

STRATEGIC PLAN SUMMARY

Overarching charge: To help protect public safety, minimize harms and cost-effectively focus limited system resources to promote an increasingly effective, efficient and equitable local criminal justice system.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES BY WORKGROUP

Community Engagement/ Racial and Ethnic Disproportionality and Disparity (R+EDD) Workgroup

Purpose: Establish specific and innovative community engagement efforts to address R+EDD and support system improvement efforts.

Focus Areas: a) Continuing community engagement, b) Increasing engagement among individuals most affected by the criminal justice system, c) Continuing to examine and address R+EDD in the criminal justice system, and d) Supporting system improvement

Initiative One: Ongoing Community Engagement

Why? The community wants to know more and have more ways to actively engage.

Initiative Two: Updated Analysis of R+EDD

Why? There has not been an updated analysis of R+EDD in the local criminal justice system since the 2018 Midyear Report.

Initiative Three: Race Equity Fellowship Proposal

Why? There is not a clear-cut blueprint for addressing R+EDD and effective agents of change are needed to increase consciousness among system actors and lead efforts to address R+EDD.

Divert and Deflect Workgroup

Purpose: Update, innovate and improve upon efforts to divert and/or deflect individuals from the criminal justice system as appropriate.

Focus Areas: a) Community partnerships and other means of prevention before criminal justice intervention, b) Law enforcement practices surrounding citation and release, and c) Pre-booking divert/deflect options

Initiative One: Familiar face case conferencing

Why? The cycle of book, release and repeat does not work, particularly among the most active of familiar faces.

Initiative Two: Diversion and deflection research

Why? Research is necessary to more fully understand how deflecting individuals away from the criminal justice system and to diversion centers (and subsequent treatment) impacts arrests, jail population and behavioral health outcomes.

Initiative Three: Crime and Jail Use Tracking

Why? There is not a regularly available county-wide crime and jail use tracking mechanism. One is needed to better understand patterns of crime, diversion and deflection, arrests, and jail use activity.

Bond and Reentry Workgroup

Purpose: Update, innovate and improve upon procedural justice and recidivism outcomes for individuals from booking to reentry from incarceration.

Focus Areas: a) Booking, b) Bond court, c) Procedural justice, d) Detention center- based reentry preparations and e) Community-based efforts to reduce recidivism

Initiative One: Ensure bond hearings are continually fair, just and meaningful

Why? While significant strides have been made in Centralized Bond Court, continuing attention is necessary.

Initiative Two: Widely accessible directory of services

Why? There is not a common understanding of what reentry services are available, let alone which work best for whom.

Initiative Three: Proposal for pretrial service option(s)

Why? Regardless of the type of bond set, there is minimal oversight of the conditions of the bond setting, let alone feedback about pretrial outcomes and/or which services work best to maximize safety, appearance and liberty.

Case Processing Workgroup

Purpose: Update, innovate and improve the processing of cases in the court of General Sessions.

Focus Areas: a) Case processing, b) Jail population review (JPR), c) Procedural justice, d) Bond reconsideration and other pretrial matters

Initiative One: Jail Population Review

Why? Absent regular reviews of the jail population, defendants that are not a threat to public safety or a flight risk can be unnecessarily detained.

Initiative Two: General Session's Court Reminders

Why? Losing contact with defendants while cases are pending results in missed court appearances, bench warrants and slower times to disposition.

Initiative Three: Research pandemic impacts and institutionalize lessons learned

Why? Charleston County does not meet the statewide case timeliness standard established by State Court Administration (80% pending less than 365 days) and it will be further compounded by the pandemic.