

## OCMN Winter Meeting

February 7<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019

DPSST – Salem, Oregon

### Attendance

Chad Lubinski (Yamhill), Andrew Sherman (Clackamas), Ben Gieger (Clackamas), Chris Chandler (Clackamas), Greetje Brunsmann (Lane), Leanna Barton (Lane), Joel Pickard (Benton), Josh Hall (Benton), Brie Murphy (Multnomah), Julie Johnson (Clatsop), Justin Bendele (Deschutes), Jeff Hanson (DOC), Katie Roller (Multnomah), John McVay (Multnomah), Rochelle Reed (Multnomah), Melea Wendell (Washington), Kaylynn Berrios (Washington), Jason Jones (Washington), Anthony Angelo (Multnomah), Jeremy Hubbard (Jackson), Tira Hubbard (Jackson), Andy Lynch (Marion), Steve Works (Josephine), Jesse Meinerts (Josephine), Scott Hyde (Josephine), Toby Baigre (DOC), Joe Swan (DOC), Michelle Axtell (DOC), Josie O’Leary (DOC), Lisa Hall (DOC), Greg Lay (DOC-Linn), Rick Campos (Multnomah), Jessica Harrison (Multnomah), Dean Alft (Lane), Michael Paturzo (Coos), Paula Fata (Multnomah), Jon Hansen (DOC), Larry Evenson (Yamhill), Chris Enquist (DPSST), Ken Yee (Multnomah), Melinda Serfling (Columbia), Rob Little (DOC-Linn), Rachel Crum (Lane)

### Minutes: Day 1

Jeff called to order at 1:02pm.

Introductions

No minutes from prior meeting available for approval at this time.

Item 1: 2019 LS/CMI IRR

- Decision was made last year to make this IRR focus on a reassessment, rather than a full assessment.
- Scores from 2015 IRR were brought forward and will be provided as collateral info as part of this reassessment IRR.
- Live scored during filming to keep scores on track with intended risk score and domains.
  - o Efforts were made to avoid the disputed items from the initial assessment (Mark/Leticia).
- Network was provided with quick score forms, some collateral information and score info from 2015.
- Network watched 2019 IRR video.
  - o Group scored out assessment with general agreement on scores.
    - Reviewed scores item by item as a group.
  - o Some collateral info needed to clarify a couple of scoring items.

- Updated CCH to reflect prison time change from 2015.
- UA records showing sobriety
- Exit chrono to document treatment completion.
- Paystub
- Jon (DOC) to send out video for scoring by network members within the month.
  - Chris (DPSST) to take point on collateral.
  - Andrew (Clackamas) to take point on prior assessment narratives.
- IRR will contain follow up on case planning targets and email link.
- All members reminded to keep scoring results confidential from general staff.
- After network members review scoring, any concerns can be addressed through Jeff (DOC).
- IRR rollout planned for May, to be another month-long window for completion.
- Network agreed that the cutoffs for scores will be set at 4 for this year's IRR.

#### Item 2: Network Charter

- This group formed as an OACCD workgroup in 2013, and gradually became a formal network. No charter was ever created, and this has now been requested by the directors.
- Larry (Yamhill) and Chris (DPSST) have drafted a proposed charter.
- Larry (Yamhill) explained that several networks have created or updated charters within the last year, or will be doing so in the next year.
- Proposed charter distributed to group, draft charters were also distributed electronically.
- Jeff (DOC) explained history of network and the context of our current decisions.
- Chris (DPSST) spoke in support of maintaining a single chairperson structure instead of a multi-chair model. The OACCD liaison has traditionally filled the role of a co-chairperson.
- Jeff (DOC) agreed, stating that while he isn't necessarily remaining as chair – he does feel that the single chair model has kept this group nimble and capable over the years.
- The draft is intended to codify the past practices of the group.

#### Item 3: WRNA IRR

- Due to some technical issues in the rollout, the window to complete the IRR needs to be extended. Jon (DOC) suggested that a firm date, rather than a flexible period, is needed. Tira (Jackson) motioned that the window be extend to March 1, 2019. Seconded by Chris (DPSST). Verbal vote was taken on this issue and passed.
- Blank WRNA copy is available in OMS, as information.
- There is some open discussion with researchers on what a IRR on the WRNA should look like, in terms of standard deviation, follow up training recommendations, overall measures of accuracy. Jeff opened the floor to discussion on setting a standard.
  - Some discussion about differences between institution and community versions.
  - Josie (DOC) offered input on the trends they are seeing within DOC institutional users.

- 22% of DOC users missed enough questions to require remedial training, per DOC standards.
    - Hard to toss out questions with the WRNA, given that the questions are binary.
  - Tira (Jackson) stated roughly 70 questions pertain to risk and a large number of the remaining questions focus largely on case management. A section of questions cover both.
    - We need to decide if the IRR should be more focused on the risk questions or be a measure of all questions.
    - “Not all questions are created equal.”
  - Jeff (DOC) explained that much of the messaging about the fact this is the first effort to measure fidelity with the WRNA will fall to him and Larry (Yamhill).
    - For staff interacting with trainers about these issues, we can remind them that this IRR is intended to set a baseline measure only.
    - By mid-March we should have interpreted the data enough to determine which staff are in need of an enhanced training response due to poor performance on the IRR.
- Jeff (DOC) asked Jon (DOC) to explain the issue with people who took the IRR before the programming issues were identified.
  - Jon (DOC) stated that 20 submissions were received. Tira (Jackson) clarified that she attempted to take the IRR four times before realizing there was an issue, and that likely there are at most only 16 people who actually attempted to take the IRR.
    - Jon (DOC) stated that if the number is in the teens, he can likely reach out to them and give them an opportunity to correct their scores against the “correct” IRR.
    - Jon sought some clarification about the supporting documents available on OMS.
      - Rochelle (Multnomah), Tira (Jackson) and Toby (DOC) offered that we need to avoid hand scoring as it would be an “abusive” method for completing the IRR.
      - Rochelle (Multnomah) asked for some clarification about negative scores in OMS. She had been told in a training it would be impossible, but she had a negative score recently.
        - Jeff (DOC) and Tira (Jackson) stated that they feel negative scores, while rare, are possible. If the strengths are present without risk, the math will result in a negative score.
- Planned WRNA trainings on the horizon:
  - 2/27-2/28: Lincoln County
  - 4/2-4/3: Yamhill County – Paula (Multnomah) plans to attend.
  - May: Klamath County
  - Spring: Multnomah County
  - Additional trainings likely to be scheduled in late Spring into Summer

- Contact Jeff for registration information.
- Pathways training in February
  - Jeff (DOC) stated this training is linked to the WRNA and the intention is to use the cadre of students from the February class as a basis for a later, more selective train-the-trainer cadre. Members of this network should consider attending either.
  - Considering another WRNA train-the-trainer in early/mid-summer.
    - Members of this network will be given priority for attendance.
      - More to follow via email.
- Jeff (DOC) explained that a contract in progress for an Oregon-specific validation of the WRNA.
  - Dr. Christa Gering
    - Norming process should not be lengthy, process is moving through DOC contact system at present.
    - John (McVay) asked how recidivism will be presented for the WRNA, how will cutoff scores be established?
      - Jeff (DOC) explained that this process will have set rates by risk score only, due to the structure of the WRNA.
      - Jeff (DOC) explained that it isn't uncommon for some local jurisdictions to desire a norming process on their subpopulation.
        - Often, small population make this unfeasible.
        - There is a question to be asked, are offenders that different between Medford and Pendleton?
        - Based on current funding and operational capacity, efforts by the state will continue to focus on state-level norming.
          - If any smaller jurisdictions seek smaller scale norming, we will discuss at this network later.

#### Item 4: Norming of the LS/CMI

- No timeline at this point on the norming process, when results are available Jeff (DOC) will send out to the network.
  - While they will be distributed to network members as information, do not disseminate until OACCD has reviewed.
  - Any statewide decisions will fall to OACCD and DOC.
  - Some jurisdictions have already adjusted level scores due to workload and capacity considerations.
    - This norming may adjust levels based on more empirical data.

#### Item 5: Training Treatment Providers

- This network has avoided training treatment providers in scoring assessment tools.
  - o Jeff (DOC) recommends that trainers offer education to non-CJ users in how to interpret and apply results.
  - o Tira (Jackson) and Jeremy (Jackson) have a template training for this model of provider education available to the network.
    - Their training covers criminogenic needs versus humanitarian needs. Explanation of the role of a PPO in behavior change, some modeling of PPO case management models. Good feedback from providers on the content.
- In regards to training court staff, attorneys, and judges:
  - o Jeff (DOC) offered that when training non-treatment staff, we need to be clear that risk tools shouldn't be used as a standalone guide for treatment referral condition, sentencing decisions (probation vs. prison), and that the main role of the tools remains identifying criminogenic risk.
    - If trainers receive requests for training of this type and want support, the network is here to assist.

#### Item 6: OATSA Retreat Training Opportunity

- OCMN has been asked to speak at OATSA about the concept of integrating general and specific risk factors into a treatment plan.
- Training is at Eagle Crest the first weekend in May.
- Jeff (DOC), Jon (DOC), Chris (DPSST), and Paula (Multnomah) currently taking lead, open to other members assisting.

#### Item 7: Salisbury Training

- Katie (Multnomah) advised that Emily is going to provide a training to judges on risk and women.
  - o The first will be on May 31<sup>st</sup>.

#### Item 8: Pre-Adjudication Use of WRNA and LS/CMI

- Jeff (DOC) reminded the network that neither tool is normed on a pre-conviction population.
  - o These tools can be used to inform case management considerations.
  - o If used as a pure risk tool, we cannot say that the risk level is informed by research.
  - o Moreover, this tool cannot be used as part of a "just desserts" model of sentencing, in which a higher risk score is used as a basis for a harsher sentence.
    - This would cause significant issues in our use of any risk assessment tool statewide.

- Michael (Coos) suggested that OARS be amended to clarify these concerns into a rule.
  - Discussion about the impact of this, the concept of liability, and the interface between OARs and a PPOs duties as defined by ORS 137.630.
    - Chris (DPSST) stated that placing this in an OAR would certainly insulate DOC from any claim of misuse of a risk assessment tool.
  - John (Multnomah) clarified that the MCJRP agreement in Multnomah already makes it clear that the results cannot be used to impact sentencing.
  - Jeff (DOC) stated that this use has always fallen in a gray area, most researchers are uncomfortable with the use of these risk/need tools in this manner.
  - Jeff (DOC) suggested that we could look DICKJERP for guidance on how they addressed this issue.
  - Joel (Benton) asked about the use of an LS/CMI for consideration on specialty court placement.
    - Jeff replied that this can be appropriate, so long as other factors are genuinely considering in the placement and that court is merely looking at the needs component of the tool – and not at the risk level.
  - John (Multnomah) explained that his view is that the tools are generally being looked at in conjunction with a large amount of other information by judges, and therefore is appropriate.
- After a short break, Jeff (DOC) offered some clarification to the above info.
  - Current practices on the use of a risk/need tool are appropriate pre-adjudication related to identify needs.
  - Jeff polls the room and several counties are using tools to inform needs.

#### Item 9: Renorming of the PSC

- The PSC is being renormed and we may well see some shift in numbers and risk categories.
  - PSU presenting findings to OACCD next week.
    - Some interesting findings about how the PSC works by racial group.
    - Likely will be a male and female PSC in the future.
  - OCMN remains the training body for the PSC, likely will be a need for some basic retraining on the revised tool.

#### Item 10: OCMN & OMS User Acceptance Testing

- Some members of OCMN are active members on the OMS rewrite.
  - A number of great upgrades are in progress, but the user acceptance testing has been pushed back to August.
  - Upgrades will happen, they are generally going to significantly improve the end user's experience working in OMS.

- Roll out trainings will take place and OCMN will be a source of trainers.
- Larry (Yamhill) asked for any OCMN members interested in testing to contact him.
- Jeff (DOC) pointed out that Chris (DPSST) had worked to see an IAA updated to allow the DPSST lab upgraded to have access to OMS and DOC400.
  - The DPSST lab has 40 computers and will be open for future OMS/DOC400 technology trainings.
- Jon (DOC) made a pitch for online video based training.
  - Technology concerns were raised about YouTube access.
  - Suggestion was made that Jon could put training videos on a USB or VHS and send them around the state via courier.
    - Staff might be excited to know that a “new” training video is arriving in the mail.
  - Jon made a plea that we not repeat the 2008 model of training this time, we have to give people hands on training.
- Paula mentioned that we need to find a better means of communication than the list serv.
  - Hard to search and read content.
  - Need to source a new model of managing information.
    - SOSN uses Google.
    - DPSST uses Google to make curriculum available to instructors.
  - We’ve maxed out on the capabilities of SurveyMonkey.
  - Some interest in Adobe Captivate
    - DPSST uses for regional training, can offer some testing.
- John (Multnomah) suggested the formation of a workgroup to make some recommendations on a learning management system to manage all of OCMN’s needs.
  - Workgroup members: John (Multnomah), Jeremy (Jackson), Jessica (Multnomah), Brie (Multnomah), Jon (DOC), Joel (Benton), Larry (Yamhill), Josh (Benton), Chris (DPSST), Chad (Yamhill).
  - Workgroup to report back at next meeting.

Day 1 meeting adjourned at 4:41pm.

### Minutes Day 2:

Meeting called to order by Jeff (DOC) at around 8:00am.

#### Item 1: BCP Workgroup

- Larry (Yamhill) explained that the workgroup is striving to build a universal review tool. Recent meeting allowed for some melding of institution and community language to resolve differences.

## Item 2: Training Updates

- Jeremy (Jackson) explained the updated model of training they are using in Jackson.
  - o Updated training classed paired with peer-to-peer reviews.
  - o Significant jump in BCP usage within the county.
- Tira (Jackson)
  - o They are using some more interactive models of training.
    - Jeopardy style training paired with prizes.
    - They will share with network when final powerpoint is complete.
- Jeff (DOC) thanked Jackson for their work, and reminded the group that we need to build off each other, rather than each build from the ground up, when it comes to training models.
  - o Still working on a medium to share training materials through.
- Jeremy (Jackson) has also overhauled the basic LS/CMI training materials.
  - o Will send out to the group for feedback at Summer meeting.
  - o Jon (DOC) will provide Jeremy with more raw video samples to use for training.
- WRNA trainings need a similar review.

## Item 3: Future of Charter

- Jeff (DOC) acknowledged that this workgroup does awesome work and needs to keep that in mind as we consider goals. We pioneered the state-wide use of an IRR, and continue to provide quality training.
- As we move forward, we need to be open to all possibilities.
  - o The IRR is effective at what it is intended to do: measure technical fidelity
  - o We need to consider how we can measure and improve other facets of risk assessment and case management.
  - o Rick (Multnomah) suggested that we make a list of goals and then check them off based on priority over a long period of time.
    - Build a five year plan for OCMN?
    - Workgroups to identify goals?
    - Target what has the largest impact.
  - o Chris (DPSST) and Jeremey (Jackson) both agreed with Rick on the concept of mapping out goals and building a plan to get there.
    - Jeremey suggested a SWAT analysis to build a larger, and more accurate, view of OCMN's capabilities and weaknesses.
  - o Jeff (DOC) stated that while we began as a risk assessment team, our view is broader now.
    - How well do people assess risk?
    - What do we (as a state) do in response to risk?
    - How well are people at targeting resources against risk?

- As a state we're good at risk (assessment and response), but we generally see gaps in how agencies respond to needs.
  - Some is driven by resources, some by skill, and some by intentional neglect.
- Jon (DOC) suggested that Jeremy should source an assessment model.
  - Discussion about what to do first.

Item 4: Brainstorming Network Goals

- Jeff (DOC) and Jon (DOC) led the group in a discussion of current tasks and future goals. The following list was created through this discussion.

Current Tasks	Future Goals
Training Risk Assessment	Charter approved
Training Case Management	Enhanced training model ("Flight simulator")
Facilitation of IRRs	Better technology usage
Audits of BCP Completion/Quality	Small Skill Training Tools (Fragment drills, SOARING 2)
	Fishbowl Recital
	Build Coaching Training (work into charter?)

During this discussion, a secondary topic was reviewed.

- Dean (Lane) stated that the things this network needs to reinvest in itself before looking towards new goals.
  - More nationwide-level trainers should come and present at the network.
  - We should reassess fidelity between trainers.
  - Set and enforce a standard for trainers to remain "certified."
  - Provide more opportunities for members to seek and receive feedback on their own coaching skills.
  - This network should fully embrace and control *all* risk assessment tools used within the state.

Item 5: Action Steps

Jeff (DOC) reset the conversation by soliciting a set of action steps to be taken between now and the summer meeting, in pursuit of our stated goals.

- Charter review and approval.
- Network Goals
  - Clarify and refine
  - Establish workgroup for goalsetting
    - Goalsetting Workgroup
      - Dean, Jeremy, Josh, Joel, Rick, Brie, Tira, Chris, Jon, Larry.

- Jeff (DOC) stated that we have a need for building a more comprehensive succession planning.
  - o Soliciting interest of members to take on larger roles in the leadership of OCMN.

Item 6: Housekeeping and Meeting Dates

- IRR Info
  - o IRR test scoring to Jon by 2/28
  - o IRR rollout moved to avoid holidays, will run all of April.
- Next meeting
  - o June 6-7, in Bend. Meeting location TBD.
  - o Fall meeting likely to be in Astoria in September, dates TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50.