

FAUG MEETING MINUTES

Josephine County

May 15th, 2019 – 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

May 16th, 2019 – 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

MEETING LOCATION:

Josephine County Community Corrections Building – Marie Hill Room
510 NW 4th St
Grants Pass, OR 97526

DAY ONE:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping



Minute Review



Minutes reviewed and approved with no changes.

Attendance

In attendance: Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Justin Bendele (Deschutes); Brad Allen (Deschutes); Denise Easterling (Jefferson); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn); Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Betti Spencer (Yamhill); Danielle Dickerson (Josephine); Dona Dotson (Curry); Allen Bergstrom (Klamath); Paula Fata (Multnomah); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Lee Cummins (DOC); Tracey Coffman (DOC-STTL); Judy Bell (DOC); Jodi Merritt (Polk/OACCD); Curran Deede (Benton); Angela Beier (Polk); Colin Rauenzahn (DOC-STTL); Keith Cokeley (Jackson); Gina Courson (Marion); McKenzie Davis (Coos); Ed Hall (Parole Board). Malinda Boyer (Parole Board); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Freddy Vidal (Douglas); Mike McManus (Grant); Reynaldo Ayala (Lincoln); Crystal Bartell (Yamhill); Steve Works (Josephine Co)

County Updates



Multnomah Co – New address for East/Gresham offices 12244 NE Glisan St. Portland, OR 97230
Phone: 503 988 3190

Parole Board

Dylan Arthur

Malinda Boyer (Board sanction specialist)

Ed Hall (Hearing Officer)

The Board is moving out of the Dome Building to a building on Tandem St. on August 5th. This will allow for remodeling.

Sid Thompson is leaving. Greta Lowery starts today. John Bailey is now a Board Member. Jarrod Hockford (IT) starts 5/20/19 (replacing Marshall).

Ed Hall described Sanction Process (see link on page 6 ('SanctionProcess') for handout provided). Maximum Deferral time allowed by law is 120 days. If offender is still in custody at that time, a teletype is sent to lift the hold and the status changes from DEFR to RETU status. If the PPO wants to take no action, they can so recommend. NOTE: The field for the Board Override is not working in the Sanctions Module.

Question asked about a case that expires when on RETU/DEFR status (offender has not been convicted of pending charge by time the PPS expires). The PPO cannot close the case. The case is not completed for the

purposes of Board business until there is a resolution. Proposal would be to have the PPO recommend NOAC. This could affect calculations if offender is sentenced to prison and auto-revoked. It is calculated for any time beyond Decision Date (hence the Decision Date is important to enter). Question posed to FAUG for recommendations ... Proposed that the PPO enter 'NOAC' into the "Sanction Given" section and send it back to the Board. Malinda feels that would be fine for her purposes ... but would want the text updated to reflect the recommendation for No Action, due to (reason for recommendation). The FAUG Rep may have to be the one to send it back, if permissions don't allow the PPO to do so.

Deferral is based on Probable Cause that a violation (usually a GC10 allegation) occurred, whereas a Postponement is usually to allow a Hearings Officer to prepare for a Hearing.

Ed handed out a handout with common issues, ways to reduce work/speed up process and with "ideal hearings packet" list. (included in 'SanctionProcess' link on page 6). NOTE: The PPO is responsible to redact Police/Probable Cause Reports.

It is recommended that everyone review OAR58 (Structured Sanction Rule).

Malinda said that she is receiving a lot of allegations of GC17/18 and the offender doesn't have those conditions. If sending a sanction, the PPO can send a request to add them.

Question asked whether the offender needs NOR if being presented with a Consent to Modify. A form was sent out that has info for offenders on what would happen regarding those conditions. The PPO can make it part of a sanction. No additional info is needed for the Board to add them.

Also, the modifications are coming back with the Amended Order without the GCs attached. Malinda says the Order specifies that ALL GCs are effective. As soon as the PPO indicates that GC 17/18 are being added, they are in effect. The offender has the ability to have a hearing related to that, however. The PPO should keep a paper copy of the form in the file. Ed can send out a sample template, if requested.

Transitional Leave

Tracey Coffman

Tracey/Colin presented a PowerPoint regarding STTL (see link ('STTL') on page 6 for the presentation). A demonstration of the automation being rolled out soon was presented, as well.

Violations being reported for AIP cases are reported to the releasing facility and questions are to be directed to the Correctional Rehabilitation Manager. Violations being reported for STTL cases will ALL go through Tracey or Colin; as do all questions.

An Administrative Return process is being worked on; allowing the offender to be returned to the institution for any reason other than a violation (e.g. Offender loses housing due to unforeseen circumstances, gets an ICE hold, etc.).

At this time, SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE DONE IN CIS. PPOs will be advised when this functionality is available for use.

Piloting/final testing OMS STTL programming will be conducted in three counties (Washington County, Linn County and Multnomah County) and three institutions (CRCI, SCI and OSP).

Training- STTL/Release Planning automation

Tracey Coffman

Training conducted on Release Planning automation. A draft of the PO section of the user manual was handed out (see link ('OMS') on page 6 for the materials).

DAY TWO:

DOC Update

Lee/  Judy

Treatment – Last meeting, FAUG talked about how the CPC info is put in the program. At the bottom, it has the “program assess date”. The dates have not been getting entered, as the person who was doing it is no longer working with us. This is being worked on.

Lee had sent the Out Of State Treatment providers list for review. These need to be reviewed to see if they need to be expired or updated. This is important for the DOC website. There have been some issues with the naming of the OOS providers. Some people entering are entering them not according to the naming conventions. This affects where it falls in the (alphabetic) list; making it difficult to find. The system alphabetizes after the dash, so do not include a second dash.

FAUG will need to decide if we want to keep the service area as the county or as the two-letter state code. This will make a difference in where it will be placed alphabetically on the provider list. A problem with using the state code is that a user cannot subset by state. A third option suggested adding state codes added to the county code. It does not appear that most Judges are using this, and they can still review the list. It is more used by CIS users. FAUG agrees that we can keep it with the county as the service area. This will be put in the FAUG Manual.

Treatment code issue; especially the ADMN closure code: There are long descriptions for most of the codes, but users cannot access them. Many users are putting ADMN when a more appropriate code should be used. The SOON Manual has good descriptions within. Lee will see if programming can add a function key to allow users to see the long descriptions. MXBN and EXPI are already approved by OACCD, but ADMN, SUCC and UNSU are not. There are descriptions in Treatment Business Rules (see link (“TxModule”) on page 6 for Multnomah County Treatment Module Business rules for the long descriptions). FAUG reviewed those descriptions. The agreed-upon definitions will also include the following added to the long descriptions:
ADMN - “This may also include an approved transfer to another treatment provider.”
SUCC - “This requires confirmation of the successful completion by the treatment provider.” “SUCC is also used if the offender is referred for an evaluation and the evaluator determines that treatment is not recommended at this time.”
UNSU - “... or did not engage in treatment as directed/referred”.

FAUG agrees that the following should be added to the FAUG Manual: “If the offender is referred for the evaluation and the treatment provider determines there is no treatment recommended, the entry and exit date will be the date of the evaluation.”

Referral date and entry date – If the offender started treatment prior to the start date of their supervision, CIS will only allow the supervision start date as the treatment start date. It cannot precede the supervision start date. Another question was at what point is the entry date used. FAUG agrees that when the offender starts participating in the treatment plan (e.g. giving UAs, attending groups, entering a treatment bed, etc.).

To be worded as follows:

“The entry date is the date the offender engages in the treatment plan per the treatment provider.”

“The exit date is the date the provider discharges the offender from the program or the offender is no longer able to or engaging in the program.”

“The referral date is the date the directive is given to the offender to contact the specific program or provider. If this date is unknown use the entry date.”

“If the offender began treatment prior to the beginning of supervision, the referral date and entry date will be the begin date of supervision.”

FAUG agrees that the Manual contain the following changes in the Criteria for program entry: Rather than the statement “Three out of the four must be met for entry” with the four criteria already listed, It would state that the first of the four criteria MUST be met, plus two of the remaining three criteria must be met.

Denise has stated that MAT is an intervention and not a treatment program in/of itself. It does not meet the criteria. FAUG feel that a MAT program that includes a treatment component would be considered sufficient to meet criteria for a treatment program.

An email regarding MAT was sent out. Andie will send an email response to Lee to send on for further consideration. FAUG concerns are whether this is accurately representing the process. One suggestion was to make the referral/exit date be completed with ADMN closure code; thereby, not affecting outcome measures. When the EVAL code is created, FAUG can address definitions/business rules on how to use the code to not affect those measures.

FAUG will need clarification as to exactly what OACCD wants for Evals. This info will be taken back to Jeremiah and Denise for consideration and decision. This will be back on the next FAUG agenda.

Lincoln County has a second treatment provider created for their treatment agency. One is for the eval and the other is for the actual treatment program. The concern is that this is also inflating treatment numbers.

Victim Panel is NOT considered a treatment program.

There was a question about gender-specific groups. There is some concern that if we don't show the gender-specific groups, then credit is not given by the state. Denise states that “We don't distinguish down to that detail.” FAUG agrees.

PSC – Angela found that when OTTO is doing a review message (not an action message), it should only advise one time and go away after four days. However, Angela found that a PPO was not in the office (on vacation) and the ‘R’ code came and went prior to the PPO's return. Question whether FAUG wants the ‘R’ code to just stay (and not auto-delete after 4 days). FAUG agrees.

Long Descriptions on Probation Conditions – recommendations have been made re: NONT and NOEA. FAUG reviewed and approved.

AIP Conditions – there have been problems reported w/ form containing old conditions. It is the wrong form and has the wrong conditions. Shawn Cost-Streety needs to be advised if those are found. Two have been found so far, so it does not appear to be a widespread problem. Make sure the proper conditions are listed.

Sanctions – The Report (sanctions in other than complete) has been approved to come out monthly. The next report comes out at the end of this month and afterwards, will be monthly. A summary page is included for at-a-glance review. The Sanction Type has been removed, as it was creating multiples whenever a PPO imposed multiple sanction types. If it is determined that the removal is problematic, let Lee know.

Judy and Lee were at the Service Request Governance Meeting. The Institution has put in a SR for a designator for ROIs. Judy/Lee have asked whether we need that on the community side. The usage may be different, but it is not impossible to add this functionality for the community side. Bonnie has a Sprint Review Meeting tomorrow and will ask whether designators will be made to show up in the new case plan. Some counties are

moving toward primarily working out of OMS and these designators may not show up. FAUG agrees to be added and we can remove ourselves if determined if it would not work well.

Significant Contact – The county reviews are showing inflated significant contacts because the default is ‘Y’. Question about how to address this. OACCD had approved (in 2004) that the info is informative, demonstrates effort/work, shows presence and is essentially meaningful. It can create a sense of over-supervision; especially on low-level cases. Management uses this info to determine how to allocate resources. It appears that there are varying definitions of what a “significant contact” is. The Reports Committee Group developed a report and determined what is significant. This may need to be reconvened to review this (and other) definitions. Lee and Tracey will take this back to their management and see how they want to proceed.

SOON Update

Lee/ Judy

SR proposal from SOON – Marking a Probation case with some kind of indicator that there is a PV pending. Create a temp closure code “PVP” to prevent the body from being closed. Also, the Fee System can bill past expiration. FAUG approves.

ABEX code approved for LC cases, in addition to Probation cases.

Count numbers should always be in 2-digit format. Let support staff know if you see any 1-digit Count numbers.

Due to lack of time, other issues to be tabled or sent out to the group.

OACCD Update

Jodi Merritt

Due to lack of time, this agenda item was tabled.

Elections/Positions

Gina Courson

Due to lack of time, this agenda item was tabled.

Upcoming Meeting Locations

Group

Due to lack of time, this agenda item was tabled.

Roundtable

Group

Multnomah County have asked that other counties check USPS to verify that a “Portland” address is actually in Multnomah Co. Some ‘Portland’ addresses are actually located in Washington County or Clackamas County.

Due to lack of time, the remainder of this agenda item was tabled.

NEXT MEETING:
August 14th & 15th – Curry County
Tentative 2019 Schedule:
November 20th & 21st Clackamas County
February 19th & 20th, 2020 TBD

Attached materials (links)



SanctionProcess.pdf



STTL.pdf



OMS.pdf



TxModule.pdf