

**Community Corrections Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice**

Minutes

December 10, 2015, 1:00PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Paul Herman for Pete Weir, 1st Judicial District

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Alexandra Walker, Parole Board

Dennis Berry, Mesa County Criminal Justice System

Glenn Tapia, Division of Criminal Justice

Greg Mauro, City and County of Denver, Community Corrections Boards

Gregg Kildow, Intervention Community Corrections Services

Kevin Strobel, Public Defender

Melissa Roberts, Department of Corrections/Adult Parole (Phone)

Paul Hollenbeck, Department of Corrections /Offender Services

Rose Rodriguez, Independence House

Shannon Carst, Colorado Community Corrections Coalition

ABSENT

Christie Donner, Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Dana Wilkes, Division of Probation Service

Dave Weaver, Douglas County Commissioner

Harriet Hall, Jefferson Center for Mental Health

Joe Cannata, Voices of Victims

John Cooke, Senate District 13

Kathryn Otten, Jefferson County Justice Services

Michael Vallejos, 2nd Judicial District

Mike McIntosh, Adams County Sheriff

GUEST

Michael Dougherty, 1st Judicial District

STAFF

Paul Herman, CCJJ consultant

Christine Adams, Division of Criminal Justice

Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Welcome</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Dougherty is from the 1st Judicial District and is a DA representative on the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee.</p> <p>Mr. Herman noted that he and Dr. Adams met with Mr. Weir earlier this week to discuss future plans for this group which we will discuss in more detail later.</p> <p>The group has two new members: Paul Hollenbeck (DOC/Prison Operations, Office of Offender Services) is replacing Angel Medina and Alexandra Walker is the new Parole Board representative.</p>
---	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Mandatory Parole Subcommittee Update</p> <p>Action</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Dougherty and Ms. Roberts stated that as of Monday, at the most recent Subcommittee meeting, they didn't have an update on the cost savings from Steve Allen JBC work. While it is unclear, this may impact the final decision to take on this recommendation on Friday by the Commission.</p> <p>Overall, it was a spirited discussion on how to present the final recommendation to the Commission. It was decided that the content of the recommendation would not change but that it would be presented into separate parts (to be voted on independently):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 50%/75% of sentence for COV vs. non-COV, and - Time on parole to be decided by risk, regardless of COV/non-COV status. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Community corrections will not change, sentences remain status quo - Victim impact will be addressed in both of the above recommendations. <p>Mr. Herman stated that COV has always been defined as it is in statute (title 18). A significant concern was that this does not include all crimes against persons (e.g., the VRA offense list is longer).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kate Horn-Murphy, who is a member of the Subcommittee and the Commission, spoke for victim groups and stated that crimes commonly thought of as crimes of violence wouldn't actually be included. - There was discussion but there were no substantive changes except to split it into two. - Ms. Walker asked if the definition of parole was left in this recommendation. It was explained that that was already voted on
---	---

	by the Commission at the last meeting as an independent recommendation.
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Follow-Up with Board and Inmate Feedback and Earned Time Scenarios</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Tapia met with representatives from almost every board across the state on Monday (December 7) during two meetings. Overall, there were four themes in their feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More time would be useful but the amended proposal could be lived with by the board representatives. - But if it were changes back to its original format they would oppose the recommendation. - It would be helpful for this Community Corrections Task Force to look at the impacts of the recommendation if it passes the Commission. - There are still some earned time scenario questions. For example, to get to 50% earned time in prison don't you have to get 1:1 days? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How this would be applied to community corrections is concerning because the 12 months allowed really turns into 6 months. <p>Mr. Hollenbeck stated that he is not clear on how the 12 months plays in because of the way the statute currently reads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are concerns about how earned time would be impacted with these recommendations. <p>Ms. Carst stated that she's heard concerns about when the referrals would actually happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Roberts stated that this process would be reflected internally at DOC, not in the statute. But we're clear that placement at community corrections at 12 months would occur. <p>Ms. Roberts stated that in follow-up to a request made at the November Task Force meeting - Meetings were not held with the inmates.</p>
---	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Follow-Up/Update on FY15-CC#16: IRT Referral Process</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Ms. Carst stated that in November, 2014 there was a recommendation to have RDDT/IRT referrals focus on where the person will eventually end up (see FY15-CC#16). There is a request to discuss where this currently stands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Tapia stated that there was a commitment to achieve this within a year of the recommendation and we're at the one year point but
--	---

<p>Next Step:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Roberts will get an update on the timeline for achieving this goal. 2. Mr. Hollenbeck, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Tapia and someone else from DCJ to meet and go over last year's recommendations for status updates. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dr. Adams will send out a packet of last year's recommendations with a link to the CCJJ status page (will be sent with minutes). 3. Mr. Hollenbeck will see if DOC (C-WISE) has the capability to make dual diagnosis referrals/flags. 4. Ms. Roberts stated that she will check back to see who is taking the lead on the referral process and to see if they can bring information to the task force. 	<p>that nothing has happened.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Roberts stated that the fix within DOC is to make a change within their OIT system, that this request was made in July and that it is currently in the hopper but that it hasn't been completed yet. - Mr. Kildow asked if this this will require a large change to achieve? Ms. Roberts responded that it's part of two different main components but that it all revolves around the referral process. - Is all of this bigger than just IRT/RDDT? Yes, if we're going to change part of the referral process we want to address everything. - What is the time line for all of this? We don't have a time line. - Mr. Tapia stated that the point is that we are no further ahead than we were a year ago. How do we bring life to that recommendation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sounds like it's stuck with an OIT request. o Ms. Roberts stated that she will be at headquarters on Monday, December 14, and will get an update on the timeline then. - Mr. Herman stated that it might makes sense for Mr. Hollenbeck, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Tapia and someone else from DCJ to meet and go over last year's recommendations for status updates. Dr. Adams will send out a packet of last year's recommendations with a link to the CCJJ status page. - It was stated that the issue is that there's not a way to flag dually diagnosed offenders so that we know where they're going. However, this was countered with a statement that we have had a dual diagnosis flag in the computer for about a year. But maybe this isn't reflected in C-WISE. We may need to redefine the process followed to flag these individuals to tie them to the correct programs and services in their release information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mr. Hollenbeck will see if DOC has the capability to make these kinds of referrals/flags. o Mr. Mauro asked if it would it be useful for the task force to see a demonstration of the electronic referral process. Ms. Roberts stated that she will check back to see who is taking the lead on this to and to see if they can bring information. o Community referrals from DOC are now lead by a parole manager. o Mr. Herman reminded the group that it was recommended that people only be referred to one or two programs instead of more. o Currently there's a flag for IRT, but we need a flag for RDDT as well, to get individuals to the correct locations.
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Herman went over the final language of the Judicial Education</p>
----------------------------	--

<p>Final Approval of Judicial Education Recommendation</p> <p>Next Step:</p>	<p>recommendation that will be presented to the Commission tomorrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Walker asked why the recommendation doesn't mention the level system/progression matrix specifically (the progression matrix)? This will be added to the bullet list. - The final wording is included at the end of the minutes.
---	--

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Memo</p> <p>Next Step:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Herman told the group that included in their packets was a memo written by Dr. Adams, to Ms. English, to address the question of comparing transition client outcomes to those that went straight to parole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is very important to note that these populations are not comparable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Recidivism definitions differ. o Overlap in populations. - This memo will be sent to the group separately with the minutes.
---	--

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next Year/Future Plans and Goals for this Task Force</p> <p>Next Step:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion:</p> <p>Mr. Herman stated that there has been significant conversation about the high risk/high need population including what it SHOULD look like. But now we need to discuss what you want to accomplish next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diversion is still sitting there as something that you were interested in. But what else would you like to accomplish? - Mr. Tapia stated that focus on substantive, bigger changes rather than smaller tweaks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Would like to resurrect the tabled recommendation about the DOC referral process. o CRCF – Community Return to custody Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How can we better improve the process? ▪ Statutory infrastructure ▪ Acceptance policy o Specialized programs - Mr. Kildow stated that if the mandatory parole recommendation is split and passes we should identify and focus on the impacts. - Ms. Rodrigues asked that the group look into expanding treatment beds and work on the continuum of care from DOC to community corrections. She stated that more treatment beds are needed (e.g., drug or mental health, and co-occurring). She noted that we don't want to send people back to DOC but the IRT beds are always full. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specialized programs – implementation and acceptance o Continuum of care vs. starting over at each step. o Need a clearer understanding of what DOC is doing in their programs and what is being completed.
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Role of various players ▪ Avoid duplication ▪ Need to see progress within and outside of institutions and have that worked into community corrections and parole. ▪ Will help to make sure that people are placed in the correct programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Roberts suggested we explore the presumptive parole track and possibly making it more mandatory and examine how that would look. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mandatory = candidates who are eligible for presumptive parole would always be paroled by the parole board. o This would require a statutory change. - Mr. Herman stated that his conversation Mr. Weir was about program outcomes and determining if we took the information provided by Mr. Tapia regarding extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and if there are things in programs that are helping them move to success and if not, how do you get programs to increase these successful outcomes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Look at which EBPs are working. o Which practices are in place and are they working. o Mr. Mauro noted that this sounds like a program evaluation, which we've suggested before. - Ms. Walker suggested the group examine the relationship between the parole board and local community corrections boards and programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How could these relationships be improved to make sure they are referred to the best place rather than denied until they just go to parole. - Need to work to align community parole officers and community corrections. Need to align with DOC regarding drug tests and sanctions in order to be on the same page. - Also interested in ISP Inmate Status <p>After a 10 minute break we will summarize these suggestions and assign people to smaller work groups to address these issues before the next task force meeting.</p>
--	--

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next Year, Continued/Summarized</p> <p>Next Step:</p> <p>*See Group assignments to the right.</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The areas of interest discussed before the break are summarized in the following list:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Referral Process 2. CRCF 3. Specialized programs 4. Mandatory parole impacts 5. Expanding treatment beds
--	---

<p>Mr. Herman and Dr. Adams will meet with Mr. Weir about membership (possible new members and those that don't attend).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Continuum of care 7. Presumptive parole track 8. Program outcomes 9. Parole board and Community Corrections relationship 10. Align CPOs and Community Corrections 11. ISP-Inmate Status <p>Between now and the next task force meeting (January 7), can three people get together and answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the issue? 2. Who is impacted by this issue with the thought that if we work on this issue who will need to be at the table? 3. What do we need to get started? <p>Items will be grouped as follows with the people listed underneath each group</p> <p>3+6 +5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specialized programs - Expanding treatment beds - Continuum of care - Rose, Shannon, Glenn (or rep), DOC BH specialist/ Carmen <p>7+9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presumptive parole track - Parole board and Community Corrections relationship - Melissa, Alex, Gregg K. <p>8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program outcome - Greg M., Dennis, Kevin <p>10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Align CPOs and Community Corrections - Glenn (rep), Melissa (rep), Shannon (staff rep – Dawn McCarter) <p>2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CRCF - Gregg (rep), Alex, Paul Hollenbeck, Linda Angell <p>11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISP-Inmate Status - Gregg, Dennis, Melissa <p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referral Process → goes along with getting last year's recs out and following up with where they stand. Also, a follow-up to #4.
--	--

	<p>4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mandatory parole impacts → wait and see what happens with the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee recommendation <p>Other issues brought up:</p> <p>Mr. Tapia stated that because it looks like we're moving toward some substantive issues, which is good, he'd like to recommend some new members join the task force, including John Draxler and Michelle Monzingo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This will need to be discussed with the chair of the task force, Pete Weir, and the chair of the Commission, Stan Hilkey. - What we decide to focus on may affect our membership but we also need to discuss those that don't attend. - Ms. Rodriguez noted that she would like to see more providers. <p>January 7 will be Mr. Tapia's last meeting before his surgery. Valarie Schamper will be his temporary replacement.</p>
--	--

Adjourned at 4:30 pm

Meeting Schedule and Location for Remainder of 2015 and All of 2016

Thursday, Jan. 7 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	700 Kipling St., 4th floor training room (Note: This is NOT the 2 nd Thursday)
Thursday, Feb. 11 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, Mar. 10 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, April 7 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	700 Kipling St., 4th floor training room (Note: This is NOT the 2 nd Thursday)
Thursday, May 12 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, June 9 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, July 7 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	700 Kipling St., 4th floor training room (Note: This is NOT the 2 nd Thursday)
Thursday, Aug. 11 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, Sept. 8 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, Oct. 13 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	700 Kipling St., 4th floor training room
Thursday, Nov. 10 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room
Thursday, Dec. 8 th	1:00pm -4:30pm	710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS TASK FORCE
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION PRESENTED TO THE
COLORADO COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE
December 11, 2015

FY16-CC #01 Judicial Education

Recommendation FY16-CC #01

The Division of Criminal Justice shall work with local community corrections boards to develop judicial education curricula for judges, probation staff, and other interested parties on the topic of local community corrections programs. Community corrections boards shall work with stakeholders including probation staff and judges to develop local curricula and determine the frequency of training. Each training program should include tours of local programs and should be tailored to local needs. The curricula should include at a minimum the following content:

- The purpose of community corrections
 - Kinds of programs available and the target populations of each
 - Role of probation and community corrections as a condition of probation.
- Board criteria for accepting/rejecting applications; clarify eligibility criteria.
- Profile of clients in community corrections
- Use of assessments in local programs and case management
- Description of Progression Matrix
- Length of placement/earned time
- Use of non-residential placements
- Sanctions and incentives used by programs
- Revocation process
- Management of special populations (behavioral health, individuals with disabilities)
- Monitoring practices

Discussion

It is important for judges and other judicial entities to be aware of community corrections programs and practices in local jurisdictions. To ensure consistency and support, this education should occur in collaboration between local stakeholders and the Division of Criminal Justice's Office of Community Corrections.