

Community Corrections Task Force Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Minutes

November 7, 2013, 1:00PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Peter Weir, 1st Judicial District
Theresa Cisneros, 4th Judicial District, District Court Judge

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Alaurice Tafoya-Modi, Private Defense Attorney
Anthony Young, Parole Board
Glenn Tapia, Division of Criminal Justice
Gregg Kildow, Intervention Community Corrections Services
Shannon Carst, Colorado Community Corrections Coalition
Harriet Hall, Jefferson Center for Mental Health (phone)
Jacqueline McCall, Department of Corrections
Joe Cannata, Voices of Victims
Kathryn Otten, Jefferson County Justice Services

ABSENT

Bill Gurule, 12th Judicial District, Probation
Brandon Shaffer, Parole Board
Christie Donner, Criminal Justice Reform Coalition
David Lipka, Public Defender
Dennis Berry, Mesa County Criminal Justice System
Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service
Greg Mauro, City and County of Denver
Steve Reynolds, 9th Judicial District
Stan Hilkey, Sheriff, Mesa County
Steve Hager/DOC Division of Adult Parole and Community Corrections
Steve King, State Senator

STAFF

Paul Herman, CCJJ consultant
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice
Christine Adams, Division of Criminal Justice

Guest Speakers

Kally Enright, Arapahoe County Criminal Justice Planner
Alison Birchard, Boulder County Criminal Justice Planner
Jack Reed, Arapahoe County Criminal Justice Planner

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

<p>Issue/Topic: Board Decision Making Presentation</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: Kally Enright and Jack Reed from Arapahoe County and Alison Birchard from Boulder County presented the results of their study that looked at the factors considered by Community Corrections boards in their decision making and how these factors compare to the statistical predictors of recidivism (as found by the Division of Criminal Justice).</p> <p>The slides for this study are available and will be emailed to the Task Force with the minutes.</p>
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic: Purpose Statement Discussion And Who is the appropriate population?</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion: The purpose statement for this task force has been discussed multiple times over the last few months but we always end up discussing HOW things should be done rather than WHAT should be done. We need to come up with a purpose statement today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is it that Community Corrections is trying to achieve and in what manner. • What’s unique about its purpose? <p>The following example was drafted based on things that have come up multiple times in this group’s conversations. This was created as a starting point and can be modified or completely ignored.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The purpose of Community Corrections is to enhance public safety and reduce recidivism by collaborating with stake holders to apply evidence-based decision making and to provide safe and secure housing as well as evidence based assessments and service delivery methods for medium/high risk, medium/high need individuals and special need populations.</i></p> <p>What’s missing from this statement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition, reintegration • Self-Sufficiency • Reduce risk • Change behavior
---	---

Should we start with the Community Corrections Council's vision statement?

- No, this task force is supposed to take a look at Community Corrections as a whole, based on system needs whereas the council is more about "doing" the work of community corrections.

From a purpose perspective is there a difference in public safety and reducing recidivism?

- Yes. One works toward accomplishing the other. You reduce recidivism by doing these things.

Yes we want to enhance public safety and reduce recidivism, and yes we can do this with the things listed above. But what is unique about Community Corrections?

- You could say that the purpose of Community Corrections is to provide a safer community. The local part of this is a very important piece here because you have a structure that is very focused on local safety and local control
- Each board and center is meant to give local ownership and control over who is placed there and how they're handled.

The difference is that the offenders are under a tighter control in Community Corrections than with probation. We're providing services in a more controlled environment.

- Regarding the purpose statement it was stated that "controlled environment" or "structured environment" may be better than "safe and secure."

This is a slice on the criminal justice continuum rather than part of the continuum.

- What are the reasons for sentencing in CO? CC should be an adjunct of that purpose.

We engage the community which is also unique.

- What are you engaging the community to do? To support offender rehabilitation. Philosophically it started with the idea that communities have the right and responsibility to control crime.

But who should be admitted and how the system should be operated is different than what the system should look like. There may be some value in thinking about the future of Community Corrections in terms of the purpose statement. Our population is becoming higher risk and higher need.

- We don't want to deviate from the sentencing scheme in CO.

Paul discussed the Commissions overall guiding principles.

- These should be thought of when making recommendations and when thinking about the purpose statement for this task force.

Paul then had the group break into three smaller groups to discuss and draft portions of the purpose statement and then the whole group reconvened to

discuss it further.

- There are three parts to this – in terms of purpose we are placing Community Corrections in the context of what the state sentencing goals are. The second piece talks about utilizing the local community. And the third part discusses how Community Corrections enhances public safety by matching appropriate evidence-based data.
- Went through the purposes of sentencing (C.R.S. 18-1-102.5). Community Corrections is meant to further these goals.
- When we look down the road how will we serve the people we treat?
- Will Community Corrections be used for someone that hasn't been adjudicated? Can we anticipate furthering the goals of sentencing without it being an actual sentence? Is there anything missing here?
- Treatment is going to be individualized and match the needs within locally monitored services.
- Community Corrections may or may not be residential but regardless individuals will be part of a community.
- The words, recidivism reduction, need to appear. Reducing recidivism may be one goal of Community Corrections, but it's not the only goal.
- Other goals include reducing dependence on the system, building skills, public safety....
- This language is a little too esoteric. We may want to use more lay person language. Imagine standing in front of city council to explain what Community Corrections is.
- Community Corrections provides individualized kinds of services while protecting the community.
- Services would be for individuals who have been assessed for multiple needs.
- Will they even know what evidence based is? Should use the term "needs" instead of "risk."
- This is not just for public education but we also want to provide guidance to the boards, providers, judges, prosecutors.
- The term "science based" may be clearer than "evidence based."
- This is a training opportunity for the public though so we shouldn't always "dumb down" what we say.

- Integrate science with supervision to protect members of the community while also providing services to the offenders.
- It should be made clear that these people have been identified as appropriate for Community Corrections based services. In theory Community Corrections boards are saying that this person matches this program.
- What response would you get from colleagues if they read this purpose statement? What would they read into this?
 - o This captures most of what Community Corrections is but it's awkward.
 - o Most of the offenders (half) are already in the community.
 - o Seems like we're missing the reentry piece. Not just transition – Everyone, including Diversion clients, has to make their way back into community and with their families.
 - There are problems with the term reentry also. Maybe it's returning?
 - Transition is a difficult word also – everyone is transitioning but you're not always reentering.
 - DOC would want to see Community Corrections provide a step down service. Continuity of care.
- Community Corrections utilizes the community to do all of these things.
- Public safety needs to be at the top of the statement, not the bottom. And everything else is how we will provide this.
- "Ensure public safety" is a stronger statement than "enhance public safety."
- Yes this is to educate the public and city council but we can't forget that this statement is also meant to provide guidance for those in the system.
- Some people think of the term "transition" as those coming from DOC while others see it as a step back into the community which could be either Diversion or those traditionally referred to as transition clients.
- Would it be better to say that we want to reduce reoffending rather than recidivism?

We want to give ownership to the local community. But if I'm a city council person I might ask why you're shifting responsibility to me.

Using the term "local community" is better than only referring to Community

	<p>Corrections boards because it's all encompassing.</p> <p>Paul closed this conversation for now. The staff will work on this and at the next the task force meeting we will discuss how this appears to those that each of you represent.</p> <p>Who is our target population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High needs, multiple needs individuals. - Who else in our communities could be serviced through Community Corrections? Those with multiple needs? Based on previous conversations the definition of multiple needs could substantially change the target population. There are many people in our communities that have high needs but are not under the criminal justice umbrella (e.g., behavioral health, homeless). It may be hard for our staff to understand how to handle these people but it could help public safety to serve non-offenders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Why couldn't they be served by other facilities? They could maybe. Hospitals or detox. o This is a completely idealistic idea though. There's really no place for these people to go anymore before entering the correctional system. - Behavioral health needs (substance abuse, mental health, criminal conduct) should be included in the statement.
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Staff will work on the purpose statement and send it to you. Below are the components developed today:</p> <p><i>The purpose of community corrections is to ensure public safety and further the sentencing goals of the State of Colorado by utilizing the local community to identify appropriate individuals to be placed in the community; to reduce risk of reoffending by integrating research-based supervision and individualized services; and to assist individuals with multiple needs so that they may successfully function in the community.</i></p> <p><i>Community corrections provides science-based assessments and individualized services within a locally monitored community.</i></p> <p><i>....For individuals who have been assessed with multiple needs.</i></p> <p>From this statement there is work to do.</p> <p>There are a number of challenges that we will face but we won't accomplish</p>
---	--

	<p>them today.</p> <p>How are we going to get into the subject matter of the working groups? Paul's thought at the moment is that there are still some key pieces of work to do such as identifying the key populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some basic things need to be defined within this purpose statement.• This purpose statement adds a challenge to the concept of structured decision making.
--	--

Meeting was adjourned at 4:17

Meeting Schedule 2013

Thursday, December 12th

12:30pm – 4:30pm

710 Kipling St., 3rd Floor Conference room