

2008 CSG Innovations Award Application

ID# 08-M-24MN

<u>State</u>	Minnesota		
<u>Program Category</u>	Public Safety/	Corrections:	
		Criminal Justice	
1. <u>Program Name</u>	Police Stop		
2. <u>Administering Agency</u>	Minnesota	Dept of Corrections	
3. <u>Contact Person</u>	Deb Kerschner	Paul Schroeder	Doug Hicks
4. <u>Address</u>	DOC 1450 Energy Park Suite 200 St Paul, MN 55108	Ramsey County 50 W. Kellogg Blvd Suite 650 St Paul, MN 55102	City of Minneapolis 350 South 5 th St, #107 Minneapolis, MN 55415
5. <u>Telephone No</u>	651.361.7366	651.266.2389	612.673.3699
6. <u>Fax No</u>	651.642.0223	651.266.2293	612.673.2619
7. <u>E-mail Address</u>	deb.kerschner@state.mn.us	paul.schroeder@co.ramsey.mn.us	doug.hicks@ci.minneapolis.mn.us
8. <u>Web site Address</u>	www.doc.state.mn.us		

9. Program Description: Collaborative project between state Department of Corrections, local probation agencies, local law enforcement agencies providing an automatic email notification of probation agents when offenders under supervision come in contact with local law enforcement.

10. How long as program been operational: December 2004

11. Why was the program created? What problem(s) or issue(s) was it designed to address?

Prior to the implementation of this project, there was no way for probation agents to be aware of all types of contacts with law enforcement for offenders under their supervision. In particular, if the law enforcement was outside their local area, information was very difficult to obtain in a timely manner. This project also takes the additional step of notifying of all contact with law enforcement, not just an arrest contact.

The program addresses issues related to timeliness as well as provides a broader scope of information (e.g., all law enforcement contact, not just arrest information). Police Stop notices are sent via email within 24 hours of the contact with law enforcement.

12. Describe the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order.

- Electronic list of active adult probationers is collated
- List is placed on shared ftp site weekly
- Participating law enforcement agencies download the list
- Daily electronic matches of police contacts are made against the list
- Automatic email notifications are generated to the probationer agent

13. Why is the program a new and creative approach or method?

This program is a paradigm shift, not only technologically but also in the area of interagency cooperation. Firstly, the program uses 'push' methodology enabling the probation agent to be notified without initiating some sort of query. The program also notifies the specific probation agent assigned to the offender; only the right people are sent the information that is needed. This is in contrast to law enforcement sending all contact reports to all nearby probation agencies. Secondly, the program is successful as a result of a unique collaboration between law enforcement agencies, local probation agencies and the state Department of Corrections. Thirdly, the program can be implemented relatively cost-free using widely available desktop tools, such as Microsoft Access.

14. What are the program's start-up costs?

There is an initial start-up cost involving existing staff resources in participating law enforcement agencies. This typically involves 20-40 hours of a single staff person to implement the match/email functionality. This local match/email functionality can be built with existing desktop tools.

15. What are the program's annual operational costs?

The ongoing costs are negligible and only involve weekly list compilation and download. Estimated ongoing costs are no more than one hour staff time per week for the state and each local law enforcement agency.

16. How is the program funded?

No formal funds are required; this program requires a minimal commitment of staff time to initiate and negligible time to maintain.

17. Did this program require the passage of legislation, executive order or regulations?

No, however, it does require a participation notification from each agency. Changes in Minnesota statutes could facilitate future participation by additional law enforcement agencies.

18. What equipment, technology and software are used to operate and administer this program?

On the local side: desktop computer linked to primary information system, SMTP, an ftp process to download files. On the state side: SQL databases to access and deliver automatic list.

19. Did this program originate in your state?

Yes, this was initially created by Doug Hicks of Minneapolis Police Department growing out of discussions with gang intelligence groups and the Hennepin County probation department.

20. Are you aware of similar program other states?

Not to our knowledge. Many big cities have formal notification processes; however, we are not aware any statewide notification process that automatically notifies the agent directly regarding any police contact for statewide probation agents.

21. Has the program been fully implemented?

No. We are currently operational with five law enforcement agencies. There are a number of other key law enforcement agencies that are in process or will need to be implemented.

22. Briefly evaluate (pro and con) the program's effectiveness in addressing the defined problem(s) or issue(s). Provide tangible examples.

The program has been widely praised by Probation Agencies throughout Minnesota, including the federal probation agents in the state. Police Stop helps find offenders on warrant, provides evidence for probation violation hearings, informs probation as offenders are arrested and held on new offenses and ensures probation is better informed about offenders under supervision. Often, supervising agents are able to connect specific police reported activity (such as loitering at a specific location) with their own knowledge about an offender (such as a restriction for that address) and take appropriate action, or communicate with investigating law enforcement to coordinate a response. The only known negatives of the program are: a) change in thinking processes related to how law enforcement information is provided, and b) working with widely variant law enforcement information system structures.

23. How has the program grown and/or changed since its inception?

The program initially started with one law enforcement and two probation agencies. This has grown to five law enforcement agencies and statewide probation agencies. Additional law enforcement agencies are in the planning stages with future implementation scheduled.

24. What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter if they attempt to adopt this program? Obstacles may be minimal in other states assuming that records are computerized. The program requires a grasping of the concept and a commitment to it. The biggest challenge for Minnesota was on the probation side; however, other states may find it easier than Minnesota if their probation system is centralized. States may find political obstacles in determining what, if any, data to share across agencies.