

# FAUG AGENDA

## JOSEPHINE COUNTY

November 14, 2012 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

November 15, 2012 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### Meeting Location:

Marie Hill Conference Room  
Josephine County Community Corrections  
510 NW 4<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Grants Pass, OR 97526  
(541) 474-5165

### Day One:

#### **Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping**

**Lily/Group**

Attendance: Lee Cummins (DOC-CC); Mary Hunt (DOC-CC); Susan Bowers (Benton); Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Ken Yee (Columbia); Erin Larson (Coos); Bob Lucas (Deschutes); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Susie Strom (Hood River); Dru VanRiper (Jefferson); Lily Morgan (Josephine); Larry Evenson (Lane); Donovan Dumire (Linn); Tracey Coffman (Malheur); Gina Courson (Marion); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Wende Kirby (Multnomah); Angela Boyer (Polk); Wayne McCollum (Tillamook); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Christopher Swayzee (Washington)

#### **Minute Review**

**Group**

CORRECTIONS:

**(Parole Board)** – Lily sent out an email from Shawna with corrections to Parole Board info on the August 2012 Meeting Minutes. The corrections, as requested by Shawna, include:

“They need all three for loss-of-life convictions, so Jeremiah Stromberg is staying until October 1, 2012.” What should have been said was just that **“Jeremiah is staying until October 1, 2012 to assist with the transition of the new members. The Board can function as a full Board with only two members, even with loss of life cases, their workloads will just take on more to cover that third position. ”**

Warrants specialist – Melinda Boyer is going out on Maternity Leave. **Her name is actually spelled with an A – Malinda Boyer.**

Annie Williamson will take that over. Currently, Julie Mills is helping. **Annie will be covering the warrants desk until Malinda’s return. Julie Mills was hired as the new Revocation Specialist (sanctions desk).**

Other Corrections:

**Page 5 (Other Items; Funding)** – Should say that funding is based on current **calculated level**; (rather than supervision level).

**Page 7 (Automation Subcommittee; Mary’s Items)** – Code for Compensatory Fine should be **CMPF** (rather than COMP)

**Page 9 (Roundtable; Betti’s issue)** – Should say **Crime Commit date** (rather than offense date)

**Update to the August 2012 Meeting Minutes:**

Regarding INPR cases: (sent out by Lily on 8/31/12). The crime commit date must be on/before June 30, 2011.

**ICOTS – Compact****Ruby McClorey**

Ruby was not present at this quarter's meeting.

**Parole Board****Shawna Harnden**

Shawna sent a Parole Board update via email. Lily sent the email out to FAUG Members. Shawna asked that Lily put this to the group on her behalf. The email states:

**Parole Board Updates:**

The Senate only confirmed one Board member in September. The new member is Amber Kaatz who came from CJC (Criminal Justice Commission) but prior to that she was a PO/Supervisor in Umatilla County. The Senate will meet again in December at which time we are hopeful to have them confirm our third member which would be our Chairperson position. The Governor did elect to make Candace Wheeler the Vice Chairperson and she will remain so until her term is up January 2014.

We are down quite a bit of staff. We currently have 3 people out on medical leave, our new hire for the sanctions desk is no longer with us and we still do not have a third Board Member. With our staffing normally being so low, even just one person out for any length of time can really affect us. All of our staff are doing what they can to help keep all the workloads flowing and as current as possible. Please let all of your staff know of the current situation and ask them to please have patience if they have not received a response in the same timeliness as they have in the past. With the staffing situation what it is, we re-evaluated some processes. Last meeting I advised of our new warrants general email address([ParoleBoardWarrants@doc.state.or.us](mailto:ParoleBoardWarrants@doc.state.or.us)) that everyone can email regarding all warrant questions, upgrade and lift requests. This allows anyone who covers that desk to be able to assist and not have to wait for one specific employee. This process has worked so well, that we decided to do the same for the Board Hearings Officer desk. Any paperwork you want sent to our Board Hearings Officer, to be included in the HO packet and considered by the Board, you can now email those documents to [ParoleBoardHearingsOfficer@doc.state.or.us](mailto:ParoleBoardHearingsOfficer@doc.state.or.us).

**Correction from Day 1 to Day 2 – Shawna sent out an email to say that the email for the Parole Board given was correct.**

Old Sanctions: Based on the projected time it is estimated to take to get all the old sanctions cleaned up, our Executive Director, Jay Scroggin wants to take this to OACCD this month and discuss the possibility of allowing FAUG reps to use the CLNA (closed, no action) code. Jay will send out an email next week advising what OACCD decided.

**DOC Update****Lee Cummins/Mary Hunt**

- **PSC**

The Risk Assessment Workgroup held a meeting on 10/8/12 to address concerns regarding the PSC. The workgroup includes the original members of Risk Assessment Workgroup plus the PSC Workgroup members. The following concerns discussed:

- 1) Incoming Compact cases. The PSC takes conviction date directly from CIS. It has been found that when clerical staff are entering the Incoming Compact cases into CIS (and the corresponding

ORS conviction is entered), that conviction data is being captured when a PSC is run. This is inaccurate information as the convictions are from another state and should not reflect on a PSC.

Lily found a case in which the offender had a Block Number (a temporary number given to offenders until they are fingerprinted in Oregon and issued a SID). This offender's case was entered and a PSC run. When Lily attempted to do a Proxy on the case, the system would not allow the use of the "No PSC Available" code or "BOTH" codes. The only code permitted was "OOS". It was discovered that the system, having collected data from CIS, believed that there was actually a conviction history in Oregon and the edits, therefore, prevented her from using the proper codes. The fix would be to program PSC to exclude the Incoming Compact cases. Shawn Miller said that he hasn't had chance to work on PSC formula yet, but hopefully will this Friday. This issue will be corrected.

Conditional Discharge and Diversion cases may also require a Proxy due to the possible lack of convictions in CIS.

If a client has both Oregon convictions and out-of-state convictions, the PO can choose to do the Proxy and use OOS code, if desired. Confusion arose as to the difference between BOTH and OOS codes. It appears to some to be redundant. Mary will check to see what the original intention for the use of the BOTH and OOS codes. The description may need updating to avoid confusion.

- 2) Differences between PSCs being used in CIS and the CJC Website. The Website is operating from their old timeframe...updating monthly...rather than overnight. Additionally, FAPA orders were only being pulled in every 3 months. Because of this, there is a discrepancy between CIS and CJC PSC scores. The CJC programmers have to change the update frequency in the Website. Until then, however, the scores will likely be different. CIS is the more updated of the pair. It may be after first of the year before the info is updated on CJS.

The question was raised as to reason to use the Website. Judges/DAs may go into it to integrate 'evidence-based sentencing' into sentencing practices. However, PO's are not likely to use the Website as much.

It is reported that FAPA data may have limited history, due to FAPA info being coded in OJIN differently.

- 3) A screen was designed to allow PO to put in conviction date and have it calculate (to allow POs to calculate a PSC prior to the entry of a conviction into CIS...replicates the use of the Website). It has created some confusion, however; giving the impression that a PSC was being run when it wasn't. Due to his confusion, the screen hasn't been put out yet. The question was raised as to whether to put it out there. Will this create confusion for the PO's? Is there a need when the conviction will be soon entered into CIS, anyhow? A reminder was made that there has been only 10-12% of cases showing a change in risk level due to a new conviction. Offenders staying within a specific type of crime (e.g. statutory, property, person) are less likely to have an increase in risk level as compared to those who commit crimes of different types. The decision made to just have the one method of running the PSC and PO's will have to wait until the day after the conviction is input into CIS. It has been acknowledged that this is difficult for counties that are not receiving sentencing info for up to 2 weeks after sentencing.

A question was raised as to what PV arrests reflect in the PSC. It appears that the PSC is not reflecting violation behavior. Additionally, some counties do not fingerprint offenders booked into custody on Probation Violations (therefore, they are not reflected on the offender's CCH in

LEDS). A concern was also raised about multiple cases being convicted on same date. The concern is that this creates the illusion of one event, rather than reflecting all of the criminal behavior. Another concern noted is that Possession of Controlled Substance cases don't seem to be reflected correctly in PSC data. Lee states that when developing the PSC, a hierarchy issue was determined. DOC are looking at some of these concerns, but are comfortable with the calculations/formulas being utilized at the moment. It has found to be more reliable than prior OCMS tool. Recommendation to document concerns, so that they can be captured/considered.

- 4) The PSC cutoff scores on CJC Community Corrections Website did not match the CIS cutoff scores. Kelly Officer has corrected this.
- 5) A request has been made to allow POs to override old OCMS scores with PSC score. OCMS has been shut down, so this override will not be permitted. The shut down was to prevent new OCMS assessments being created.

Policy overrides are being looked at to determine why so many are being done. This will not include overrides down based on in-custody status. The focus is with the overrides to a higher level.

- 6) Reason codes for Proxy. Juvenile History is not currently reflected with a code. It was decided that an override based on Juvenile History was valid for the Proxy. Therefore, a code, most likely JUVE, will be created in the table. Lee is estimating this will be done within next 30 days. The manual will also be updated. A question was raised as to the need of the new code; because the override questions ask about adult arrests...and the only Juvenile-related question has to do with age at first arrest. The arrests during Juvenile ages not reflected in questions.

A code was requested override code for arrest data only. This was denied. The PSC already has Oregon arrest info which should be same as Proxy.

Some POs have raised concerns about offenders with many jail sanctions and that this is not captured in the PSC formula. It is felt that the PSC was "not accurately" scoring. Therefore, a request was made for a "PO Discretion" override code. This was denied. The rationale for the denial was that the OCMS was excessively overridden and a "PO Discretion" override code could lead to excessive overrides to the PSC.

Currently, OVRDE shows in score column when the PSC is being overridden, creating a desire to redesign the W/W Caseload screen with proposed changes. Lee passed out a handout showing proposals to the screen. Many POs and Supervisors have expressed concerns that it is desired to know what tool was used to override. One proposal includes original calculation and an Assessed (overridden) level. The second proposal only has the supervision level and the tool it is based on. A suggestion was made to change the "CLS" heading to "Supervision Level" in proposal, but the group feels that current "CLS" header works and that POs are accustomed to it. Leaving the "CLS" header intact will also alleviate the need to update manuals. The decision was to show (on the W/W Caseload screen) the CLS (supervision level) and the tool/reason used to get that level.

Consideration also being made to allow real estate on the screen for "OTTO" alerts to be added. The current "Reass Due" column is being deleted to allow real estate for OTTO alerts and for the tool/override reason.

Another proposal was made for the W/W Risk Assessments screen to move columns around for clarity. Also adds "Reason Score" column that will reflect the score of the override tool used

(i.e. LS/CMI). However, this column cannot be added without a Service Request. A question was raised that if the reason is that the person is unavailable (in custody, in residential treatment), what “score” to be used in the “Reason Score” column? Suggestions included: “N/A” (not applicable), “N/S” (no score); “0” or a blank. It was also suggested that consistency with other screens be considered. Decision made that “N/S” would be used.

The “Rule Date” column in the W/W Risk Assessments screen is being deleted as it is considered obsolete.

A question was raised as to whether POs should do a “mass reassessment” of their entire caseload, thereby updating all risk assessments to the PSC/Proxy. A problem was detected with the outcount cases; that the levels will not show after the case has been admitted off of the outcount status. Any assessment problems may be due to the PO doing the assessment before the admin staff readmits the offender back from outcount status. It has been noticed that the level will show in assessment screen...but not in summary once the person was readmitted. The level disappears from the assessment screen...as well as Public Info Screen. The workaround is that the PO must delete the PSC and then recreate it after readmission from outcount status. This bug appears to not be a problem on CMPO and ABSC outcounts. It was said that this will be somewhat taken care of when OTTO comes into production. Recommendation made to not do any reassessments on outcounts.

A question was raised regarding CMPO cases and funding. CMPO cases are only funded on limited level, so a reassessment not needed for funding purposes, but initial assessment is necessary to be sure the case is funded at all (doesn't drop off after 6 months). Lee will check to be sure this is correct.

It was noted that on the W/W Risk Assessment screen, the outcount status is not displayed.

- 7) PSC data screen (20 screen). This has been expanded to include “Yes/No” information for Property/Statutory/Person Offenses.

Policy Overrides – These were originally meant for county policy...not PO policy. The overrides should be made based upon formal county policy only. The category should not be used as a catch-all or as a “PO Discretion” code. In October, a report was run to see how many “Policy” overrides have been done.

The issue was raised about using the “Policy” override for those cases where the clients live out of the county, but that county will not accept the case for transfer (as an “Unavailable” reason). Should this be done in different way? The Unavailable reason code table can include an “out of county misdemeanor” code. Different counties might use this in different ways. A recommendation was made that there should not be a large number of codes. It was recommended that only a limited number of codes be made available.

- 8) The old Reports Committee has been reconvened. They will develop PSC reports, in addition to the reports ordinarily developed.
- 9) OTTO – Suggestion made to the workgroup that if the PSC level changes behind the scenes...OTTO should alert the PO; thereby prompting the PO to rescore the PSC. An alert should also be made in situations which require an assessment/reassessment; including: return from ABSC after 6 months; a new custody cycle; admission from DOC institution or Local Control; and a status change (i.e. a PPS expires and leaves only a Probation to be supervised, which moves the case from PPS to Probation status). NOTE: An alert will not be set for new

felony convictions...unless it changes the level. After OTTO is implemented for PSC alerts, it will be reviewed to see what else it can be used for. Service Request Number 2553

Day 2 – Diane Route had concerns about excluding offenders from alerts being set. The question raised as to whether cases on outcounts should be excluded. Example: if a change is detected by OTTO on an ABSC case, do we want to be alerted? We were reminded that those alerts would only be seen when subsetting the caseload screen. Lee will ask if there is a second alert set, instead of the red ‘R’. Decision is to not exclude outcounts from the OTTO alerts.

- 10) The Limited level not being reintroduced...per workgroup decision. However, the FAUG group raised the following concern: some counties use this designation to discern between offenders on mail-in status vs. in-person reporting status. The Workgroup believed that the Unavailable code was considered to alleviate this need. Programmers may have an idea on how to deal with this concern. One recommendation was to create a different caseload...but this is a lot of work for support staff to move from one ADP to another. EPRs would not need to be altered, as they are only attached to the PO’s mailbox number...and this would not change when moving an offender from one ADP to another. Whilst this can be done, it is easier for a PO to move an offender from mail-in to reporting status if the change is only in the Supervision Level. A suggestion was made to create an override reason such as “Mail” or “Admin”. This will allow the PO to make the change w/o having to go to admin staff to move offenders from ADP to ADP. An edit in the PSC may prohibit an override, however, as if an offender is assessed as a Low, you cannot override to Low...and the override reason is therefore not available. This makes using “Mail” or “Admin” not an option. Suggestion made to use “Very Low” (which is in line with LS/CMI levels), instead of Limited. Another suggestion made to add a field to Caseload Summary screen that could be used as a designator. This would require an F11, 4, ?, which would require a new module and a service request. This issue will be brought to the workgroup for consideration.

Day 2 – Lee communicated with Denise Sitler and Jeremiah Stromberg about this issue. The original thought was that the Limited cases were not going to have to mail-in, or be supervised in any way. However, that is not what the case is amongst many counties. Some counties have Casebank or Low cases that are supervised at different levels, based on their county’s policies. There is a limit to 4 classification levels, currently, although the LS/CMI has 5 and the workgroup only approved 3 (based on PSC levels). The Low/Limited was collapsed, resulting in the 4. Suggested that it be brought back to 5 to allow the Low/LTD to be separated, as well as the High/Very High cases be sorted, as well. Because the workgroup decision was for 3 levels used, it was not possible to merge the 5 levels into the 3 allotted. The PSC is the initial sorting tool and the LS/CMI is used to determine supervision level. OACCD has their meeting today, so hopefully, Jeremiah Stromberg can raise this issue there. Because this is a Director-issue, POs should speak with their Directors to raise concerns.

Denise Sitler replied to Lee with the following info. Actual cost workgroup (study done every 6 years by statute). The APPA study only includes 3 levels for PSC. It appears that there was a misunderstanding. FAUG is not recommending changing the PSC levels...but instead, the supervision levels. Lee is sending Denise a clarification. Lee will send to FAUG Reps the responses received. FAUG Reps will take this issue back to their offices and discuss it with their Directors and it will be added to the next FAUG Meeting. Anybody who feels passionately should contact Lily and have this issue raised at the next Automation Subcommittee meeting. It is recommended that Wende and Donovan speak at this meeting, as well, as they will already be there. Angela was also

- 11) Ability to do PSC is blocked on cases on Inmate/Admit Pending status. This is done to prevent the problems of doing assessments prior to admission...then when admitted, the assessment goes away. This block will not be removed. The ability may be brought back once OTTO is online.
- 12) All of these issues are put back into an expanded manual.

- **Static 99R**

It was put into production today (11/14/12). The open Static99's were needed to be closed/deleted first. This has been done. Any that were left over were deleted this morning before the 99R could go into production. Parole Board felt that all current Static 99 should have new Static 99R done...but this could cause issues; with Hearings being necessary on some cases. Therefore, the decision was made to not require the Static 99R be done on current Static 99.

- **Open/Pending Sanction clean up**

A request made to have authorities restored to FAUG Reps to allow bringing case back from "sent to Board" status before Board acts upon it. Because of the offender status as a Board case, this is not approved. This relates to the Board's legal liability. Lee will create a sheet of sanction authorities available for our information. CLNA has added as a "Closed – No Action" closure code. Shawna Harnden is checking to see if FAUG Reps can have access to close "CLNA" and not have to send them to the Board.

A new query has been run on open/pending sanctions. There still are 7704 open. The query will be sent out and the outcounts will be sorted out and included at the end to allow POs to see which active cases still have open sanctions. Interventions have also been included.

There is no deadline on the clean up. Shawna has a list she is cleaning up for Board liability issues. POs will have to deal with the open sanctions prior to closing the cases out, however.

Deschutes County found a bug on a (current) Board case. An open Intervention was completed, but then the PO wanted to delete it. Option 23 was done to move it to PEND, but because the offender was in BRD status, it wouldn't allow the PO to do anything else with it. It was cautioned to consider this before moving a closed Sanction/Intervention to PEND status on a BRD case, as it cannot be closed again without DOC action.

TransLeave cases: The Parole Board has no authority over those cases because the offender is still under control of the Institution. However, the offender on TransLeave has the Status Type as "LV"; which allows the location to create a Sanction. This is different from Inmates, where an "IN" status would not allow a Sanction to be created. Not many offenders on TransLeave are sanctioned. Some counties do not sanction them...just send the offender back to prison. A sanction cannot be sent to the Board. The Institution must be notified, but how is this done in Sanction Module? Can the Sanction be completed? Are we allowed to sanction an offender on TransLeave? Recommendation is to not do a Sanction in the first place...to contact the Institution...and on those cases where a Sanction was done, use option 15 as would be done on LC cases. Lily found a NOR form used to sanction TransLeave offenders (max sanction time is 3 days). She will send the form to FAUG Reps. At the next FAUG Meeting, Hank Harris (TransLeave Manager) will be there. This would be a good topic for that meeting.

Compact Parole cases: Regarding open sanctions on cases that are just compact cases, but the status is Parole. CIS will set the case to BRD status. However, the Parole Board does not have authority

over the case/sanction. Due to BRD status, the CIS edit will not allow FAUG Reps to close the open sanction. Contact Lee and they can be resolved. These cases cannot be excluded, however, from the edit.

Fixes that have been made in the Sanction Module:

1. "Sanction Given" info is now on main screen, rather than "Sanction Recommended" info.
2. CLNA was showing on Supervisor Review and HO Review screens. This should not have been. They now have been removed from that screen.
3. On the option 19 screen, a request was made to make option 19 lead to the W/W Sanction screen.
4. Mary asked which modules allow POs to change SID number without having to back out first. This causes info to be lost for the PO, requiring reentry of the info. These should be fixed to require the PO to back out of the screen. If any are found, let Mary know.

### **Day Two:**

#### **Automation Sub-Committee**

**Lee Cummins**

1. Next meeting is scheduled for December 11 at 1-3 pm at the Dome Building (Rm 108).

#### **SOON Issues**

**Mary Hunt**

1. List sent out of open offenses where all offenses have reached/passed their max date...excluding ABSC cases. Mary wants to know if this type of list would be helpful on a regular basis. Recommendation was made for quarterly reports. Approved to have the reports sent to SOON and cc to FAUG DL.

When the Reports Committee starts on new CIS reports, this can be considered as a new report.

It may be possible to have CIS reports sent in PDF format. The request would be sent into a DOC folder and the PO would get a notice...but except for Linn/Douglas counties, DOC access is restricted. Due to this, this request is on hold. It may be developed to see if the report can just be emailed...but this could cause problems if the documents are too big.

SOON is trying to annually review ABSC lists to see if warrants are still out there.

This report does not reflect Line Closures only (use option 16 (CC Reports Menu), 4 (Total Office Reports), 7 (Parole Officer Caseload Report) to access these reports. These reports cannot be displayed...must be printed). There are a lot of selection criteria available for sorting (particular ORS, Sentence Type, Sentences, etc). This allows for flexibility in running reports.

2. Service Request # 2559 – Request for edit to prevent sentence closure if open sanction exists. By putting edits on sentence closure it impacts the Institution in OISC. This edit

could prevent Institutions from admitting the person in the system. Therefore, a modification to Service Request. That on sanction side...it will allow to complete the sanction if the sentence has been closed...no changes...only closure. The question was raised whether anyone objects. No objections were raised. Will likely take place sometime during next year. Meanwhile, support staff will have to open the sentence, allow you to close the sanction, then reclose the sentence. NOTE: The issue regarding affects on Institutions also impacts the request for an edit to prevent sentence closure if tracking conditions not completed in CIS. A modification to the request being looked at.

3. New Condition code ZERO is now in the table and is available. A bug prevented the availability, but the bug has been fixed.
4. The CMPF code has been added to the table in the Release Plan (replaces OTHER with description of Compensatory Fine).
5. Question from SOON. A PO changed an offender to another caseload (F11, 4, O...but not from option 22). It was discovered that any PO can do this. Question asked if we should leave this authority with all POs or just with FAUG Reps or take it away completely. Decision made to remove the authority from all users, including FAUG Reps. A PO that needs the authority can get authorization to be added to support staff menus.
6. Update on OACC Reports Committee. Steve Berger heading that committee. Regarding reports, the group discussed current LS/CMI reports and any changes/modifications they felt were needed. A big issue is on DOC resources. Request made to allow access to PSC and LS/CMI from CIS or CMIS. The problem with this request is that Shawn Miller is the only person able to do this. He has no help. There have been significant issues moving reporting from the old to the new server. Additionally, the budget issues are coming due for legislature, so LS/CMI reports are not going to progress quickly. Some of the info on the reports is confusing. Laura Medcalf is going to help with the report info. The current report is only pulling data on Felony Offenders in CMIS. This is because Directors wanted data on funded caseloads, but this doesn't give info on caseloads as a whole. The Misdemeanor caseloads can be incorporated into the reports with modifications. However, it was discovered that it would be a huge undertaking, so they will simply create another set of reports that will run both Felony and Misdemeanor caseloads. The number 1 priority on the PSC reports is regarding the usage of the PSC. Directors want the report monthly...and for it to include the override reasons, as well. Shawn Miller will later create a self-generating report in CMIS. The next priority regards the Misdemeanor offenders. Another is LS/CMI report for overdue behavior change plan. Includes offenders if there has been no action in last 6 months. Not all counties are using the behavior change plan. A question was raised as to the cutoff timeframe for LS/CMI list on the overdue list. It was believed that the LS/CMI should be done within 60 days, but the list is showing the offender in blue (New/Due) for only 30 days, then showing overdue. The Directors will have to approve this change. Laura Ritchie has to make all of the requests. Wende will make the request to Laura to move it to 60 days. The group also asked about reports for Stable Acute, Static 99R, ODARA and Polygraph. The reports will be created in CIS. A Service Request will go in, likely around beginning of the year. Work will be done with SOSN and FVSN to find out data needed. The committee reviewed how to work better with ToDo List and working with OTTO.

The group wanted an OTTO notifier for the Stable. It would not go in with current request on OTTO...which only addresses the PSC. If a module (i.e. Polygraph) is created, but no reports are entered...reports cannot be run. A remedy is being sought. Recommendation that future FAUG agendas include a "Reports" item.

**Treatment Module**

**Tina Potter**

The Courts have authorized online Tx in Tri-Counties area. Can we create "WEB" as a Tx code? No objections.

**IRT's for INPR status**

**Vickie Fisher**

We were unable to get to this item due to lack of time.

**Roundtable**

**Group**

**Tracy (Malheur Co)** – Tx closures (admin successful/unsuccessful). What is appropriate closure if the offender is nearly finished, but PPS expires prior. If within their power to complete the program within the timeframe of supervision, then they should have done so and the closure would be unsuccessful. Each case needs to be evaluated individually to

**Gina (Marion Co)** – Is OMS being used to replace CIS? Answer is no. There is no money to replace the program at this time. As new programming comes up, it is attempted to be developed in OMS. There are limits to this development, however.

Question about printing the Case plan and action plan. Request made to have the "next report date" and "strengths and accomplishments" from the Case Plan inserted into the Action Plan. It would be an enhancement to combine the Case Plan into the Action Plan.

**Lily (Josephine Co)** – on the F11, 5 menu, can "CMA" be changed to "LS/CMI"? Laura Medcalf would be the person to contact about making the change.

**Bob (Deschutes Co)** – In the Behavior Change Plan, the Goal Details were not printing. It has been reported and is being corrected with next enhancement.

When the Change Plan auto-chronos CIS, it does not say what was entered in the goal details. If the auto-chrono could include the info in OMS. This will not be changed. The chrono box is the only place to enter a chrono that will go automatically into CIS.

**Dru (Jefferson Co)** – Going to use E-Court. Yamhill Co already using it. Jefferson, Crook and Lane is going Dec. 10. Some of the forms don't work well in E-Court, so the Court will not be allowing a combination Motion/Order in one form. It must be a separate form. This is an FYI to all counties that this may affect business with those Courts.

Group ran out of time to continue with Roundtable. Any pressing issues should be addressed via email.

**NEXT MEETING – Tillamook County**  
February 20-21, 2013