

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>Line 50 - POs are not involved in co-case management for cases that are detained. A PO is only assigned after the individual is sentenced.</p> <p>Line 60 - Add programming to decisions that are made</p> <p>Line 200 - Did I miss earlier where SSISA is defined or written out fully? Same with ADA</p> <p>Line 348 - I think the field PO should be spearheading discussions after the case staffing related to offenders in on a NOS however the caseworker has the body and can provide the offender access to the phone for residence or treatment issues.</p> <p>Line 541 - If you are going to make the residence process solely the responsibility of the PO, it would be appropriate to outline what information the case worker needs to provide the PO with since the case worker has the body. This should include address, phone numbers for the occupants and landlord (if applicable), who occupies the residence, if the residence is Section 8 to the offender's knowledge.</p> <p>The directive does not outline who does the parole summary.</p> <p>I think the case staffing report, parole summary and offender case plan should all be the same form, with minor variations on a page at the end of it that is different for each report.</p>	<p>Adjusted definition</p> <p>Adjusted language</p> <p>SSISA is defined. We added reference to ADA directive.</p> <p>Language is appropriate in the directive.</p> <p>It is to be in accordance with 371.14, which is being revised. We will be sending out a draft directive with updates.</p> <p>It is outlined in lines 559-561</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback; there has been discussion about this.</p>
<p>In reference to section 14-f Release Sensitive Notification Decisions (RSN)</p> <p>Lines 506, 507 and 508 state:</p> <p>"A representative from the facility or probation and parole office will be designated to present the case summary to the Department Directors."</p> <p>I would suggest that line be replaced with the following:</p> <p>"A case summary will be prepared and submitted in accordance with procedure 371.08.01 of 01-19-06."</p>	<p>That procedure is out of date.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>In reference to section 15-b Residence Approval, lines 542, 543 and 544 state:</p> <p>"The field CSS will need to initially screen the residence and document the collaborative decision in electronic case notes."</p> <p>But directive 371.14; 4.1.2a indicates the jail caseworker will make the initial contact with the proposed residence.</p>	<p>The initial screen is a determination by the field to determine if the proposed residence is going to be acceptable; e.g., victim issues, sex offender zones, etc... We have a draft directive on Res. Approval with these changes, which we will post.</p>
<p>The initial harm statement, ORP harm statement and apology section, and re-entry harm statement seem redundant. Is there a reason the issue is revisited 3 times?</p>	<p>The attachments are different and to be filled out at different times in the case planning process.</p>
<p>1. 291 Sec. 3.a. – Summary of activities, program, employment, on-going case mgt. activities.</p> <p>1. 423 Sec. 12: 60 days, not 120 days. Add longer ‘to serve’ where they are not required ...ADD ‘or refuse’ to do correctional programming....</p>	<p>Adjusted language</p> <p>Adjusted language</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 60 – Delete a space between Corrections and facility - Line 62 – Add something pertaining to treatment decisions/case planning - Line 63 – Change “reintegration” to “release” - Line 67 – Add something pertaining to treatment decisions/case planning - Line 96 – Change to An inmate who “will complete or has completed” their maximum sentence... - Line 215 – Delete space between comma and unless - Line 223 – Is this done within 5 days of admission? - Line 265 – Move line to the left - Line 331 – Please define “meet”. This implies the caseworker and PO will meet face to face with inmate. Difficult to do OOS. 	<p>Thank you</p> <p>See above response; changed</p> <p>Thank you – done.</p> <p>Thank you - changed.</p> <p>This is our standard glossary definition</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Adjusted language</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>- Line 342 – Please define “meet”</p> <p>- Line 371 – Change “will” to “may”. As is requires case notes every 90 days with all 11 categories. This may not change every 90 days and will be redundant.</p> <p>- Line 498 – Does a RSN no longer require a case note? Attachment 3 indicates that a case note is still needed.</p> <p>- Line 642 – Should “one year” be “six months”?</p> <p>- Line 643 – Should “6 months” be “16 months”? If they refuse anytime after 16 months, they no longer have time to do programming and would be considered a max out case.</p> <p>- Line 666 – Will we no longer have a MP code?</p> <p>- Line 698 – Include scenario for individuals being charged with a new crime while incarcerated, not just while in the community.</p> <p>- Line 714 – Add parenthesis) at end of “designee”.</p> <p>Thank you for this directive. It will help with clarification for all of us caseworkers!</p>	<p>There will be a summary every 90 days. The case may not change in 90 days, but the summary will be entered.</p> <p>Added; thank you. Yes; changed.</p> <p>6 months is correct.</p> <p>We added the code. Thanks.</p> <p>Added language. We just use a slash.</p>
<p>I would like to provide feedback on the two revised directives: Offender Case Planning and Facility Case Management.</p> <p>Both directives are similar and share the same purpose:”Enhance public safety” and “Prepare the offender for successful re-entry.....” etc.</p> <p>What needs to be included is:</p> <p>1 Data on how we have addressed this purpose thus far. What is it specifically that we are trying to improve on?</p> <p>2 What is the projected improvement that will occur with the new directives?</p>	<p>This would not be part of the directive. We are trying to improve on the re-entry process for offenders returning to the community to allow for better outcomes for offender success.</p> <p>It is the purpose statement in both directives.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>3 What metric will the DOC use to compare our current case planning/case management efforts to the proposed changes going forward?</p> <p>To me this is an important piece that we often leave out. When we talk to legislators and the community we should be able to quantify our improved efforts in “public safety” and “successful re-entry”. Also, I think we need to define what “successful re-entry” is. Many offenders are being taken back to jail for furlough infractions. Some minor some very serious. Our incarcerative trigger has changed dramatically over the years and as noted by Senator Sears and verified by DOC staff, it is difficult to hold offenders accountable since we are overcrowded. Is it a successful re-entry if a furloughee is using heroin but not committing other new crimes? Is it success if someone goes back to jail 4 times but is non-violent?</p> <p>The public (the public I know) wants offenders that come out of jail, on any legal status, to obey the laws, work, not be on drugs and not be on welfare.</p> <p>If we can show <u>improvement</u> in “public safety” outcomes and can define and demonstrate offender “success,” we are better positioned to ask for funding and positions because we will have credible evidence and can “lead the way.”</p>	<p>This will be developed by QA. The driver of these two directives is to reduce workload while maintaining integrity, and clarify the role of facility caseworkers and case co-managers.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
<p>re: parole supervision section lines 109 and 110:</p> <p>subject to the supervision of the Department of Corrections (or the Commissioner of Corrections) and under the control of the parole board (or governed by the parole board or under the jurisdiction of the parole board).</p> <p>re: Director of Community Corrections Review and Classification Designees lines 468 and 491 state "He" will convene, etc. Replace he with he or she or who. It implies that the D of CCR or designee and C is always a man.</p>	<p>Not sure what you are suggesting; this is an accurate definition.</p> <p>Agreed - thank you. We changed.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>13 It is the policy of the Department of Corrections to prepare incarcerated offenders for successful 14 transition back into the community while maintaining public safety. Offender Case Management in 15 a facility includes assessment, classification, program planning, and re-entry planning that follow correctional 170 a. Within five (5) days of a new admission into a correctional facility or transfer to another 171 facility, excluding weekends and holidays, the following activities shall occur on all 172 inmates, unless special circumstances demand more time. <i>No inmates shall be moved</i> <i>173 from the initial lodging facility to another facility until all of the following is completed.</i> this can not be the case for women - women lodged in a male facility are supposed to be transferred to crcf right away. 181 c) Deliver Facility Orientation, to include PREA orientation, unless it was done in the last six (6) months; 182 d) Determine if the inmate is a parent of a minor child and fill out the Child 183 Surveys; make sure both Child Surveys are done - ICHILD and CHILD - Intake Child Survey and CSS Child Survey (for every minor child). 184 e) Contact Department for Children & Families (DCF) as required What does this mean? when is it required? To see if there is an open DCF case? For women we should be doing this. For dv and sv offenders is there a requirement? 254 vi. Conduct all risk and needs assessments applicable for the</p>	<p>Agree with all comments.</p> <p>Good questions to ask. We need to explore a new directive or other procedure to address this. We will discuss with Legal.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>inmate and review the 255 results with the inmate. Explain to the inmate the correlation between high scores in criminogenic risk and need areas and the correlation with recidivism and case planning.</p> <p>293 review, etc.), but will meet with the inmate at least every 14 business days. This meeting and any updates/changes within the last 14 business days</p> <p>294 will be documented in electronic case notes.</p> <p>307 The assigned CSS will document in electronic case notes all inmate meetings, case management 308 events, reviews, staffings, team meetings, assessments, and anytime there is an event or change for the inmate. All case notes 309 will be in accordance with administrative</p> <p>318 c. There will be regular conversation around the OCP, use of facility based resources, the residence, community319 expectations, and utilization of community resources</p> <p>367 a. The assigned facility CSS will conduct a case summary and review every 90 days on all 368 sentenced inmates assigned to them, pre and post min.</p> <p>402 10. Programming</p> <p>403 The CSS will prepare packets needed for treatment depending on crime convicted of, as well as length 404 of minimum sentence and criminogenic risk/need areas. Programming classification will be in accordance with administrative directive</p> <p>409 11. Work Camp Placement</p> <p>410 a. It is the responsibility of the Facility Superintendent to ensure that all eligible offenders in 411 their facility have been referred to the Director of Community Corrections, Re-entry and 412 Classification/designee for work camp placement. 413</p>	<p>Continue to use the DCF-DOC MOUT as a reference.</p> <p>Thanks. We added your language.</p> <p>We don't think this is needed.</p> <p>We added.</p> <p>We added.</p> <p>We don't think this is necessary to add.</p> <p>We added.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>414 b. All offenders meeting work camp eligibility and requirements will be referred to the 415 Director of Community Corrections, Re-entry, and Classification/designee for work camp 416 placement. 417 418 c. The facility CSS or CLUS will refer the case to the qualified health care professional to be 419 medically cleared.</p> <p>There needs to be a bullet here (or added language) about how work camp designation happens for women at CRCF.</p> <p>576 o Intake, Assessment, Classification, and Admission 577 o CSS Meeting 578 o Initial Case Co-Management Review between field and facility CSS 579 o Section 1 Classification and Facility Expectations of the OCP.</p> <p>Complete both child survey forms (same language as other directive)</p>	<p>Not needed here. There is a new Memo on Work Camp Eligibility that covers this.</p>
<p>I don't see a lot of change in this case staffing form. It appears that only additional paperwork was added to the form though it was a small amount.</p> <p>Most of the information that is including in the case staffing is all available on the database. We completed and enter the data. We again reenter it again on the case staffing form if one needs to be completed. This seems very redundant to me.</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 slightly increased if this form is put into policy.</p>	<p>We will be adding the case staffing process from the interim procedure on case staffing that went into effect 1/17/12.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>My feedback is this.... Please Please Please do away with all of this nonsense paperwork. Has the recidivism lowered b/c the offender filled out an ORP? The offender answers the questions with what they think we want to hear. They all say the same thing, I want to work, I want to go back to school, I know I have to take this b/c of my conviction. We assist them in how they can obtain these goals of theres and..... then what?? We have offenders not following their furlough, they dont show up for their mandated groups, they dont follow up on referrals, they wont get themselves to Christine Longmores group, they make excuses for not doing worksearch, we issue g.s. gps, thinking reports and again then what... and we think that having them fill out ORP or OCP is going to make a difference??</p> <p>Prior to an offender being released into the community they are signing contracts of what programming they will be expected to participate and complete. The offender knows what is expected of them, having it on paper has not make a difference! Really how do we hold offenders accountable now and how are we going to hold them accountable b/c they havent follow thru. This paperwork is not going to change any attitude or beliefs that they may have and I'm am unclear as to how it will lead them to be more successful.</p> <p>Holding staff accountable???? How is it we are holding offenders accountable??? Why is this about the Probation Officer?? Didnt it state Offenders responsibility? Why are we making more paperwork that is unrealistic in changing the offenders beliefs and attitudes. I have conversations with all offenders, gather info, make referrals and document in casenotes. Now we have to put it on paper and still document in casenotes??? Is this going to encourage the offender to now follow recommendations??</p> <p>Probationers have their probation conditions which clearly states what the probationer needs to do. As a probation officer it is our job to make sure that they complete the expectations from the courts. They have a copy of the probation conditions why would they need ORP/OCP</p>	<p>OCP is required by legislation. The intent is to allow the facility and field staff, along with the offender to work on release planning well before the offender is actually released. Having re-entry planning improves the re-entry stability of the offender, and ultimately should reduce last minute work on the case workers part.</p> <p>By agreeing to this plan, the offender formally acknowledges what is expected of them, and will allow them sufficient time to plan their re-entry around this.</p> <p>The OCP is an introductory mechanism to engage the offender in dialog about what need and risk areas will be addressed while in the custody of the department. This alone, is not intended to hold the offender accountable or change beliefs and attitudes, but to serve as a means to enter into that dialog with the offender.</p> <p>Probation conditions are identified by the court as requirements for successful completion of Probation. Consistent with the mission of DOC, it's equally important that we assess and</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>especially if we are trying to reduce paperwork for officers.If their probation is revoked that is the court holding them accountable/responsible. Prior to comming out to the community on furlough the paperwork is signed by the offender that states what the expectation is when they are released. I am unclear as to how this is going to make a difference with the success for the offender..... lets go with less paperwork and please hear/ listen to the staff who are crying out for less paperwork!!!</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>	<p>address the risk and need areas of a probationer. Conditions don't fully address those other areas of need.</p>
<p>Line 170-172</p> <p>"Within five (5) days of a new admission into a correctional facility or <u>transfer to another facility</u>, excluding weekends and holidays, the following activities shall occur on all inmates, unless special circumstances demand more time."</p> <p>The things listed will not need to be done every time an inmate is transferred to another Facility.</p> <p>Line 176 "Detained Inmates- a) Vermont and FBI record check; include DMV and other applicable states;"</p> <p>An FBI record check is good to have but it will not show current open citations etc. A FBI record check on a newly sentenced inmate will not have the most recent information, as there is a delay in reporting.</p> <p>Line 294 - Instate Inmates: After the initial meeting, the CSS will meet with the inmate on an as- needed basis or during any case management activity (staffing, parole review, treatment review, etc.), but will meet with the inmate at least every 14 business days. This meeting and any updates/changes within the last 14 business days will be documented in electronic case notes.</p> <p>This is an unreasonable expectation. If a CSS had a case load of 50-60, which is routine here at NSCF then that would require 100+ meetings</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Understood; the time for the offense to be entered into the record is beyond our control.</p> <p>The current standard is 2 per month. Instate inmates will</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>per month. This is a huge difference verse out of state cases were the contact standard is 45-60 days depending on the status of the inmate.</p> <p>Line 321</p> <p>Both the Field and Facility Case Co-managers should be focusing on release planning during the incarcerated period for the inmate.</p> <p>Personal opinion here but someone should let the P&P offices know about this. The complete opposite has been the rule and not the exception.</p> <p>Line 375 - Case Review and Summary</p> <p>What is the point of this section. The Facility CSS should do this at some point but to review the status every 90 is a waste of time. Where will this report go and what will come of it? More paperwork and documentation with no real world results.</p> <p>Line 439 -13. Central Level Case Staffing</p> <p>This section is missing a staffing for RF. If the Field and Facility differ on an offenders eligiblity for RF then I believe that a staffing is in order. Current practice seems to shut out the Facility CSS beyond the initial section of the RFPLN form.</p> <p>Line 547 Residence Approval</p> <p>180 days prior to the projected release date the facility CSS will notify the field CSS of the proposed address for release. The field CSS will need to initially screen the residence and document the collaborative decision in electronic case notes.</p> <p>The current standard of 30 days seems to be working. Investing effort into residence 6 months out seems to be a waste. People move. Situations change. Landlords opinions change. Some of the people offering residence run into legal troubles themselves.</p>	<p>require more contact as they are engaged in programming, more intensive release planning, etc...</p> <p>Thank you for this. If you do not get appropriate response from the case co-manager, this should be addressed with your supervisor.</p> <p>We disagree on this. Case summaries should be current as to behavior, programming, release planning, etc. This does not need to be time consuming. Cut and paste previous summaries, and updating is fine.</p> <p>The RF process has specific roles in determining RF. The facility is to determine eligibility, and the field is responsible for determining appropriateness. All denials go thought central office.</p> <p>This is not a physical check. This is to determine if the field would accept this residence. This is to prevent cases where residences are getting denied and we need to do referrals to community agency for transitional assistance, which can take time to develop. The Residence Approval directive is also being updated.</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>I think we should go back to the old form 55. It is a lot easier and takes a lot less time. We could put in phase 1, 2 and 3 if we needed too.</p>	<p>This is an IT issue and not operational at this time.</p>
<p>Line 73 – Community Re-Entry & Conditional Re-Entry – The wording is basically the same – what is the difference? Can one of them be eliminated?</p> <p>Line 145 – RSN paragraph: A case in which the Department takes a special care in release planning...this sentence is so long. The department takes special care in all releases that we do. The wording makes it sound like we are only concerned about the RSN’s.</p> <p>Line 267 – we (OOS Unit) is suppose to send out the meet and greet letter to the offenders, within five (5) business days. Five days is not enough time. Sometimes we don’t even notified within that five (5) days. What about 30 days?</p> <p>Line 520 – Clarification on the ‘who’ is responsible for the case staffing? Is the person that doesn’t agree, do the case staffing? Who – it really needs spelled out. This is a constant sore subject with both parties.</p>	<p>Agreed; community re-entry was deleted.</p> <p>Thank you for your detailed review; the definition has been updated.</p> <p>We disagree. 5 business days upon the case being assigned to the case worker is appropriate.</p> <p>Clarifying language has been added for all case staffing.</p>
<p>*Can the Initial Harm Statement, Offender Responsibility Plan and the Community Harm statement be scanned into the document rather than being typed in?</p> <p>* <u>Section 2 will be done on all inmates ... For those eligible for RF this will occur 1 year prior to thier minimum:</u> This should instead indicate "1 year prior to their Projected Movement Date - this way it will be accurate for offenders at the work camp as well, who at 18 months from minimum can reduce their minimum sentence by 6 months and be RF eligible.</p>	<p>We removed all Harm statements. Yes, you can scan pages in.</p> <p>Thank you. We changed to ‘earliest release date.’</p>

**FINAL FEEDBACK ON #371.02 FACILITY CASE MANAGEMENT
COMMENT PERIODS ENDING: October 28, 2011**

FEEDBACK	DOC RESPONSE
<p>Page 5, letter k (within 5 days of admission to a facility) determine RF eligibility.</p> <p>Perhaps it would be more beneficial to review eligibilty for RF closer to the RF eligibility date. In 5 days, how will an offender NOT be eligible as there will be no non-compliance?? Perhaps it is just the wording....maybe "review RF eligibility date and plan for RF eligibility approval process" is more what is intended??</p>	<p>The purpose is to review RF early in the process to help determine programming.</p>