

- **David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC**

00:00:03

Welcome everybody to this Webinar, and advancing fairness and transparency national guidelines for post-conviction risk and needs assessment

- before we get started in Just a moment. Let me just give you a few housekeeping notes first of all, to ask any questions of the presenters. Please type them into the Q. A. Panel at the bottom right of your screen.
- These questions will be answered at the end of the Webinar, and please note that we might not be able to get to all of the questions, we will do our best to answer as many as possible, and we will certainly respond through email at a later date. If you put your email in the along with the question.
- If you encounter any technical or audio problems during the Webinar, please contact zoom's technical support, and that link will be shared in the chat.
- With that I would like to introduce Dr. Heather Tubman Carbone.
- associate Deputy Director at the Us. Department of Justice office of justice programs to get us started, and to begin this Webinar.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:01:07

Thanks so much, David. Good afternoon, everyone, David said. Thank you so much for joining us. We are excited to have you all here today. We are even more excited to tell you about these guidelines and about some technical assistance opportunities, so you can put them to work in your jurisdictions.

- So first a quick note you'll be hearing from a handful of us today. We've got a lot of great folks on the line. I just want to give you a rundown of who we are.
- All right. So you just heard from David Demora, senior policy adviser at the Csu Justice Center. You'll hear from his make that in a moment.



Unknown Speaker

00:01:43

We're also joined by Dr. Sarah Demore, President of Policy Research Associates.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:01:48

Charles Robinson, Deputy Chief of Probation and Pretrial Services at the office of administration of the United States Court. I'm sorry the administrative office of the United States court sees more coffee. We are additionally joined by Stephen Fogg, Director of Governance and Strategic Initiatives at the Correctional Leaders Association

- by Darlene Webb, Director of Operations at the American Probation and Parole Association we are joined by Director and pre-site from the Missouri Department of Corrections by Brian, near a Solo deputy Commissioner of field services at the Massachusetts Probation Service and Mahise Tavares, a project manager at the Csd Justice Center.
- So today we'll be talking about 6 different topics all around these guidelines for transparency and fairness.
- You'll hear. Welcome an overview. I'll get us started on that in a second we'll describe the need for the guidelines sort of the origin story of this project.
- We'll offer a brief overview of the guidelines themselves, which were published last year. We'll share a practical application of the guidelines, and that's where you'll hear from. Folks like Director pre-sight to talk about what this means for the field.
- We'll talk about the technical assistance opportunity. And we will also describe some next steps, particularly if you are interested in pursuing the technical assistance. Next slide, please.
- before we jump into that, just a quick overview of who we are as the funder of this project as you heard, I'm. Heather, chubman, car, bone, and from Bureau of Justice Assistance. We are situated within the office of Justice programs.
- The office of Justice programs is an arm of the Department of Justice. We provide Grant funding training, research and statistics for the criminal justice community. You may have also heard of the cops office or Ovw. The office of violence against women we are one of the 3 grant-making components of Doj along with those other 2.
- Okay.
- And our mission is pretty specific. It's to provide leadership and services and grant administration to criminal justice policy development



Unknown Speaker

00:03:53

to support state, local and tribal justice strategies.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:03:57

Basically, we make grants and provide technical systems or fund to technical systems to help you solve the problems in your jurisdiction in a way that works for you. That's our purpose. That's what we're here to do

- Next slide, please. We are led by Director Carlton Moore. He was appointed by President Biden in February, 2022,



Unknown Speaker

00:04:17

and our agency at Bja is broken down into 4 offices. I'm. With the policy office. You can think of us as the areas that define programs and design funding opportunities. We've also got a programs office.



Unknown Speaker

00:04:30

This policy office is the what Programs office is the how is the financial management? And as I'm sure many of you, we've also got an operations office, and you may have heard as well of the public safety officer. But



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:04:43

the public safety officer benefits program



Unknown Speaker

00:04:46

to support



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:04:48

and provide benefits to survivors of foreign law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers. Next slide

- we have 5 major strategic focus areas. The first one is to improve public safety through measures that build trust with the community and ensure effective criminal justice systems.



Unknown Speaker

00:05:08

The second is to support reductions in recidivism and prevent unnecessary confinement and interactions with the justice system.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:05:16

The third strategic focus area is the integration of evidence-based and research-driven strategy into the day-to-day operations of bj a and the programs we administer and support

- the 4 strategic focus area is to increase program effectiveness with a renewed emphasis on data, analysis, information, sharing, and performance management.



Unknown Speaker

00:05:36

And in all of these we seek to ensure excellence through outstanding administration and oversight of our investments



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:05:44

next slide, please?

- And so the big question, how do we do that? How do we support the field? Most of you know us by our funding by the Grant fund that we push out to state local tribal and nonprofit agencies and organizations. So funding is a big one. There's also education. We support research



Unknown Speaker

00:06:00

and other deliverables to inform the field about what works.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:06:04

and then I think of the next one we call it equip. I also think of it as translation. How do we take what we know and make it something that you can use to change your practices? And that's that piece, I said earlier about changing the day to day work.

- and the last thing on here is partnership. So we consult. We connect, we convene, and this project is the result of a long-standing partnership with the Csu Justice Center
- next slide.
- Thank you. And this Project in particular, was born out of the justice, reinvestment, initiative that is, a data-driven approach to improve public safety, reduce corrections, and related criminal justice, spending and reinvest savings and strategies that can decrease crime and reduce reset of the notes.
- Just a 3 investment, or gr, as we call it. You may have heard of. That is a State level project that we go from State to state with our partners at the Csg. Justice Center and the Crime and Justice Institute.



Unknown Speaker

00:06:57

and where States are interested and where it's appropriate, help them apply a process to address their problems or their greatest challenges of the day, where they span most corporations of government or multiple agencies figure out what is happening. What do you want to be happening? And how do you bridge that delta in between.



Unknown Speaker

00:07:13

as we go, state to state and work on these challenges. We often hear things about close conviction, risk assessment, like I need this, but



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:07:22

or I know this is the right thing to do. But i'm not sure how to answer this question, and a storage and sundry other things on the topic, and we spend a lot of time supporting technical assistance all the time and money to help gas agencies answer those questions.



Unknown Speaker

00:07:37

And we realize, though when the Jri engagement is over, that technical assistance walks away.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:07:42

and at the same time there are states who are not engaged in justice reinvestment that have the same questions. So we wanted to make this sort of knowledge available to the field, and that is where this project was born.

- Next slide, please the Council State Government's Justice Center is a partner on justice reinvestment and other projects, with a Bureau of Justice Assistance. C. H. E. Justice Center is a national nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that combines the power of a membership association representing State officials in all 3 branches of government, with policy and research expertise to develop strategies that increase public safety and strength in communities
- through our work together on justice reinforcement. We identified this me that I just described, and Csg. Conceived of the project to increase communication and fairness and transparency around the use of post-conviction, risk assessments.
- So this project was born. We you'll hear in a few minutes about how and who were convened to put these together, and the resulting guidelines, and then how we plan to make that available



Unknown Speaker

00:08:48

to the field next slide, please.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:08:51

So, as I said earlier, we're going to walk through. I'm going to hand off to David in a second to ask you through some more background. Then we'll talk briefly about the guidelines and the big announcement. Here is a technical assistance opportunity. So you'll hear about the guidelines. So if you are to be using post conviction, risk assessment tools, brisk and need assessment tools



Unknown Speaker

00:09:09

in line with these guidelines, you might hear. Let's say one through 4 and say, yeah, we got it. We're doing those things great, but 5 through 7. We need a little bit of help on.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:09:18

We have a self-assessment tool You can take You'll hear about that, too. And then we're looking for anyone who needs it anyone in the field to raise your hand and say, hey, I need either very light touch, assistance, or I need more in-depth assistance to help me implement or make improvements related to X. Y. And Z. Guidelines.

- It's not an all or nothing proposition. Our hope is that agencies will see themselves and your needs and your



Unknown Speaker

00:09:41

successes, as well as areas that you want to improve in individual guidelines that are presented here, and then raise your hands for assistance. That will be provided at no cost to the agency.



Heather Tubman-Carbone (OJP)

00:09:52

So with that



Unknown Speaker

00:09:54

again thank you for joining us. I'm. Going to turn things over to David Mora at the Csu Justice Center.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:10:01

Thanks, Heather. I'd like to take a few moments and talk with folks about why we developed these guidelines. And what what is the need.

- There is, in fact, a need for a standardized, standardized approach to risk a needs assessment across the nation. What happens right now is that instruments tend to be used differently. They can be used differently from state to state, or frankly from county to county, within the State.
- What happens when that when that occurs is that the potential for increased disparities can be pretty dramatic.
- I've worked in many States where the same individual has different risk levels, just depending on which particular county that person was assessed. In what officer that may have done the assessment, or whether or not they were assessed within one department, say, probation versus another department say parole.
- It's the same person. But what happens are very different responses to that individual based on those different results.
- This really fuels, perceptions of unfairness as well as concerns over a lack of transparency. How did this happen? How did I get here? How did this score get developed? What were the things that were being looked at.
- How is it that this thing that is it, you know, affecting me? Or if i'm a family member is affecting somebody that I have? Who's in the criminal justice system? Or is the general population meeting the general public concerns about how are we getting to these results. And what happens next? Slide, please.
- Now, in fact, most states in the Us. Use risk assessment. We did a survey a few years back, and what we found was that looking at probation populations, for example, 45 States were reporting using risk assessment instruments. Now there were 5 states that didn't respond They either didn't respond.
- They reported that they didn't at that time use risk assessment, or somewhat concerningly, did not know whether or not they used risk and need assessment
- next slide, please. When we looked at parole populations, what we found there was that 48 States report using risk assessment instruments. Only 2 states that Don't have post custody, supervision, populations, Don't use risk assessments logically.
- Next slide, please.
- Then we look at the national coverage on risk, and needs assessment tools, and that coverage is really fueled concerns about disparate outcomes, particularly for people of color, and you can see some of the headlines here in law. 360 risk assessment tools are not a failed minority report
- in the crime report. There's no evidence of race bias and risk assessment. So sort of a response to some of those issues. On the other hand, you see another one headline here: Can racist algorithms be fixed concern over those underlying algorithms and the lack of transparency in many tools about those algorithms.
- And then, you see, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania's proposed risk assessment tool is racist. Critics say it's up for a vote this week anyway.
- and in the Boston Globe discrimination in the age of algorithms. So a lot of concern and a lot of concern in national publications that Aren't necessarily peer reviewed publications. Aren't. Necessarily.

- if you will, science based publications. But lots of concerns among the general public about the use of these tools and the impact or potential negative impact on people of color. Next slide, please.
- The coverage really did raise important questions about bias. And so again, you see here algorithmic decision making tools are only as smart as the inputs into the system that biases and data sets will not only be replicated in the results
- they may actually be exacerbated.
- and research shows that risk assessments often do not accurately predict risk and produce results that are biased against people of color, particularly African American.
- Then Senators, African Americans, then Senators Cory, Booker Richard Durbin, Kamal Harris, and Representative Sheila, Jackson, Lee, and John Lewis put out the statement, and these concerns are very real and very valid.
- Many times the concerns that are raised are attacking the wrong thing. In other words, sometimes
- the attack is against a risk and needs tool. That, in fact, may be accurately predicting. But unfortunately, what it's accurately predicting is the external bias in the system right? That maybe here people are more likely to be arrested than here if they are a person of color.
- Maybe here what happens for women is different than what happens somewhere else. And so, even when a tool is accurate.
- we have significant concerns in terms of how there can be disparate outcomes because of what's happening in the larger criminal justice system, whether that's law enforcement, the courts probation for role wherever it is that we're looking.
- And so we have a responsibility to not only make sure that the tools are accurate in terms of how they predict, make sure that the data sets are not biased.
- We also have a responsibility to look at how this works in the larger system, and how we need to make better decisions when we get the results of these tools, and we'll talk more about that a little bit later
- next slide, please.
- It is, in fact, true that historically many instrument validations Don't include a statistical test for accuracy across race ethnicity or gender. But the field has definitely been shifting in this area in the last 5 to 7 years. There is certainly a very
- clear and recognize concern that these are issues, and that in order for risk, and needs assessment to continue to be used.
- these have to be addressed, and it it. It is imperative that they continue to be used. I like perhaps many of the people in this Webinar remember when we did not have these tools, and we, when we made very poor decisions based on our clinical and professional judgment.
- and the bias that came through, unconscious or otherwise, in those decisions, and so to have tools that can help us be more accurate, be less biased, is incredibly important in in fighting the disparity that does exist in the criminal justice system.
- Next slide, please.
- There's also often a lack of transparency, and explaining the instruments. Use the fairness, the accuracy, to people who undergo the assessments, as as I mentioned,

earlier as well as other criminal justice stakeholders, and and also the broader public. And so what you know it's funny. I often.

- and sitting in a courtroom, for example, and i'm listening to a professional explaining this information, and they know exactly what they're saying.
- but how they're doing it, what they how they're presenting. It is not resonating with the people who are listening because they're explaining it out of how they think about the world, about how their own discipline and their own professional
- titles, if you will, in education, and the folks that are listening have different types of experiences and education in different areas, and Don't really get what it is that the individuals are talking about.
- This becomes even greater when we talk to the broader public as well as to those folks who are directly affected. So there's a significant issue in terms of how we communicate. This information is a significant issue, and making sure that when we're communicating it.
- or being very clear about what it is that the tools can and cannot do
- about how we reach the conclusions that we reached, and how we are attempting to utilize this information, to help people succeed as opposed to simply put them in a box of such as low or moderate, or high, or whatever particular types of labels that different jurisdictions use
- next slide, please.
- So the guidelines post 3 questions to help policymakers and practitioners. First of all, what degree of accuracy. Should the post conviction risk in these assessment instrument meet, what do we say? What do we say? It has to be at least as good as, or at least as accurate apps.
- Secondly, how can users best determine the fairness of the instruments across race, ethnicity, and gender, especially given, as I mentioned the history of bias and disparities that exist currently still exist in the criminal justice system.
- And then what way should information about the use of the instruments and their underlying algorithms be transparent and communicated publicly to all relevant stakeholders.
- Next slide, please.
- So the methodology in terms of developing these guidelines went a bit like this. The first one was looking at the existing research. What? What is out there? Because there's certainly a lot of research out there. You have to the problem is, it's not a whole one place. And so you have to take some time and gather all of that information and go through it.
- The second is
- really looking at the existing guidance about the use of risk, and needs assessment. And again, there's a lot of guidance out there once again, not all in one place, so gathering that the third piece was developing an advisory board of experts, which i'll show you in just a moment.
- and the fourth one was reaching out to folks outside of that advisory board as well, so that we had diverse voices involved talking to folks who are advocates for people who have been hurt by someone in the system talking to advocates who are advocating for fairness for those people who are in the criminal justice system.

- talking to folks that are outside the world of risk, assessment or research, talking to practitioners, talking to public stakeholders.
- getting as many voices as we could in order to understand
- not only the concerns, but also some of the best ways that we could then communicate what we were trying to do to a variety of individuals
- next slide, please.
- So the 26 member Advisory group and I won't. Go through all of these. But what you will see here? Are folks from a lot of different places. You will see a lot of researchers and and leaders in the in the field of risk, and needs assessment. You will also see folks that are practitioners and working day in and day out. They may not have been developing the tools, but they're utilizing the tools, or they're responsible for implementing the tools or for developing policy about the tools.
- And so we wanted to get as many of those folks as we could to work with us. One thing I do want to point out is that you will see One of our advisors was Dr. Editor.
- and sadly
- passed away this past year. It is our honor to really take all of the guidelines here, and dedicate them to Dr. La Tessa and his many years of incredible work, and what he's done in moving the field forward is lost and deeply felt. But we are very pleased to be able to dedicate this work to him.
- Next slide, please.
- The guidelines address gaps, and how tools are administered, and they provide additional benefits. First of all, they help us make better decisions, which is ultimately one of the big goals. We want to have right helps reduce bias, which is again, a key issue
- helps increase accuracy.
- and it helps promote both rehabilitation of the individual and public safety which are not dueling goals. Those are both go holes that are equal in importance, and frankly.
- without doing one. You're not going to have the other and so the guidelines really look at how tools are administered in order to improve all of these 4 areas
- next slide please
- These guidelines are post-conviction, they pertain to the use of post-conviction, risk, and these assessment instruments in order to help inform decisions in case planning that occur after court disposition specifically after conviction and sentencing.
- They may also be used in the application of assessment results to inform decision making in case planning in the context of alternative forms of process, criminal justice processing, such as after a decision has been made to offer a diversion program to someone
- next slide, please.
- And with that it is my pleasure to turn this over to Dr. Sarah Demore, who was our consultant and key author on the guidelines. And so it is with great pleasure that I asked Dr. Demore to take us through the guidelines.



Sarah L. Desmarais, Policy Research Associates

00:22:31

Thanks, David. I'm really thrilled to be here with you all today, and really talk about the work that we put in for years. Truly, on developing what we thought would be very comprehensive, very clear and very relevant Guidelines for the field Next slide, please.

- The guidelines were officially launched last year, August thirtieth 2,022
- on Bj's public safety risk assessment clearing coast website and also on the Csg Justice center website. So you can see those 2 links there. These materials are all available for free download, and there will be more referencing of different resources that are available online.
- Next slide, please.
- The guidelines are divided into 4 categories or 4 sections of guidelines. The first pertains to accuracy in the use of risk and needs assessment results; the second pertains to fairness.
- the third pertains to transparency in the process and in the results; and then the fourth is relating to the communication and use, and really about with increasing effectiveness in the field.
- I'm going to talk about each of these in turn, and i'm going to go through, and i'm going to start with the definition, because you would say that these terms are clear, and everybody understands them in the same way.
- But really it's important for us to be kind of grounded in these definitions, and to understand how we interpreted each of these terms as we move forward.
- So first, when we talk about accuracy, accuracy refers to the degree to which assessment results predict the recidivism outcomes they were designed to predict as indicated by the observed rate and severity of the criminal behavior, as well as the identification of individuals at greater and lesser risk of recidivism.
- determining accuracy will also involve considering whether the post-conviction risk and need this assessment. Instruments are completed and used as intended to inform case decisions and planning within facilities and within the community.
- So here just grounding our work in the use and understanding how we view accuracy in this process. Next slide, please.
- So we had 4 guidelines. I'm. Going to provide these at the highest level. But then, in the materials that are available online, we provide action, steps and guidance for each of those action steps in terms of how an agency can truly implement these guidelines and practice.
- So the first guideline is that we conduct a local evaluation of the post-conviction, risk and needs assessment instrument to ensure that the instrument is suitable for that agency's population.
- This is really one of the first times that this has been said as a national guideline, although many of us in the field have been sending, say this for a long time, that we believe in the value of local evaluation
- as part of the local evaluation. I'm going to talk a little bit more about the statistical standards. But when we're speaking of local evaluation, we mean about to refer to both the accuracy and fidelity of the assessment. So, making sure that assessors know how to complete the assessments and what information goes where

- we also are talking about the validity of the results, so the degree to which that the assessment results are indeed predicting the recidivism outcomes. They are intended to predict.
- We also believe that ideally, that this local evaluation would happen before an agency implements. These tools and practice that doesn't mean it has to, and we'll talk a little bit more so. If you have you, you're with an agency that implemented without doing a local evaluation. As has already been shared, there will be opportunities for technical assistance in the future.
- So the second guideline around accuracy was really bringing this large advisory boards together and coming up with consensus around what are the minimum performance thresholds of post-conviction risk and needs assessment results completed in the field.
- So really drilling down and defining the statistical standards. Those metrics that indicate that you have good or better integrator reliability, that you have good or better predictive validity. And we talk about this in terms of the assessments overall the population of people for whom these evaluations are being completed.
- as well as looking at this as a function of race ethnicity and gender.
- The third guideline under accuracy is to use a continuous quality improvement process to ensure successful implementation of the post conviction, risk and needs assessment instrument.
- David and myself and others. On this Webinar. I'm. Sure many others who are joining us as participants have been involved in various stages of implementation, and know just how hard that can be in the real world.
- And so here, in this section of the guidelines, we provide strategies. We provide guidance to really try to reduce some of the guesswork of how often you need to be doing evaluations, what the training protocols might need to look like.
- How would you go about doing a case audit or supervise other people who are completing these assessments.
- So in this section we really provide guidance to the field around how to make sure that these tools continue to be used accurately in practice.
- Then, finally, the fourth guideline under accuracy is about the need for a multi-step approach to assessing risk and needs assessment over time as a function of which instrument has been selected
- so many of the instruments that we refer to in the guidelines, and that folks are using in the field include dynamic factors. In other words, factors that can change over time.
- So if agencies are using
- post conviction, risk and needs assessments that include dynamic factors, factors that can change. Then we provide guidance around. How often you should be re-administering these assessments? In other words, if we think that the factors can change so too, could be assessment results. And so we provide guidance in that way.
- The other thing that we do in this multi-step approach, which is not necessary on all cases. But again, depending on specific tool selection
- is to describe the difference between and the need for steps. When you use risk screening tools as well as post conviction, risk and needs assessment tools.

- So we distinguish between screening and assessment, and we describe how, over time those 2 types of tools work together, and I won't. Get into the details today, although happy to get on my Professor's soapbox at some point. But
- that is part of what we describe here to really ensure that agencies have the language and understanding of how these tools differ, but also how these tools work together
- next slide, please.
- So the next section of these guidelines all relate to fairness, and we have a lot of conversation, and did a lot of work around understanding and arriving at a clear definition of fairness in this context. So for our
- guidelines, fairness is the degree to which assessment results have the same meanings and applications across groups defined by race ethnicity, gender or other characteristics, such as mental illness.
- fairness should be considered in the development, validation and implementation of post-conviction risk and needs assessments next slide, please.
- So this has been as David alluded to earlier. We're a lot of the conversation the media coverage and the discourse has been around post- conviction risk and needs assessment in the last 5 to 7 years. And this is really important, and we feel like this is really where we are pushing the field forward in many important ways.
- So the first guideline under fairness is that you must examine the results of the post-conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments for predictive bias and disparate impact across groups.
- And again, we provide much more detail in the materials, but very briefly predictive bias refers to the degree to which these results are estimating or forecasting risk in the same way across across groups.
- Now this print impact refers to whether or not they are being applied to inform decisions in the same way across groups. So these are 2 very important distinctions, and we provide guidance in the guidelines regarding how you look at. And consider both of those issues.
- The guideline number 6 Around Under fairness is apply the post-conviction risk and needs assessment instrument results to individual cases in keeping with the risk, need responsibility. Principles
- so very briefly risk need responsibility. I'm. Sure most of you are familiar. Risk relates to the allocation of resources being proportionate to the individual's risk
- need, refers to targeting criminogenic factors that for that person relate to their recidivism, risk.
- and responsibility is doing so in a way considering individual and contextual factors that will be most likely to promote both successful rehabilitation as well as public safety.
- So this is a well accepted model in our field, and what we do here is tie our guidelines to understand and advance the work in terms of using these principles to improve fairness in our decision making processes
- 7 is about adopting strategies agency-wise. That will help minimize the potential that local implementations of any given post-conviction, risk and needs assessment instrument will not promote disparities. And so here, going above and beyond, looking at the instrument itself.

- moving into strategies and policies that agencies can locally implement. To really ensure that we are achieving the goals of reducing racial and ethnic and gender disparities.
- Next slide, please.
- So the next guidelines are the next set of guidelines relate to transparency. So transparency refers to how information about the content, the structure, and the application of these instruments is disseminated to stakeholders. And we define that stakeholder group very broadly as David alluded to to include system stakeholders.
- those working in the criminal justice system, those who are participating in the system and effective by the system as well as the community or the general public.
- So transparency is relevant in both the development and implementation of post conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments. And really I mean a take home message here is that it requires proactive communication
- next slide, please.
- So, guideline Number 8 is that we provide system stakeholders with relevant information on the development intended use and validation of post conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments. So this is guidance that relates to individuals who are involved in the development of instruments.
- individuals who are involved in the validation of instruments as well as agencies, who are involved in the implementation of the instruments, and we provide guidance to all those groups. Number 9 is develop a written policy that guides the local use of post-conviction risk and needs assessment instruments.
- And so here this is a written policy that says who the assessment results will be if the assessment will be completed on
- who the assessment results will be disseminated to, and how, and also gives transparency in terms of understanding for individual assessors. When and how these things should be implemented.
- Number 10 is communicating the strength and the limitations of post-conviction risk and needs assessment instruments to the general public understanding. That in the general public is also a key stakeholder in the implementation of post-conviction risk and needs assessment instruments.
- as David shared earlier. We don't always communicate about assessment results, or the assessments themselves to audiences in ways that might be understandable. We tend to get into our own fields and use our lingo and our language. So here we provide guidance about how we should be communicating the strengths and limitations of these instruments, and it covers a lot of what we already talk about in 9 and 8.
- But for consumption by the general public. So we provide some strategies there. Next slide, please.
- The last section of the guidelines refers to communication and use, and what we acknowledge here is that the manner in which individual assessment results are communicated and can greatly affect their impact on decision making, and consequently their effectiveness.
- We've seen time and time again in the field and in research, and just in practice, that improper communication of individual assessment results can undermine our efforts

to vote accuracy, fairness, and transparency in the use of post-conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments.

- And thus we believe this should be a key consideration in any implementation. In essence. These last few guidelines really help support our ability to achieve accuracy, fairness, and and transparency.
- Next slide, please.
- So neither. I item Number 11. Here is anchoring communication of assessment results in the R and our principles. So again, in the same way that we're, seeing that you should be applying the assessment results consistent with R. Andr. We also provide a framework for communicating results, using the R. Andr. Principles.
- Item number or sorry guideline. Number 12 is contextualizing the results of the post conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments.
- This one really relates also to transparency. So here we are talking about putting parameters and being clear on the kinds of information that were was used to complete the assessment results. The circumstances in which the assessment results were derived.
- and the circumstances in which they should be applied. So again, providing context for understanding the assessment results, and not to act as if the assessment results exist in a void.
- The third and final guideline is about developing a template for how we communicate individual results of post-conviction, risk and needs assessment instruments to all relevant stakeholders, including the individual being assessed
- We recommend really frankly, multiple templates. We're not going to necessarily communicate to the court in the same way we can. We would communicate to the individual being assessed.
- So Here again, we provide strategies and actions that would help each of those individual recipients of information. Those different stakeholder groups receive this information a way that is most understandable and most sort of digestible for them to really understand the results of individual assessments.
- Next slide, please.
- So with that I'm. Going to hand it over to David.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:38:06

Thanks, Sarah.

- One of the things that you keep hearing is we're talking about the guidelines as we keep talking about risk and needs assessment. And we're doing that very purposely and very consciously, because what's happened too often in the field is, we just talk about risk assessment.
- and then we start thinking of risk in terms of dangerousness, which is not what the R. And our models are.

- That is not what the honor in our model was developed to do. And, in fact, arguably, the risk part of the R. And R model is among the less important components of it right because the needs of the dynamic components that need to be changed.
- and responsibility is the way to be able to impact folks in order for them to make those changes. And so we very purposefully wanted to make sure that as we talked about this, and as we talk with you about this, that we're constantly talking about risk and needs
- assessment and not shortcutting it to risk assessment, because that has really caused some implementation problems across the country.
- With that i'd like to introduce
- Deputy Chief Charles Robinson from the permission and pretrial Services office at the administrative office of the Us. Courts, to talk a little bit about the practical applications of the guidelines.



Charles Robinson

00:39:29

Hey, David? Thanks a lot for me. This project has been a lot of fun and a great learning experience.

- I think the guidelines do a really good job of providing agencies something that's long overdue, I think, for many of us, whether you're in the process of adopting an instrument, or if you're like many other places.
- you've already adopted an instrument. The guidelines give you the principles you need to really make sure you're doing that with quality. I think they also provide a way for organizations to hold themselves accountable.
- I think there are several benefits for organization. So if you dive right in here, you see, we have some of those listed here. We have clarity, and when we talk about clarity, we're really talking about use and limitations of the instrument.
- What should the instrument be used for, and how should the an instrument be used? And I think, David, you and Sarah, you both mentioned confidence, and being able to communicate around the instrument, and I think the guidelines provide some practical
- advice about what we can do in that space, and certainly working with one of the areas that I think has been a hurdle for many organizations. It's sustainable implementation and getting the instruments scored with and used with
- fidelity. So I think the guidelines do a really good job of moving organizations forward in that space. And, Sarah, you've been talking about, and, David, you just mentioned the R. And R. Model.
- and when it comes to resourcing, I think you guys have done a really good job
- talking about that. And for me the last one that you see here, reduce disparities in cost is of paramount importance to me for organizations. When you talk about understanding the difference in outcomes across race gender and some of the other areas, and understanding how disparities

- might be influenced by the instrument that is of paramount importance. And I think the guidelines do a good job of telling us how to
- address those things. And more importantly, I think, once we understand disparities, it'll help us think about how we can put in mitigation strategies. One of the things I'll do real quick is dive a little bit deeper into resource allocation. And I know, for organizations, especially in
- situations like many of us find ourselves in now we're funding is a bit different or a bit leaner than maybe it has been in past years. We're thinking about how we can make things work and using risk assessment to really make decisions about who gets services
- is going to be a really valuable thing for organization, and could give some the confidence to shift resources where they need to. So I think, when it comes to practical benefits when organizations are sitting down with the strategic plan and deciding on where they want to make adjustments for budget reasons.
- This is a great way to think about that, and a great way to guide that decision with research. Who can I not provide services to when you think about low-risk people and the likelihood of success for them.
- I think that's an area where you can start to shift some of your resources as an organization. Next slide, please.
- The next group of people, when you talk about benefits for me is a primary. When you think about stakeholders for the system, and it's the individual that's being supervised by our agencies.
- For me, they are often in a room without a voice, and these guidelines give voice to some of the things that they are involved with related to our agencies, whether it be service delivery, or whether it be any of the other things that we do around public safety.
- I think these guidelines as a benefit for the client
- give the officer the information they need to work with the climate.
- I think that's one of the biggest benefits that the client will see is that it restructures the relationship and the the working the lines between the individual under supervision and the officer, and I think it allows the officer to do a couple of things
- mit ctl, and one make decisions about what services to provide and to make decisions about what services might be unnecessary. It might be more of an impediment to success rather than a necessary part of the change process. So I think 150.
- The person or the individual that's under supervision will see a number of benefits from doing this work, and certainly, when it comes to mitigation of bias, not only in sort of the instrument itself, but in service, delivery and expectations. I think you can see how these instruments can help us do
- some of those things next slide, please.
- Yeah, I think the next group is the broader stakeholder pool, and I think often for many of us who've been involved in the implementation of risk assessments at the local level. This becomes a major concern often, because
- folks don't
- mit ctl and trust the instrument. Many consider it a black box, and I think these guidelines do a great job of helping practitioners and leaders have conversations

about the instrument, have conversations about what the findings are, what the output of the instrument, 150,

- I mean, for the person have conversations with stakeholders about what information is used to generate the outcome. Sarah, I think some of the things that you were talking about really fit in this box, and I think stakeholders can really
- see themselves as part of the process, and see themselves as a collaborative partner, and really get the benefit
- from these guidelines. So next slide, please.
- Yeah. And I think this is the last group that we talk about here, and it's a partnership that we have with researchers like Sarah and others who can really help us work through some of the expectations. In my experience, having researchers who can guide you through
- the validation process and some of the test against
- disparities and bias that you you here talked about here is
- so valuable.
- you you you really need that partnership with researchers and partners, with people who understand how to conduct these tests. To really know that what you're doing is getting you to the best place and getting the best report best results. Excuse me, so I think working with researchers
- is going to be one of the more valuable things that comes out of this when you talk about partnerships with stakeholders and with others. So I think for me.
- if I want to be really practical about
- the benefits here for researchers.
- I think my experience has taught me that people like Sarah know the questions to ask. and they know how to help you build the continuous quality, improvement
- infrastructure that's necessary or sustainable implementation. So I think working with them can really help not only leaders.
- but the people that are doing the assessments on the ground every day.
- So next slide.
- Yeah, I think we're up to next steps. Now, David, back to you.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:47:20

Thanks so much, Charles appreciate that we had a question that we'll just respond to quickly before we go into next steps. So one of the questions that we were asked was, Can we say more on improper communication of risk and need assessments, so can can we share more about the wrong way to share results?

- And and Of course there are multiple ways in terms of sharing results, poorly, including whether or not people lead with the needs and what can be done to help the client move forward, or just

- sort of save your high risk, and they start to stop there. But there are, as I said, there are multiple ways, and Sarah is going to jump in here as well, and talk a little bit about it from a Shall we say more technical perspective?



Sarah L. Desmarais, Policy Research Associates

00:48:06

Sure, thanks, David. This is a great question, and i'm not going to provide a completely satisfactory answer, because, frankly, I could give a whole seminar on all the wrong ways to communicate risk and needs assessment results.

- So what we do is highlight strategies that have been shown in communication science as better ways to communicate information, so ways that will really result in you having the audience pay attention to the right information and receive that information in the most understandable way.
- I'll just give a couple of examples, and then again encourage you to dig deep into that 60 page document for more and more guidance there, because we do review a lot of specific strategies. One that David talked about is considering the order of information.
- So we know from psychology and communication science that the order of information matters and frames how you receive the rest of the information. So if you start with, let's say, just like as David alluded to, this person is at this risk level.
- then provide all the reasons why you think they should be released. That might not be an effective approach. So we provide some guidance around order of information. Another thing that we do is provide guidance around specificity in the language, so to be as specific as possible. So, for example.
- saying that this person's results, place them in a risk level, instead of attributing a state of risk to that person permanently. So when we say this person is a high risk person that is very different than saying the assessment results. Place this person in this risk level, or at this level of risk.
- Those are just 2 really concrete examples of clarifications that we do in the document.
- We also say how we should contextualize the results. For example, if the assessment instrument specifies a certain timeframe over which these assessment results are essentially valid.
- So again, we'll go into all the details, but those are just a few examples that come up for me off the top my head to this for this question.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:50:19

Thanks, Sarah. Appreciate it. Next steps. Well, couple of things first of all. Next slide, please.

- We
- are fortunate that the American Probation and Parole Association and the Correctional Leaders Association have agreed to partner with us on this work, and we have folks from those associations with us today, and would like to just give each of them a few minutes to chat with you about
- what they do, and and working with us, and I will start by asking Darling Webb, who's the Director of Operations at a Ppa. To chime in. And then, after that I will ask Stephen Fox, so darlene.



Darlene Webb

00:51:03

sure with American probation and pro association. We are a nonprofit membership organization where we have a place for probation and prol officers, community correction officers

- to be come together and be trained. We also have a Grant division, a very large grand division, or should I say, a very large grant a set of grants.
- but we train around the the United States on various topics and bring these people together. We just finished around the first time original trainings. This was our
- our first first go of it, and we did 5, and we invited David and the team to present.
- and a platform in front of the entire crowd at each 5 of the regionals at a plenary session, so that they could present this to everyone that attended. So I think this is



Unknown Speaker

00:52:16

a place that we can use a Ppa as a conduit to get this information out to probation, prol community supervision officers.



Darlene Webb

00:52:26

We can use our social medium, we can use any of our

- contacts, and
- we have a by monthly newsletter that goes out that we have at least 40,000 individuals that are signed up for that. So this this is a conduit that we can use for
- Csg Justice Center, and to get this type of information out to a broader set of people.
- and we brought Travis Johnson on board. He is our technical assistance and Grant, manager for a ppa, and he'll talk about the the collaborating and technical assistance.



Travis Johnson

00:53:20

Yeah, everybody. I'm. Travis Johnson. So yeah, with this, Grant, I know you mentioned earlier that there was going to be some possible Ta: on site or virtually. So. Yeah, we'll be available to help with any of that in the partnership to provide the technical assistance and training

- and all the aspects of this project based on what the Justice Center wants. So we'll be there to help out. And I mean, that's about all I've got to say about it.



Darlene Webb

00:53:42

Yeah.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:53:43

thanks, darling. Thanks. Travis. Appreciate it. Forward to working with you

- Next slide, please.
- We are also fortunate to be able to partner with the Correctional Leaders Association, and we have with us today Stephen Flag, who is the director of governance and strategic initiatives, and that would like to turn it over to you for some some thoughts as well please.



Stevyn Fogg, CLA

00:54:09

Great. Thank you so much. I'm pleased to be here today and see a is honored to be a part of this initiative, As some of you may know, our members are the Ceos of all 50 States for Territories, for large jail systems and military corrections.

- and our members oversee 400,000 correctional professionals, and approximately 8 million incarcerated individuals, and those individuals who are under probation and parole
- in general, we are committed to influencing policy and practices that affect public public safety. Sorry and partnering on this project is one of the ways that we do this.
- and one of the things that we have pushed forward from day one is being a data informed. And so this data information a data inform approach helps us with prison management and reform.
- But you know one of the important things is making sure that the data that we rely on is accurate, impactful, and that it can demonstrate long term benefits so many years ago still a form day racial disparity. Committee and similar to this project.
- We have implemented a self-assessment tool which helps our members to determine where. And if there are inequities.
- biases, disparities, and operational and programmatic decision making. And so in the spirit of transparency, I remember, share their data with their peers and with others at our national conferences and regional meetings and at our symposia.
- And so what this does is it? It helps to learn the feel to what we're doing. It allows us to identify resources, to directly address issues under a members control, such as the risk guidelines in the tools. So we're really pleased to be able to pull our resources
- and our expertise with others like Bj. A. And Csg. To advance our mission in our vision. And, in fact, I just want to share that we were fortunate to have David and Ruby Castle Bos from Bj. A
- talk about this project at our recent winter conference. and that winter Conference is one of the 10 events that we host
- each year that allows for, you know networking among our correctional leaders, but also others who have a vested interest in the things that we're interested in as well, and so bringing resources to our our directional correctional leaders is is paramount, but also pushing it up to the field and being impactful is also important. So, in addition to exposing our members through our events
- similar to Apa and the others. You know we will be broadcasting what we're doing and how we're working together on a social media feed. We will be hearing internally at our various webinars and other meetings and galvanizing
- correctional leaders to make sure that we're available to provide that expertise in that. Input. So
- we're ready to get to work, and we're really pleased to be a part of this. Thank you so much.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

00:57:31

Thank you, Steven, Appreciate it.

- We wanted you to also hear from a correctional leader and from a probation leader. And so we have asked a couple of them to speak with you. And first of all, I'd like to ask Director Pre-sides to perhaps say a bit about the Guidelines and and the importance to correctional leaders, and then we will
- ask Brian Marcelo from from Massachusetts to also speak a bit so, Director.



Anne Precythe

00:57:59

Thank you, David. It is such a pleasure to be here. I have to say, I have been involved in Evidence-based practice work for over 20 years now I've been with corrections for over 35 years

- and in 20 years. I can tell you. It is finally wonderful to be able to see all of this key information in one location. This is truly a one-stop document
- for leaders and practitioners in this field.
- I am very excited because I remember back 20 years ago, beginning this journey in North Carolina.
- we were searching the Internet and grasping for all types of information. This is a trusted source with the Council of State Governments, Justice Center and Bja Partnering together to bring this information to you.
- It is so exciting, and I I could quote Charles. I could quote Sarah and Steven. There's just so much good information, and the question about how can information be
- communicated inaccurately.
- having been on the front line of probation and parole, and being in the courtroom, and being in probation and parole hearings. it's purely accidental
- people do the best they can to communicate what they know or what they're thinking of at that time. Now there's a document that is user friendly. It is easy for anybody on the front line or in leadership, to understand
- and really help
- practitioners understand how to communicate. Why are we doing a validated instrument. Why are we paying attention to needs? Because, if needs Aren't addressed, they turn into risk.
- So it's all of those simple things. And then my mind went back to judges.
- and how
- difficult it can be for probation officers in the courtroom to be able to explain to a judge the importance of why we're doing a risk and needs instrument, and what that

instrument is doing to help us understand how to manage and case plan with that individual through the course of their supervision.

- So the transparency piece, I think, is critical, and we don't need to be afraid of what we're doing. We should be proud of how we're doing it, and that we have validated instruments, and we're doing them
- fidelity to the model, and that we're delivering the message correctly. If it's a secret what we're doing. We shouldn't be doing it. And so to be able to explain to the individuals that we're trying to help to be able to explain to the courts what we're doing to be able to explain to law, enforcement
- and the general public. I'm just so very proud of this document and appreciate being given the opportunity to get a sneak peak and give some initial feedback.
- It's just a fabulous document, and I'm really very proud of everybody who worked on it, and very thankful and appreciative for a document like this at this time in my career. So thank you, David, for your leadership on this, and I hope people will take time to look at it, and certainly make it available to all those who have interest in how to further the conversation.
- So thank you.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:01:29

Thanks so much, Director. We appreciate your work with us over the years, and and that your willingness to share

- your your views and to help us really think about the best ways to communicate to folks who are not just researchers or statisticians, etc.
- With that I I would like folks to hear from probation as well. And so, Brian, if you would be so kind.



Brian Mirasolo

01:01:56

you know kind of piggybacking off of Director Preset, and a lot of what you know, Charles had said earlier.

- You know, this projects in these national guidelines are really critical to the success of the work Practitioners do around the country day in and day out.
- and the the great thing about the guidelines specifically is they they really do provide a bit of a roadmap to success for an organization on that, and you know both that kind of the administrative level. And at the you know, the line level where officers are dealing with probationers every day.

- You know probation. We're we're definitely in the business of helping people achieve positive behavior change.
- And these guidelines are really rooted in.
- You know the risk need responsibility, principles taking those putting them into a case plan.
- you know, for an individual understanding how to do that really is the foundation to help set somebody up for success in an evidence-based way in the field of community corrections
- and the Guidelines help organizations kind of set that up internally
- which you know will lead, I I think, earlier in the call. Better decisions, you know, increased accuracy
- reductions in bias and really important, the promotion of rehabilitation and public safety. You know, those 2 things are not mutually exclusive.
- They they really go together in helping somebody actually
- achieve positive behavior. Change does lead to increased public safety. I know, just in Massachusetts we we've been lucky enough to work with David and the you know
- Council State governments.
- You know we use the public domain tool. We've had it validated locally. We've established integrated reliability. We're actually starting to prepare a revalidation at this point.



Unknown Speaker

01:04:06

But we've also established policies in continuous quality improvement work



Brian Mirasolo

01:04:11

really to ensure fidelity for our processes and for the you know the accuracy of the work we're doing, and we've hired a team of coaches.

- you know, around the State to focus specifically on, you know.
- continuous quality improvements rooted in these kind of foundational, risk-needed and responsibility principles along with case planning.
- and the guidelines, at least on my end, have been very, very helpful around communication. I know others have really talked about the importance of communication in helping people understand.
- You know, in a lot of different kind of ways

- what we're doing when we do actually sit down and assess somebody and take. You know the findings of that, and hopefully establish a case plan. That's very much, you know, individualized for that particular person to connect them with the right kind of treatment or services, and.
- you know, really inform our supervision strategy in a good way, so that we can help model and skill, build as well with the person on that end. And you know, I think the guidelines really just.
- you know.
- are are pretty amazing on that. And in helping agencies get to a better place around the country. As I know, we're always all looking to improve. So
- thanks, David.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:05:38

Thanks, Brian. I appreciate it as well.

- I now have the pleasure of turning this over to and before I do that.
- I would just want to mention that he has been on this project with Sarah and myself from the very beginning, and it is due in no small part to her incredible work and support over these last few years that we are where we are today. So one thank you again.
- and 2 now. She has some exciting news around technical assistance to share with folks.



Lahiz Tavaréz (CSG)

01:06:11

Thank you, David, and thank you, everyone to all of our speakers for joining us today. So let's talk about next steps for this project, as you've heard Throughout the presentation the new material is not a new risk, and needs assessment instrument.



Unknown Speaker

01:06:27

Right? So rather it's a set of guidelines for improving your use of risk, and and needs assessment instruments.



Lahiz Tavarez (CSG)

01:06:35

So in that suite of resources there are 5 available. You will see a screenshot of the main page for the guidelines here, and you will find the link to that page in the chat.

- These, for resources and the guidelines themselves were developed with a variety of audiences in mind. So the 5 resources, you'll find, are a pair of FAQ documents, one aimed at legislators and the other one for agency administrators.
- The FAQ documents outline Why, the national guidelines are needed, what the guidelines do and the benefits of the guidelines. There is also an executive summary document, and that practitioners and a longer deep dive companion publication aimed at researchers and others who are charged with implementing the guidelines.
- The fifth resource that you'll see. Here is the self-assessment tool
- So the self-assessment tool provides a report to agencies on the implementation status of each of the national guidelines for your respective agency. It allows you to rate each of the guidelines and its subcommittee on a scale ranging from not plan to fully implemented
- we recommend that the self-assessment be completed by people responsible for selecting or implementing post-confection risk and needs assessment instruments, developing related policy and making decisions regarding their use.
- The self-assessment tool can be completed multiple times to track implementation progress. Over time
- you can access the self assessment@www.risk self-assessment. You can also find that link through
- the link in the chat from our web page.
- We have a new visualized report which will be available in the next couple of weeks for agencies to complete the self assessment, and that will be a great tool for you to be able to visualize those



Unknown Speaker

01:08:33

That is better.



Lahiz Tavarez (CSG)

01:08:36

So let's talk about the new opportunities for technical assistance.

- The through these opportunities they will make available 2 rounds of applications. One is starting in March, of 2,023. So later this month.
- and another in early 2,024 up to 16 different sites will be selected for level 2 or level 3 ta
- throughout the 2 year. Grant period. Thus 8 per year, and we'll discuss in just a bit what those levels mean.
- Sites that are selected will receive ta ranging from low to moderate to high intensity all sites selected or requesting technical assistance will receive tailored services based on identified needs and goals that are discussed with our project team.
- There will also be pure connection opportunities available in order to engage with other selected sites and learn from one another.
- So there are 3 levels available of technical assistance
- for level. One state, local and tribal jurisdictions will be able to request ta on an ongoing basis all the way through 2,024 for level. 2 up to 6 sites will be selected per year, and for level 3 up to 2 sites will be selected per year.
- A full application process is required to receive level 2 or level threeta. and we'll discuss that application process shortly. But let's first talk about what ta for each of these levels looks like
- for a level. One ta consists of low intensity, technical assistance. Where the length of da is less than 3 months. there are no limits on how many sites can request level Oneta.
- These are seen more as one-time request which can include short-term assistance with adopting any of the guidelines requests for resources, and can also include peer connections or expert consultations
- for each level of ta. There is also an agency commitment component through level one T. A. The agency commits to completing the self-assessment tool and signing up for ongoing Ca resources and opportunities
- Level 2 consists of moderate intensity, technical assistance to be provided for up to 6 sites for up to a one-year period
- ta services for level. 2 will incorporate any services provided to level one as well as a virtual kick off events. Monthly ta calls and conversations to help guide strategy, development, policy, review and implementation.
- as well as a more intense implementation progress tracking through level twota. The agency commits to all of the commitments for level one
- as well as completing the self assessment tool at regular 6, 12 and eighteenth month intervals.
- sharing agency policy and procedures, and examining racial equity as well as participating in the peer. Learning events
- Level 3 consist of high intensity, technical assistance to be provided to up to 2 sites for up to a one year period
- ta services for level 3 will incorporate any services provided to levels one and 2,
- as well as the ability for site visits which will allow for onsite assessments of quality and fidelity practices.

- It will also include onsite and or virtual focus groups, trainings, and meetings. For these selective sites. We will also offer meeting, call, facilitation and additional implementation assistance
- through level threeta. The agency commits to all commitments for level one and 2, as well as sharing aggregate data and supporting onsite activities.
- So corrections and community supervision agency administrators can maximize this. Ta Bab is committing to improve the use of their assessments improving transparency about processes being willing to engage by sharing challenges and learning with our other selected sites.
- and by the collaborative engagement through ta and surveys that will be provided
- to fully implement the national guidelines. It is important for agencies to examine data from a race equity lens to ensure tools are used proper appropriately receiving. Ta will help establish your agency as a leader in the field on risk assessments, and we want agencies to be able to share their experiences with peers to assist other agencies with adopting the national guidelines.
- corrections that community supervision agencies who are working on adopting the guidelines on their own can apply for a technical assistance on a short-term basis. And this is what level one is. In order to request level oneta
- agencies must complete the level. One Ca: request for which can be accessed through our website as well. As complete a self-assessment will submission
- through the request form. You will be able to identify your needs and share any additional details as to how we can best assist you. This opportunity will also become available later this month
- Level 2 and level threeta opportunities will allow state and local state, local or tribal jurisdictions responsible for the administration of post-confiction risk, and needs assessment of adults in their community to apply for technical assistance.
- county supervision agencies, or multiple county supervision agencies applying together will also be considered
- jurisdictions that wish to examine their instruments that may be specifically related to assessing women in the criminal justice system, or tribal members who are supervised by state, local, or tribal nation.
- Super Efficient agency will be given priority. Consideration. Opportunities for this will be made available later this month.
- If you are applying for level 2 or level 3 Ta, you will need to complete the online application form.
- provide letters of support from agency oversight bodies and the chief executive of any partner agencies, including your own.
- Develop a narrative demonstrating how your agency meets the selection criteria which is outlined in the request for applications, document.
- as well as the agencies need for ta and commitment to the national guidelines. Additionally, all applicants must complete a self assessment tool submission.
- There are 5 steps to the site. Selection Process. First sites will complete the application, form
- and perform the initial assessment through the self-assessment tool.
- Second, the Csu Justice Center will gauge the site status goals. And needs. Third, the Csi Justice Center will identify an engagement strategy and what we can offer.

- Fourth, the Csi Justice Center will review applications based on the selection criteria and make recommendations to Bj.
- And finally Bj. We'll review the recommendations and select Ta. Sit in conjunction with the Csg. Justice Center.
- By participating in this project, selected sites will have the opportunity to become national leaders in implementing, cutting edge strategies for improving the accuracy, fairness and communication and use of post-conviction. Risk and these assessments.
- The guidelines provide practical measures. Your agency can take. whether you are continuing to use the same instrument that has been in place for years, or are considering, adopting a new one.
- Participating state and local jurisdictions can receive written resources, and in-person and distance-based trainings along with consistent one on one outreach and support.
- If you are not applying for technical assistance. There is still many other ways to become involved. You can start by reviewing
- our suite of resources available for a variety of audiences.
- You can take the self assessment to evaluate the status of your Agency's efforts in preparation for adopting the national guidelines. Later on you can sign up for a new setter to just stay up to date on any opportunities and future resources for this product.
- And if you, if you have any questions, you can submit a request, you can use the same level one T. A. Form, or you can reach out to any of our project members.
- Thank you. And now do we have any other questions.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:17:18

I don't believe that we have any additional questions that have been put in the chat at this point, though certainly, if anyone has one who wants to do that. We will take a minute or so while we are reaching the end here.

- I do want to take this opportunity to once again thank our Advisory Board members, who provided us with invaluable support over the course of this project, and really helped us shape the guidelines as we move forward, and of course would like to also thank the Bureau of Justice Assistance for their willingness to fund this
- and to stick with us through the processes. We develop these guidelines.



Lahiz Tavarez (CSG)

01:17:59

Thank you, David, and just to clarify, as we're waiting here a minute for any questions, the application form as well as the level one Ta request form will be made available through our website as well as Bj's website, so you can find information on both of those sites that will take you to the right place.

- If you are also watching any of the social media for any of the organizations that you've heard from today.
- they will be posting
- the link to those applications, as well as announcing when they are released.
- And I see a question. I came in the chat. What is the deadline for the application. So, because we have not yet released
- the application, we don't have a a concrete deadline, but we do anticipate that it will be open for around 4 weeks.
- Thank you. And yes, we can share the link to sign up for the Newsletter.
- I'll give it another minute to see if any other questions. Come in.
- and I will post the link for the Newsletter in a second in the chat as well.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:19:32

We appreciate everybody who has joined as a participant today. And thank you very much to all of the of my colleagues who joined me on the Webinar this afternoon. Really, it has been.

- has been one of the great joys of my career to be able to work on this particular project, and we are very much looking forward to being able to provide technical assistance to a number of sites over the course of the next couple of years.
- very much hope that folks will indeed apply when the applications open, and that we will then have the opportunity to really help folks further improve and shape what they're doing with the use of risk, and needs assessment in their particular jurisdictions.



Lahiz Tavarez (CSG)

01:20:21

please. If we have no other questions, I think that we can let people move on with their work. Yes, sounds good. Thank you, everyone. I posted that link there and watch out for the recording of this Webinar. Please reach out to any of us with any questions.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:20:40

Thank you, everybody.



Stevyn Fogg, CLA

01:20:42

Thank you, and to all of you here. Thank you very much. We appreciate you joining us.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:20:48

and

- we'll see what we get in the next few weeks. Once this stuff gets out.



Charles Robinson

01:20:55

Thank you, David.



David A. D'Amora, MS, LPC, CCFC

01:20:56

Hey, I want to do something in DC. And I want to do something in Massachusetts. So think about how you get something going here all right.