

To: Alabama Statewide Steering Committee
Fr: Vera Institute of Justice & Crime and Justice Institute
Re: Statewide Steering Committee Meeting on October 3, 2008
Date: October 10, 2008

On October 3, 2008, the Vera Institute of Justice (Vera) and the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) helped to facilitate a meeting of the Statewide Steering Committee for the Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project (CCASP).

The meeting had two goals: (1) to review the recommendations of the Site Selection Work Group and select four pilot sites to participate in the CCASP; and (2) to further develop the required elements of the Comprehensive Community Punishment and Supervision Plan that will be used by the local jurisdictions. (The agenda for the meeting is set out in Appendix A.)

The first section of this memorandum summarizes the key points of the meeting. The second section summarizes the next steps to be taken by the Statewide Steering Committee.

Summary of the Meeting

Site Selection

Interested members of the Committee (i.e., those from the jurisdictions that applied (Montgomery, Jefferson, Lawrence)) were excused and not present for this part of the meeting's discussion. (See Appendix B for a list of meeting attendees.) The site selection application process was reviewed, which included the following key points:

- Seven jurisdictions applied and the Site Selection Work Group recommended four jurisdictions to act as the CCASP's pilot sites: Lawrence County, Jefferson County, Marshall County and Montgomery County. The three sites that were not chosen were Dale County, Madison County and the Fourth Judicial Circuit.
- Each application was scored and the selection was made based on five selection criteria: maturity of community supervision services, data collection system, impact on the ADOC population, leadership ability and potential, and commitment to the goals of the CCASP.

- The order of implementation was determined based on the following criteria: manageable size, use of Midas, vision for community supervision services, support from key stakeholders and diversity in funding.
- The strengths and weaknesses of each applicant were reviewed and discussed by the Committee members.
- The Site Selection Work Group recommended that the order of implementation be: (1) Lawrence County, (2) Jefferson County, (3) Marshall County and (4) Montgomery County.
- The first local steering committee is scheduled for early November 2008. The remaining sites will begin on a staggered timeline, beginning 4-6 months after the prior site begins.
- Work on the local level will begin with a comprehensive diagnostic analysis of local community corrections policies and practices (conducted by Vera), followed by the creation of a Comprehensive Community Punishment and Supervision Plan (drafted by the local steering committee with assistance from Vera and CJI).

It was noted in the discussion that only one jurisdiction from the southern part of the State submitted an application (Dale County), and the selected jurisdictions are all from northern Alabama. However, it was explained that only four jurisdictions south of Montgomery currently have community corrections programs.

The Statewide Steering Committee voted unanimously to approve the selection and the order of implementation recommended by the Site Selection Work Group.

Comprehensive Plan

At its retreat in July 2008, the Statewide Steering Committee began setting out the required elements of the Comprehensive Community Punishment and Supervision Plan that the local pilot sites will develop and draft. The Committee also established the following four work groups to address and make recommendations on certain elements of the plan: Data, Evaluation, Program Services Strategy and Risk/Needs Assessment. The Work Groups met during September 2008 and reports were presented to the Committee (and are included as Appendix C).

Based on the required elements agreed to at the retreat, and the work done by the Work Groups, a more comprehensive list of required elements was drafted and presented to the Statewide Steering Committee (see Appendix D).

The Committee discussed the required elements generally and also sought to answer two specific questions: (1) What are the core programs and services that are to be required by every jurisdiction; and (2) What types of reports should the local jurisdictions provide to the Statewide Steering Committee and in what frequency?

The core programs and services can be divided into three categories: (1) those that address **public safety and risk**, e.g. supervision and electronic monitoring; (2) those that address the **needs** of the offender, e.g., drug treatment and cognitive behavioral therapy; and (3) those that address ways in which the offender can successfully **reenter society**, e.g., housing assistance or job training.

The Committee agreed to the following:

- The Plan must be approved and signed by a number of key criminal justice stakeholders at the local level: Presiding Judge, District Attorney, Sheriff, Chief of Police, Probation Office Supervisor, Chair of County Commission, Community Corrections Program Director, representative from the defense bar, victim representative, and key service providers (selected by the local steering committee).
- All of the core programs and services listed in Appendix D are desirable in every jurisdiction. However, the Committee acknowledged that not every jurisdiction would need or have the resources to provide such programs and services. It was therefore agreed that the local jurisdictions would be presented with the full list, and then asked to set out in its plan which ones it already provided; which ones it did not provide; and a strategy to obtain those missing programs or services.
- The Committee made clear that programs and services need not all be provided by a government agency or organization. The work of the local steering committee should be, in part, to mobilize and bring together local resources to contribute to the project. For instance, faith-based organizations may be asked to organize a mentoring program; or the committee may seek to engage graduates of the local drug court.
- It was generally agreed that the Committee should review bi-monthly reports from the local pilot sites for the first year, and then quarterly reports thereafter. The Committee agreed that a working group should be established to consider the substance and frequency of reports. Jeff Williams volunteered to serve on the work group, and the Committee co-chairs will appoint 4-5 additional members.

Data Work Group

The Data Work Group made the following recommendations:

- All community corrections programs should have access to the pre- or post-sentence investigation reports completed by the probation/parole officer.
- Midas should be used by all local jurisdictions. It is provided at no cost to the counties and the Administrative Office of the Courts is supporting its development, both in terms of funding and staffing resources.
- Local jurisdictions should complete either ADOC's 10-point scale checklist or the Sentencing Commission's sentencing standards worksheet on all convicted felons.

Each of these recommendations must be further discussed and explored with members of the Committee. In addition, the Data Work Group will finalize a list of data that the local pilot sites will be required to collect.

Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group

The Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group is examining whether a common risk/needs instrument can be used at various points in the system and by all pilot sites, with the possibility of expanding its use statewide. The work group will meet in late October to review the instruments used across Alabama and around the country. The work group intends to make a recommendation to the Committee at its next meeting on an instrument that could be used by the pilot sites and an accompanying validation process.

Next steps

Pilot Sites

The work on the local level will start immediately. Next steps include:

- The Chief Justice will appoint the chair of the local steering committee for the first pilot site (Lawrence County).
- Members of the local steering committee will be named soon thereafter, and will be chosen by the chair in consultation with the co-chairs of the Committee.
- The first local steering committee meeting in Lawrence County is scheduled to occur on or about the week of November 10, 2008.
- The data diagnostic will begin at the local level in mid-November and will take approximately 4 months to complete. A report will be presented to the local steering committee on or about March 2009, and a comprehensive plan will be created and finalized on or about April 2009.
- Work in Jefferson County, the second pilot site, will begin on or about April 2009. A chair and the members of the local steering committee will be named closer to the starting date.

Statewide Steering Committee

The work of the Statewide Steering Committee continues over the next several months. The next meeting date is not yet scheduled, but it is expected to occur in either early December or mid-January, depending on how the work groups progress. The work to be done between now and the next meeting includes:

- Data Work Group to meet and finalize a list of data that the local pilot sites will be required to collect.
- Questions raised by the Data Work Group to be investigated and discussed with members of the Committee.
- A Reporting Work Group will be established (the co-chairs will appoint members) and meet to discuss the reporting requirements.
- The Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group will meet again in late October to finish its research and prepare a report for the Statewide Steering Committee.

- Vera and CJI will prepare draft instructions for the comprehensive plan, which will compile the sections as agreed to by the Committee.

Next meeting:

The co-chairs will be in touch with the Statewide Steering Committee members with updates on how the work is progressing and the date of the next meeting.

Agenda

*Alabama Statewide Steering Committee
Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project (CCASP)*

October 3, 2008

10am – 2pm

Judicial Building, Montgomery, Alabama

- 10:00** **Welcome**
Rosa Davis
- 10:00 – 11:00** **Site Selection Recommendations**
- Report from Site Selection Work Group
 - Vote on pilot site selection and order of implementation
- 11:00 – 11:10** **Break**
- 11.10 – 12.10** **Elements of the Comprehensive Plan**
- Small groups to discuss list of elements (20 minutes)
 - Group discussion (40 minutes)
- 12:10 – 12:45** **Lunch**
- 12:45 – 1:45** **Work Groups - Reports**
- Data
 - Risk/Needs Assessments
- 1:45 – 2:00** **Wrap-Up & Next Steps**
- 2:00 p.m.** **Adjourn**

List of Attendees

*Alabama Statewide Steering Committee
Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project (CCASP)*

October 3, 2008

10am – 2pm

Judicial Building, Montgomery, Alabama

Site Selection Discussion

Rosa Davis
Judge Clark Hall
Hon. Pete Johnson
A. Vernon Barnett
Jeff Williams
Lee Knowles
Cynthia Dillard
Miriam Shehane
Deborah Daniels
David Horn
Lynda Flynt
Bennet Wright
Melisa Morrison

Additional attendees for Comprehensive Plan Discussion

Judge Philip Reich II
Ellen Brooks
Rebecca Johnson
Foster Cook

Absent

Judge Michael Bellamy
Judy Newcomb
Marty Ramsay
Rev. Jiles Williams
Kent Hunt
Jerry McQueen
Buddy Sharpless
Stacey Neely
Neal Armstrong
Lindsey Allison
Rep Barbara Boyd

Work Group Reports

(see attached)

Programs and And Services Strategy Work Group
Wednesday September 17, 2008

The Programs Services workgroup convened at 10a.m. in the formal conference room of the Judicial Building at 300 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Alabama. Rosa Davis chaired the meeting. Present were Melisa Morrison, Pete Johnson, David Still, Jeffrey Williams, representatives from Etowah County, Jerry McQueen and David Horne.

The Committee reviewed the Committee Charge:

- Define the core program areas that the local jurisdictions should consider when developing their comprehensive plans (e.g. drug/alcohol addiction; education; cognitive behavioral therapy, etc.)
- Develop standards for various aspects and components of the program services (e.g. administration, fiscal management, personnel, staff development, management information system, etc.)

The group discussed that these charges are related more to the core programs for a Community Corrections Program while the Comprehensive Plan would include all aspects of the community continuum. The Committee therefore looked at the critical elements of the plan more generally with a view toward coming back and adding specific core programming with specific general standards if necessary.

The Committee identified the following critical elements of the jurisdictions plan:

1. Collaboration and agreement among community participants showing which offenders are managed or supervised along the continuum.
2. Definition of roles (missions) of all partners according to the supervision levels provided avoiding duplication of services and levels of supervision (defining the population in each).
3. Description of programs/services/supervision available in the jurisdiction and the providers.
4. Organizational Structures (eligibility criteria)
5. Program Capacity/Staffing Qualifications for the jurisdiction through each partner
6. Standard Operating Procedures for the jurisdiction and each partner
 - a. Quality Assurance
 - b. Data collections
 - c. Reporting
 - d. Data sharing
7. Descriptions of Sanctions and Incentives for the jurisdiction and each partner
8. Description of Continuum of Supervision and Programs
9. Description of treatment & levels of care w/ criteria
10. Funding Sources and accountability
11. Intra-local agreements for supervision and services

Program and Services Strategy Work Group Report, p.2

The work group further defined some of these elements:

1. A collaboration agreement to be signed by each significant partner including the judges, district attorney, defense system or defense bar representative, all local supervising agencies, and all participating service agencies.
2. Define the mission of each participating supervising agency, identifying the place of each within the local continuum by identifying level of clients served, minimizing duplication of services, and eliminating duplication of supervision of individuals except by specific agreement for provision of service.
3. Define the population served by each supervising agency by offenders place in the continuum: pre-trial release; pre-trial diversion; convicted, probation; prison diversion; split sentences; probation violator; prison diversion violator; and parole; and by criminal history, 1st offender or repeat offender.
4. Define the supervisory staffing qualification and training requirements and staffing ratios for each supervisory agency and level of supervision.
5. Define equipment necessary for each level of supervision necessary to the mission of each agency.
6. Define how supervision is performed at each level and require individual supervision plans for all offenders. The required levels of supervision include intensive, medium, low, unsupervised and special circumstances. Supervision should include an array of steps in intensity including reporting (daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly) in person contact, supervisor visitation, electronic monitoring, community surveillance, and overnight (work-release).
7. Define the sanctions and incentives utilized in each agency.
8. Define agreements for movement of offenders between agencies.
9. Define the certified services and programs level of programs and services available for each supervising agency. (All programs and services must be certified if there is a certifying process for that program or service.) Each jurisdiction must include the following core programs and services within the continuum, indicating what services and by whom services are provided:
 - a. Drug treatment – at various levels including education, out patient, intensive out patient, and inpatient.
 - b. Drug testing – at varied frequencies depending on the level of need
 - c. Mental health treatment or reference
 - d. Job training and job referral
 - e. Education – including GED
 - f. Life Skills
 - g. Cognitive behavioral training
 - h. Health and housing reference services
 - i. Family Counseling
 - j. Payment monitoring for payment of fees, fines and restitution
 - k. Risk and needs assessment
 - l. Crisis intervention services

Program and Services Strategy Work Group Report, p.3

- m. Community Service opportunities
- n. Transition services from confinement to the community.

- 10. Plan for annual financial auditing of each agency by accredited auditors
- 11. Signed local agreements between agencies and between agencies and service providers.

The work group agreed to submit the above proposals to the Steering Committee for additional discussion and input.

Evaluation Work Group
September 19, 2008

The Evaluation Work Group met on September 19, 2008 at 10a.m. in the small classroom of the Judicial Building at 300 Dexter Avenue in Montgomery, Alabama. Present were Foster Cook (work group chair), Rosa Davis, Ellen Brooks, Kent Hunt, Terry Patty, Phil Bryant, Richard Fiore, Bennet Wright, Melisa Morrison and Miriam Shehane.

The Charge for this work group is to address the following issues:

Progress Monitoring

- What information should the local jurisdictions include in their comprehensive plans in regard to progress monitoring?
- Are there certain elements of the program services that should be monitored and tracked?
- How often should the local jurisdiction report back to the Statewide Steering Committee on the progress and performance?

Quality Assurance

- What is the recommended quality assurance process that should be used by the local jurisdictions?
- What needs to be reviewed in this process?

Long-term Evaluations

- What data needs to be collected by the local jurisdictions in order to conduct proper process and outcomes evaluations in the future?

The Chair provided the following agenda:

- I. Review elements of a local plan – information required
- II. Describe progress monitoring and reporting
 - A. Process reporting
 - B. Developing benchmarks and timetables
 - C. Reporting on process towards benchmarks and timetable
- III. Data elements – Process and outcome
- IV. QA process

I. The group began its work by reviewing the elements of the local plans including

1. Evidence of collaboration

Evaluation Work Group Report, p.2

- a. Is there a collaborative effort of all level agencies that accomplish a true continuum in the community which defines the role and missions of each community supervising agency?
2. Definition of roles (mission)/partners
 - a. Where they fit into the continuum.
 - b. Partners could be DHR, non profit groups
3. Description of programs/services being offered including supervision and eligibility criteria.
 - a. Description offered in total and then by each agency.
4. Organizational Structures
5. Program capacity
 - a. Staffing and staff qualifications
6. Standard Operating Procedures (to include - data collection/reporting and sharing of information and quality assurance)
 - a. Questioned whether the standards should be state or set locally, standards set by this committee would probably end up being state standards depending upon results of the pilot sites.
7. Description of sanctions/incentives
 - a. Community structures should include incentives and sanctions
8. Description of the continuum of supervision of programs
9. Description of level of care and partners.

The plan should include a description of:

- A system of sanctions/incentives
- What is the continuum and how does it work within the jurisdiction
- What supervision is utilized in the community – monitoring and surveillance

Common items for evaluation, program or service to service within the jurisdiction, and jurisdiction to jurisdiction are:

Programs
Level of care
Costs
Financial support
Certification
Qualifications (for program and staff)

Whether evidence based practices are employed is another element common to each service and each jurisdiction.

Evaluation Work Group Report, p.3

A proposed time line and reports for the project:

- I. Status reports (6 months)
 - a. Current status (where we are) – program and services
 - b. Provide a report on how the plan will be developed
 - i. Periodic progress reports on plan development
 - ii. Provide an issues report from facilitated local meetings to determine the local issues that will be addressed.
 - iii. Allow evaluation committee to “drop in” on local meetings to determine the progress of the jurisdiction.
 - iv. Possible meetings between sites?
 - c. Data collection report
- II. Implementation of plan (12 months)
 - a. What the plan is (where are they going)
 - b. How they plan to implement the plan (how are they going to get there)
- III. Process and outcome evaluation (24 months)
 - a. Report on implementation of the planning process – used to judge compliance
 - i. Has the plan been implemented
 1. Description of elements
 2. Actions/changes/ enhancements
 3. Collaboration
 4. Elimination of duplication
 - b. Outcomes/results
 - i. System improvements/outcomes
 1. cost effectiveness, elimination of duplication
 2. effect on prison population
 3. prison diversion
 4. effect on FTA
 5. time to disposition
 6. community impact (reduction in crime)
 7. mental health resources
 8. revocations down - decrease of time spent in court by supervisors
 9. victim restitution
 10. accountability, payment of court costs and fees
 11. community involvement
 12. program completion/retention
 13. faith based involvement
 14. community service site (\$)
 15. DHR impacts – child support

Evaluation Work Group Report, p.4

- ii. Offender outcomes
 - 1. recidivism
 - 2. education
 - 3. substance abuse
 - 4. housing
 - 5. employment
 - 6. drug free and crime free days
 - 7. program service completion
 - 8. program completion/graduation without revocation
 - 9. FTA ↓
 - 10. probation revocations ↓
 - 11. child support ↑
 - 12. health/dental and mental care
 - 13. drug free babies

Agenda item III

Data elements – Process and outcome

It was agreed that data elements would be left for the data committee.

Agenda item IV

QA process

The issue of quality assurance will be discussed at the meeting on Oct 3, as Vera and CJI need to clarify what is meant by this.

Data Work Group

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 26, 2008
To: Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project
State Steering Committee
From: Data Working Group
Re: Data Working Group Charge

This memo summarizes the recommendations of the Data Working Group for jurisdictions chosen to be pilot sites in the Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project (CCASP). The Data Working Group was charged, in part, with developing the required data elements that will be included in the local jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. We have addressed each question contained in the charge for the Data Working Group, identified the associated obstacle(s) to each question element, and listed recommendations to realize the goals of collecting and sharing critical information for offenders punished and supervised in community settings.

To utilize the resources of the State and the pilot sites effectively, the location of current data elements needs to be detailed and defined better. Critical data elements are currently collected and maintained at both the state and local levels. The majority of the Data Working Group's recommendations pertain to information collected on offenders in local jurisdictions – not information collected by the Alabama Department of Corrections or the Board of Pardons & Paroles. It is imperative that information collected at the state level is made available to those responsible for supervision of offenders in community settings, but the core of the recommendations from this group focus on information collected at the local level.

The ultimate deliverable from the Data Working Group is envisioned to be a comprehensive listing of data currently available at the state and local levels (with notes showing where the information is located) and recommendations for additional data elements that need to be collected by the local jurisdictions chosen as pilot sites for CCASP.

The charge given to the Data Working Group included the 4 elements listed below.

1. What data should be reported by the local jurisdictions in their comprehensive plans?
2. What format should this data take?
3. Is it feasible for the local jurisdictions to utilize the Midas information management system?
4. Can data be shared across agencies and organizations?

Data Work Group Report, p.2

The box on the next page summarizes the Data Working Group's responses to these 4 questions. Following the box with the questions and responses, obstacles to the collection and sharing of critical offender information are listed and recommendations are provided to overcome these obstacles.

What data should be reported by the local jurisdiction in their comprehensive plans?

The data that is reported is a function of what information is available to report. The Data Working Group, as specified above, will produce a listing of information currently available and variables that are not available but need to start being collected for more informed decision making. After this list of data elements is complete, this group will then provide a listing of suggested reports that would be helpful and informative in monitoring progress of the pilot site jurisdictions.

What format should this data take?

The information that is gathered at both the state and local levels should be offender and case based information. It is vital for more detailed analyses that information on offenders collected be recorded and stored at individual levels (rather than at the aggregate level) in electronic format. Information collected at the individual level allows for a more substantive assessment of programs' and offenders' progress.

Is it feasible for the local jurisdictions to utilize the Midas information management system?

Yes. MIDAS is provided free of charge to local jurisdictions by the Administrative Office of Courts (AOC). In addition to offering MIDAS free of charge, AOC also provides training and support for users of the application. Currently MIDAS is most fully developed for Court Referral programs, but it is in the process of being expanded to more fully cover community corrections programs and drug courts.

Can data be shared across agencies and organizations?

Data can be shared across agencies and organizations, but this is not a formalized process in many jurisdictions. Much of the sharing of information is paper-based and needs to be changed so information may be shared and accessed electronically to speed up the process and allow people charged with supervision more access to offender information.

Data Work Group Report, p.3

Obstacles & Recommendations

Obstacle 1: Obtaining and gathering critical information/data of the offenders admitted to a community corrections program.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that community corrections programs have access to a pre or post sentence investigation (PSI) completed by a probation/parole officer. It would be ideal if all community corrections programs utilized the MIDAS program.

Pardons & Paroles officers are required by statute to complete a PSI for all felonies. The PSI contains information on the offender and offense not contained elsewhere. These PSIs contain detailed criminal histories – in-state, out-of state, juvenile and youthful offender criminal history – and rich detail about the commission of the current offense.

If all community corrections programs used MIDAS, this would ensure that all programs were collecting and coding the same data consistently and this information would be stored at one central location simplifying data extraction and analysis.

Obstacle 2: Maintaining a good working relationship with the different agencies involved in the criminal justice system.

Recommendation 2: In order to share information across the numerous agencies and organizations responsible for offender supervision, there needs to be increased collaboration and more cooperative effort to create and maintain a system where the sharing of critical offender information remains in place and is readily accessible.

Obstacle 3: Requirement that all information captured in the community corrections program be maintained in an electronic format.

Recommendation 3: Utilize the web-based MIDAS application which is offered to all community corrections programs at no cost to the program by AOC. AOC manages this application and provides all training and support for the application to users all of the state. However, not all community corrections programs utilize the MIDAS system. Some programs have created their own case management system in which data is captured electronically. The main focus here would be to ensure that the data can be analyzed in a uniform manner to ensure that the program elements could be measured against the other programs in other jurisdictions.

Obstacle 4: Obtaining information/data on all offenders entering a community corrections program to determine the number of felony diversions from prison.

Data Work Group Report, p.4

Recommendation 4: Require that the local jurisdiction complete either ADOC's 10-point scale checklist or the Sentencing Commission's sentencing standards worksheet on all offenders entering a community corrections program. This assessment process should be captured in an electronic format (preferably in MIDAS).

In a perfect system, either the 10-point scale or the sentencing standards worksheets would be completed (and recorded electronically) on **all** convicted felons, not just those sentenced to community supervision, to track the destinations of all offenders. By doing this, further analyses could be completed detailing the destination of offenders with prison or non-prison recommendations (worksheets) or those who qualify as reimbursable diversions (10-point scale).

Risk/Needs Assessment September 17, 2008

The Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group met in the small classroom of the Heflin-Torbert Judicial Building in Montgomery, Alabama, to consider the use of risk and needs assessment tools in community corrections programs in Alabama. Present at the meeting were: Rosa Davis, Chair; Foster Cook, TASC; Roger Thorne, TASC; Rebecca Johnson, Montgomery County Community Corrections; Ann Cargo, Pardons and Paroles; Cynthia Dillard, Pardons and Paroles; Bennet Wright; and, by phone, Jennifer Fahey, Crime & Justice Institute.

The Work Group is charged with examining the following:

- What assessment tools are being used in the local jurisdictions and by state agencies?
- Are these tools validated?
- At what points in the process and for what purposes are the tools used?
- What is the feasibility (including cost) of adopting a statewide instrument, including the feasibility of each of the instruments reviewed?

I. Summary:

The work group identified some of the assessment instruments now used and agreed to further research this question, surveying community corrections programs and asking CJI to assist with other states. The group discussed the desirability and justifications of using risk and need assessment instruments, the current use of such instruments in Alabama, and the use of such instruments at the various stages along the continuum of sanctions in Alabama. Rosa will survey the community corrections programs and talk to Jennifer Fahey about looking at other states, particularly those that have automated systems or instruments subject to automation. The group particularly identified North Carolina, Virginia, Ohio and possibly California as states that may be of interest. Instruments from other states or national instruments of interest include the Arizona instruments the OST, MOST and FROST, and the LSIR. This is not meant to be an exclusive list.

The work group is looking for a common instrument that can be used by the pilot sites.

II. Instruments currently in use in Alabama:

The workgroup identified three assessment tools currently in use in Alabama and agreed that inquiry should be made of the Community Corrections Association members as to whether they use any additional instruments.

Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group Report, p.2

The three tools identified include (1) the instruments used by Pardons and Paroles (actually three instruments); (2) the new risk assessment tool developed for Montgomery County Community Corrections; and (3) the assessment tool used by Court Referral Officers in assessing placement of misdemeanor drug offenders.

(1) Pardons and Paroles

The Risk and Needs Assessment tools used by Pardons and Paroles consist of three instruments: (1) a risk assessment used for probationers to determine levels of supervision after sentencing, (2) a needs assessment used to determine needs of probationers and parolees, and (3) a risk assessment instrument used as a tool for the Board of Pardons and Paroles to reference when considering an inmate for Parole. These instruments were developed for Pardons and Paroles from Pardons and Paroles case files on probationers and parolees and have not been further validated. The assessments are completed after sentencing. The probation risk assessment is used as a tool for determining the levels of supervision, and the needs assessment is used to define program areas for minimizing criminogenic traits of the offender. The assessment may be re-administered to determine progress in the offender. The parole risk assessment is administered in prison and is used as an aid to determine parole release eligibility.

The limitation on the P&P instruments that must be further researched is the effect on the viability of the instruments for use at all stages due to the limitation of the population on which the development of the instruments were based. Would there be a limitation on the use of either instrument for this reason? Should the instruments be re-normed?

(2) Montgomery County

The Montgomery County risk and needs assessment instrument is used to determine the suitability of an offender for Montgomery Community Corrections by assessing the likelihood that person will complete the program based on the success of past offenders with similar cognitive and behavioral attributes. This instrument is brand new and has not been validated. The system is a fully automated, web based, plug and play system. The system updates its analysis as more participants are added.

(3) CRO Instrument

The CRO instrument is used to determine the level of treatment for an assigned drug offender. This instrument has been in use for a number of years. This does not appear to be a “risk” assessment, but the workgroup needs to develop additional information.

(4) Other instruments in use in Alabama

The Group decided Rosa should determine what other instruments are used in Alabama and how they are used. Rosa agreed to survey the community corrections programs.

Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group Report, p.3

II. National Instruments

Some of the national instruments may lend themselves to common use as progressive instruments using only certain sections of the risk instrument at the initial assessment, followed by more complete assessment and reassessment at further stages in the criminal justice system. The Group asked that Rosa work with CJI to determine what other states and instruments should be reviewed with suggestions that the work group look at North Carolina, Virginia, Ohio and possibly California as states that may be of interest. Instruments from other states or national instruments of interest include the Arizona instruments the OST, MOST and FROST, and the LSIR. This is not meant to be an exclusive list.

The group agreed that once other states or instruments are identified, the following issues should be pursued in discussions with those jurisdictions or entities using or creating the instruments.

1. Whether a progressive instrument should be used?
2. Where is it being used – where they are being used have they been validated?
3. What are they being used for?
4. Who administers the instrument – are they automated or not?
5. What the training bill was like was retraining required. What the implementation training consisted of – train the trainer?
6. Is there a data sharing capability?
7. What was/is the cost of creating and maintaining such a system?
8. What is the ability of the instrument to evolve or is it static?
9. What is used to norm the instrument?
10. What quality assurances are in place – to ensure consistency of use and application?
11. What time does it take to administer – what is the difficulty level of using the instrument/program.
12. Who is the tool administered to and what environment is it being used in?
13. What populations are they used on and what population are they based on (eg. Probation/parole) and will it make a difference in scoring?

III. The Use of Risk and Needs Assessment Instruments

The work group recognized the goal of identifying risk and needs assessment instruments that could be used at different stages of the criminal justice process, beginning with arrest, identifying whether one instrument could be adapted to cover all steps in the continuum. It was recognized that different instruments target different populations and, therefore, may have different factors or the factors may be weighted differently.

Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group Report, p.4

The justification for the instruments includes:

- to place offenders in appropriate programs for addressing needs and using appropriate levels of supervision,
- to ensure programs are cost effective,
- appropriate use of supervision of resources ,
- risk assessments tools may be used for data collection, therefore an automated process is important.

The stages at which assessments are appropriate were identified are arrest, pretrial release, pretrial diversion, sentencing, post sentencing supervision, prison classification, release from prison (parole and split), release from supervision.

The purpose of risk/needs assessment at each stage of the criminal justice was discussed and outlined as follows:

STAGE	PRETRIAL/ PT DIVERSION	PROBATION	SPECILAITY CRTS Drug/DUI/ Mental	COMM CORRECTIONS	CC RELEASE PAROLE
Purpose <i>Product</i>	Release/ eligibility/plan Probability of coming to court Probability of returning to court <i>Eligibility for Diversion program</i>	Presentence investigation <i>Sentencing plan</i>	Eligibility determine treatment <i>Assessment and treatment plan</i>	Eligibility <i>Sentencing plan</i>	Release recommendation
Operational need	Supervision level	Supervision level and case management	Case management	CIM	

Broadly, the risk assessment is used at arrest to determine pre-trial releases eligibility or likelihood the accused will return to court, at all other stages the instrument is used to determine likelihood of reoffending and/or levels of supervision.

It was also noted that Virginia uses a risk assessment to determine some prison diversion for otherwise prison bound offenders. This appears to be a good and feasible use of risk assessment in the pilot sites for “prison recommended” offenders. Such use should be defined at the next meeting of this work group.

Risk/Needs Assessment Work Group Report, p.5

The last group discussion concerned the issues surrounding the use of an electronic data base or MIDAS system to collect and store data from the risk and needs assessment instruments that need to be answered by the data work group. Issues included:

- Can the instruments be included in MIDAS – technically, yes
- If filled out and stored on MIDAS who owns the data?
- Who can change data or should data be changed?
- Are there other issues that should be addressed by the data group?

IV. Next Steps

The next meeting will be set for the last week of October. The agenda for that meeting will include:

- Report on the community corrections survey or risk and needs assessment instruments. (Rosa and CJI)
- Report on national survey. (Rosa, CJI, and Group members assigned to research and interview other states and/or national instruments)
- Report on the adaptability and advisability of the Pardons and Paroles instruments for the remainder of the continuum.
- Decision recommending instruments and the use of instruments for the pilot sites
- Determine whether there a validation process that needs to be undertaken for the instruments in Alabama, and how and when this can be accomplished?

Elements of a Comprehensive Plan

Cooperative Community Alternative Sentencing Project (CCASP)

Elements of a Comprehensive Plan

- **A description of the ongoing collaborative efforts of all agencies and stakeholders in the local jurisdiction.**
 - Ensure that there is no duplication of services
 - List any intra-local agreements, for movement of offenders between agencies
 - Plan must be approved and signed by each significant criminal justice partner
 - Identify obstacles to collaboration and proposed plan to resolve them

- **A description of the existing services and programs offered in the local jurisdiction, including the goals and objectives of each service**
 - Provide a statement of the goals and objectives of each participating supervision agency
 - Include list of providers
 - Demonstrate the continuum of services
 - Each service should be certified if there is a certifying process for that service

- **Identify the gaps in the services provided in the jurisdiction**
 - Where does the jurisdiction need additional services?
 - What population does not get served?

- **The identification of a target population for each program and service, including the eligibility criteria.**
 - Include the level of supervision provided by each agency
 - Which agency provides which service
 - From where in the system is the offender referred (e.g., pre-trial release, pre-trial diversion, convicted probation, prison diversion, split sentence, probation, etc.)
 - Eligibility criteria should include criminal history, first offender or repeat offender

- **A description of the use of risk/needs assessment tools by the community punishment agencies and programs.**
 - [Risk/Needs Assessment Tool to be discussed by Work Group.]

- **A budget and the anticipated sources of funding for the program services.**
 - Plan for annual financial auditing of each agency by accredited auditors

- **A timeline to develop new services and reach stated performance measures, including how best to prioritize the new services.**
- **A description of the data collection system and the information collected by the program.**
 - How the information collected at the local level will be made available to supervision agencies at state level (and vice versa)
 - Individual level data (rather than aggregate level data)
- **Organizational structure of each community-based supervision agency**
 - Staff qualifications
 - Program capacity
 - Training requirements
 - Staff ratios
 - Equipment needed to perform services
- **Description of the sanctions and incentives used by the jurisdiction and each agency**
- **Description of supervision services**
 - Require individual supervision plans for all offenders
 - Services should include supervision for all levels, e.g., intensive, medium, low, unsupervised and special circumstances
 - Should include an array of steps (e.g., daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly reporting; in-person contact; supervisor visitation; electronic monitoring; community surveillance; overnight work release)
- **Each jurisdiction must include the following core programs and services:**
 - Drug treatment – at various levels including education, out patient, intensive out patient, and inpatient.
 - Drug testing – at varied frequencies depending on the level of need
 - Mental health treatment or reference
 - Job training and job referral
 - Education – including GED
 - Life Skills
 - Cognitive behavioral training
 - Health and housing reference services
 - Family Counseling
 - Payment monitoring for payment of fees, fines and restitution
 - Risk and needs assessment
 - Crisis intervention services
 - Community Service opportunities
 - Transition services from confinement to the community.

- **Standard Operating Procedures**
 - Quality Assurance – each jurisdiction to describe a quality assurance plan
 - Reporting
 - Status reports (6 months)
 - Current status (where we are) – program and services
 - A report on how the plan will be developed
 - Periodic progress reports on plan development
 - Provide an issues report from facilitated local meetings to determine the local issues that will be addressed.
 - Allow evaluation committee to “drop in” on local meetings to determine the progress of the jurisdiction.
 - Possible meetings between sites?
 - Data collection report
 - Implementation of plan (12 months)
 - What the plan is (where are they going)
 - How they plan to implement the plan (how are they going to get there)
 - Data sharing
- **Evaluation measures to assist in outcomes evaluations**
 - System improvements/outcomes
 - cost effectiveness, i.e., elimination of duplication
 - effect on prison population (i.e., increase or decrease admission to prison from the jurisdiction)
 - prison diversion
 - effect on failures to appear
 - time to disposition
 - community impact (reduction in crime)
 - mental health resources
 - revocations down - decrease of time spent in court by supervisors
 - victim restitution
 - accountability, payment of court costs and fees
 - community involvement
 - program completion/retention
 - faith based involvement
 - community service site (\$)
 - Department of Human Resources impacts – child support

- Offender outcomes
 - recidivism
 - education
 - substance abuse
 - housing
 - employment
 - drug free and crime free days
 - program service completion
 - program completion/graduation without revocation
 - FTA ↓
 - probation revocations ↓
 - child support ↑
 - health/dental and mental care
 - drug free babies