data are also recorded in Probation's mainframe database however based on the different termination types recorded (e.g., Closed/1203.9 transfer Out, Closed/Early termination, Closed/Expired, Closed/Negative, Closed/Sentenced, Denied/Special, and Withdrawn), it is unclear whether terms of probation are successfully or unsuccessfully completed.

Transition Day Reporting Center

The Alameda County Probation Department operates the Transition Day Reporting Center (TDRC) to provide a central location and hub for individuals under probation supervision that are in the Realigned population. The facility was opened in March 2015, and data for individuals receiving services from the TDRC are recorded in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet.

Data for TDRC services was provided by the Alameda County Probation Department from the opening of the TDRC in 2015 through November of 2016. Data fields recorded include:

- ❖ Individual Identifier (PFN)
- ❖ Client Name
- ❖ Client Date of Birth
- ❖ Date of Service Enrollment
- ❖ Service Provider
- ❖ Program Provider





Alameda County Probation Department

AB 109 Evaluation: Data Gap Analysis

- ❖ Client Gender
- ❖ Client Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Date of Referral to Service
- ❖ Provider Submitting Referral
- ❖ Program Submitting Referral
- ❖ Date of Service
- ❖ Service Provider
- ❖ Program Provider
- ❖ Program Exit Date
- ❖ Exit Status

While the data elements highlighted above are reported reliably, TDRC data does not track specific programs or services received through the TDRC or referrals for services to outside agencies. Without these data it is unclear what services are being provided to each individual receiving service from the TDRC.

Employment Services

The Alameda County Probation Department partners with four local organizations to provide employment services for clients: Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS), Oakland Private Industry Council, Inc. (OPIC), Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), and Acts Full Gospel (ACTS). Data are recorded in Microsoft Excel worksheets and contain the following data elements that reliable for the evaluation of employment service utilization:

- ❖ Name
- ❖ PFN
- ❖ Date of Birth
- ❖ Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Referral date
- ❖ Enrollment date
- ❖ Start date
- ❖ Date of employability assessment
- ❖ Assessment Completion Indicator

Additional data fields tracking job readiness training, employment case management, transition work programs, incentivized performance, placement information, wages, and job retention are provided however too much of these data are missing to meaningfully analyze.

Data for AB 109 Reporting and Evaluation

The data provided to RDA by the Probation Department contained sufficient and reliable information to determine probation client's probation type (e.g., felony probation, PRCS, or mandatory supervision), as well as their supervision start and end dates. However, in order to identify the County's realigned probation population under the expanded definition of Realignment, RDA had to match Probation data to data provided by the DA's Office on all AB 109 eligible cases in the County since the start of Realignment (over 33,000 from October 1, 2011 – June 30, 2016). The Probation Department should work to coordinate with the District Attorney's Office or Superior Court to identify and track which probation sentences are attached to AB 109 eligible cases.

RDA utilized probation data to determine individuals' status for the analysis, as well as their supervision start and end dates. However, due to limitations noted above, RDA did not report on risk assessments, revocations, or termination types.



Transition Day Reporting Center

TDRC data showed 297 individuals receiving services through FY15/16. However, because the TDRC data does not track specific programs or services received through the TDRC, or referrals for service to outside agencies, these data are unable to inform the extent to which specific services are utilized by individuals connected to the TDRC. Moreover, because TDRC data do not include each individual's realigned status, it is not clear whether TDRC services are being provided beyond the intended target population (County realigned individuals on probation), or if this discrepancy is related to data reliability issues. RDA matched TDRC data to the County's realigned populations as well as the felony probation population, and upon review the data identified a number of individuals beyond the scope of the intended target population.

Employment Services

Because a majority of data fields are missing large amounts of data, including completion of job readiness training, employment case management, transition work programs, incentives earned, job placement, and job retention, RDA was only able to utilize enrollment dates to identify the number of individuals who enrolled in employment services each fiscal year. RDA matched employment data to Probation and DA's Office data to identify the population types (e.g., Felony Probation, County Realigned Probation, AB 109 Population) of each individual receiving employment services.

Sheriff's Office

Overview of Data System

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office purchased a new Jail Management System from Advanced Technology Information Management Systems (ATIMS) that went live in September 2015. The new JMS is a web based SQL database from which data can be extracted in many formats, including Microsoft Excel or .csv format. According to the Sheriff's Office, the new database captures much more data than the previous mainframe data system which was very limited. Due to the previous limitations, data requests for information prior to September 2015 must go through ITD, where they have converted data previously in paper and/or PDF format to electronic format.

AB 109 Data Availability and Quality

According to Sheriff's Office staff, the new JMS is able to be queried by AB 109 population type (e.g., PRCS, 1170(h), parolees) and captures many new data elements that were previously unable to be tracked. Some of these data elements, such as information on in-custody service receipt, are input by Sheriff's Office staff while other data elements, including court data (e.g., bail amounts, charges filed, and convictions) are pushed from ITD's CRIMS database to the Sheriff's Office JMS. While Sheriff's Office staff expressed that these data are tracked and able to be queried across AB 109 population types, the Sheriff's Office was not willing to execute a data sharing agreement with RDA that allowed us access to these data.



Alameda County Probation Department

AB 109 Evaluation: Data Gap Analysis

The Sheriff's Office was able to provide only the following data elements, and only for the time period from Oct 1, 2011 through November 30, 2016:

- ❖ PFN
- ❖ Name
- ❖ Date of Birth
- ❖ Race
- ❖ Gender
- ❖ Charge Event Number(CEN)
- ❖ Entry Date on the CEN
- ❖ Primary Charge on the CEN
- ❖ Booking Circumstance on the CEN
- ❖ Release Date on the CEN
- ❖ Release Reason on the CEN

These data sent to RDA were high quality in the sense that very little data was missing. However, based on the data we received we were unable to identify the County's in-custody realigned population (with the exception of parolees), and booking estimates are systematically over-estimated because the dataset was missing a jail entry ID. The data was at the level of the CEN, so unless all the CENs were entered/released on the same day, it was unclear how to group the reasons for someone's admission.

Data for AB 109 Reporting and Evaluation

RDA received a database that included all bookings and releases from October 1, 2011 – Nov 30, 2016. These data were at the CEN level, meaning that there is a new row for each charge incident, whether for new crimes, warrants, etc., even in instances when individuals have not left custody. Although RDA attempted to use CENs to generate admission IDs, this was not possible because CENs are sometimes added after a person is booked into custody and prior to their release. Although most bookings have only one booking date attached to each CEN, this is not always the case, and as a result the total number of bookings and average daily population estimates are likely to be overestimated.

RDA was unable to identify bookings for specific realigned offenses as well (other than for parole violations) because the booking circumstance variable did not uniquely identify individuals sentenced under PC 1170(h) or booked for PRCS or MS violations. Additionally, some of the booking circumstance options appear to have changed since the Sheriff's Office purchased a new data system, and not all new categories align systematically with those included in the previous data system. Because sentencing information, including sentence dates, are not included in the data, it is not possible to ascertain when someone's status changes from un-sentenced to sentenced, or to systematically match Sheriff's Office data with data from the DA's Office in order to identify the County's sentenced realigned population. As a result of these limitations, there is no concrete way to measure the overall impact of Realignment on the County's jails based on the data provided by the Sheriff's Office. Further, there were over 8000 unique charges used in the dataset, meaning a significant amount of data cleaning and matching would need to be done to correctly identify AB109 charges.



District Attorney's Office

Overview of Data System

The District Attorney's Office utilizes the District Attorney Legal Information Tracking (DALITE) case management system to record detailed information about each case filed in Alameda County from charging through sentencing. DALITE is a Microsoft SQL database administered by CMC Training and Consulting, Inc. Data can be extracted in Microsoft Excel or.csv format.

The DALITE system was updated in August 2016 to improve integration with other data systems across the County; however, the reliability of new data coming from the updated system at this time is unclear. Therefore no data from the DA's Office was made available to the evaluation after July 2016.

AB 109 Data Availability and Quality

The District Attorney's Office provided a Microsoft Excel file with two sheets to RDA in order to identify the County's realigned population under the County's expanded Realignment definition; one sheet included all cases from October 1, 2011 through June 30, 2016 that were AB 109 eligible from the time of charging through sentencing and another sheet included all cases that became AB 109 eligible at sentencing. However, due to apparent staff capacity issues and/or data accuracy issues, the DA's Office was unable to provide data on all cases filed during this same time period. As a result, RDA is unable to conduct an outcome analysis at this time.

The following data elements were included in the data provided to RDA for identifying the County's realigned population:

- ❖ Municipal Court Branch
- ❖ Municipal Court Docket Number
- ❖ Superior Court Branch
- ❖ Superior Court Docket Number
- ❖ Unique Person Identifier (PFN)
- ❖ Defendant Name
- ❖ Defendant Date of Birth
- ❖ Initial Charge Date
- ❖ Case Filing Date
- ❖ Primary Offense at Charging
- ❖ Conviction Date
- ❖ Primary Offense at Conviction
- ❖ Conviction Date
- ❖ Sentence Date
- ❖ Sentence Description
- ❖ Probation Violation Indicator
- ❖ Duration for Sentence

These data were able to be used to identify the County's realigned population. However, it is noteworthy that approximately 13% of dispositions were listed as null (i.e., missing) and subsequent information for these cases such as disposition date, sentence description, and sentence duration was also missing for these dockets. While staff from the DA's Office enter data into the database at charging, and data are updated upon sentencing through the Court's CORPUS (now Odyssey) data system, according to DA's Office staff, if too much time elapses prior to charges being filed (or if no charges are filed), no data is



retained in DALITE. It could be the case that these are some of the cases for which dispositions are listed as null.

In addition to a number of cases with “null” dispositions and dispositions dates, Superior Court branch and docket numbers are missing for as much as 60% of the Municipal Court dockets in the data set. This impedes the ability to match DA’s Office data with other department’s that also track these docket numbers. Finally, while RDA requested the primary (most serious) offense for each case, staff expressed that they can only extract the first offense listed, which is typically the primary offense, although not always. If at all possible, the DA’s Office should develop a mechanism for identifying the primary offense for each case, without relying on the order of the offenses listed.

Data for AB 109 Reporting and Evaluation

RDA was only able to identify the County’s Realigned populations through June 30, 2016 due to the data quality limitations associated with the updated DALITE system. Also, because over half of the Superior Court case numbers were missing, matching DA’s Office data to Probation data is cumbersome and not as precise as matching on a unique identifier. Wherever possible, RDA matched the data based on the unique PFN identifier and the Superior Court docket number. Where the Superior Court docket number was not available, RDA matched unique PFNs, as well as sentencing and/or conviction dates from the DA’s Office with probation start dates from Probation data in order to identify all probation start and end dates of AB 109 eligible cases that resulted in probation sentences.

RDA also used sentence descriptions to identify the types of sentences used for AB 109 eligible cases resulting in a conviction from October 1, 2011 – June 30, 2016. Twenty-two (22) different sentence types, eight of which were related to probation, were included and a significant portion of these data were missing.¹ Additionally, these data did not always correspond with data provided by other departments including Alameda County’s Probation Department.

Behavioral Health Care Services

Overview of Data System

BHCS utilizes the InSyst Client Database to record information on all clients’ treatment episodes and encounters for mental health and substance use services. The computer based system records information on demographic characteristics, substance abuse and dependency issues, service types, service locations, discharge codes, and diagnoses, including ICD-10 codes for primary and secondary diagnoses, as well as Axis 3 – Axis 5 diagnoses. The system does not record mild and moderate care provided by Alliance and Blue Cross health care services.

¹ Given the challenges with the Court’s Odyssey system, there appears to be missing data resulting in underestimates of the “County Realigned on Felony Probation” population and overestimates of the “County Realigned Not on Probation” population. This is also noted in AB 109 Client Overview Report.



BHCS also operates a mental health services access line that allows individuals and organizations to report potential mental health and substance use related needs for individuals. Individuals themselves can also self-report, and BHCS can then provide an immediate response or a referral for service.

AB 109 Data Availability and Quality

RDA provided BHCS with a list of the County's realigned populations and felony probation population (including name, PFN, date of birth, race/ethnicity, and gender) which IT staff used to identify all mental health and substance use treatment episodes, as well as well as for whom the mental health services access line was called. Data were provided in an easily accessible format (.csv) and the following data elements were provided

- ❖ Client BHCS ID
- ❖ Client Name
- ❖ Client Gender
- ❖ Client Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Client Date of Birth
- ❖ Reporting Unit
- ❖ Provider Agency
- ❖ Type of Service
- ❖ Primary Diagnosis
- ❖ Primary Diagnosis Description
- ❖ Axis I – Psychological Diagnostic Categories
- ❖ Axis II – Personal Disorder and Mental Retardation
- ❖ Axis III – General Medical Condition
- ❖ Axis IV – Psychosocial and Environmental Factors
- ❖ Axis V – Global Assessment of Functioning
- ❖ Episode Open Date
- ❖ Episode Close Date

Mental health service data were provided for all episodes from October 1, 2006 – November 30, 2016. Most fields had less than 1% missing data. However, approximately 4% of episodes have missing end dates. Because start dates for many of these episodes were as early as 2007, this appears to be data entry error rather than long-term treatment. Although this represents a small number of cases, if at all possible, BHCS staff should always include episode close dates.

BHCS provided information on the mental health access line in a similar .csv format. Fields provided in the mental health access line data set included the following:

- ❖ Individual Identifier (PFN)
- ❖ Client Name
- ❖ Client Gender
- ❖ Client Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Client Date of Birth
- ❖ Log Identifier
- ❖ Disposition Identifier
- ❖ Disposition Description
- ❖ Disposition Code
- ❖ Disposition Code (Alternate)
- ❖ Referred Entity
- ❖ Date Accessed
- ❖ Referral Source
- ❖ Method of Referral
- ❖ Identifier for Presenting Need
- ❖ Type of Presenting Need
- ❖ Medication Referral Location
- ❖ Age at Referral

Less than 1% of data are missing for most fields from the ACCESS line data as well. Data for some categories, such as medication referral location, were listed only when applicable. Although the ACCESS



line is used for immediate treatment or referral, only the date of the call is available. The ACCESS line data does not provide a means to reliably identify the outcomes of each call, including whether the call resulted in an individual being connected with mental health and/or substance use services.

BHCS also provided substance use service data in a .csv format with the following fields:

- ❖ BHCS Person ID
- ❖ Client Name
- ❖ Client Gender
- ❖ Client Race/Ethnicity
- ❖ Client Date of Birth
- ❖ Reporting Unit
- ❖ Provider Agency
- ❖ Type of Service
- ❖ Primary Diagnosis
- ❖ Primary Diagnosis Description
- ❖ Axis I – Psychological Diagnostic Categories
- ❖ Axis II – Personal Disorder and Mental Retardation
- ❖ Axis III – General Medical Condition
- ❖ Axis IV – Psychosocial and Environmental Factors
- ❖ Axis V – Global Assessment of Functioning
- ❖ Episode Open Date
- ❖ Episode Close Date

As with the mental health data, less than 1% of data were missing for most fields. The data set included fields for Axis III through V diagnoses, with no data recorded in these fields. This may be related to the nature of diagnoses referred to substance abuse treatment. Because the primary diagnosis is associated with substance abuse, Axes III through V are not applicable. Less than 1% of the episode end dates were missing for the substance abuse treatment data.

Data for AB 109 Reporting and Evaluation

BHCS does not have a data field that tracks whether individuals receiving mental health and/or substance use services are a part of the realigned population. However, according to BHCS staff the Alameda County Sheriff's Office and Probation Department provide BHCS with quarterly lists of AB 109 clients so that BHCS can match on clients' names and assess the extent to which the realigned population is accessing BHCS services.

The InSyst data BHCS provided RDA was thorough and merged easily with the Probation and DA's Office datasets because BHCS staff included the unique PFN that RDA provided for them in each row of the data, which represented each treatment episode. RDA used these data to identify individuals who received mental health and/or substance use services in each fiscal year from October 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016.

Community Development Agency

Overview of Data System

CDA's Homeless Management Information System is a Microsoft SQL database manufactured by Bowman Systems. Data can be extracted from this database in many formats including Microsoft Excel and .csv format. The CDA works under the United States Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD),





Alameda County Probation Department

AB 109 Evaluation: Data Gap Analysis

and according to CDA staff HUD often redefines data elements and adds/omits response options for data fields which impact the year to year comparability of the data without extensive data cleaning (for instance HUD has redefined chronic homelessness as well as the data field this information is stored in).

AB 109 Data Availability and Quality

Despite tracking AB 109 referrals from probation, CDA staff expressed that a number of individuals on probation enroll in services without a probation referral. In addition, CDA staff expressed that they did not have the capacity to match PFNs to their unique CDA client identifiers. RDA staff went to the CDA's offices to match all individuals on felony probation or county realigned individuals to all the housing assistance events since 2011. Since many of the individuals in the full CDA dataset would not be justice involved, RDA was careful to only pull information for CDA clients in both datasets. RDA collected information on the following data elements:

- ❖ Unique CDA Client Identifiers
- ❖ Client Name
- ❖ Client Date of Birth
- ❖ Client Alias
- ❖ Employment Status
- ❖ Highest Level of Education
- ❖ Residential Status Prior to Entry
- ❖ Provider Name
- ❖ Program Phase
- ❖ Program Entry Date
- ❖ Program Exit Date

CDA data can only inform the extent to which CDA housing services have been accessed by individuals on felony probation and county realigned individuals since the start of Realignment. Since RDA's scope was only looking at the existence of housing assistance, the extra fields of interest were not used in the initial overview. However there were large amounts of missing data in these data fields, and data elements were redefined and response options are added/omitted over time.

Data for AB 109 Reporting and Evaluation

In order to identify all individuals on felony probation and county realigned individuals who have received CDA housing services since the start of Realignment, RDA staff matched a list of realigned clients based on names and dates of birth with CDA data in order to develop the most comprehensive list of CDA housing service recipients. After identifying individuals who utilized CDA services using a range of matching techniques around variations in name and date of birth, RDA used CDA entry and exit dates to determine the number of individuals who received CDA services from FY11/12 - FY 15/16, by population type.



Since the program is intended to provide housing case management to individuals who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and to help them secure short-term shelter and long-term stable housing, we assume individuals enrolling in the program received these services; however, we cannot assess the extent to which individuals secured short-term shelter and/or long-term stable housing.

Interagency Data Sharing

Representatives from multiple County Departments involved in AB 109 implementation suggested that there is a fair amount of data sharing that occurs across justice partners; however, they also noted that agencies need to develop additional formalized processes for data sharing in order better serve the AB 109 population in particular, and criminal justice-involved individuals in general. The sections below highlight some of the current strengths and challenges in data sharing across Alameda County.

Strengths

Staff across most county departments expressed that the County does a good job sharing data, pointing to ITD's CRIMS web based platform which integrates data from the juvenile and adult probation case management systems (PRSIM and APS respectively), the Superior Court's data system (Odyssey), and the Sheriff's Office Jail Management System (JMS). Law enforcement officers, including probation officers as well as police officers with local law enforcement agencies and the Sheriff's Office are able to view these data and attain real time information about the criminal histories of individuals they are seeking and/or interacting with.

Agencies such as the Public Defender's Office, Sheriff's Office, and Probation Department also received specific data that are pushed to their data systems directly by CRIMS. This allows these agencies to attain up-to-date data on justice involved populations in Alameda County, and data are relatively easy to integrate because justice partners including the Probation Department, Sheriff's Office, and the District Attorney's Office all use a common unique identifier, the PFN, to track individual clients.

In addition to cross system data sharing between justice partners, according to BHCS staff, BHCS also receives quarterly reports from Probation and the Sheriff's Office directly so that they know which of their clients are AB 109 client.

Challenges

In order to develop a greater understanding of what is and is not working well across AB 109 partners and to improve the AB 109 system of services, it is important for AB 109 partners to share appropriate data and prioritize data-driven decision making. Although County staff suggested that data sharing occurs in Alameda County, some also expressed that privacy concerns impact the extent to which departments can share data with one another, especially with regards to HIPPA protected behavioral health care data. In addition, although RDA has executed data sharing agreements to receive data that is protected by Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) laws in dozens of counties across California, several criminal justice departments in Alameda County were very hesitant to sign these agreements. In addition, RDA had



to work separately with counsel assigned to each department, rather than being able to work directly with one representative from County Counsel who could execute a countywide CORI-compliant data sharing agreement.

One of the most notable data sharing challenges aside from executing data sharing agreements is around identifying the county's realigned population under the County's expanded definition of realignment. Because the DA's Office and/or Superior Court do not have an indicator for all cases that are AB 109 eligible in their data system, there is no coordinated effort with Probation to identify the extent to which their felony probation population is realigned under the County's expanded definition of Realignment.

BHCS staff also expressed that despite Probation and the Sheriff's Office sharing some data with them, they do not receive regular reports when their clients are revoked or incarcerated which would help them access outcomes for justice involved individuals, and especially the County's realigned population, utilizing services teams, intensive case management services, FSP services, etc. BHCS staff also expressed that while service providers are expected to produce monthly service delivery and outcome reports, justice partners are not.

It is important for bi-directional data sharing to exist across AB 109 partners because without a clear understanding of client outcomes, BHCS and contracted services providers do not have access to the data necessary for adjusting services to better meet AB 109 client needs. However, it is worth noting that there is hesitation amongst some BHCS staff to further share data with justice partners because of confidentiality issues and the potential for these data being used to harm their clients.

Recommendations

- ❖ All AB 109 partners should compile and maintain an analytic "data dictionary" to aid analysis and interpretation. A data dictionary will help describe how operational data is interpreted and used within each department, and can help promote a common set of terms used across the county.
- ❖ Probation should work with the District Attorney's Office or Superior Court to develop a method for identifying and tracking which individuals under community supervision are realigned under the county's definition of realignment. This effort would likely require the District Attorney's Office or Superior Court to add a data field to identify all cases that are AB 109 eligible at sentencing.
- ❖ TDRC staff should track the specific services individuals receive on site, as well as referrals for services and service outcomes, in order to understand the extent of services utilization and client success.
- ❖ The District Attorney's Office should develop a mechanism for identifying the primary offense for each case, without relying on the order of the offenses listed, since the first case is not always the primary offense.



Alameda County Probation Department

AB 109 Evaluation: Data Gap Analysis

- ❖ The Sheriff's Office should consider developing a single-day snapshot of the county's jail population. Since entries and exits only tell part of the story, a more nuanced view would involve population status on a given day, such as sentenced/un-sentenced population, supervision status, service referrals, and court hearing status. Ideally, this snapshot would be automated to create an ongoing archive for analysis.
- ❖ AB 109 partners should use data "freezes" so they can assess historical data using a consistent multipurpose dataset. By using historical data, managers can look at data that allows for consistent measurement. A freeze would include all people that have been closed or released, as well as those that are currently in the justice system. This approach can help both internally within the system as well as externally for public requests for information. A data freeze is different from standard reports since it would develop a dataset that could be stored for future use. It also avoids the challenge of losing temporal data if certain items are overwritten.
- ❖ AB 109 partners should create indicators for mental health, probation supervision, and service needs using existing diagnostic tools. With the use of pre-trial tools, client risk and needs assessments and other diagnostics, there is an ability to better manage the needs of individuals with behavioral health issues. This data doesn't have to be used for case management, but could be used in aggregate forms to preserve client confidentiality.
- ❖ AB 109 partners should develop baseline or consistent reports to monitor progress, and a standing team to analyze and discuss them. Developing a team that routinely goes over reports, assures quality of data, and then matches data reports with operational realities gives an ongoing resource to standardize reports and information to leadership. Standard reporting then also allows for automation and more efficient uses of staff time.