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Thinking for a Change Graduation:
What WSIPP Indicates about Community Supervision Policies that Reduce Crime

- Focus on higher-risk, not lower-risk, populations
- Crime deterrence from the swiftness and certainty of punishment, but not for severity of punishment (Swift & Certain sanctions)
- Referrals to programs (delivered with fidelity) and assigned based on individual needs
- Supervision that includes face-to-face contact between CCOs and supervised individuals, coupled with treatment/interventions
Meaningful Supervision Today:

- **Assessment:** Identification of each supervised individual’s risk and needs, and development of an individualized case plan

- **Engagement:** Regular CCO contact in field offices, home, work, school, and family

- **Programming:** Referrals and participation in change programs and services
  - Involves community engagement and partnerships to improve communication and wraparound treatment and services for supervised individuals and families

- **Accountability**
  - Swift and certain response to violations of conditions of supervision
  - Drug testing
  - Reinforce compliance and positive behavior
Individuals Supervised on May 31, 2017

Statewide | 18,096

Community Justice Centers

Work Release
Community Supervision Caseload: Targeted Higher Risk to Reoffend

Risk to Reoffend:
- High Risk: 71.6%
- Moderate Risk: 13.5%
- Low Risk: 14.5%
- Unclassified: 0.4%

Source: Omni for Offender Demographics as of May 31, 2017

Source: Data Analytics Major Sentencing Changes (Wave Chart)
Supervised Population Has Changed Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>FY 1996</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Manslaughter</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Crimes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery/Assault</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property/Other</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source Table 1A
Who is Currently on Supervision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Location Prior to Supervision</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly from Jail or Courts</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Supervised Individuals for Special Sentence Types:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOSA (prison &amp; residential)</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alt.</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First–time Offender Waiver</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Offender Sentencing Alt.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From out of state</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OMNI for Offender Demographics on May 31, 2017.
Supervision Funding Per Supervised Individual Has Increased as DOC Focuses on the Highest Risk
Swift & Certain Sanctions

Engagement with Supervised Individuals

Cognitive Behavioral Interventions

Meaningful Supervision
CCO Contacts

- In 2014, CCOs had approximately 458,000 face-to-face contacts with supervised individuals.

- **Minimum** contact standards for high-risk supervised individuals are 3 face-to-face and 1 collateral contact per month for High Violent Risk; and 2 face-to-face and 1 collateral contact per month for High Non-Violent Risk individuals.

- CCOs meet with supervised individuals in the field offices, at their homes, schools, and places of employment.

- Collateral contacts can be with family members, treatment providers, employers, educators, etc.
Based on a supervised individual’s assessed needs, CCOs refer them to one or more of the following programs:

- Thinking for a Change
- Drug treatment
- Domestic violence treatment
- Sex offender treatment
- Mental health treatment

Referrals based on higher risk/higher need
Supervised Individuals in Community Programming
FY2014 to FY2016 by Type

Source: OMNI Offender Data on May 31, 2017 – Data from DBHR Target is not included

Programs included in CBIs are all ACT, A2A, MOC, T4C, Anger Control Training, Beyond Trauma, Beyond Violence, and Cognitive-Behavior Orientation.

Other Programs includes all programs not in CD or CBI (ex: Vocational and Sex Offender Treatment.)
Accountability: Swift & Certain Sanctioning Model

- Legislation passed in 2012, creating the swift and certain sanctioning model for response to violations

- Due to Swift & Certain legislation, initial reductions in contracted jail violator–beds were achieved, resulting in savings to the State

- $6 million of the savings were reinvested in treatment services for individuals in the community (balanced approach)
  - Provided additional treatment slots in the community in an effort to save significant future prison commitments
  - Programs developed with quality assurance to monitor fidelity and ongoing program evaluation

- Outcomes are being tracked, measured, and analyzed
Accountability: Drug Testing

- In 2016, CCO’s administered over 117,000 urinalyses.
  - 10.2% of all tests were positive for prohibited substances.
In December 2008, the PEW Center identified 13 strategies for successful supervision and reentry to reduce recidivism and hold supervised individuals accountable.

The following table shows the strategies and how DOC is currently achieving each strategy and what the historical practice was (pre 2000).

# DOC Compared to PEW Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEW’s 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry</th>
<th>THEN (July 1, 2000) Before Offender Accountability Act (OAA)*</th>
<th>NOW – Calendar Year 2017 WA State Community Supervision Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define success as “Reduction and Measure Performance”</td>
<td>• While DOC’s goal was to reduce recidivism, there was a limited number of performance measures for community corrections.</td>
<td>✓ Results Washington and Results DOC track measures related to supervision compliance and recidivism as well as intermediate options and response to noncompliance. There are improved behavior change strategies and measures specific to recidivism reduction, substance abuse, employment, and other reintegration outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor Conditions of Supervision</td>
<td>• CCOs had no ability to impose new supervision conditions. • CCOs had to adhere exclusively to the conditions in the Judgment and Sentence, exactly as imposed by the Courts</td>
<td>✓ Policy expectations have been set that any DOC-imposed conditions must be directly related to the offense behavior ✓ Checks and balances are in place to monitor that imposed conditions follow DOC policies expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Resources on Higher Risk</td>
<td>• Offenders were supervised based on offense, not risk level. • All offenders sentenced to community supervision were supervised.</td>
<td>✓ New laws -- ESSB 5990 (2003) and ESSB 5288 (2009)** -- realigned supervision to focus resources and supervision on higher risk offenders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DOC Compared to PEW Strategies – cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEW’s 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry</th>
<th>THEN (July 1, 2000) Before Offender Accountability Act (OAA)*</th>
<th>NOW – Calendar Year 2017 WA State Community Supervision Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frontload Supervision Resources</strong></td>
<td>• No measures or outcomes existed to orient or frontload resources.</td>
<td>✓ Orientation and intake, including risk/need assessment, happen within the first 30 days of release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ This performance measure is tracked monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement Earned Discharge</strong></td>
<td>• CCOs did not have authority to implement this. CCO could report to court and request discharge.</td>
<td>No statutory authority to award earned incentives at this time but we are proposing/have proposed legislation on earned incentives***.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Supervise Offenders in Their Communities**              | • While some offenders did have face-to-face contacts in the field (home, work, school, etc.), many were on a banked caseload and were only required to check in via kiosk.  
• No set contact standards.                              | ✓ All offenders have minimum contact requirements by DOC Policy, based on validated risk assessment.  
✓ DOC has 16 work releases, 89 field offices and 6 Community Justice Centers located across the state. |
| **Engage Partners to Expand Intervention Capacity**       | • No policy-driven expectation of contact with family or support members  
• Limited contact and engagement with community stakeholders.  
• No identification of offender needs in that community. | ✓ Local multi-disciplinary groups  
✓ Family and support members are involved in reentry and supervision  
✓ Increased referrals and follow-up with community service providers |
### DOC Compared to PEW Strategies – cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEW’s 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry</th>
<th>THEN (July 1, 2000) Before Offender Accountability Act (OAA)*</th>
<th>NOW – Calendar Year 2017 WA State Community Supervision Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess Criminal Risk and Need Factors</strong></td>
<td>• No measures developed or implemented.</td>
<td>✓ DOC has a highly accurate and validated risk tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ DOC’s needs tool, used at intake, identifies risk and protective factors to help direct offenders to appropriate resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Surveillance and Treatment in Case Plans</strong></td>
<td>• While there were successful programs, they were not consistent nor available throughout the state.</td>
<td>✓ Case plans are developed based on risk/needs and occurs within first 30 days of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Program services and referrals for treatment in the community have increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ DOC’s Smart Supervision Grant focuses on staff training and programming fidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involve Offenders in the Supervision Process</strong></td>
<td>• Some staff had skills sets in working with offenders but it was not trained nor developed as a skill set.</td>
<td>✓ Offenders are closely involved in their supervision, from orientation at intake through completion of their sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Staff are trained in motivational interviewing and engaging with offenders to improve results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Smart Supervision Grant will ensure continued training and honing of these skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DOC Compared to PEW Strategies – cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEW’s 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry</th>
<th>THEN (July 1, 2000) Before Offender Accountability Act (OAA)*</th>
<th>NOW – Calendar Year 2017 WA State Community Supervision Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engage Partners to Expand Intervention Capacity | • While collateral contacts have always been part of supervision, without strategies to frame risk needs and responsivity, these contacts were not as effective as they could have been. | ✓ Each offender’s residence and employment are verified  
✓ Through field visits, DOC has contact with support system, including family, employers, treatment providers, and others involved in the offender’s life. |
| Use Incentives and Rewards | • Certificates for some accomplishments were awarded | ✓ Incentives for positive behavior in work releases, offender change programs and chemical dependency programming are offered.  
✓ Currently, DOC has agency request legislation that would add earned incentive credits for supervision length. |
| Respond to Violations with Swift and Certain Sanctions | • Response to violations was administered through the courts. | ✓ Swift and Certain response to violations was implemented statewide in 2013.  
✓ DOC addresses violations through an internal administrative hearing process.  
✓ Courts retain jurisdiction on Alternative Sentences (Special Sex offender Sentencing Alternative, Family and Offender Sentencing Alternative, and Residential Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative) |
Statewide Supervision

- DOC supervises high-risk felony individuals across the state of Washington
- Resources and delivery of services may differ from county to county, rural vs. urban areas, etc.
Supervision Upon Release

- Supervision includes:
  - Release Plan, which includes stakeholder engagement to mitigate risk
  - Approved Release Address
  - Referrals and access to CBIs and treatment
  - Temporary Housing Assistance for individuals transitioning to supervision from prison
  - Ongoing monitoring of supervised individuals:
    - Verification of reported residence,
    - compliance with court ordered conditions,
    - progress in treatment,
    - facilitation of behavioral change, and
    - risk/needs assessments

- Without supervision:
  - Individuals return to their communities without the programs, monitoring, guidance and access to resources towards addressing their needs, thus aggravating their risk to reoffend.
Resources for Inmates Releasing Prison:

- Pre-Enrollment for Medicaid Services
- Increased Access to Housing Voucher Program
- Job Skills and Readiness from participating in Correctional Industries jobs while incarcerated
Employment and Education

- Correctional Industries Navigators
- Education Navigators
- Post Release Employment Partnerships:
  - FareStart
  - Goodwill
- Partnerships with WorkSource
Moving Forward...

- Future workload study
- Incentives to reinforce compliance and positive behavior
- Continued focus on risk-based supervision
- Evaluation of the components of Swift & Certain
Questions?