

### March 14, 2014

Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

#### **CO-CHAIRS**

**Theresa Cisneros**, 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, District Court Judge

#### **MEMBERS**

**Dennis Berry**, Mesa County Criminal Justice System

Joe Cannata, Voices of Victims

**Shannon Carst**, Colorado Community Corrections Coalition

**Christie Donner**, Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

**Bill Gurule**, 12<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, Probation **Harriet Hall**, Jefferson Center for Mental Health

**Stan Hilkey**, Sheriff, Mesa County **Gregg Kildow**, Intervention Community Corrections Services

Steve King, State Senator

Peter Weir, 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District, DA

**David Lipka**, Public Defender **Greg Mauro**, City and County of Denver Jacqueline McCall, Department of Corrections Kathryn Otten, Jefferson County Justice Services Walt Pesterfield, DOC Division of Adult Parole and Community Corrections Steve Reynolds, 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial District **Brandon Shaffer**, Parole Board Alaurice Tafoya-Modi, Private Defense Attornev **Glenn Tapia**, Division of Criminal Justice

**Dana Wilks**, Division of Probation Service

**Commission members in red** 

# **Purpose Statement**

<u>The purpose of community corrections</u> is to ensure public safety and further the sentencing goals of the State of Colorado. This is accomplished by utilizing community corrections boards and the **local community** to identify **appropriate individuals** to be placed in the community, **implement research-based policies, practices and programs** to assist individuals so that they may successfully function in the community.

#### **Topic Areas**

- 1. Community and Community Boards
- 2. Populations Served by Community Corrections
- 3. Referral Process

### **Topic #1 / Community and Community Boards**

#### Statement of the Problem

- There is a lack of clarity regarding how boards represent and engage the community.
- Board decision making processes have remained largely unchanged despite emerging practices to improve decision making using evidence based approaches.

### Topic #1 / Community and Community Boards

### Pros/Cons/Feasibility

- This topic needs to be addressed from the community perspective and part of the larger correctional process – instead of a silo model.
- Board membership should represent the community and include people of color whenever possible.
- Community education is needed about benefits of community corrections programs.
- There is a need for evidence-based decision making.
- It may be difficult to get the boards to accept structured decision making tools.

### **Topic #1 / Community and Community Boards**

#### Plan to address topic / Timeline

A working group has been created to:

- Collect and review board membership across the state.
- Review current statutes and local ordinance/rules regarding membership.
- Review formal board decision making criteria.
- Review of "model" decision making processes.

#### **Topic #2 / Populations Served by Community Corrections**

#### Statement of the Problem

 Low risk/low needs (but possibly high stakes) and high risk/high needs populations are in need of specific strategies that are not currently offered by the general community corrections programs or existing specialty programs.

### **Topic #2 / Populations Served by Community Corrections**

### Pros/Cons/Feasibility

- Some programs do not have the ability to serve special populations.
- Statutes limit how funding is distributed; currently a "one size fits all" model.
- Current practice, driven by funding, requires offenders to find work immediately - when research suggests that they may be better served by receiving services first.
- Must avoid encouraging programs to accept lower risk offenders because they have better outcomes. Research supports focusing resources on medium and high risk offenders.

### **Topic #2 / Populations Served by Community Corrections**

#### Plan to address topic / Timeline

A working group has been formed to:

- Profile the low risk/high stakes and "super high risk"\* populations.
- Examine DCJ performance standards and determine necessary steps to obtain flexibility in who is served.
- Study how funding drives the current program model to determine feasibility of providing services immediately upon entry and delaying employment requirement.

\*LSI score 36+

### **Topic #3 / Referral Process**

### Statement of the Problem

- The current referral system is inefficient and ineffective; it is constrained by statute and administrative regulations.
- Information provided to boards is inconsistent and often incomplete.
- Referral criteria is not evidence-based.

### **Topic #3 / Referral Process**

### Pros/Cons/Feasibility

- Improvement in referral process could ensure the targeted population is getting referred.
- Improvements in information sharing would improve decisionmaking by DOC case managers, boards and programs.
- This is complex: Prior efforts to improve decision making have lacked a successful outcome.

### **Topic #3 / Referral Process**

#### Plan to address topic / Timeline

A working group has been formed to:

- Review statutes and DOC administrative regulations to look for opportunities to include research-informed referral criteria.
- Review current process and tools/assessment instruments in use to determine methods to improve diversion, transition and parole referrals (Mesa Co. in particular for diversion process).
- Review obstacles to information sharing.
  - Statutory, federal regulations, HIPAA, agency policy
- Explore and promote risk driven decision making at the service provider level.

## Discussion Priorities Next Steps

### **Topics Reminder**

- 1. Community and Community Boards
- 2. Populations Served by Community Corrections
- 3. Referral Process