R. Guy called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. EST. Five members were present, establishing a quorum.

Texas Response

- K. Winckler gave an overview of the Complaint made by Ohio against Texas.
- There was discussion of the Compliance Elements:
  1. K. Winckler explained the audit procedures. She noted that the auditors had limited knowledge of the Compact, which made the audit more difficult. She also stated that Harris County, Texas would serve as the model for other counties at the end of the process.
  2. K. Winckler discussed the difficulty in demonstrating the authority of the Commissioners and Administrators.
  3. K. Winckler discussed training objectives.
- K. Winckler noted that annual changes in the rules make compliance and training more difficult.
- She noted that Texas was beginning its pilot training today in seven sites in Harris County. She stated that the training was to be closed-broadcast and would last four hours, reaching approximately forty people. She noted that the curriculum was drawn from the Commissioner training, but was pared down for the practitioners. She stated that the training included both a pre- and post-testing instrument.
- K. Winckler passed out a Quick Reference Rules Guide and a Rules timetable, both authored by K. Winckler.
- K. Winckler discussed the new goals of response times and the success of the Compact Offices, including a quota system set up for staff.
- K. Winckler stated that Texas was looking into scanning all documents into an electronic database. She noted that records are kept in the counties, and not in the Compact Office.
- K. Winckler noted that Texas had increased the pay scale of the Compact office.
- K. Winckler noted that a subcommittee had been formed to deal consistently and directly with the directors of probation in Texas.
- B. Martinez asked if the guides authored by K. Winckler were generic or specific to Texas. K. Winckler noted that the guides were generic.
- R. Guy asked if Texas had a state council. K. Winckler noted that Texas did, but that the council was not active.
- W. Emmer asked what it would take to get that state council to be more active. K. Winckler noted that the members were governor appointees, and did not matter in Texas.
- There was discussion of the effectiveness of state councils in other states.
- R. Guy asked what kind of technical assistance could be provided by the Commission and/or the National Office. B. Martinez asked if D. Blackburn should accompany Texas and Pennsylvania on their internal audits.
- There was discussion of lack of technology in the Texas Compact office. D. Blackburn suggested that K. Winckler contact S. Razor and X. Donnelly of the National Office for assistance.
- K. Winckler discussed CJAD in Texas. She stated that it is an entity that receives state money to distribute to offices according to a formula developed by the state legislature. She noted that its rules required certain acts by each probation department, and stated that while CJAD can penalize probation departments that do not comply with ICAOS, but that penalties never happen.
J. Rubitschun suggested having a single point of contact in each county. K. Winckler stated that she did not believe that will work. She noted that by getting counties involved by edict will result in a group of people who are the only ones who handle Compact cases.

V. Jakes asked if Texas still planned to have August 2008 as the goal date by which to have all officers trained. K. Winckler stated that Texas hoped to meet that goal by holding one training per month until August 2008.

W. Emmer noted that Tennessee as been using the on-demand training available on the Commission website very well.

Pennsylvania Response

B. Martinez gave an overview of the Complaint made by Ohio against Pennsylvania.

B. Martinez listed the proposed members of the audit team: Margaret Thompson, someone from the Director of Court Services Office, and a Manager from Allegheny County Probation. He also asked for assistance from the National Office.

B. Martinez gave an overview of Pennsylvania’s proposed audit. He asked for technical assistance from the Commission regarding proposed standards.

B. Martinez noted that judges and district attorneys need additional training opportunities as well.

R. Guy commended both states for the work they had done so far, and stated that the Committee would enter closed session after lunch to discuss the processes and potential guidance.

K. Winckler respectfully asked that the Committee not go into closed session so that she could serve her state as a resource of information about the Committee’s discussions. R. Guy noted her request, and R. Masters noted that the discussions related to an enforcement action that the Commission had already approved.

K. Winckler stated that she would respectfully object to B. Martinez participating in a closed session. B. Martinez recused himself.

The Committee broke for lunch.

Audit or Compliance Monitoring Process

The Committee took a voice vote to go into closed session. Passed.

The Committee reviewed the motions discussed in closed session.

R. Guy noted the need for due process in the Committee’s actions.

K. Winckler stated that she would email B. Martinez the details of Texas’s audit.

R. Guy made a motion to accept the corrective action plan provided by Texas and arrange for verification by the Committee no later than July 1, 2007. J. Rubitschun seconded. Motion passed.

G. Powers made a motion that an audit be performed in Allegheny County by July 1, 2007, with a minimum of 95 cases reviewed (same number as in Texas), and verification to occur by August 1, 2007. J. Seigel seconded. Motion passed.

J. Rubitschun made a motion that a two-person review team be sent to both Texas and Pennsylvania’s compact offices. G. Powers seconded. Motion passed.

R. Guy made a motion to ask the Executive Committee to fund a two-person audit verification team. G. Powers seconded. Motion passed.

There was discussion of the long-range direction of the Committee.
There was discussion of the development of a self-assessment tool and the types of assistance that can be offered by the Committee and the National Office.

There was discussion of possible audit standards and how to determine those.

T. Johnson and V. Jakes will help to organize and work on the current assessment tool. X. Donnelly will be their point of contact in the National Office.

R. Guy asked that the National Office take the five questions from the second item on the Compliance Committee strategy list and make them into a survey, with the results to be presented at the Committee’s report in September.

There was discussion of the formal process of complaints.

There was discussion of the budget for audits.

R. Guy stated that he did not prefer having a standing Committee member and/or Commissioner in charge of Compliance audits.

R. Masters noted this may be a due process violation.

J. Rubitschun suggested putting a one or more former Commissioners under contract as auditors.

R. Guy asked the National Office to compile a list of potential retired Commissioners and DCAs in each region, as well as a matrix of possible costs of contracting this label.

R. Guy stated that the next meeting would be held on June 11, 2007 via teleconference to discuss the work done on Strategies 1-3 as discussed and asked that everyone have drafts of their work ready to present at that meeting. He stated that A. Hassan would be the point of contact for those materials, and directed that all drafts be given to her one week prior to the meeting.

R. Guy stated that once the Executive Committee had approved funding of a 2-person audit team, that team would begin to build a verification timeline with Texas and Pennsylvania. He asked that D. Blackburn provide K. Winckler with potential dates by the end of the week.

Old Business

There was additional discussion of the process for rule suggestions.

There was discussion of formulating processes for the Committee.

G. Power made a motion to adjourn. J. Rubitschun seconded. Meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.