

# FAUG AGENDA

## Deschutes County

May 21, 2014 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

May 22, 2013 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### Meeting Location:

Deschutes County Community Corrections  
Programs Building  
63311 Jamison Road  
Bend, OR 97701  
(541) 385-3246

### Day One:

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

**Chris/Group**

In attendance: Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Justin Hecht (Clatsop); Erin Larson (Coos); Chris Bell (Deschutes); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Jim Gravley (Grant); Darrell Gilmer (Harney); Michael Elkinton (Jackson); Denise Easterling (Jefferson); Lily Morgan (Josephine); Allen Bergstrom (Klamath); Larry Evenson (Lane); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn); Gina Courson (Marion); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Wende Kirby (Multnomah); Angela Boyer (Polk); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Betti Spencer (Yamhill); Lee Cummins (DOC); Mary Hunt (DOC); Shawna Harnden (Parole Board); Ruby McClory (DOC-Compact); Tanner Wark (OACCD-Deschutes); Natalie Reyes (Multnomah); Angel Harp (Multnomah).

#### **Minute Review**

**Group**

Corrections to February 2014 minutes – email address for DNA lab was corrected.

#### **OACCD**

**Tanner Wark / John Watson**

RE: eCourts – We have been granted additional access in eCourts to permit viewing of documents, however, the access to Financial Obligations info was not yet granted. FAUG again requested that this be addressed by OACCD. Tanner will get back to OACCD about the Court Ordered Financial Obligations access. Chris B. recommends that we also work with our own Trial Court Administrators as a concerted effort to get the access to Court Ordered Financial Obligations info granted to users. John Watson is also working on this issue.

Multnomah County goes live on May 27, 2014. They have stopped updating OJIN.

## **Parole Board**

**Shawna Harnden**

Our newest Board Member (Michael Wu) started 3/3/14. He replaced Candace Wheeler. Candace had reached the end of her second term. Michael comes to us from Clackamas County where he was a District Attorney.

When the Sex Offender Notification Level System (HB2549) was going through Legislation; it was thought to be going into effect January 2017. After further review, it actually went into effect January 2014. Assessments are to be completed on all eligible sex offenders, those that are releasing from the institution and those that are in the community but have never had an assessment done. Any offender that releases on or after January 1, 2014, will no longer be given a 'predatory' designation by the Board. If the offender had a predatory designation prior to January 1, 2014, the designation will remain. Shawna also found out that the Courts have discontinued designating offenders as 'predatory', as well. With the new level system that is going into effect, it may be up for future discussion to create some type of notification process for Level III within CIS. There will be an appeal process, should the offender feel their newly assigned level is incorrect, they will need to follow the process to file an appeal, which the Board will review. The details to the entire process are unclear as rule has yet to be written. For now, nothing changes for POs until process/rule is written and adopted. The Board will send out info as it comes available.

When an offender has been issued a revocation, a release plan needs to be submitted to the Parole Board prior to the offender releasing from the revocation. When sending the release plan to the Board following revocations, please email them to Debra Zwicker, Orders Specialist, (Debra.L.Zwicker@doc.state.or.us).

Shawna will send out new staff roster. There are several new staff with the Board but we are fully staffed (finally). She will also advise what should be sent where. The website for the Board also has a "Contact" link that has the info on who does what and their contact information. She will look into adding a section on the website advising more detail of who does what.

Shawna mentioned in the past, sanction reports have been submitted that reflected notice of rights (NOR) as being administered but upon further inquiry found NOR was not administered. It is helpful to the Board if additional information in the text section is added advising "NOR administered, offender XXXX waived the hearing & 10 day period" or "NOR administered, offender XXXX waived the hearing but reserved the 10 day waiting period. 10-day waiting period begins on XX/XX/XXXX." It is helpful if that information is at the beginning of the report but if put at the end that works as well. Malinda Boyer, the Revocation Specialist, has to read every sanction that is submitted to the Board, she receives over 700 each month.

## **Compact**

**Ruby McClorey**

The Interstate Compact Office is short-staffed. They will hire a new DCA soon. There will also be a part-time position added to the budget package; awaiting approval. Char is also helping with Transfer Requests. It is hoped she will continue working on this.

Ruby and Woody's caseloads are being split alpha-wise on 6/1/14. Afterward, the request is to continue sending correspondence in the General Delivery email address – [Oregon.Interstate@doc.state.or.us](mailto:Oregon.Interstate@doc.state.or.us) – and if it is a (truly) urgent request, please put that in the subject line. Urgent matters are hoped to be responded to within the same week, if possible.

It was reported that if a case is terminated early, it may take a while to get the Order and get it to the receiving state so they can initiate the closure. Chris B. said that she has been able to change the "End Date" for the supervision in ICOTS and this action will prompt the receiving state to receive notice and then initiate the closure process.

### **Closing Board Sanction**

**Michael Elkinton**

Mike asked if issue will ever be addressed ... cannot close any open Sanctions that are in Board status. Lee had already advised about authorities. A huge amount of Sanctions were being completed in the field and this can lead to potential problems for the Board. Therefore, the FAUG authorities were reduced to disable changes to cases in Board status.

A lot of POs are still sending LC sanctions to the Board. Chris B. recommended adding an edit to DOC400 to try to prevent this from happening. Lee asked that we ask our offices to be more careful to not send LC sanctions to the Board.

The Board has learned that PBIS is going to crash, so the program is being rewritten. It appears it will be an improvement ... and furthermore, Laura Metcalf (DOC) is going to be working on the rewrite. Because she works with DOC400, she has insight into how the programs can interact better. After this is done, perhaps the Sanctions Workgroup can be resurrected to address issues.

Again, recently problems were noted with line spacing in Sanctions Module. Lee reminded the group of the limitations. The limitations are:

For PO text (448 lines = 8 pages)

For HO text (240 lines = 5 pages)

### **DOC Update**

**Lee Cummins**

**Mary Hunt**

**PSC** – Nearly all of the issues have been worked through at this point. The workgroup has been disbanded for the moment. A couple of issues are on hold for next update of PSC; including Limited Level restoration and DUll arrest v. conviction issues (a DUll arrest shows as a "person" category and the conviction shows as "statute"). Additionally, a couple of other issues are still being reviewed.

Pat Schriener had previously sent out an email to FAUG Reps – Asking the group's input on Proxy Override Codes. Decision was made to not allow the codes proposed.

The Compact Offender piece is still not working correctly. Cases for Offenders with out-of-state records were being excluded from PSC, but if the Offender had a previous OR criminal history, this also removed the OR history. Additionally, some Compact cases that should not have a PSC (because they should have been excluded) actually do have one showing in the system.

Denise Sitler sent out reminder that Leave Offenders will fall out of the “funding pool” if not assessed in 60 days of release. OTTO should remind POs that the Offender’s record needs attention. FAUG group was asked to remind POs in our offices to assess them promptly. FAUG was reminded to get PSCs done as soon as possible; especially when approaching the “snapshot” dates, so as to avoid Offenders being missed in the “snapshot”.

Budget Presentation for OACCD (done by Denise Sitler) – Denise would be glad to do the presentation for FAUG, if desired. FAUG group consensus is that it would be useful/helpful. Mike E. and Lee will arrange this for the August meeting.

**ILearn** – This is currently on hold – OACCD is still deciding whether it can be funded.

**PBIS** – A prior issue was that POs were not getting emails when Sanctions returned ... and this has been broke since 2010. This appears to now be working. However, it is noticed that if the UserID is not attached to that caseload, that PO will not get an email. Some POs now reporting they are getting the emails as they should. Sanctions returned are to be addressed promptly, for if not done within 120 days, the Board has to take no action. Shawna reminded the group that the CLNA code is not meant to be an ongoing-used code.

A list of Sanctions in RETU status report was handed out at last FAUG Meeting. A new list may be distributed soon.

**RI Code (for chronoing the Reach-Ins)** – the prior issue was that this code was being used as the “place” and “person” field. The decision is that it should only be used in the “person” field. The institution has a “RII” (place) code – was intended to be used for “Records Information”. The recommendation was to discontinue the code to avoid the confusion. Although this code does not show on the Community users’ table, it was still able to be accepted if the user input “RI” in the “place” field. This has been fixed. Verified that DOC400 considers “RI” not a valid “place” code.

**Release Plans** – A new query was run on open Release Plans. Lee will send it out. The open Release Plans on Offenders that are in the institution have been done by Lee (as she is the only one able to change those records). FAUG Reps are asked to close the others on the list.

Hank Harris had asked that ALL Release Plans be approved/denied in the system, but this is still not happening. FAUG Reps asked to remind POs in their offices to do this (using either “A” or “X” to accept or deny).

**UA Report** – Denise sends out the UA Missing Info Report. The question was raised as to whether FAUG Reps even use it? Most say that the reports are not used – but some do use them. This report is mostly for the institutions. The decision is to continue sending the reports and the FAUG Reps can just delete them if they don't use them in their offices.

**Notifiers** – It was previously asked if POs could gain “view only” access to the Notifiers in DOC400 records. This has been done (option 21 from main menu – then enter the Offender SID or look up by name). Change access will not be made available to POs, however.

**Website update** – The website is being updated. Mike E. has sent the updates; including Chair/Co-Chair/etc and FAUG Meeting Minutes.

## **SOON Issues**

**Lee Cummins**  
**Mary Hunt**

**OACCD Reports Committee** – Committee wants more info from CMIS; including Stable and Acute Scores. A request will be made to have that info field made into a DOCSUM code so that this info can be pulled for reports (and would also make it available for use in Merge documents). We can sponsor the Service Request and SOSN will be notified, but their approval is not necessary. When the DOCSUM code is available, Mary will advise.

**OOS** – A few issues had arisen regarding public (mainly Offenders) being able to see data on OOS. Offenders were calling offices to complain that their info still showed on OOS when their cases had expired. It was determined that those cases weren't yet closed by the POs. Advocacy groups did not like data on those Offenders on field supervision being made public. The Policy group has completely changed over time and so history was not remembered as to why it was done in the first place. A decision was made to remove all field supervision offenders from the site. Therefore, Community data has been pulled from OOS.

**New Dispositional Departure Data tracking** – SOON were in favor of tracking this data. Decision was to use 3 codes (U = Upward, D = Downward and N = None (default)). A 4<sup>th</sup> code (“O” for Optional Probations) was proposed to be added. And it was recommended that an edit be made to limit that code to cases with SGL scores of 8G, 8H or 8I. A corresponding report is being requested of Reports Committee to go with this field. A request may also include Optional Probations that are now serving their presumptive sentences. SOON wants to know if FAUG wants to include a column to indicate Departure cases on the Kardex. FAUG strongly agrees with this. There is room on the Kardex if certain fields that are no longer being used are removed from the Kardex. In addition to a Departure case flag, FAUG also identified a desire to include a column for the Grid Score (regardless of whether the case is a Departure case) on the Kardex. Mary will include this in a current Service Request that was OACCD-sponsored.

**Race code for Pacific Islander** – There was no code ever created for Pacific Islanders. Mary looked on NCIC, but did not see it there, either...but saw that this category was included under “Asian”. Therefore, the description for “Asian” in DOC400 was updated to include Pacific

Islander. Later, Mary found a new code in NCIC for Pacific Islander. Approval was granted to add "P" to the table. It will be included in a table update when final approval granted. Mary will send out notice when it is ready.

**Restitution** – A workgroup is meeting to develop a plan for improving percentage of Restitution being collected. Linn/Douglas Counties focusing on this at this point. It was learned that in the Conditions Tracking screen, any amount \$1M or more will not show accurately, due to insufficient space for the amount of digits. This issue was added to a Service Request currently in the works to expand the space.

**Caseload Definition File edits** – A caseload number was recently modified by a PO in Washington County accidentally whilst the PO was viewing the caseload info record. This was reported and the PO walked Mary through the steps he had taken when it happened. It was learned that, although the PO was in the viewing screen, the record was still able to be modified. This has been fixed with an edit.

A cleanup list was sent to SOON Reps to find caseloads without POs attached to them. Some caseloads were deleted when the POs no longer worked there. This should not be done. Now, such caseloads are designated as "Discontinued". Many Offenders on Outcount status were left on "Discontinued" caseloads. A list includes these Offenders. Another list shows Offenders not attached to any caseload at all. This includes some assigned to previously-used "regional" caseloads.

Multnomah County and SOON requested a cleanup list for Offenders being supervised where the PPS "O" line had never been entered. It was discovered that there are a number of such records out there. This can affect funding (because the case is not showing as supervised case, not accruing Supervision Fees, etc). First, a list will go out for current cycles missing an "O" Line. Then, a list will go out for ALL records without "O" Lines.

#### **Roundtable**

#### **Group**

Angie (Polk Co) – The PO info screen can be modified by any user. Question was raised as to whether this should be permitted. Only IT can update email addresses. Phone numbers can still be changed, however, as needed. This is as designed. No changes will be made.

Angie (Polk Co) – Question about whether sanctioning an Offender after abscond time in our current practice is following EBP. This issue has been forwarded to Denise for review.

Justin (Clatsop Co) – A Sanction was sent off for review – however, emails are not always going to appropriate PO when the Sanction is completed. Lee said this is a known bug. But, Lee asked Justin to send examples and to notate where the PO was working from when the error happened; in order to help identify where the problem is lying. It is thought that this may be tied to accessing the Sanction from the "F11, 4, xxx" function; rather than from the "W/W Sanctions" screen. There is a known bug in the Fee System that is similar.

Lily (Josephine Co) – Asked for Feedback on MH Court code to Conditions Table. Currently, it is being entered under "Other". There were no objections.

Betti (Yamhill Co) – It has been noted that some POs are getting kicked out of Sanctions module. Lee said she is aware of this problem, but the must be addressed by service request. This will be best addressed later with the rewrite.

Betti (Yamhill Co) – asked if POs are seeing people entered into LEDS MH database (done by the Offenders, themselves). Everyone in the FAUG group was unaware of this part of LEDS.

Chris B (Deschutes Co) – An issue arose where a PPS Warrant was requested, but returned to PO and not issued. At the same time, the PO requested a Probation Warrant on the Probation case. The case was closed to ABSC after the Probation Warrant was issued, but the PO did not verify that the PPS Warrant was issued before closing the case to ABSC. Because the PPS Warrant was never issued, the PPS case expired whilst the Offender was on ABSC status. It was later discovered that the Warrant Request was still in RETU status. After consulting with the Board, it was determined that the only option was to delete it ... even though we don't delete actions taken. The question was asked if another code to close out the Warrant Request could be created, instead of deleting it (i.e. CLNA). Lee will request a query to see how many of these exist before further consideration.

Bonnie (Linn Co) – Question asked why DOJ has access to our chronos. A problem arose where a DOJ employee had reviewed an Offender's chronos and then sent the supervising PO an email; critiquing the PO's interactions with that Offender. This is not acceptable. Lee said this is an IT profile question. Outside agencies have to go to a process to gain access to our system; including stating a purpose for needing access. This may be raised through supervisors by filing a complaint.

Andie (Douglas Co) – Question asked about a case where the PO was going to override the PSC level based on LS/CMI, but the system said that the LS/CMI wasn't current. In OMS, that record was green, but she still had to update the LS/CMI in order to override. The record was likely green because the risk level was LOW ... not because the LS/CMI was current. DOC400 will require that the LS/CMI be current (less than 12 months old) for the override to be accepted.

## **Day Two:**

### **CMA Enhancements**

**Jeff Hanson**

This system was intended to be Phase 3 of five total phases, but after a reorganization, Phases 4 and 5 never realized. OACCD formed a group (formerly LS/CMI Network) to move forward case management and planning using EBP. This system was originally intended to take place of DOC400.

IT has been keeping track of bugs, etc. The network put together a proposal of enhancements that will move case management forward. Jeff will put forward the proposal to the Exec Team that contains four options: 1. create a whole new system (scrapping what we currently have – least likely to occur because of cost) 2. a piecemeal approach to building the program (running both programs) 3. Full policy option package to complete the CMA (will require significant financial resources) and 4. Individual Service Requests. Trying to build a political support to get this done (Exec Team has the most influence). There is no attempt to circumvent

the current Service Request process. This process will take several years and has about 35 pages of modifications. This program also is important to the Institutions; as it is to Community Corrections.

Question is asked about the role of FAUG if the CMA Workgroup has the main focus on the new system. General consensus is that FAUG will still be necessary and should funnel info to other workgroups. FAUG should remain as the overarching automation group and a more "formal" process for bringing issues back to FAUG. Decision to have Marne and Larry be the liaisons from CMA to FAUG. Next CMA meeting is June 19-20 in Bend (Deschutes Co). All are invited to attend. Lily was asked to send emails out to FAUG.

Question asked about CMA crashing. If there are problems, POs should notify the FAUG Rep; who should call Help Desk so they can track issues. Include screen shots, if possible. Any type of enhancements should be sent to Jeff Hansen.

If DOC400 was going to be scrapped for a new program, the underlying core-program/databases will still remain. Therefore, any new "off-the-shelf" program would have to be majorly modified to be viable in Oregon.

Request to Jeff made to reach out to Directors across the state to reinforce how important it is for CMA and FAUG Reps to attend these meetings. Jeff will talk to Jeremiah.

### **Earned Discharge**

**Mary Hunt/Wendy Kirby**

Set of handouts passed to FAUG (most recent emails sent out). Includes list of Offenders eligible for review through 6/30/14.

New lists will come monthly (similar to ASR lists). Offenders will start to show up 60 days prior to their first eligibility date and will show up for two months and then drop off. Soon, OTTO will be updated to include Earned Discharge. When the list is received, the PO should check to see if the Offender is eligible. If not eligible, a re-review is to be done in 60 days. When eligible, PO will sign off on the review form. OACCD expects the form to be completed. An optional grid was passed out to aid in tracking.

Comp Fines and Restitution must be paid in full. Offender must be in compliance with case plan. It is up to each county to decide what that means (whether treatment indicated on the case plan is to be completed before the case can be closed EDIS or whether "substantial compliance" is sufficient).

This came out of HB3194. Counties will get full funding for these cases.

Chris Hoy convened the workgroup in Sept 2013.

Two forms are Mail-Merge Forms. The Rule is now Temp-Adopted, so if your Director wants your office to start using this process, it is OK to do so.



**Incarcerations** – any sentence served after the conviction date is counted as Incarceration. This includes sentences served on weekends. The months in which weekends are served are retracted, due to the incarceration. NOTE: The idea is “community time”

**NEXT MEETING –**  
Clatsop County  
August 20-21, 2014