

Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force
Reentry & Reducing Recidivism Working group
Meeting Notes: April 27, 2020
Digital Conferencing Technology

Attendees:

- Nick Allen, *Interests of Incarcerated Persons*
- DeVitta Briscoe, *Interests of Crime Victims*
- Russ Brown (alt. for Jon Tunheim),
Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
- Suzanne Cook, *Statewide Family Council*
- Sonja Hallum, *Washington State Office of the Governor*
- Representative Brad Klippert, *Washington State House of Representatives, Republican Caucus*
- Mac Pevey (alt. for Secretary Sinclair),
Washington State Department of Corrections
- Chris Poulos (alt. for Lydia Flora Barlow),
Statewide Reentry Council
- Clela Steelhammer (research/data support),
Caseload Forecast Council

Facilitation Team: Amanda Murphy, Chris Page, Molly Stenovec, Maggie Counihan, and Hannah Kennedy

WELCOME & AGENDA REVIEW

The Facilitation Team welcomed attendees to the meeting and Molly reviewed the agenda for the following 1.5 hours. She explained that the group will be reviewing a draft list of desired outcomes and discussing the draft summary table. The team also reminded the group that they will be presenting to the full Task Force at the next meeting on May 7. Asked them to think about what else is needed for the group to be ready to present to the task force.

DRAFT DESIRED OUTCOMES

The draft list of desired outcomes was created by the facilitation team after reviewing previous meeting summaries. They asked the working group if the list is missing anything, incorrect, or unclear.

- A member noted that the phrase “incarcerated, or upon release” does not fully capture all individuals who reenter. Suggested removing that phrase and the whole group agreed.
- **Questions regarding desired outcome D:** “front-loading reentry services including coaching, mentoring, and support to individuals as they transition back to community” -
 - At what point does “front-loading” start? **R:** Members noted that sometimes individuals are not eligible for services until the end of their sentence, which is not best for success and said that planning should start at the initial contact with the criminal system. Mentioned that the earlier a plan for reentry can start, the better it is for staff and those incarcerated.
 - A member suggested adding the word “treatment” could be added.
 - Another member mentioned adding “vocational training” as well.
 - **Q:** Unclear if this is outcome is about supervision after release or during incarceration. **R:** Molly noted that the list is not currently limited to supervision. **R:** A member noted that it matters if this is about supervision while incarcerated or after release and that reentry is something that begins at the beginning.
 - Facilitation team suggested that this is the criteria that the working group will use to develop recommendations (e.g., see if the recommendations meet this list of desired

criteria). If there is a need to differentiate between supervision while incarcerated or after release, for members to make suggestions.

- **C:** A member noted how crucial it is to be clear that the group is discussing the entire continuum of reentry.
- A member suggested adding “early and continuous access”. **R:** Members said that it may need to be clearer that this is part of an individual reentry plan. Suggestion to look at the RCW. **C:** A member noted that not all individuals transition through prisons, they also navigate through county jails and urged members to think globally.
- **Questions regarding option E:**
 - Add “and reentry services” to this outcome.

Other comments:

- A member recommended adding two other desired outcomes- reducing barriers to stability and independence and more resources available for restorative justice process. Whole group agreed to add those new desired outcomes.
- Members noted about awareness of research and studies before implementing.

SUMMARY TABLE

The Facilitation Team updated the summary table with potential recommendations and information based on materials sent by the subject matter experts, by reviewing legislation that was introduced during the last session, and meeting summaries. The team asked the working group if there were anything else that members wanted more information or other recommendations they wanted to consider.

Working group members discussed the summary table and draft of potential recommendations. What follows are key discussion highlights.

- Importance of having programs put in place that align with research.
- Conversation around point 3a regarding the right to vote, which Molly noted was a recommendation that came from SB 6228
- Research around supervision and an inventory of needs and program capacity at Department of Corrections will be provided.
 - Noted that role conflict exists between enforcement and case management functions
 - Members noted the complexity around supervision, reentry plans and the courts and the possibility of eliminating “carve-outs”.
- Agreed to remove references to “wrap-around” which refers more to juvenile supervision.
- Members agreed to combine 1g, 1h, 1i and discussed bringing 1f to the full Task Force for conversation (1g-f: all related to DOC response to violations of terms of supervision)
- Wanted more discussion and clarity on a supervision model before developing recommendations on staffing models and professional development (1j and 1k)

NEXT STEPS & ACTION ITEMS

- **Mac Pevey, Nick Allen, Suzanne Cook, Christopher Poulos** will present to full Task Force on May 7. They will hold another meeting to prepare which is open to the entire working group.
- **The Facilitation Team** will schedule another working group meeting.