

Don't Just Be a Rule Follower

Presented by:

Mary Kay Hudson (IN)

Mac Pevey (WA)

Jeremiah Stromberg (OR)





THE ROAD HOME

Update!

Application of the Rules

How do you ensure that your staff have a clear understanding of the Compact's goals and its rules?

ARS

Does your state strive to prioritize the Compact's goals overrule enforcement when navigating difficult situations? [Always, Sometimes, Never, IDK]

Are there any perceptions we need to change when it comes to Compact rules and how they are applied?



Just because you can doesn't mean you should....

Do we want to adhere to certain rules or do we want to see lasting change?

How do you know when to apply the rules and when to apply common sense?

- Parolee with substantial mental health needs was paroled from jail with virtually no reentry plannings
- Family (his only known means of support) was not aware of compact and took him to their home in another state hundreds of miles away
- As soon as Sending State DCA was aware of his location, contact was made to the Receiving State DCA.
- Resulting in IMMEDIATE granting of RI's

DCA Cooperation

Without this action, the risk that parolee would abscond was likely increasing public safety risks

- Request for return reporting instructions were received by a sending state following a rejection of a transfer request for an individual granted RI's during investigation
- Without a documented or known plan for supervision in sending state, the case was elevated to the DCA
- Upon case review, transfer documentation was deemed conflicting/unclear
- DCAs worked together to determine where this individual needed to be confirming a valid plan DOES exist in the receiving state

Questionable Documentation

Lessons learned by BOTH States

- *Sending State need to improve verification/documentation practices*
- *Receiving State need to improve communication, review practices before jumping to automatic rejection & return*

- Immigrant sex offender was released from prison and immediately detained by ICE
- When ICE decided not to deport, supervisee was released in a state without resources and was challenged with significant language barriers
- With no awareness or understanding of the compact, his family moved him hundreds of miles away to another state
- Upon approval of emergency RI's to ensure seamless supervision, it was discovered ALL of his supportive family lived in highly restricted areas.
- PO worked with him and his family to find appropriate housing near his support network

PO Applying Compact Purposes

Instead of rejection and displacement of a sex offender, receiving state PO utilized resources to best protect the public and ensure transferee is in close proximity to his support network

Human Side of Compact

What are your state's advancements regarding targeted interventions with this population?

*What does **SUCCESSFUL SUPERVISION** look like in your state?*

ARS

To ensure success, should we focus less on noncompliance with conditions of supervision and work to ensure community safety, treatment for addiction, victim services, and the best course for rehabilitation based on the needs of the individual? Yes, focus should be on rehabilitation needs. /No focus should be on noncompliance of conditions of supervision.



Techniques for addressing non-compliant behavior

What steps to take before retake/revocation?

How are you learning about this?

ARS

Are you comfortable seeking behavior modification solutions or applying risk, needs, and responsivity? Yes, No

ARS

Do individuals going through the compact understand the Compact and its requirements? Always, Sometimes, Never, IDK

Importance of Engagement for Successful Supervision

Motivated by a primary concern for public safety and discouraged by the constant recycling of offenders through the system, many probation and parole policymakers are looking for better answers to the question of what works.

ARS

Promoting change versus applying restrictions; What's most important? Change, applying restrictions



COMPACT PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

ARS

- 1. Should transfer decisions (particularly discretionary) focus more on the ‘opportunity’ versus the ‘reason’ For example, support networks are not always direct family members in a receiving state. When deciding to approve a transfer what is of utmost importance? Opportunity for successful supervision OR Reason for transfer under the rules**
- 2. Will revocation make it less likely that offenders will reoffend or are there other interventions that are more effective? Revocation is most effective, Other interventions are most effective**

Practices Developed to Promote Change



- What has your state developed?
- Are they working?
- How do these practices fit into compact cases?

Reducing Barriers to Success

- What practices focus on successful outcomes?

According to data, a large number of individuals who are retaken are retransferred shortly after.

Are receiving states exhausting all measures to ensure that retaking is required?

Is the act of retaking modifying behavior?



Offenders Retaken

3,342

Retaken Then Re-Transferred

1,295

Majority (54%) are 'Residents' of the receiving state



ARS

Is there an assumption that revocation/retaking will “get the offender’s attention” and result in better performance? Yes, retaking appears to result in better response; No, retaking does not appear to result in better response; I don’t know