INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION
COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary and Minutes
via Conference Call
11:30am to 12:30pm (EDT)
April 15, 2003

Committee Members in Attendance:

1. Bonnie Long-Oliver, Compact Administrator, CA
2. Michael Mullen, Chairman of Parole, CT
3. Robert Sanders, Deputy Secretary for Field Services, DOC, KS
4. Judith Sachwald, Director of Parole & Probation, MD
5. Warren Emmer, Director of Field Services, DOC, ND
6. Bill Rankin, Compact Administrator, WI

Committee Members Not in Attendance:

Denis Agniel, Chairman of Probation & Parole, MO
Mike Ferriter, Compact Administrator, MT
Sherry Pilkington, Asst. Director of Special Operations, DOC, NC
Ginger Martin, Administrator, Community Corrections, OR

Guests:

1. Marita Williams, CA
2. Charles Placek, ND
3. Julianne Crosby, ID
4. David Guntharp, AR

Staff:

1. Rick Masters
2. John Mountjoy

- Warren Emmer, Chair of the Committee, called the Compliance Committee to order at 11:30am (EDT). Following introductory remarks, Emmer called for a roll call of members. 6 of 10 members were present, establishing a quorum. Emmer reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting.
• Emmer called for the approval of the minutes from the March 4, 2003 meeting. Motion to adopt brought by Sachwald, seconded by Mullen and unanimously approved.

• Emmer called for a report from each of the workgroups as previously assigned:
  1. Training & Technical Assistance to States (Ferriter, Sachwald)
  2. Proximity Mentoring Assistance (Agniel, Long-Oliver)
  3. Arbitration & Mediation (Emmer, Sanders)
  4. Sanctions (Fines, fees, suspension, termination, litigation) (Mullen, Pilkington)

• Training & Technical Assistance to States (Ferriter, Sachwald) – not all members present. Sachwald reported that the group was looking at a hierarchy of training and technical assistance and graduated levels of assistance; will propose an objective sanctions grid outlining infractions and resultant actions for states at the next meeting.

• Proximity Mentoring Assistance (Agniel, Long-Oliver) – not all members present. Long-Oliver reported that the group, similar to Group #1 was looking at a matrix of options for states and trying to develop a method by which states could help their neighbors out with issues and training (see attached report).

• Arbitration & Mediation (Emmer, Sanders) – see attached report; Masters also working with members to develop specific language, re: mediation and arbitration.

• Sanctions (Fines, fees, suspension, termination, litigation) (Mullen, Pilkington) – not all members present; members have been working on a draft document and will get to other committee members prior to the next meeting.

• Emmer reviewed the deadlines for submission of materials prior to the June 5 & 6, 2003 face-to-face committee meeting in Lexington, KY. All reports from the workgroups should be sent to Mountjoy by May 1, 2003. Mountjoy will compile the reports and send back to members for review by May 6, 2003. This document will drive the committees conversation at the June meeting.

• Emmer called for New Business. Rankin, a new member of the committee, asked for assignment to a workgroup. Emmer and Guntharp will discuss with Rankin and make an assignment prior to the May 1 deadline for materials.
• Emmer called for a staff update. Mountjoy provide information on the June 2003 meeting as well as updates to the Commission website, www.adultcompact.org, including a threaded discussion board and document sharing software.

• Emmer, based on consensus from the group, stated that the next meeting of the committee will be the June 2003 meeting in Lexington, KY.

• Seeing no more business, Emmer called for a motion to adjourn. Motion brought by Sanders, seconded by Sachwald and unanimously approved.
I. Welcome & roll call
   • Establishment of a quorum

II. Approval of minutes of March 4, 2003 teleconference meeting

III. Report of Workgroups
   • Workgroup reports
     1. Training & Technical Assistance to States (Ferriter, Sachwald)
     2. Proximity Mentoring Assistance (Agniel, Long-Oliver)
     3. Arbitration & Mediation (Emmer, Sanders)
     4. Sanctions (Fines, fees, suspension, termination, litigation) (Mullen, Pilkington)
   • Workgroup work deadlines
   • Workgroup next steps

IV. Discussion: Workgroup Strategies

V. Staff update

VI. New business

VII. Next meeting(s)

VIII. Adjourn
I have been struggling to get my arms around the project that we all are tasked with. I've finally decided that, at least for me, looking at our project from the context of a strategic planning exercise helped. I don't know if you all agree with my thinking, but here goes.

If we agree that the goal of our committee is to provide the commission with "tools" to insure that states may stay in compliance with the terms of the compact, each of our committee sub-groups are actually working on strategies to achieve that goal.

To illustrate this point further, Robert Sanders and I are working on a "strategy" to achieve our stated goal as it relates to the commission's use of mediation and arbitration. As we develop our strategy, we'll need to specifically discuss the "who's, what's, when's and how's" that will be associated with mediation and arbitration.

Let's take this example one step further; in the context of mediation:

- **What**.....Conduct authorized mediation sessions with representatives of appropriate states after a **petitioning** (complaining) state has filed a grievance against a **responding** (offending) state. The anticipated outcome of the mediation session(s) would be that the parties would agree to strategies that will resolve the underlying problem(s) that was the basis for the filing of a grievance, in order to bring all parties into compliance with the compact.
- **Who**.....Trained mediators that may be a State Commissioner(or their designee) or others that have been authorized by the commission to represent it in an agreed too mediation session(s) with representatives of states that are a party to a grievance/action.
- **When**.....As soon as is possible for all parties, when called upon by the commission to conduct a mediation session.
- **How**.....In a manner that is agreed to by all parties.

I don't know if the content of this email is helpful to you. Robert and I will be talking more about this matter this afternoon.

Call or email your comments to me.

Thanks...

Warren
701-328-6192
TECHNICAL AND PROXIMITY MENTORING ASSISTANCE

A portion of the fiscal plan will be to hire one half-time training assistant and one full-time program assistant. The dues that each state has committed to pay have been designated to assist states in training and technical assistance. These dues will be used to fund the positions.

I. Requests to the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision (ICAOS) from states for technical or proximity mentoring assistance pursuant to the new Compact, would be by the following means:

• The state requests assistance.
• The ICAOS receives a complaint from another state.
• The ICAOS recommends the assistance.

Who would provide the assistance?

• A representative(s) from ICAOS accompanied by a trainer.
• A representative(s) from a neighboring state that is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Compact, accompanied by a trainer.
• An outside consultant.

III. How the ICAOS will proceed with aiding states that requests or require technical or proximity mentoring assistance:

1. A State requests assistance and/or they request the assistance/expertise of another state.
   • Staff the request (with Executive Director or staff).
   • Contact the state that requested assistance with a decision.
   • Decide who will provide the assistance and schedule the session(s).

2. A complaint is received regarding another state.
   • Staff the complaint (with Executive Director or staff).
   • Inform the state the complaint was made against.
   • Present a plan to each involved state that would give options on how to resolve the complaint that may include technical assistance or proximity mentoring.
   • Decide who will provide the assistance based on feedback from the states involved and schedule the session(s).

3. In cases where there are no trainers with expertise in the area identified, it may be necessary to involve an outside source or consultant.

IV. Who would pay for the technical or proximity mentoring assistance?
1. Funding for technical or proximity monitoring assistance from the ICAOS would be derived from dues paid to the commission by the states. If staff from another state is involved in the assistance, the commission would pay for lodging, meals and traveling expenses.

2. Funding for consultant fees need to be decided.