



STATE OF WASHINGTON
SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD
PO Box 40927 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0927
(360) 407-1050 • FAX (360) 407-1043

MINUTES
Benchmarks Committee
Tuesday, June 30, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Criminal Justice Center

Members Present

Bev Emery
Anmarie Aylward, Invited Member
Russ Hauge
Brad Meryhew
Peggy Smith
Maureen Saylor
Lindsay Palmer

Staff Present

Shoshana Kehoe-Ehlers
Andi May

Others Present

Patricia Layden, Private Citizen

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Bev Emery called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

II. Introductions

III. Revise and Adopt Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one revision. The order of agenda items VI and VII were switched.

IV. Approval of Minutes

April 28, 2009 Minutes – Tabled to next meeting.
Shoshana Kehoe-Ehlers orally recapped the April 28th meeting minutes.

V. Continue Detailing Initial Reentry and Supervision Component Parts

The Committee continued drafting a detailed map of what goes into reentry and supervision components of the sex offender management system; this involved reviewing the component parts chart drafted at the April 28th Benchmarks Meeting and the goals the

Committee wanted to accomplish with these component parts. The Committee then spent quite a bit of time during the meeting identifying what the measurements should be for these objectives.

In coming up with these measurements, the Committee first reviewed the Texas, Vermont, and Colorado sex offender treatment reentry models contained in the February 2007 CSOM article. The goal is to compile models from other states, begin to draft benchmarks for Washington State and then compare and contrast the two. We will look at Washington next month.

The Committee identified the special factors that make up that the Prison Based Sex Offender Treatment Reentry Models in the three states. They are listed below.

Other State Models:

Vermont ~

- What's implied in that is that there is a risk assessment when entering prison. That risk determines the tiering of the varying levels of treatment.
- There is close coordination between prison and community based treatment.
- They use a variety of risk assessment tools to assess offenders.
- The parole/probation officer and the offender work one on one.
- There is a designated officer for the release plan. There is coordination between the parole/community officer and prisoner.
- There is use of volunteers in the community for offenders that do not have an outside support system.
- The parole officers are specially trained.
- Surveillance/monitoring balanced with a case management approach to goal directed lifestyle.

Colorado ~

- They use a "Restorative Justice" framework
- It appears that sex offenders with significant resources are selected for the program.
- Limited program with significant volunteer required resources.
- Very specialized; does not serve all sex offenders.

Texas ~

- Risk assessment is completed early in the prison entry phase, similar to Vermont.
- Tiered treatment in prison
- Research based parole guidelines
- Community Reintegration to community ~ probably volunteer based
- They look at Static 99 factors for release and Dynamic Factors in release decision-making. The static factors are not the same as static 99. Static is general offenders and the static 99 are specific to sex offenders.
- Texas uses an indeterminate sentencing system.

The Committee next identified the benchmarks/measurements for each of the steps/objectives are a part of reentry prerelease and transition/release planning. (The steps/objectives are contained inside the boxes that make-up the map of the component parts chart.)

Reentry Pre-release

Objectives for Prison based sex offenders

Court/DOC: Presentence Investigation (PSI) Report for Superior Court Sex Offender (SO) Population.

- Is there a report?

Intake

- Is intake happening?

Sex Offender Treatment (TX)

- Does every SO have the opportunity to say they want TX
- If they ask for TX, do they get risk leveled
- Does every high risk SO that wants get to into TX and does every low risk SO get in TX.
- **Gap:** SO who have to wait for TX have their release date delayed.

Psychosocial TX

- Are the other treatments available?

Prison Personnel

- Is specialized training provided and is it used that way?

Visits

- Is there such as thing as therapeutic visits?
- Are visits with family members allowed?
- Are there policies in place to protect the victim?

Education and Vocation

- Are these services available

Objectives for Non-Prison based sex offenders

Court/DOC: PSI Report for Superior Court SO Pop.

- Is there a report?

Intake

- Is intake happening?

Reception

- Doesn't take place.

Classification

- Does it take place? (it is a different time frame)

Sex Offender TX

- Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA) offenders will have treatment.

Psychosocial TX

- Are the other treatments available
- Is it available and are SO eligible to enter the program

Jail Personnel

- Is there any specialized training for local jail correction officers?

Visits

- Is visitation allowed? Are there therapeutic visits?
- Are there protection measures in place for the victim?
- Is there some information provided to local jail officials about victim protection?
- Are therapeutic visitation services available?
- Is there a systematic referral available for the victim?

Education and Vocation

- Are these services available?

Transition/Release Planning

Objectives

Discretionary Release Process

- Is there a release plan in place?
- Is there any discretionary component available?
- How many release plans get approved?

Bridge Based Treatment

- Is there a formal mechanism in place to bridge treatment?

Establish Community Support Networks

- Does every offender have some established network? Is it in the release plan? Refer to the programs listed in the three model states discussed earlier.
- Is there specialized training for those involved in the network?

Family

- Does support/training/formal preparation for the family exist?
- Are there support services and protection in place for the victim who is part of the sex offender's family?

Victim Involvement in Release Process

- Is this available?

Stakeholder Assistance in Housing

- Is there any networking system between DOC and community housing?
- Is there specific housing assistance provided by DOC?
- Who is involved in this phase? (There could be quite a few different stakeholders.)

Collaboration

- Are there formal networks/processes in place?

At the Committee's next meeting, the members will continue identifying the benchmarks/measurements for each of the steps/objectives that are part of the transition/release and supervision components.

VI. Department of Corrections Role in *Reentry*

Anmarie Aylward briefly presented on what DOC puts into the initial reentry and transition of a sex offender into the community when the offender is in prison. She addressed two areas: What is the timeframe for reentry and what type of training do DOC officials who monitor sex offenders receive? She surveyed some DOC staff members to get their opinion on these questions.

What is the timeframe for reentry?

She found that there was little consensus amongst DOC officials; there was however consensus among them regarding the transition-phase in county jail and prison.

The DOC staff develops a release plan 12 to 18 months prior to the sex offender's release date. They will bring in specialized individuals and/or stakeholders if necessary. Once released from prison, the sex offender is in the community. Probation violation jail/prison time does not provide release plan services; or at least its pretty vague.

What type of training do DOC officials who monitor sex offenders receive?

Transition and reentry official policies do not differentiate between sex offenders and non-sex offenders. Community Corrections Officers receive training, but there is no official policy that mandates specialized training. CCOs do receive an initial block of sex offender training in the field and in prison. This training is not officially listed as a DOC policy.

Ms. Aylward explained that DOC has measures for objectives listed in the map of reentry and supervision. Some are listed in a g-map. Ms. Aylward will work to provide benchmarks materials for each box for this Committee.

There is no specialized training for the prison officials. Training on managing/supervising sex offenders and non-sex offenders is generally combined. CCOs who have a special interest in supervising sex offenders are generally the ones considered for those positions.

The Committee ended this part of the agenda by discussing the impact address approval has on a release plan and how a sex offender's support network or lack of support network impacts release date.

VII. Debriefing SOPB Yakima Forum

The Committee members discussed the general trends and impressions they heard from the participants of Benchmarks session at the SOPB Yakima Forum on June 25th.

The following themes resonated with the members:

- Housing
- Consistent communication
- Need for a process/uniformity for leveling all over the state.
- Matching registration requirements from one state with Washington requirements.
- Difficulty accessing documents out of state and in state, especially between small and larger counties.
- The community appears ready for change; a lot of support for a problem solving approach.
- There is not enough time for the release process of sex offenders.
- Rural vs. Urban challenges with accessing services for the sex offenders.
- Victim representatives were less concerned about SO moving into the neighborhood, and more upset about not being included in the reentry process.

VIII. New Business

There were no new business items.

IX. Public Comments

Private Citizen, Patricia Layden, occasionally spoke during the meeting.

X. Adjournment

Chair Bev Emery adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.