

Community Corrections Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

April 11, 2013, 1:30PM-5:00PM
Jefferson County JAC
Remington Building

ATTENDEES:

CHAIRS

Theresa Cisneros /4th Judicial District, District Court Judge

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Joe Cannata/Voices of Victims

Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service

Glenn Tapia/Division of Criminal Justice

Greg Kildow/Intervention Community Corrections Services

David Lipka/Public Defender

Tim Hand/DOC Division of Adult Parole and Community Corrections

Shannon Carst/Colorado Community Corrections Coalition

Greg Mauro/City and County of Denver

Bill Gurule/12th Judicial District, Probation

Steve Reynolds/9th Judicial District

Dennis Berry, Mesa County Criminal Justice System

Christie Donner/Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Stan Hilkey/Sheriff, Mesa County

Harriet Hall/Jefferson Center for Mental Health

Kathryn Otten/Colorado Department of Labor and Employment

STAFF

Paul Herman/CCJJ consultant

Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice

Christine Adams/Division of Criminal Justice

Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

Peg Flick/Division of Criminal Justice

Laurence Lucero/Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT

Peter Weir, 1st Judicial District

Claire Levy/State Representative

Steve King/State Senator

(Appointment pending)/Parole Board

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Discussion: Theresa Cisneros welcomes the group and previews the agenda.</p>
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: Community Corrections in Colorado and the Community Corrections Advisory Council</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: Glenn Tapia presented a PowerPoint outlining the following elements of Community Corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of Community Corrections • Structural Basics of Community Corrections • Local Control – Historically and Today • Funded Capacity of Community Corrections • Funding History of Community Corrections • Growth and Evolution of Community Corrections into 2013 • Vision Statement for Community Corrections • Community Corrections Data and Outcomes • Infusion of Evidence Based Practices (EBP) in Community Corrections • Challenges and Opportunities in Community Corrections • Governor’s Community Corrections Advisory Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ History ▫ Purpose ▫ Accomplishments ▫ Current Initiatives • Macroscopic Summary of Community Corrections
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic: Current State of Community Corrections</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: Paul Herman, facilitator and consultant to the Commission, lead the group in a discussion about current day criminal justice system needs. He also asked the group to address how Community Corrections can be most effective in addressing current needs.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Corrections, like Parole and Probation, has a variety of specialized populations and many options for a wide variety of offenders, and the internal workings of those options have changed and specialized over time. • The populations are different now than from when community corrections started decades ago. Also, research has allowed us to differentiate the populations. • All offender populations are more specialized and specifically defined. There are many more options and possible pathways. The question is, for each one of the ever-growing options, what does the system need for those options? • Another question is what are the needs of our system in Colorado at this point in time? What are the system needs from the system perspective?
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (cont'd)</p> <p>Current State of Community Corrections</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the needs of the system, critical needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stable and secure housing – Stability factor (this is a need for both the consumer and the community) -Employment -Training (life skills / soft and hard skills) -Increased education -Mental health treatment -Substance abuse -Parenting programs -Budgeting -Financial education -Long-term financial planning -Sex offender treatment -Domestic violence treatment -Criminal thinking -Cognitive restructuring -Pro-social thinking -Affordable Transportation -Communication technology (phones, email, etc.) -Pre-natal -Family (support, therapy) -Victim empathy -Basic health needs / Hygiene -Standardized rules enforcement -System navigation -Restorative justice -Transition support -Peer mentoring -Structure and supervision -Relapse prevention -Sanctions -Incentives -Medication • Community Corrections has a greater ability to respond more quickly to both positive and negative situations. • There is greater leverage with community corrections – but there is a need for more of a carrot too. • What separates Community Corrections from probation and parole when managing clients is proximity - more ability to respond, greater ability to observe and interact. • There are several ways to address all the issues defined in the first exercise. • Offenders’ basic needs should be met before you can start addressing specific needs. Housing, meds, etc. need to be met first. • Offenders need stability. • Consistency with case management is an ongoing issue. • Comm. Corr. facilities provide more safety for an offender (as opposed to being on the street). • The case manager to offender ratio is better at Comm. Corr. too.
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (cont'd)</p> <p>Current State of Community Corrections</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a fluidity and choice quality about community corrections with board control. • The selectivity and quality of Comm. Corr. has something in it that probation and parole don't have. • Community Corrections in and of itself is a stable support system/environment – even if your case manager isn't there, there is line staff. <p><u>Offender Focus</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let's focus in now on a particular client, let's look at the offender. • Offender Typology – <i>characteristics that when met meet the responsivity principle.</i> • Responsivity is the last area that we need to address. • How you sort and how you supervise are the first steps, responsivity is the next. • Greg Mauro spoke to the driving factors on acceptance and the work regarding development of a decision making matrix. • Define the offender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Risk -Time -Violence -Readiness • Data/Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Risk/Needs – LSI -High stakes crimes • Dennis Berry states that in Mesa County there is still a system with very subjective decision making. In the last few years Mesa has started taking riskier clients. • Risk is a dynamic, not static characteristic – risk is not a fixed measure. • DOC needs information for placement. The LSI can be misused - It's not the right tool for institutions. • DOC doesn't use LSI for placement, but it gives the case manager some historical information. • To what extent does local control go AGAINST meeting offenders needs. • Geography is not taken into account in assessment tools – but when the rubber hits the road it's an obstacle – accessibility of appropriate interventions is challenging. • An offender must go through a local board before going to another board. • What about standardization of local boards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With boards –there are often more political obstacles than treatment obstacles. • How do you keep an offender in THEIR community if their needs can't be met in their community? • Which brings us back to the big question of 'What is the ROLE of community corrections?' We can't have that conversation until you define who you're talking about. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Diversion question is 'If,' the transition question is about 'When.'
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (cont'd)</p> <p>Current State of Community Corrections</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In regards to condition of parole and condition of probation the question is also an 'If.' ○ 'Ifs' are conditional upon assessment. ○ The majority of DOC folks don't even get to go to Comm. Corr. (currently, 37% of DOC inmates are released through community corrections). ○ Ideally, the transition person should be a 'When' not an 'If.' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The offender and case manager in DOC often have the discretion on Comm. Corr. – The offender can always refuse to go to Comm. Corr. and the case manager could say it's not worth their time to pursue. ○ Does probation have a flow chart that helps identify steps and decisions regarding the 'If'? ○ Probation should be uniform across the state and NOT make a recommendation. ● We need to address problems that arise with multiple gate keepers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The gatekeeper's decisions are also subjective – juggling lots of subjective decisions. ● Are there standards around structured decision making? No, because it gets back to local control. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We're one of the few states that actually has standards – but ours are performance measure standards that have more to do with areas such as program administration, security and case management.
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Identify Key Issues:</p> <p>Define Scope of Work</p> <p>Work Plan and Next Steps</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Paul Herman led the group on what needs to happen between now and the next meeting.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We need to understand what goes into the 'Ifs' and the 'Whens.' ● It would help to be able to diagram various points and various decisions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will help us understand who is making what decisions and what elements are being considered. ● We'll put the outcomes from all of today's info into a comprehensible format. ● We need Eric Philp to paint the picture on typology (see page 4). ● Greg Mauro will provide information on Denver's project to develop structured decision making. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part one of Denver's project is 'who do we place,' part two is 'where do we place them?' ● We need to draft a diagram of the process. Also, we need to engage providers in the group to ask what they're looking for as far as receivers of this. ● We need to address screening and local control. ● Next month the group will see a presentation on the CCJJ procedure.
---	---

Meeting Schedule 2013

All meetings to take place at 710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room unless you are notified otherwise

Thursday, May 9, 2013	1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, June 13, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, July 11, 2013	1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, August 8, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, September 12, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, October 10, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, November 7, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.
Thursday, December 12, 2013	1:30 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.