



Governor's Re-entry Council

Meeting Summary September 12, 2013

Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST)
Hall of Heroes
4190 Aumsville Highway
Salem, OR 97317

CHAIR: Colette S. Peters

NOTE TAKER: Kelli Ketchum

ATTENDEES: Colette Peters; Patrice Altenhofen; Kristi Wings-Yanez; Thomas McClellan; Jerry Moore; Mark Royal, Paul Solomon, Tim Moore for Dan Staton; Dick Withnell, Erinn Kelley-Siel, Gerald Hamilton for Greg Hamann; Denise Walls for Rep. Kevin Cameron; Robert Lee for Margaret VanVliet; Kim Brockamp; Cindy Booth

OBSERVERS: Pegge McGuire, Seantel Heisel, Martha Duncan-Perez, Patrick Vance, Parrish VanWert, Debra Giard, Matt Meier, Doug Cooper, Chris Hoy

1. Approval of Meeting Summary

DISCUSSION:	The council had minor updates; page 4 – corrected 4-year plan to a 5-year plan
ACTION:	The council approved the meeting summary for February 6, 2013
ATTACHMENTS:	 GovernorCouncilMeetings0262013.pdf

2. Breakthrough Plan – Discussion/Approval

DISCUSSION:	Director Peters explains the new format (using a 'breakthrough plan format') is familiar to those from OYA and is a process DOC is completing as part of the Organization Transformation currently underway. The department is going through and mapping the organization to really understand the vision, to set
-------------	---

clear goals and to move the organization to what we would traditionally see from a private sector view point. DOC is beginning to establish outcomes, set targets and is measuring how we are doing well beyond our recidivism measures and well beyond our traditional key performance measures. We are looking to target every part of our organization so we will know how we are doing from our IT services requests, to payroll, all the way to outcomes for our adults in custody and the safety of our staff. We will also establish targets and define what successful transition means. We would like to ensure our efforts are lining up to our CORE efforts.

We would like to have this same vision for our Council so we can look at a document that clearly maps our work, tracks progress and helps us ensure we have completed what we want to.

With this in mind, Cindy reviewed the Breakthrough Plan for the Reentry Council. We have established focus areas, but do not yet have a routine measure for these other than the performance measures the DOC is undertaking. Through this measurement process we hope to have a better story of the achievements and goals that have been accomplished with the Council's direction.

The focus areas from the February Council meeting include some efforts of prior reentry work groups. However, the work groups have not met since the fall of 2012 due to legislative session and changes (retirements, role changes, etc.) of partner agency staff. It is time to reengage leadership and the content experts to work on the next set of reentry priorities and bring forward recommendations the Council can move forward.

The Council will be asked to identify agency and organization representatives to work on issues identified in February, 2013 as the focus areas the Council seeks to address in 2014. Review of Breakthrough Plan document:

- Aging Population
- Business Community
- Education (on-line & funding)
- Employment & Backgrounds
- Family Engagement
- Housing Resources for DOC & OYA
- Incentive Funds
- Juvenile Re-entry
- Mental Health Population
- Sex Offenders
- Veterans
- Visitation Barriers

	<p>Dick Withnell commented that from a community view point each one of these goals would need a dollar and cents return on investment. If we do this action we will save this amount. We need a win/win representation. This will also create a base line of what we will achieve by completing these. How are these actions driving recidivism down?</p> <p>Adding the Business Community (engagement).</p> <p>Erinn Kelley-Siel suggested talking with the Work Force Policy Advisors in the Governor’s office about efforts already underway to engage employers and others in conversations to ‘close the employment gap.’ Recommends a single point of contact for employer committees is important – rather than multiple committees trying to work the same issues.</p>
ACTION:	Review targets based on discussion and bring back to next meeting for review and approval.
ATTACHMENTS:	 <p>Breakthrough Plan 9-12-13 mtg.pdf</p>

3. Council Structure Recommendation & Membership Needs

DISCUSSION:	<p>Director Peters shared the department has talked with Council members and within the regarding how the Reentry Steering Committee functions. The majority of the feedback indicates here has been a lot of redundancy in effort and people resources. In many ways the Steering Committee was playing both roles as was the Council. Historically, the Council met quarterly and the Steering Committee met monthly. Workgroups would meet when they could. Workgroups would report back to Steering Committee while then going back to the Council for decisions.</p> <p>A recommendation is being presented today suggesting some structural changes to the Council’s governance process; to breathe new life into the work groups while continuing to value those individuals that have been so dedicated to the Steering Committee by asking they continue their contributions by participating on work groups. The work groups will report to the Council who will provide oversight to the groups as well as take responsibility for moving issues forward.</p> <p>Recommended Structure: The Council will serve as the hub and the work groups will work individually and together when topics overlap. Each work group will report back to the Council. We ask that members on the Council consider participation on workgroups as well, when possible. Please do send a designee.</p>
-------------	---

	<p>Mr. Solomon stated he thought it was a good idea, there was some redundancy with the Steering Committee and work groups. The key with this will be finding the right people to populate these work groups.</p> <p>Mr. Cooper stated that the history of the Council indicates things moves slowly; the Steering Committee had moved that process up a bit faster so he is concerned that if the Council only meets quarterly this might make the new process take even longer.</p> <p>Director Peters shared it might still move slowly, at least initially, but we anticipate the new process will allow the work groups to bring more complete and fully-vetted issues for the Council’s consideration. And, with Council member on the work groups, they can assist to bring issues forward. Mr. Solomon asked if there will be a lead on the work group and from where? Director Peters’ hope is to have a member of the Council or designee on each work group. Content experts are also welcome. The work groups will be staffed. In addition, depending on the topics, people may be able to participate for short time-frames and then move on to the next topic with a different Work group.</p> <p>Ms. Kelley-Siel suggested we carefully consider how many work groups to convene and for what period of time they will work.</p>
ACTION:	<p>The Council will determine next work group categories at the next meeting following an overview of accomplishments to date. Originally, the Council chose four topics to work on: Reentry Housing, Employment (and Education was added in 2011), Continuity of Care (physical and mental health issues), and Transition Resource Centers.</p>
ATTACHMENTS:	<p> Restruture Proposal 9-12-13 mtg.pdf</p>

4. 2014 Strategic Plan

DISCUSSION:	<p>Director Peters presented an overview of the topics outlined during the February 2013 Council meeting and asked the Council to consider focusing on 4 to 5 issues over a one or two-year period for work group assignment.</p> <p>Ms. Kelley-Siel suggested renaming the work groups as “Implementation Teams.”</p> <p>Ms. Duncan-Perez gave an overview of the Washington County Reentry Counsel and suggested a consumer or ex-offender be a member on the</p>
-------------	---

	<p>Governor’s Reentry Council or on an Implementation Team.</p> <p>There was discussion about HB 3194 (2013); specifically Section 13 regarding Short-Term Transitional Leave (STTL) which is of interest to Council members with regard to reentry. This legislation changes the period of STTL from up to 30 days to that of <u>up to 90 days</u> for certain persons convicted on or after August 1, 2013. There were several questions about ‘funding’ to implement various segments of HB 3194. A review of how each work group focus area could line up with HB3194 is requested due to the impact on communities with regard to early releases.</p> <p>Mr. Solomon stated that resources will be a challenge as for where services will be coming from.</p> <p>It was suggested each Council member sit down with their research staff to see what one thing they can really move forward at the local level that will “move the dial” in terms of engagement and process improvement. Giving each workgroup one goal and have them report back to the Council.</p> <p>Chief Moore wanted to assure that the research will come from all the stakeholders; not just DOC. And yes, it will be a shared research process.</p>
<p>ACTION:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use breakthrough plan discussed today to focus work for next year (or two). Work with the DOC research team to determine which “dials we can turn” to really make a difference. We will cover all topics possible, but narrow scope to really target outcomes. Set targets and determine the costs and benefits for what gets attention. 2. Connect with Work Force Advisors in the Governor’s office regarding Closing the Employment Gap initiative. 3. Implementation teams will be responsible for developing a communications plan/strategy for each effort which will roll-up to a Council communication plan on where we are heading as a Council (as well as reviewing progress to date). <p>In order to keep momentum going, the Council agreed to hold a meeting on November 20, 2013 to approve work group topics and convening processes.</p>
<p>ATTACHMENTS:</p>	

5. Reports from State Agencies

<p>DISCUSSION:</p>	<p>Oregon Department of Corrections Director Peters reported on the department’s efforts concerning HB 3194 and those sections that most impact the department. DOC received a budget that on the Community Corrections side we are very pleased with. That segment of the budget saw additions to the ‘base’ budget as</p>
---------------------------	---

well as the addition of reinvestment dollars that will help in our transition and reentry work.

On the other side of DOC's business, DOC received, over-all, the worse budget since the great recession. Last biennium there was a \$56 million dollar hole. This budget presents over a \$96 million dollar hole which means every division is being hit (with the exception of Community Corrections pass-through). DOC has engaged in the transformation work with Mass Ingenuity (referenced earlier) and we are hoping to develop department efficiencies using that process..

Board of Parole

Board Chair Kristin Wings-Yanez reported on the passage of HB 2549; legislation authorizing a 'tier' or level system for sex offenders.

This bill creates a three tier system for ranking sex offenders. Right now we have a 'one size fits all' sex offender registration system. The new system moves away from the 'predatory or not' category and will rank the sex offender based on a risk assessment tool that is selected by the DOC and the Board of Parole. The Board is tasked with ranking all the sex offenders.

Level 1 – Low Risk

Level 2 – Moderate Risk

Level 3 – High Risk

A Level 1 offender can petition for relief from registration only after they have been off supervision for at least five years. The Board will review the assessment; look at nature and degree of violence in the offense, age and number of victims in the offense; age of the person at the time the offense took place; the length of time since the offense that required reporting; and the time period in which the offender has not reoffended. Looking at support systems, housing, employment, etc. No community notification are submitted to news, neighbors, schools, etc.

A Level 2 offender can petition for relief from registration only after they have been off of supervision for at least ten years. The same things listed for Level 1 are taken into consideration. Community notifications will be submitted to neighbors, household members, schools, etc.

A Level 3 offender does not get the option for relief from registration; however, after a period of ten years they can request to be reassessed – the process to potentially be moved to a Level 2. But even if successful, they will never receive relief from registration. Community notifications to everyone including household members, neighbors, schools, media, etc.)

There are about 4,000 of the over 20,000 sex offenders off supervision that still need to be assessed. If all goes as planned, the level system will begin January 2017 where all past and current sex offenders will be placed into the level system.

Starting January 2014, all offenders coming out of prison will be assigned a level. The period from now to January 2017 allows the Board to complete assessments on those in the community who do not have an assessment of which there are approximately 4,000. No offender can ask for relief until Jan 2017.

Oregon Youth Authority

Seantel Heisel reported on behalf of Director Pakseresht.

A 2013 bill passed to allow OYA parole officers to take parolees into custody. This was housekeeping legislation to correct an oversight. Budget-wise OYA was very fortunate; funded at current service level; a 2% hold back was about a \$7 million reduction.

OYA did receive a budget note to 1) create a business plan for a youth reformation system which is a predictive process model to inform decisions throughout the juvenile justice system to ensure the right youth at the right place with the right resources available; and 2) evaluate the youth facilities for juvenile use versus community use based on the corrections forecast, including future use of the buildings if not used.

Oregon Department of Transportation

Tom McClellan reported on 3% across the board cuts. Mr. McClellan provided an update on the process to issue ID for offenders under the Valid with Previous Photo (VWPP) process stating that from the first batch of 25 received, only 11 were issued. ODOT has the ability to process 100 each month. DOC will look into why some were not issued and how we can maximize the process.

Parrish VanWert responded the main reason only 11 out of 25 were issued is because these first offender records did not have a photo on file with DMV. DOC have developed data filters for the pre-screening process to catch these situations before processing. To work, the photo on file with DMV must no older than 9 years, 2 months. DOC and DMV continue to conduct monthly transports of up to 10 offenders from a Salem and the Madras institutions to their local DMV office so the offenders who have no Oregon DMV file can obtain an identification card.

Sponsors, Inc.

Paul Solomon, Executive Director reported that Lane County passed a Public Safety Levy which means Sponsors, Inc., will most likely see a bump in its budget.

	Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors (OACCD) Mark Royal, Umatilla County Community Corrections Director The budget is viewed as restorative in nature – back to that of the 2007-09 biennium. Even though the work load is now different, it is still considered to be positive.
ACTION:	None
ATTACHMENTS:	None

6. Reentry Housing Conference, 9/19/13

DISCUSSION:	Invite to join the September 19 th Reentry Housing Conference
ACTION:	
ATTACHMENTS:	 ReEntry Agenda.pdf

7. 2014 – 2016 Proposed Schedule

DISCUSSION:	We have the Council scheduled to 2016. Council members are invited to place these dates on their calendars. Meetings will be held at DPSST unless otherwise stated.
ACTION:	None
ATTACHMENTS:	 2013_2016_Schedule_of_REC_Mtgs.pdf

8. Good of the Order

DISCUSSION:	None
ACTION:	None
ATTACHMENTS:	None

NEXT MEETING:	Date: November 20, 2013 Time: 2:30 to 4:30 PM Location: DPSST, Hall of Heroes 4190 Aumsville Highway Salem, OR 97317
FUTURE MEETINGS - AGENDA ITEMS:	Review of Implementation Teams