

final minutes

Criminal Justice Policy Commission Meeting

9:00 a.m. • Wednesday, February 1, 2017

Senate Appropriations Room • 3rd Floor State Capitol Building

100 N. Capitol Avenue • Lansing, MI

Members Present:

Senator Bruce Caswell, Chair
Senator Patrick Colbeck
Representative Vanessa Guerra
D. J. Hilson
Kyle Kaminski
Sheryl Kubiak
Barbara Levine
Sarah Lightner
Laura Moody
Jennifer Strange (via teleconference)
Judge Paul Stutesman
Andrew Verheek
Judge Raymond Voet

Members Excused:

Stacia Buchanan
Senator Bert Johnson
Sheriff Lawrence Stelma

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and asked the clerk to take the roll. A quorum was present, and absent members were excused.

II. Approval of January 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes

The Chair called on Senator Colbeck to provide an update to members if there are any changes or additions to the proposed January 4, 2017 CJPC meeting minutes. There were none. Commissioner Lightner moved, supported by Commissioner Hilson, to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2017 meeting as proposed. There was no further discussion. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

III. Introduction of Melinda Fandel, Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice Coordinator

The Chair introduced Melinda Fandel who is the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice Coordinator for the Department of Health and Human Services. She noted that she is here to represent the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice and to provide updates on the work the CJPC is doing on the cost analysis of moving 17-years old to the juvenile justice system. She offered her assistance to the Commission and is available to provide any information the Commission may need from herself or the MCJJ. Commissioner Kubiak asked if Ms. Fandel had the opportunity to view the RFP and if it is in line with what the goals are for the Juvenile Justice Committee. She indicated that MCJJ members were given a copy of the RFP at their last meeting and seemed to be very pleased with it. Commissioner Kubiak inquired if any representative with juvenile justice expertise would be assisting the CJPC with the evaluation of the RFP. The Chair responded that the Commission is certainly willing to talk to people, but, in terms of evaluating the RFP, the Legislature entrusted the Commission with the responsibility of conducting the study.

IV. Update from Senator Colbeck

The Chair called on Senator Colbeck for an update on the criminal justice package of bills before the legislature. Senator Colbeck highlighted the 20-bill package and answered questions from Commission members. The Chair noted that Grady Bridges has an analysis prepared by the Senate that can be emailed to members. After discussion of the bills, Senator Colbeck asked members to let him know if there are any amendments that need to be brought forward. The Chair stressed that members are free to comment on pending legislation, but to make sure it is clear they are not speaking on behalf of the Commission. A discussion of a difference in the definition of recidivism recommended by the Commission and what is proposed in the legislation followed.

V. RFP for Study of County Costs to Redirect 17-Year-Olds to Juvenile Justice System Update

The Chair called CJPC Data Administrator Grady Bridges for an update on the RFP. Grady highlighted the timeline for the evaluation process found in the Proposal Evaluation Form he prepared and distributed to CJPC members on January 20 for comment and feedback (see attached.) He continued with information regarding the criteria and scoring to be used in the bid evaluation process. Commissioner Kaminski inquired if pricing would be opened at the same time as the bid and if value versus purely cost would be considered during the evaluation process. Grady indicated that is the plan and the

scoring will be based on not only value, but also the reasonableness of the approach they intend to use. A discussion of the creation of a review panel and the scoring process followed. Commission members who are interested in being part of the review panel were asked to let Grady know by noon on February 8. Bid information will be sent to members of the review panel after the February 17 bid deadline and then to all Commission members after the scoring is completed.

VI. Recommendation to the Legislature for Uniform Jail Management System

The Chair called on Grady to provide information regarding this agenda item. Grady explained that, at their last meeting, the data subcommittee had discussed some of the complexities with gathering jail data. He noted that collecting jail data directly in an automated fashion or using a unified jail management system were two possibilities discussed. He noted that Senate Bill 11, introduced by Senator Colbeck, calls for the collection of data in a unified jail management system as the jails update their systems. The Chair presented questions the Commission may want to consider in accessing jail data that include utilizing data currently collected by Appriss or using an alternative collection of data by setting up a system where data comes into that system from the jails directly and can be accessed by the Legislature. Commissioner Kaminski cautioned that there are serious issues regarding the handling of criminal justice data that will need to be considered. The Chair asked Commissioner Moody if she would be able to obtain a written opinion from the Attorney General regarding getting access to data currently collected by various entities including Appriss. She responded that requests are typically made by legislators and elected officials. Representative Guerra will work with Commissioner Moody to submit a request for an Attorney General's opinion. Commissioner Hilson noted that it might be beneficial to prepare a cost benefit analysis of the different options being considered. Commissioner Verheek added that it might be helpful to get an idea of which counties are able to submit information using their existing software and who is not. Commissioner Kubiak pointed out that SCAO has already done an analysis of what management information system counties are currently using and how they differ and the Sheriff's Association had attempted to move to a unified system and was met with a lot of opposition. She encouraged the Commission to work collaboratively with those bodies that are already moving in that direction. The discussion continued. The Chair asked Grady to prepare a document that includes a recommendation for a short-term plan using data from Appriss and a long-term plan to either build a unified management system or some system that can collect jail data from all the counties. The plans should include the confidentiality aspects of the type of data being collected and any Headlee implications. The document is to be shared with the members and discussed at the next meeting, if time permits.

V. Mental Health Subcommittee Update

The Chair called on Commissioner Lightner for an update. She reported that the subcommittee met with Bob Sheehan from the State of Michigan Community Mental Health and discussed the letter the subcommittee is preparing to the sheriffs to survey what they provide for mental health screening, assessment, and services. She will send the members the latest version of the letter after the meeting and asked for feedback by Friday. She continued with information on the cuts that have been made in funding and insurance issues surrounding mental health services. The Chair noted that Grady is working with the data subcommittee on other questions to be included in the survey. Commissioner Levine inquired if there are any questions on the survey that address diversion. Commissioner Lightner indicated there are not, but encouraged Commissioner Levine to submit additional questions by Friday. Commissioner Strange expanded on the conversation she had with Mr. Sheehan and noted his willingness to assist in distributing a survey among all of community mental health providers if it would be beneficial for the Commission to hear the concerns they have. She added that Commissioner Kubiak provided them with the results of a 2010 survey sent to sheriffs and will send them the Diversion Council's report on outcomes as soon as it is released. Commissioner Kubiak indicated that she will also send a copy of the report to Chair Caswell. The issue of the suspension of Medicaid services when someone is in jail or prison was then discussed. The Chair noted that this may be an issue the Commission may want to weigh in on.

Commissioner Levine raised the issue of cash bail and the hardship incurred to meet bail when benefits are cut. The Chair asked Commissioner Levine to put together a statement dealing with the bail issue and the implications of not being able to post bail. He thought this might help the Commission begin the process of considering whether to make a recommendation on this issue. Commissioner Verheek volunteered to assist.

VI. Data Subcommittee Update

Commissioner Kubiak noted that the subcommittee has worked on a county-wide survey on programming which will be sent to jails and community correction boards and called on Grady to provide more details. Grady will send out an email describing the content of the survey and asked for Commissioner input on the specific wording of the questions. The plan is to discuss the submitted wording at the mid-month subcommittee meeting and then bring the proposed survey to the March CJPC meeting for review.

VII. Commissioner Comments

The Chair asked if there were any other comments from the Commissioners. Commissioner Kubiak commented that, in response to the process here, she has learned a lot today about how important what we put out there as recommendations are and what is internal and external needs to be very explicit. Commissioner Moody commented that she received a text from Senator Colbeck asking her to share that Senator Proos is supportive of the Commission's recommendation and any discrepancies are likely the result of the Legislative Service Bureau's drafting. He is supportive of the amendment to better align the bill language with the Commission's recommendation. The Chair thanked Commissioner Kubiak and the data subcommittee for their work. He also added that he appreciates the probing questions from the Commissioners. There were no other comments.

VIII. Public Comments

The Chair asked if there were any public comments. Spencer Herlong, SAS Institute Inc., 1133 S, Washington Avenue, Lansing, MI 48910, provided comments on obtaining local data.

IX. Next CJPC Meeting Date

The next CJPC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, March 1, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. in the Senate Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor of the State Capitol Building.**

X. Adjournment

There was no further business. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

(Approved at the March 1, 2017 Criminal Justice Policy Commission meeting.)

Proposal Evaluation Form - Legislative Council 17-Year-Olds Study

Instructions for Evaluation

Members of the Review Committee will use this evaluation form to score proposals in order to measure the quality of each submission. The criteria for evaluation, their relative weights, and the scoring scale guidelines are described in the sections below. The scores from all of the evaluators will be combined into an evaluation score summary to determine the point total for each vendor.

Proposals must meet all of the following criteria in order to be considered for review and scoring:

1. Submission by the deadline of 5:00pm EST, February 17, 2017.
2. Submitted with complete and signed cover letter.
3. Address all of the requirements outlined in the RFP sections on eligibility, scope of work and deliverables.

Criteria and Weighting

Each of the five evaluation criterion has a total number of points possible based on the number of requirements outlined in the RFP and a relative weight to denote its importance to the selection process. After scoring each section the points awarded [*Score (Pts.)*] are expressed as a percentage of the points possible [*Score (%)*] in order to normalize sections with varying number of requirements. Each sections percentage of points possible is then multiplied by the weights provided below to determine the final score. In the example provided below the proposal received a total score of 86 out of 100 points possible.

Section	Weight
1. Statement of the Problem	10%
2. Work Plan	30%
3. Prior Experience	15%
4. Personnel & Subcontractors	15%
5. Cost Analysis	30%

Criteria	Points Possible	Score (Pts.)	Score (%)	Weight	Final Score
Statement of the Problem	5	4	80.0%	10%	8.0
Work Plan	25	22	88.0%	30%	26.4
Prior Experience	20	18	90.0%	15%	13.5
Personnel & Subcontractor	35	31	88.6%	15%	13.3
Cost Analysis	35	29	82.9%	30%	24.9
Total	120	104			86.0

Rating Guidelines

For each of the subsections of the rubric, evaluators will be asked to score the proposal on a scale from 0-5 points. When evaluating proposals the following point system and guidelines should be used to score each section. A column for comments has been included in the form so that reviewers can record notes for each section to help them justify the score they give.

Point Value	Scoring Guidance
5	The proposal provides a very comprehensive, complete, detailed, and clearly articulated discussion of how the requirement is met.
4	Satisfactory response with sufficient detail. Adequate discussion of how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies
3	Criteria appear to be minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies or lacks focus and detail.
2	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met.
1	Very inadequate response that fails to meet the criteria and demonstrates the bidder's lack of knowledge and ability to meet the of the criteria.
0	N/A Does not address the criteria or simply re-states the criteria.