

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

**Minutes**

January 7, 2016 1:00PM-4:30PM  
710 Kipling, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor conference room

**ATTENDEES:**

**CHAIR**

Pete Weir, 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District (Absent)

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Alexandra Walker, Parole Board

Dave Weaver, Douglas County Commissioner

Dennis Berry, Mesa County Criminal Justice System

Tom Harbaugh for Dana Wilkes, Division of Probation Service

Glenn Tapia, Division of Criminal Justice

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

Gregg Kildow, Intervention Community Corrections Services

Joe Cannata, Voices of Victims

Kevin Strobel, Public Defender

Michael Vallejos, 2nd Judicial District

Paul Hollenbeck, Department of Corrections /Offender Services

Rose Rodriguez, Independence House

**ABSENT**

Christie Donner, Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Harriet Hall, Jefferson Center for Mental Health

John Cooke, Senate District 13

Kathryn Otten, Jefferson County Justice Services

Melissa Roberts, Department of Corrections/Adult Parole

Mike McIntosh, Adams County Sheriff

Shannon Carst, Colorado Community Corrections Coalition

**STAFF**

Paul Herman, CCJJ consultant

Christine Adams, Division of Criminal Justice

<b>Issue/Topic:</b>	<b>Discussion:</b>
<p>Welcome</p>	<p>Mr. Herman started the meeting at 1:05pm. He stated that most of today will follow the December meeting about areas of interest for 2016. Specifically, the topics of interest that small groups were assigned to meet about and report back on.</p> <p>One additional item is in regard to the Judicial Education recommendation presented to the Commission last month. During the meeting Kate Horn-Murphy asked if local control, as it pertains to victims, was addressed. Mr. Weir stated that this issue would be added to the bullet list in the recommendation (see red handout/appendix). Is there any discussion on this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This addition is okay but should we include (e.g., victim issues)? Since that was specified in Mr. Horn-Murphy’s question? Yes. This was the intent of Mr. Weir’s statement.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Herman also noted that one lesson learned with this recommendation was in regard to the title. We’re not talking about judicial education in the traditional sense so it would have been good to reword the title before sending the final version to the Commission so that we didn’t have to explain what we really meant.</p>

<b>Issue/Topic:</b>	<b>Discussion:</b>
<p>Follow-Up to December Meeting</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Final Groups/Leadership</p> <p>A. Maximizing Utilizing Specialized Beds/After Care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rose Rodriguez and Courtney Kramer (DCJ/OCC) and Amie Walton (DCJ/OCC)</li> </ul> <p>B. Relationship between Parole Board and Community Corrections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alex Walker will take this information to the</li> </ul>	<p>Mr. Herman stated that in February the Commission will be having its annual retreat and will look at what has been done over the last year in the various groups as well as what else needs to be addressed and what needs to be taken off the table entirely. Currently, CCJJ is set to sunset in two years. So what do you want to accomplish in the next two years? Assuming the Commission doesn’t continue past these two years they will need to decide what else needs to be accomplished to advance the system.</p> <p>This group was asked to meet in small groups between our December and January meetings to look at specific topics and to answer three questions (see handout at end of minutes). Note that people other than those assigned may have actually been part of the group that met, not all participant names are listed here.</p> <p>A. Maximizing Utilizing Specialized Beds/After Care (3+5+6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ms. Rodriguez stated that specialized program beds are under-</li> </ul>

<p>rest of the board for their input.</p> <p>C. Outcomes</p> <p>D. Presumptive Parole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg M. will lead along with Gregg K. and Alex.</li> <li>• Need Melissa at the table.</li> </ul> <p>E. CRCF</p>	<p>utilized by about 20 beds per year (ranges). She noted that the group thought about how they could help DOC while they're waiting for their OIT designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ultimately we need to fill the beds but it's not just about waiting for DOC referrals. When CTAP started we were hopeful that this would help but this will take time. There are other issues around program to program referrals as well.</li> <li>- We need to align the referral process with offender placement.</li> <li>- If there's a need but still unused beds it's probably the process.</li> <li>- Really, there's a treatment matching issue- the need/capacity exists. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Supply is there, demand is there but they aren't coming together. There are plenty of offenders not receiving the correct treatment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Judge Vallejos is surprised that this problem exists. He asked if Denver fills their beds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o For some it may be a geographical access issue but it may also be that the wrong people are in those beds. So the beds may be filled but not necessarily with the correct people.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Is there a board acceptance issue? Possibly some but probably more so with the sex offender population. This is not as much of an issue with the behavioral health population. Part of the problem is that people are often not sent to community corrections until they fail probation.</li> <li>- While we're waiting for other things to happen we need to start working on communicating with DOC. Getting to the right people is difficult. There are many facilities so you're still reaching a finite number of people.</li> <li>- Case managers may not be reaching out to specific programs though. They are likely just telling you what KIND of program the individual needs.</li> <li>- To summarize, the issue is: Not maximizing the utilization of specialized beds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Underutilization → partly because of process, and partly because of matching.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- What do you need to start working on this issue? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Want to talk to some DOC case managers, but not inundate them with questions.</li> <li>o Sort through what's already been done.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Who should be at the table? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DOC – referral unit, clinical services, reentry, case management</li> <li>o Judicial – chief probation officers, problem solving court representatives, judge, probation services, parole board, public defender's office</li> <li>o Community Corrections – specialized program providers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

(Ms. Rodriguez will represent this group)

- For now excluded the sex offender population because that will take us down a different, very complex, path.
- What are the first three steps to be taken:
  - Call meeting
  - Prioritize needs
  - Identify existing gaps
- Who should lead this charge: Rose Rodriguez and Courtney Kramer (DCJ/OCC) and Amie Walton (DCJ/OCC)

\*\*\*Remember, we're not trying to solve these problems, what do you need to start?

Judge Vallejos asked what a community corrections facility receives when a arrives? They should get a working file within a few days that includes summary information. But it's very little that can be used to make a decision.

- Need continuity of information. But this is something we have discussed and made recommendations about before

#### After care/continuum of care

- Issue: People tend to not receive after care.
  - There is a philosophical difference about whether it's even needed (purpose/efficacy). The effects expectations and decisions about how people flow through the process. There is information and training available but people may not understand it enough to seek out the information.
  - The purpose of continuum of care is not clear. Not only do we not all agree that it is needed but there is disagreement about what is could and should look like.
  - Has there been recent work on aftercare (want to make sure we wouldn't be duplicating anything)? No. Nothing significant.
  - Who should be at this table?
    - Case manager, TASC, CPO, Community corrections representative, mental health representative (line level treatment provider)
  - Is this a policy level or operational level? Probably operational until they identify policy issues that stop them from doing the right thing.
  - What are the first steps to be taken?
    - Create a document package about what aftercare can look like.
    - Align philosophies
- This will remain attached to the special beds item, above.

#### B. Parole Board and CC stake holder relationship

- Issues: When community corrections is most appropriate, understanding condition of parole (COP) beds, and what is

available and for whom.

- Some of this might look like the judicial education recommendation. Maybe another LEAN initiative would be appropriate and/or another regular meeting with stakeholders to work together to make sure a person doesn't ultimately parole homeless.
- How do we get engagement from the board? Part of the problem is that there has been engagement but it skips around.
  - o Ms. Walker hasn't run all of this by the board and doesn't feel that she can commit the board to anything but she will take this to them for their input.

#### C. Program Outcomes

- Gaps exist between outcomes and the 8 guiding principles of evidence based correctional practice (see [https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/docs/reports/2007\\_CCJJ\\_EBP.pdf](https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/docs/reports/2007_CCJJ_EBP.pdf)) which makes it difficult to determine if a program really works.
- The system we currently use is based on how many people are successfully terminated. It is not risk informed but is historically based. We don't know if a 60% success rate is good or not.
  - o We need to define what the baseline should be and how to measure it to make this determination.
- Mr. Tapia stated that he heard from someone who made a point that aside from it being the right thing to do there is no incentive to improve a program's outcomes. As long as beds are full you're paid the same amount. The philosophy of doing the right thing isn't always shared because people are paid by the state for doing the minimum.
  - o This is an expectations issue and a market driven philosophy. But providers often have mixed feelings about this.
  - o There are no ways to measure performance unless you're so bad that it can't be ignored.
- This is a policy level issue.
- Who should be at the table: program representative, DOC, DCJ,
  - o Need legislative representation because they can get help move away from the capacity driven philosophy.
  - o Dennis Berry will lead this group along with Valarie Schamper (for Glenn Tapia). Pete Weir should be included as well as Steve Allen or someone from OSPB and an attorney regarding contract information.
- Steps to get started on this:
  - o Create a package about what else is happening.
  - o A subcommittee from this TF could figure out what a performance based contract should look like. Begins with a good way of measuring programs.
  - o Following the Commission method it may be useful to develop a rec of creating a performance based system.

## D. Presumptive parole track (7+9)

- We have some comments but it is important to note that we never heard back from Melissa Roberts.
- The main issue is the use of presumptive parole - when it is used and who it should be used with.
  - o The idea that it should be used with everyone that goes to community corrections and wrapping it into the use of ISPI was discussed.
  - o A challenge of presumptive parole includes when it's determined that someone needs more time for more treatment. It may become a negative if people see it as time being added for showing a need.
- Impact: supports community corrections matrix and eight guiding principles; supports EBP work and the idea that progression is based only on your own behavior. May also impact board decision making. Parole would be impacted but Melissa needs to comment on this.
- Presumptive parole is date certain parole. If you meet certain criteria you will receive parole. The idea is that you would do your programing in that amount of time.
  - o It was meant to be an incentive.
  - o There have been two versions. First, in 2012, where the community corrections boards made the decision assuming the parole board would release individuals if they met their requirements.
  - o Now the parole board makes the initial decision assuming individuals will be accepted by the community corrections board.
- We need to try to capture as many people as possible. Possibly create a LEAN initiative and an ongoing method to assess the progress and impact
  - o But not only do we need to get people around the table we need the same people around consistently (some organizations change their representation regularly and this causes us to start over repeatedly).
    - A "rapid improvement event" may be useful to get the same people and avoid changes that happen at various agencies.
  - o Who will lead this charge: Greg M. will lead along with Gregg K. and Alex. We need Melissa at the table though.

## E. CRCF (Community Return to Custody Facility)

- Issues: This becomes a warehousing issue and can end up hurting people because of the finite timeframes. In addition, there are space issues and people may be sent to a place that is far from where they will ultimately parole so there is little motivation to get a job, programing issues.
- Is the revocation issue being addressed or are they just being made

	<p>to sit until they're done? Offenders are often not aware of what's going on because the pass off communication between the CPOs is always not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are also possible transportation issues (although this may depend on location). When someone is revoked to CRCF they don't necessarily know where they're going.</li> <li>- The purpose and goals of CRCF is also not a clear or agreed upon strategy.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o There are 13-ish facilities with approximately 300 beds</li> <li>o These individuals are not screened by the program or the board.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- There are not enough beds though and so there is a waiting list.</li> <li>- How does this differ from condition of parole?</li> <li>- There are two types of COPs → progressive vs. regressive.</li> <li>- Lack of understanding about when CRCF is appropriate is problematic.</li> <li>- Any changes would impact CRCF programs, jail programs that house people prior to CRCF and clients.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Legislative changes could make purpose clear.</li> <li>o Potentially, OBH could contribute to this issue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- CRCF was designed with good intentions but it doesn't work. The way it is currently designed is dysfunctional.</li> <li>- If a group is created they will need to start with defining the purpose and legislative intent.</li> <li>- Who will lead this: Melissa Roberts would be a good leader, but is this even an interest of hers? Paul Hollenbeck will work with Ms. Roberts on this since she's been assigned elsewhere and isn't at the meeting today.</li> </ul> <p>F. Align CPOs and Community Corrections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This group was unable to connect with Ms. Roberts so we have nothing to report at this time.</li> </ul> <p>G. ISP – Inmate Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This group also did not yet meet.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Dot Priority Method</p> <p><b>Next Step:</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Mr. Herman lined up the flipchart information discussed above and gave each task force member three sticker dots. Each person was told to put the dot in any way they'd like to indicate the importance of issues according to them. In other words, someone could put one dot on three different topics, two on one topic and one on another topic or all three on one topic. The top three would then be determined by number of dots. Items F and G were excluded today since the small groups were unable to meet and present on these issues. The folks who were supposed to meet about these items were asked to meet before the February meeting at which time further discussion about priority will occur.</p>
--	--

	<p>**A – Maximizing Utilizing Specialized Beds/After Care – 8                  B – Relationship between Parole Board and Community Corrections - 3                  *C – Outcomes - 13                  ***D – Presumptive Parole – 7                  E – CRCF - 4</p> <hr/> <p>F – Align CPO and Community Corrections                  G – ISP Inmate Status</p>
--	---

	<b>Discussion:</b>
<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b>  Announcements</p> <p><b>Next Step:</b></p>	<p>Glenn – out until April or May, but Val will be sitting for him with Courtney in the audience.</p> <p>Membership – haven’t spoken to Pete yet. But there are also a few people who rarely come and should maybe come off our list. May add some other names based on the priorities.                  In February at the CCJJ meeting part of the discussion will be about bylaws, voting and conflicts of interest.</p> <p>We meet before the next CCJJ meeting in February.</p>

Adjourned at 3:30 pm

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

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



**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS TASK FORCE**  
FINAL RECOMMENDATION PRESENTED TO THE  
COLORADO COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE  
**January 8, 2016**

**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
- Address local control issues and different board practices around the state for various topics (e.g., victim issues)

**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.

## CCJJ Community Corrections Task Force: 2016 Areas of Interest

1. Referral Process
2. CRCF
3. Specialized programs
4. Mandatory parole impacts
5. Expanding treatment beds
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

For each topic answer the following questions:

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?

Items will be grouped as follows with the people listed underneath in each small group (other people or replacements may have actually been part of the group):

3+5+6

- Specialized programs
- Expanding treatment beds
- Continuum of care
  - Rose, Shannon, Glenn (or rep), DOC BH specialist/  
Carmen

7+9

- Presumptive parole track
- Parole board and Community Corrections relationship
  - Melissa, Alex, Gregg K.

8

- Program outcome
  - Greg M., Dennis, Kevin

10

- Align CPOs and Community Corrections
  - Glenn (rep), Melissa (rep), Shannon (staff rep – Dawn McCarter)

2

- CRCF
  - Gregg (rep), Alex, Paul Hollenbeck, Linda Angell

11

- ISP-Inmate Status
  - Gregg, Dennis, Melissa



1

- Referral Process → goes along with getting last year's recs out and following up with where they stand. Also, a follow-up to #4.

4

Mandatory parole impacts → wait and see what happens with the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee recommendation