

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

Friday, March 20th, 2015

Board Members

Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
Angel Weant
Bill Hildenbrand
Carl Blake
Jeff Geist
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Jessica Curtis
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Merve Davies
Mimi Scheuermann
Missy Gursky
Nancy Jackson
Tom Leversee
Marcelo Kopcow
Rick May

Visitors

Jerry Frey
Roger Kincade
Taralyn Clark
Tom Casey
Bev Casey
Christina Ortiz Marquez
Jill Lampela
Debbie Baty
Carolyn Turner
Jo Stack
Mathias Antony
Susan Walker
Pat Mathew
Linda Martin
Steve Parker
Cindy Plampin
Sasha Hatchings
Roberta Ponis
Pat Harris
Laura Saurini
Doug Broun
Jodie Goter

Visitors

Robin Richards
Diana Lawyer-Brook
Laurie Rose Kepros
Jamie Gibbs
Wellesley Bush
Roxanne Alder
Julie David
Deborah Kulas
Deb Paulsen
Amanda Edward
Marissa Palaclos
Cassi Sattazahan

Absent Board Members

Alli Watt Brie Akins Kim English Mary Baydarian Richard Bednarski

Staff

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky Harmony Fox Lucy Klos Roxanne Hotchkiss
Cathy Rodriguez Jesse Hansen Raechel Alderete

Board Meeting Begins:

Introductions –

Future Agenda Items – No future agenda items.

Announcements - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the SOMB presented to the Joint Judiciary Committee this week. The presentation was very successful and reviewed the SOMB strategic plan.

Raechel Alderete noted two upcoming trainings, Sandy Jung and James Haaven. Also, the NAPN conference is coming to Denver in May and registration is open. Lastly, the SOMB conference is approaching and registration will be available in mid-April. Those interested in making award nominations or doing a sponsorship should contact Raechel.

Angel Weant noted the upcoming Advanced Probation training beginning in May. This event does have limited availability for the public to attend.

Tom Leversee requested that anyone having articles or other research related to polygraph submit them to the Best Practices Committee for review.

Approval of February minutes -

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY MINUTES: motion to approve Mimi Scheuermann; 2nd Carl Blake.

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| 15 Approve | 0 Oppose | 2 Abstain | Motion Passes |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|

Approve Agenda – Agenda is approved.

Lifetime Supervision Report (Presentation) – Jesse Hansen, Angel Weant, and Chrstina Ortiz-Marquez – Handout Provided.

Mimi Scheuermann commented that probation reported in the report that the average caseload is about 23 cases. She asked how that related to the quality of supervision and does probation feel that this is a manageable number.

Angel Weant commented that the caseloads are capped at 25; however, the numbers have sometimes exceeded this cap. She added at there are about 2,500 people on sex offender probation statewide. There are criteria for SOIP that a probation officer has to meet, depending on the current phase the individual is in. In the beginning this intensity is much higher and so these cases are assigned the greatest workload value.

Tom Leversee commented the outside evaluation of the SOMB Standards noted challenges relating to the Risk, Need, Responsivity (RNR) principles. He questioned how the criterion for being on SOIP relates to the RNR principles?

Marcelo Kopcow commented that an evaluation may come back as a low risk, but this individual may still go to the Department of Corrections (DOC) based on the offense committed and the mandatory sentencing for the offense.

Angel Weant commented that SOIP is conviction based, not risk based. This may mean that some individuals are in the system longer due to the index crime.

Allison Boyd commented that she believes that there are not a lot of low-risk offenders that are going to DOC because not very many sex offenses have a mandatory sentencing.

Angel Weant commented that 65% of those that come through the court system receive a community sentence. 2,500 of those cases on probation are being successfully managed in the community.

Jessica Meza asked DOC how often they return to an offender to ask if treatment is desired. Is this something that is asked only as the offender is received into DOC, or is SOTMP reviewing these cases periodically, and how often is that?

Christina Ortiz-Marquez of DOC responded that an offender can request to be reviewed after an appeal. SOTMP will then review the offender for treatment. Treatment is now being prioritized on Parole Eligibility Date (PED), not on sentence. Offenders within 4 years of their PED are prioritized.

Susan Walker commented that it appears that only 77 people are in phase one, whereas there are 287 in phase two and she asked why that was. Additionally, she asked why only 7 people appear to have been released to parole, whereas 204 people remained within DOC.

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that this may be a data collection issue.

Jeff Geist noted that more hearings were held than the numbers are currently suggesting (referring to the 7 people released to parole). He asked DOC to explore this slide further, but he commented that ultimately it is up to the parole board as to who gets released.

Susan Walker asked why the costs of evaluations are rising.

Merve Davies described the reasons for his agency's rise in fees.

Nancy Jackson asked how long people are on the wait list, and whether treatment is more effective right before someone is released or does it matter when they receive treatment versus when they are released.

Steve Parker responded that many of the DOC's efforts are to reduce the time on the waitlist. He also commented that he is not currently aware of any research stating if treatment is more or less effective for someone about to be released versus someone who has years left to complete.

John Odenheimer asked how phase two works. Does this mean they have finished phase one and are back in general population until they get in phase two or are they moved directly to phase two?

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that it used to be that they did go back on a waitlist and therefore they were moved back into the general population. Now, most high-risk cases are going straight from phase one to phase two without going back to general population.

Allison Boyd asked DOC about how many DOC clients were on probation prior? Secondly, of the 138 paroled, 27 are being reported as re-paroled, are there cases where people are being released from parole without a positive recommendation from SOTMP?

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that this has happened but that it is exceedingly rare.

Marcelo Kopcow asked if there was data for how long an individual, with and without indeterminate sentences, generally serves in DOC

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that they did not have this information at this time, but that they would try and gather it.

Nancy Jackson asked about the decreasing number of treatment providers and what the SOMB do to support providers

Jesse Hanson commented that it is not considered a trend yet, as this is the first year a decrease has been observed, and noted this is also the first year the SOMB has introduced the "not currently practicing" designation.

Cathy Rodriguez commented that her experience was that she did see a decline in her applications for providers. She wondered whether burn out is a factor, as well as the stress of law suits, the difficulty of the work, and the frustration with the breakdown of the shared living arrangements (SLA). Additionally, there could just be a group of people retiring while fewer are entering the field.

Missy Gursky commented that the field faces all of the aforementioned difficulties, as well as not achieving the fiscal goals for many providers.

Dianna Lawyer-Brook commented that she was aware of a report that stated about 60% of individuals are beyond their required time PED. She stated that this has been frustrating to her in the past, but that she has seen a significant change in this recently as DOC seems to be decreasing this bottleneck. She added that looking at this report it would appear that many of those sent back to DOC are sent back on technical violations.

Angel Weant commented that some offenders are being revoked based on technical violations and they are typically not being revoked based on a new sexual offense.

Carolyn Turner asked if there was any data on parole board members and how many individuals each member has referred for full board review and how many offenders they have declined.

Laurie Kepros commented that the general technical violation rate is about 51% for all parolees (not just sex offenders). She also commented that in reference to how long do offenders actually spend incarcerated, she was aware of an independent study that was done and manually calculated which found that offenders are spending on average 210% of their minimum sentence for indeterminate offenders. She added that DOC provides annual reports on their website that covers many of the questions being asked, including duration of time various sentences actually serve. Judicial likewise has an annual report that covers statistics based on judicial district. She asked DOC about their risk assessment and about how many individuals are in high, moderate, and low risk categories.

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that about 16% are in the high risk category, based on the Static 99. She noted that this information was based only on the individuals who were in treatment at that time. The remaining offenders then would fall in the moderate and low categories.

Bryan Jameson commented that compared to this data about 1 in 4 people incarcerated have a sex offense and then about 1 in 7 of those are out on parole. He asked what has been the increase since 1998. And why are so few being processed out on parole?

Jeff Geist commented that he would like to review the statistic on this question to assure overall accuracy.

Christina Ortiz-Marquez commented that DOC is moving towards a RNR model but that the ultimate decision for parole is up to the parole board.

A comment from the audience urged the SOMB to continue to look at the treatment provider issue of burn out. With fewer providers entering the field and with more sex offense cases entering the system this could become a much more serious issue.

Break

Feedback on DOC Variance from Board (Action Item) – Application Review Committee – Handout provided. Carl Blake explained the request for continuing the DOC Variance which has been presented to the SOMB previously.

APPROVAL OF VARIANCE: motion to approve Merve Davies; 2nd Amy Fitch.

19 Approve

0 Oppose

0 Abstain

Motion Passes

Strategic Plan Update (Action Item) – Cathy Rodriguez and Raechel Alderete – Cathy Rodriguez reviewed the strategic plan, which was developed from input provided by the external and internal evaluations of the Standards. The SOMB is addressing many of these items, including a complete revision of the Adult Standards and Guidelines, including possible revision to the Low-Risk Protocol. The Best Practices Committee is processing research on polygraph and will make recommendations for use of the polygraph.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that increasing the victim's voice within the SOMB Standards and Guidelines is a priority for the SOMB. More direction is expected to come from the follow-up to the Victim Panel, which is on the agenda for next month's board meeting.

Allison Boyd noted that having a victim's advocate on both adult and juvenile teams has been a goal of the Victim Advocacy Committee for some time and remains a focus. In the Adult Revision Committee there have been some dramatic changes that support the victim's voice within the entire process.

Cathy Rodriguez commented that the Continuity of Care Committee has been working on an intake form that is ready to be piloted in order to gather more information about how to better provide continuous and appropriate care.

Additionally, the SOMB has been working on developing a safety plan for offenders coming out of DOC but before they are able to get into treatment.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky also noted that the SOMB is creating a Point of Contact list that would be a comprehensive source of the primary points of contacts for various agencies. When completed this will become available via the SOMB website.

Cathy Rodriguez commented that the Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) designation has been considered and reviewed by a Committee. The Committee did make changes to the tool, but the Committee does not independently have the ability to change the designation of SVP.

Raechel Alderete noted that the SOMB has hired a new staff member, Roxanne Hotchkiss, who is the new Implementation Specialist. She is currently reviewing the application process and will be providing training on changes to the application forms and process.

Tom Leverage asked if there was a timeframe for switching to the new Competency based model application process.

Raechel Alderete commented that full implementation is expected by February 2016. Another goal the SOMB has been addressing is how best deal with issues that might arise within MDTs/CSTs. Through the various panels, the SOMB has gathered more information on what those problems specifically are and are now trying to address those issues in trainings, as well as identifying and clarifying each person's role, and how to address problems when they do arise.

Lastly, Raechel Alderete commented on Informed Supervision. The Juvenile Standards Committee made some suggestions in this section of the Standards. Various concerns brought to the SOMB have been addressed and guided the changes made in this section.

Lunch

Variance (Decision Item) – Merve Davies and Deb Paulson – Carl Blake explained the Variance and noted this is a previous Variance to be renewed.

APPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF VARIANCE FOR ONE YEAR: motion to approve Nancy Jackson; 2nd Amy Fitch.

17 Approve

0 Oppose

1 Abstain

Motion Passes

Supervision Officer and Caseworker Panel (Presentation) – Angel Weant and Cathy Rodriguez – Angel Weant asked what challenges and success the panel members have navigating the system of working with sex offenders.

Julie David commented that she feels it is overall successful. Even though different agencies may use the Standards and Guidelines slightly differently, having these Standards and Guidelines ease the ability to have a conversation about sex offenses and empowers the community. The greatest struggle she has faced is a lack of resources, especially because she is now in a rural area. In particular housing is the hardest and possibly the most critical resource she finds offenders are lacking.

Question: **Does your role overlap or conflict with other members of the CST/MDT?**

Cassi Sattazahan commented that she feels it sometimes cannot be avoided, but is not often a problem for her. She added that ultimately with good and consistent communication most problems are avoidable.

Roxanne Alder commented that Human Services often rely on the Standards and Guidelines. Sometimes they do have individuals who may not feel they fall under these Guidelines and sometimes they have conflicts with this, but through communicating and working with the caseworkers she feels most problems are resolved.

Question: **Are there competing goals with other team members in managing these cases?**

Roxanne Alder noted that there are different end goals for various agencies, which can be a challenge.

Question: **What challenges have you experienced working with offenders within family systems?**

Roxanne Alder commented that all of her cases require her to work within family structures. They are almost always looking at separation of a household in some way. This can be very difficult for families, especially in the beginning. In her experience most families do start to understand as criminal charges are brought forward and they begin to move through the system.

Wellesley Bush commented that in the adult system they also are often in situations of separating a family as the victim and offender are in the same family. This can be very difficult to manage, but with clear and open communication between the family and the team this can dramatically help the family not only to understand but also help the offender.

Julie David commented that one of her challenges is when either family members or even the offender themselves are in denial. If the family is in denial this can create a lack of support for the offender getting treatment or taking accountability. When the offender is in denial they may not inform the family about what they can and cannot do, and this can cause additional challenges.

Question: **Knowing that there are challenges, financially, what systemic challenges have you experienced related to financial obligations with these clients?**

Wellesley Bush commented that offenders do face a large amount of financial challenges upon being released. Oftentimes housing is the largest issue, but also all the requirements for polygraph and treatment can cause hardships, particularly for offenders who are under employed or not employed. She commented that there are funds available to help when an offender is working in treatment, but there is also a concern that if all the services are being paid for what investment does the offender have in treatment.

Roxanne Alder commented that Social Services may also cover many costs for offenders.

Julie David commented that sometimes people who cannot afford their treatment are then sent back to DOC because they are not able to comply with treatment requirements. DOC has acquired an employment navigator who can help offenders find gainful work, help build their resume, or assist them in preparing for interviews.

Wellesley Bush added that when it comes to housing she has found the SLAs to be very helpful, even when it is not required that the offender live in one.

Question: **What problems have you had imposing sanctions or using rewards?**

Deborah Kulas commented that there are many sanctions which can prove to be helpful from longer duration in treatment through returning to DOC. But she added that they avoid returning a client to DOC until all other options are exhausted, but rather try to come up with creative other sanctions. She also noted that lately they have been trying to utilize more rewards than sanctions. This requires really knowing what rewards will matter to the offender.

Question: **What is your experience working in a rural area while working with this population and with limited resources?**

Wellesley Bush commented that she has experienced supervising sex offenders in Denver where there are fewer stigmas and a lot more resources. But in a rural area there are a lot less resources and a different dynamic with the community. Again, the number one problem they face is housing. Without proper housing the offender cannot register properly or get meaningful employment and this all poses hardships and creates a less stable environment for everyone.

Question: **What is your experience including victim representative in the CST/MDT?**

Wellesley Bush commented that in her experience, victims are primarily looking for offenders to get help and to not hurt anyone else. When victims are included in the team she has always found it very helpful and has learned much more about the overall case and how it impacts each person involved. That being said she has found it very hard to get victims involved. Often times it seems like the victim and the offenders world are separate, but her experience leads her to believe that through communication they can be brought together to help everyone heal.

Julie David noted that victim representatives are very hard to be able to get on the team. Many times the victim's voice is lost even within the families where the victim and offender are in the same family. Families are focused on getting the offender back home and with helping the offender through treatment and she has seen the other child who is the victim left at home or not asked how they feel about what is happening.

Question: **What are some successes have you had with this population?**

Wellesley Bush commented that she has had some great successes, and believes that with open communication there is always a solution. This communication also helps the offender see that he/she can complete this, his/her needs are being listened to, and this helps the offender keep going with treatment.

Cassi Sattazahan commented that she has had many conversations with offenders where they are now able to relay new tools they have learned, and have specific stories about how and when they have utilized those tools successfully.

Roxanne Alder commented that her most proud moments are when she is able to slowly move out of someone's life because he/she has grown and are strong and able enough to live and function without much supervision.

Deborah Kulas commented that she has seen a dramatic change in the supervision of sex offenders. She is seeing more rewards being used instead of sanctions and this really has shown her the evolution within the field.

Jessica Curtis commented that she was surprised to hear that Deborah Kulas is the only officer supervising this population in her area. She also asked if any additional weight is given to juveniles who have committed a sexual offense versus those who have not.

Angel Weant responded that JISP cases are given a higher work load value.

Jessica Meza asked what the supervisors' experiences have been within the MDTs/CSTs when they want one thing and the treatment provider wants something different?

Wellesley Bush commented that the sex offender units are set up as team and this really aids in their ability to communicate. The ultimate goal of the supervisors is to protect the community and in rare cases this may mean a different action than a treatment provider will want for the client.

Deborah Kulas noted she also agreed that she has not had significant problems with wanting something different than the treatment providers. In cases where the offender is removed from treatment this does not mean the offender cannot later return to treatment when ready.

Allison Boyd commented that there are crime victim compensation boards which will pay for a victim's therapist to attend the supervision team meetings and up to 6 session to work on victim clarifications. She also commented that housing is a huge issue for victims and there are not funds to help with this.

Carl Blake commented that the Treatment Provider Panel noted a much greater problem with the supervising officers ultimately being able to make decisions over other team members. In the Juvenile Standards the Supervisor is no longer the head of the team and if there is a problem the team has to work it out together.

Wellesley Bush commented that they have a SART there to staff the problem with other professionals to allow a resolution.

Roxanne Alder commented that she feels she has been able to communicate about conflicts. Over the years they have learned not to place someone first, but to communicate first and then move once a decision is made together.

Tom Leverage asked if there are things within the statute or even the Standards and Guidelines that they would change.

Rozanne Alder commented that some treatment providers have a very strict modality and will not alter the plan based on the client's age, family wishes, or culture. This can create a huge problem getting treatment when the treatment is not meeting the family's needs. So having that flexibility could be very useful.

Susan Walker asked what percent of juveniles are taking polygraphs.

Roxanne Alder commented that probably about 70% of kids adjudicated are polygraphed. Anxiety, developmental disabilities, or difficulty understanding information might be reasons for not using a polygraph.

Jessica Curtis asked how polygraph is used in relation to removal from the registry.

Roxanne Alder commented that it is not a legal requirement to have the polygraph, but it is a useful tool that they do use.

Laurie Kepros asked where the supervising officers get their treatment providers.

Deborah Kulas commented that they use many factors which could include the offender's ability to get to treatment, but also personality types, the specifics on the case, transportation, and the ability to have a provider that the agency can financially support.

Laurie Kepros commented that she particularly appreciates the supervising officers taking in the geographical challenges because there are areas in the state with little to no providers and this can be a huge challenge.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

Turning Participant Results

Session Name: New Session 3-20-2015 3-07 PM

Created: 5/11/2015 3:51 PM

| Device ID | Remote No. | First Name | Last Name | 1) Motion: Approve the February minutes | 2) Motion to approve an extension of the DOC variance | 3) Motion to approve variance |
|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2B201 | 1 | Pam | Bricker | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B212 | 2 | Mary | Baydarian | - | - | 3 |
| 2B213 | 3 | Richard | Bednarski | - | - | - |
| 2B216 | 4 | Carl | Blake III | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B226 | 5 | Allison | Boyd | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B22D | 6 | Jessica | Curtis | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B237 | 7 | Merve | Davies | 1 | 1 | - |
| 2B23B | 8 | Kim | English | - | - | - |
| 2B246 | 9 | Amy | Fitch | - | 1 | 1 |
| 2B25B | 10 | Jeff | Geist | - | - | - |
| 2B261 | 11 | Missy | Gursky | - | 1 | 1 |
| 5EE64 | 12 | Rick | May | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B26A | 13 | Bill | Hildenbrand | 3 | 1 | - |
| 2B26E | 14 | Nancy | Jackson | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B281 | 15 | Jeff | Jenks | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B291 | 16 | Marcelo | Kopcow | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B295 | 17 | Allison | Watt | - | - | - |
| 2B2A8 | 18 | Tom | Leversee | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B2D6 | 19 | Jessica | Meza | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B2F5 | 20 | Kandy | Moore | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B2FF | 21 | John | Odenheimer | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B302 | 22 | Mimi | Scheuermann | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B32A | 23 | Jeff | Shay | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B32C | 24 | Angel | Weant | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2B32F | 25 | Brie | Akins | - | - | - |