



STATE OF WASHINGTON

Sex Offender Policy Board

PO Box 40927 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0927
(360) 407-1050 • FAX (360) 407-1043

Benchmarks Committee Meeting Minutes

Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission, Rm. C-226
109010 – 1st Avenue South
Burien, WA 98148
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
February 25, 2009

ATTENDEES

Russ Hauge
Sheriff Mark Brown
Anmarie Aylward
Brad Meryhew
Kecia Rongen
Bev Emery

Staff Present

Jean Soliz-Conklin
Shannon Hinchcliffe
Shoshana Kehoe
Andi May

Others Present

Dave Pavelchek, from Washington State University; Kyra Kester, from Washington State University

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman Russ Hauge at 10:10 a.m.

II. Introductions

The Board members and attendees introduced themselves

III. Revise and Adopt Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

IV. Approval of Minutes

MOTION # APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 30, 2008 MINUTES

Moved: Brad Meryhew

Seconded: Bev Emery

Passed: Unanimously

V. Update on Legislation and Discussion on Purpose of this Committee

Ms. Soliz-Conklin updated the Board on the Governor's bill suspending personal service contracts and how that may affect this Committee contracting with WSU. Because WSU is a public agency, any service agreements between the Board and WSU may qualify as interlocal agreements as opposed to personal service contracts. Ms. Soliz-Conklin will be inquiring with the Office of Financial Management about whether interlocal agreements are exempt from the Governor's personal service contract freeze effective until June 30, 2009.

Before starting the discussion on committees and stakeholder involvement plans, the Chair opened the meeting with some general remarks about both SOPB and the Benchmarks Committee's work.

- Because of the amount of work the Board is currently doing, along with the legislative session, there is a general consensus to slow down the Citizen's guide project. Members would like more time to thoughtfully consider what will go into the guide.
- When session is finished, this Committee may have to increase the speed and level of work it will have to do. Mr. Hauge recently testified before the legislature on SB 6011. There will most likely be criminal sentence reductions across the board. Concern was expressed that the sex offender sentences not fall into those cuts. A suggested compromise would be to focus on determinate plus sentencing for sex offenders.

These remarks spurred discussion by the other members.

- This purpose of this committee is to map out the official response to reveal sexually deviant behavior and make recommendations for best practice. In light of the Darrin Sanford case in Clark County and the significance of sex offender policy, this Committee has the opportunity to put together a thoughtful, comprehensive scheme for sentencing sex offenders.
- ISRB and Lucy Berliner are good resources for determinate sentencing plus research.
- There was also some discussion about the need to ensure that people understand the length of time sex offenders are actually held under determinate plus sentences.

VI. Complete Tasks One and Two of SOPB Benchmarks Committee Workplan

A. Task One – Definitions

There was a proposal to redefine recidivism for purposes of this Committee. Several points were made by the Committee when discussing this.

- The committee should not include the crime of Failure to Register as a re-offense. The Failure to Register numbers skew the recidivism rates. The

recidivism re-offense should be a “substantive” offense. The Committee may want to present this to the full Board in the future.

- There was a consensus the term recidivism clearly differentiate between recidivism of sex offenses and non-sex offenses.
- WSIPP’s recidivism standard is any new conviction with three years.
- This committee may be looking at an eight year period for recidivism rates.

There was a suggestion to maintain an ongoing definition list for this committee and at some point present the definitions to the full Board.

MOTION# The definition of recidivism will no longer include Failure to Register offenses.

Moved: Bev Emery

Seconded: Kecia Rongen

Passed: Unanimously

The members went on to clarify what “sex offender response system” means. It is from the time the offense became known, either by a report to law enforcement or contact with victim’s services, to the point of conviction.

The Committee agreed that it needs to redefine reentry. This should be put on next month’s agenda.

VII. Social Science Research Related to the Supervision and Reentry Systems

1. Introduction and Overview

Mr. Pavelchek and Ms. Kessler introduced themselves and explained their process. They work in the social science research department of Washington State University. Mr. Pavelchek explained there are some general problems on managing research and that some things are not well represented in the data system. His department surveys the professional community, the informants, and the people that observe and give you the information. Non-data things will come out of professional groups of people, key processes, etc. Those are reasonable targets to survey. Fortunately, email feedback is an effective survey tool for this group and less expensive.

2. Designing the Survey and Identifying Key Informants

WSU reviewed the CSOM model questions for their proposed survey as suggested. There are some challenges from the questions of CSOM Mr. Pavelchek explained that many of the questions will have to be re-written. However, they are useful. To map out the process WSU will need to sit down with the Committee and identify the key informant groups, figure out the challenges of accessing, and then create reasonable timelines.

The Committee worked on mapping out the key informants of supervision and reentry. When doing this, Mr. Pavelchek suggested looking at what data can and

cannot be obtained. This will dictate who WSU will survey. The members suggested a list of key informants for supervision and re-entry to include: law enforcement (this includes: Sheriffs and line officers, registration, classification system), DOC/CCOs, victims representatives, judges, offenders, treatment providers, ISRB, and possibly Administrative Law Judges.

Mr. Pavelchek and the members discussed different methods of surveying groups. Offenders will probably be the most difficult to survey, so the initial focus will be on the two most accessible groups, treatment providers and DOC/CCOs.

Mr. Pavelchek explained that with the time constraints WSU could probably complete the design and one pilot within the fiscal year. The design will take approximately four months.

Mr. Pavelchek explained that the cost of one pilot is fairly easy; the variable is how much more design work they we need to do. He will need to have another conversation with this Committee to ask for its priorities. He will then be able to figure out the necessary resources to accomplish this.

Next Step: Ms. Soliz-Conklin will contact the Board immediately if she finds out that there is an opening to fund this contract with WSU. The Committee agreed to set an emergency teleconference or in person meeting in Olympia to revisit the survey design and key informant list if funding is approved.

VIII. Public Comments

There were no public comments

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Russ Hauge at 11:55 a.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE BENCHMARKS COMMITTEE

Russ Hauge

Date

Shoshana K. Kehoe

Date