

MEASURING COLLABORATIVE RISK-DRIVEN INTERVENTION

An Interactive National Dialogue on Research,
Evaluation and Analysis of the Hub/Situation Table
and Related CSWB Models

Summary of Dialogue

January 24-25, 2017 Toronto, ON

Disseminated by
Community Safety Knowledge Alliance



Community
Safety
Knowledge
Alliance

Research to Practice to Alignment



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Centre for Forensic
Behavioural Science
and Justice Studies

USASK.CA/CFBSJS



Community
Safety
Knowledge
Alliance
Research to Practice to Alignment



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Centre for Forensic
Behavioural Science
and Justice Studies
USASK.CA/CFBSJS



This summary of dialogue has been prepared for dissemination to participants, sponsors, and interested stakeholders involved in the measurement of collaborative risk-driven intervention. In partnership with the University of Saskatchewan, University of Western Ontario, and Canadian Society of Evidence-Based Policing, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance welcomes a broader audience to use this summary of dialogue to enhance, promote, and strengthen research, evaluation, and analysis of Hub/Situation Tables and related community safety and well-being models.

Disclaimer: *The opinions shared in this summary are those of participants, speakers, and the author. They do not reflect the opinion of event sponsors, organizers, CSKA or its various partners.*

Event Organizers:

- Cal Corley – Community Safety Knowledge Alliance
- Shannon Fraser-Hanson – Community Safety Knowledge Alliance
- Chad Nilson – University of Saskatchewan
- Laura Huey – University of Western Ontario/Canadian Society of Evidence-Based Policing

Event Sponsors:

- Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice, Corrections and Policing
- Global Network for Community Safety
- Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services



Special thanks to Bailey Guminny from Durham Regional Police Service for assistance in recording dialogue during the event. A big thanks to CSKA staff for assisting in the development of this dialogue summary.

For further information on this event or Community Safety Knowledge Alliance, please contact:

Shannon Fraser-Hanson
Manager
(306) 384-2751 sfraserhansen@cskacanada.ca
www.cskacanada.ca

To reference this summary, please use the following cite:

Nilson, C. (2017). *Collaborative Risk-Driven Intervention: An Interactive National Dialogue on Research, Evaluation and Analysis of the Hub/Situation Table and Related CSWB Models (Summary of Dialogue: January 24-25, 2017 at Toronto, ON)*. Saskatoon, SK: Community Safety Knowledge Alliance.

CONTENTS

Message from Event Host	p.3
Message from Event Coordinator	p.4
About the Event	p.5
About this Dialogue Summary	p.7
Opening Address (Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance)	p.8
State of the Discipline: What Have We Accomplished to Date? (Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)	p.9
Group Discussion: Strengthening Our Methods and Deliverables (Laura Huey, University of Western Ontario)	p.14
KEYNOTE ADDRESS: The Role of Evidence in the Future of Collaborative CSWB (Norm Taylor, Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being)	p.15
The Risk-Driven Tracking Database: The Latest in Data Capture and Analysis in Ontario (Claudia Tenuta/Emily Jefferson, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services)	p.20
Group Discussion: Improvements to the Hub Database (Markus Winterberger, Community Mobilization Prince Albert)	p.23
Group Discussion: Overcoming Challenges in Measurement (Jason Newberry/Jamie Brown, Taylor-Newberry Consulting)	p.26
Group Discussion: Performance Indicators in CSWB (Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)	p.29
Group Discussion: The Linkage Between Evidence and Practice (Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance)	p.31
Outcomes of the Event	p.32
Recommendations Moving Forward	p.33
Appendices	p.35
i. Event Poster	
ii. Event Agenda	
iii. Facilitator Biographies	
iv. Participant Contacts	



MESSAGE FROM EVENT HOST

Collaborative risk-driven approaches to community safety and wellbeing are growing across Canada as police and other community leaders realize that the more traditional and siloed approaches are insufficient. The Hub model, which got its start in Saskatchewan, is growing extensively in communities across Ontario, and in other provinces, including British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island.

The model is highly refined. All accounts suggest the Hub model is making a real difference out there. There is, however, corresponding and widespread agreement on the need to improve data analysis and evaluation of the model. It was in this vein that CSKA and the consortium of partners invited Hub practitioners and those within the measurement and evaluation community together for two days in January 2017, to engage together on ways to improve data analysis, research and evaluation.

I think each of us left the two days energized and committed to working together to further improve the integration of research and evaluation into the model. It is really the only way to achieve the sort of outcomes all of us are looking for.

This was but the first of many such events that the Community Safety Knowledge Alliance and its partners envision as the movement toward collaborative risk-driven approaches to community safety and wellbeing continues to expand.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Cal Corley'.

Cal Corley
Chief Executive Officer
Community Safety Knowledge Alliance, Inc.



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Centre for Forensic
Behavioural Science
and Justice Studies

USASK.CA/CFBSJS

MESSAGE FROM EVENT COORDINATOR

The inspiration for taking this event from idea-to-reality was perpetuated by the ongoing sharing, brainstorming, and growing collegiality within an informal network of Hub/Situation Table analysts, evaluators, researchers, and supporters. Since 2011, each time we were able to learn from one another, our capacity to measure became that much stronger.

To truly maximize our collective potential, however, there was a need to pull the measurement and practitioner communities together under the same roof, where we could engage in rich dialogue around measuring collaborative risk-driven community safety and well-being (CSWB). Most participants would likely agree with the observation that while together in January, we made some solid headway towards building a strong foundation for measurement of CSWB.

Moving forward, however, we must recognize that the Hub Model of collaborative risk-driven intervention is being replicated at a pace that is far too quick for science to catch up using response-oriented approaches to requests for proposals and evaluation bids. It is only through collaboration within the measurement community, and the pursuit of a truly national CSWB research agenda, that we will be able to find ourselves at the forefront of that social innovation.

Similarly, considering the uptake of this model across the country, I feel it is fair to project that there are changes in policy, procedure, and practice on the horizon. These changes need the support of good research and reliable results. Our dialogue on the leading practices in measuring CSWB, overcoming challenges, and designing an agenda for the future, is the first step towards helping decision-makers become fully prepared for the decisions that lie ahead. It is my hope that readers from the practitioner, measurement, and policy communities, will use this *summary of dialogue* as a tool in charting their shared paths forward.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chad Nilson'.

Thanks for your time,

Dr. Chad Nilson
Community Engaged Scholar/Advisor
Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies
University of Saskatchewan

ABOUT THE EVENT

The *Interactive National Dialogue on Research, Evaluation and Analysis of the Hub/Situation Table and Related CSWB Models* was arranged to provide an opportunity for researchers, evaluators and analysts engaged in Hub/Situation Tables, or other related collaborative risk-driven models for community safety and well-being (CSWB), to come together to share, collaborate and build capacity for future development of knowledge, evidence and practice. The purpose of this event was to build collective capacity within the measurement community; to produce an improved scientific understanding of collaborative risk-driven CSWB; and to facilitate a working linkage between the measurement community and the actual practitioners engaged in efforts to improve CSWB.

The impetus for the event largely stemmed from the desire among the growing CSWB measurement community, to connect, share, and explore opportunities for improving our overall measurement of the Hub Model of Collaborative Risk-Driven Intervention. A clear benefit of hosting such an event was also the opportunity to involve key stakeholders and supporters of the model in this dialogue. Doing so will help foster a bridge between research and practice within the broader context of CSWB.

The topics explored in this event included opportunities to overcome challenges in measurement, improve/strengthen the Hub/Situation Table (Risk-Driven Tracking) Database, create performance indicators for CSWB, and identify new methods for valid and reliable outcome measurements of these models. A theme throughout this event was identifying and strengthening the linkage between evidence and practice in collaborative risk-driven models of CSWB.

The format of presentations was largely discussion-focused. Each facilitator was asked to present an overview of their topic, along with practical illustrations from their own evaluative/analytical work. Following this, the larger participant body was invited to discuss the insights and implications of each topic. This not only provided a good opportunity for questions and response, but a healthy dialogue that drew in various perspectives from across the country.


The event itself was held at Holiday Inn Airport East in Toronto, ON. Although many participants were based in Ontario, others came from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, and Florida. As shown in the table below, participants for the event involved analysts, evaluators, and supporters of the Hub Model. These participants also represented a good cross-section of interests from the government, community-based, private, policing, and academic sectors.

Number of Event Participants by Sector, Type and Location (N = 63)

VARIABLE	VARIANT	N
Type	analysts	14
	evaluators	15
	supporters	34
Sector	government	14
	community-based	19
	academic	5
	private	11
	policing	14
Location	British Columbia	2
	Alberta	5
	Saskatchewan	9
	Manitoba	1
	Ontario	44
	Prince Edward Island	1
	Florida	1

During the registration process, participants were asked to self-describe their role in the Hub Model of collaborative risk-driven intervention. As the following figure shows, there was a fairly equal balance between representatives from the measurement community and those from the practitioner community.

Ratio of Measurement to Practitioner Participants



ABOUT THIS DIALOGUE SUMMARY

As a resource to both participants and non-participants of the event, this document was created to highlight the key messages in each of the sessions. In the next few sections of this document, an overview of each session will be provided. Following each overview will be a summary of feedback, questions, and general dialogue from the larger group.

Following the session summaries, two additional sections are provided. One section includes an overview of the key outcomes stemming from the National Dialogue event. These outcomes are derived from observations, feedback from event participants, and work that has been inspired since the event. The second section provides a summary of the main recommendations moving forward. Included in the appendices are the event poster, agenda, facilitator biographies, and participant contact list.

OPENING ADDRESS

(Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance)

Cal Corley's opening address positioned the event as one where the measurement community can collectively engage in dialogue on improving data analysis, research, and evaluation of the Hub Model, while at the same time, exchanging ideas and observations with community safety and well-being stakeholders who are involved in supporting Hub/Situation Tables.

The key message in Cal's opening address was for event participants to embrace the opportunity of collaboration for the sake of improving both measurement and the working linkage between the measurement community (analysts/researchers/evaluators) and the practitioner community (Hub/Situation Table supporters).

During his address, Cal highlighted the diverse group of participants in attendance who have, for the first time, come together on a national scale to begin an ongoing dialogue on improving our analytical, research, and evaluative abilities; in order to contribute to an improved understanding of community safety and well-being.

STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE: WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED TO DATE?

(Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)

Chad Nilson started the event with an overview of the state of the discipline in evaluating the Hub Model and analysing data collected at Hub/Situation Tables. He began with a discussion on the role of evaluation in collaborative risk-driven CSWB. Next, he reviewed some basic understandings of the Hub Model and the process of collaborative risk-driven intervention. Chad then turned to evaluation, and covered some of the main types of evaluative/analytical work, common topics, leading methods, and data sources. He then reviewed past evaluation results, discussed the impact of evaluation on Hub/Situation Tables, and highlighted the importance of the event for improving our collective measurement capacity. The following is a summary of Chad's presentation on the state of the discipline in evaluating collaborative risk-driven CSWB.


Role of Evaluation

- allows for systematic reflection.
- provides measurement of outcomes.
- tracks progress and monitors performance.
- verifies intentions.
- identifies opportunities for improvements.
- reveals barriers and challenges.
- informs decision-making.

The Hub Model

- Developed in Prince Albert, SK.
- Implemented in Ontario under the term Situation Tables.
- Replicated in over 60 communities Canada-wide.
- Since 2011, over 8,000 intervention discussions across the country.
- Has been reviewed by several Privacy Commissioners.

Program Theory



The Process

- regularly-scheduled weekly meetings
- early risk detection
- limited sharing of information
- mobilization of services
- intervention planning
- intervention deployment
- report-back & closure
- ongoing de-identified data collection

Types of Measurement Contributing to the Hub Model

- developmental evaluation
- formative evaluation
- summative evaluation
- table data analysis

Past Hub Model Evaluations

AUTHOR (YEAR)	COMMUNITY
Nilson (2014)	Prince Albert, SK
Litchmore (2014)	Guelph, ON
Ng & Nerad (2015)	Toronto (Rexdale), ON
Brown & Newberry (2015)	Cambridge/Kitchener, ON
Babayan, et al (2015)	Brantford, ON
Gray (2016)	Lanark County, ON
Nilson (2016)	Samson Cree Nation, AB
Clement (2016)	Ottawa, ON
Nilson (2016)	Chatham-Kent, ON
Nilson (2017)	Barrie, ON

Past Hub/Situation Table Data Analyses

AUTHOR (YEAR)	COMMUNITY
Winterberger (2014)	Prince Albert, SK
North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit (2015)	North Bay, ON
Lamontagne (2015)	Sudbury, ON
Nilson (2015)	Barrie, ON
Campbell (2016)	Durham, ON

Common Topics in Evaluating Hub/Situation Tables

- benefits
- satisfaction
- access to services
- challenges
- improvements
- capacity
- collaboration
- next steps

Common Methods in Evaluating Hub/Situation Tables

- interviews
- surveys
- focus groups
- observation
- case study
- pre/post comparisons (secondary data)
- frequency distributions (table data)

Common Data Sources in Evaluating Hub/Situation Tables

- table discussants (table members)
- discussion subjects (clients)
- key stakeholders (steering committee)
- community stakeholders (other professionals)
- agency data files
- Hub Database (e.g. risk factors)

Past Evaluation Results

- quicker access to services
- increased access to services
- improved communication
- reduction in barriers to information sharing
- improved working relationships
- clients feel supported
- service providers feel more effective
- improve client-service provider relations
- reduction in risk to more manageable level

Impact of Evaluation

- higher level of understanding
- effective trouble-shooting
- re-energizing experience
- verification of proper process
- identification of next steps
- improvements in application

Purpose of Measurement Event

- improve our rigor
- diversify and strengthen our methods
- expand our data sources
- identify key indicators
- build a measurement network
- allow science to inform practice

Facilitated Discussion

Following Chad's introductory presentation, he led a discussion with participants on a variety of topics related to maximizing the role of evaluation (and analysis) in improving community safety and well-being. The following points capture the spirit of that discussion, including both comments and questions:

- We need to recognize the inherent role of science in social innovation.
- We must minimize the gap between research and practice—so that both can inform one another.
- We must find a way to shorten the cycle between an activity, data collection, evaluation, and application of results to the program/project.
- Where can we access funds for research, evaluation, and analysis of the Hub Model?
- What is the role of predictive analytics in the area of CSWB?
- We must enable practitioners to have better access to/understanding of data-driven solutions.
- We need to be cognizant of the necessary linkages between theory, practice, and policy.
- Some of the challenges in evaluation concern the linkage of data and protection of privacy.
- Policy follows, rather than enables. Therefore, it is important that practice is driven by the best research and analysis available.
- Getting access to data, completing evaluation, and building ownership over analysis is made easier by strong relationships among the different agencies involved in Hub.

GROUP DISCUSSION: STRENGTHENING OUR METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

(Laura Huey, University of Western Ontario)

Laura led participants into a discussion on ways to strengthen our methods and deliverables from the perspective of ‘good science vs bad science’. She highlighted the criticalness of using data that are relative to answering the right questions. Too often, practitioners and academics try to make use of the wrong data and pursue the wrong questions for what they are trying to accomplish. Laura also spent some time demonstrating how different methodologies themselves, despite good intent, can be wrongly applied—resulting in misleading findings. To illustrate differences in good vs bad science, Laura provided a number of examples from various scientific fields. Some of the key points Laura offered included:

- Be aware of the hierarchy of good quality research and the variation in methodological rigour that exists.
- Do not be fooled by big data, it can have many problems too.
- Do not ignore the value of qualitative data in research and evaluation.
- We must acknowledge the linkage between research and policies—which means we need to be extra diligent in providing good evidence to decision-makers.
- Pay attention to the context of your questions and the objectives you are trying to reach.
- Be sure to acknowledge your limitations and let the reader decide whether your research stands as ‘good science’.
- The best form of research answers specific questions as opposed to general findings.
- Good research does not always get disseminated broadly because it fails to challenge the status quo in findings and/or methodology.
- Take advantage of academics with expertise and experience studying your topic; learn and collaborate with them.
- Be careful not to use methodologies in irrelevant and meaningless ways simply because it is the ‘gold standard’.

Facilitated Discussion

Following Laura’s discussion, there were a number of questions, comments and concerns raised about the path we can take towards ‘good science’. The following summarizes the dialogue among participants:

- How bad do things have to be before we should not consider it science at all?
- How can we make sure good evidence gets in the hands of decision-makers?
- How can we build relationships with researchers in our community?
- There must be consistency and fidelity in whatever model we’re studying, so that we can establish proper parameters and test reliability of our indicators.
- How do we determine the right results to report and share with policymakers?
- Social innovation is not driven by any particular method or research approach.
- We always have to be mindful of our assumptions and address limitations.
- When do we know we have good evidence that is generalizable?

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: THE ROLE OF EVIDENCE IN THE FUTURE OF COLLABORATIVE CSWB

(Norm Taylor, Journal of Community Safety Well-Being)

The following is a transcript from Norm Taylor's keynote address delivered during a supper banquet on January 24, 2017:

Opening Remarks

Good evening. Let me begin by thanking the organizers of this event for inviting me to speak on this topic, *The Role of Evidence in the Future of Collaborative CSWB*. I am honoured, and in keeping with that honour, I'm going to be a little more formal in the way I deliver my remarks tonight.



As many of you know, I wear a lot of different hats in my professional life. Last year, I was very proud to take on a new and different role as the first Editor-in-Chief of the first peer reviewed quarterly ... the first ever ... dedicated to our emerging field of collaborative CSWB. It is in that capacity that I deliver this address tonight. So, let me begin.

January 20th was an historic day. In my view, that day should always be remembered ... for being the day before Jan 21st, when almost 3 million women and men took to the streets, in cities around the world, to push back against the rise of regressive and oppressive rhetoric. Truly, best thing I've witnessed since the summer of 1969.

Two potent words, those are: *regressive* and *oppressive*.

Now, I could get political by concentrating on the latter, but that is not my purpose tonight, nor is it the point I want to address. No, tonight, in keeping with the focus of this 2-day gathering of social innovators, I want to focus on the former. Because, of all the dangers we may be sensing in the recent turn of global events, perhaps none is more pernicious than the foreshadowing in that *regressive* rhetoric ... rising here in Canada, in the US, and abroad ... that foreshadowing of a world where public policy might be formed on the equivalent of 140 character opinions and ideologies.

In many ways, preventing such a trend sits as the very foundation of this event.

Among the many signs that were captured and shared over the weekend from that historic day of protest, one really caught my eye. Due to the peculiarities of Facebook, Cal Corley had 'liked' the photo on his own page, and as a result, as sometimes randomly occurs among Facebook friends, the post appeared on my timeline late Saturday night. As soon as I read it, I knew I'd have to use it here.

The photo showed a young man in his teens, holding a sign that mimicked the usual chant-format of protest signs, with which we are all so familiar. It had two questions, and two rejoinders. The sign said:

What do we want?

And the first rejoinder was: *Evidence Based Science!!*

Then, of course ...

When do we want it?

And the answer was: *After Peer Review!!*

Without doubt, that's the very definition of *academic nerd humour*, right? But, let's consider its significance to our work together here this week.

Social Innovation and Public Policy

My good friend Dale McFee often likes to say that social innovation won't ever matter if it doesn't find its way into public policy. Now, that is a position that might rankle a lot of community-based organizers. And, it is true that some of the best social innovation arises outside of the formal systems of government at all levels. In fact, some of the best arises from the grass roots, and in counterpoint to those very systems.

I have tremendous respect for those innovators who operate in the community space, marshaling philanthropic or fund-raising resources, and delivering powerful programs over many years, often with little compensation for themselves. I have also seen how hard it is for them to sustain those sources of necessary funding year after year, and how too often such innovations remain rooted locally, non-scalable, and unable to reach their full potential in the widest range of environments with similar needs.

Let's face it, public policy often equates to those so-necessary and sustainable resources. And, while not always and certainly not guaranteed, when adopted into public policy social innovation can become enduring practice, with a much better survival rate in the face of political and ideological swings.

Unfortunately, this is so true, that we also see the endurance of many practices that have no business being policy in the first place. That's where we come in. That's why this event is so important.

From Opinion to Culture in Our Target Market

First, let's take a minute to consider the most direct markets we aim to serve in our social innovation. None of the policing, criminal justice and human services sectors—whose collaboration we are aiming to achieve in service of CSWB—is without its own sad traditions in the adoption and perpetuation of policies and practices for which there was and is not only no evidence to support them, but ample sources of counter-indicating evidence available to them.

From conversion therapies for sexual orientation and gender identity, to extraordinary rendition and enhanced interrogation techniques, from administrative segregation applied to young offenders, to mandatory sentencing and 3-strike practices that have led to mass incarceration across the US, and from punitive responses to drug and alcohol addiction, to bully-protecting and victim-shaming reassignment policies in classrooms. I could go on ... and on.

Many of these practices derive from long held social ideologies, some from religious mythologies, and far too many from the mere convenience of the system serving its own administrative lethargy, or from a beleaguered public service that must respond with duplicity to the economic and political priorities of a tax-and-fund system that favours the most advantaged while ever-expanding the marginalization of those it was intended to support.

More importantly, perhaps, is that we know from experience how fine the line is between opinion and organizational and systemic culture. Consider, just within policing, some of the examples of a culturally-based adherence to practices that are not supported by the evident social science, or conversely, the steadfast reluctance to adopt practices that are.

How many police services continue to deliver DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) programs?

How often do we hear US and Canadian police spokespersons still invoke the debunked 21-foot rule as the basis for justifying excessive use of lethal force?

How often are we asked to simply accept that the documented and disproportionate carding of young African-Canadian males is simply an aberration in the effective application of intelligence gathering practices, absent the production of any similar documentation on how such intelligence has been applied to any measurable effect?

How many police services continue to resist adopting harm reduction practices, because they run counter to a punitive narrative?

Why is the proven promise of Restorative Justice alternatives still being limited to some isolated applications?

Now, those were merely some policing and criminal justice questions. Here's one that is for everyone.

Why do we continue to let abstract and misinformed Privacy concerns be employed as a systemic impediment to sharing the information that is both necessary, and legally anticipated in every sector, for our human service sectors to respond adequately, collaboratively, and with appropriate urgency, in the face of mounting, concrete evidence of compound and acutely elevated risk situations, and in the face of multiple inquests that reveal this very habitual practice for its full and ultimate dangers?

Now, I recognize we are not here tonight to litigate those or other opinion-based practices.

But, we must recognize their implications, their lessons, and their costs, if we are to continue moving forward in our socially innovative directions in CSWB.

Where Are We with Evidence in Collaborative CSWB

Let's consider where we are headed in that journey. Our private firm completed and published the first Canada-wide Account of Hub/Situation Table Adoption two months ago. That's just one model, as we all know, but the rate of its proliferation is both impressive and daunting at the same time. To date, the evaluations and data analytics tracking that model have been strong in their own right, but they have also been limited to qualitative studies and formative, developmental, and process-related insights. All good, but we will need much more if we are to support practitioners who know all too well that like any socially innovative practice, it is a model that yields a lot of predictable stress points in its early going. We hear a lot about those stressors in our advisory work, and we've talked a lot of adopters "off the ledge", so to speak. These stresses may derive from uneven privacy interpretations, or from uneven commitment or energy invested at the Table, or in the interventions and follow-through. Whatever their nature, only predictable, consistent and evidence-informed practices will permit this model, with all its promise, to survive the inevitable reactionary pressures that will most certainly arise from time to time in each and every jurisdiction.

It's also worth noting that to date, two particular forms of evidence have yet to appear to any great degree. One of those is what we might call the '*lived experience outcomes*'. Our colleague Dr. Nilson recently published a commentary in the November issue of our Journal of CSWB, and fruitful conversations are well underway in that regard. Enough time has passed that meaningful things, both the positive and negative lessons, can and must be learned from the actual subjects of those 8500+ interventions that have occurred across the country.

Another form of required study goes to the *quantitative and economic impacts* of the model. I am very proud to announce tonight that the March issue of our Journal will feature the first comprehensive and quantitative study of this nature. The paper is co-authored as an adaptation of a recent Masters thesis by the original researcher, Murray Sawatsky, who retired almost two years ago from the Sask. Ministry of Justice, jointly with his two research advisors from the U of R, Dr. Rick Ruddell and Dr. Nick Jones. Murray applied well-established costing models for determining the savings to the City of Prince Albert from measurable reductions in specific categories of crime, following the introduction of the first Hub Model in Canada. He and his collaborators have subsequently, and only recently, updated his calculations using the costing models released just weeks ago by Public Safety Canada.

Editorial guidelines restrict what I can say about the paper before its upcoming publication. But, suffice to say, the calculations, based on policing data alone, reveal *significant difference* outcomes in most of the crime categories studied, with resulting savings to the PA Police measured in the millions of dollars over the period from 2011 to 2015. We believe this first study will set the stage for more such studies, as the appetite for economic evidence will continue to grow, not just for that model, but for all collaborative CSWB initiatives and programs.

Where Are We Headed in Collaborative CSWB?

Stepping into my private role for a moment, while conducting our nation-wide account, and in our continuing professional support to many communities, my colleagues and I are increasingly hearing the "what comes next" question. With a nod to our own Global Network clients in Durham, Halton, PEI, Brantford, Barrie, North Bay, Brandon and Surrey, and with respect to the bold initiatives of the OPP,

MCSCS in Ontario, and BPRC in Saskatchewan, the phrase my colleagues and I have adopted to frame “what comes next” is *CSWB in Action*. Kind of speaks for itself, right?

We’ve all heard and read a lot about CSWB Planning as a general concept ... we look forward to speaking with more and more communities and provinces about how these early adopters are starting to put the ‘Action’ into that concept. And, just to be clear, by the word “action” I am referring to defining, pursuing and implementing the highest priority data-driven and evidence based opportunities and solutions for systemic reform and collaborative programming that will achieve the measurable CSWB outcomes that communities need most ... and need most urgently.

The Editorial Vision and Commitment of Your Journal of CSWB

So, to close, let me return to my Editor-in-Chief role, where on behalf of CSKA, our publisher Multimed, and our team of Section Editors and professional staff, I would like to make this commitment and express my promise to you tonight. Our Journal is committed to advancing the social science ... and thus informing and shaping the public policy ... that will be necessary to conceiving, launching, proving concept, proliferating, funding and sustaining progressive and socially innovative practices ... policies and practices that are born of research, evidence and scientific knowledge where it can be found or created, supported by data where it is or where it can be mined and shared, and at all times, anchored in a renewed collaboration among all parts of the public service system to meet the Community Safety and Well-Being ambitions and outcomes that all our citizens deserve.

If you haven’t yet read the Journal’s first 3 issues, please do so when you can. Please look forward to reading our March issue, where the interactive dialogue continues, framed by 7 very strong and diverse new articles.

And, let’s recognize the importance of sharing with others your work together here this week and in the collaborations to follow, and all the great work you’re all pursuing in your respective day jobs. And so, I would ask this of you tonight. Whether you’ve published many times before like some of the people in this room have, or if you’ve never before seen yourself as an author, please join us in this mission. We publish original research, social innovation narratives, practice guidelines, commentaries, editorials, and even letters to the editor. Be bold. Be controversial. And, if you should choose to go with that last category and express your thoughts in writing to the Editor-in-Chief, please be kind.

Thank you. I’m happy to take any questions or discussion about my remarks or about the Journal itself.

THE RISK-DRIVEN TRACKING DATABASE: THE LATEST IN DATA CAPTURE AND ANALYSIS IN ONTARIO

(Claudia Tenuta/Emily Jefferson, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services)

To provide an overview of the latest analytics for Hub/Situation Tables, Claudia presented Ontario’s journey with the *Risk-Driven Tracking Database (RTD)*¹. Her presentation began by providing an overview of three phases that make up Ontario’s Provincial Approach to CSWB, with a focus on the



Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework. The next part of her presentation outlined the implementation and advancement of data collection from Hub/Situation Tables in Ontario. During this discussion, Claudia highlighted 4 key points:

- In Ontario, multi-sectoral risk intervention models are happening at the community level.
- The RTD provides a standardized means of gathering de-identified information on situations of elevated risk for communities implementing multi-sectoral risk intervention models.
- The RTD is one tool that supports these models by helping communities collect data about local priority risks and evolving trends to assist with the community safety and well-being planning process.
- Ontario’s RTD data elements align with other jurisdictions across Canada to allow for national comparatives.

Following this, Claudia shared the RTD Roadmap for the province of Ontario. This roadmap identifies the progress made and future directions for the RTD in Ontario, including 35 communities expected to be on-boarded by spring 2018.


PHASE	ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE
RTD Proof-of-Concept (Phase 1)	Intro of Microsoft Dynamic CRM 2011; North Bay onboarded	Aug 2014 - Aug 2015
RTD Proof-of-Concept (Phase 2)	Intro of Microsoft Dynamic CRM 2013; Cambridge onboarded	Sept 2015 - Jan 2016
RTD Provincial Roll-out (Phase 1)	18 communities will be onboarded across Ontario	Feb 2016 – June 2017
RTD Provincial Roll-out (Phase 2)	15 communities to be onboarded	June 2017 – ongoing

¹ Based off the original Hub Database created by Nilson, Winterberger, Young (2014) in Saskatchewan.


Turning to a discussion on the implementation of the RTD, Claudia highlighted some of the main data fields in the database. These include:

- 102 risk factors that fit within 26 categories and 13 CSWB groupings.
- Socio-demographic data such as discussion type (e.g. person, family), sex, and age group.
- Agency and sector engagement (e.g. originating, lead, and assisting).
- 51 protective factors that mediate the exposure to risk factors.
- 29 different types of services that can be mobilized in order to mitigate risk.
- Persons affected by the elevated risk/intervention process.
- Sectors involved in the discussion/intervention process.
- Whether consent was provided before or after the discussion was brought forward to the Hub/Situation Table.

To illustrate the utility of the database, Claudia and Emily shared their results of an analysis using data from 12 different Hub/Situation Tables in Ontario. The results are based upon 935 discussions over a one year period (2016). Overall, 88% of these discussions “Met the Threshold of Acutely-Elevated Risk”. In addition, 70% of these discussions resulted in a closure reason of “Overall Risk Lowered”. As the following figures show, the leading risk categories during the study period include mental health, criminal involvement, and drugs. Some of the leading sectors involved in Ontario discussions include health, justice, and community and social services.



2016 Provincial RTD Results – Sector Engagement



Facilitated Discussion

Following Claudia's presentation, participants were engaged in a discussion around the future potential for data collection, storage, and analysis using the RTD and similar applications. The following summarizes the dialogue among participants:

- How can other communities or provinces utilize the database?
- It is critical that across the country, we keep consistency in the Hub/Situation Table variables and maintain strict compliance with privacy legislation and any other relevant policies or guidelines (e.g. the Four Filter approach to the Hub Model).
- It is very important that Ministry preserves the rawest form of Table data, and that the data continue to be owned by the communities where it is collected.
- The use of 'protective factors' is being piloted as a heuristic for operational purposes, while the pilot of 'services mobilized' is being used to build capacity for measuring Table outcomes.
- What additional data collection options are there once consent is obtained?
- Why is Ontario not using the 3 cognitive risk factors used in Saskatchewan?
- The RTD will help to inform CSWB planning across Ontario.
- How have some communities (e.g. Cambridge, Barrie, Chatham-Kent) been able to go beyond the RTD and start to collect data from clients?
- How can risk data and protective factors be used to validate funding?
- How can collective groups (like Ontario Working Group for Collaborative Risk-Driven Community Safety and Well-Being) access the RTD for their own research and planning?
- It is important to build local analytical capacity (e.g. private sector, academics) to use the data for more than just monitoring Hub/Situation Table performance.

GROUP DISCUSSION: IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HUB DATABASE

(Markus Winterberger, Community Mobilization Prince Albert)



One of the main purposes of this event was to explore how we can improve our overall measurement of the Hub Model. A major source of data on Hub/Situation Tables is the Hub Database (RTD in Ontario). Therefore, Markus facilitated a discussion on the opportunities we have nationally, to improve the database. To guide this process, Markus posed five questions to participants. These questions and their responses are summarized in the following sections.

What are your initial thoughts on the Hub Database?

- This allows us to see multi-sector data for the first time.
- The risk data are telling us important things about community needs we never knew before.
- The database provides us with opportunities to outline future service budgets.
- It provides an excellent opportunity for some agencies to learn about their community, where they ordinarily wouldn't have the capacity to collect such rich information.
- The Hub Database is one of our most effective tools for protecting privacy; it keeps the discussion disciplined and structured.
- The database provides a useful illustration of the service flow between agencies, and how we can best mitigate risk.
- It is a great tool that demonstrates the truly complex nature of risk affecting individuals and families in our community.

What are the remaining challenges with the Hub Database?

- There's always a struggle between gathering too much information and not enough.
- We are not sharing the data enough. There needs to be more access to the numbers.
- Some communities still struggle with trying to suggest new variables versus creating their own local study flags.
- We are not using the study flags (nor analysis of them) to our best potential.
- The Hub database is a reflection of clients engaged through Hub, it is not a true sample of the larger community.
- Because the data are de-identified, it makes linking outcome data to intervention data a real challenge.
- The data captures presence of risk and services mobilized very well, but does not allow us to track client outcomes or actual risk reduction.
- It captures who is involved in Hub discussions, but doesn't fairly capture the efforts of other agencies contributing to the discussion process.
- We don't see any risk factors for gambling captured, yet it is still in the database.
- There are some underlying risks which are not captured: poverty and lack of life basics.

What suggestions do you have for improving the Hub Database?

- In making improvements, we need to make sure we are not affecting the synergy and flow of the discussion process.
- When improving it, we must make sure that we are not over-expanding the database to compensate for a lack of data elsewhere in our human service systems.
- As much as we want lots of data, we must remember the inherent purpose of the table or it will quickly lose its purpose.
- All efforts we make to improve the database must be built around the protection of privacy.
- We need to find a way to capture discussion outcomes without the Hub Database morphing into a case management tool.
- We need to make it clear for discussants that we should only be entering data that are relevant to the current situation of acutely-elevated risk, not something related to the client's past.
- We need to start examining the relationships between variables in the database (i.e. crosstabs).
- It would be of value to insert a metric of risk complexity, as opposed to an accumulation of different risk factors.
- There is no room for protective factors in a risk-tracking database that is designed for rapid intervention (as opposed to ongoing case management). Conversely, some feel that it helps to identify client strengths and opportunities for building upon those strengths.
- Services mobilized is perhaps the most important variable created, yet collecting it at the table may not be appropriate—as once a situation is out of acutely-elevated risk, no further information should be shared. Others disagree, for common discussion closure practices often involve a basic summary of services mobilized.
- The conclusion date should be the date of intervention, not the actual data entry date.
- The closure variable is sometimes cumbersome to work with. Perhaps it could be split in two.
- What indicators are we suggesting need to be present in order for risk to be lowered?

How can we achieve consistency across the country?

- We need to stress that the role of the database is more than just for data collection, it is a strategically-designed instrument that can be used to encourage consistency, reliability, and fidelity to the Hub Model.
- Ontario has 102 risk factors and services mobilized. The rest of Canada has 105 risk factors and is not capturing services mobilized. We need to bridge that gap.
- We need to pull together a national consortium of government, academic, community-based, and private sector analysts and evaluators who can be stewards of the database and guide national continuity.
- The Hub Model itself must be implemented consistently across Canada before we can expect to gather comparable data.
- We must build a fidelity tool that ensures consistent discipline in application of the Hub Model and use of the database.

What should be our next steps with the Hub Database?

- We need to start using our Hub data to explore other opportunities in CSWB—namely identifying and responding to systemic issues that are detected at the Hub/Situation Table.
- We need to use the database as a starting point for particular community issues—but dig down further to truly understand the contributing factors to those issues.
- We should start exploring options to link agency data on the backend to the de-identified Hub data on the front end. This will help build capacity for improved analysis of intervention outcomes.

GROUP DISCUSSION: OVERCOMING CHALLENGES IN MEASUREMENT

(Jason Newberry/Jamie Brown, Taylor-Newberry Consulting)

Moving toward better science requires researchers, analysts, and evaluators to identify and overcome challenges in measurement. To guide us down that path, evaluators Jason and Jamie led a discussion on the common (and still emerging) challenges in measuring collaborative risk-driven intervention. They approached this discussion through a framework of their ongoing evaluative work with the Kitchener and Cambridge Situation Tables in Waterloo Region, Ontario. Throughout the discussion, Jason and Jamie were not only diligent in soliciting participant feedback, but careful to illustrate actual solutions to some of the problems raised in the overall discussion.



In facilitating discussion, Jason and Jamie identified several key challenge areas. These areas make up the remainder of this section. Within each section are both suggestions from the facilitators (based on their experience) and feedback from participants. Also included are several suggested solutions to these challenges.

STARTING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Facilitator-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is often limited time for detailed communication on evaluation process and design. • A Hub/Situation Table is not a single entity, but rather a consortium of 20 or more agencies with different interests, data points, privacy thresholds, and data collection capacity. • There is variation in the extent to which Table members can ‘speak for their organization’. • There is often diffusion of responsibility to the evaluation over time. • There are varying risk tolerances of organizations to the range of possible evaluation questions that can be pursued.
--	--

Participant-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult for agencies to figure out their role in the evaluation process. • There is often a disconnect between different jurisdictions involved in the same Hub/Situation Table. • It is difficult to sort out the role of clients (and determine client access) in the planning stages. • Managers and steering committees typically expect measures on long-term outcomes that are very difficult to attribute to the Hub/Situation Table. • Many agencies are still nervous about sharing information, let alone participating in an evaluation process requiring additional data access.
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend time clarifying the desired outcomes agencies want measured. • Lower the expectations of outcome measures from the beginning—so that agency leaders focus on short and intermediate outcomes of the collaborative risk-driven intervention process. • Consult with smaller subgroupings of the Hub/Situation Table. • Engage both Table discussants and their managers at the home agency in the evaluation planning process.

ACCESSING SECONDARY DATA

Facilitator-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to arrange for data sharing agreements. • Confusion on the requirement of ethics approvals (research vs evaluation). • Several layers of decision making within organizations slows down data access. • When trying to access data, you have to consult with higher level decision-makers who do not fully understand the model—which makes it difficult to explain evaluation design. • Secondary data is largely uninterpretable unless it can be matched with data points from the Hub/RTD (which are of course is de-identified).
Participant-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are differences in the extent to which agencies use and store client data (e.g. assessment tools, client database, referral forms). • There is variation in the ability for agencies to link data from different sources. • Not all agencies have an equal investment in data collection/storage capacity. • Agencies that do have the capacity to produce strong secondary data may not be involved in all discussions within the sample. • Most agencies gather data on what is relevant to their funder, not necessarily what is valuable to evaluations on the Hub Model.
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies should store the client’s Hub/Situation discussion number in their own databases, to allow for easier data linkage during evaluation. • Explain the methodological design to stakeholders at each stage of data approval and acquisition (ideally with the ‘doers’). • Make sure that discussion/situation re-openings are clearly tracked back to the original discussion/situation. • Approach partner agencies with cross-sector MOUs around data capturing, storage, and analysis for the purposes of evaluation. • Explain the purpose and utility of secondary data collection in evaluation.

ACCESSING PRIMARY DATA

Facilitator-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to connect with former clients who are often transient. • Large refusal or no show rate among clients. • Frontline workers assess that their clients are experiencing too many challenges to participate in the evaluation process. • Once risk is reduced, technically, continued contact and information sharing on the client is inappropriate. • Frontline workers worry that evaluation may jeopardize therapeutic alliance. • Evaluation must be part of the consent process—as evaluators need to have some context on the individual’s situation leading up the intervention.
Participant-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to seek permission from managers, yet need the support of frontline workers to get access to clients. There is often a disconnect in this effort. • Not every frontline worker sees the value of evaluation, which impacts their effort to deliver client access to evaluators. • Clients may not be able to recognize they were helped by the Hub/Situation Table. • There is a considerable risk for sample bias toward clients who had a positive relationship with their intervention team.
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a consent variable to the Hub Database. • Take advantage of other neutral (non-Hub) supports currently engaging the client.

MEASURING LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

Facilitator-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funders and managers often focus on the long-term outcomes instead of immediate service mobilization and risk reduction. • The mandate of the Hub/Situation Table does not extend beyond basic triage. Responsibility for longer-term outcomes lies with the subsequent human service system—which is not within the purview (typically) of Table evaluations. • While we can certainly imagine innovative mechanisms that create integrated connections between risk interventions and long-term wraparound supports (indeed, some have happened organically), the “theory of change” of most Hub/Situation Tables suggest long-term evaluation is premature.
Participant-Identified Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With so many sectors involved, it is difficult to identify relevant indicators to measure long-term outcomes. • It is very difficult to methodologically, and even theoretically, link table interventions to the typical indicators of CSWB.
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation must be embedded at the front-end of the intervention process. • There must be an alignment of legislation with both the needs of intervention and evaluation. • The Hub Database must be linked to external individual-level data, and used within the proper boundaries of privacy concerns and legislation.

GROUP DISCUSSION: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN COMMUNITY SAFETY WELL-BEING

(Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)

In preparing to improve measurement capacity, one of the key priorities is to develop valid and reliable indicators for CSWB. To align the context for dialogue on this topic, Chad opened the session with a brief overview of performance indicators within the realm of CSWB. He defined performance indicators as “a specific, observable, and measurable characteristic that serves to define a concept in a practical way—while showing progress toward a particular output or outcome”. He then proceeded to discuss the importance of evaluation type, evaluation goals, program theory, and various influencers of indicators.

According to Chad, in defining our indicators, the type of evaluation we are conducting matters. For developmental evaluations, we focus on problems, creations, principles, leadership and strategy. For formative evaluations, the focus for indicators is on need, capacity, partnerships, process, collaboration, change, benefits, and challenges. Moving into summative evaluation work, key indicators may include impact, effectiveness, outcomes, and sustainability.

Once we are clear on our evaluation type, Chad suggested that participants concentrate on the goals for the evaluation. While evaluating the Hub Model, a goal of *performance monitoring* may include indicators such as referrals, interventions, and risk detection. When performing *outcome measurement*, the indicators may involve service engagements or risk reduction. Finally, when trying to demonstrate causality, evaluators may want to develop indicators on upstream service engagement and its impact on risk reduction.

Moving toward a more conventional approach to determining indicators, Chad presented some general discussion around the logic model, and in particular, how program theory can help shape indicators. Short-term outcome indicators for the Hub Model can include service mobilization or knowledge of risk (for example). Moving down the linear path, some potential intermediate outcomes may include service engagement, risk reduction, and clients are supported. Finally, the long-term outcome of the Hub Model can involve a variety of indicators for improved community safety and well-being (e.g. improved mental health, reduced violence).

The final portion of Chad’s introductory comments identified a number of ‘influencers’ on performance indicators. According to Chad, the impact of these influences on key indicators can vary in duration and intensity. They also may very well change per community and time period. Overall, these influencers on indicators include: expert opinion, past research, community stakeholder interest, data availability, collection capacity, evaluation resources, timelines, and of course, budget.

Following his context overview of performance indicators, Chad led a discussion on different types of performance indicators. In particular, he sorted them into 4 main groupings. These include ‘collaboration’, ‘service mobilization’, ‘risk reduction’, and ‘community safety and well-being’.

Further to this, ‘community safety and well-being’ is split into two sub-types: ‘sector specific’ and ‘aggregate’. The table below summarizes suggestions from participants.

INDICATOR GROUP	SUGGESTIONS
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuum of collaboration • Change in the level of collaboration • Change in collaborative behavior • Understanding of collaboration • Value of collaboration • Client file transfers • Agency-to-agency referrals • Shared clients • Information sharing • Communication • Shared goal-setting • Shared measurement
Service Mobilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service connection • Service engagement • Offer of service • Service delivery • Client intake
Risk Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced risk factors • Adoption of service plan • Supports in place • Threat removed • Feeling of support
CSWB – sector specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental health • Physical health • Housing stability • Employment • Personal safety • Community involvement • School engagement • Sobriety • Treatment progress • Order compliance
CSWB – aggregate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced vulnerability • Complexity of risk

In wrapping up the group discussion on developing performance indicators for CSWB, Chad invited participants to discuss some key strategies for developing sound indicators, and ultimately, producing a good evaluation. Suggestions from participants include:

- Take a systemic approach to indicator development.
- Measure what you are intending to measure.
- Do not let one indicator define the entire Hub Model—instead, involve multiple indicators.
- Explore protected data collection from lead agency immediately before/after Hub discussion.

GROUP DISCUSSION: THE LINKAGE BETWEEN EVIDENCE AND PRACTICE

(Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance)

The final session of the event focused on the linkage between evidence and practice in CSWB. The purpose of this session was to get the measurement community and the practitioner community to start thinking about how they can better work together, for the purposes of collectively maximising their scientific and service outcomes. Guiding that discussion, Cal posted four questions to participants. Participant responses to these questions are summarized accordingly.

How can we improve the integration of measurement experts into collaborative risk-driven intervention?

- Have them become immersed into the operations of the Hub/Situation Table.
- Involve a measurement expert on the Steering Committee.
- Make collection of evidence one of the cornerstones of inter-agency MOUs.
- Identify the key benefits of research to Hub practitioners.
- Provide sufficient budgets to allow for integration of the measurement community.
- Recognize the evaluative lens of the Hub Database.
- Engage practitioners in every stage of the evaluation process.

How can we foster improved linkages between science/evidence and practice?

- Invest in research/evaluation/analysis as part of annual budget.
- Foster local sharing opportunities.
- Pursue joint projects together.
- Elevate the profile of analysts/evaluators within human service agencies.
- Create a community of practice among analysts, evaluators and researchers, with linkages/involvement to the practitioner community.

What do we have going on for us already?

- Strong measurement leadership from the academic, private, community-based, and government sectors.
- Desire among community leaders to endorse and support the measurement process.
- Growing body of evaluation literature that provides a solid foundation to build future work.
- Experience of several communities who have good relations between the measurement and practitioner communities.

What is currently holding us back?

- Infidelity in application of the Hub Model.
- Unfamiliarity of agency leaders with both evaluation and the Hub Model.
- Annual budgets and fiscal year end reporting expectations.
- Privacy legislation and interpretations of that legislation.

OUTCOMES OF THE EVENT

(prepared by Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)

In planning this event, we had one goal in mind: to generate opportunities for collaboration, networking and a sharing of ideas for improving our measurement of the Hub Model (and related CSWB initiatives). Since hosting the event in January, we have been pleased to learn of some initial and secondary outcomes stemming from our shared dialogue in Toronto². The following points highlight some of the initial outcomes of the event. We are hopeful that as the measurement and practitioner communities continue to learn new ways to work together, we can collectively produce better evidence on leading practices in CSWB.

- New research partnerships between the private and public sector on evaluating Hub/Situation Tables.
- Re-energized effort to infuse data with practice during the pursuit of solutions in CSWB.
- New relationships among members of the measurement community—which have already led to innovations in methodology, collaborative evaluation, and pursuits of research funding.
- Integration of academic and private-sector evaluators in community-based activities aimed at building measurement capacity.
- Connections between the measurement and practitioner community over discussions of increased evaluation/analyses of the Hub Model.
- Shared appetite for national consistency in application of the Hub Model Principles and collection of Hub/Situation Table data.
- Motivation for community partners to pursue resources for proper and ongoing measurement.
- Inspiration to host a national event that will bring together Hub/Situation Table discussants/chairs and key supporters of the Hub Model.
- Invitation to submit articles, reports, narratives, or commentaries to the *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being*.
- Access for Hub Model supporters to some of the leading research/evaluators/analysts immersed in Hub/Situation Tables.
- Prioritization of research/evaluation/data analysis among community partners engaged in collaborative risk-driven intervention.
- Increased understanding among Hub/Situation Table supporters, for what the measurement community requires to pursue ‘good evidence’.
- Collective acknowledgement within measurement community, to pursue improvements in methodology and data collection without interfering with the flow, synergy, and efficiency of Table operations.

² These outcomes were learned of through follow-up communication with event participants.

RECOMMENDATIONS MOVING FORWARD

(prepared by Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan)

During the national dialogue event, we shared considerable discussion on next steps moving forward. Many of the suggestions provided during these discussions were in the theme of ‘improved methodology’, ‘increased data access’, and ‘enhanced buy-in and support’, to name a few. In an effort to try and support our efforts for future work in the measurement of CSWB, a number of recommendations are offered below. These recommendations are based upon the observations and analysis of discussion dialogue among participants. They in no way represent the official policy or views of Community Safety Knowledge Alliance or any of its government funders or sponsors. They are simply intended to guide future work of the measurement and practitioner community. Although numbered for ease of reference, the numbering of these evaluations in no way represents their priority over one another.

- 1) The original *Hub Database Guides and Description of Variables* should be revised and re-distributed. The original authors of the database should work with a cross-section of stakeholders from across Canada to refine and improve the database for the whole country.
- 2) In forming a Hub/Situation Table, partner agencies should include shared data collection, evaluation, and analysis as priority activities for signatories of their MOU.
- 3) Communities (and their measurement assets) may want to consider using the Hub/Situation Table Database to begin capturing data on systemic issues. This will arm communities with important information required for the next stages of community safety and well-being: planning, alignment, barrier reduction, system improvement, etc.
- 4) In providing valuable support for data collection, measurement, and model fidelity, it is important that government ministries be clear that their role is in ‘support’ and not ‘ownership’ of the Hub Model or related databases. Doing so will encourage communities to take a leadership role in analysing and measuring their own data.
- 5) Hub Model stakeholders should develop a national fidelity tool that will assist communities in complying with the core concepts and components of the model. Such consistency will create better opportunities for local, regional, provincial, and national measurement. It will also serve to clarify and reduce the risk of deviation from the established discipline and practices of the Hub Model.
- 6) All levels of government should budget for ongoing research, evaluation, and analysis of Hub/Situation Tables and other related CSWB activities.
- 7) Construct a sharing network within the measurement community that brings together researchers, evaluators, and analysts to collaborate and improve measurement of the model.
- 8) Data gathered at Hub/Situation Tables should be managed and owned by communities. Although the government and private sectors can enable effective data collection solutions, the data should be controlled locally, and governed using a bottom-up approach.

- 9) The measurement community has made great strides in tracking ‘risk factors’, ‘service mobilization’, and ‘protective factors’, however, we need to start operationalizing actual ‘risk reduction’ that is attributable to the collaborative risk-driven intervention process.
- 10) In the spirit of national consistency, communities not currently including *cognitive impairment* in their local Hub/Situation Table database may want to consider its inclusion (*cognitive impairment*: suspected, self-reported, diagnosed).
- 11) To enable improvements in collaborative risk-driven intervention, and improved measurement of these efforts, policymakers should explore changes in privacy legislation that allow for disciplined information sharing and data linkage, while still protecting the privacy of individuals and families.
- 12) It is clear that among members of both the measurement and practitioner community, the ‘services mobilized’ short-term outcome variable is of particular interest. Where difference lies, however, is in the practices of collecting this data. Some argue for efficiency and thus advocate for collection of these data at the Hub/Situation Table. Others argue for privacy and therefore advocate for collection of this data separate from the Hub/Situation Table. The measurement community should explore opportunities to track services mobilized while protecting both Table efficiency and the privacy of discussion subjects.
- 13) Establish ongoing opportunities for interaction among the measurement and practitioner communities.
- 14) Increase shared ownership over the measurement process by including practitioners (e.g. agency leaders, frontline staff) in the defining of research questions, identifying data sources, and disseminating results.
- 15) Pursue an increase in quantitative measurement capacity of Hub Model outcomes, without over-indulging in the ambiguous space of ‘big data’. In other words, be weary of the allure statistics provide to high level decision-makers. Pay close attention to methodological reason, reliability, and validity.

APPENDICES



Community
Safety
Knowledge
Alliance



UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN
Centre for Forensic Behavioural
Science and Justice Studies



MEASURING COLLABORATIVE RISK-DRIVEN INTERVENTION

An Interactive National Dialogue on Research, Evaluation and Analysis of the Hub/Situation Table and Related CSWB Models

WHAT The Community Safety Knowledge Alliance, in partnership with University of Saskatchewan, University of Western Ontario and Canadian Society of Evidence Based Policing, have organized an opportunity for researchers, evaluators and analysts engaged in the Hub/Situation Table model, or other related collaborative risk-driven models for community safety and well-being (CSWB), to come together to share, collaborate and build capacity for future development of knowledge, evidence and practice.

PURPOSE The purpose of this event is to build collective capacity within the measurement community, to produce an improved scientific understanding of collaborative risk-driven CSWB; as well as, facilitate a working linkage from the analytical, research and evaluation community—to the actual practitioners engaged in efforts to improve CSWB.

WHO This gathering will appeal to analysts, researchers and evaluators currently, previously, or potentially involved in the Hub/Situation Table and other collaborative risk-driven CSWB models across Canada and the United States.

WHY Since 2011, the Hub model of collaborative risk-driven intervention has been widely-replicated across Canada and parts of the United States. Over the past few years, research, evaluation and analysis of the model have occurred in several segregated pockets. Never before, has this cohort of analysts, researchers and evaluators been able to come together and work, share, or develop collectively. The goal of this gathering is to establish and strengthen a network within the scientific and analytical community, around opportunities to measure and improve collaborative risk-driven intervention and other models of collaborative risk-driven CSWB.

FOCUS Topics explored during this event include opportunities to overcome challenges in measurement, improve/strengthen the Hub/Situation Table (Risk-Driven Tracking) Database, create performance indicators for CSWB, and identify new methods for valid and reliable outcome measurements of these models. A theme throughout this event will be identifying and strengthening the linkage between evidence and practice in collaborative risk-driven models of CSWB.

WHERE Holiday Inn Airport East, 600 Dixon Road, Toronto, ON

WHEN January 24 from 1:30pm – 4:30pm, cocktails 5pm, dinner 6pm, speaker 7pm
January 25 from 8am – 3pm (breakfast + lunch provided)
** registration is free, please submit registration forms by December 19, 2016 (required for planning).*

PROUDLY SPONSORED BY THE ONTARIO MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, GLOBAL NETWORK FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY AND THE SASKATCHEWAN MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, CORRECTIONS AND POLICING



MEASURING COLLABORATIVE RISK-DRIVEN INTERVENTION

An Interactive National Dialogue on Research, Evaluation and Analysis of the Hub/Situation Table and Related CSWB Models

AGENDA

JANUARY 24, 2016

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD
130pm	Opening Address	Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance
2pm	State of the Discipline: What Have We Accomplished to Date	Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan
3pm	<i>BREAK</i> (sponsored by Canadian Society of Evidence Based Policing)	
315pm	<i>Group Discussion: Strengthening Our Methods and Deliverables</i>	Laura Huey, University of Western Ontario
430pm	<i>BREAK</i> (sponsored by University of Saskatchewan)	
5pm	Cocktails + Networking	
6pm	Dinner (sponsored by Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services)	
7pm	The Role of Evidence in the Future of Collaborative CSWB	Norm Taylor, Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being
745pm	Cocktails + Networking	

JANUARY 25, 2016

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD
7am	Breakfast (sponsored by Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice Corrections and Policing)	
8am	The Risk-driven Tracking Database: The Latest in Data Capture and Analysis in Ontario	Claudia Tenuta, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services Emily Jefferson, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services
830am	<i>Group Discussion: Improvements to the Hub Database</i>	Markus Winterberger, Community Mobilization Prince Albert
10am	<i>BREAK</i> (sponsored by University of Western Ontario)	
1015am	<i>Group Discussion: Overcoming Challenges in Measurement</i>	Jason Newberry, Taylor Newberry Consulting Jaime Brown, Taylor Newberry Consulting
12pm	<i>LUNCH</i> (sponsored by Global Network for Community Safety)	
1pm	<i>Group Discussion: Performance Indicators in CSWB</i>	Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan
2pm	<i>Group Discussion: The Linkage Between Evidence and Practice</i>	Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance
3pm	EVERYONE DEPARTS	

PROUDLY SPONSORED BY THE ONTARIO MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, GLOBAL NETWORK FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY AND THE SASKATCHEWAN MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, CORRECTIONS AND POLICING

FACILITATOR BIOGRAPHIES

Cal Corley, Community Safety Knowledge Alliance

- Lead developer and CEO of CSKA.
- Former RCMP Assistant Commissioner.
- International policing leadership and management advisor.

Chad Nilson, University of Saskatchewan

- Community Engaged Scholar at University of Saskatchewan – Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies.
- Pioneer in evaluating and developing a conceptual understanding of the Hub Model.
- Lead developer of the Hub Database now used across Canada.

Claudia Tenuta, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services

- Community Safety Analyst with the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services.
- Involved in making the original Saskatchewan Hub Database available to Ontario communities through an advanced online platform capable of powerful analytics.
- Contributor to Phase II and III of Ontario's Provincial Approach to Community Safety and Well Being.

Emily Jefferson, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services

- Community Safety Analyst with the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services.
- Involved in making the original Saskatchewan Hub Database available to Ontario communities through an advanced online platform capable of powerful analytics.
- Contributor to Phase II and III of Ontario's Provincial Approach to Community Safety and Well Being.

Jamie Brown, Taylor-Newberry Consulting

- Evaluation Consultant for Taylor-Newberry Consulting in Guelph, ON.
- Assisted in development of Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship – University of Guelph.
- Conducted the evaluation of Situation Tables in Cambridge and Kitchener.

Jason Newberry, Taylor-Newberry Consulting

- Co-founder/Principal Consultant of Taylor-Newberry Consulting in Guelph, ON.
- Extensive experience in evaluating system-level designs and using community-based research methods.
- Conducted the evaluation of Situation Tables in Cambridge and Kitchener.

Laura Huey, University of Western Ontario

- Associate Professor of Sociology at University of Western Ontario.
- Director of Canadian Society for Evidence-Based Policing.
- Coordinator of the Good Data Initiative to develop and promote good data collection, retention, sharing and access among police services.

Markus Winterberger, Community Mobilization Prince Albert

- Strategic Analyst with Community Mobilization Prince Albert, SK.
- Co-developer of the Hub Database now used across Canada.
- Lead analyst of Hub data for Saskatchewan's 13 Hub Tables.
- Involved in researching evidence-informed solutions to systemic issues undermining human service delivery.

Norm Taylor, Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being

- Inaugural Editor-in-Chief of Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being.
- One of two founding architects of the Hub Model of Collaborative Risk-Driven Intervention.
- Senior Advisor to the Deputy Ministers of Justice in both Saskatchewan and Ontario.
- Founding Partner of the Global Network for Community Safety.

PARTICIPANT CONTACTS

NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL	PHONE
Alexander, Gina	Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice	gina.alexander@gov.sk.ca	306-798-1360
Anderson, Ron	Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice	ronald.anderson@gov.sk.ca	306-787-0397
Babayan, Alexey	Brant County Health Unit	alexey.babayan@bchu.org	226-922-0772
Baker, Stan	Durham Regional Police Service	sbaker@drps.ca	905-261-4343
Brown, Jaime	Taylor Newberry Consulting	jamie@taylornewberry.ca	519-835-5666
Campbell, Eric	Durham Regional Police Service	ecampbell@drps.ca	905-579-1520 ext 4332
Carter, Brad	Durham Regional Police Service	bcarter@drps.ca	905-579-1520 ext 4394
Corley, Cal	Community Safety Knowledge Alliance	ccorley@cskacanada.ca	306-384-2741
Cotton, Brad	Brantford Police Service	bcotton@police.brantford.on.ca	519-756-7050
Cressos, Jim	Canadian Mental Health Association	jcressos@cmha-yr.on.ca	905-841-3977 ext. 2223
Cribley, Ken	City of Windsor/Windsor Police Service	kcribley@police.windsor.on.ca or kenneth.cribley@ontario.ca	647-881-0340
Crier, Marcia	Samson Cree Nation Hub	mcrier@scnea.com	780-585-4449
Davidson, Bill	Langs	billd@langs.org	519-653-1470 ext. 236
Dumont, Troy	Community Mobilization Prince Albert	tdumont@papolice.ca	306-960-9281
Dunlop, Tamara	Community Mobilization Prince Albert	tdunlop@papolice.ca	306-765-2883
Fletcher, Andrew	South Simcoe Police Service	andrew.fletcher@southsimcoepolice.ca	905-775-3311 ext 2037
Fraser-Hansen, Shannon	Community Safety Knowledge Alliance	sfraserhansen@cskacanada.ca	306-384-2751
Frederick, Tyler	University of Ontario Institute of Technology	tyler.frederick@uoit.ca	647-829-4206
Fryer, Tammy	City of Windsor - Windsor Police Service	tfryer@police.windsor.on.ca	519-255-6700
Garrison, Gordon	Prince Edward Island Ministry of Justice and Public Safety	gagarrison@gov.pe.ca	902-569-4932
Gormley, Sean	Peel Regional Police	2544@peelpolice.ca	905-453-3311 ext 3603
Gray, Stephanie	Lanark County Situation Table	LCST@bell.net	613-812-3778
Gumminy, Bailey	Durham Regional Police Service	bgumminy@drps.ca	905-579-1520
Huey, Laura	University of Western Ontario / CAN-SEBP	lhuey@uwo.ca	519-661-2111 ext. 85151
Hum, Suzing	Public Safety Canada	suzing.hum@canada.ca	613-991-3307
Hunter, Ken	Global Network for Community Safety	ken@globalcommunitysafety.com	306-960-4835
Jefferson, Emily	Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	emily.jefferson@ontario.ca	416-212-3557
Johnson, Erica	Samson Cree Nation Hub	ericapagejohnson@gmail.com	780-585-3793

Kalinowski, Brent	Global Network for Community Safety	brent@globalcommunitysafety.com	905-498-8650
Lamontagne, Elyse	CMHA Sudbury/Mantoulin	elamontagne@cmha-sm.on.ca	705-675-7252 ext. 259
Lee, James	Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	james.y.lee@ontario.ca	416-325-6039
Locke, Donovan	Toronto Police Service	donovan.locke@torontopolice.on.ca	416-808-0117
MacEachren, Robyn	Ontario Provincial Police	robyn.maceachern@opp.ca	705-329-6435
McKean, Scott	City of Toronto	scott.mckean@toronto.ca	416.526.0588
Mitchell, John	North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit	john.mitchell@nbpsdhu.ca	705-471-1400
Myles, Jennifer	CHMA Waterloo Wellington	jmyles@cmhaww.ca	519-400-7473
Napoose, Jenn	Samson Cree Nation Hub	jnepoose@gmail.com	780-585-3333
Nerad, Sonja	SN Management	sonja@snmanagement.com	416-953-6552
Newberry, Jason	Taylor Newberry Consulting	jason@taylornewberry.ca	519-835-5666
Ng, San	Vision & Results Inc.	sng@visionandresults.com	416-720-8597
Nilson, Chad	University of Saskatchewan	chad.nilson@usask.ca	306-953-8384
O'Connor, Christopher	University of Ontario Institute of Technology	christopher.oconnor1@uoit.net	905-721-8668 ext 5882
Oakes, Kyla	Prince Albert Hub Table/Mental Health & Addiction Services	KOAKES@paphr.sk.ca	306-940-6232
Pelletier, Stephanie	Public Safety Canada	stephanie.pelletier@canada.ca	613-949-9528
Riley, Jesse	Toronto Police Service	Jesse.riley@torontopolice.on.ca	416-808-0127
Ross, Paul	Ontario Provincial Police	paul.ross@opp.ca	613-257-5610
Russell, Hugh	Community Justice Consultant	hughcrussell@yahoo.ca	613-553-0963
Saddleback, Vernon	Samson Cree Nation Hub	acahkosis@gmail.com	780-585-3793
Schaefer, Jean	Peel Regional Police	1706@peelpolice.ca	905-453-3311 ext 3614
Schmutz, Jordy	Brantford Police Service	jschmutz@police.brantford.on.ca	519-756-0113
Simcoe, Tammi	Ontario Provincial Police	tammi.simcoe@opp.ca	705-329-6435
Singh, Jessy	City of Toronto	jasdeep.singh@toronto.ca	647 217 4368
Smith, Brian	Toronto Police Service	brian.smith@torontopolice.on.ca	416-808-0145
Swarney, Matthew	Motorola Solutions	matthew.swarney@motorolasolutions.com	905-948-5747
Taylor, Lisa	Global Network for Community Safety	lisa@globalcommunitysafety.com	416-238-4888 ext 230
Taylor, Norm	Global Network for Community Safety	norm@globalcommunitysafety.com	905-767-3467
Tenuta, Claudia	Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	Claudia.tenuta@ontario.ca	416-212-1888
Trahan, Sean	Ontario Provincial Police	sean.trahan@opp.ca	613-257-5610
Waldie, Stephen	Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	stephen.waldie@ontario.ca	416-325-3132
Wells, Kevin	Samson Cree Nation Hub	kwells@scnea.com	780-585-2211
Wheatley, Dave	Motorola Solutions	dave.wheatley@motorolasolutions.com	847-212-7477

Wilson, Jen	Carizon Family and Community Services	jwilson@carizon.ca	519-743-6333 ext. 330
Winterberger, Markus	Community Mobilization Prince Albert	mwinterberger@papolice.ca	306-765-2884