INPUTS	ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES	IMPACTS
<ul> <li>Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) funding for a part-time pretrial consultant and project coordinator.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Attend bi-monthly project meetings, subgroup meetings and participate in Core Team</li> <li>Provide advice to all groups regarding evidence based pretrial programs</li> <li>Assist in the coordination with CJC staff and NIC staff to host NIC</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Leadership and support provided for implementation of state plan.</li> <li>Public Safety Task Force convened.</li> <li>S tatutes reviewed regarding: Arrest mandates for certain Oregon crimes; Delegation of release authority from Judicial to Executive branch; Preventive Detention; Victim's rights; Criteria for release of pretrial defendants; Money bail; Mandated treatment; Aid and Assist for special needs defendants</li> <li>Data-driven process to universally measure "Failure to Appear" in all counties in Oregon determined</li> <li>Process for collecting a "jail data snapshot" of all Oregon county jails determined</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Oregon project members oriented to evidence-based pretrial programs.</li> <li>Subgroup decision point recommendations completed for Oregon report</li> <li>Communication opportunities and support provided to eight Oregon county teams who completed NIC Pretrial Training</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Increased understanding of evidence based pretrial programs throughout the state Individual rights honored via victim centered practices</li> <li>Increased knowledge and utilization of evidence-based pretrial programs through local implementation efforts</li> <li>Increased support and assistance in implementation of evidence-based pretrial programs</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>CJC staff, project participants and project coordinator</li> <li>Oregon jail data</li> <li>Oregon Constitution</li> <li>Oregon pretrial statutes</li> <li>National Institute of Corrections publication: "Essential Elements of High Functioning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Pretrial Training in Oregon</li> <li>Convene and orient Public Safety Task Force to Oregon pretrial programs and key issues</li> <li>Examine Oregon Constitution and statutes related to pretrial justice</li> <li>Examine Oregon pretrial operational, pretrial operational, pretrial data and policy issues</li> <li>Increase capacity or collection and analysis of Oregon jail/pretrial</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Financial incentives for Oregon counties to implement evidence-based, risk informed pretrial programs considered</li> <li>Standard, best practice model developed for inclusion of effective defense counsel representation at pretrial "first appearance"</li> <li>Court's ability to "clear" outstanding warrants from other jurisdictions determined</li> <li>Current use of video arraignments and the impact to Oregon pretrial justice analyzed and determined</li> <li>Automated static pretrial risk assessment to be made available to Oregon counties developed or selected</li> <li>Statewide use of a pretrial risk assessment tool implemented</li> <li>Future mandate of county use of a pretrial risk assessment considered</li> <li>Counties engaged in community conversations regarding priority of detention, risk-based release policy and use of jail space</li> <li>Community and stakeholders educated regarding pretrial risk assessment</li> <li>Community and stakeholders educated regarding pretrial risk assessment</li> <li>Community and stakeholders educated regarding victims' rights and victim centered practices to honor those rights</li> <li>Local practices determined regarding priority use of jail space</li> <li>Pretrial risk assessment for special populations implemented</li> <li>Municipal Courts and cities in Oregon included in pretrial reform efforts</li> <li>Local communities assisted in implementation of evidence-based pretrial monitoring programs and practices</li> <li>Local communities assisted in implementation of automated court-date reminder systems</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Recommendations for constitutional and statutory changes to promote pretrial reform in Oregon completed by Public Safety Task Force</li> <li>Recommendations to enhance pretrial resources and evidence-based practices in Oregon made by the Public Safety Task Force</li> <li>Resources dedicated for planning and implementation</li> <li>Access available to evidence-based tools for more informed decision making</li> <li>Evaluation completed of pretrial processes and performance</li> <li>Evidence of Increased stakeholder and community support for Oregon pretrial</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Reduced number of low-risk individuals detained pretrial in Oregon, as a result of moving to a risk-informed pretrial system</li> <li>Improved planning and increased data access and sharing resulted in improved performance</li> <li>Practices implemented that effectively divert the individuals with mental health issues and provide mental health services within jails</li> <li>Practices implemented that prioritize public safety for both rural and urban communities</li> <li>Improved public health outcomes</li> <li>Maximized release of individualswho can be safely monitored on pretrial release</li> <li>Improved court appearance rates of those individuals released while on pretrial</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Pretrial Justice Programs"</li> <li>National Institute of</li> </ul>	data • Recognize Oregon Pretrial Reform "Associate Counties", consisting of those	<ul> <li>Statewide long term data integration accomplished, providing increased: access to local jail and Odyssey pretrial data; access to state and local pretrial performance data, including jail population, appearance rate, public safety rate, victim notification, risk level and force release data; validation of pretrial risk assessment tools; access to technical knowledge, additional technology resources such as SEARCH</li> </ul>	reform <ul> <li>Increased access to, and use of, data to inform policy decisions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>status</li> <li>Improved county management of local jail population</li> <li>Cost effective practices that maximize the use of taxpayer funds</li> </ul>
Corrections Publication: "Measuring What Matters" • Public and/or Private Information Technology and research experts	counties who have engaged in local pretrial reform efforts • Create a County Tool Kit	<ul> <li>Factors used to make decision on arrest determined and analyzed</li> <li>Community and law enforcement educated regarding risk factors and effectiveness in determining risk of FTA and re- offense, maximizing release</li> <li>Decision-making factors re-prioritized, emphasizing use of resources, available services and use of jail as last resort</li> <li>Tool for law enforcement to use in the field to assess risk and make arrest decision developed or determine</li> <li>County-centered inventory of resources for law enforcement to utilize in lieu of arrest and detention developed, maintained , and updated regularly</li> <li>Close collaboration maintained between disciplines within the county</li> <li>Officers educated about need for services and loss of health insurance when individual is incarcerated</li> <li>Crisis Intervention Training provided for officers (CIT)</li> <li>Cross-training sessions conducted between police departments and sheriffs' offices</li> <li>Factors impacting decisions regarding use of jail space and use of risk determined</li> <li>Regularly scheduled "snapshots" of jail population conducted, including agreed upon list of items to track</li> <li>Pretrial risk assessment tool selected, implemented, and validated</li> <li>Standard established for inclusion of defense counsel First Appearance</li> <li>Process for sequential bail review implemented</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Increased collaboration between local jurisdictions</li> <li>Increased data capacity within local jurisdictions</li> <li>Increased use of pretrial risk tools in local jurisdictions</li> <li>Increased knowledge in local jurisdictions regarding evidence- based pretrial justice</li> <li>Increased implementation of risk informed pretrial justice systems in local jurisdictions</li> <li>Reduction of low risk individuals on pretrial status harmed through unnecessary incarceration</li> <li>Individuals on pretrial status identified as high risk maintained in custody to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Demonstrated improved collaborative effort in local jurisdictions</li> <li>Data utilized by local jurisdictions to inform policy and practice regarding pretrial justice</li> <li>Improved local outcomes regarding public safety and court appearance</li> <li>Improved use of local jail resources</li> <li>Statewide benefit from the implementation experience of the Pilot Counties</li> <li>Increased knowledge and experience that will inform future reform efforts and/or statutory changes</li> <li>Efficient and productive pretrial system that</li> </ul>
OREGON PRETRIAL	WORKGROUP LOGIC MODEL	<ul> <li>Automated court date reminder systems implemented locally and data tracked regarding impact on local appearance rate</li> <li>Local use of video arraignments and the impact on local pretrial reform efforts determined and analyzed</li> </ul>	maximize public safety	demonstrates taxpayer benefits