

**Meeting Summary**  
**Alaska Criminal Justice Data Analysis Commission**

**May 28, 2025**

**10:00 a.m. – 12:40 p.m.**

**LIO Office, Anchorage, and Zoom**

Chair Matt Claman called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. Members present were Lt. Jean Achee, Sen. Matt Claman (chair), Terrence Haas (Zoom), Ret. Judge David Mannheimer (Vice Chair), Heather Phelps, Lisa Purinton (for James Cockrell), Brenda Stanfill (Zoom), Ret. Judge Trevor Stephens, April Wilkerson (Zoom), Capt. Brian Wilson, and Mary Wilson (Zoom).

Alex Cleghorn, Tracy Dompeling, Rep. Andrew Gray, Judge Kari McCrea, and John Skidmore were absent.

Staff present were Susanne DiPietro, Teri Carns, Brian Brossmer, and Susie Dosik.

Chair Claman called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

**Approve Agenda**

Judge Mannheimer moved to approve the agenda; Ms. Purinton seconded the motion, and members approved it without objections.

**Approve February 20, 2025 meeting summary**

Judge Mannheimer moved to approve the February 20, 2025 meeting summary. Judge Stephens seconded the motion and members approved it without objection.

**Public Comment Period**

Chair Claman opened the meeting to public comment at 10:11 a.m. There were no public comments, and the Chair closed the public comment period at 12:35 p.m. Chair Claman noted that the Commission receives public comment at any time on its website.

**DV Report**

Chair Claman noted that the report had been amended during the time between the last meeting and the current meeting. Judge Stephens moved to approve the amended report. Judge Mannheimer seconded the motion and members approved it without objections.

## Reentry Program Data Presentation

Ms. Dosik presented an overview of Reentry programs: their purpose, funding, what is available in Alaska, how the programs are implemented, and outcomes.

*Purpose:* Re-entry programs are designed to help incarcerated people be successful in the communities to which they are released. They include a range of services, from housing to employment, treatment, social supports, transportation, and more.

*Funding:* Money for the programs comes from a variety of sources, including the Mental Health Trust, Second Chance Act and other federal programs, housing programs, Medicaid, and other state and local sources. Ms. Phelps said that the Mental Health Trust has funded coordinators at 100% for several years. In FY'26, they will fund four coordinators at 50%, and none in FY'27, as the programs transition to sustainable funding sources.

*Organizations participating:* The organizations participating in re-entry coalitions and programs include Department of Corrections, Department of Health (Division of Behavioral Health in particular), Department of Labor and Workforce Development, the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation, Alaska Mental Health Trust, United Way, Alaska Native non-profit corporations and health services, and a variety of non-profit organizations.

*Eligibility:* Program participants must have been convicted of a felony to participate in re-entry programs and services, and have medium or high-risk scores on the LSI-R, a risk assessment instrument administered by Dept of Corrections to all persons sentenced to a certain amount of incarceration. Participation is entirely voluntary at all points. This process of self selection means that outcomes depend on a level of personal motivation that could be the reason for success in any part of the program.

*Academic research:* Ms. Dosik said that the length of a person's incarceration has been shown to have no correlation with the likelihood of their recidivism. Judge Mannheimer asked if that meant that incarceration is not a deterrent to further crime; Ms. Dosik said that was correct. She said that program participation has been shown to have some correlation with reduced recidivism, depending on the type of program, and completion of it.

Ms. Dosik summarized the twenty years of research that have been available since re-entry concepts were first embodied in programs. She noted difficulties in analysis including limited data, variability in how programs were carried out (e.g., Reentry courts, Second Chance programs), COVID disruptions, and research structures that didn't provide reliable data.

Ms. Dosik said that programs based in the Responsivity-Needs-Risk model (RNR) showed the most promising results. Interventions that addressed criminogenic needs (attitudes, companions, self-management, problem solving skills, and values) had the highest success rates. Even with those programs, data about cost-effectiveness were weakly correlated because of difficulties in data collection and research designs. In addition, the fact that participation was entirely voluntary limited the usefulness of the findings. The main measure of effectiveness was criminal recidivism, broadly defined; Ms. Dosik suggested that other outcome measures, or more detailed recidivism analyses could provide a better assessment of the value of reentry programs.

*Challenges for Alaska:* Ms. Dosik said that Alaska challenges to understanding reentry programs included inconsistent implantation of programs, lack of data, and gaps in services. Anecdotally, some of the programs appeared to be effective in changing participants' attitudes. Members discussed the fact that the programs are voluntary, and therefore, people who participated and finished may have been motivated and able to summon the resources, personal and otherwise, to complete the work. That motivation might account for the success, rather than any specific service or program. Judge Mannheimer asked why services such as housing and employment assistance were needed, if changing a person's attitude was the primary key to success. Ms. Dosik said that the foundation of stability provided by housing and income gave people a base from which to work.

Ms. Stanfill said that Rep. Gray's office had a presentation on reentry that described success for high-risk misdemeanants, brought about with a different approach. Chair Claman said that he wasn't hearing that members wanted more research on this topic, and suggested that it be reviewed again at the December 2025 planning meeting for 2026.

### **DAC Research projects**

*Probation and Parole* – Ms. DiPietro said that members agreed to review data that might be available to better understand how probation and parole are used, and how effective they are. Ms. Wilkerson said that data generated for a sunset review of the Parole Board would be available to assist in that project, along with data back to at least 2014 about probationers and parolees. Chair Claman said that the legislature would like to know more about discretionary parole, especially about whether petitions to revoke parole are less frequent for discretionary parolees.

### **Unjustified Disparities**

Chair Claman noted that the legislature had authorized two ongoing projects to examine this issue: one being undertaken by the Alaska Federation of Natives with the Alaska Justice Information Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage. Ms. Wilkerson said

that the legislature provided funding only for the AFN project; DOC is reviewing the possibility of other grants to fund other work.

Chair Claman invited Dr. Brad Myrstol, director of AJiC to comment. Dr. Myrstol said that AJiC is working with AFN on the first phase of the project, a comprehensive literature review of all factors that could contribute to disparities in jails and prisons. He said that because Alaska has a unified system of corrections, there are no separate jails and prisons, complicating the work. They are also reviewing booking data to see how changes in legal state affect disproportions in populations. He said that AJiC will provide updates over the next months as it continues its work.

### **Victims' Services – update**

Ms. Purinton described the information, including some about victims, that will be collected for the state as law enforcement agencies continue to implement the NIBRS data management system. Ms. Stanfill said that she would meet with DAC staff to discuss information that might be available through the DV victims' services' agencies database, VELA (Vela is the name of the company that created the database; "VELA" is not an acronym that could be spelled out). Ms. DiPietro said that staff would have a more detailed plan at the next meeting.

### **Pretrial/time to Disposition – update**

Ms. DiPietro said that court clerks were providing DAC staff with case files. The work is progressing, depending on the clerks' other responsibilities.

### **New project – update Sex Assault data and report**

Ms. Stanfill asked whether DAC should update the 2017 ACJC report to create a baseline of data immediately preceding the effective date of legislation changing the age of consent. Adding 2017-2022 data and analysis would provide the foundation for a study in a few years to show any possible changes that occurred with the new consent law. Members agreed to create a subcommittee to consider what data might be needed, and what agencies should provide it. Judge Stephens, Ms. Stanfill, and Capt. Wilson were interested in participating. Chair Claman said that the Department of Law should also join.

### **National Association of Sentencing Commissions conference**

Ms. DiPietro asked if any members other than Judge Stephens, Ms. Stanfill, and Capt. Wilson were interested in attending. Chair Claman mentioned executive branch travel restrictions that might affect decisions. Ms. DiPietro asked for decisions by the end of the first week in June.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:49 p.m.