

Re-entry Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Minutes

June 10, 2015, 1:30PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling, 3rd Floor Conference room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Mark Evans, Public Defender's Office
Evelyn Leslie, Colo. School for Family Therapy
Christie Donner, Colo. Criminal Justice Reform Coalition
Hassan Latif, Second Chance Center
Monica Chambers, Department of Corrections
Tom Giacinti, Representing Community Corrections
Regi Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
Alfredo Pena, Parole Board
Beth McCann, State Representative
Charles Parkins, Division of Youth Corrections
Robert Werthwein,
Pat Steadman, State Senator
Alison for Rick Raemisch, Dept. of Corrections

ADDITIONAL

Anne Carter, Parole Board
Melissa, Parole
Jesse Jensen

STAFF

Paul Herman/CCJJ consultant
Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice
Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT

Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety
Dave Young, District Attorney 17th JD
Jennifer Bradford, Metro State University of Denver
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department / SB94
Joe Pelle, Boulder County Sheriff's Office

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome and Introductions	CCJJ consultant Paul Herman welcomed the group in place of the Re-entry Task Force Chair, Stan Hilkey. Paul explained that Stan would be unable to attend this meeting and that he (Paul) would lead the discussion and group process in his place.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Commission Charge</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Paul presented a re-cap of the first two meetings of the Re-entry Task Force. He explained that at the first meeting (in April) the group sifted through a large amount of data and information from probation, community corrections and parole including but not limited to data on technical violations, new offenses, offender success and offender revocation.</p> <p>He explained that during the second meeting (in May) the group revisited data from the first meeting, but also spent a good deal of time discussing re-entry from a general perspective. The group also entered into a lengthy discussion of whether the main work of this task force should be focused on re-entry from a broader perspective or if it should focus on technical violations.</p> <p>At this point in the discussion Paul took the group through a short PowerPoint outlining why the charge for this task force is to start with work on technical violations:</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CCJJ established an Exploratory Re-entry Planning Group with a variety of stakeholder representatives in December 2014. • That group met three times between December 2014 and February 2015 and went through a lengthy and in-depth process to determine and prioritize various re-entry work areas. • The planning group established a list of criteria to prioritize Issues to address. That list included things like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Issues that are legislative or policy oriented -Issues that are contributing most to recidivism -Areas which have a relationship to prior CCJJ issues and that the Commission is already familiar with -Issues that aren't just about a 'lack of resources' -Issues that address the largest audience and provide the greatest impact and biggest 'bang for the buck' (as far as impacting the majority of offenders, and those who are most dangerous) -Issues that are most achievable • The planning group identified 8 priority problems for Re-entry consideration as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a significant gap in finding stable housing for offenders in

	<p>the community</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Providing IDs for offenders leaving custody facilities continues to be a problem even though some progress has been made in the last few years. 3. Collateral consequences of conviction are roadblocks to successful reentry. 4. Technical violators continue to be a problem for the criminal justice system as a whole, in probation, community corrections and parole. 5. There is a gap in residential treatment beds for behavioral health problems resulting in offenders not receiving timely and appropriate services and increasing the likelihood of failure in the community. 6. Access to medical and mental health care including medication continues to be a significant barrier to successful reentry. 7. Young adult males 18-25 years old are failing at a significant rate. 8. The most significant concern for Youth Corrections is post custodial recidivism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning group then used the criteria established previously and voted on the following top three problem areas to address first: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical violators 2. Collateral consequences 3. Access to medical and mental health care • Paul reiterated that the planning group spent a great deal of time in a very thorough process to vet the myriad of re-entry issues and determine the top three areas to begin the work. • The planning group presented their work to the Commission in February 2015 – with the Commission then giving the charge to the Re-entry Task Force to begin with technical violations.
--	---

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Technical Violations</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Probation and Parole presentations next meeting outlining the description of people who <u>successfully</u> complete</p>	<p>Paul began a discussion with task force members about the overall picture of technical violations including the nature of the problem, how we know it's a problem, who and what technical violations impact and what can be done about TV's.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul noted that in looking at prison admissions, ½ of new admissions are technical violators. • At the May task force meeting the group agreed that whether it's 47% of offenders who are successful or 58% - either way that success rate is not okay. • The numbers of technical violators and failures are well documented – what this group needs to do is turn the conversation around and discuss the definition of success. • After the first Re-entry Task Force meeting a one-page grid was created highlighting all the information available about who violates, why they

	<p>violate, when they violate, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included in that information was a synopsis from community corrections with a description of people who successfully complete comm. corr. However that information wasn't available from probation and parole. • Paul led the group in an exercise to help define success and asked task force members to describe how they define success. <p>DEFINITION OF SUCCESS / Group responses (flip charts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new crimes • An offenders ability to find something to be/feel productive about • Criminogenic needs have been addressed • Access to the right services and people utilizing those services • Never giving up, continuing to try • The moment of clarity and responsivity by the offender • An offenders ability to be substance abuse free • Criminogenic needs have been addressed to prevent new crimes and disruptive behavior, especially when it comes to TV's on parole • No longer under supervision of the state (we falsely make the assumption that something WE do in 3-4 years with an offender will make them a desirable pro-social person. • Ability to move positively through the various stages of change. An offender needs to get to the preparation stage, then if they can get a good plan in place and move toward the maintenance stage – that's success. • A system that delivers evidence-based practices. • Success is two pronged – what is the system doing and what is the offender doing. The system delivery needs to be top notch but it also needs to be received and implemented by the offender. • Success means no more victims. • The goal is long-term success, not short-term compliance. The system needs to be preventative instead of reactionary. • Success is incremental and measured in small ways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Learning how to handle a phone call for example. Success is fulfillment for an individual in learning new things and developing new skill sets. We need to look at outcomes that please the OFFENDER = that equals success. For example, being adequately employed, etc. by choice. An offender needs to develop a vision for themselves. Success is when people are able to envision something new for their lives. Success is <u>not</u> an end result. Success is not just checking items off a list. Success is anyone working on progressing in their lives who AREN'T on the street perpetrating crimes and who AREN'T making new victims – THAT'S SUCCESS. • Getting off paper which fulfills terms and conditions plus being successful in life. However these are two profoundly different things. At the end of supervision you would hope people are at some level of stability. • Defining success is different for those under the label of 'sex offender'. 29% of DOC inmates are sex offenders, the stigma stays with them so they can't get housing, jobs, etc. This is a large percentage of offenders handicapped with that label.
--	--

- Success is a healthy support structure.
- An offender has to consider themselves a citizen and 'part of society'. They need to feel they belong in this place and have a place in society. That's the intangible meaning of success.
- Paul then asked the group WHO is successful in working with people in such a way that helps them come to that moment of clarity.
- Charles offered a synopsis of the Definition of Success as follows:
" Completion of imposed sanctions - Treatment without recidivating and/or relapse – Ideally with some repair to harm imposed on the victim/community – Reintegration into society "

WHO IS SUCCESSFUL IN CREATING THIS WORK WITH OFFENDERS (flip chart)

- People who run TC's. They build a community around a person that they can't run away from. It teaches people to be responsible for themselves.
- Direct victim participation in offender accountability, when appropriate.
- Recovery court
- Relationships - someone who can help an offender decide if that they want to be in a different place.
- Someone with the capacity to connect and help. The qualities that are needed are relational. This is complicated in CJ system because it's not necessarily always valued.
- Someone who can help build resiliency
- Someone who "has been in my shoes"
- Paul asks what the problems people face with re-entry are.

PROBLEMS PEOPLE FACE WITH RE-ENTRY

- People don't know HOW to change.
- It's the people in your life who help you focus on the change.
- There needs to be a real and human connection to someone who is going to be your reason for change. It helps if that person has walked the walk. This is not necessarily in a structured setting
- Walking the walk and trust are important, but that person doesn't have to have been in the same situation.
- Paul asked for a handful of volunteers and tasked them with putting the aforementioned lists of success into 'buckets'.

SUCCESS BY CATEGORY (flip charts)

- Mark Evans reported back on the outcomes of the small group by categorizing success into buckets of Personal, System and Relational Success.
- **Personal Success**
 - No new crimes
 - Finding something to be productive
 - The moment of clarity and responsivity
 - Substance abuse free
 - No more victims
 - Incremental change including employment, sobriety, family, fulfillment, vision
 - healthy support structure

	<p>-An individual feels like they have a place in society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Success <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Criminogenic needs addressed -Access to the right services and people using those services -Getting off paper / No longer under the supervision of the state -The 'system' delivers EBP -Achieving terms and conditions -Structured direct victim interaction -Drug and recovery courts • Relational Success <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The group reported back that they discovered that the relational piece melded into everything. <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration helps to change the culture. • On the 'person' side of things, in the best of all worlds we would raise healthy adults. • On the system side we would parent healthy systems. • We could also add in inner-generational success / long-term success • Paul asked what the group sees as next steps. • We've had an idea of steps to success and to use this in terms of fewer people being revoked, but what are the next steps to take this to a discussion less about TV's and more about 'Success'? • When you process new things through an old filter it's hard to see things differently. • Success is marked by people getting to brand new different places in their lives. • It's about how much of YOU is in your decisions and recognizing your own bias. • One way to go down this road is for the group to figure out the biases in this room? Where are you coming from? • It would be helpful to find better measurement markers. Except for 'no new crimes' the rest are difficult to measure. • We have a lot of data about who fails; we have a lot of measures about what's been implemented to try to address failures. But how do we look at this differently – not through the lens of TV's, numbers. • Using data can be an appropriate filter. • Let's look at this holistically rather than just through the individual. <p>HOW DO WE LOOK AT THIS WITH DIFFERENT FILTERS? (flip chart)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize your bias • Better 'mechanisms' to define success • Using data • Holistic approach • ID the 'perspectives' of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Probation -Parole -Community Corrections -How does the Legislature perceive this?
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work force health and mentality. • Perception as reality -Public, Media, etc.
--	--

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Develop a Work Plan / Next Steps</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Small working group to meet and discuss how to address TV work through the lens of 'success'</p> <p>Presentations from Probation, Comm. Corr. and Parole on the actual technical violation and revocation process</p>	<p>Paul offered a plan for next steps.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul asked for 4 to 5 volunteers to get together and discuss looking at this through a different lens. • The small group will work on a structured plan to move forward. • The following task force members agreed to help figure out next steps. Melissa, Regi, Mark, Tom G, Monica, Hassan • Germaine will contact the group to set up a date/time. • Mark requested a presentation by someone of the actual technical violation and revocation process. • Germaine will send out the link to the National Parole Resource Center document entitled "Responding to parole violations", which is an action kit and action guide.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Adjourn</p> <p>Issue/Topic:</p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.</p>

Next Meeting

July 8th, (Wednesday) 1:30pm – 4:30pm 710 Kipling St., 3rd floor conference room