

**Minutes of the NCJIS DISPOSITION REPORTING SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING**

April 30, 2014

The NCJIS **DISPOSITION REPORTING SUBCOMMITTEE** was called to order at 9:00 on Wednesday, April 30, 2014. Guinevere Hobdy presided in the training room of the General Services Division Building, Carson City, Nevada and via videoconference in room 501 of the Campos Building, Las Vegas, Nevada.

SUBCOMMITTEE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Guinevere Hobdy, Department of Public Safety, General Services Division
Patty Peters, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Teresa Wiley, Sparks Police Department
Scott Sosebee, Reno Justice Court
Joey Orduna Hastings, 2nd Judicial District Court
April Neiswonger, Walker River Justice Court
Crystal Allen, Douglas County Sheriff's Office
Jan Budden, Douglas County District Attorney's Office
Kristen Aaquist, Sparks City Attorney
Shelly Williams, Nevada Department of Corrections
Laura Snyder, Administrative Office of the Courts
Tom Ely, Parole & Probation (late, not in roll call, but present)

SUBCOMMITTEE BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Leslie Titus, North Las Vegas Municipal Court
Lt. Mike Silva, Elko County Sheriff's Office
Anna Vasquez, Clark County Justice Court, TAC
Madge Cassel, Clark County Detention Center

STAFF MEMBER(S) PRESENT:

Jody-Ann Ashmore, Department of Public Safety, General Services Division

OTHERS PRESENT:

Donna R Cupp, Lyon county Sheriff's Office

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order-Verification of the Quorum (for possible action)

Guinevere Hobdy: Are you ready to call the meeting to order? Thank you for attending the NCJIS Disposition Reporting Subcommittee Meeting. Jody, will you please call the order?

A roll call of the Advisory Board verified the presence of a quorum.

Quorum was met.

Agenda Item 2 – Introduction of members of the public and public comment

One member from the public, who did not wish to speak.

Agenda Item 3- MTG Computerized Criminal History System Records Audit Executive Summary (For discussion)

Guinevere Hobdy: Did everybody get the MTG Computerized Criminal History System Records Audit?

Group: Yes

Guinevere Hobdy: Did anybody have a chance to read it? What are your thoughts? The most important item was on page #5, the final data quality assessment. The measure and value of the probability of a fully recorded complete, accurate timely criminal history record, which includes the arrest and disposition was 24.97%, of our total 1.8 million records.

Unannounced: Question about arrest data quality, it looks like they receive an arrest, 97%, but it being complete and accurate is only 28%?

Guinevere Hobdy: What we learned was impacting that was ACDs (Add, Change, Delete form), timeliness, and it being complete (missing data).

Unannounced: ACDs?

Guinevere Hobdy: The ACDs changed the outcome.

Las Vegas unannounced: Just because an ACD was sent out does not mean it was wrong to begin with.

Guinevere Hobdy: I understand that.

Las Vegas unannounced: To imply that only 28% of everything that was sent up was incorrect, I do not think that is right.

Unannounced: I would want to know what was incorrect. At booking they do the name, date of birth and all that stuff, after the arrest what they charge and prosecute is different from the arrest data.

Guinevere Hobdy: They were comparing your arrest records with what was at criminal history. What was on the probable cause sheet was not matching what was in criminal history. My best assumption is that ACDs were impacting that. Does not mean it was incorrect, it just means we did not capture what was on the ACDs to match what was on the report.

Unannounced (Teresa Wiley): That has to be one bunch of ACDs to go from 97% to 28. I think something is wrong with that figure.

Guinevere Hobdy: That is just what is received.

Las Vegas unannounced: I think we all agree something is wrong with that figure.

Guinevere Hobdy: The 97% is what we received timely. There were different components that were reviewed in this audit. Those components contribute to that lower number.

Las Vegas unannounced: I have not have time to read that big thing. Does it lay it all out what they found.

Guinevere Hobdy: I have the complete study that I will send out to all of you. This is just the summary. I want everybody to understand that the arrest record number that you see is the data in criminal history is 97%, it being complete was 60%, and accuracy was 28%. So there are lots of variables, and the study supports it.

Heather Pulaski: I think that we would all like to know what that criterion was, because 28% is an awfully high number. If you are considering everything that had an ACD, I do not consider that inaccurate, just because the final product does not match what was in the PC Charge. Charges are amended, downgraded, upgraded and changed; I would hope that those types of scenarios are not included in those numbers.

Guinevere Hobdy: That was one thing that was discussed when we had our wrap up meeting. I will push out that entire packet to you so you can read and review it. This is an overall snapshot, not just related to accuracy. Does anyone have any other questions regarding Item #3?

Joey Orduna Hasting: How is report going to be used? Is it going to be distributed? Now that we have it how are we going to use it?

Guinevere Hobdy: Julie Butler is currently using it to justify the Criminal History Modernization and the outreach and education that we have been doing and the back fill of dispositions. So we have been using it in various ways to help us get grant funding or legislative approval to improve criminal history.

Laura Snyder: Is this going to be used to report to the Advisory Board on our recommendations? I feel like we are up against a time constraint here if we do not know the details and need to provide feedback to the advisory board with those details.

Guinevere Hobdy: At the advisory committee meeting I am going to be doing a recap and discussing the criminal history audit report in detail. This report was just for your knowledge and understanding of what is being seen at the state. I do not know if it will assist us today in making a decision.

Laura Snyder: So it will not be tied to the work of this committee?

Guinevere Hobdy: No, it was strictly informational.

Crystal Allen: If we send the ACDs in and they have been received, but have not been inputted into the system, are those counted as not inaccurate?

Guinevere Hobdy: MTG did a sampling of our criminal history. It was a random sampling. They compared the data received from the arresting agency to the data in criminal history. If there was anything missing or incomplete, it would fill in a box stating that it was missing or incomplete. While discussing this I asked if this could be an ACD issue and if that is the case, it is not inaccurate; it has just changed from what it was at the time of entry. This was only one small component; I do not remember the other components as to why it would be considered inaccurate. There is no way to really answer your question.

Crystal Allen: We send quite a few ACDs. It can take a long time sometimes to get that updated into the system.

Guinevere Hobdy: They did not have any of our ACDs. They were not looking at what we were doing; they were strictly looking at what was being provided by the arresting agencies and the courts and what we had. We were not giving them any ACDs, but if you had an ACD in your case file, that would make a difference.

Crystal Allen: Gotcha.

Guinevere Hobdy: It was based on what they received.

Crystal Allen: Ok.

Guinevere Hobdy: I could not report any of that because it would skew the findings.

Crystal Allen: Who did those get sent to?

Guinevere Hobdy: MTG, in Washington, the consultant company. Everybody participated; I only had two police departments that I could not motivate to get the information from.

Crystal Allen: I know that our jail does not keep that stuff; we keep the file with the ACDs. I do not remember if our office was asked for that.

Guinevere Hobdy: You did participate, because I did get it.

Teresa Wiley: Did they take into account traffic offenses that would be on the arrest record, but not in criminal history?

Guinevere Hobdy: That was built in as non-retainable criteria, and automatically dismissed.

Las Vegas unannounced: Is all that criteria in the documentation that you are going to send out?

Guinevere Hobdy: I do not know. It has been a month since I read that report. I will have to go back and look.

Las Vegas unannounced: I think those are the kind of things that we have to have when we go before the Advisory Committee when we are making these statements. We need to have a clear understanding of how we got that stat.

Guinevere Hobdy: Maybe I should have sent the other report to you first, but Julie had asked me to send it to all of you. It was strictly informational only.

Laura Snyder: It looks like they focused on disqualifying offenses.

Guinevere Hobdy: Felonies, gross misdemeanors, the special... That is exactly what they were looking for.

Teresa Wiley: What does that mean?

Guinevere Hobdy: Disqualifying offenses were deemed anything that would prevent someone from getting a firearm, or employment. Sex offender registry, DUI, domestics, anything that was reportable or mostly what would disqualify them from getting a firearm or employment.

Guinevere Hobdy: Are we ready to move on to action item #4?

Agenda Item 4- Disposition survey results (For discussion)

Guinevere Hobdy: Disposition results. AOC partnered with us to do this survey. We sent out 240 to a combination of TACs, administrators, justice of the peace and clerks of the court. Out of that 46 responded, 19% participation.

Laura Snyder: Was it to 240 different agencies? Was it duplicated within the same court?

Guinevere Hobdy: It was sent only to TACs, not the ATACs. That is how I came up with that number, there are 240 TACs.

Laura Snyder: So only one per agency.

Patty: There were questions from my agency that we were not clear on. What does "initiate" mean in the survey? It could mean different things for different agencies. We go out and get the case number, but do not create it. Everyone had a different idea of what those questions were asking.

Guinevere Hobdy: In that example I would say the court initiated it and you received it.

Patty: That is my point. I wondering if there was a clear understanding from all the agencies and entities what you were asking for.

Guinevere Hobdy: Point noted.

Patty: Should be taken into consideration when we are putting this data together.

Teresa Wiley: I was curious on for example, the name of a person, 4% do not use a name. I don't think they understand what "don't use" or "initiate" means. Like, I don't create somebody's name, they give it to me. I understood, because I sat on this committee, but others may not. So, I do not know if this data is accurate.

Guinevere Hobdy: Ok.

Teresa: For example, I do not always have the booking or court case number at my time of arrest, but I do eventually get it.

Guinevere Hobdy: Did your agency create it?

Teresa: I don't, but this says receives from another agency.

Guinevere Hobdy: Right, but does your agency Create it?

Teresa Wiley: That is not what this says. It does not "say did I create it". I think there is confusion.

Guinevere Hobdy: To me "initiate" means "create".

Las Vegas unannounced: That is the point, to you that is what it means, but to somebody else it may mean something totally different. What we are saying: is that the copulation of this document is truly accurate because of the misconceptions of what people thought.

Scott Sosebee: I think we can accept that is a problem that can plague many surveys. From the data we do have, are there any conclusions that we can discuss? I do not think we are in a situation where we have the time to go back and do another survey, and I think there was a short time even getting this survey created and published. And based on some of the other requirements put on us. Is there something we can begin to use to support any recommendations that we are probably going to need to make by the end of this meeting?

Teresa: Can we pull out law enforcement from court responses? The courts are going to say no to "do you provide the PCN", because that has to come in to them. If we are having a problem with some arresting agencies not providing the PCNs we are not going to know that because we put the court and law enforcement together.

Scott Sosebee: I agree with that because the numbers are skewed because 75% of your responders are courts. We should slice of the law enforcement agencies and booking facilities so we could see what is being initiated there versus what the courts care about. That might make it more obvious that the courts are not providing a key piece of information.

Guinevere Hobdy: OK

Las Vegas unannounced: Is that something that can be easily done?

Guinevere Hobdy: We will have to check with our survey provider. I will get back to you this afternoon.

Scott Sosebee: This was sent to [260] TACs, and that included TACs that were at courts?

Guinevere Hobdy: Probably.

Scott Sosebee: Do we have a feel if the return of this is representative of the sample that it went to? Or were we expecting more responses from law

enforcement? Can we say that this is representative of the group that we attempted to survey, in terms of the percentage of response?

Guinevere Hobdy: I did not have anything my mind when we sent this out, I was not sure what to expect.

Teresa: I thought I saw multiple responses from Nevada courts, Washoe County courts.

Unannounced: There are several in Washoe county.

Scott Sosebee: There are a high percentage of those not using the old NOCs. I was trying to see if anything stood out as good or bad. If we are starting with the assumption that all of this information is required, and I think that was the intent was to highlight on the minimum information that would be necessary. It would seem to me that we could use what would seem ambiguous data; I think we could use this to support the idea that we are not doing a very good job moving required data through the system. Maybe we could get some more refinement out of this if we could see the law enforcement side or the booking facility information compared with what the courts think they are receiving or what the courts are sending on. Sharing, or sends to another agency, that is very low. So we are not doing a very great job of handing off required data to the next agency.

Teresa: The court would probably presume when they answer it, "send to another agency", that they are sending it to DPS. Is that a presumption that we are making?

Las Vegas unannounced: That is where people have different perceptions on what it is asking.

Teresa: Even the same thing for records' case number, I am presuming that meant an OCA. For a lot of people a records' case number is not an OCA.

Las Vegas unannounced: There are many different numbers, booking, case, or lodging.

Scott Sosebee: Do we have the time to do another survey?

Guinevere Hobdy: The NCJIS Advisory Committee is May 8.

Scott Sosebee: Do we ask for an extension of this aspect of it and still proceed forward with other preliminary recommendations?

Patty: I would like to ask for an extension of it and send out another survey to clarify. We have a technical sub-committee meeting coming up and we can address the importance of the survey and clarify the questions to the attendees.

Scott Sosebee: Even if you kept a similar survey structure, but asked one question up front asking what type of agency do you represent, booking, court. The next piece is having the data elements that you look at structured to the specific type of data elements that would be expected at your core. And that way you are not trying to decipher the difference between a booking case number or record case number, or court case number.

Guinevere Hobby: So, make the information specific to that type of agency.

Scott Sosebee: And then, maybe you can do an explanation of the high level flow that we see. And, maybe that helps with what Patty is bringing up as the concern with being confused by some of this. If we were to do this a second time, we could maybe provide a little bit of clarity to what initiate means. I think there was some intentional ambiguity between electronic versus manual processes. This wasn't intended to isolate the difference between manual and electronic processes either. If you are still doing it by hand are you still manually moving this data by handing it off? I think that is another aspect. I just offer that as an option if it fits within the broader scheme of getting information to NCJIS and to get more accurate data and refine it. And I do not know if that fits with the time line, but I would say that might be a way we could do it.

Las Vegas unannounced: Scott, do you recommend that we do that today? Meaning that we identify what the questions are and exactly how the survey is going to go out to the courts versus prosecutor versus law enforcement.

Scott Sosebee: I do not want to, I think I would defer to Guinevere in terms as to what to have prepared, because I think the NCJIS Advisory for the main meeting and having recommendations prepared for that is probably our primary focus, and deliverable that we need to have by the end of the day, so if one aspect of what is going to get reported to the Advisory Committee is that we attempted to do a survey but we are not sure that we got great results from that and that we would like to go ahead and extend that. But that would assume that the Disposition Committee's objectives move beyond just this NCJIS Advisory Committee. If our whole purpose was to have deliverables and recommendations for this advisory committee and we were not intending to go on I would not say that we put any more effort into the survey. I would say that we totally focus on the recommendations. But if we are going to, if this committee is going to live on past this next NCJIS Advisory Committee meeting than I would say Yes we should probably revisit the survey. Begin to get that moving to where it does return usable information that is helpful in decision

making and then move on to other recommendations as well that aren't dependent on the survey results.

Laura Snyder: If we go back to our last meeting, the intent of the survey was to get an idea of what data existed and who used what types of data, and how. Then we were all going to call these agencies to discuss the details of the data elements. I am concerned if we send out another survey the response rate will actually go down because they feel like they have already answered these questions. The other aspect is we were really focusing on the data quality and is why we did not ask the electronic question.

Guinevere Hobdy: You are correct, Laura. I believe, with the knowledge that we have, which is we are not consistently moving data through the process. I think from that we can make some recommendations. We are missing data. We have three things that are telling us clearly that we are not getting the information. This is the whole point of having the committee, to make recommendations. This was not supposed to be a long term committee.

Las Vegas announced: Does it make sense that "sends to another agency" is so low, but "receives from another agency" is so much higher?

Scott Sosebee: I was thinking about that, I think it is the court skew there. The courts are receiving the information from other agencies and my guess is that they are not handing it off. They did not assume that Public Safety was another hand off or it is another indication that there is no standard because of the way that the courts report their disposition. They may very well not be providing all key pieces. And we know in some point there wasn't even reporting, though I think that part has been addressed. For me whether we are looking at manual or electronic the key is that we are looking at standardize required fields of information. And to begin to educate all the agencies that these pieces of information are essential to our criminal history repository and that we have a responsibility to put that information in accurately and make sure that the next, that information is handed off to the next agency. And if that agency starts falling down on doing what they are supposed to with that information than what I would like for the second part to be consistent reporting or auditing function that says not just in a broad sense that the courts are failing to report but that this specific court is failing to report this specific piece of information. And then now you can target why, if they are not providing that information. And then we would know, because we would follow up with them and they would say our system does not have the capability to store that piece of information. Now we know that is a technical issue that maybe we can put them in the direction of a grant. And we have a known issue there. Or, if it is a man power issue, maybe that can somehow be addressed and we can target it. I feel we need to start moving out of the high level we have a problem with the courts reporting and move into something where we can focus in on some, specifically what is that particular court's problem with reporting. And I feel

that is done through establishing what the standards are, of required information and then reporting on where those agencies are failing to meet the standards. I know we might have had a brief discussion last time on the difficulty in doing some of the reporting. But maybe, in terms of a recommendation it could be at least established that we feel that this would be beneficial but we don't have a solution for how we would do this level of reporting because of your manpower issues. But I do feel like maybe that might, to me, be very beneficial. We often get this, and I am speaking for Reno Justice Court, you know whether it is USJR reporting, or whatever; you are not doing it right. Ok, well tell us why we are not doing it right. We have the intent to do it correctly, but just being told we are not doing it right doesn't really inspire a lot of motivation to change. But if you are told specifically why you are not reporting it right and given an opportunity to change it, I think in many cases most of our agencies and courts would do the right thing and try to make those improvements over time. Particularly if there is effective feedback loop there. Where they are able to say, this is why we can't do this. I think that would be very beneficial.

Guinevere Hobdy: When you say not reporting right, are you talking about an audit that PD&C would perform. Where are you getting it is just not right?

Scott Sosebee: So, I can tell you that, and we have, these dispositions are not the only reporting area where courts struggle. It is just one. But you would have a similar thing with DMV convictions. Ok, the courts are not reporting DMV convictions, well if you go back and you talk to the courts, they are reporting DMV convictions. They are not reporting them timely, because they report them once a week. They report their dispositions once a month. That might factor into your timely number. It is because they have set up a standardized procedure where they batch run their dispositions once a month. And they are going to mail those in. That is certainly not timely. But, in their mind they are doing it. I think that is where if you establish the reporting standard that a disposition needs to be submitted within such and such time, and I do not know statutes and all that actual requirements we get into differences there. But I think we are coming at this with this broad number that the courts are not reporting and when we have done our surveys and talked with the courts, we identified the courts that weren't reporting and they started reporting. I still do not know if that is going to improve our timeliness percentage very much.

Guinevere Hobdy: Statutes do not dictate timeliness. The only thing that regulates the repository is a federal regulation that says we have to report dispositions within 120 days of receipt.

Las Vegas unannounced: That 120 days, are they being reported within that time?

Guinevere Hobdy: On the current FBI records, Yes. On the backfill, No.

Las Vegas unannounced: So, right now they are timely?

Guinevere Hobdy: Right now they are timely because I have five temps. But as soon as those temps go away we will be back to being uncompliant.

Las Vegas unannounced: Ok, you guys have five temps. So I am talking about the agencies that as far as the data that comes up to you, they're timely, but you're timely because you have five temps, and then when you are down people and you will be uncompliant.

Guinevere Hobdy: Correct, but we are going to the June ISC for ten permanent staff. And Julie is in the process of recommending on a grant that it be repurposed for 20 new, additional, temporary staff members. The state is really trying to get the staffing to get those dispositions entered as they come in from the back fill project and to keep up with the current. We are seeing an increase in the current dispositions based on our outreach to the courts letting them know that they were not reporting.

Las Vegas unannounced: It looks like the agencies are getting you the data during the time frame that is required.

Guinevere Hobdy: Some are. We still have about 20 courts to reach out to.

Las Vegas unannounced: What is the percentage? I assume it is small.

Guinevere Hobdy: Out of 79 courts, 49 are reporting.

Las Vegas unannounced: I am talking more about the data.

Guinevere Hobdy: If I have courts not reporting than I am not getting the data.

Las Vegas unannounced: I get that, but if you have a court that is only sending a small amount in versus the one that are sending the largest amount in, you are still getting a tremendous amount of data. You are just not getting all of it.

Guinevere Hobdy: Correct.

Las Vegas unannounced: So do we really need to focus on the courts that we are not getting the data from?

Guinevere Hobdy: Absolutely.

Scott Sosebee: That is an area where, I have said it before and I will say it again, I do not trust those numbers. You say only 49 courts are reporting, I

feel a lot of courts may not report for long periods of time because they do not have reportable cases for long periods of time. So are those courts getting wrapped up in that number? I think we had offered solutions where we would send nothing to report at this time report to you as a way of saying yes we have acknowledged our responsibility to report, we have nothing to report, so stop saying we are not reporting. Do you see what I am getting at? We are not getting that consistent reporting back on who is really there, because to me that number seems kind of off the cuff to me. And it is kind of a damning number. And I would like to get that reporting structured to where both from the AOC side of the house, from the court side of the house we say yes we agree that this is fair and accurate reporting of our state of affairs today. We have also had situations, where we say can't you say why this court is not reporting well. And off the cuff, anecdotally, we could say, Austin Justice Court they never provide the PCN. That would be good useful information to get in some type of reporting that comes out saying yes Austin Justice Court reports but they never provide us the PCN. That would be good information to put out there in some type of structured reporting or some method or mechanism to report it back out to the AOC, so if they are willfully not reporting the PCN, then somebody can go back and say OK Austin, why are you not sharing the PCN. Well we never get it. Now we can find out why they are not providing the PCN which is causing problems for your data entry clerks because now they have to manually do the research and try to match it up. That is what I am trying to say, that is where we are trying to get to. And I think that would be very beneficial. Maybe I am alone on that. Otherwise we just continue to say that there is a problem. And we are not getting to those underlying areas where there really is the problem, and it feels like it is kind of being pushed off into there is a problem out there and I really just feel that is the area that we could invest our time in. Even if there are known issues with your staffing's ability or your reporting capabilities we could say this would be nice to have, but we can't do it today. But this is where I think where we need to start going and start knocking off the pieces that we can. Somebody tell me that I am wrong.

Guinevere Hobdy: You are correct in a couple of areas. When I say that 49 courts are reporting, the courts that are partnered with AOC are all reporting. The other, non-AOC courts I have not had a chance to reach out to, yet. We did a snapshot in time, because we have not mechanism in place to track what is coming in except by manually counting. Jody painstakingly counted and logged each court that came in for a month. There is a plus and minus factor, of course because not everybody reports to us every month or every week, so it could be every three months. If you look at how many records are received at the state repository annually, 94 thousand on average, and you compare it to the dispositions entered that is actual accurate reporting that I can provide. I am only getting 50%. That means there is 50% out there.

Scott Sosebee: I agree that they are missing, but why are they missing?

Guinevere Hobdy: I believe the outreach and education I did recently had an impact. I agree with you on your standardization. I also think auditing is necessary. I know that PD&C does auditing of jail client agencies, but not everybody. I think the state needs to consider auditing all agencies regardless of whether they are in jail client. But to do that we need policies and procedures in place. That would be a part of the recommendation. Court reporting, monitoring just to determine where the deficiencies might be.

Las Vegas unannounced: Auditing sounds really good if you have the people. But I think training is the key. Letting these agencies know the importance and helping them resolve some of the problems they may have. There may be some very simple reasons why you have not gotten your data from a specific court or agency.

Guinevere Hobdy: Did you like the outreach and education?

Hillary, Henderson PD: I liked it, but it could have been sent out better and reached more people.

Guinevere Hobdy: One of the recommendations that came out in the critique form was to do an annual seminar with all of the agencies. And to do breakout sessions specialized to the types of agencies. Does that sound like something we would like to pursue or recommend?

Hilary, Henderson PD: I think that is fine, but I think some of the same agencies come to those. I think we need one on one with agencies that are located outside the larger cities.

Guinevere Hobdy: OK

Scott Sosebee: I am assuming that, and I like the idea of the training, but I would certainly agree that that is an aspect but I would think first we want to set and create maybe some simple stuff off the standardized stuff and that is followed up the training support and a reference page on your website. Where you can begin to refer people to a common place. And I think after two or three years it just becomes common knowledge that we all start to carry around. I would agree with what Patty said which is that is probably where our best bang for our buck is. She was specifically talking about the training, but I think if you combine that with the standardization of information and combine those together I certainly think that is probably where our best efforts are at. The reporting piece, and I agree with the auditing that yes that is time consuming. The way that I had thought of auditing is that maybe is it was a yearly, or biannual, every other year, with some kind of requirement where you did some kind of sampling similar to what was done by MTG and executive summary; you know some extension of that. Maybe that could be supported by grant funding or something like that. Maybe that could help where it would not be so

arduous. And the other reporting aspect is something to help us target more of the training and identify the real source of the problem. I would consider the auditing different from the reporting notion that I was talking about. That was really to help us get to root cause of problems with specific agencies for specific data.

Teresa Wiley: In the first meeting the state said that they would accept a disposition on toilet paper or a napkin; I think there should be mandatory ways that we will accept disposition reporting. That way the agencies know what they are expected to report and how to report it.

Guinevere Hobdy: I have been banned from saying that and haven't said it since.

Laura Snyder: We did talk about creating some sort of standard format during the first meeting. I still agree with that. I would like to echo what Patty was saying, that sometimes this is just a matter of a phone call. Let's not create a big process that needs to be mandated and publish policies and procedures. We talked about how that is not the right relationship that we want to start creating. We need to get the underlying issues addressed. If we created a long process of policies and procedures, it would be around the problems and not really be around what we want.

Scott Sosebee: What if they are guidelines initially? Set out guidelines, here are some templates for reporting, and maybe over time the guidelines become something more structured. I like what you are saying that if we start building everything around all of our problems than we are not getting to that other layer. Maybe just softening it to guidelines, you can begin using your guidelines as your training mechanism and then see how much that gets us.

Laura Snyder: Your standard form can be a part of your guidelines.

Scott Sosebee: One final idea, that I kind of had that thought might pull some of this together, and again this is more pie in the sky type of thought, but Public Safety might have some sort of resources, or maybe the courts what if there is some way to marry up some sort of grant funding for some of this as well. In terms of, now we are going through, now we have gotten to the point where we are actually really down to the root cause being a technical issue or something of that nature. Is there some method to provide aid after that agency or that court, to say, ok we can't pay for you to fix this directly be we're going to help you with this grant, or it can be under an umbrella of a grant. So that is kind of the last part I thought might be something that we could kind of sell and build that could help overcome some of those issues if you truly have a court that doesn't have the resources to make some type of accommodation or they just put in their new case management system and totally did not include a required field and now they need to go back and make enhancements. So that was a

last idea I put out there for discussion and consideration. Certainly nothing that could be built right away but is an area that could be put on our list of recommendations for future considerations.

Guinevere Hobdy: I am going to recap what we have discussed.

1. standardization and guidelines
2. outreach and education, either a seminar or one on one
3. auditing, annual or biannual-to be decided
4. report monitoring, to learn the root cause of a problem

Scott Sosebee: We would normally refer to it as exception reporting. Maybe it could be done quarter, I don't know, and I would actually put that as a higher priority than the auditing. The auditing I would move towards the bottom. If it was a choice between one or the other I would go with the exception reporting over the auditing.

Laura Snyder: When you are talking about exception reporting are you talking about it being more of a tool to be used to go one on one to either the agency or the court to identify the areas that they need to work on to create timelier, accurate..(interrupted, inaudible)?

Scott Sosebee: I think so, yes, it is the kind of transition from the, we know from what Guinevere has looked at that we are seeing 48-49 courts reporting. It is to go beyond that just to provide more fidelity to that; is really where I am thinking it would be an extension of that conversation to say you know we haven't received any reporting from Austin in 90 days. You know there would be some flags, some mechanism to do that. Then we will have a real understanding of that problem and feel like half the courts are not reporting just because they hate DPS and there is no way they are every going to report a disposition. So it is really to transition to that next level of saying what is, how we can answer that question why are these courts not reporting. And I think that it does start with that list. And I think what we did there is we call them and we do that. But then I think that when we do have that situation where we do have a (inaudible) that court is now reporting regularly. You know that. Everybody is comfortable that court is reporting regularly. We are now concerned about the quality of the data that they are providing. Or they are providing incomplete data. How do we get that information? Your data entry clerks probably know the courts that or the agencies that they hate entering for because they do not provide certain pieces of information. Let's begin to highlight that. That entry clerk says they, this court never provides PCNs. Flag that and then when you do the quarterly report or whatever, we say we never get this piece of information from this court. And if that is shared with the AOC, then I think the AOC could begin, and I do not want to speak on behalf of the AOC but I think if it is shared directly on behalf of the court, I would think that

they could provide that answer to that question. So I don't know how to get that information, but that is kind of what I had in mind.

Teresa Wiley: I agree. And I think there are some courts that don't deal with reportable offenses to a great deal. So I do not know if in that exception report there is a mechanisms to say out of charges that were reported this certain amount of charges are from this court that haven't been reported on. You may have a court that only does traffic and all the criminal stuff goes to another court. And they report it, but you may never see anything from that court based upon there is no criminal history record created at an arrest level from that court because it is all traffic.

Scott Sosebee: That sounds like it is similar, on the warrant side of the house, there is the nightly sync or the I forgot what they call it, where they, basically all the open warrants are dropped down and then the agency that is reporting is electronically has to validate. That might be a longer term type of proposition but I think if, that is what like you are describing, like we are expecting something.

Teresa: We are expecting this court to report to us but they never do, but if you look at the criminal history records that are out there, there are three.

Scott Sosebee: Las Vegas Muni pops to mind, as, I know that was one of the courts that wasn't reporting for a period of time, but they are a muni court. How many reportable cases do they have?

Las Vegas unannounced: Those dispositions were still going up to Metro. So we were sending those up. We were just coming up through a different method. I think a lot of that can be resolved by the state just reaching out and really seeing what they have and do. But doesn't the state already know who the agencies are that are not reporting? Wasn't that part of the study?

Guinevere Hobdy: We did an analysis of what is coming in the door that was separate from the MTG study. And that is how we came up with out of 78 courts only 29 were reporting, and then we reached out to AOC. It is not accurate because it does not capture those who report once every three months. I knew there was a discrepancy but I had to start somewhere. There is no way other than manually counting and documenting what courts are coming in.

Laura Snyder: I thought that Robin Sweet did an outreach also to the courts and provided information to Julie after that. Did that produce any results?

Guinevere Hobdy: It was Robin's efforts that really turned that number around from 29 to 49. And we brought on two more prosecutors. It was a great effort.

Laura Snyder: So, the 49 is an updated number?

Guinevere Hobdy: Yes, but there will still be a plus or minus, and what that number is I could not tell you.

Scott Sosebee: So, when a disposition is reported there is not a time stamp?

Guinevere Hobdy: No, there is not time stamp. It comes in the mail, we count it, bundle them by 100, and stick them in a bucket to be data entered.

Scott Sosebee: When it is data entered into your data base it should be time stamped.

Guinevere Hobdy: There is, but here is my problem. I can get a disposition in from anybody; I wanted to track what courts were sending us dispositions. By statute it is their responsibility. That is what I wanted to track. I can tell you that there has been a disposition entered from every court, the source if from all over.

Scott Sosebee: So, that might tell me that might not be a great metric, then because if a court does have an arrangement and in the case like Las Vegas Muni Court, they had an arrangement with Metro to submit their dispositions but then they were all spun up because you know, and I don't know all of the particulars of it all but if in fact Metro was submitting and you were getting the ones you were supposed to, or a fraction or a portion of them. But I know they kind of felt like they had their backs against the wall because they were told that they weren't reporting.

Guinevere Hobdy: Actually, they came to me.

(talk over)

Scott Sosebee: I feel if you are getting them from multiple sources and they have an arrangement and that has worked out at a local level I would feel like that would be ok. Right?

Guinevere Hobdy: I am fine with it; except what I found was when we reached out we found that that relationship disintegrated over time. The person who had once done it is no longer there. When I did the outreach and education I said that was OK, but suggested that it be revisited once a year to make sure the other entity was still good with sending dispositions on their behalf, how is that going. Maybe the court reaching out to us saying are you still getting everything.

Teresa Wiley: In the last five years a lot of people have retired out. I think we could do that through the standardization, the guidelines, the training and our exception reporting.

Laura Snyder: I think it is important to include in the exception reporting the follow up.

Teresa: I agree with that.

Guinevere Hobdy: Exception reporting, is that a manual or electronic process?

Laura Snyder: You are the only one that has that information to know, and you are manually receiving and counting, I am not sure what that looks like for you.

Las Vegas unannounced: You have to process that data anyway, so as that data is coming in, and I do not know of all the ways that data comes in, but if it comes in a packet from Las Vegas Metro you still have to process those. If there is 5,000 that come in that day.

Guinevere Hobdy: Right, but if Las Vegas Metro is sending 5,000 in a day and it is from various courts I need to record the source, Metro, and the courts that are submitting.

Unannounced: Which you are not currently doing.

Scott Sosebee: I guess my thought on that would be, if we, if somebody would come up with another way of identifying where the source of the problem is, please offer it out there. But, if this problem is at the level we think it is, I think that is a necessary step. I am not saying that I would not offer for one to say that you need a whole other team, certainly, I don't think that, I think that we start off with small steps and put it in some way with your process, so it is manageable and easy to accommodate and not being in there and not processing the data, I am not a good person to say that. I think that would I would suggest is that we have this concept out there, this notion of the exception reporting, the intent of it is to highlight root cause of problems that are causing you issues. You know you can incrementally improve that as you move forward. Maybe if a court sends in a batch, you know if it comes in once a month you get a batch, you know maybe there is a way, Ok we received this batch, and that's a way that you could, if you have to do it manually. But at the end of the day I feel like probably, really it is kind of a (inaudible) because if you got stuff that is going, that is reported electronically or whatever, you know, and I don't have the data so I can't answer that question. Maybe that is something the technical team could look at. I don't know that, I would just put this out as an ideal for examining it.

Las Vegas unannounced: Maybe that exception reporting is going to have to be manual. Maybe that is where the grant funding comes in till such time as we can have this done with interfaces.

Teresa Wiley: I think exception reporting is going to be a process also. It may become a non-issue after you get your staffing.

Scott Sosebee: I think that is an excellent point and my whole idea for this came from the electronic side, where, when, from your interface, when your interface is rejecting data that is coming through we would create an exception report off the data that was being rejected because of the quality. And from that exception report you very quickly go from, you know when we were doing electronic citations, at first we were getting an 80% acceptance rate, every week we would generate an acceptance report. We go right to the agencies. These are the problems that we are seeing with your data. And then you do a, and now you say, and I am not joking, you went from an 80% accuracy to 99% accuracy because you now specifically know what the problem is. Every time you see blond come through it rejects. Ok what is the problem? It is the hand held or the police officer, they need to update their (inaudible). Now you fix that problem. Now you don't have to do it for every record, maybe you do it on a sample, maybe you just pick one day. So make it manageable. But I think that is fidelity (inaudible). I would even be fine with going to your data entry clerk and said which one of these are a nightmare for you to fill out. Which ones cause you a headache when you see this court, or this agency report because they don't do it right. And then you collect that info and validate it and do it.

Laura Snyder: Which ones are you having to put in your suspense files? Those are really your target items right there because you know you cannot enter them.

Guinevere Hobdy: Kendra is the supervisor over the unit and works with the disposition team. (speaking to Kendra) Is there enough information in the suspense bucket to do an analysis? And come up with a manual exception report based on what we are discussing here today?

Kendra Callan: Yes, I would think so.

Guinevere Hobdy: That might be our first step. To do a manual report of what we have in house of exceptions.

Laura Snyder: If we had it separated by court or agency and each of their problems.

Scott Sosebee: And it is not touching every single record. And I think if it is written up in such a way that is very caveated, that these are courts that we are rejecting, I think that is what we put that we would reject their disposition, or that we cannot enter the disposition because of this. And then we begin to do that and maybe you do that every quarter. And then the last thing that I was thinking is that if it was partnered with the AOC in such a way, that that was a shared report, you know, they had a chance to review that beforehand and find out the best way to communicate it back to the courts, because I know that sometimes if the court gets a stack back, it does not matter how nicely you have worded that letter that is on top of the stack, that stack is going into their suspense file to sit for years. So we want to avoid that too. I think, I mean that, but keep it manageable, I know I would not suggest that we create this huge process, but just some way to provide that fidelity of what is happening there with the exception reporting.

Laura Snyder: If we took one type of issue from each court that is a problem, just one example, instead of sending the whole stack. It is not overwhelming. But what you do send is representative of the problems.

Guinevere Hobdy: I seem to find a phone call is better to tell them they will be receiving this. Now that we have talked about this I think that DPS needs to that manual analysis before we do the standardization guidelines. I think it will help determine the guidelines.

Unannounced: What the problems are at each court.

Guinevere Hobdy: We could do the outreach and report monitoring. And then, eventually get to auditing.

Joey Orduna Hasting: Guinevere... (Interrupted)

Las Vegas unannounced: Manual report, you guys are doing and then working with AOC first, then we do the standardization and guidelines, then we do the outreach and education. Then we do the report monitoring.

Guinevere Hobdy: Correct. Joey, what did you have?

Joey Orduna Hasting: The director of Public Safety already has the authority in statute to audit. He or she can pull an audit at any time, if I remember the statute correctly. I feel a recommendation saying "audit" it is a false sense of security because that already exists. I think the three or four other recommendations are more concrete.

Las Vegas unannounced: Let's get rid of "audit" than.

Guinevere Hobdy: Ok, so no auditing because it already exists.

(Talk over)

Laura Snyder: And if we have guidelines to point back to and other measurements that we can point to, let's see how that works first.

Guinevere Hobdy: I think with the report monitoring you are doing your auditing but it is not a site auditing.

Laura Snyder: Not as formal.

Las Vegas or Joey Orduna Hasting unannounced: As Laura had said, everybody knows that is it their responsibility now, so maybe the audit process can be used in limited situations where an entity isn't responding.

Guinevere Hobdy: But that would be at our discretion at a later date.

Las Vegas or Joey Orduna Hasting unannounced: Right because the statute already allows you to audit.

Guinevere Hobdy: Are we ready to carry a motion of action? So the recommendations for motions are:

1. DPS to do a manual analyst of report auditing to determine the exception report
2. Standardization and guidelines
3. Outreach and education

Las Vegas unannounced: Then there would be a fourth for the exception reporting?

Guinevere Hobdy: That would be continued and then grant funding down the road.

Scott Sosebee: I will add one last thought before we take the vote, and that is, I think when all this is, one of the key things I think to emphasize with the standardization, because we are not specifically addressing electronic at this point, but I do feel that we need to at least to acknowledge when this is reported to the Advisory Committee that that is our goal. To get towards electronic reporting, but that we felt that these steps are necessary to even have the quality of data to allow us to get to the electronic data, because, this was the problem I ran into before, we just kind of tried to rush to the electronic reporting, that's why we are kind of in this, partly in this mess because we put the systems in place to accept the reporting but then the data was bad. So I feel that that needs to be addressed so that it gives the committee, they understand that yes we are looking toward electronic, that is still the end goal,

that these are steps we feel are necessary to even allow us to get to that point, so somehow capture that. That would be the last caveat that I would add to it.

Guinevere Hobdy: I will put that in my presentation.

Joey Orduna Hasting: Just for clarification purposes, when we are talking about standardization of reporting are you referring to the form that is on your website?

Guinevere Hobdy: That is one, and the crystal report that Craig just developed was actually paired from that and the AOC report. Those are standard now.

Joey Orduna Hasting: So, you are not talking about creating new standards. It is really making sure everyone is using what already exists.

Guinevere Hobdy: Yes, and putting the guidelines to it. We still have courts that send us three/four page dispositions that you have to read through pages to get the information. And the green sheets that do not have enough information.

Joey Orduna Hasting: That sounds great, I just wanted to clarify.

Guinevere Hobdy: The form that we have, developed through AOC, is good. It is well liked.

Las Vegas unannounced: Doesn't part of the standardization also address the key data elements? That maybe some of the systems are missing.

Guinevere Hobdy: Yes, in the guidelines it will address the required data.

Heather: The problem is that works for electronic dispositions. I know for Metro there are a good percentage of dispositions that are not electronic, and we do have to fill out those forms. Take things that never get assigned to a district attorney they are dismissed or denied before it even gets to the court. The law enforcement agencies have to manually send each one of those up and those numbers go up every month.

Guinevere Hobdy: Maybe we could look at a standardized form for the district attorneys.

Las Vegas unannounced: And law enforcement since they enter charges.

Laura Snyder: Any source you would receive it from.

Scott Sosebee: I think that is a great idea. My last piece to that, that I kind of envision is the guidelines that we give a high level view of the process, to create

a common language for all these things too. I think all those pieces would be very helpful and then as new, as we begin professional associations through the committees the technical committees, and all those types of things we begin to push that information out and we don't have this big problem when you lose this key person, that somebody has the opportunity to come it and go for years without any knowledge that this is a part of their responsibility.

Guinevere Hobdy: OK

Las Vegas unannounced: Some of the things that we are talking about down here are that with that standardization with the forms that we are talking about, the data elements that are needed on that form, you got agencies that have these new case management systems or they are developing new case management systems. They need to know as soon as possible what those data elements are that you want to capture. To go in after the fact is going to cost everybody boo coo bucks.

Guinevere Hobdy: I have been working with Elko and Clark. They have been doing huge case management updates.

Laura Snyder: Nye and Douglas.

Guinevere Hobdy: Nye and Douglas are? Douglas is on board with our data element requirements. I do not know about Nye County. I will have to contact them.

Las Vegas unannounced: Do we know right now what those data elements are?

Guinevere Hobdy: Yes

Las Vegas unannounced: That we would like everybody to capture?

Guinevere Hobdy: Yes

Las Vegas unannounced: And where are they?

Scott Sosebee: We got a summary of them on the survey. The piece that needs to be careful there, is that if you are communicating with the court, this might be a discussion for another day, what is the courts responsibility, is it required of them to keep the booking case number. Or the record case number. Those might be conversations for another day as we begin to transition to hopefully to receiving all of this information, but now the problem is the courts aren't capturing the number. Cause I don't know whether they need to or not or that is where you really get into problems on the case management systems about how they track those types of reference numbers if you will.

Laura Snyder: that might be a situation where you have a booking or PCN.

Guinevere Hobdy: Another question before we vote on the recommendations, do we want to continue the subcommittee to develop the standards and guidelines? Or continue for any other reason?

Las Vegas unannounced: I think it is a good idea.

Teresa Wiley: I would like to see a couple of more meetings. If we are making recommendations for standardization guidelines and training and auditing, I would like to see what that really comes out to say.

Laura Snyder: We have already created a vision among us; it would be difficult to hand that off to someone else.

Teresa Wiley: I also think that with all the users out there they will receive the guidelines better from a committee versus the state.

Joey Orduna Hasting: I think the benefit of the subcommittee is that we have the opportunity to match up expectations with practicality because we are the ones doing it.

Las Vegas unannounced: Some times what we put on paper is not what happens in real life.

Agenda Item 5- Recommendations to the NCJIS Advisory Committee for improving the completeness, timeliness and accuracy of criminal disposition reporting by criminal justice agencies.(For discussion and possible action)

Guinevere Hobdy: Can we have a motion for the recommendations?

Teresa Wiley: I would like for make a motion to recommend to the Advisory Committee that DPS monitor the current dispositions to provide an exception report.

Scott Sosebee: I second.

None opposed, all in favor.

Motion carries

Patty Peters: I would like for make a motion to recommend to the Advisory Committee standardization of forms and guidelines.

Joey Orduna Hasting: I second.

None opposed, all in favor.

Motion carries

Teresa Wiley: I would like for make a motion to recommend to the Advisory Committee that we provide education and outreach regarding disposition reporting, standardization and guidelines.

Laura Snyder: I second.

None opposed, all in favor.

Motion carries

Scott Sosebee: I would like for make a motion to recommend to the Advisory Committee that we look long term at establishing some type of grant program or identifying grant opportunities to aid agencies and courts to improve their disposition reporting.

Teresa Wiley: I second.

None opposed, all in favor.

Motion carries

Las Vegas unannounced: I make a motion that when this is all said and done this is done electronically.

Guinevere Hobdy: That is our goal.

Agenda Item 6 – Comments of committee members (for discussion)

Joey Orduna Hasting: I understand that all the NOC codes are posted on your NV share. We have an issue getting to that NV share through our firewall. We have a printed list of NOC codes from Washoe Sheriff. Can you post the NOC list to your DPS website?

Scott Sosebee: The sheriff's office actually posts that on line. Can you get that from their web page?

Joey Orduna Hasting: We ended up doing that, but our concern is, because we are not on county server, we are on our own server. Our concern is what if the sheriff's office doesn't post it. We do not want to rely, as we have in the past on another agency.

Guinevere Hobdy: And do they have a current one because I just did a new report that has all the USJR values. I will email Craig directly and set it up.

(talk over)

Las Vegas unannounced: Those things are changing all the time.

Joey Orduna Hasting: Guinevere, if you could email that to Craig that would be awesome.

Guinevere Hobdy: I will add him to my distribution list.

Agenda Item 7 – Public comment (for discussion)

None.

Agenda Item 8 – Schedule next NCJIS Disposition Reporting Subcommittee meeting (For discussion and possible action)

Guinevere Hobdy: When do we want our next Disposition Reporting Subcommittee Meeting?

Scott Sosebee: When is the Advisory Committee?

Guinevere Hobdy: May 8th. And I can follow up with an email to everybody.

Group: June.

Guinevere Hobdy: I will have Jody shoot out some dates.

Teresa Wiley: I am not available the first week of June, I am on vacation.

Guinevere Hobdy: What is a good day?

Unannounced: Wednesday

Group agrees.

Agenda Item 9 – Adjournment (for possible action)

Adjourned 10:41 am