

March  
2021



# **LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

## **New Early Intervention System (EIS) Metrics**

### **SYSTEMS ACCOUNTABILITY BUREAU**

**March 31, 2021**

## NEW EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEM (EIS) METRICS

As part of the current enhancement of the EIS business process, three nuanced and rigorous metrics will be used to flag staff whose performance of duties in handling incidents is out of the norm or for potential acknowledgement of commendable performance (two goals emphasized in the EIS Process Guideline). The new metrics and flagging criteria, presented in Table 1, will be automated to the extent possible including the calculation of the proposed new metrics. Interactive dashboards will make available to facility management the names of staff who excelled in their crisis management, require support/training, or are potentially being overused during crisis management.

Table 1. New EIS Metrics

Table 1. Proposed New EIS Metrics to Identify Staff Behavior (Commendable or High-Liability)					
	What it does	How it is calculated	What it means	Lower threshold	Upper threshold
Youth-based intervention score	Holds constant the youth receiving the intervention and compares staff who intervened with that same youth.	Pull all staff incident reports (PIRs and SIRs) involving a specific youth in the past two months. Calculate for each involved staff member what their level of intervention was relative to the average of all other staff who intervened with that same youth. Subtract the average of other staff's intervention levels with that specific youth from that staff member's intervention level. Repeat this process for all youth who received interventions from more than 1 staff member in the past two months. Take the average across all youth for that staff member.	Higher scores reflect less effective de-escalation and crisis management relative to other staff.	At or below the 5th percentile at their facility (commendable)	Above 1.5 (high liability)
Incident-based intervention score	Holds constant the incident in question and compares staff who intervened during that same incident.	If there are 2 or more staff involved in an incident, calculate for each involved staff member what their level of intervention was relative to the average of all other staff who intervened during that incident. Subtract the average of other staff's intervention levels from that staff members intervention level. Repeat this process for each incident that month with 2 or more involved staff. Take the average across all incidents for that staff member.	Higher scores reflect less effective de-escalation and crisis management relative to other staff	At or below the 5th percentile at their facility (commendable)	Above 1.5 (high liability)
Engagement score	Addresses the possibility of deliberate indifference	The number of physical intervention incidents for the month in which that staff member is flagged as being "actually involved" are summed and divided by the number of incidents they are flagged as being either "not actually involved" or "witness". This score will only be calculated for staff who have completed a PIR or supplemental PIR within the past year.	Higher scores reflect frequent engagement in crisis management	Below the second percentile at their facility (high liability)	At or above the 95th percentile at their facility (high liability)

As shown in Table 1, **the proposed EIS system has three new scores:**

Some staff, by nature of assignment, are constrained by safety and security circumstances generated through youth behaviors to engage in higher levels of physical intervention. To account for this, the **youth-based intervention score** reflects staffs' application of more effective de-escalation and crisis management relative to other staff. To calculate this variable,

- Pull all incidents for youth "a" in the past two months (PIRs and SIRs<sup>1</sup>).
- When there are 2 or more incidents involving youth "a", calculate a deviation score for each involved staff [on a scale from 0 (verbal intervention only) to 6 (soft restraints or OC spray)] relative to the average of all other staff who intervened with that same youth through subtraction.

<sup>1</sup>Assault on minor, assault on staff, attempted assault on minor, attempted assault on staff, disruptive and physically aggressive, escape attempt, fight, level 3 leaving area, level 3 self-harm, mental health crisis - aggressive, near fight, self-harming behavior/not life threatening, serious property damage, and serious self-injury.

- A positive score means this staff member used less restrictive interventions to manage the incidents with youth “a” than other staff typically did with youth “a”.
- A negative score means this staff member used more restrictive interventions to manage the incident with youth “a” than staff typically did with youth “a”.
- Repeat the process for youth “b”, youth “c”, and so on, until deviation scores are calculated for all youth toward whom that staff member applied a physical intervention that month.
- Once deviation scores are calculated for each youth with whom that staff member engaged during an incident, the average across all those deviation scores for that month is calculated.

The second metric is an **incident-based intervention score**, in which a higher score reflects more effective de-escalation and crisis management relative to other staff. To calculate this variable:

- Examine all PIRs for incident “a”.
- When there are 2 or more staff involved in incident “a”, calculate a deviation score for each involved staffs’ level of intervention relative to the average of all other staff who intervened during that incident through subtraction.
- A positive score means this staff used less restrictive measures to manage incident “a” than other staff did during that same incident.
- A negative score means this staff used more restrictive measures to manage incident “a” than other staff did. We will then repeat this process for incident “b”, incident “c”, and so on, until we have included all incidents which occurred that month. Once deviation scores for each available incident are calculated, the average deviation across all incidents that month for each staff member is calculated.

Staff who are 1.5 above the average on either of the first two metrics or below the 5th percentile at their facility on the third metric will be flagged by EIS. Future calibration of these thresholds may be done and/or additional thresholds may be considered as new data becomes available to further enhance the ability to accurately flag only staff which require review.

The final score is an **engagement score**. To calculate this engagement score, the number of physical intervention incidents for the month in which that staff member is flagged as being “actually involved” are summed and divided by the number of incidents they are flagged as being “not actually involved” or a “witness”. This metric is still tentative and will be finalized after the calibration testing is complete.

These metrics will identify behavioral trends that are anomalies among the staff. All staff who apply a physical intervention that month will have an analysis run on all three metrics, and all staff will have an analysis run each month on the third metric (engagement score). These three indices will be automatically calculated every month and then sorted by SAB staff to remove cases which must be deferred (this process will also be automated to the extent possible). After deferments have been removed, the EIS review notification form and supporting scores (including trends for the previous 6 months) will be displayed in Power BI dashboards and shared monthly with all facility supervisors. The notification form will contain two lists: staff that require EIS review (for less effective crisis management, possible deliberate indifference, and staff who are potentially being overused during crisis incidents) and staff that merit acknowledgment for effective crisis management. Specifically, the monthly dashboard will include a list of staff with the highest 5% on relative intervention scores at each facility. This will facilitate peer mentoring and recognition of the staff who demonstrate commendable crisis management.

These three indices will enhance the EIS by aligning with the EIS Process Guideline admonition to “examine the indexed documentation by category of incident, observing which employee’s present unusual patterns of Safe Crisis Management incidents and/or inappropriate conduct allegations as

**compared to similarly assigned employees** (peer officer thresholds)". [emphasis added] Once the new PIR forms are implemented, there are other fields that could be included as part of the EIS screening (e.g., youth demeanor).