

Day One

Introductions/welcome/housekeeping

Present – Susan Sowers (Benton); Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Erin Larson (Coos); Rich Vigil (Crook); Bob Lucas (Deschutes); Roger Stampke (Harney); Shaun Anderson (Hood River); Michael Elkinton (Jackson); Dru VanRiper (Jefferson); Lili Frank (Lake); Larry Evenson (Lane); Donovan Dumire (Linn); Gina Courson (Marion); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Wende Kirby (Multnomah); Angela Boyer (Polk); Robin Fillbeck (Tillamook); Tina Potter (TriCounty); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Betti Spencer (Yamhill); Lee Cummins (DOC); Mary Hunt (DOC); Shawna Harnden (Parole Board); Tanner Wark (OACCD/Deschutes); Kurt Symons (Jefferson); Meredith Allen (DOC Release Counselor – DRCI)

Minute review

February 2013 FAUG Meeting Minutes approved w/o corrections/modifications

Roundtable

Polk Co – Angela states that POs in her office have reported an issue with getting kicked out of AS400 when working with addresses. Other counties state that some of their POs are having the same issues. Chris Bell states she has worked with Dave Wells on this issue, but no resolution yet as they are unable to figure out why issue occurs. Mary Hunt says issue is random/intermittent and has been unable to be recreated. Several tickets have been entered in the past and no resolution has ever been found. Mary believes this issue may have some connection to the linkage errors raised in prior meetings (using “Info Windows” rather than using the “Full Screen”). It has been noticed that the changes being made to the address are taking effect, despite the user getting kicked out. Suggestion offered that users experiencing this be cognizant of what steps are being used to get to the address screen...this may help to track down the problem. Mary suggests to not change offenders in the Info Windows (F11, 4, X)... and instead, recommended that users go to main screen (w/w Caseload) and use option 15. SOON and Fee Group are requesting to make a separate main menu option to change addresses rather than having to back out to change offenders.

Benton Co – Susan states that her office has had an Option 24 issue. When selecting multiple offenders and the DOCSUM file is downloading, the system would time out and never fully load the DOCSUM file. Susan states that Ted Mitchell has emailed her; telling her that the issue has been fixed as part of a rewrite. This rewrite was supposed to have been released last night and should now be in effect. No other members reported similar issues. Mary Hunt said that the issue of the multiple selection not sorting alphabetically is being corrected, as well.

Washington Co – Christopher brought a request from his office that when POs are accepting IRTs, that they put a date on the document they send that indicates the date that the IRT is being accepted. This issue raised by clerical staff who are having to research some transfers to determine the date to release the client from Washington Co before sending the file to the receiving county. Most offices are stating that their forms have the

date as part of the form...or if the receiving county is notifying the sending county of the acceptance by email, that it is the date of the email. This info to be taken back to Washington Co.

Washington Co – Christopher brought request from his office that the employment info field in AS400 be auto-updated if the PO entering a chrono (indicating a significant contact w/ the Offender), unless the PO manually makes a change. Point was raised that with using OMS to enter the chronos, the system requires the PO to manually enter the info before the chrono can be added. This will eliminate the need to fix AS400 to auto-update the field. The OMS system is being highly encouraged as the system to utilize in entering info...therefore, the decision is to not recommend any changes to AS400.

Deschutes Co – Bob raised a question about the email generated when an offender is arrested on Board Warrant. Currently, the email has the “arrest date” populated with all zeros. Bob asked if the date of arrest be populated with the actual date of arrest. Shawna states that they always enter the date of arrest in the system that the Board uses. This is how they calculate Inop Time. Lee says that when Board takes action in PBMIS, the data should be mirrored in the DOC system and this may be the action that prompts the auto-email. Shawna will take it back and work with Board and DOC IT staff to see how the two systems communicate with each other and see how to make the date populate on the notification email.

Deschutes Co – Bob asked how other counties are handling offenders’ static factors which hold LS/CMI scores at MED? Recommendation made that if the PSC score is LOW, to not override based on LS/CMI. If the PSC score is MED or HI, then a Policy override should be done, based on conformance, in order to reduce the risk level. The Policy override should be based on County Policies, rather than individual PO practices.

Deschutes Co – Bob asked about offenders overridden to LOW based on unavailability (in custody, etc) still appearing on Home Visit lists. Chris Bell reports that offenders used to be moved to LTD and would therefore be excluded, but LOWs have always been included on the lists, based on the practice in their office of doing HVs on LOW cases. Suggestion was made to make an option to run the HV list and be able exclude LOWs, if the PO so desires. Lee says this contact standard piece is old programming and may not be an option. In the next phase of PSC to be rolled out, it may have programming to allow for this. Suggestion made to resurrect the LTD risk level. This has previously been raised, but is currently tabled. Wende is working with the Reports Committee and they are finding that a lot of reports are not working properly...and some reports are going to be revamped. Additionally, OTTO may resolve this issue when rolled out.

Deschutes Co – Bob asked why, on HV lists, if using “V” code for victim, it is not counting in AS400 as a HV. This was supposed to be corrected previously. Mary will check to see if this can be fixed as a ticket.

Deschutes Co – Bob raised issue with Behavior Case Plans...that when IRT being done and the sending county has not completed a BCP (still in progress), that the receiving

county is not sure if they should complete the old BCP. Recommendation to send this to Jeff Hanson to address. Suggestion made to add an ADMN code to administratively close old BCPs. Assessment/Case Management Committee will keep track and prioritize within the group any issues with LS/CMI. FAUG Reps can send issues to this group. Larry will remind the members in this committee to bring resolutions back to FAUG for approval. Wende said that items which are not applicable any longer are being closed out and any still-relevant items will be built upon.

Multnomah Co – Wende asked for list of sanctions which are now 120 days old or older to avoid having another big cleanup list. Shawna states that the 120 day limit is there because the Board can only hold for 120 days. The Board has to lift their hold on the 120th day. Therefore, the Board wants sanctions to get to them well before the 120th day. Shawna will look to see if there is a report that she can run on their system that will show old sanctions.

Jackson Co – Mike raised issue that a Parole Compact case that is not able to have sanction closed because the Board is not involved with that parole and the “Parole” status prevents the FAUG Rep from closing the sanction. Lee says these have to be sent to her to close.

Parole Board

Shawna thanked everybody for working with the Board during the last year with all of the changes going on at the Board. An announcement for new Hearing Officer closes on May 21st. Abby’s job rotation ends on May 22nd. Malinda Boyer is the new Sanctions point-person.

Mary raised issue regarding PPS/Board cases – she states that SOON Reps have brought up an issue that in some offices, some of the POs will ask to close out a case even though the discharge paperwork hasn’t been received from the Board. Some POs are demanding that the cases be closed despite the paperwork not having been received even after the clerical staff explain that they cannot close the case without it. Mary asked Shawna to explain why support staff cannot close cases without the discharge paperwork. Shawna says that if the last action on a particular case was Board Warrant or Suspend/Detain and the case is past its Expiration Date, the case will not be discharged until the Sanction is completed on Board’s end. This is to prevent cases from accidentally being discharged (i.e. whilst on ABSC status). Another reason is to verify that Inop time has been calculated correctly. Shawna states that if there is a case that a PO believes should be discharged, but hasn’t been, email her to inquire.

ICOTS – Compact

Ruby not present – but was honored with Employee of the Year award today.

DOC Update

- OACCD – Tanner Wark – Question was asked “how long does county have before a specialized assessment and override done?” He states that there is not a

policy override for a tool...overrides are only based on county policies. He reminded that the PSC is a sorting tool only. Counties should notify DOC of policy overrides. Directors are able to check caseloads to see the number of overrides being done.

- NOTE: John Watson and Tanner Wark are the OACCD liaisons for FAUG. Awareness is attempting to be made that all automation suggestions come back through FAUG for approval.

Request was made for LTD and Very High levels to be added (for supervision purposes...not for funding purposes). This has been brought to OACCD. Tanner states that the risk scores drive funding. He says that a decision needs to be made where cutoff scores would lie. This request is being made to allow POs to discern between LOW/LTD on combined caseloads. Some counties would like to differentiate between a reporting and non-reporting case by assigning a non-reporting case with the LTD risk level. Point raised that although most counties' philosophies are that LOWs are not supervised, this is not what is really happening within the offices. On many LOW caseloads, the reporting/non-reporting cases can be fluid; going from reporting to non-reporting status and back again; thus creating a workload issue for case reassignments. This has been tabled during this legislative session; but may be included in next phase of updates.

Release Plan – Meredith Allen (Deer Ridge Release Counselor) asked that POs utilize the Acceptance/Denial function in the Release Plan (P/A/X).

Meredith states that if DOC tries to create a plan when a still-open Local Control plan exists, they cannot create the new plan until the open plan is closed. In the past, they have gone in and changed it or have deleted them...which is deleting/changing history. Recently, Release Counselors have been instructed to send them to FAUG Reps, but it was soon learned that the FAUG Reps cannot change the status because of the "Institution" status of these cases. Mary and Lee are the only people who can complete the open Local Control Release Plans. However, they don't always know whether they should close them. They have run a query (sorted by County) of open plans and handed them out to the FAUG Reps. These plans should be closed.

Meredith was asked to give FAUG Reps some info about Release Plans. She says it is of dual-purpose (for the Parole Board to create conditions with...and for the POs to know the plan being proposed). Release Counselors have had questions about LC cases being included in case plans. Release Counselors have been unclear if a LC case is still active...and they need to know if the Board should put conditions regarding the LC case in the plan. Meredith said it would also be helpful to know if a Probation is still active or has been revoked. It was recommended that a chrono to explain the status of the probation cases (i.e. upon file closure) to help Release Counselors know what to do with those cases. Acceptance/Denials in the case plan is very helpful...Meredith asked that POs please continue to use that. If there are questions/concerns, please raise them.

Question was asked of Meredith about the “Field Trip”. Meredith said that inmates (incarcerated over 12 yrs with no family/support in community) can have the Transition Coordinator and/or Release Counselor take them out and show them how to use their Oregon Trail card or use the bus route. This is to alleviate some anxiety of the long-term inmates who are ready to release.

Meredith says the plan is to have a Release Counselor attend FAUG meetings if they are near a facility to keep channels of communication open.

FYI – Meredith states that the trend is to go away from calling Inmates or Offenders as “Inmates/Offenders” and the shift is to call them “Adults in Custody” or “Incarcerated Adults”. The idea is to remind the Inmates that they are adults and that they are responsible for their decisions and the consequences that come with those decisions. The Oregon Youth Authority has been using the term “Youths in Custody” for some time now.

DOC Update

- Automation Sub-Committee – Lee said that the sub-committee did meet for last time on 4/9/13. The decision is that this committee will no longer meet. We have our conduits that will report to OACCD Exec now. OACCD President is Scott Taylor (Mult Co). He was asked by Automation Sub-Committee member how they are to get their message to them. It is a work-in-progress and they are redeveloping their own Automation Sub-Committee. One issue raised is that there are a number of user-groups and would help if there are lists of service requests (called a “Service Request Report”) to know what Service Requests other groups are requesting and whether they want to join in. The question was asked whether FAUG wants this as well (stating that the Fee Group has already requested this). No FAUG Rep opposed. Lee/Mary wants to be made aware if there are any issues with FAUG Reps feeling as though decisions are being made w/o including FAUG. They recommended that queries be run occasionally for open sanctions. The Automation Sub-Committee can be reconvened if need-be.
- Risk Assessment Workgroup – The program ILearn was introduced. ILearn is a web-based learning program. A few counties and institutions are trying this program out. It could be expanded to include other types of training. Donovan, Angela, Wende, Lee and Jeff Hanson are working out logistics of this program. Question asked about what other types of training should be included. Lee will keep us apprised. There is a tracking system to track trainings attended/completed. This part is more expensive than the training pieces being offered. It was pointed out that the trend noticed is of a multi-generational workforce; with new-hires being more tech-savvy and existing employees used to older-style systems...ILearn could possibly bridge the gap. Meredith says that she uses the program and is able look at her transcript and can insert outside trainings in it, as well. The ILearn program is done at the user’s pace. Donovan states that it is helpful to have access to the same trainings that the Institutions

use. Upkeep of trainings offered and keeping the user IDs current are some issues found. The program has quizzes to help ensure that the user is paying attention to the materials being taught, rather than allowing the person taking the training to simply page through the program to get to the end. The ILearn system doesn't link to DPSST, but the user can print the transcript and send it to DPSST.

Day two

DOC Update

- **PSC** – Lee said that DOC is trying to go over remaining items in PSC, particularly the formula itself (i.e. Why does this person show up this way? How is FAPA factored in?) She reminded FAUG members that conviction data is not pulled from OJIN, but instead is pulled from CIS. Based on delays that may exist in some counties in getting recent conviction orders, the PSC may take longer to be current. Lee reports that it is hard to exclude certain things out...the formula bases data on the client themselves, rather than the details of their convictions. Example: Lee says that Lily M. found that Compact offenders (which has info excluded from PSC) which later picked up an Oregon case would have that Oregon case excluded from the PSC. This is because these clients themselves have been excluded based on their Compact status. However, if the offender's status changes from Compact to a local community supervision case (Probation, PPS/LC or PPS/BRD), then the data will be included. Additionally, LEDS data is only updated monthly. The data can be retrieved daily, but it is not being done yet. All of this is creating inconsistency between the PSC and CJC website. This issue is being worked on to be able to include all relevant data. Lee has entered a service request. DOC is looking at hosting the CJC website to keep the data as their own and not have these discrepancies between PSC and CJC scores.

Lee states that Lily M. also found that she was able to remove an override on a case she received from IRT and then could not put it back. Lee states that the old OCMS system did not allow a PO in one county to enter an override on a risk score that a PO in another county entered. The question was raised in the OACCD Risk Assessment group as to why an override would be undone. A suggestion was made there and is now being brought to FAUG – should there be a time limit on ability to remove an override? ...or should there be an edit to prevent removing an override? In discussion, some suggested that overrides not be able to be removed. Others wanting to be able to have a more fluid risk level. Based on business practice of not overriding or adjusting risk level prior to sanctioning, the need still exists to keep the “delete override” option. Decision made to keep the “delete override” option...this decision will be taken back to the Risk Assessment group.

The question was raised as to how many people are using OMS. Most offices are not consistently using OMS to do most casework. It appears that training on OMS is the issue. Angela offering to provide some OMS training at next FAUG Meeting in Polk Co.

Request made to add a function to reveal detail of Proxy. Lee will see if this can be done w/o a service request. If it cannot, then it may be included in the Phase II release of the PSC.

There is also a recommendation that an edit be put in place to disallow an override to LS/CMI if one hasn't been done within 1 yr in the community or within 2 yrs of release from institution.

Currently there is a block to prevent doing a Proxy on a client that is in institution. When OTTO is online, the block will be lifted. OTTO will be advising when a risk level change is indicated.

Lee believes OTTO may be released in July. This has not been set for certain. Angela asked that an agenda item be added to August FAUG Meeting to discuss possible additions to the OTTO functionality.

Regarding DUII arrests on PSC detail, it is counted as person crimes, rather than statutory (as they are in ORS tables). When the PSC manual is expanded, it will be looked at. FMP cases are being excluded from PSC scoring.

Reassessments on PSC scores have been moved from the To Do List.

Suggestion made to Lee to add option to menu to display chronos. Most POs display the chronos from their w/w Caseloads screen. There does not appear to be a true need to add a menu option. Users can use OMS to access chronos.

Chris Bell had asked Lee if a client who closes out a supervision cycle on a FPR then comes in on new Misd supervision cycle, do we risk them with PSC? Decision is to do so because many counties do supervise Misd cases and the PSC is used for case assignments. There will not be a policy set on this, however.

Programming has said that to avoid undesired characters (or multiple pages of blank lines) in AS400, to put text in Notepad and then cut/paste into AS400 from Notepad (WordPad may also work). Lee states that Programming are wanting to not spend time/money to fix this. Charles states that he has heard from users that copying/pasting from Word to OMS then to AS400 has created problems. This has yet to be observed, but suggested that this be watched for. Bob states that many formatting problems disappear when using Text Editor function in AS400. NOTE: Bob notices that a workaround for the addition of the multiple pages of blank lines is to go into Text Editor, add a character, and then delete it and the multiple pages of blank lines disappear.

- **SOON issues** – An issue raised by SOON. They are able to delete offense/sentence data that had Inop Time already added to it. What resulted was that the offense/sentence data was deleted and the Inop Time was not (which left the remaining data as “ghost data”). An edit was added to require that Inop Time must be deleted first. This can be done on LC cases, but if a Board case, must go through the Board first.

A Service Request was made by OACCD for an edit that will not allow sentence closure if the outcome measure conditions are not accurate (CSWK, REST, CMPF,). Example: If restitution is ordered, but the amount is to be determined...and later is deleted by Court because restitution was not requested...and the PO does not bring this info to clerical, the condition will exist, but will not have an amount, and any payments tracked will create a negative balance. The edit will require that a restitution order with amount to be determined will be entered as a “NO” on “trackable condition” and if the amount is received, then the condition can be changed to trackable. The edit will also stop the user from entering a payment if when entering payments or adjusting balance it creates a negative balance in the condition. The edit will also prevent from altering unit balances if an initial unit amount hasn’t been added. Mary will make sure that users can still escape out if the edit prevents an action without locking the user’s computer.

Susan pointed out that currently several counties are using e-Court system and next year, the whole state will migrate from OJIN to e-Court...but the e-Court system does not show payments and will not break out the balances (REST, Comp Fines, etc). This issue is known. Mike will ask John/Tanner why we are tracking Restitution/Comp Fines when e-Court will not show amounts/balances.

Lane Co had been doing some clean up and were discontinuing a caseload. In the process of transferring off the offenders on the list, all active offenders were moved off and then offenders on outcounts were moved off. The staff noticed that there were 8 offenders on outcounts, but knew that there should have been more offenders on outcount status. The staff then ran a Parole Officer Report and it was found that 60 offenders were listed on outcount on that caseload, rather than 8 that showed originally. Somehow, by looking at caseload history on each offender and then going back to look at the outcount screen, the missing 52 offenders were one-by-one added back. It appeared that the system needed somebody to go in to “touch” the caseload history on that offender and it would refresh the caseload summary screen. Mary asked that FAUG Reps take back to their offices the request that if discontinuing a caseload, please go to the Parole Officer Report to double-check that all offenders are located.

- **FSN** – If automation changes happening and SOON or FAUG are doing testing that might impact them, be sure that SOON and FAUG are kept apprised.
- **SOSN – Static 99R, Stable/Acute and Polygraph Module** – Mary not able to go to last meeting. SOSN wanted more reports on the S99R, S/A and Polygraph Module. Mary has entered a request. The criteria still need to be outlined (elements needed, sort criteria desired), but the service request has been entered to get it into the queue. The next meeting is in Jefferson County in July. Mary plans to be present at that meeting.
- **Next meeting is August 21/22 in Polk Co.**