

Community Corrections Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

May 9, 2013, 1:30PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling, Ste. 3000
Lakewood, CO

ATTENDEES:

CHAIRS

Peter Weir, 1st Judicial District

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Joe Cannata/Voices of Victims

Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service

Glenn Tapia/Division of Criminal Justice

Gregg 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 (phone)

Dennis Berry, Mesa County Criminal Justice System

Christie Donner/Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Harriet Hall/Jefferson Center for Mental Health

Kathryn Otten/Colorado Department of Labor and Employment

Claire Levy/State Representative

Dr. Anthony Young/Parole Board

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

ABSENT

Steve King/State Senator

Steve Reynolds/9th Judicial District

Theresa Cisneros /4th Judicial District, District Court Judge

Stan Hilkey/Sheriff, Mesa County

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Discussion: Peter Weir welcomes the group and previews the agenda. Theresa Cisneros was unable to attend today’s meeting. She will return next month.</p>
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic: Community Corrections in Colorado Colo. Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice – CCJJ Background</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: Kim English presented a PowerPoint to the task force members outlining the history of the Commission and the standard protocol and procedures for the CCJJ Task Forces.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation included the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Roles and responsibilities of task force members -Roles and responsibilities of staff -Mission of the Commission -Background information on Evidence Based Practices -Data on Community Corrections in Colorado -Task Force process -The role of Working Groups -Recommendations process -Current Task Force structure -Prior Task Forces and Committees, and, -Information about the CCJJ webpage and Facebook page
---	---

<p>Issue/Topic: First meeting summary</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: Paul Herman, facilitator and consultant to the Commission, lead the group in a discussion about the outcomes from the first meeting.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the first meeting there was significant discussion about system needs. To better understand direction for the group, it is essential to first determine where the system is currently. • Staff took the flip-chart notes from the last meeting and compiled them into a one page document. • One of the items discussed at the last meeting was how the Comm. Corr. population currently is more risky than when Comm. Corr. was established. • There are a lot of tools to determine general risk and need for offender populations, but responsivity is another matter. • The document distributed outlines columns of ‘Offender Characteristics’, ‘System needs’ and ‘Community Corrections Unique Role’ - As the discussion in this group moves forward the next many months, task force members will fill in the columns making them richer and deeper.
---	---

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>First meeting summary</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of Comm. Corr.'s unique roles as a system is its ability to be selective. • Another unique element about CC is the placement process. • For example, Denver is looking at their process to see if their board can come up with a more solid/predictable structure when it comes to decision making. • Is there a better way to 'chunk' the flipchart outcomes and columns? Or is this sufficient to start? • Yes – as far as system needs, distinguishing between 'Subjective needs' and 'Objective needs' could help. And 'Material needs' vs. things like 'treatment needs', etc. • The group could distinguish 'Material physical needs' vs. 'Treatment Cog. Needs', etc. • Actually we're dealing with both, the offender has SA treatment needs and the system has to have the capacity to address those treatment needs via delivery of service. Are there system needs that are <i>not</i> offender needs? • Are there system needs that are <i>not</i> offender needs? • Yes – the group will need to view this from a broader context before they begin to focus and narrow in. • The group should also consider fundamental principles of the Commission, for example, public safety. • The group should also address victim's needs. • Another issue is that local boards need more information about possible incoming offenders to make their decisions. • The issue is not necessarily more information, but rather the correct information, the right information and organized information. • The information about both Diversion and Transition client populations is critical. • And, boards need to know what services are available to address those needs. • Accepting someone in community corrections should also take into account whether the offender needs can be addressed. • One of the gaps in data currently available is the victim's perspective, nature and extent of the offense itself. • Sometimes there is also the issue of resolving competing needs. • The system could say a sex offender needs to be in Comm. Corr. – but let's say the victim is in Boulder so the offender can't go there, but what if that's where the best treatment is? • There are many 'chunks of needs' – Offender needs, family's needs, victim needs, what does a community corrections program need vs. what the larger criminal justice system needs. • For example- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -For a CC program, the need could be structure, leadership, staffing, funding, adequate referral process, integration with other agencies, etc. -CJ System, might need a halfway point for offenders, a midway for Diversion and Transition both -These are unique needs • We also have to look at program needs for Comm. Corr. – what kinds of services, what are the benefits of an ISP program vs. Comm. Corr. program – how does CC fit into the other pieces available to offenders. This is similar to
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>First meeting summary</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>the ‘Options or pathways’ discussion the Sentencing Task Force has had.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing looked at this awhile back, who are the offenders, what are the options – we tried to describe broad categories and what the current definition and structure was for that, what was unique about that pathway, etc. • The idea was to look at all of those and then target in on the best option. • Research is getting better and better at looking what goes into risk, and then to look at specific services – what programs deliver the right services for the right offenders. How do we start slotting people? Where do you put them where it’s more likely to get the best results? • For example, some of the most difficult people to manage are Vehicular Homicide offenders. They committed an awful crime but may have very low level needs, and low level risk. • Could we use a logic model? Inputs, products and services and outputs? • Punishment is also a component; it’s not just about the offenders services. <p>(Flip chart notes)- Broader perspective -CCJJ Mission/Guiding principles Punishment Victim Perspective Risk/Need Research-based Structure Confidentiality Charge/Conviction State/Local needs ----- Program ----- Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other broader system needs? What about the infrastructure itself? Do we need more community corrections beds, and how do we effectively fill those beds? And are the facilities distributed correctly (to serve the statewide population). • Comm. Corr. facilities are jurisdiction specific. • Adams County needs more beds while Arapahoe Co. has empty beds. • Do we have the right beds in the right places. • Is there a problem with some boards that are overly selective? • There are some board that simply won’t accept parole violators. • What about data regarding acceptance/rejection rates by boards? Boards are reluctant to accept an offender when it’s a ‘Condition of parole’ offender because they’re failing and regressing. <p>Paul directs the group to the second handout in their packet which outlines the distribution of community corrections beds and the flow and process of how those beds are eventually filled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This documents shows how Comm. Corr. is more and more complex now than it ever was in the past
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>First meeting summary</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, it's best to get clear about where the system is NOW before trying to discern gaps and a direction to go in the future. • How do we answer the question of 'IF' this person is appropriate, then 'WHEN' should they be accepted, and 'WHERE' do they go. • How are decision makers looking at an individual and answering if, when, where, how – and what about HOW LONG? • Part of what we're doing in these early meetings is mapping where we are now before deciding where we want to go. • A 'Condition of Parole' offender – means someone who spends time in a halfway house before being put on regular parole (?). • A 'Parole' offender – is already on parole and being placed in Community Corrections for violations (?). • Another major systemic need is education of stakeholders as the gatekeepers vary jurisdiction to jurisdiction. • Gatekeepers often don't agree on typologies and efficacies of treatment programs, etc. • We need to have a concerted effort to educate stakeholders. • Also, we might need some changes in the parole board system. Sometimes the DOC offender gets to the program but still hasn't had their official parole hearing date to find out when exactly they will be put on parole. • Let's return to examining what the issues are now, and not working on solving issues. • How do state parole, DOC and local guidelines/interests intersect? • Another issue that is more in the weeds is the confidentiality about information NOT provided to the boards. • There are three systems at play - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Comm. Corr. system itself -Local boards -Local programs <p>All three systems have to fit within the state criminal justice system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOC and its needs have to fit within the local community system as well. This may need to be mapped to help understand overlap and competing elements. • Mapping this would help get a better feel about system needs. • From a broader perspective, do we need a research driven approach to community corrections? • There is a lot of Comm. Corr. data, but not necessarily about board decision making processes. • If we believe every high risk DOC inmate should transition through Comm. Corr. – we would have a very different need. • Does the system need to look at the eligibility – for instance, transition referrals. Someone could've failed diversion, be heading to DOC, and then are they eligible to be immediately referred back to CC. • What about clarity regarding why we have a system of local boards to begin with. What's that role and how does it fit into the system? Local boards don't seem tied into any sort of systematic structure. Why does Colorado do it that way? Why does the board 'system' exist in this particular component of the criminal justice system, but not in probation and parole? • This is the issue about Decision Makers, and it is unique to Community
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>First meeting summary</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Corrections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where does Colorado rank in terms of how other states manage this? It's hard to compare other states because Colo. Is very unique. • Do other states have both transition/diversion like we do? In some states Diversion cases come under the judicial branch of government. In a lot of states it's the judge and the probation department. In other states, all of it is wrapped up into an executive branch. • Even though we have a lot of data – what does that tell us? • We should also, add the question of 'WHY' to the decision making process. Some people want CC for a roof over their head (homeless parolee), some people want it for increased supervision, some want it for treatment, some want it for stability (for example to stabilize an offender who is spiraling downward).
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Report Backs</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Eric Philp from the Judicial Department distributes three handouts and reports back to the group about offender Typologies.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's a long tradition of offender typology research. • In the past, Colo. used the CMC (Client Management Classification) system to determine offender typology. • Currently, the state focusses on responsivity. • Responsivity means matching the offender to the appropriate needs and services. • Responsivity should be a cognitive, behavioral based system with the inclusion of case management. • The Judicial Department worked with JSAT (Justice Systems Assessment and Training) to perform an analysis of LSI and ASUS data with the goal of researching effectiveness of the LSI. • The first step was to look at the effectiveness of ISP programs, which were designed for career criminals. • There are 7 clusters of offender profile types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Limit Setters (high needs/risk, difficult folks to deal with, this is probation's greatest weakness). -Case Work Control (offenders high in criminogenic needs) -Selective Intervention Treatment_AOD (these offenders have a singular need involving alcohol or other drugs) -Selective intervention Treatment_MH (they have a singular treatment need involving mental health) -Selective Intervention Situational (low risk offenders, low in criminogenic needs) -Case Management Younger (several years younger than the average adult probationer) -Case Management Older (on average five years older than the average adult probationer)
---	--

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>Report Backs</p> <p>Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased percentage of the probation caseload that used to 'age out' is now actually growing. • There is a diagram (page 6 of the LS Supervision handout) that shows a series of circles that rank these 7 groups on a risk level continuum. • Probation in the process of creating one-pager 'cheat sheets' for all the typologies that will be a quick go-to guide for PO's. • 'Limit Setters' and Casework Control' are the two populations at highest risk with the greatest needs (ISP offenders). • To what extent are these typologies similar to parole? They are probably constant across all populations. The only thing that separates them is age. • However, distribution is different for parole than Community Corrections. • For example, with Limit Setters a PO basically lives in the offender's back pocket, which then involves more resources. • Can we look at this on the PSI end as well? Yes, this will ideally be part of the battery of assessments. • PSI's are currently done on only 20% of misdemeanor cases and 50% of felonies. <p>Greg Mauro, from the Denver Community Corrections board presents a PowerPoint about Denver's development of a guideline tool for board acceptance.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg emphasizes that this project is still 'in process' and nothing is official yet. • This got project got underway after board members indicated that they thought a guideline would be helpful in terms of achieving more consistency in decision outcomes. • Board members also wanted to more effectively organize and use existing information to aid in decision-making. • They also wanted to promote the use of 'best practices' and have the ability to provide an objective basis for explaining decisions. • The guideline tool organizes information that's important in making an acceptance/rejection decision. • The tool uses an objective scoring system to reflect a person's performance or situation regarding areas that are significant. • The outcome of the tool is not 'the answer', but it can provide a common starting point regarding issues that are relevant and can aid in decision making. • What about staff intensity and resources to use this tool on every referral? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Denver has the staff resources to do this, through board administration funds -For consistency and fidelity, one person will do this • How do you define violence? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Statutory definition • The Denver board is highly engaged in this process, the Board in the 14th JD is starting to consider going this route as well. • Next steps for Denver are to test 'live cases' in Summer 2013 and hopefully implement the tool in fall 2013.
---	--

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p data-bbox="123 243 508 275">Identify and Prioritize Key Issues</p> <p data-bbox="272 317 358 348">Action</p>	<p data-bbox="561 243 1528 306">Paul Herman leads the group in a discussion about identifying and prioritizing key issues.</p> <p data-bbox="561 348 708 380"><u>DISCUSSION</u></p> <ul data-bbox="581 390 1528 1850" style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the general consensus as to where we are right now, how does Comm. Corr. fit into the other systems? • What are some other ideas about prioritization right now? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Expectations of CC, what are we trying to accomplish? -Are people who go through CC after prison more likely to be successful? -Does CC make a difference for folks coming out of DOC (better public safety and long-term reentry success)? -What does the data tell us about this? Any correlation between the period of time somebody spends in transition and their success? -We should collect and look at practices and criteria used by local boards throughout the state. What kind of standards are in place, do they have standards? Can we get that from various boards? -What is the info that DOC routinely has and collects? How much of that is given to local boards and does it vary from board to board? -One of the LEAN projects identified gaps and problems, maybe this group could have a presentation on the LEAN project outcomes? -As far as offenders sentenced to DOC, less than 1% do not have PSI's in their file. -Should we have a recommendation that PSIR's need to be in the CDOC Case management file? Currently, probation is responsible for transmitting this (rather than courts) to DOC electronically. Still need to do some work on the part of DOC and boards. -What about the 252 Boards? And what about the 1360 beds – are these effective? Is there any analysis on this? Any analysis on CRTC (Community Return to Custody) beds. Any outcomes on this? -Any data from other states, Kim? -Is there any research that addresses CC revocation data and CRTC beds? -Let's look at what the Denver County Jail is doing regarding new AR's that state nobody goes back to DOC on a TV from a CC (per Tim). They'll go to Mountain Parks or some other weigh station instead. -We have a profile of who succeeds. As far as TV's - 1/3rd of these are due to drug issues. -What about presumptive parole collaboration with the parole board. How are we going to manage this? -We also need a compilation of what services are available for sex offenders in Community Corrections.

<p>Issue/Topic: (continued)</p> <p>Identify and Prioritize Key Issues</p>	<p>-Do we want to take a look at MH populations and how many of those are being referred to CC? Does CC have the capability to treat?</p> <p>-The CARAS is in its fifth revision, it is used by the parole board now and is an excellent tool. Should local CC boards be educated on this?</p> <p>-Could CARAS be used as a tool by the local boards as well?</p>
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Adjourn and Next Steps</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCJJ Staff to answer questions that arose during the meeting • Possible future areas of work <p>-System mapping (if, when, where, how, how long) / process: what's similar, what's different, who are the gatekeepers at which points</p> <p>**What do we want to know? What's going on? Create template for mapping. Develop template in next meeting.</p> <p>-What else do we need to know about the current system to move forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap up discussion on current system.
---	--

Meeting Schedule 2013

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

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.