

Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force

Date: July 25, 2008, 2:30 - 3:30PM

Attendees:

David Kaplan, Chair
Christie Donner, Task Force Leader
Germaine Miera, DCJ/Researcher/Facilitator
Brian Connors, Public Defender (sitting in for Doug Wilson)
Kim English, DCJ/Researcher
Tim Hand, Deputy Director of Regional Operations (Parole)
Greg Mauro, Community Corrections
Shelby McKinzey, CU Boulder
Carolyn Turner, CURE
Regi Huerter, Oversight Committee Chair
Lacey Vertumen/Nami?

Absent:

Dianne Tramutola-Lawson, CURE
Pete Hautzinger, District Attorney Mike Biggio, The Free Coalition
Carl Blesch, DCJ/Community Corrections
Paul Herman, Consultant
Doug Wilson, State Public Defender
Jeaneene Miller, Director of Parole

Issue/Topic:

Update (David Kaplan)

Action:

Issue/Topic:

Parole Case Management & EBP
Tim Hand

Action:

Discussion:

Introductions and Recap (David Kaplan)

General comments from David-
Meeting added next week
Final meeting the following week
Lots to get done between now and then

Today we are taking a closer look at Parole Case Management and Parole Structure

Would like the group to put together recommendations next Monday and Tuesday and email them in so we can look at recommendations next Wednesday.

Tim revisits his Power-Point presentation from our last meeting. The group goes over in detail the 8 areas of EBP and

1. Assess offender risk/need levels using actuarial instrument

Tim says offenders are assessed at DRDC but Regi wants to know about follow-up assessments during an inmate's stay. Tim says performance assessment summary is done every 6 months, LSI done every 6 months as well.

Kim reports that Dave Michaud says he only gets the LSI in about one out of every five cases.

Tim says the reason the board doesn't get all the info is more of a technology issue.

Christie says the LSI is only done at entry, not every 6 months.

Many issues with the board, technology, and the limited time the board has to process inmates.

Information sharing is an issue, even within facilities in DOC.

Tim clarifies that the LSI is re-administered every 6 months on parole, not necessarily in prison.

There are many issues around the parole board and release decisions.
REC – Task Force to support recommendation that the board follow DCJ's Parole Board Risk Assessment Instrument.

Tim's possible recommendations on this issue-

Issue/Topic:

Parole Case Management & EBP
Tim Hand (cont.)

Discussion:

Ideally there would be a full-time assessor for people coming before the parole board. Assessors would work regionally, one in each of four regions.

Regi talks about the new plan by DOC to implement re-entry specialists.

Tim says he's talking about a different position, someone who would administer assessments. Regi says maybe we don't need an assessment person exactly.

Kim says we should have assessment addressed in every task force.

Tim – 18 re-entry specialists in the facilities currently.

The Task Force considers a recommendation to assure there are adequate resources to support re-entry into the community.

David – although there may be an assessment conceptually is it done in practice?

The assessment can guide what offenders might need but are the resources available? – Christie

Greg asks if parole officers want to conduct assessments themselves to bond with the client or if they care if it is done at an assessment center, etc.

Tim says they don't necessarily need the officer to do the assessment when the parolee comes out.

Regi- we want to support risk related assessment and life skills assessments. If we said there are 18 re-entry specialists. If they were trained to do assessments is that adequate? If inmate is going to community corrections the assessment is done at that point.

Majority of offenders who are released into the community don't go to community corrections.

Greg – LSI should be administered when they come out.

Tim – The PO should be doing the assessment and conducting the assessment so they know what exactly is going on with the offender.

David, let's wrap this, clearly we want to work on recommendations.

2. Enhance Offender Motivation

We realize this is important and are moving in this direction – Tim says DOC is committed in this direction. We are working on our approved treatment provider network to enhance that as much as possible.

Issue/Topic:

Parole Case Management & EBP
Tim Hand (cont.)

Action:

Discussion:

REC- support implementation of Motivational Interviewing so that all staff are trained in MI by 2010 and all new staff are trained now as they come in. There should be opportunity for annual re-certifications and booster training. Support MI coaching in facilities. Support DOC in their quest to incorporate MI.

We have lack of rewards and incentives for offenders – Tim

We need to focus not just on what's going wrong but what's going right

If offender is placed on ISP, ankle bracelet, we say hey, if you do well we will support

Christie – Would UA's and BA's be paid for by department instead of offender if they come back clean. On ISP 'we' pay for UA's and BA's already.

3. Target Interventions

Recommendation – a psychologist of some sort regionally to support parole officers out there. PO could do a whole lot better of a job following offender from parole to discharge if they had someone helping with offender's psychological issues. Tim thinks he could implement this.

Caroline Turner wants to know if a Parolee can complain about their PO and feel safe about it.

REC – who is taking care of release issues for offenders coming out of private prisons? Is there a re-integration person for those prisons?

The re-integration specialist should be on a ration basis 1 specialist per how many inmates

DOC's new re-entry program is JHET funded

4. Provide skill training for staff and monitor their delivery of services

Broadband system – you have to argue that you have a clear idea of programs before you can get a pay raise.

5. Increase Positive Reinforcement

REC – Have DOC develop and utilize positive incentive based reinforcement system

How about a parole advocate who actually helps with services more than supervision (like the family advocate)? Include restorative practices in this.

Conditions are offender specific.

6. Engage ongoing support in natural communities

Issue/Topic:

Parole Case Management & EBP
Tim Hand (cont.)

Action:

Issue/Topic:

Tim Hand (DOC) discusses his 3 possible ideas for release decision making

Discussion:

7. Measure relevant processes/practices

Have TASK measure performance practices, as is done with the STIRRT program.

8. Provide Measurement Feedback

Kim asks if they (DOC) are incorporating EBP?

Per Tim "We really have no resources"

Tim Hand's 3 release ideas

#1 – There are two issues, offenders are doing well but are not getting paroled for whatever reason. The second one is that what is really disruptive is that parole board is pulling people out of ISP-I early and they're failing.

Kim wants to know if we've got stats that prove this. Kim wants to know what the research shows as far as optimal time. If you get deferred a million times you are MORE likely to escape.

The real incentive is **date certain** and 2 months off the back end is gravy on the top.

Give the offender an absolute Parole date, it can always be taken away but give them something to work toward. As long as you do well you'll have a parole date. This plan is not subjective at all. Based on that, people would say 'I've got to buckle down here'.

Offender comes to halfway house, eligible to be referred at 19 months and placed at 16 months. Take 120 days off 16 months and you're good.

Possible scenario - Offender comes in July 25th 2008, guaranteed out in 12 months. Assume the offender does really well and after four months goes to ISP-I. After moving to ISP-I he keeps doing well and will be off ISP-I in 6 months.

Under this program release would be date certain unless an offender 'screws up'. If they do REALLY well they can be moved to ISP (even better).

Under this plan, an inmate in community corrections would have a 12 month run for sure.. if they do well they can cut that down to 10 months. If they do even better they can move to ISP. ISP-I community program is an incentive based program (this is basically non-res for transition inmates).

Issue/Topic:

Tim Hand (DOC) discusses his 3 possible ideas for release decision making (cont.)

Action:

Issue/Topic:

Christie reports back to group on her research "Envision a perfect parole structure"

Discussion:

Tim Hand's 3 release ideas (cont.)

#2 – If an inmate is doing well give them an early discharge from Parole and cut their parole sentence in half. This would be consideration for early discharge.

Regi- we would need to work with victim's advocates to explore this and be mindful. Maybe just recommend exploring this as a group.

REC – explore early release on probation and parole.

#3-Change the releasing authority

Tim wants community corrections boards to make the decision for Prison straight to ISP-P.

This method goes around the community corrections board.

If we put cases in front of community corrections boards from DOC-leap over-go to ISP. Maybe the proposal is to say, we're going to encourage the board to look back at placements. Pilot an assessment tool to look at release from DOC to ISP-P, etc.

Greg – you're going to get a lot of pushback from the community corrections boards.

Regi – move this into a community corrections task force.

Tim would like to officially take the recommendation that we transfer people from residential to ISP unilaterally. But moving from prison, over halfway house and to ISP-P probably needs more study.

Christie Donner

Christie reports back to group on her research "Envision a perfect parole structure"

She presents 3 documents-

Document #1 -Outline of the report, Christie goes over the 8 areas covered in the report.

When this project first started it was to ask people what is your perfect vision for the structure of parole. What happened in course of the interviews is that people offered a lot more ideas in many other areas. There ended up being more information offered up.

Issue/Topic:

Christie reports back to group on her research “Envision a perfect parole structure” (cont.)

Discussion:

Executive Summary –

What did people say about the parole board, what recommendations do they have. Christie wants us to use this primarily as an educational tool. 2/3 or the interviewees were self selected, other 1/3 were recommendations that interviewees gave her.

This report is NOT is a definitive study of parole and structure. It is simply taking a ‘pulse’, not a research project. The project is purely qualitative and mostly anecdotal.

Document # 2- Interview Results

75 suggestions

Document #3-Summary of suggestions

What came up clearly in interviews is the need to expand transition options, transition beds. Is this a county issue a state issue a combo issue?

This is an area that needs more exploration but most are in concert that this needs to happen.

Regi – I think we DO need a recommendation staying state run something to help step people down into the community. In the game of transition, local/state partnerships seem to make sense. Maybe we can put a facility on a jail campus to help offenders move out. There is push back from communities on local vs. state run facilities.

At first, community corrections was run by the state. Maybe we call it a ‘step-down facility’. Community corrections exists because the community buys into it – Greg. Regardless of if it is state run there has to be consideration around Public/partnerships, multi-level public/private partnerships, etc. We need to have collaboration.

No adequate screening devices to get people referred to Community Corrections. Again, we need a better system for how the Parole Board works and we need to build in some efficiencies.

Not just about criticizing the parole board but helping them out. We need to analyze them and get them some serious help. How do we help them improve their functionality? Paul conducts a benevolent experience as far as an audit.

A lot of these criticisms could be levied against any parole board in the country, any parole board in the history of Colorado.

Issue/Topic:

Christie reports back to group on her research "Envision a perfect parole structure" (cont.)

Issue/Topic:

Meeting comes to a close

Action:

The group is charged with sending the top 10 recommendations to Germaine

Discussion:

REC-System wide audit on current use of assessments, are they being scored appropriately, etc. Is this something Brad Bogue could under take?

We really need to put some big money into drug and alcohol treatment and mental health if we at all want to see a turn-around in these folks.

We need to look at statutory condition number 10, all technical violations, the kitchen sink statute.

We will allow association if it doesn't have to do with activity relating to new criminal activity.

During revocation hearings there are 11 parole officers waiting around for their case to be called.

We need to standardize definition of recidivism.

Can we institute local criminal justice planning commissions in all communities?

David wraps up meeting. Thanks Christie for all her hard work and commends her research for being so in-depth and thoughtful.

The group leaves with an assignment to look at Christie's 75 suggestions and send the top 10 recommendations to Germaine