FAUG AGENDA

TILLAMOOK COUNTY
February 20, 2012 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
February 21, 2012 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Tillamook County Community Corrections
Meeting location: Tillamook County Sheriff's ATV Center
5995 Long Prairie Road – Tillamook, OR

Day One:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping   **Wayne/Group**

Present: Angela Boyer (Polk); Wende Kirby (Multnomah); Lee Cummins (DOC); Mary Hunt (DOC); Tina Shippey (Coos); Wayne McCollum (Tillamook); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Robin Filbeck (Tillamook); Tracey Coffman (Malheur); Gina Courson (Marion); Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Susan Sowers (Benton); Carolyn Knox (Lincoln); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Marco Beitl (Wasco); Justin Hecht (Clatsop); Jim Gravley (Grant); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Susie Strom (Hood River); Michael Elkinton (Jackson); Denise Sitler (DOC); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn); Betti Spencer (Yamhill); Shawna Harnden (Parole Board); Jay Scroggin (Parole Board); Hank Harris (DOC Release Services)

Minute Review   **Group**

Correction to last page – regarding E-Court system – should say Linn Co (rather than Lane Co).

Release Planning Process   **Hank Harris – DOC Release Service Mgr**

Hank reminded group that in the Release Plans, there is an electronic/automated acceptance/denial function within the plan. There are three codes:
- P = Proposed (used by Counselor when plan initially sent out
- A=Accepted
- X=Denied

Not all counties are using this function…some are simply using emails to notify Counselor if the Release Plan is accepted or denied; whilst others are putting the acceptance/denial in the chronos. Hank said the preference is to avoid using the chronos, as it can leave the Release Counselor without a notification that the Plan was accepted or denied. The desire is for more advance notice of the denials to allow the Counselor time to plan with the offender for a new plan/secondary choice.

ACTION ITEM: Hank asking FAUG Reps to ask POs to use the automated accept/denial function.

Question: Will this process create an auto-chrono or other way to notify the PO that there was any sort of activity with the plan? The primary case manager is the Institution Counselor, so the PO will likely not get any notice. The only activity on Release Plans that prompts an auto-chrono is when the Plan is transferred from one location to another.

Question: When a Release Plan is accepted/denied, does it need to be sent back to the Counselor/Institution? Whilst the Counselors can retrieve the plan at any time, it should still be sent

back to the Counselor. Although it is possible to forward the Release Plan to the Board, it should never be done by the PO.

Question/Concern: There are times when the plan is coming to the PO and also are already at the Parole Board. The POs cannot do anything with it when it is at the Board. By statute, the Release Counselors are supposed to have the plan to the Board w/in 60 days. Hank believes it may be possible that a Release Counselor is sending the Plan to the PO and to the Board and it is sitting with the Board. Hank can address the issue and ask that the plan be sent to the Board last, not at the same time it is being sent to the PO.

Question/Concern: POs are still getting initial release plans within 30 days of release. Hank believes it could be due to a calculation change at last minute or could be an issue with a particular Institution/Counselor. Hank will make himself available to discuss this. PO's can email Hank at: Hank.J.Harris@doc.state.or.us with questions or concerns.

Regarding making recommendations for Special Conditions; the Release Counselors have some directions about what/when conditions can be recommended. On occasion, it is the POs adding recommendations, as well. It would save Parole Board time if knows who is making the recommendations.

ACTION ITEM: Hank would recommend that the person making the recommendation for a special condition put their name (not initials) after the recommendation to indicate to the Board who is recommending the conditions. This will not create/require a programming change. FAUG Reps to take this recommendation to the POs in their offices.

Per Jay (Parole Board): Conditions regarding NoContact with Victim, as well as Alcohol Restrictions can still be recommended. High Profile package (especially Matrix cases) can have GPS/Geographic Restrictions recommended, too.

The issue has arisen regarding old Release Plans not having been completed. New plans cannot be created without completing the old plans. At one time, the old plans were being deleted, but this should never be done…nor should the old plans be modified and used to create a new plan. Most times, the non-completed plan is a Local Release Plan that is still sitting there, never completed…and the offender has since gone to the Institution. For now, FAUG Reps cannot complete them…so Counselors and/or FAUG Reps should forward the issue to Lee/Mary; as they have permissions to complete them.

ACTION ITEM: FAUG Reps are to advise their POs to close the Local Release Plans. Release Plans should be completed before it goes on Post.

Question to Diane: Can we run a query to see how many open release plans exist? She believes so and will run a query.

Issues have arisen with offenders on PPS/Board (nearing expiration) who also have Probation cases which are revoked. During the time the offender is serving their LC sentence, the Board case expires. If Board is notified, the Board will close their interest. If the Local office tries to send the new Order to the Board, the Board will not want it. The message "Community not allowed to transfer to the Board" will appear. However, if still Board Order is still active (not expired) and a LC Order is to be added, the LC staff cannot send that plan to the Board, either. Abby Firestone (Parole Board) said that the Community cannot send the LC Order to the Board. They can create it and notify the Board. The Board can then pull it and add it to the Board Order.

ACTION ITEM: FAUG Reps to advise Local and Clerical staff: Do not contact IT about this issue. The standard process for notifying the Parole Board of a LC Order can be either via email or fax of the Local Order.

Reminder regarding Waivers: It is crucial that these cases be investigated as quickly as possible to allow County of record time to plan in the event the waiver is denied.

There have been issues arising regarding "99"-ADP caseloads and nobody receiving the Release Plans sent to them. If issues arise regarding "99" caseloads, need to be sure that a User-ID are attached to the caseload. Clerical can assist.

OTTO & the PSC   **Diane Rhoutt – DOC**

Meetings held regarding the new OTTO program (to-do list for PSC to remind/alert PO when a PSC should be done). Diane and Rosa will be working on this. Mockups were passed around to show what the screen might look like…

An addition was made to the screen ("R" = Review changes). The PO will put an "R" in the option column and hit enter and can review the messages. This notification will come up until the change is made. The PO can also subset their caseload based on Review Messages. There are no huge changes, but POs will need to learn how to use this. The alerts are alert indicators…and when timeframes are established, the PO will get daily alerts after a certain point. Additionally, there is an audit piece to allow management to see if users are paying attention to their alerts/notifications. When programming up in test mode, we will be able to see it. Perhaps by next FAUG meeting, we may have the ability to see a dry-run of the program.

Reminder: OTTO can also be used for many other things, besides PSC…so it has the capability to be expanded to be useful in other job duties…so this can be considered in future for enhancements.

The workgroup had to consider the types of offenders to include and the types to exclude. The following are the excluded types:
- AP – Admit Pending
- DI – Discharge
- HL – Hold Code – no longer used
- IN – Inmate
- IV – Investigation
- LC – Local Control
- LP – Leave Pending
- SP – Second Look Pending
- All outcounts exc. CMPO

The types of notifications for POs in need of being developed:
- If a change in PSC level going up/down (behind the scenes operation) occurs.
- If a change in PSC matches an override level (i.e. if the PSC is LOW and overridden to MED and later, the PSC becomes MED)
- If offender comes in on an initial custody cycle or status change from non-accepted cycle or return from outcount.

The Risk Assessment Workgroup has met. They have yet to make a determination if PSC is to be done on offenders on Leave status. They ordinarily fall out of funded pool. The question being considered is

can we exclude the requirement of a PSC Proxy… if while on Leave status a PSC was done…in order to avoid having to do it again because the person now is on Post.

Policy questions were taken to the workgroup last week. PSCs for offenders not on an outcount should be done within certain timeframe. On OCMS, the requirement was every six months. The subject of a six-month timeframe (for the initial PSC and for old cases still under OCMS scoring) is going to go to the OACCD Exec Team.

PSC and the Budget…the Budget is tied to PSC scores. Cutoff scores were decided by creating a percentage in each category (HI, MED, LOW). It was anticipated that 10% would come out as HI, but it actually came out to be nearly 24%...even more for MED. This could create an enormous budget that will not get approved. The question is being raised to OACCD as to how to address this for next biennium. This current biennium has already been figured.

Another issue being proposed to OACCD is regarding the 12,000+ Casebank cases. Will OACCD give the "green light" to override those back them down to LOW so that the PSC will not flag those cases as requiring an LS/CMI.

The PSC has been out since September 2012 and Laura has run the numbers…most counties doing OK with utilizing the PSC, but some, especially the larger counties, still have a lot of cases classified under OCMS scoring.

The old rule said offenders that have been on abscond status for over 6 months needed a new assessment…should this apply to PSC? When offender comes out from outcount (not just ABSC), they should have a new assessment. OTTO should catch those cases because of the behind-the-scenes functionality and will alert the PO to do a new PSC.

Subject raised…if a Proxy is done on a case due to the "No PSC Score" reason and a PSC does become available, should PSC be required? Does it matter if the newly available PSC level is less than/greater than/equal to that of the Proxy? After discussion, due to tracking and statistics, it should be required. Question asked if it will also include "OOS" cases? Decision is to only include the cases flagged "No PSC Score" or "BOTH".

Question: Do we wait to rescore PSC if an offender is coming back off of ABSC status or should the PO serve the sanction first, and then rescore? This will not create a new admission, so unsure. Denise Sitler will verify as to when/why captured and advise.

Question: If an offender is being supervised on out-of-state only offenses (Compact) and the offender is fingerprinted to obtain a SID, will that create a "conviction" and make a PSC available? Incoming compact offenders have been excluded from formula for PSC. All conviction data comes from CIS…and if Oregon statute entered into CIS, the PSC will think that is an Oregon crime…and will create a PSC…so it has been excluded to avoid this problem. At this time, this even includes offenders that have an Oregon CCH.

Question posed to FAUG members; whether to use the PSC test group or volunteers from FAUG to do testing. It would be best if there were test caseloads…however, OTTO is not changing any data, so can use live caseload data. Volunteers were requested: Bonnie Timberlake, Angela Boyer, Wende Kirby, Susan Bowers, and Tracey Coffman volunteered.   NOTE: The OTTO message system can have multiple primary POs and the notifications/emails will go to all of them.

CMS/LSCMI Updates & Reports   **Laura Medcalf – DOC**

Lee talked with OACCD Exec Team about FAUG concerns that the LTD level not included in the PSC. The Exec Team said they want the Liaisons (John Watson and Tanner Wark) to take it to the committee.

It has been noted that a person can still go to Judge's CJC website and get a different PSC score than what will result in CIS. It is important that DOC site update the CJC site, but this has not yet been done. It is on hold for now, but this will be addressed. Reminder: until then, it will be possible that the DA or Judge could see a different score than CIS will give. Reminder: a conviction isn't available to be factored into the formula until it is entered into CIS and the overnight process is run.

"Policy" overrides to the PSC: The workgroup expressed concerns about POs possibly using the "Policy" override reason code as a "PO Discretion" avenue. The workgroup will take it to the group before next OACCD meeting. They want to build a joint document between OACCD and DOC as to what should constitute a "Policy" override.

A new issue was noted: The use of an old LS/CMI assessment to override PSC/Proxy score. In some cases, when using LS/CMI to override the PSC…the LS/CMI could be old…and no edit exists to require a more current LS/CMI assessment. LS/CMI's should be done/updated yearly. This issue will be going to OACCD Exec committee to see if it should go into the PSC rule.

Issue: Once someone overrides PSC/Proxy due to local policy, how long does county have before it must run the specialized assessments and change override? The workgroup's recommendation is 90 days. This will go to Exec Team for discussion.

Issue: Will scoring of Proxy include the instant offense? This has not yet been discussed and is for future discussion with workgroup.

Next Risk Assessment work group meeting is March 13. Let Lee know if there are anything to be brought to the group.

Parole Board   **Shawna Harnden**

Discussion about old, open sanctions and the use of the CNLA code. The Board is working with Lee and Helen (programming). Question raised - should they do one big swoop to auto-close old, open sanctions? The original answer was no. The question was re-presented to them recently because numbers not going down fast enough and perhaps, a mass auto-close would be a better solution. The decision was made to do so…therefore, all open sanctions older than 120 days (on Board cases) will be auto-closed with "CLNA". The CLNA closure code indicates that the Board is not looking at the sanction…only closing it.

Staffing: There is a new sanctions person: Malinda Boyer…still in training. Sanctions had been behind due to a prior employee (no longer working at the Board), so the Sanctions Desk is currently in chaos, but slowly getting the numbers down. If old sanctions are not getting resolved…and it is not a CLNA issue, contact Shawna.

Staffing: Of the14 staff, the Parole Board have 7 that do admin functions that pertain to the POs. Of those, the Hearings Officer, Warrants Desk, Sanctions Desk and Orders Desk all have new people working on them. There are 2 new Board members in past 6 months: Amber (from Umatilla Co and a background in PO work) and the Chairperson; Kristen W Y. She is familiar with administrative law. With all this transition, the annual HO training has been postponed. The Board are trying to get it going again in October.

There is legislation upcoming that affects Parole Board. HB2549 (a House Judiciary Bill). It proposes changes from the current SO system to a "Tier System" (based on static99)…and it will replace language for predatory designation. State Police will still be gatekeeper for this. The legislation also addresses application for relief from the system (stating that a "Level 1" person would become eligible to apply). Board is interested because other states use a separate Board to address SO issues, making it specialized and taking it out of Parole Board's function. However, the Governor doesn't want a new Board of Commission; instead, wants the responsibilities to stay with the current Parole Board. Currently, the Parole Board are having to catch up on missing Static 99's (mostly discharged cases). They will contact the (discharged) offenders with a questionnaire and notification of the new system. When the process is done, the individual will have the right to petition for a review of their score to see if it can go down in level (e.g. Level 3 to Level 2). Level 3 offenders will be on state Police website. The application for relief would come to the Parole Board, not individual counties. They will reach out to local DA Office and ask if they would like to be heard. Challenge to Tier and relief will cost $240 to file. To accomplish this task, two Admin II positions will work on the Static99 cleanup. One of those positions will "sunset" in 2017, leaving only one. An Operations Policy Analyst will write rules and be in charge of the add/review process and a Board member will need to be added…making a total of four positions to be added. A Hearing is set for next Thursday. There seems to be a lot of interest, but the cost is likely to be enormous. Parole Board is neutral on this bill.

Regarding Hearings Officer issues, if POs feel their questions are not being answered from the Hearings Officer's email, they can email the general email address.

ICOTS – Compact   **Ruby McClorey**

Ruby unable to attend this meeting. No questions were raised by FAUG that need to be taken to Ruby.

DOC Update   **Lee Cummins**

- **Automation Sub-Committee**

   The subcommittee has been reconvened. The next meeting will be April 9th. This is a venue for FAUG to take automation issues.

- **Sanctions**

   In regards to the old, open sanctions (see Parole Board discussion for further details), DOC is trying to pull a query of cases with open sanctions that were done *when case was in Board status*. It is not a perfect query…has about 99% accuracy. Sometimes, the sentence structure is confusing and the query doesn't know what to do. If FAUG Reps notice that a Local sanction was closed CLNA (in the mass auto-closure) and should not have been, notify Lee/Mary and they can correct it.

   A report was run, showing over13,000 open sanctions and of those, about 2,300 are Board cases. The question raised: can we close all open sanctions automatically? Prior FAUG discussions showed in favor. The "AUTO" code auto code will be used…and will use the same date that the Board will use on theirs (to show consistency). This will affect open sanctions older than 120 days. FAUG approve. Concern raised that Lane Co automatically create sanction when a warrant is requested. This may create problems where their sanctions are being closed whilst the offender is still on ABSC status. Lane Co is not in favor of this…as the business practice there is that their supervisors will not approve warrant request until the sanction is done. Jay will talk to their Director about this. Lee will keep FAUG updated on dates.

With the current edits, there should never be a backlog like this again.

Concern raised as to whether a mass auto-close will create confusion to institution where old sanctions are closed without updating the "sanction given" field. This may prompt requests from the institutions to the POs for information. Lee will look into this.

Question ask if periodic reports could be sent out to prevent a future buildup. This is a one-time closure. The reports regarding Sanctions w/o Movement may give some assistance, but it would be preferred to have a report to assist management to know if the numbers are starting to accumulate. Mary is on Reports Committee. They have talked about allowing Sanctions reports to be run at any time. They can review this to see if this is a possible report.

FAUG Authority Sheet passed out to show what FAUG Reps can do until the AutoClose is done. The permissions are tied to CURRENT status…so a FAUG Rep can close a Board sanction if the case is currently NOT in PPS/Board status.

Interventions can be completed, but not deleted. The Board do not care about Interventions ("V" types), but welcome the information if the PO decides to send it to the Board. The Board will look at any Interventions sent to the Board, but it is not required…as no decision is being made. However, there have been cases where an offender is being sanctioned hard on the Probation case and the PO will do an Intervention (on a major violation) on the Board case…and on some of these, this is concerning to the Board. Reminder: Any custody unit sanctions must be submitted to the Board ("S" types).

Question: Should Interventions be exempt from the edits that prohibit FAUG Reps from dealing with Interventions on Board status cases? FAUG response is that this is not an issue. Lee will see about how this will work on the programming side.

Question: Can FAUG Rep have permission restored to allow them to pull a sanction sent to Board accidentally. Lee advised that it cannot at this time.

Reminder: Compact Parole cases show as "PA" status. Don't contact Help Desk about dealing with sanctions on those cases. They don't know what to do with it. Contact Lee or Mary on those cases.

- **LS/CMI & CMA**

  There hasn't been much work on CMA or LS/CMI recently.

  Lily had asked to modify the menu (F11, 5, M) to state "LS/CMI" specifically. This was done by Diane yesterday. Other items requested by Lily in her email (dated 2/14/13) will be added to list for service requests.

  DOC has now made changes to the Intake procedure. All incoming inmates will receive a complete LS/CMI during Intake process. Existing population, however, will not be included in this change. But, if an inmate is being evaluated for AIP, they must have current LS/CMI.

  A question was raised to FAUG group from SOSN – Jeff Hansen asking for FAUG input: SOSN wondering if the Stable 2007 constructs (domains) could be added to the behavior change plan/domain sections. FAUG did not see any obvious concerns/issues. Lee will advise Jeff

Hansen. Since institutions are also using the same dropdown list, they must be given a chance to weigh in on this issue, as well. Further discussion about this: Bonnie Timberlake advised that Jeff's LS/CMI Training Group have been evaluating the case plan to review for potential changes. Wende believes that there already was a SO-specific domain, but there were complaints about the objectives available for use in the Case Plan. Laura Medcalf said there were also concerns expressed that LS/CMI domains should not be altered. Additionally, the institutions are asking for a bunch of action items from the Mark Carey guides to be added. There will be future discussion on this.

- **OACCD**   **Lee Cummins**
Meeting March 13-14 in Yamhill Co.

DOC Update   **Mary Hunt**
- **SOON Issues**
An email was sent out Tuesday, 2/19/13. A while ago, OACCD wanted to create a service request that would add an edit which would require the entry of gender and race during admission process. The edit already exists on institution side, but not on community side. There are records out there without either/both field entered. The programming has been done. A report shows only 150 active offenders currently affected (this list has gone out to SOON Reps). However, several thousand discharged cases do exist (but, the edit will prevent any of those cases from having a new offense entered without entering the gender/race info). It was noted that some cases, such as incoming compacts on Conditional Discharges had situations where a particular state wasn't seeing the offender, so this info was left blank. The only choices for gender are Male/Female. An "Other" category once existed, but this is no longer an option. The gender also impacts the PSC score. The Race field has an F4 prompt to select a category. "Unknown" is an option for Race. The gender/race info can be corrected, if necessary. This is a function of the support staff who would be doing the entry. This is just an FYI for FAUG.

ACTION ITEM: FAUG Reps to advise their offices that a clean up list being distributed…and if PSC is done prior to clean up, then another one must be done to accurately calculate, based on gender. Reminder: It does require the 24-hour update time prior to running the new PSC. Helen will run a final list to see if any remaining active cases to be updated.

Clerical staff use a lot of processes/screens for the admission process…starting with an initial screen and moving forward from there. It was recently discovered that, although everything appears to be entered correctly, not all of the info shows as it should. It has been found that some of this is due to a "linkage error". If the clerical staff starts a process and they change offender mid-process, this can cause linkage errors. Clerical staff must F3 back to initial screen in process *before changing offender* to avoid this.

Day Two:

DOC Update (day 2)   **Mary Hunt/Lee Cummins**
LEE

* Text Editor issues when POs went into a Sanction in the Sanction Module and was trying to add lines…caused problems. If edit done to remove F13 Insert and F14 Delete functions, it can resolve this and prevent crashing. POs can still use the Text Editor functionality and would therefore have to use this feature to insert or delete text. There is a limit on how much text can be added. Max number of

text lines if 435. FAUG sees no issue with this. Not much programming needed. This should be able to be done relatively soon.

* Lily noticed that Option 23/24 would bring up blank fields. It was found that 11756 Treatment records exist that associate to Treatment Programs which not in the Treatment Module master table. OMS cannot handle this. Diane believes that she can program around this. She can recreate a table with all the old programs…going into the expired table. This should address the issue without any side affects. Can still see the old Treatment Programs in the module by subsetting for the expired programs.

* Issues with new delivery system with mailmerge function with one PO in Yamhill Co and most POs in Washington County. The issue in Yamhill Co could be a record problem. Betti can send a message to Ted Mitchell to see about addressing it. Ted Mitchell and IT staff in Washington County are working on the issues in Washington County.

* Question was raised about the certificate error when accessing LEDS and now with new Option 23/24 delivery function. Ted Mitchell has said that it should be fixed shortly.

* Also noticed that with new mailmerge function, the PO name is not being merged same as before. Could be issue with Employee Maintenance Table (EMT). How name is entered on description line in DOC could cause issue, but other counties are noticing same thing and EMT has not been altered.

MARY

* Asked about email sent out earlier regarding W/W Supervision Fee menu option. On CCPPO menu, option 6, W/W Supervision Fees exist where the POs can enter fee payments. She asked if there is any issue with removing this option. This will prevent POs from entering fee payments. FAUG agreed that only those with authorities should be entering this info. By removing the option, this will prevent the POs from accessing the W/W Fees option. If POs need to have access to this option, they should go through the process of gaining permissions. In Yamhill Co, the POs create the DOR report document (option 26). This will not affect this function. Those who should have Fee access can still send the info to DOR in an automated program. FAUG doesn't see any issues with removing this option from POs menus. A few fields are missing on DOR side, but they don't use those fields anyhow…no changes will be seen on PO side.

* SOSN: Mary attended meeting last month to talk to them about OACCD Reports Committee. Besides LS/CMI and CMA reports the group has been working on, the group also wanted reports on Static99R, Stable Acute and Polygraph. Mary advised SOSN that this is being worked on by the group. Mockups for each report are being created and will be brought to next SOSN meeting. Mary will keep FAUG informed.

DOC Update   **Tanner Wark / John Watson**
- **OACCD**
  John Watson could not be present. Mike E. can take any concerns/questions to John to take to OACCD. CoChair is Tanner.

Roundtable   **Group**

Wende (Multomah), asked about adding "email" as a selection for "place" code in DOC chronos. Most POs seem to be using "Mail" for email communications. FAUG agrees "email" should be added to the table.

Wende (Multnomah), asked about adding a place to enter Offender's email address in the system. Response is that there is not enough real estate for adding this…so something must be given up if this is to be added. Lee can take this back to Diane to see if she has an idea…perhaps a new screen or window (i.e. F11, 4, Email).

Tracey (Malheur), asked about changing the phone field names (currently HmPh and WrkPh). General consensus is to just have 2 spaces for phones w/o names…or ability to tag the field as a "cell" or "home" or "work", etc. Multnomah Co is currently using a program that scrapes phone data to call Offenders re: supervision fees, appointments and Court dates. This change could affect that system.

Lee (DOC), RE: IRT for INPR status cases. Vicky Fisher asked about IRTs on INPR offenders. This should be addressed at OACCD. OACCD and SOSN have already discussed this…said that an Inactive case is on Inactive. Therefore, no IRT is to be done. Counties can notify another county that an INPR case has moved there as a courtesy, especially if a high-profile case. Jay also reminded that cannot reactivate INAC/PPS cases simply due to high risk status only.

Marne (Clackamas). Asked about transferring PSI's to DOC. Currently, the facesheet is being uploaded. There was a way to upload the word text (instead of just the facesheet), but counties lost the ability and now this is not available. Suggestion made that a ticket be sent with list of all PSIs; asking how to upload them to DOC. This will make the PSI available for review/use by Institutions.

Betti (Yamhill), asked about Treatment Module…any way to add email address or website to the Treatment record in the module? This would be a service request. FAUG agrees it would be a worthy service request. Additionally, a request made to add a line (with Y/N flag) to indicate the Treatment Program is part of the ManageAttendance program.

Justin (Clatsop) – Said he has to reset password when getting out of test program. Answer: Must F12 back to main menu. Cannot "90" (logoff) out of CCTEST.

Justin (Clatsop) – Two cases transferred to his caseload from another PO in office. The case is not showing on his caseload right away…takes a week or two. He is having to refresh a couple of times to get it to work. Mary said to have staff call her with this issue. This has happened in the past with the system not updating properly. Mary was able to fix it simply by "looking" at the screen…somehow this prompts an update. This could also track back to the "linkage error" problem mentioned on Day 1. SOON could request to have a menu option to just do caseload changes.

Justin (Clatsop) – Issue arising when doing a sanction (from caseload screen) and it is done and sent to Board or Supervisor...he gets kicked out and has to reenter. This is an info window, rather than a fullscreen window….and sometimes happens. This may be a ticket item. Lee will take this issue to Diane to ask if would be a ticket or service request. Mary had been emailed about POs doing sanctions and sending them to supervisors and it not showing up on supervisor's list…but in looking at this, it appears to be in Board status. This is probably the PO putting "Y" to send to Board at same time as sending it to the Supervisor.

FYI (Hood River Co) – Hood River Co have new staff: Supervisor Mary Simmons has come from Clackamas Co, plus a new PO just out of the academy.

Mike E. Question: Which counties still tracking Sanction Movement. The majority of counties are still doing so. The email with Sanctions without Movement reports still going out, but no action is necessary…the email is a FYI email only…it is solely for tracking purposes.

NEXT MEETING – Jefferson County
May 15-16, 2013