

*Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice*  
**Sentencing Reform Task Force**

**Parole Working Group**  
**Minutes**

October 28, 2020 3:30PM-4:30PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

**ATTENDEES:**

**WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**

Kristen Hilkey, Chair, Colorado State Board of Parole  
Taj Ashaheed, Second Chance Center  
Kazi Houston, Rocky Mountain Victim Law Center

**STAFF**

Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant  
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice  
Damien Angel, Division of Criminal Justice  
Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice  
Stephané Waisanen, Division of Criminal Justice

**ABSENT**

Jeff Chostner, District Attorney, 10<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

**GUEST**

Michael Dougherty, District Attorney, 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Welcome &amp; Introductions <i>Kristen Hilkey</i></p>	<p>Working Group Leader Kristen Hilkey thanked members for participating in the Working Group and proceeded with introductions.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Discussion of Goals <i>Kristen Hilkey &amp; WG</i></p>	<p>Kristen clarified for the group that, if their goal is to prepare a recommendation for the 2021 General Assembly Session, it must be ready for the Task Force by December in order to forward it in January as a preliminary recommendation to the Commission.</p> <p>Kristen asked what objectives the group would like to accomplish. Members briefly discussed what they envisioned and agreed the objective was to create a parole model that <i>promotes successful outcomes for the individual, victims and the community.</i></p> <p>Kristen said she thought these issues would be useful to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sentence progression – How can our ideas work in the Department of Corrections (DOC) when there are no facilities or programs to address individual risks and needs.</li> <li>• Front-end vs back-end – The front end (probation) should look different from the back-end (prison). Do these look different? Should the parole board see individuals at the beginning of their prison sentence and communicate what needs to be accomplished to be recommended for parole?</li> </ul> <p>CCJJ Consultant Richard Stroker, who has extensive experience consulting with parole boards nationwide and was formerly the director of probation and parole in South Carolina, mentioned that Michigan’s parole board assigns a one- or two-year supervision period for individuals granted parole. Richard offered to share his knowledge and experience of other jurisdictions with the Working Group.</p> <p>Members suggested reviewing data that shows most violations of parole occur within the first 18 months of release (see Figure 60 on page 45 of DOC annual statistical report: <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/10XKvOtuc0tB9rW-oXc6q3SzrmzSod1Db/view">https://drive.google.com/file/d/10XKvOtuc0tB9rW-oXc6q3SzrmzSod1Db/view</a>). This information could be informative when discussing if a five-year parole sentence might be too long.</p> <p>DCJ staff will review data that was prepared for a former Parole Task Force.</p> <p>There was a discussion about adding members to the Working Group. Kristen will reach out to DOC’s parole division for additional participation and Taj will find a person with lived experience who has recently completed their parole term.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Discussion of Goals <i>Kristen Hilkey &amp; WG</i></p>	<p>Kristen mentioned that she worked with OIT at DOC to collect information regarding the reasons for parole revocations, but the system was only recently implemented so there may not be much information yet. She also said the group needed information regarding whether a technical violation is actually masking a new crime, that is, the parole officer returned the person to prison on a technical violation rather than pursuing prosecution. DCJ staff will see if data are available to address this question.</p> <p>Richard identified four topic areas the group was discussing, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure of parole                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timing</li> <li>- Eligibility</li> <li>- Transparency</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Length of parole</li> <li>• Conditions of supervision</li> <li>• Supervision violations</li> </ul>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Next Steps, Action Items &amp; Adjourn</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM</b> Conditions of Parole document to be distributed to Working Group <i>Kristen Hilkey/Staff</i></p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM</b> Parole in other states <i>Richard Stroker</i></p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM</b> Information from former CCJJ parole task force <i>Kim English</i></p>	<p>For the next meeting, Kristen asked that members think of judges, former parolees, and victim representatives that would be a valuable addition to the working group. Additionally, Kristen asked members to think about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful outcome approaches for individuals, victims, and the community</li> <li>• Length of parole</li> <li>• Progression</li> <li>• Supervision</li> </ul> <p>Kristen will send DCJ staff the current conditions of parole document to distribute to members.</p> <p>Richard will be prepared to discuss other state parole practices.</p> <p>Kim and DCJ staff will review data and information from an earlier CCJJ parole task force. Kim will explore if data are available to answer the question regarding the proportion of technical violations that are the result of a new crime that was not prosecuted.</p> <p>Members will establish a regular meeting schedule at the next meeting. The next meeting is Wednesday, November 4, from 3:00pm to 4:30pm.</p>