Oregon Criminal Justice Commission

2025-27 JRP Semi-Annual Report #1

County.Guide.(Formula.and.Competitive.Grant.Funding)

December 17, 2025

2025-27 Biennium: County Planning & Strategy Report, Guide

Due date: February 15, 2026

Estimated Completion Time: The Semi-Annual Report #1 (SAR #1) is designed so that for most counties it should take about half a day of focused work total – roughly 2-4 hours for smaller counties / less complex JRP efforts and 4-6 hours for larger counties with multiple JRP components.

Background: This document is meant to help your county complete the JRP SAR #1 for Formula and Competitive (if applicable) funding. It follows the same section numbers as the SAR #1 form in SM Apply. You do not have to read this cover to cover. You can scroll to the sections you need help with.

Point of Contact: Lindsey Cullins, Justice Reinvestment Program Manager

Table of Contents

Introduction

JRP funds a continuum of community-based sanctions, services, and programs intended to reduce recidivism and reduce DOC imprisonment while maintaining public safety and holding individuals accountable.

At the same time, Oregon statute and rule require the Criminal Justice Commission to _specifically assess_ whether each county is reducing DOC prison use for a particular set of felony convictions (often referred to as the "JRP-measured felony crime types" or "JRP-eligible offenses/crime types"). The new SAR format and content are meant to more completely address the Legislature's assessment mandate.

Why SAR #1 looks different this biennium

This Semi-Annual Report (SAR #1) is different from what you have done in past biennia.

- SAR #1 _is a planning and strategy_ snapshot of your county's _overall JRP effort_ for this biennium. SAR #1 sets up what you will talk about in future SARs.
  - Later SARs will ask you things like how it is going, what progress you see (even in simple terms), and what you are adjusting.

- SAR #1 covers your **JRP Formula and Competitive (if applicable) funding only**.
  - You will be asked about your JRP Victim Services and Evaluation (if applicable) funding separately.

By _"overall JRP effort,"_ we mean:

Everything your county is doing with <u>all</u> JRP funds combined (e.g., short-term transitional leave, JRP-funded probation officer time, jail sanctions, MRT/CBT groups, treatment, downward departure efforts, navigation, etc.) to _reduce prison use and/or recidivism for JRP-eligible crime types_.

What This Report Is and How it Connects to Future SARs

This first Semi-Annual Report is meant to help your county:

1. Name the main problem your overall JRP effort is trying to address for _JRP-eligible populations_.
2. Describe your county's overall JRP target population (where your resources are focused).
3. Set 2-3 objectives for the 2025-27 biennium that describe what you want your overall JRP effort to accomplish.
4. List the key activities you are using to work toward those objectives, and possible outputs you could track in the future.
5. Describe data challenges and priorities related to JRP.
6. Let CJC know what support would be helpful to your county's JRP efforts.

How SAR #1 sets up later SARs in 2025-27

This SAR is the foundation for the rest of the biennium.

- In future SARs, we will ask you to:

    - Reflect on the objectives, activities, and outputs you list here.
    - Describe what seems to be working, what is not, and any adjustments you are making.
    - Share any early signs of progress or changes you are noticing (even if they are based on simple counts or patterns).
    - Update us on data improvements you are working on.

The 2025-27 biennium is a "sandbox":

A chance to try things, see what works, adjust, and learn so that in the 2027-29 biennium we can all be more precise about outcomes and evaluation of JRP efforts/programs.

- SAR #1 is designed to help counties (a) describe their overall JRP strategy and (b) identify data gaps that prevent clear "dollars → impact" reporting for the JRP-crime types types the CJC must assess.

    - We are not requiring new data fields, new "flags," or perfect tracking this biennium. We will be looking for plans and improvements we can all make in these areas.

- In 2027-29, we expect to ask for more precision on JRP metric-type tracking (and we want 2025-27 to be the time for counties and the CJC to discover gaps and improve workflows).

SECTION 1: County JRP Overview

1. **Attestation:** Our LPSCC has reviewed our county's semi-annual report (SAR #1). **(Y/N)**

   Why we're asking:

   - By statute, the LPSCC is the applicant for JRP.

2. **LPSCC Involvement:** Was your LPSCC involved in the planning of your county's 2025-27 JRP approach and the objectives you will describe in this report? **(Y/N)**

   Why we're asking:

   - We are not evaluating your LPSCC relationship, but we do want to understand whether JRP planning and reporting are connected to your LPSCC discussions.

   What a good answer looks like for question 2:

   - **Example:** "No. Our LPSCC has not yet directly provided input/feedback into our JRP objectives and approach. We plan to update our LPSCC every 3 months to gather feedback and course correct around our objectives, activities, and inputs if necessary."

3. **Problem Statement:** Describe your county's JRP-related issue (e.g. property, drug, and driving & DUII) that your overall JRP effort (reducing prison use and recidivism) is designed to address. **(150 words)**

   What is a "problem statement" for JRP?

   For JRP purposes, your *problem statement* is a 2-3 sentence description of the main *county-level issue* your *overall JRP effort* is trying to improve, within JRP's lane. We are looking for a *system-level pattern*, such as:

   - High revocations for JRP-eligible supervision cases
   - Heavy use of prison for certain JRP-eligible felonies
   - Recidivism patterns for certain JRP-eligible populations
   - Accountability or disparity concerns tied to JRP-eligible cases

   Focused on *JRP-eligible populations*, where JRP dollars can reasonably influence the system. Not simply "what the JRP PO does" or "we have a work crew." Think of this question as:

   "What is happening in our county's justice system, for JRP-eligible populations, that concerns us and that our overall JRP effort is meant to help improve?"

   Common pitfalls to avoid:

- Too vague / broad: "Our county has a lot of crime" or "we have many people with complex needs."
- Too program-focused: "Our JRP-funded probation officer has 75 cases" or "we have a work crew program."

Those tell us something, but not the *system pattern* JRP is aimed at addressing.

Examples:

You do <u>not</u> need to copy these, but this is the style we are looking for.

- ***Example 1:*** *County with several JRP components (PO, sanctions, treatment)*

  - ➢ Over the last several years, our county has seen steady prison admissions for JRP-eligible property and drug offenses, even when local sanctions and treatment options are available. Technical violations (missed appointments, missed treatment, positive UAs) frequently result in full revocations rather than graduated responses. Our overall JRP effort is intended to shift this pattern by using more consistent local responses and supports so that revocation is not the default.

  - ▪ Why this works:
    - ✓ It is clearly about *JRP-eligible offenses*.
    - ✓ It identifies specific *drivers* (technical violations → revocations).
    - ✓ It hints at what *JRP is trying to change* (shift responses away from revocation).

- ***Example 2:*** *County whose JRP effort is mainly a JRP-funded probation officer*

  - ➢ JRP-eligible supervision cases in our county have high rates of technical violations and revocations, and supervision practices differ considerably between officers. JRP funds a probation officer whose caseload is focused on these JRP-eligible cases. Our overall JRP effort is aimed at improving supervision consistency, using graduated responses, and reducing revocations for this population.

  - ▪ Why this works:
    - ✓ It identifies the pattern (high technical violations and revocations, inconsistent practice).
    - ✓ It shows how JRP funding is used to improve that system issue.

4. **Target Population:** Describe your primary target population for JRP-eligible offenses. **(Check All That Apply)**

    How is "target population" different from "problem statement"?

    The problem statement is about a *system pattern* (e.g., how revocations happen). The target population is the group of individuals you are primarily focusing on with your *entire JRP effort to change that pattern*. Think of this question as:

    "Which population, if we focus our JRP resources on them, is most likely to help change the problem we just described?"

SECTION 2: County-Identified Objectives

1. **Objectives:** List **2-3 objectives** that reflect what your overall JRP effort aims to accomplish during the 25-27 biennium. These can be quantitative or qualitative, as long as progress can be described later. ***If you receive Competitive Grant funding, you must identify one objective associated with Competitive Grant funding.***

   What are we asking for?

   In SAR #1, we ask you to list 2-3 objectives for your overall JRP effort. These objectives should:

   - Connect to at least one JRP statutory goal:

      ➢ Goal 1: reduce prison use, while keeping the public safe and holding individuals accountable.
      ➢ Goal 2: reduce recidivism, while keeping the public safe and holding individuals accountable.

   - Be realistic for the 2025-27 biennium.

   - Be things you can describe progress on in later 2025-27 SARs, even if using simple counts or patterns.

   We recommend using a SMART-ish structure:

   - Specific: Focused on one main change.
   - Measurable: You can tell if it is improving (even with simple counts or well-described observations).
   - Achievable: Reasonable with your staffing/resources.
   - Relevant: Tied to your problem statement and target population.
   - Time-bound: Within this biennium.

   Examples:

   You can use similar wording if it fits your county.

   - ***Example 1: Goal 1 (Prison use): using local sanctions instead of defaulting to revocations***

      ➢ By the end of the 2025-27 biennium, increase the use of local sanctions (e.g., short jail stays, community service, treatment responses) as the first response to technical violations for the JRP target population instead of immediately filing revocations to prison.

      ▪ How we'll know progress is being made:

- ➢ Once per year, review a simple count or small sample of violation responses for the JRP target population to see whether local sanctions are being used as the first step more often than in prior years.

- ***Example 2:*** *Goal 2 (Recidivism): reduce technical revocations*

  - ➢ By the end of the 2025-27 biennium, reduce technical revocations among the JRP target population by improving responses to early violations (missed appointments, missed UAs) and increasing use of intermediate sanctions.

  - ▪ How we'll know progress is being made:

    - ➢ Track (e.g., with simple counts or small samples) the number of technical revocations for the JRP target population each year and look for a downward trend, along with notes from case staffing about how responses are changing.

SECTION 3: Key Activities That Support County Objectives

1. **Activities and Outputs:** For each objective above, list 3-5 major activities and at least one possible corresponding output you could count in the future.

    We are asking for clear, high-level connections between objectives → activities → potential outputs.

    Key definitions:

    - *Activities = What your JRP effort does*
        - Example: running MRT groups, using a violation response grid, holding JRP case staffing, flagging JRP-eligible cases in the CMS.

    - *Outputs = Simple counts that show those activities happened*
        - Example: number of JRP clients starting/completing MRT, number of JRP staffing, number of violations handled with local sanctions.

    Examples:

    - ***Example 1: Rural county with JRP-funded probation officer***

        - Problem (from Section 1, Question 3): Over the last several years, our rural county has seen high revocation rates to prison for JRP-eligible property and drug cases, often in response to technical violations like missed appointments or positive UAs.
        - Target population (from Section 1, Question 4): Adults on community supervision for JRP-eligible property and drug offenses who are assigned to the JRP-funded probation officer's caseload, are generally assessed as medium risk, and have a history of technical violations (missed appointments, missed UAs, or non-compliance with conditions).
        - Objective (from Section 2, Question 1): By the end of the 2025-27 biennium, implement a consistent, graduated response approach for the JRP-funded caseload so that technical violations for the target population are more often addressed with structured local responses and supports, rather than resulting in full revocations to prison.

        - **Possible activities:**

            - ✓ Develop and use a simple violation response grid for the JRP-funded caseload that lists graduated responses (e.g., increased check-ins, brief jail sanctions, added treatment sessions) before revocation.

- ✓ Ensure that each individual on the JRP-funded caseload has a case plan that incorporates risk/need assessment results and lists agreed-upon responses to likely violation types.
- ✓ Coordinate with local treatment providers (SUD/MH) so that referrals and engagement for the JRP target population are timely and documented.

- **Possible outputs:**

  - ✓ Number of technical violations for the JRP target population where a graduated response from the grid is used before revocation is considered.
  - ✓ Number of individuals on the JRP-funded caseload who have a completed case plan using the standard template.
  - ✓ Number of JRP target population referrals to SUD/MH treatment from the JRP-funded probation officer.

- *__Example 2:__* *County with JRP PO + jail sanctions + MRT*

  - ➢ Problem (from Section 1.3): JRP-funded jail sanctions are used without a consistent plan, and revocations remain high.
  - ➢ Target population (from Section 1.4): JRP-eligible supervision cases with prior sanctions, referred to MRT.
  - ➢ Objective (from Section 2): By the end of the 2025-27 biennium, ensure that JRP-funded short jail sanctions for the target population are consistently tied to a documented plan for MRT participation (start or re-start).

- **Possible activities:**

  - ✓ Require that every JRP-funded short jail sanction for the target population includes a documented expectation in the case plan for MRT participation.
  - ✓ Prioritize JRP-funded MRT slots for individuals who have just completed a short jail sanction.
  - ✓ Coordinate weekly between probation and MRT providers about JRP-target population participants.

- **Possible outputs:**

  - ✓ Number of JRP-funded short jail sanctions for the target population.
  - ✓ Number of those sanctioned who start or resume MRT within a defined timeframe.

- ✓ Number of coordination contacts between probation and MRT providers about JRP cases.

SECTION 4: Data Discovery

This is not an evaluation of your data processes/practices. We know many counties have limitations with Odyssey or other case management systems; use spreadsheets or shared drives for some data; or do not have dedicated data staff.

We are trying to understand:

- Where are the most common gaps?
- What might be realistically improved in this biennium?

1. **JRP Metric Tracking: Data You Don't Currently Have:** For the objectives you listed, identify a key data point/s you would ideally track to measure progress – but that your county does not currently collect or have available. **(Check all that apply and/or describe.)**

    Examples:

    - "A reliable flag in our probation and jail data that tells us which cases are JRP-eligible."

    - "Completion status for MRT and JRP-funded groups (completed, dropped, terminated)."

2. **Main barrier:** What is the main barrier to getting that information? **(Check all that apply and/or describe.)**

    Examples:

    - "Our case management system does not have a dedicated JRP field. Staff sometimes note 'JRP' in free-text comments, but it is inconsistent and not reportable."

    - "Completion status is kept in separate spreadsheets by providers and not sent to our office routinely."

3. **One area to improve this biennium:** If you could improve data or documentation in one area this biennium, what would it be and why? *(Think about: workflows, eligibility criteria, screening processes, internal caseload tracking, etc. We will ask about progress toward this in later SARs.)* **(Check all that apply and/or describe.)**

    Examples:

    - "Create a simple, consistent JRP indicator in our probation case management system and train staff on when to use it, so that we can begin to pull basic JRP counts."

- "Develop a simple quarterly report template that providers use to send us starts and completions for JRP-funded groups, and store this in one central place."

SECTION 5: Support Needed from CJC

1. **Support from CJC:** What types of support would you like from the CJC related to your JRP effort? **(Check all that apply; optional comments welcome.)**

   Examples:

   - Clarifying expectations:
     - ➢ What counts as a JRP-eligible program?
     - ➢ Can we use JRP funds in this way?
   - Objective or planning support:
     - ➢ A short call to refine objectives so they are realistic.
     - ➢ Help connecting objectives to activities and outputs.
   - Equity / responsiveness:
     - ➢ Help thinking about how to better serve populations experiencing disparities.
     - ➢ Guidance on culturally responsive practices.
   - Data discovery:
     - ➢ Help mapping where data currently lives.
     - ➢ Advice on a simple, realistic first step (e.g., a flag, a shared spreadsheet).
   - Peer learning:
     - ➢ A short virtual session where counties share how they are using local sanctions or tracking JRP cases.