UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE®

KENT SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum
Challenges to Criminal Justice Reform in Louisville

by
Stephanie Grace Prost, PhD

Submitted To:
Keith McKenzie
Director, Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum

Date Submitted: June 2, 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum (KCJF) was created to convene legislators, criminal justice professionals, justice-involved individuals, and constituents to enable discussion and solicit input regarding criminal justice reform in Kentucky with the overarching goal of facilitating data driven change in areas of entry and diversion, sentencing, reentry, and healthcare access.

At the forum held in Louisville in July of 2019, participants were asked to complete a short survey that included questions regarding perceived problems and potential solutions linked to these four areas. Surveys were collected and participant comments were entered manually into a dataset for later qualitative exploration, namely thematic analysis. To assure methodological rigor and to temper coder and analyst worldview, data regarding challenges associated with criminal justice reform in Kentucky were first coded individually by two coders and then jointly via a consensus building strategy, processes detailed included in this report. Areas of coder disconnect were cataloged using an audit trail which is also included in this report. Finally, the post-consensus building data underwent a thematic analysis. Here, the following four themes emerged: **Society and Second Chances, Legislation: Linking Attitudes to Access, Funding: Key to Access and Accountability, and Programming: Prevention and Intervention.**

Participants herald these inter-related facets as barriers to criminal justice reform in Kentucky. Specifically, participants indicate that societal perceptions of persons in the criminal justice system shape legislative efforts and as a result, access to services, and individual and agency accountability via funding. The need for a holistic, multisystemic approach to diversion and reentry was highlighted in their comments, as was the role of racial bias as core to what is perceived as limited buy-in among key decision-makers. Participant comments also point to the importance of reducing stigma and dismantling the notion of 'other' in revising public understanding of persons with justice-involvement and in fear reduction. Relatedly, participants identified legislation, and therefore legislators, as key players in criminal justice reform in Kentucky. Challenges were noted related to existing policies, but also to the genesis of novel legislation. Participants note that the hyper-politicization of criminal justice issues contributes to the demise bi-partisan policy creation, bringing consequences to bear on those with justice-involvement. Forum participants called on decision-makers to reduce opposition and to seek the betterment of those who are justice-involved and the general Kentucky population, as well.

Participants remarked that discretion, namely in decisions regarding the funding of supports and resources, stands at the foundation of program access for affected individuals. Further, participants note that limited access begets few successes among persons with justice-involvement which may lead to further justice-system involvement. Finally, programming—services aimed at preventing crime and supporting those facing reentry—is only made possible through macro-level efforts (legislation and associated funding). Louisville forum participants further remark that programs must be tailored and comprehensive, with special attention paid to the transition period between carceral and community spaces.

Broadly, participants indicate that getting those who need help necessary supports will translate to improved outcomes for those diverted from, detained within, and returning from the criminal justice system and for the Commonwealth, more broadly. Importantly, however, results from the current thematic analysis must be tempered in light of forum processes, participant demography, and coder and analyst worldview. And while challenges identified do point to potential reforms, analysis of forum participant comments related to proposed solutions is an essential next step.

History of the Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum

Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum (KCJF) was created to convene a variety of criminal justice system stakeholders to inform criminal justice reform in Kentucky. Stakeholders sought at forums include legislators, criminal justice professionals, justice-involved individuals, and Commonwealth constituents.

Importantly, KCJF intends to elevate the voices of those persons seldom heard in policy discussions. Rather than drive decisions based solely on the perspectives legislators and criminal justice professionals, KCJF welcomes and invites intentionally those people who have been involved with or affected by the criminal justice system including persons under community supervision, those who are formerly incarcerated, and families and friends of persons with former or current justice-involvement. Through these collective forums, multiple groups are able to share insights with legislators regarding criminal justice reform in Kentucky. It is this targeted approach that is expected to yield comprehensive and thoughtful policy revision and genesis and thus, long-term sustainable outcomes for persons with justice-system involvement and the Commonwealth, more broadly.

In addition to direct conversations with legislators, forums are used as an opportunity to collect data regarding the concerns and insights of justice-system stakeholders. It is the intention of KCJF to make the data, associated analyses, and emerging findings available to state and local legislators and others to better inform legislative efforts affecting individuals, families, and communities in the Commonwealth. To date, the KCJF has hosted two forums, one in Louisville and one in Owensboro, and the third forum will be held in Berea. The following methods, analysis, and results represent participant perspectives from the Louisville forum.

Louisville Forum

Participants for the 2019 Louisville forum were recruited with fliers describing the location, purpose, and panelists for the event. The fliers were shared with KCJF core partners and a press conference was held with Spectrum News 1, WLKY, and Wave 3 News.

The keynote speaker for the Louisville Forum was Justice and Public Safety Cabinet Policy Advisor, Dallas Hurley. In addition, Representatives Reginald Meeks, Attica Scott, Lisa Willner, and Senator Gerald Neal were in attendance. Other stakeholders represented included the Kentucky Department of Corrections Reentry Services, the Kentucky Supreme Court, and the

Kentucky Department of Corrections Probation and Parole. At the forum, Mr. Hurley gave a broad introduction to the four topics (viz. entry/diversion, sentencing, healthcare access, reentry). After this, forum participants chose a breakout group where one of the four topics was discussed, led by an expert in that area.

Before the topical discussion, however, forum participants were asked to complete the "Problems" section of a two-part survey regarding their perspectives on criminal justice reform. After the topical discussion, forum panelists offered a question and answer session and then forum participants completed the "Solutions" section of the survey. Both sections included several questions, each asked for every topic. Questions in the Problems section included: 1) What did you like most about [topic]? 2) What challenges do [topic] pose? and 3) What would you add to [topic]? Questions in the Solutions section included: 1) After hearing from the panel, what programs or policies are you most interested in for [topic]? 2) What specific goals or objectives should participants in this forum set regarding improving or expanding the [topic] discussed today? and 3) What information or resources should be used to improve the [topic] discussed today? Finally, participants were also asked to report several demographic characteristics including but not limited to gender, race, age, income, and relationship to the criminal justice system.

The surveys were collected, and participant responses were entered into a single data set between August and September of 2020. Initial and secondary coding of data began in October of 2019, followed by consensus building between February and March of 2020, and thematic analysis in May of 2020. Data management, coding, consensus building, and thematic analysis were supervised by Dr. Stephanie Grace Prost, Assistant Professor, Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work at the University of Louisville. Data entry, coding, and consensus building was completed in part by Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work MSSW student, Elizabeth Katlyn Muwanga.

Participant Demography

Respondents were primarily from urban communities (*n*=24; 96%) between the ages of 33 and 85 (*M*=53.7). Respondents were most often female (*n*=21; 63.6%), Caucasian (*n*=19; 61.3%), and married (*n*=18; 51%). The majority (*n*=26; 78.8%) were college educated with an average income of $109,000 (range: $20,000-720,000). The majority of respondents were working (*n*=24; 72.7%) at the time of the forum and in a criminal justice profession (*n*=12; 38.7%). However, 35.5% also identified as linked to criminal justice reform firsthand (*n*=11) and 16% identified themselves as family members of those with criminal justice system involvement.

Thematic Analysis Methods

In all, 92 comments were collated across the 'challenge' questions within the Problems section of the forum survey. These comments were first coded independently (establishing both primary and secondary codes), by two coders (Stephanie Grace Prost-SGP; Elizabeth Katlyn Muwanga-EKM) beginning in October of 2019. Primary codes are considered to 'hang' more

closely to the data, representing the primary focus of the comment (viz. concrete). Secondary codes are considered to represent further nuance within the primary code. During this process, comments were duplicated as necessary using the attached procedure (KCJF Coding and Consensus Building Procedure).

After initial independent coding, concurrent consensus building took place, leveraging discussion among two coders (SGP, EKM). Between February 5 and March 25, 2020, coders navigated their independent data sets, creating a new, consensus data set that compiled all codes after discussion. Contention and resolve between coders regarding all comments was documented in the attached audit trail (KCJF Louisville Forum Audit Trail). The consensus building process resulted in 26 thematic areas across a total of 163 comments.

Finally, thematic analysis was undertaken (beginning in May of 2020). Guided by the streamlined codes-to-theory model for qualitative inquiry (Saldaña, 2016) and the framework and Microsoft Excel procedure drawn from Bree and Gallagher (2016; example screencast available here), the analyst sought to reduce data appropriately and to identify themes within forum participant comments best representing perceived challenges to criminal justice reform in Kentucky. First, uncodable comments were removed as appropriate (e.g., "unable to hear"). Then, remaining comments (135) were sorted by cell color to cluster by codes. Initial emerging codes appear below.

Table 1. Codes resultant of concurrent consensus building

Codes	Frequency	Proportion
Programs	24	17.78
Money	22	16.3
Attitude	16	11.85
Legislation	10	7.40
Accountability	8	5.93
Buy in	6	4.44
Accessibility	5	3.70
Jobs	5	3.70
Police	4	2.96
Second chances	4	2.96
Health	4	2.96
Insurance	4	2.96
Judicial	3	2.22
Transitions	3	2.22
Drugs	2	1.48
Training	2	1.48
Sentencing	2	1.48
Transportation	2	1.48
Community	2	1.48
Best practices	1	0.74

Fear	1	0.74
Education	1	0.74
Documentation	1	0.74
Enforcement	1	0.74
Family	1	0.74
Peer support	1	0.74

Next, data consolidation or reduction was completed (May 1-10 of 2020). Similar to quantitative factor analysis, this strategy allows for a large volume of data to be condensed into larger, collective themes aimed at unifying comments provided by forum participants regarding challenges to criminal justice reform in Kentucky. Decisions to reduce data were framed by analyst experiences in criminal justice research, anti-oppressive practice, and efforts as a Multisystemic Therapist with the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. The first round of consolidation yielded 14 themes, the second round yielded 5 themes, and the final round revealed 4 themes (May 11 and 12 2020).

Once data reduction was completed, data overview blocks were created in Microsoft Excel. These blocks are organized or sectioned by primary themes (4), and beneath each theme, the analyst identified central points offered by constituents (forum participants) and related exemplars (coder SGP, May 12 2020). Emerging themes, data overviews, and associated key points appear below.

Thematic Analysis Themes and Key Points

Theme	Society and Second Chances
Data overview	Societal perceptions of persons in the criminal justice system shapes legislative efforts and as a result, access to services, and individual and agency accountability via funding. Constituents herald the need for a holistic, multisystemic approach to diversion and reentry, and identify racial bias as core to limited buy-in among key stakeholders. Reducing stigma and dismantling the notion of 'other' are integral to revision of public understanding and reducing fear.
1	"The continue[d] **racial bias** that has systematically affected and infected our system" requires **buy-in**, "getting everyone on the same page" and "on board with the program" such as judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement. Need for "training law enforcement, judicial, corrections professionals in anti-racism/pro-reconciliation" strategies to promote effective reentry that begins during incarceration and to refine the limited risk assessment tool currently used in Kentucky. On the outside, "getting more organizations involved and [offering] more than one second chance" is necessary.
2	We need people to actually start "believing in them" because money available (and therefore programs) is rooted in attitudes. "Dedicated funding" is needed, but "not required by law", and when available, often "limited to specific drug charges/or use" which means **discretion gets in the way of supports**. Seeing justice-involved persons as people like ourselves requires our demand of holistic services and supports-case management to include targets of employment, transportation, mental health and medical needs, housing issues, MAT needs, co-occurring disorders, education/vocational skills--and all of these supports are shaped by attitudes. Attention often paid to individual, while other systems missing from the picture: "Family integration" is key…but "need direct services that focus on children of the incarcerated parents as well as the other parent." The importance of peer and community supports and responsibilities was also noted.
3	Need increased emphasis on the importance of **second chance hiring** while also assuring associated agencies (e.g., corrections) are "preparing those impacted by helping to develop skills for the workplace." "If there [are] jobs out there, people need to be hired…" "give people [a] chance, try them out to see how they will work...you can train them also." But "community business and professional are unwilling to hire former inmates"; they have a "different perspective

	on [those] who have been incarcerated." Constituents name the Kentucky chamber as instrumental in helping reduce stigma among employers to improve hiring practices (e.g., sex offenses). Mental health problems, further, do not necessarily "open doors for employment;" **stigma also influences healthcare provision** (e.g., doctors), creating additional barriers.
4	"Society needs to be more welcoming" to aid in prevention, treatment, and recovery; public understanding and acceptance and perception of efforts is key; Many "fear of an increase in crime and worsening of these problems" and are **afraid to decriminalize**. This is coupled with a "general attitude of punishment/ incarceration being the solution among many policymakers" is especially problematic. One constituent notes, "I guess there are people who think everyone who commits a crime should be punished to the fullest amount of time."

Theme	**Legislation: Linking Attitudes to Access**
Data overview	Driven by societal perceptions and instrumental to funding pipelines, constituents identified legislation and therefore legislators as key players in criminal justice reform in Kentucky. Challenges and recommendations were noted related to existing policy, as well as opportunities for novel legislation (e.g., extended clinic hours). Importantly, forum participants note that the politicization of criminal justice issues leads to the demise of essential policy. Forum participants call on decision-makers to reduce opposition and to instead negotiate for the betterment of not only those who are justice-involved, but the general population, as well.
1	**Changes to existing laws** to make possession of drugs a misdemeanor, use the "same or similar 'conditions' or 'requirements' ... for diversion/entry even though the charge is a different rank," and reduce sentencing that "spread[s] to other crimes not drug related" which can lead to artificial inflation of consequences (e.g., "the average sentence today is 13 years"). Constituents also seek to reduce prohibitions that target nonviolent felons, reducing their access to public benefits (e.g., SNAP) and that the voting rights of formerly incarcerated to be [automatically] restored "without waiting so long;" perhaps exploring laws that would support "mandatory schooling" to reduce risk of habit-forming.

2	Getting legislature to agree and anything passed into law is difficult. **Politics of decision-makers** (judges, prosecutors, etc.) make it "too easy to kill legislation."
3	"It is hard to get health care"--"insurance providers (in my experience) often don't approve people for inpatient treatment if they are using wrong drug or have been in jail too long." Forum participants note this is an opportunity for legislators--revise "the longevity of support/chang[e] insurance policy" to make things less problematic. "Laws that limit access to Medicaid" or "availability of Medicare" can be revised and **new legislation** introduced that targets new interventions, such as extended clinic hours, to help those with justice-involvement secure health care and manage lifestyles--"the restrictions the governor wants to place on receiving health care punishes those reentering," but constituents cry for a "focus on population health."

Theme	**Funding: Key to Access and Accountability**
Data overview	Discretion stands at the foundation of access and individual and agency accountability--constituents note that those in power dismantle supports. This may lead to the decreased success of persons with justice-involvement and of agencies charged with their care (e.g., courts, corrections, parole). Worse, limited successes at the individual- and agency-level feed negative stereotypes about people and governmental bodies (e.g., Kentucky Department of Corrections), subsequently reducing the potential of legislative action necessary to support individuals with justice-involvement and the greater Commonwealth.
1	Funding for programs are "at the leisure of someone else;" again, **discretion gets in the way of supports** and some programs will always be at risk. For instance, too much authority among those with negative attitudes (those in judiciary or corrections) allows for de-emphasis on reentry. Stigma drives access ("Who is going to pick who are [eligible] for these programs?") by cutting funding (healthcare providers) despite the role of money and social benefits to success.
2	Not enough "monies to keep these programs up and running" and financial difficulties and budget cuts dictated at state-level mean **costs passed onto client**--constituents note that agencies often "charge [too] much money for these programs." Even when programs are available, they are often limited (not enough space for those who are

3	eligible or dedicated to specific drug charges/or use), but equal access is needed for all, especially thorough, "successful evidence-based mental health programs." Increased funding would support **agency accountability**. More resources will allow refinement of risk assessment tool used in Kentucky, increased tracking and documentation of agency results, driving greater "uniformity and accountability" to assure agency compliance. Monies are required to provide evidence necessary to increasing belief and enforcement of policies.
4	More monies would support **individual accountability**: stepdown programs and treatment across the board, greater "tracking and documenting results" follow up [of client] regarding programming (employment, housing, education, treatment), and monitoring of willing participation. Also key to "holding violators meaningfully accountable" thereby avoiding crime commission.
Theme	**Programming: Prevention and Intervention**
Data overview	Programming--to prevent crime and to support those reentering--is made possible through macro-level efforts, namely legislation. Supports must be tailored and comprehensive, with special attention paid to the transition between carceral and community spaces. As was noted with legislation and funding themes, constituents indicate that getting those who need help the necessary supports will translate to improved outcomes for those diverted from, detained within, and returning from the criminal justice system and that of the Commonwealth, more broadly.
1	Need for **accessible, thorough treatment** across the board including prevention and recovery supports. Begin by increasing awareness of available programs. Funding at root of access ("$10 day-jail")--some programs too expensive or transportation unavailable. Shortage of mental health providers in Kentucky is a problem, and many are concentrated in only a few areas. This means that many individuals face reduced access to programming (agency doesn't exist, too far away, limited beds available), including residential options. Once accepted into programs, constituents note the importance of willing participation--consequences are needed to assure accountability and minimize recidivism.

2	Need for **individualization-case by case approach** to programming. Currently inadequate, namely the lack of concrete transition plan from prison to outside world, [need] "stepdown program from prison" as "inmates are released with clothes on their back" and little else. We "need tracking," and to start early, follow through, and follow-up during individual's incarceration and upon release. Holistic supportive services also relate to individualization; once they are released from incarceration, systemic barriers quickly emerge (e.g., food, transportation, assistance w/gaining access to medicines/medical needs, education).
3	**Kentucky benefits from "getting everyone who needs the help the help they need"**--thus, we all suffer when there is no preparation for employment or housing. Not all citizens qualify for the programs based on prior felony convictions, persons with nonviolent charges should have access to public benefits (SNAP, etc).

Exemplars

Exemplars are direct comments from forum participants along with the associated gender, race, and age of the forum participant. These are understood as particularly representative of emerging themes. Gender (F: female, M: male), race (B: black, W: white), age (years).

Society and Second Chances

- Society needs to be more welcoming (WM, 37)
- Racial bias...has systematically affected and infected our system (WM, 67)
- [Need to] emphasize the importance of second chance hiring, preparing those impacted by helping to develop skills for the workplace (WF, 40)
- Community business and professional are unwilling to hire former inmates (BF, 69)

Legislation: Linking Attitudes to Access

- Fear to decriminalize and general attitude of punishment/incarceration being the solution among many policymakers (WF, 58)
- Political-too easy to kill legislation (WM, 40)
- Fear that these... rules will lead to an increase in crime (WM, 68)
- I guess there are people who think everyone who commits a crime should be punished to the fullest amount of time (WF, 72)

Funding: Key to Access and Accountability

- Funding for healthcare programs are always at risk and at the leisure of someone else (BF, 36)
- They don't have enough monies to keep these programs up and running (BM, 56)
- Charge to[o] much money for these programs (B, 55)

Programming: Prevention and Intervention

- Inmates are released with clothes on their back no preparation for employment or housing (M, 73)
- Getting everyone who needs the help the help they need (W, 50)
- Prevent prohibitions for nonviolent felons to have access to public benefits (i.e. SNAP) ...[restrictions] punish those reentering (WM, 67)

Conclusions

Thematic analyses are intended to describe only and thus are not intended to inform conceptual modeling and theory building. However, constituents' responses clustered beneath four prominent themes, each linked intimately to the other representing a systems-orientation including roles for society, legislators and funders, and highlighting the importance of programming. Participants also recognize that benefits provided to those with justice-system involvement will support the larger community, as well.

Importantly, findings from the current thematic analysis must be consumed in light of forum processes, constituent demography, and coder and analyst worldview. Forum processes, such as keynote speaker presentations, panel question and answer sessions, and survey question construction and instructions shape participant understanding and therefore responses (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Relatedly, participant demography from the Louisville forum may not reflect that of other forums (i.e., Owensboro, Berea). It is therefore probable that comments and driving perspectives are distinct between locations and findings presented here warrant temperance. Finally, thematic analysis relies heavily on coder and analyst worldview—while this is an important strength in qualitative inquiry, limitations to this approach also exist. Gender, race, age, income, relationship to the criminal justice system, and other factors shape interpretation, coding, discussion, and subsequent analysis, theme identification, and selection of associated key points. Efforts were taken to mitigate the influence of worldview during coding, consensus building, and thematic analyses by using a series of independent and concurrent coding processes, documenting comment coding contention and resolve, and retaining distinct spreadsheets cataloging analyst data reduction strategies. All are available for review upon request to KCJF Director, Keith McKenzie.

Numerous recommendations may be drawn from current findings. For instance, Louisville forum participants identify challenges linked to limited accessibility and the lack of individualization in programming. Thus, increasing accessibility and individualization are likely warranted. However, such recommendations are not derived directly from constituents as forum participants but instead through thematic analysis. The logical extension, therefore, is that attention must be paid to proposed solutions offered by forum participants from the Louisville forum and in the future, from other forum locations. These efforts will be essential to KCJF's goal to facilitate data driven change in entry and diversion, sentencing, reentry, and healthcare access for justice-involved individuals in the Commonwealth and in turn, to supporting the peoples of Kentucky, more broadly.

Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum
Coding and Consensus Building Procedure

I. **Data entry**
   a. Data are to be entered in a secured, password-protected Excel file for each forum location, separately, using the previously constructed data set format
   b. Individuals entering data are to save the data in at least two distinct locations, not on cloud drives
   c. In addition to all coded data sets (one per party in team), assure that uncoded versions of all final data sets are retained, as well
   d. Problems and solutions are entered in separate worksheets, named "Problems" and "Solutions," respectively

II. **Data preparation**
   a. Data in each column to be sorted A to Z initially, exclusive of column header. **Do not expand the current selection.**
   b. Create a code book in a new sheet at end of workbook and name it "Code Book"
      i. Select the second column and fill 'black'—this serves as a visual divider between primary and secondary codes

III. **Quality assurance**
   a. A minimum of 10% of all cases are to be checked for accuracy by person other than individual who entered initial data for each forum
   b. Do this by first locating the associated hardcopy survey and navigating each response to all questions in the data set
   c. If differences are found between what the QA reviewer reads on the hardcopy survey and what is found in the data set, catalog the following in new Excel file (" (Location) Forum QA")
      i. Survey number
      ii. Language currently in data set
      iii. Language in hardcopy
      iv. Revised language to be used in data set
      v. QA reviewer initials
      vi. Date of data revision
   d. Do this for all differences, creating new columns for III. c. ii. – vi.
   e. If differences are found and revised language needed, enter revised language in data set where appropriate
   f. If more than 5 revisions are required, individual who entered initial data may require supervision and greater proportion of QA review (e.g., 20% of cases) until error rate reduced

IV. **Initial coding**
   a. *Note: you may revise both primary and secondary codes during the coding process; it is iterative and dynamic. Our impressions change as we become

further immersed in the data. You may decide to revise a primary code while still during the primary coding process—this is okay! If you decide to revise a primary code while in the secondary process, you do not need to go back to the primary coding sheet. However, you will need to rearrange the primary coded column in the "Problems (or Solutions) Color Sort" sheet by color/frequency as detailed in section IV. d. v.

b. *Note: save frequently! You can enable Excel to autosave every few minutes under Preferences -> Sharing and privacy -> Save

c. *Hack: if you're not sure exactly what shade of blue your code for 'law enforcement" was (for example), go back to your code book, select the code, and the fill color will update in your home dashboard. Then, simply select the cell you intended to code and click the fill color.

d. Primary coding

    i. Using inductive approach, code each cell for each question beneath each heading in both the "Problems" and "Solutions" worksheets, moving row by row from top to bottom.

        1. Codes are often semantic at first (what is said, often includes 'in vivo' or direct quote), though movement towards abstraction and latency is common (what is implied—ideas or concepts not stated outwardly).

        2. Use different colors for each novel code, placing the primary codes in first column of the Code Book sheet of the workbook. Make sure the name of the code is included in the cell and it is filled with the correct color as you will come back to these throughout the coding process.

    ii. Code all cells with I don't know/not sure/illegible/couldn't hear and related content with red text and no fill (not coded).

    iii. If two themes emerge in one cell, duplicate the cell, inserting copied cell by shifting cells down, and code accordingly. It is not uncommon to have a single cell duplicated many times representing a variety of codes. Shifting cells downward is critical—accidentally shifting right will bump your data into the next column/question. Further, keeping the duplicated cells together will allow you to assure that coding of that field was completed.

    iv. Once all primary coding is completed, duplicate the sheet and name the new sheet "Problems (or Solutions) Color Sort"

    v. In the "Problems (or Solutions) Color Sort" sheet, you will sort each column, exclusive of the header, by color (see Appendix, Image 1 and Image 2). Do this by copying and pasting cells to cluster responses containing the same primary code together. Starting at the top of the worksheet column, the first code will be those cells that were not coded

following by the code with the greatest frequency (after the not coded cells) and so on where the bottom of the column will contain codes that appear less frequently

vi. Note*: Be careful when moving cells (copying, pasting, deleting) to not accidentally delete content. To avoid this, only shift cells up or down. You can assure you have not accidentally deleted content by checking the row count in the initial worksheets ("Problems," "Solutions"). If your data starts and ends on a different row, an error may have occurred.

vii. Hack*: Consider the importance of contrast when building the Color Sort sheets—if you have four codes that each contain 3 cells each, arrange them so that colors contrast more readily (e.g., pink, orange, red, purple may appear easier on the eyes if arranged as pink, red, purple, and orange)

viii. When color sorting is completed, begin the secondary coding process

e. Secondary coding

i. In the "Problems (or Solutions) Color Sort" sheet, begin by inserting a column to the right of primary coded column. Do this by selecting column to right of primary coded column, right click, and select 'insert'

ii. Name this column "Secondary Codes"

iii. Now, begin the secondary coding process, inserting the primary code into the secondary code column adjacent to the cell first. Review the cell, does the content reflect a subset or facet of the primary code? If so, use a colon (":") and insert the secondary code (see Image 2)

iv. As you create secondary codes (e.g., primary code: financial barriers; secondary codes: low pay; poor money management), place these in the third column of the Code Book sheet of the workbook. Again, make sure the name of the code is included in the cell and it is filled with the correct color (see Image 3)

v. Once all secondary coding is completed, duplicate the sheet and name the new sheet "Problems (or Solutions) A to Z Sort"

vi. In the "Problems (or Solutions) A to Z Sort" sheet, select both the primary and secondary coded columns for each question column and sort A to Z, exclusive of column header. **Do not expand the current selection**. Now you are ready for consensus building.

V. Consensus building and concurrent secondary coding

a. Begin by creating new Word file ("(Location) Forum Audit Trail") and designate one member of team as auditor

b. Open a new, uncoded version of forum data set

c. Then, all parties are to review all codes in all workbooks

d. Next, all parties will code each cell for each question beneath each heading in both the "Problems" and "Solutions" worksheets of the uncoded data set,

moving row by row from top to bottom discussing their own pre-identified primary codes in the "Problems (or Solutions) A to Z Sort" sheets using the procedure outlined in IV. d. Remember, each cell may be coded with more than one primary code. Approach these cells by discussing the primary codes of each party that are most closely related before moving to the next primary code in the same cell.

e. Note: If you have several primary codes but you all agree, no need for audit trail documentation—

f. When disagreement emerges, the auditor will catalog the following:

   i. Language in data set cell

   ii. Primary codes of all parties (identify coder initials for codes; e.g., financial barriers (EM); mo' money, mo' problems (SGP))

   iii. Notes regarding discussion of potential primary codes and final primary code. For example "one of three parties identified primary code "financial barriers," another party identified "socioeconomic status," and the third identified "mo' money, mo' problems." Socioeconomic status is described by ascribing party as linked to oppressive structures whereas 'mo' money, mo' problems' sounds judgmental…parties agree to use "financial barriers" as primary code and that secondary codes can be used to delineate varying system-level drivers of barriers."

   iv. Primary code to be used in final data set

   v. Note*: It is possible that the disagreement reflects differences in the number of primary codes between coders. Meaning, one coder may have four themes and another coder may only have one. Discuss the codes that are most closely linked first using the procedure in V. e. i.-iv. Then, for remaining codes, coders must still seek consensus. This means the coder proposing additional codes not identified by the other coder must seek the approval of the other coder. If disagreement emerges, follow procedure in section V. e. i.-iv. If the other coder accepts the proposing coder's additional codes, these do not require catalog.

   vi. Note*: It is also possible that a novel primary code may emerge during the consensus building process—meaning, discussion yields a new code that none of the initial coders identified that is distinct from primary codes already in place; if this happens, duplicate the cell in the final data set, code accordingly, and add the novel code to the code book. This needs be documented in the audit trail—though initial primary codes will not exist, discussion is still to be captured and the final primary code identified (see below screen shot of audit trail outlined in blue, items b. and c.)

   vii. Note*: It is also possible that a novel cell is encountered in the final data set that one or more primary coders did not have in their initial data sets.

This is likely due to errors caused by copying, pasting, and deleting. If this occurs, primary concurrent coding is indicated. Coders will identify all potential primary codes and if contested, will engage in tasks denoted in section V. e. (do not include discussion and final primary code sections)

> If there jobs out there people need to be hired to (illegible) them. I believe that give people chance try them out to see how they will work and you can train them also.
>
> a. Primary codes: -educational programing (EKM), jobs, accessibility, second chances (SGP)
> b. Discussion: EKM says her initial interpretation was of training taking place during incarceration, agree with SGP.
> c. Final primary code:

    g. Once primary coding consensus is achieved, code the cell in the final data set using the same procedures detailed in IV. d.

    h. Do this for every cell

    i. Once primary codes for all cells have been completed, all parties are to take place in concurrent secondary coding.

        i. The auditor will catalog the following:

            1. Notes regarding discussion of potential secondary codes

            2. Final secondary code

        ii. Do this for every cell

VI. Data reduction (categorization and thematic analysis)

    a. Once consensus building is completed, the final Code Book Sheet can be used as a framework for identifying categories (identifying relationships between primary codes)

        i. The auditor will catalog the following:

            1. Notes regarding discussion of categories

    b. Categories can then be reduced further into themes

        i. The auditor will catalog the following:

            1. Notes regarding discussion of themes

    c. P.S. Hierarchical flow charts or organization charts are a great way to present findings showcasing the relationships between raw data, codes, categories, and finally, themes.

    d. Results will then be drafted by the auditor, grouped by theme, and are to include exemplar quotes from raw data

    e. Results presented to KCJF leadership for review/revision/dissemination (iterative process)

Image 1

Image 2

Image 3

Primary Codes		Secondary Codes					
Did not respond/unclear							
Social work							
Law enforcement							
Insurance		Provider refusal	Barriers to health care	Policy	Accessibility	Lifestyle	
Laws/sentencing		Reduce severity of drug charg	Progression from bill to law	Political division	Pre-legislative opposition	Sentence length	Restoration of voting rights
Accessibility (programs)		Limited availability	Decision-making	Few qualify	Brokerage	Continuity	
Money		Gov't cuts	Individual income	Limited staff	Overpriced		
Buy in		Risk					
Diversion		Substance use/mental health	Long-term support				
Fear		Increase in crime	Contagion effect	Political will			
Education		Law enforcement					
Judiciary		Limited judicial discretion					
Documentation		Need for data					
Accountability		Provider	Participant				
Community		Dispersion (too far between)	Too few	Social justice			
Second chances		Opportunity for employers					
Housing							
Jobs		Available but ineligible	Essential skills	Policy	Limited preparation	Employers reticent	
Acceptance							
Teeth (enforcement)							
Training							
Bias/stigma		Race	Criminals				
Public							
Health		Lesser focus	Intervention	Policy			
Re-entry/Transition		Early start	Follow up				
Transportation							
Health care providers							
Control							
Uniformity							
Family							
Peer participation							
Correctional services							
Best practices/models							
Prevention							
Representation							

Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum
Louisville Forum Audit Trail

1. Fear of increase in crime and worsening of these problems
   a. attitude EKM, bias; SGP-attitude
   b. may become another primary code, I struggled with coding "fear" as attitude, SGP said fear was a feeling distinct from attitudes, EKM said bias is a feeling, SGP argued that wasn't right
   c. we ended on fear as a code
2. Getting more organizations involved and more than one 2nd chance
   a. programming EKM; community SGP-
   b. EKM sees programming as a results of more organizations and 2nd chances, SGP sees them as community
3. housing, jobs, dedicated funding or not req. by law, limited to specific drug charges/or use, discretion, risk assessment tool in KY limited, education
   a. charges EKM; SGP accessibility
   b. SGP read as barriers to accessing services
   c. we ended drugs
4. If there jobs out there people need to be hired to (illegible) them. I believe that give people chance try them out to see how they will work and you can train them also
   a. EKM coded as educational programing, SGP coded as jobs, accessibility, second chances,
   b. EKM says her initial interpretation was of training taking place during incarceration,
   c. agree with SGP
5. Judiciary, limited resources, including all addition(s) services, limited beds available, individualization-
   a. EKM coded as diversion, SGP coded as not coded
   b. decided to go with not coded rather than ascribe meeting
   c. not coded
6. Judiciary, limited resources, including all addition(s) services, limited beds available, individualization
   a. EKM had coded as money, programming and judiciary; SGP coded as judiciary and accessibility.
   b. EKM initial interpretation was similar to judiciary
7. Mental Health-
   a. EKM had programming, SGP had mental health,
   b. in discussion we decided there was not enough info to draw significant meaning
   c. coded as not coded
8. Public understanding and acceptance-
   a. EKM had attitude; SGP had acceptance
   b. changed to attitude that EKM had.
9. Who is going to pick who are eligible for these programs-
   d. SGP had accessibility; EKM had programs,

e. SGP said focus is more on who's in charge of access to programs.

f. EKM chose accessibility

10. Fear that these more (illegible) rules will lead to an increase in crime
    a. EKM had attitudes, SGP had fear
    b. decided on attitudes

11. Fear to decriminalize and general attitude of punishment/ incarceration being the solution among many policymakers-
    a. EKM had attitudes, SGP had fear
    b. decided on attitudes

12. Getting everyone on the same page
    a. EKM had attitude, SGP had buy in,
    b. settled on buy in

13. Getting judges and prosecutors on board. The continues racial bias that has systematically affected and infected our system. Training law enforcement, judicial, corrections professionals in anti-racism/pro-reconciliation (illegible word) to criminal justice
    a. EKM attitudes, SGP had bias,
    b. keep attitude

14. I guess there are people who think everyone who commits a crime should be punished to the fullest amount of time.
    a. EKM attitudes, SGP had bias,
    b. keep attitude

15. Public perception of efforts
    a. EKM had attitudes, SGP had public
    b. went with attitudes

16. Spreading to other crimes not drug related.
    a. EKM drugs, SGP fear,
    b. going with sentencing

17. The average sentence today is 13 years-
    a. Elizabeth had charges (sentencing), SGP had legislation,
    b. went with legislation

18. There is always a risk by decreasing consequence of crime that it minimizes the issues and reduces accountability and drive to avoid committing crime-
    a. EKM had charges, SGP had bias,
    b. we settled accountability

19. Voting rights restored without waiting so long mandatory schooling to help them reform from their habits-
    a. SGP had education, EKM had programs
    b. settled on programs

20. Availability of Medicare, Hours clinics and Medicare offices open, lack of folks on health care and lifestyles, need to focus on population health
    a. SGP had availability, EKM had programs

      b. EKM explained programs was a general statement, outside of "prison programming", speaking to a "service" that is lacking. SGP explained programs are time restricted problem focused "interventions".

      c. Knock programs, keep accessibility

21. Compliance
      a. uncoded-EKM, Missing cell, SGP
      b. SGP did not have it in data set, EKM did not have it coded due to error
      c. uncoded

22. fear of the ending Obamacare
      a. EKM- programs, SGP-insurance
      b. SGP sees Obamacare as distinct from a program, EKM just kind of labeled it as programs
      c. Settled on insurance

23. Follow through on getting the people connected to the food/transp., Assistance w/ gaining access to medicines/medical needs once they are released from incarceration
      a. EKM- Programs, SGP- Health, accessibility
      b. EKM- Sounds like a general of lack of programs/services, SGP- recognize how program is closer to data meaning
      c. Settled on program and accessibility

24. Funding for healthcare programs are always at risk and at the leisure of someone else., stepdown program from prison (sisters)
      a. EKM had money and programming, SGP had buy in, funding, and reentry
      b. SGP said she was making a leap about decision making being tied to buy in
      c. We settled on money and programs

25. Getting all involved individuals on board with the program.
      a. EKM had attitudes, SGP had buy in
      b. Sticking closer to the raw data, EKM concedes that buy in is better
      c. Coded as buy in

26. Getting everyone who needs the help the help they need. That the person re-entering would have health care upon release.
      a. EKM had programs, SGP had accessibility
      b. EKM acknowledges

27. Charge to much money for these programs. Courts and probation are not on same page.
      a. money, programs, buy in- SGP;
      b. money, programs, buy in, judiciary (concurrent)

28. Convicted felons and licensing boards
      a. SGP- jobs; ELM- charges
      b. SGP charges stand as a barrier to employment
      c. Charges

29. Family/community supports and responsibilities, employment, transportation, case management. Mental health medical needs, housing issues, MAT needs co-occuring disorders, education/vocational skills.
      a. EKM- programs; SGP- jobs, housing, community participation, diversion, transportation, health and education

    b. b. drop diversion, housing, health, transportation, education as those are programs, change comm. Participation to comm.

    c. c. programs, comm.

30. Funding, holding violators meaningfully accountable
    a. SGP- funding, accountability; EKM-Same (concurrent)

31. Liked the idea of case by case basis on licensing re-entry folks
    a. SGP- jobs; EKM- programs
    b. discussed the meaning
    c. EKM conceded to jobs

32. Necessary funding and personal to care (illegible)
    a. EKM and SGP- money (concurrent)

33. Reentry has to start while they are in incarceration. Society needs to be more welcoming. Reduce stigma- KY chamber helping employers w/ reducing stigma prevention treatment recovery
    a. SGP- jobs, transitions, bias public; EKM- programs, attitudes, legislature
    b. attitude, programs, transitions jobs, community

34. System does not adequately prepare inmate for reentry. Inmates are released with clothes on their back no preparation for employment or housing.
    a. SGP- jobs, housing, transitions; EKM- programs
    b. transition, program

References

Bree, R. T., & Gallagher, G. (2016). Using Microsoft Excel to code and thematically analyse qualitative data: A simple, cost-effective approach. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2).

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Saldaña, J. (2015). The coding manual for qualitative researchers. New York, NY: Sage.

Data Use Agreement
Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum

The Chair of Kentucky Criminal Justice Forum (hereafter KCJF), Keith Mckenzie, will share forum materials with researchers, Dr. Stephanie Grace Prost and/or Elizabeth K. Muwanga, as outlined below.

1. Confidentiality: researchers agree to keep the forum data confidential until such a time as the data is made public or with prior express permission from KCJF.

2. Encryption: researchers agree to share the data via end to end encryption. Further, the researchers agree that the data will not be shared on the "Cloud" and only on a password protected personal computer.

3. Termination: This agreement is good for one year from the date signed and can be renewed yearly.

4. Consultation: The researchers agree to consult with KCJF before using the data before it is made public and get express permission to use the data. KCJF will be named as an author on any works published from the data.

5. The University of Louisville: It is recognized that the University of Louisville is not a party to this agreement. If anyone outside of the researchers would like