

FAUG MEETING MINUTES

Via video conference (Webex)

November 18, 2020 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

MEETING LOCATION:

Via video conference

DAY ONE:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping

Marion County

Minute Review

Group

The meeting minutes were updated prior to the meeting. As presented/updated, they have been approved without any suggestions for further updates at this meeting.

Attendance

Angela Beier

In attendance: Marne Pringle (Clackamas); (Clatsop); (Coos); (Crook); (Curry); Brad Allen (Deschutes); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Denise Easterling (Jefferson); Allen Bergstrom (Klamath); (Lake); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn); Gina Courson (Marion); Paula Fata (Multnomah); Jacob (Tillamook); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Jessica (Wasco); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); (Yamhill).

County Updates

Group

Deschutes and Douglas – Announced that their counties will be working to fill vacancies. No other updates from other counties at this time.

Interstate Compact Update

Ruby McClorey

A Learning Module will be coming soon with enhancements. Mark Patterson will be sending an announcement next week. This will be a new learning management system. The new help points have been completed and will be in the update.

With COVID uptick, new restrictions are out. It's on the website ... www.interstatecompact.org/COVID19.

Parole Board

Dylan Arthur

In October, had to lay off three support staff in their office. Response times may suffer accordingly. Board Member Patty Cress returned to DOC in Release Services. Therefore, the Board is down to four Board Members. They have asked the Governor's Officer to not fill the position through the end of this biennium. It will likely be posted in April/May 2021 when the next budget is approved. Almost everyone is telecommuting. Rachel Hunter is at the Orders Desk, Kim Coons is helping with training and Debra Zwicker is at the Warrants Desk.

Lee C. brought up the process of withdrawing warrants from the Board. PPOs have the ability to withdraw using WTWT, but we are not supposed to do that. We should be sending an email to the Board and requesting that they withdraw it. The Board would not know that it's been withdrawn otherwise ... could result in unintended warrant arrests. Dylan confirmed this is the case. The Board will also be adding INOP Time even on withdrawn warrants (a change from prior practice). If the PPO requesting the withdrawal of a warrant, but doesn't want INOP Time to be added (i.e. based on erroneous info), they need to so indicate in the request. Otherwise, INOP Time will be added.

Transitional Leave

Jon Hanson

Jon was not able to attend. No updates available at this time.

OCMN

Tracey Coffman

Tracey was not able to attend the last OCMN meeting. There are no updates to report at this time.

NOTE: Judy will update on the "sex"/"gender" fields later in the meeting (see SOON Update below).

OACCD

Jodi Merritt

Will be meeting tomorrow afternoon re: legislature. They will be starting the process re: Measure 110 and how that will impact us. They are waiting for feedback from legislators. Rules have not yet been written. The language they put in may need some fixes. There is still talk about supervision of SO and DV Misdemeanors. This may have to be a separate bill and OACCD is in the process of writing that.

RE: 'Virtual Visit' code: Should the definitions be taken to OACCD? Have the group agreed on it? Yes, it has been approved. Jodi will take that to OACCD tomorrow.

OACCD convened a small workgroup to work on the 'Eval' code for the Tx Module. They approved to have the 'Eval' code put in, but there is still the decision as to whether to have different closure codes or just "successful", "unsuccessful", etc. attached to it. They are close to a decision on that point.

DOC Update

Lee Cummins

Lee has been working on some CIS Tools upgrade and other behind the scenes programming issues.

Lee brought up a recent question about a possible new sanction code (Return to Court) – Bonnie T. has an email from a coworker regarding how that would be used. Originally, when CIS was created, Probation Violation Reports could be written up in the Sanctions Module and sent to Court. However, in some counties, the Court and/or DA's Office did not like the look of them and therefore, Word Documents were used, instead. These are stored on an "H Drive" which other PPOs don't generally have access to. This creates an issue where a Duty Officer might not know that a Word Doc PV Report was submitted unless the PPO documents it in the chronos (which not everyone does). Judy advised that if the case is not permitted by the Court to be sanctioned, that docket in CIS will be labeled as such and the Sanctions Module cannot be used. The system has an edit built in to prevent the creation of a sanction in such cases. This would require a restructure of the Sanctions Module to allow for that. Judy suggested that counties set up a shared drive to allow all PPOs access to the PV Reports.

Bonnie will do some more research and get back to the group. She will also advise the coworker that this is a process that could take some time, as FAUG must approve all new codes.

Reminder that when a sanction is in RETU status, it is locked, even to FAUG Reps. If a sanction is in that status, the FAUG Rep needs to send an email to Lee so that she can move it back to PEND if it is a PPS/LC or probation case. This is usually due to a case being sent to the Board when it is not a Board case. Be sure to view the Board Note (option 18) as it can also be returned when the Board is requesting further information you need to supply and then send back to them. If the record is now in a Board status you cannot delete or complete the sanction, even if the sanction was created prior to Board involvement. Contact Lee for assistance in that case. Review the Sanction section in the FAUG Manual for details. It is hopeful that the Board will create a new code that will allow for FAUG Reps to complete those (not in a Board status) that is in sanction status RETU.

The Sanctions Service Request is still on-hold. IT is not wanting to fix the bugs in CIS that are remaining. They want to spend time on OMS. The OMS Programmers are very busy right now.

CIS Tools Upgrade Project: This will provide a Graphical User Interface to CIS, which will make it look more like an internet program. The RFP has closed and two vendors will be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee. Demos will be reviewed around Dec 17. The back-end will still be CIS, which is a mixture of Report Program Generator (RPG – the native language of the iSeries) Control Language programming, Structured Query Language (SQL) and a variety of mixtures of COBOL – SQL COBOL, Integrated Language Environment (ILE), SQL COBOL and the older stuff is just plain old COBOL. The front end interface is only about 25% of the system. All the magic happens in the background. There is very little info available on the project until after the vendor demos are done.

Service Request 2997 was entered: to remove or suppress the significant contact field in the chrono header for the measurable contact group. This may be picked up sooner because it is a very small one. IT is very busy with the Tools Project, so timing is not yet known.

Reminder re: CMIS Reports. Rumors were going around that CMIS may be going away. Denise clarified that CMIS is not working completely as it should. It has old datasets. When drilling down in the reports in CMIS, you might not be getting exactly what you're looking for. A new CMIS system may be coming. The old program is old and not everyone can work on it. Denise said that if there is any specific report that we need, can ask if Research can develop a specific report. Remember that Denise sends out a lot of reports to the Directors, so the report you might need may already be created.

SOON Update

Judy Bell

A (single) Service Request was submitted to add a field in CIS labeled "gender" to be put on the descriptor screen (no other screens) that will be near the "sex" field. The "sex" field will represent the biological body parts and the "gender" field would represent how the client identifies. This would also be added into OMS. The "sex" field is already labeled "gender". This field pulls from the CIS "sex" field. This would mean it needs to be changed to "sex" and a field labeled "gender" added. These would mirror the fields in CIS. OCMN approved this change. Question posed to FAUG regarding these changes. There were no objections. All other module owners need to agree and then Judy will put forth the changes to the SR.

POST NOTE: SOON had further discussions with a transgender expert, and their recommendation for use of the sex field will likely be changing. SOON was asked to discuss this topic and newfound information with their POs and management, and to return to the next SOON meeting ready to discuss and decide on a new recommendation to OACCD. SOON will likely recommend community mirror institution practice of using legal sex in the sex field.

A question was posed regarding new intake cases that would be new-case transfers that come into the office. Should the PSC be done prior to the transfer or upon receipt in the receiving county? This was suggested by SOON that it come before FAUG, because in some counties, it is the support staff that does them and in other counties, it is the PPOs that do the PSC. FAUG was polled. FAUG were not strongly opined in either way. Judy can add it to SOON's recommendation and send it to OACCD. It was also noticed that with differing practices in other counties, it may be that each county would need to develop their own process anyhow. For now, this will stay county-by-county.

Judy brought up a question that had been raised to why new PSCs need to be done when one had recently been done. This sometimes has to do with movement inserts. This can result in a change in custody cycle numbering. The last PSC has to match the last custody and location status. If users have a question about the PSC needing to be done yet again, check the custody cycle status. It's possible that a new movement had to be inserted after the last PSC was done.

DOC is working on transition from WEBLEDS to LEDS2020, to be effective 3/1/2021. Each agency can contract with WEBLEDS if desired. Oregon State Police is offering eAgent (LEDS2020). Agencies wanting to use LEDS2020 to have their Reps contact OSP to arrange that. OSP does a demo once per month. Judy is forwarding that as they come. Access to training will also be available. More features will be available (including the absence of a cap of hits received).

The new Fee system is in the works. There will be an interface with DOJ that will allow viewing specific Restitution data (currently only available by calling the Courts).

Reminder that closure code COMP should only be used when the Incoming Compact client returns to the sending state PRIOR to the supervision ending (i.e. returning voluntarily or by warrant from sending state). If the client completes supervision whilst still in Oregon, use EXPI code.

OMS Presentation

Chris Sitkei

This is in response to FAUG/OCMN and will allow the uploading of county photos of clients' mugshots to OMS. It will tap into the mugshot uploading program already in the system. This only works in Chrome or latest Edge browsers. The IE browser is no longer supported/working with the program. There may be some connectivity issues in some offices, however. This will go live toward the end of November. Testing is still needing to be done.

Chris did a presentation regarding this upcoming feature.

Scars/Marks/Tattoo Demo

Dawn Purcells

This is being used through the current SMART database/program with DOC. Some fixes are still being done. This will allow users to upload photos of clients' scars/marks/tattoos into the system. We currently have view access to that program.

Some other states are very interested in duplicating the SMART system.

Dawn did a presentation regarding this upcoming feature.

Judy asked that users NOT delete any duplicate scars/marks/tattoo information that is in CIS. It can cause problems, including orphan records. A SR is being looked at to create an edit that will disallow the deletion of a record in CIS that was created in OMS. Judy can assist if users want to double-check.

Lee mentioned that it may be that FAUG Reps will be the users who are uploading in each office. This will need to be decided. Some counties might not want to participate in the uploading into the SMART program. Dawn said that any questions/concerns can be directed to her.

Lee asked if the FAUG group would be interested. All in attendance appeared to be in favor of participating in utilization of this program/feature. Lee will see about getting it set up for community to get added to this project.

February meeting location (confirm)

Group

It appears that the February 17, 2021 meeting will be virtual.

A call was made for volunteers to do Option 20/24 demos for new users or as refresher for veteran users. She will reach out to Angie to see if she has ideas.

Roundtable

Group

Andie (Douglas) – The NOR dates and text are disappearing when sanctions are sent electronically to supervisors. Washington Co has seen long narratives disappearing, but that has to do with limits to the system. (NOTE: Andie’s connection was spotty, so much of her concerns was unable to be heard. Lee suggested she send an email with her concerns).

Bonnie (Linn) – a user in her office asked if a generic Treatment Provider code could be entered in the Tx Module that the user could use for a private therapist. The rules would not allow for that. Other partners are involved and use the module. Denise would also not be OK with this.

Paula (Multnomah) – said that Charles A. wanted to remind others of the number to their Intake Office for sending clients. Number is 503-988-3081, press ‘0’ and ask for the Intake Officer of the Day. They are about two weeks out on Intakes.

Gina (Marion) – reminder to send information to the Intake email, because PPOs working from home otherwise would not get the information.

NEXT MEETING:
February 17, 2021
(virtual – via WebEx)

Tentative 2021 Schedule:
TBD