

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>I did have a few comments, CSC INDAP, IDAP, ISAP are not programs, they are just groups we run and there are some definite distinctions. So when we cal them groups they are seriously misleading. I am not sure about our sex offender “programs” but I suspect they are also just groups. In the section where we discuss timelines are we also going to be specific about what assessments will take place? It might be a good idea to have a minimum of what is essential.</p> <p>Also, why do Attachments 1,2, and 3 have so many redundancies? Are we supposed to suggest which we feel is best?</p>	<p>We call our CSC, INDAP etc. programs.</p> <p>That is covered in a different directive.</p> <p>The attachments are different and to be filled out at different times in the case planning process.</p>
<p>I realize that this form is supposed to auto fill and that only some of the pages are applicable however how have we reduced work when the form in its entirety is still 10 pages.</p> <p>The CSSs (PO/Case worker) can provide case management and support without this type of document.</p> <p>I thoroughly believe a document like the ones I have attached provide clear direction for the offender and can be used to address risk areas, programming, financial requirements, and sobriety. I have used them multiple times attached to violations for the court, parole board and case staffings to show both failures to abide and compliance. (See attached.)</p> <p>I do not support this new Offender Case Plan directive as I believe we are just re-inventing ORP.</p>	<p>We disagree. This requires much less data entry by the CSS.</p> <p>This is a case plan for the offender to allow both the offender and the PO to know what is expected for them to do.</p> <p>This is a global case plan that follows the inmate from start to finish (jail to discharge/max). All in one document. Thanks for sharing your case plans.</p> <p>ORP has been significantly modified and streamlined.</p>
<p>Line 245 states: "Initial residence screen". Suggest it read "initial residence screen by facility CSS per directive 371.14; 4.1.2a.</p>	<p>The initial residence screen should be by both the field and facility CSS. The field will be making an initial determination to determine if</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

<p>Line 248: Appears the line should be tabed to the left and identified by a solid bullet consistant with the three bullets above it. Line 250 states: "Physical residence check" - Suggest it read: "Physical residence check by field office". This would more closely match the language in draft directive 371.02 lines 548 and 549.</p>	<p>this will be an appropriate placement for the offender.</p> <p>Agreed around line 248 and 250 - thank you.</p> <p>We changed.</p>
<p>- Line 46 – Max Out Case: An inmate who will complete or has completed their maximum sentence... - Line 79 – Remove one of the “Projected Movement Date (PMD)” - Line 81 – Attachment 1 is NOT a list of PMD codes - Line 169 – Please define “meeting”, as this implies that the caseworker and PO need to meet in person with inmate (difficult to do OOS) - Line 171 – Please define “meeting” - Line 200 – There is no definition as to when Section 3 should be completed. Is it the same guidelines as Section 2? - Line 201 – The term “Risk Management Supervision” is used. The definition of this earlier in the directive relates to individuals in the community. This would mean that inmates do not have to do Section 3. Instead, should it be defined as individual with needs reducing programming? - Line 225 – Term Community Harm Statement – I did not see this defined anywhere. Also, when does the completion of a new Community Harm Statement happen?</p>	<p>This is our standard glossary definition</p> <p>Thank you - done. Thank you- deleted language. Thank you - adjusted language</p> <p>Thank you – adjusted language</p> <p>Thank you – adjusted language; and no, inmates do not do section 3. Section 3 builds off of section 2 (re-entry plan) which is done in the facility.</p> <p>We have deleted all harm statements in the new OCP. Thank you – changed. Changed language earlier in directive</p> <p>See above.</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

<p>- Line 248 – This line should be moved out to the left</p> <p>- Line 249 – Please define “meeting”</p> <p>- Attachment 2 – Line 336, Line 345, Line 351 and Line 358 are repeats from Initial Harm Statement and Re-entry Harm Statement. Does the individual have to do it 3 times?</p> <p>-</p> <p>Attachment 4 (OCP) – It is not labeled “Attachment 4”, but is referred to as that throughout the directive.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Attachment 4, Section 1 – Under the education section, add place to mark if they have obtained GED and date.</p> <p>- Add something regarding inmate/offender refusal to participate.</p>	<p>Will fix. This is not a WORD document so we hadn’t inserted it yet into the directive itself.</p> <p>Thank you - added GED.</p> <p>Not needed on this document. This is the plan the offender must abide by in order to be released into community supervision. If they refuse mandated programming, they will not be released into community supervision.</p>
<p>What is the difference between the 180 day "Initial Residence Screen" and the 90 day "Initial Residence Screen for Approval?" (ll. 314 & 316)</p> <p>180 days prior to Projected Release Date</p> <p>312 o Section 2 Transition and Re-entry Plan</p> <p>313 o Case Co-Management meeting with assigned CSSs and the inmate</p> <p>314 o Initial residence screen</p> <p>90 days•315 prior to Projected Release Date</p> <p>316 o Initial residence screen for approval</p>	<p>We took out this reference. It is spelled out in FCM on pp. 19 & 20.</p>
<p>Section 3 under Treatment Programs you need to put in CSC phase I along with the phase II that is there. Some offenders have to do the whole program in the community.</p>	<p>Thank you, you are correct.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>#344.01 Collaborative Community Supervision</p> <p>Line 34. we do not follow this directive and haven't for quit some time. If it is still valid, perhaps we could follow it?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>re: parole supervision section lines 78 and 79: subject to the supervision of the Department of Corrections and under the control of the parole board (or governed by the parole board or under the jurisdiction of the parole board) not the control of the commissioner.</p> <p>Lines 162 and 163: to successfully engage offenders in the case planning process for successful re-entry</p>	<p>Definition is correct.</p> <p>Thank you for this suggestion, it will be included.</p>
<p>numbered pastes have suggested changes in them. bold sections are questions/ suggestions</p> <p>90 Programs: The Department of Corrections provides a range of treatment programs to 91 address criminogenic risk need areas.</p> <p>?Should there be a definition of Correctional Programs (those that address criminogenic risk and need) vs. other programs that are strengths enhancing?</p>	<p>This might be better addressed in a program guide, as opposed to this particular directive.</p>
<p>152 Correctional Caseworkers and Probation Officers (Correctional Services Specialists) are 153 needed to support and assist offenders in developing a meaningful case plan according change to CSSs need to support and assist.....</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>212 c. Offender Responsibility Plan (Attachment 2) Isn't clear if this section, before 2, is completed by inmates who have 90+ days to serve, or only those who have to complete section 2</p> <p>236 b) The facility CSS will assist the inmate to make initial contact 237 with identified community resources and to set up 238 appointments for the inmate within 30 days of their release to 239 the community.</p> <p>Shouldn't release planning start right off? Inmate should be planning from the moment they come in - particularly around housing</p>	<p>Discussions around release planning should be taking place, however actual planning would seem wasteful if the person has a long period of time to serve incarcerated.</p>
<p>280 6. Case Planning Requirements for Furlough Violators many furlough returns say "interrupt until approved residence" - there is no time stated. what happens with those cases?</p>	<p>These are addressed through the case staffing process, and then through supervisory oversight.</p>
<p>On case plan template - Risk Needs: the ones listed are from the LSI-R and are gender neutral. There are additional risk/needs that have been found for women - contained in an LSI trailer. Can we add those?? I can send them in a bit - don't have them in front of me right now</p>	<p>This can be a training issue.</p>
<p>There is nothing in the templates that speaks to family obligations/children/reunification/DCF caseplans/child support, etc (not ADDRESSED BY "FAMILY/MARITAL").....If we are working holistically and in collaboration with other AHS departments, we should</p>	<p>Agreed, in part. This are important components, to include; however, we do need to be careful in how we approach this, so we don't corner ourselves in and create</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

include this	expectations or agreements that we may not be able to follow through on.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If this is an OFFENDER case plan, how will the offender input the necessary data? 2. POs and facility caseworkers should not have to enter ANY tombstone data into this form. LSI scores are in the database. Charges are in the data base. Listed offense, MPL, CVS -- all in the database. Sex offender risk assessments are in the database. 3. If this is yet another PAPER form where POs have to go from screen to screen to access information, go back to the drawing board and figure out how to put it online. 4. Look at Section 3 of the demo case plan. It is supposed to be for the COMMUNITY. Yet, much of the information that's asked for (in fields that say cannot be left blank), is JAIL information. For those people in the community who have never been to jail, this information IS NOT AVAILABLE. 5. Offenders on PROBATION have a list of conditions from the court. That is their case plan. 6. Offenders on PAROLE have a list of conditions from the Parole Board. That is their case plan. 7. Offenders of furlough (CR, PAF, etc) have a list of furlough conditions. That is their caseplan. 8. Offenders in the various treatment programs (ISAP, IDAP, VTPSA, CSC, BIP) have treatment agreements. Those make up their individual case plans. 9. Why are we writing down the same data 2, even 3, times? What purpose does it serve? 10. All of this information is in case notes, at least when the system works and accepts submissions. Why are we writing it again? 	<p>This is our case plan for the offender</p> <p>There will be some necessary tombstone data that will be needed, but we have reduced it.</p> <p>Addressed above</p> <p>Addressed above</p> <p>Incorrect; those are the conditions of supervision. This will move beyond that to address risk and need areas.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Addressed above</p> <p>Addressed above</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>I don't believe that the harm statement needs to be in the form or the community apology. Most of these guys don't think they have victim and I don't think that it would be a productive use of time. I also don't think that most of the offenders are ready to complete that until they have been in the community for a while.</p> <p>I think that all that needs to be on the forms is a general caseplan; 3-4 sentences on what they plan to do in the facility/community. I would emphasize the substance abuse/domestic violence or any other key risk areas.</p> <p>It was my impression that the paperwork reduction community met to reduce the workload on staff not to expand the paperwork. From reading this, it has occurred to me that the paperwork will have ONLY expanded if this form is put into a working policy.</p>	<p>We are changing the offender forms.</p> <p>We disagree; research indicates that all need areas should be addressed for maximum reduction of recidivism.</p> <p>We disagree; this form replaces the Offender Responsibility Plan form.</p>
<p>In my opinion, a case plan should be the parole agreement, the probation order or the CR that the person is being supervised on. I think a case plan is a work in progress and it's hard to answer most of the questions on this OCP or the ORP because the offender is generally so new to the process when you're doing an ORP/OCP. Also, along this vein, the harm statement seems premature. Getting an offender to recognize they have victims (let alone write a statement to them) can take the entire period of supervision to do. That's what the need reducing groups (ISAP, IDAP, CSC) assist with and I don't see the value in the harm statements this early in the process. Our caseplans should be supporting the groups the offenders are involved with and not creating extra forms to complete. Since the offenders are doing this type of work in their groups, to complete the ORP/OCP becomes redundant. I believe that casenotes should be better utilized. A</p>	<p>Incorrect, those are the conditions of supervision. This will move beyond that to address risk and need areas.</p> <p>In part we agree; some changes have been made.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>casenote should list the goals (a caseplan if you will) of an offender and casenotes from that point on should list their progress with the goals; there doesn't need to be forms to fill out. So for me, perhaps there should be a focus or training on what goes into a casenote. What does an intake casenote include and what should casenotes after the intake look like?</p>	
<p>My experience within the Department of Corrections began as a COI in 1997 .I transitioned to CSSI in 2001, and then in 2003 transitioned to CSSII / program facilitator for the CSC and later INDAP programs within a correctional Facility setting. From my experience it takes offenders a significant period of time before they are ready, willing and able to make an educated sincere effort in many of the areas that the OCP is requiring them to define shortly after sentencing . In my experience the ability for an offender to successfully identify "risk" is most often measureable after the offender has received education or treatment, coupled with completion of many tasks to develop skills needed to do such. Looking at amends to the community and completing an apology to a victim or victims are tasks that should be completed. It is my opinion that the ability to do so in a meaningful way will be better served after the offender has engaged in programming, treatment, or education that is designed to provided them with an understanding of what allows them to engage in risk behavior and how that has impacted others and themselves. In short, it is my opinion that these are excellent areas to address but should be considered at a later time in an offender's sentence.</p>	<p>See above response.</p>
<p>You shouldn't have to enter the same information 3 times. If you put it in one section it should autofill into the other areas that triplicate it.</p>	<p>See above; but this form does auto fill.</p>
<p>The case planning for both facility and OCP needs to include use of assessment and screening tools in identifying criminogenic need areas,</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>targeting those areas for intervention and incorporating any responsivity factors identified into the plan.</p>	
<p>Section 3- CVS - Should have a drop down menu for listed or non-listed as this is what the field looks at and what the data shows when we do a CVS</p> <p>Projected movement date - not relevant for field / it would be nice to see a drop down menu that allows for this option</p> <p>Under Risk - Need - There needs to be some blocks left empty so PPOs can address specific probation / parole or furlough conditions that are no directly related to the LSI</p> <p>Not sure if this could be done or not but if their is a topic from the LSI that is not a need / risk that it would be nice to show this some way which could provide more space for other topics that are which would prevent a lengthy case plan.</p> <p>Directions needed on how and where to save, assume the same place?</p> <p>I'd like to see some some guidance provided on what you're looking for under list ways to address: Can this be anything the PPO wants, are you looking for the specific steps needed to meet the goal - clear direction on expectation is needed</p> <p>Just seems to me that there are too many different time frames which I think makes it difficult for staff to do or remember.</p>	<p>We are changing the forms.</p> <p>Agreed; see above.</p> <p>Agreed; we will modify the form.</p> <p>No need to save; form will be done on the database, specific to the offender.</p> <p>This is a comprehensive and fluid document that allows the CSS to be creative in addressing the offender's risk/needs.</p> <p>This is a training issue.</p> <p>The new ORP form will take care of this.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>Maybe a cheat sheet would be helpful at least this would provide staff with one piece of paper to look at instead of going through a 14 page directive.</p> <p>There should be a way for the field to only save and print only section 3.</p> <p>I like the revised case plan - much simpler process for the field, so thank you!</p>	<p>You're welcome.</p>
<p>The sentence "If the inmate has issues with reading and writing, the facility CSS should assist the inmate in completing this section." appears in several places of this draft. Shouldn't we be referring these inmates to CHSVT to help them overcome these issues? At the very least, an ADA request should be generated to determine if the issue truly exists. Are the caseworkers to take the inmate at their word, or should some sort of assessment be done? I realize that CHSVT educators are not caseworkers, but the caseworkers are not teachers either.</p> <p>There is nothing in the draft that addresses instances where the inmate refuses to cooperate with the OCP/ORP. What will be the repercussions? This is critical because this dynamic has been the largest stumbling block to getting them completed.</p>	<p>Utilization of CHSVT staff may be an option. For offenders with a disability, staff is expected to be accommodating to support the offender through the process; this may mean transcribing for the offender.</p> <p>There are ramifications; compliance with case plan (OCP is required for RF eligibility.) The offender can, in reality, only refuse the ORP section. The OCP includes programming and other requirements. If the offender is not in compliance with components of the OCP, it could delay their release. For example, if they are required to do mandatory programming and they refuse, they will not be released.</p> <p>This is based on the LSI, and other information that is collected during their incarceration. As for MH, these cases should be documented and followed up with, prior to release.</p> <p>It will now be stored in the offender database profile.</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

Regarding the re-entry planning, who determines what the transitioning inmate needs? We are doing substance abuse assessments, but there is not the same availability for those with MH needs. The outside providers will not accept a diagnosis or treatment plan from CCS and there are no arrangements for the outside providers to do them while the inmate is in jail. It would be expected that each inmate on some sort of MH med while incarcerated would need to maintain this upon release, so setting them up with the outside providers prior to release makes sense.

How is the ORP (and the other inmate reliant attachments) shared with the field CSS? Is this something that goes on the shared drive? This needs to be a standardized part of the process...

The coordination between facility and field CSSs should also be a clear expectation. How these things happen should not be a case by case scenario. There should be scheduled times where these meetings occur. Each field CSS should have a time to visit each facility that houses their inmates, much like a police officer has his/her traffic violation hearings handled by the courts. I would suggest that this be at monthly intervals.

This draft is a reaction to our poor numbers when it comes to ORP/OCP completion. We need to make this a major component for both staff and inmates. Failure to cooperate by the inmate should have serious ramifications. My suggestion is to create a "OCP 101" type of course through the CHSVT venue. The inmates could create their portions on the computers and the teachers could forward them to the assigned facility CSS for processing. Any inmate who fails to complete their portions as expected/required should be restricted from participating in other recreation or educational electives until this core course is done. Until we put some teeth into this, the results will not change.

We disagree and feel that the directive provides clear time frames. This directive is to be used in conjunction with the Facility Case Mgt. directive which will be promulgated at the same time.

Thank you for your suggestions.

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>The actual case plan is TOO lengthy! Being so extensive will only minimize its usefulness. Why is so much data required in it? It does not benefit anyone or make it any easier to manage a case. Why place the LSI in so many locations throughout? Starting from "scratch" with a goal of 2 pages and then rate the usefulness of all the data may achieve a shorter document.</p> <p>Would splitting the document into 2 separate things make more sense? The transition plan gets used for release ONLY. It is not needed afterwards so why keep it a part of the caseplan? More data is then left in a caseplan that is no longer needed again. SIMPLIFY!!!!!!!!!!!! Paperwork reduction!!!!!!</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>This is to be a living document that will follow the offender to and from jail settings. Also, see above.</p>
<p>Page 7 section f - Rentry harm statement to be completed at initial meeting with css.</p> <p>This is an unreasonable expectation for completion. During the initial meeting, review of the furlough conditions, what to do in case of emergency, where to go to get food stamps, review of bus schedule, financial form completion, completion of furlough forms, collection of DNA (for PAF offenders), review of work search process, etc occurs. There is too much information presented for offenders to focus on that significantly impact their daily living on furlough to get through. Completion within 30 days is more realistic. Offenders with have a chance to "calm down" the stress of release to the community and can begin to appreciate how their behavior has caused harm.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Would it be possible to be consistent in nomenclature, e.g., Facility CSS staff are called "caseworkers" whereas Field CSS staff are called Probation & Parole Officers?</p>	<p>Agreed; we will check the language.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>In fact the signature nomenclature for the OCP is "Probation Officer" and not "Field Caseworker" which is used in the body of the document.</p> <p>Overall this is a huge improvement from the ORP and should be easier to address with offenders.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>
<p>1. Purpose of the OCP: In reviewing the directive, it appears to me that the underlying purpose of the ORP / OCP is to establish and enforce co-case management between the facility caseworkers and the PO's in the field. While this is an important endeavor, it does not need this unwieldy document or process to facilitate co-case management. The case management time lines identified in lines 296 - 318 are adequate to address what needs to happen, by whom, and within what time frame. The greater issue to address is the concept that Corrections is divided by facility and field: we have to break that barrier and realize we are all under the same agency and should be working together, not at cross purposes. I guess I'm talking about a philosophical change, rather than increasing our paperwork and stress.</p> <p>2. If the purpose is primarily to facilitate co-case management, then the OCP should not be required on probation or parole cases. They are NOT incarcerated and only have one case manager: a PO. And, they already have an existing case plan (their conditions of probation / parole) that addresses ALL of the issues pertinent to housing, employment, education, treatment or programming, and victim issues where applicable.</p> <p>3. In Section 3 - Community Case Plan and Expectations, line 267, it states "the Community Case Plan is a fluid document and should be updated and modified as circumstances change with the offender. This part of the case plan should be reviewed and updated no less than every 90 days. The CSS will document each review, highlighting any changes, in</p>	<p>We are adjusting the form.</p> <p>The purpose of this directive and case plan is to develop good release and case plans for our offenders to improve their chances of success while in the community. Case co-management is a necessary part of this.</p> <p>We have changed the language.</p> <p>Agreed that standardized process of case notes</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

<p>the electronic data base."</p> <p>One of the things we all despise about the ORP / OCP is the REDUNDANCY. (Sorry for yelling.) Why are we writing casenotes? Casenotes in and of themselves are a fluid document of the changing circumstances of the offender. Why are we being expected to document everything in casenotes, and then re-document it in a "fluid" case plan? Repeating my work is absolutely infuriating and a waste of time and energy.</p> <p>If the department wants an easier way to evaluate a PO's work on a case, then it should establish a standardized method of casenoting that makes it easier to look up information which would eliminate having to wade through copious casenotes. (I may not be articulating it well . . . what I'm saying is that if everyone wrote casenotes in a similar fashion, using the same language or phrasing, then it would be easy for anyone to enter hit "control F" (for FIND) and enter a phrase, and go directly to the section of the casenotes that deals with that topic. If this still doesn't make sense, ask Mike Touchette and he'll explain it!)</p> <p>4. Offender Responsibility: This comes with time. And, for sex offenders and DV offenders in particular, this is a lengthy process that is dealt with via programming. Everything from line 345 - 463, should be something a PO can give to an offender to work on when the PO feels the time is right and the offender is receptive. In fact, it can be coordinated with their treatment program. Taking responsibility is a process that occurs over time, and in serious victim cases (ie: sex offender or DV) should occur in conjunction w/ programming - not in a contrived "must do now" situation (it can potentially cause more harm than good when dealing w/ a DV offender.) Is there some reason people think that PO's don't address these issues with offenders? Are there other ways PO's can address your</p>	<p>is important, but that is not part of this directive.</p> <p>We are removing the harm statements. See final draft</p>
--	--

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>concerns without creating more paperwork?</p>	
<p>Lines 296-318... Time Lines. I hope there is no expectation that these will be adhered to. How can anyone keep track of specific time frames? Will there be a database that will notify caseworkers of all the due dates? If there is not, then DOC will be wide open to liability. Being too specific always opens up liability.</p>	<p>It is the responsibility of the CPS/CWS/CLUS to supervise their staff to ensure compliance with this and all directives.</p>
<p>Line 224 Section 2 - Transition and Re-entry Plan (Attachment 4)</p> <p>i. Section 2 requires a meeting between the inmate, the facility CSS, and the field CSS. This meeting will be coordinated by the facility CSS as noted above.</p> <p>This will never work. In my opinion a meeting between Field and Facility staff could be condensed into a few emails. If a face to face meeting is not the intent of this section it should be stated. I have inmates from every county in the state. I would not expect Field staff to travel to NSCF to meet with the inmate and I.</p> <p>Line 244</p> <p>ii. Section 2 will be completed on all inmates 180 days prior to their earliest release date except for those listed in ii. c. below.</p> <p>a) For inmates who are RF-eligible this will occur one (1) year prior to their minimum.</p> <p>The RF window can be "lost" by the inmate for any number of reasons. The current RFPLN does not guarantee an inmate will get the RF. Assuming an inmate will get the RF is a dangerous guessing game went a</p>	<p>This should occur. Case Co-management needs to involve the field, facility and offender in dialogue.</p> <p>See Facility Case Mgt directive. This is one of the purposes for the quarterly summary: to keep updated on RF eligibility. If staff feels that their co case-manager is not participating, they should address this with their supervisor.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>PO can fail to do there part until the last minute.</p>	
<p>I find that the ORP/caseplan holds very little value to the offender or to the PO. It is a lot of paperwork that no matter how hard I try to get my offenders to do it, they either fail to do so or put very little effort into it. I agree with some other PO's that have brought up the issue; with just having a contract that states what the offender needs to do and by when. I have my own system of how I document when parole summaries are due, and what paperwork has been done or needs to be done. If we are expected to have a meeting with every offender and caseworker in the jail, there is no way possible that we can make it work. We are already overworked. I just think that it is just another added thing that isn't necessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
<p>I would like to start with a positive comment. Co-case management with PO Inmate and caseworker meeting together face to face in the same room is something we did years ago prior to being tied to data entry. Happy to see folks believe we need to go back to that. I believe lots of changes need to occur to go back to this practice. For one the changing of assigned POs and caseworkers makes this impossible Inmates will need an assigned PO and casworker which will remain the same during their stay with us. Not realistic to think POs can travel the state as the inmates get shipped around. This could work if we had caseplanning/reentry jails and program jails. Inmate starts off in his home facility caseplan completed by PO and caseworker, then off to program followed by return to get ready for community release. Case plan should be simple, need area-program to address need and time frame based on length of sentence.</p> <p>Makes no sense to me at all that we would use the same plan for probationers. To fill out all those forms and then enter all the data over and over in the computer is a waste of time for a DV probation case with special condition s DAEP no victim contact or not to harass victim. Let's</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>do something that makes more sense. The probation Supervision contract is clear to the point and works well in court for vop. After all Judges all went to law school and they like agreements and contracts.</p> <p>It's very sad that the law makers had to point out to DOC that PO's should be out supervising offenders in the community and not sitting at our desks typing and filling out assessment after assessment. This goes against the purpose, of those laws. Sad when law makers passed term probation because we as DOC are to busy trying to fix everything about our offenders that we can't manage caseloads.</p> <p>I recommend we throw out these documents and attachments. Start over and this time please keep it simple. Filling out forms is getting in the way of real casework and caseload management.</p>	
<p>Once again, the new version of the ORP is a cumbersome and singularly UNHELPFUL document that no one will actually USE in the day-to-day supervision of offenders. In order to effectively supervise offenders, we (and they) need to know their OBLIGATIONS-what they need to do- and their DEADLINES-when they need to do it. Anything else is just fluff. Sometimes other factors impact someone's ability to get what they need to accomplish done-that's when PO's can use their CASEWORK SKILLS. It does NOT need to be put into written format at all-and esp. not into THIS format! Why not just use the old probation contract form which outlines what the offenders need to do and when-very simple, easy to understand and use....if it needs to be called ORP then rename the thing! I think the DOC needs to take a good long look at WHY we are inventing the ORP....and then look at the intent behind it.....also DOC needs to be mindful that we are under legislative mandate to REDUCE PO duties and not increase them.</p> <p>Hopefully, the people in a position to eliminate this document will start</p>	<p>Case plans will be on all risk management cases regardless of their legal status. The form</p>

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>taking these factors into consideration.....</p> <p>#1. I'll start here. Lines 173-175 read" Community Supervision- Section 3, Community Case Plan and Field Expectations (Attachment 4) of the OCP will be completed on all Risk Management cases. " WHY? And does whoever wrote that know that most of the Risk Management cases are probation and parole cases not furlougees. Those cases do not even HAVE a min date, max date, projected movement date, or PMD code.That can all be removed.</p> <p>#2. The need areas are completely UNRELATED to what they actually need to do to complete probation in a satisfactory manner</p> <p>#3.Lines 224-234 read as follows: d.Section 2 - Transition and Re-entry Plan (Attachment 4) i. Section 2 requires a meeting between the inmate, the facility CSS, and the field CSS. This meeting will be coordinated by the facility CSS as noted above. a) The purpose is to prepare the inmate for release and to introduce the field CSS and the inmate. This meeting will focus on identifying acceptable housing, obstacles and barriers to release, review of the Offender Responsibility Plan, community supports, programming progress and/or needs, community resources available to the inmate, field case planning and field supervision expectations."</p> <p>Nice idea, its the way we USED to do things before all these added duties but it is completely unrealistic now. In order for this type of meeting to actually happen, we would need to accomplish several things: a. We would need to return to having ONE PO assigned from when an offender is first sentenced , all the way through the end of their supervision. That PO would be responsible for P&O's, VOP's, furlough,</p>	<p>has been modified.</p> <p>See above. This case plan goes beyond the conditions of supervision and will address risk and needs of the offenders.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>This can be done via the phone.</p> <p>We are working on this mandate.</p>
---	---

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>parole, etc etc etc and supervise the case through all statuses. Because of that, we would need to eliminate the whole CCSC/CRSU division. This would again allow case continuity and true knowledge of offenders risks/needs. In addition, if a PO had the case all along, time would not be wasted repeatedly having to learn new cases and update new files.....</p> <p>b. We would need to return to having COMMUNITY correctional facilities, where the offender was from. The offenders should then stay in their home community correctional facilities. PO's cannot and should not be expected to travel across the state to meet with inmates.</p> <p>c. We would need to actually follow the legislative mandate to reduce PO paperwork duties in order to free up time for PO's to have the luxury of meetings with inmates.</p> <p>#4. Lines 260-266 read "e. Section 3 - Community Case Plan and Expectations (Attachment 4) i. This section will be completed by the field CSS within thirty (30) days of intake on all offenders under Risk Management Supervision.</p> <p>ii. This part of the case plan will address mandatory programming and legal requirements, as well as risk/needs of the offender. Any risk/need area that scores 50% or greater on the LSI-R must be addressed in this case plan."</p> <p>The DOC is doing a poor job of supervising even the basics. We do not even hold furloughees accountable, and they are the most highly supervised offenders on the streets. Why are we adding criteria to address in the case plan in addition to mandatory programs and legal requirements? Let's try to narrow it down and focus on whats really important, the things that directly impact crime. I am sure the community would much rather have us do a good job on making sure sex offenders participate well in sex offender treatment and work on relapse prevention than on having Joe Blow criminal take a pottery class to address his need for recreation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions.</p> <p>Language has been modified.</p> <p>Language has been modified.</p>
--	--

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

<p>After all, I as a tax-paying community member don't even have time for things like that because I have to WORK and PAY MY BILLS.</p> <p>#5. Lines 267-271 read: "iii. The Community Case Plan is a fluid document and should be updated and modified as circumstances change with the offender. This part of the case plan should be reviewed and updated no less than every 90 days. The CSS will document each review, highlighting any changes, in the electronic database."</p> <p>We are ADDING to PO duties!!! This is in violation of the pending legislative mandate to REDUCE PO duties!!! And what was the random thought behind updating this every 90 days? Why not once a year or if something changes? And just what electronic database will this be in? Our computer systems are currently atrociously outdated (although I am aware updates are "in the works").</p> <p>#6. Lines 273-277 read: "f. Re-entry Harm Statement (Attachment 3) This section will be completed by the offender during the initial meeting with the field CSS following release to the community. If the offender has issues with reading and writing, the CSS should assist the offender in completing this section."</p> <p>What the heck IS a harm statement??????? WHERE would such a statement go? I could not find a spot on the form for that! Why would we do such a thing? I don't even understand this nonsense!!!</p> <p>Oh,NOW I found it- in the attachments section, not the definitions. Again, who is this for? Apologies are meaningless unless they are heart-felt....and even then, they aren't always that great a thing. If this is supposed to repair harm to the community, I guess I'm just not sure how that works since the community doesn't get this form.....and even if they</p>	<p>This is for staff to review the case plan for accuracy & relevancy. It can be modified as necessary.</p> <p>See above; also, language has been modified. We removed Re-entry Harm Statements.</p>
--	--

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>#9. Lines 291-294 read: "c. If the offender is convicted of a new offense, or has had a case staffing which results in a mandated program needing completion, staff must start the case planning process from the beginning, starting with Section 1 - Classification and Facility Expectations."</p> <p>Once again, this is ADDING to PO duties!!! This is in direct violation of the pending legislative mandate to REDUCE PO duties!!! Just because the furlougee violates does NOT meant the case plan was at fault! It is the OFFENDER'S issue. The case plan should NOT automatically need adjustments! If there are new mandated programs or legal requirements, then yes, the case plan should be updated. Other than that, this is just creating more busywork-which is something we need less of, not more.</p> <p>#10. Lines 298-302 outlines the timelines when things should be done, and reads: "5 business days after sentencing o Intake, Assessment, Classification, and Admission o CSS Meeting o Initial Case Co-Management Review between field and facility CSS o Section 1 Classification and Facility Expectations of the OCP."</p> <p>I cannot speak for facility caseworkers since I haven't been one in over 20 years....but 5 days does not sound like a particularly realistic time frame. It is absolutely unrealistic to expect a PO assignment AND an initial co-case management review (whatever THAT means, its certainly not in the definitions section!) within that 5 days!</p> <p>#11. Lines 305-308 outlines the timelines when things should be done, and reads: 1 year prior to Projected Release Date o Case Co-Management review between the assigned CSSs and the inmate</p> <p>Nice idea, but again unrealistic. First it adds to PO duties in violation of</p>	<p>This should be occurring with case co-management anyway. This is not an additional duty - this is clarifying what needs to be involved with case co-management.</p> <p>This will be addressed in the Residence Approval directive.</p> <p>See above</p>
---	--

**FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011**

<p>offenders in the community. In keeping with best practice, the Quality Assurance Division will monitor for compliance with this directive. To assist with quality controls at the local level, database supports will be explored to assist in identifying plans, pending completion at various stages of the process. In the absence of available database supports, the QA Division will conduct random audits to determine compliance.”</p> <p>Holding staff accountable is one thing, but why is it that the OFFENDERS aren’t held accountable for anything? Why is it not part of the directive that offenders will go to jail if they don’t follow their ORP? And if they WON’T go to jail for not following their ORP, then why are we even wasting our time on it? This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>#15. Lines 385-470 is the attachment where the offender answers a bunch of questions.... Who gets the answers? What is DONE with the answers? If no one cares about the answers, why are we even asking the questions?</p> <p>#16. Why does each section repeat the same information (PID, MPL,RSN,SFI etc etc etc)? In fact why is that information in there at all? Most of it is irrelevant to the process, and certainly unimportant in the actual supervision of offenders!</p>	
<p>Line 203 – this section is be completed at intake by the assigned facility CSS for all sentenced inmates serving 90 days or more. Is this a change?</p> <p>Line 360 – Write a brief apology to your victim(s) or community. Was Victim Services part of this? Right now the apology to the victim goes to Amy Holloway, in Victim Services and is filed in the apology bank. If the victim wants to read it they can or not read it.</p> <p>Line 527 – asks the same questions – is this information going to populate</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We are changing the forms. All Re-entry Harm Statements have been removed.</p>

FEEDBACK & DOC RESPONSE S – #371.05 Offender Case Planning
COMMENT PERIOD: 8/22/2011-10/28/2011

<p>from the other form And again on line 416 – write a brief apology to your victim(s) or community</p> <p>Why do we keep asking the same question?</p>	<p>See above</p>
---	------------------