Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Date: October 14, 2009, 9:00AM - 12:00PM

Attendees:
David Kaplan, Chair
Christie Donner, Task Force Leader
Tamara Brady, Colorado State Public Defender's Office
Joe Cannata, Voices of Victims
Tim Hand, Deputy Director of Regional Operations (Parole)
Regina Huerter, Manager of Denver Public Safety
Kathie Izor, CURE
Greg Mauro, Community Corrections
Maureen O'Keefe, DOC
Dianne Tramutola-Lawson, CURE
Carolyn Turner, CURE
Sarah Steen, CU
Stefan Chodkowski, Politicalworks
Tom Stockburger, SAS Institute
Kim English, DCJ
Kevin Ford, DCJ
Paul Herman, Consultant

Absent:
Lacey Berumen, Executive Director, National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI)
Carl Blesch, DCJ/Community Corrections
David Michaud, Parole Board Representative
Jeaneene Miller, Division Director (Parole)
Pete Hautzinger, District Attorney

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome	David Kaplan welcomed the group and introduced the focus of the meeting agenda. In addition to updates, the task force will return to the discussion of structured decision-making strategies for the Parole Board that was begun last month. Additionally, the task force should begin to compile any recommendations with statutory implications for review by the Commission.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Update from Parole (Tom Hoffman and Parole Violations) DOC Parole is going bring Tom Hoffman to Colorado for consultation.	Tim Hand updated the group on the progress to invite to Colorado Tom Hoffman, the former Director of the California Division of Adult Parole Operations at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), who Tim met at the 34th Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association in CA August 23-26, 2009. • Mr. Hoffman will advise on the experience in California with the implementation of the Parole Violations Decision-Making Instrument. (See *Parole Violations and Revocations in California* (2008) at http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/224521.pdf and the CDCR webpage at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/PVDMI/index.html). • Plans for the visit include a tour of a metro Parole office, lunch with DOC Director Ari Zavaras and Parole Board Chair David Michaud, a meeting with the Parole Division management team. • Tim has provided reading materials forwarded by Paul Herman to the management team for their preparation for the meeting with Mr. Hoffman. • Paul Herman commented that Mr. Hoffman has great experience and expertise regarding the implementation of the parole revocation decision-making process and bringing about culture change within California parole. • Also, Paul reported that MO, KS, MI, and GA are reporting good recidivism numbers from their efforts in the area of parole and revocations.
Tim Hand will provide an update of the Tom Hoffman visit at the next PIS meeting.	• The visit by Tom Hoffman is tentatively scheduled the week of October 26th. Tim will provide the task force an update of the visit at the Nov. PIS meeting.
(BP-51: Standardize Driver's License Restrictions in Parole)	Tim also updated the TF on efforts related to CCJJ 2008 Recommendation BP-51 (Standardize Driver's License Restrictions). This recommendation addresses the inconsistent standards of behavior and driving privileges of individuals on parole and recommends that a policy be written to standardize these privileges. • Tim reports that Deborah Schmidt is looking at administrative rules surrounding drivers' licenses in Parole. • An administrative rule (AR) proposal to address standardization of driver's license rules as been written and is under review. • Tim expects that by the November PIS meeting the AR will be under official 30-day review or approved. The intention of the policy change would be to minimize the varying philosophical and individual influences currently brought to bear on driving privilege decisions made by parole officers. These driving decisions would be reviewed similar to others where decisions are passed up to supervisors for review. It would also be advantageous to treat all individuals placed in the

community the same, whether they are classified as "inmate status" or parolees.

Cultural change is aided by the introduction of objective supervision criteria and rules. Evidence-based practices put in practice in California and other states around the country can also be put into practice in Colorado. The practices and expectations of parole officers can shift to embrace newer, more successful methods of supervision. Among any group there are early adopters of change and those who are more resist. Time and training can serve to demonstrate the value of and allow a smooth transition to new methods. It is true that in California, some parole officers chose to leave rather than adopt change and others were removed because of their inability to adapt to changed policies and methods.

Are parole officers' performance tracked by the number of successes and failures (revocations) among their parole supervisees? This is very difficult to do because not all parole caseloads are the same. Some caseloads are larger than others and some are more difficult than others. This is often determined by the characteristics of the parolees. Exit reports from parolees are closely monitored and patterns of comments, both positive and negative, are noted. Patterns of negative comments result in intervention such as providing additional training.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Potential Statutory Recommendations Mary Cannon can present potential statutory changes at the Nov. PIS meeting.	David Kaplan asked the group what areas of discussion and focus by the task force may lead to recommendations requiring statutory action or modification. The following were some of the items mentioned: • Clean up the mandatory hold/arrest statutes and policies (distributed last month on the document titled, "Statute and Policy: Mandatory Filing of Parole Complaints Seeking Revocation.") o Mary Cannon will research statute issues that can be standardized and updated. • Following the visit by Tom Hoffman, Parole will determine whether there are statutes that would require revision to accommodate modifications to revocation decisions. For example, it would be helpful to have the ability to cancel warrants for specific technical violations by taking particular mitigating circumstances into account. • Standardizing the driving privilege policy mentioned earlier in the meeting may require statute. • The use of cell phones for the purpose of parolee management would offer an immense advantage. There is great disagreement about this, but this option should be explored. • The logic and application of offender association rules is inconsistent and flawed. A formal review of these restrictions has not been undertaken, but active discussions about the policy are occurring at the management and supervisory levels of Parole.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Parole Structured Decision Making	At the previous PIS meeting, task force members considered two general alternatives for structured decision making in parole: a decision tree and a decision matrix. The task force found the decision tree approach more promising and agreed to explore this option. It was decided that, although David Michaud (Parole Board Chair) could not attend the meeting, it was worth the time of the task force to begin discussions of the decision tree concept. Paul Herman and Christie Donner led an extensive discussion of structured decision making in parole using a decision tree. • Christie Donner offered a rough draft of a decision making model to stimulate discussion. • The model provided was designed to show the kinds of information that could be included in such a model and how a protocol for decision making, using the information, could be devised. • The model was not intended for implementation. Therefore, the model is not provided in these minutes, but points of discussion on the concept are summarized. Paul described how changing a parole decision system is an evolving process. • A decision system cannot be designed or implemented in totality or in a hasty fashion. • Those working on the introduction of a new decision structure should be prepared to engage in an incremental implementation involving intensive study, testing, and modification. • Additionally, elements of information that feed the decision process may require their own study and improvement. For example, if the LSI-R was to be used as a critical piece of information, it may be necessary to evaluate and/or enhance LSI-R assessment skills or evaluate the use of the LSI-R in settings where it had not previously been employed. • The use of a decision tree is, at this point, not controversial, including accepted practices of risk, need, and readiness assessment. • To accomplish implementation, though, requires efficacious, effective and timely assessments and determining which data are available, which data should be used, and which data provide the greatest value to the parole board. Paul and Christie describe that the protocol for the decision tree could be based on a "multiple hurdle" approach. • The tree could be designed with multiple decision points where inmates are eliminated or moved forward for further consideration based on information at each point. • The decision approach could also be designed to take multiple levels of information into account for the decision points. • The scope of the tree could include determinations of the type of hearing (for example, a file review or a face-to-face hearing) and the selection of inmates for hearings. • An important goal of a decision tree is to maximize the time and focus of the parole board members to those inmates in need of greater scrutiny. For

example, those inmates who are low in risk and need and high in readiness or the opposite should not need extensive review. Release or release denial is simple in these cases. The time saved on the "simple" cases would afford more opportunity for review of inmates with more complex combinations of risk, need, and readiness characteristics.

Conducting the assessments and preparing the materials for a decision tree could result in heavier workloads for DOC case managers. It is assumed that some of the data contributing to an inmate's parole file would be automatically populated. The preparation of the "decision file" would be initiated by the parole application process.

The discussion narrowed to the relative merits of specific data items of the example decision model, for example, use of:
- the Level of Service Inventory-Revised overall and subscale scores,
- the Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Inventory score,
- DOC need-level codes,
- the Progress Assessment Summary,
- criminal history variables,
- trait or dispositional personality and attitudinal variables,
- behavior change and improvement measures,
- DOC Code of Penal Discipline violations,
- assessment of degree of social support,
- readiness determination, and
- victim rights considerations.

In several cases data integrity issues would need to be addressed:
- The current fidelity of some assessments would require improvement before the data item would be considered reliable.
- The frequency and timeliness of assessment may also require adjustments.
- There may need to be adjustments to the data items included in the decision tree to reflect the current placement of the inmate (DOC, community corrections residential, community corrections non-residential, parole, etc.).
- The inclusion of some items may be problematic due to their limited applicability to all inmates. For example, programmatic progress reflected in program participation is necessarily limited by the availability of programs.
- Some data items would require study to determine whether they differentiate between release candidates. If all candidates score or are described similarly on a particular data point or assessment, the decision item would not help identify the better candidates.

Additional suggestions or observations for a decision model were made including:
- The addition of mental health status as a decision item.
- Using the decision tree to assist in the setting of parole conditions.
- Whether the data would be subject to open records requests.
- The need to look at the Victim Rights Act and fitting victim input into the model.
- Reviewing current statutes (including SB 09-135) to determine any impacts

	and whether statute modification is necessary.
	• Implementing a decision model will result in the need for additional training for case managers and re-entry specialists.
	• The implementation of the model would necessitate a study an upgrading of data systems to enhance the integration of data from multiple sources.
	• Users of the decision tree would require training on the decision tree and training to expect and accept the inevitable adaptations of the decision tree as it is modified to maintain responsiveness to the decision environment.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Next steps	Potential items for discussion include:
	• Updates by Tim Hand: the Tom Hoffman visit to Parole, the work by Debbie Schmidt on the driver's license policy, the work by Mary Kanan on revocation statutes, legislative/policy efforts surrounding cell phones and association rules
	• Update on the November 1 report in response to SB 09-135.
	• Update on CCJJ Recommendation BP-57 (Outside Agency Analysis and Assistance for the Parole Board).
	• Structured decision-making: continued discussion of the decision making process draft proposal.
	• Plan to generate statutory and other recommendations from the Task Force to present to the Commission in December with voting in January. The delay will allow stakeholder input and, if required, review by the CCJJ Re-entry Oversight Committee.

Next meeting:
Thursday, November 12, 2009
9AM-12PM
150 East 10th Avenue