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Summary of Missouri’s criminal justice trends identified at July Task Force meeting

- High incarceration rates and growing prison population
- Largest growth in female prison population in the country
- High crime rates impacting many parts of state
- Increasing prison admissions, driven largely by nonviolent offenses and people who violate the terms of their supervision
- Significant behavioral health needs among those who are supervised in the community
Missouri’s current prison population growth will require spending hundreds of millions in construction and operating costs

According to current trends, MDOC will be 2,351 prison beds short of needed capacity by the end of FY2021.

- The cost of constructing a new 1,636-bed facility (e.g., Chillicothe women’s facility) is about $175 million.
- Operating costs would approach $27 million annually.

Note: Above projection is best-case scenario of MDOC’s projections. Furthermore, rate of growth in female prison population may necessitate construction on a greater scale, and sooner.

Source: Missouri Department of Corrections Offender Profile, FY2016; Missouri Department of Corrections, August 2017 Population Forecast
Missouri’s criminal justice system involves many decision points and actors.

Criminal activity leads to apprehension by local law enforcement and detention in county jail.

Who stays in local jail beyond initial detention?
Judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers, and sheriffs all play roles in determining who remains in jail while cases are pending, as well as ultimate sentences.

- Keep in jail or release on bond?
- Send to prison or probation?

95% of all who enter prison will exit...are they ready?

One of the primary objectives of reentry is to reduce recidivism, or the rate at which people return to criminal behavior patterns.
Based on discussions with Missouri stakeholders, several areas were identified at the July Task Force meeting for further analysis:

- **Drivers of crime** in Missouri and how trust in the system in some communities may be rebuilt.
- **Recent growth**, including *Missouri’s female prison population*, and how this growth can be curbed.
- **Policy and practice around MDOC county reimbursement** and its impacts at the state and local level.
- **Use of structured reentry services** to improve the transition from prison back into society.
- **Parole decision-making practices** and how they can be improved and streamlined.
- **Supervision practices and outcomes**, including the high volume of people who enter prison for failing on supervision.
- **Interconnected Justice reinvestment** will take a comprehensive approach in addressing these issues.
## Update on data collection required by justice reinvestment process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Requested</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prison admissions and releases</td>
<td>Missouri Department of Corrections (MDOC)</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prison population snapshots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision openings and terminations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision population snapshots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Screening and assessment data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment and programming participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parole board decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statewide arrests</td>
<td>Missouri Department of Public Safety (MDPS)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal history information for prison and supervision populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Felony and misdemeanor sentences</td>
<td>Missouri Office of Court Administration (OSCA)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSG Justice Center staff have pursued regional perspectives in stakeholder engagement, reflecting the state’s size and diversity.

Since the last presentation...

Since July 11, members of the CSG Justice Center team have made seven (7) site visits to Missouri, including visits to Southeast Missouri (Kennett, Cape Girardeau, Hillsboro), Southwest Missouri (Springfield), Kansas City and surrounding communities, St. Louis and surrounding communities, Audrain Co., and more.
Since the launch of justice reinvestment in July, CSG Justice Center staff have spoken with a wide array of stakeholders.

### Meetings
- **MDOC supervision staff and administrators** (St. Louis, Kansas City, Kennett, and more)
- **Sheriffs** (Cole, Greene, and Audrain)
- **County commissioners** (Audrain and Cape Girardeau)
- **Circuit judges** (Jackson and St. Louis Counties)
- **Prosecuting attorneys** (Jackson, Platte, Buchanan, Pulaski, Cole, Boone, St. Charles, and Jefferson)
- **Public defenders** (Jefferson)
- **Law enforcement** (Cape Girardeau and St. Louis)
- **Victim service providers and advocates** (Kansas City, Cape Girardeau, St. Louis, and more)

### Observation
- Probation and parole **officer/client meetings**
- **Community-based programming** provided by probation and parole officers
- **In-prison programming** provided by MDOC staff
- Parole release hearings
- Pre-parole interviews with offenders and report preparation

### Focus Groups
- **People on probation or parole supervision** (Kansas City, Cass County, Kennett, and St. Louis)
- **Probation and parole officers** in the field
- Probation and parole **field supervisors**
- Institutional parole officers (IPOs)
- Institutional parole officer supervisors
Project Overview

September Presentation:  
*Prison and community supervision*
- Programming and preparation behind the walls
- Parole policy and procedure
- Community supervision

October Presentation:  
*Crime and its effects in Missouri*
- Drivers of changes in crime and jail and prison populations
- Collateral consequences
- Victims services and needs

November Presentation:  
*Pretrial, jail, and county/state dynamics*
- Criminal justice dynamics between the state and counties
- Other policy options
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What works in changing behavior is informed by research—qualified staff with adequate resources

Missouri is facing high costs—state prisons and county jails are overcrowded, and recidivism rates are driving the costs higher

There is a roadmap for addressing these challenges:

a. Assessment and triage of resources to people at the highest risk
b. Strengthening community-based services
c. Better structuring parole decision making
Overview

1. Reentry and the Challenge of Changing Behavior
2. Missouri’s Reentry Reality
3. Moving Missouri Toward Structured Reentry
Reducing recidivism for people on probation and parole supervision will yield many benefits for Missouri

1. The key to reducing recidivism is changing people’s behavior so that they engage in less criminal activity, **which in turn means less victimization and safer communities.**

2. **Almost two-thirds of adults convicted of a felony in Missouri are on either probation or parole supervision** in the community, so making even modest improvements with those populations will translate into significant beneficial impacts in the state.
Moving toward a proactive, balanced approach to supervision improves the behavior of people on probation and reduces recidivism.

**Traditional Approach**

- Ensure people are aware of probation conditions
- Check to ensure they **complied with the conditions**
- Perform enforcement functions such as drug testing and searches
- Success is measured by number of appointments made, lack of violations, etc.

**Balanced Approach**

- Assess for risk/needs
- Develop **case plan with performance-based objectives**
- Link people to relevant services
- Assist people in complying with supervision terms and achieving behavior change
- Success is measured by progress toward identified case plan objectives
**SYSTEM CHECKLIST:** The key features of a balanced supervision system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Assess risk, need, and responsivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Target the right people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Frontload supervision and treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Invest in and build active linkages to proven programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Use case planning to facilitate positive behavior change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Respond to both positive and negative behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hold people accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Measure outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the right approaches being taken with the right people?

If not, efforts at changing behavior (i.e., reducing recidivism) will be much less effective and sometimes counterproductive.
1. **ASSESS**: Comprehensive assessment of risk, needs, and responsivity is the cornerstone of risk-reduction strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Reoffending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 10% re-arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 35% re-arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 70% re-arrested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Without Risk Assessment…**

**With Risk Assessment…**
2. **TARGET:** To reduce recidivism, supervision and programs must be focused on people with higher risk/needs

Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Treatment Dosage for a Supervision Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>No Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **FRONTLOAD**: Supervision and supports should be focused on the period when people are most likely to reoffend.

3. FRONTLOAD SUPPORTS: A continuum of services must be able to provide the right services at the right time

People should start at the level of supports necessary to address their risk and needs, but they should “step down” to lower-intensity and lower-cost interventions with treatment progress.
4. **INVEST IN PROVEN PROGRAMS**: Selecting and implementing risk-reducing programs helps ensure that resources are expended wisely.

1. **Who should receive programming?**
   - Moderate and high-risk people

2. **What kind of programming structures are effective?**
   - Cognitive-behavioral with graduated skills practice
   - Cognitive (no behavioral)
   - Psycho-educational
   - Journaling
   - Punishment-oriented
   - Changes in Recidivism by Program Type:
     - Cognitive-behavioral with graduated skills practice: -26%
     - Cognitive (no behavioral): -26%
     - Psycho-educational: -26%
     - Journaling: -26%
     - Punishment-oriented: +8%

3. **What should programs target?**
   - Central 8 criminogenic needs:
     - Criminal history
     - Criminal associates
     - Criminal thinking
     - Criminal personality pattern
     - Substance use
     - Education/employment
     - Family dysfunction
     - Leisure/recreation
5. **USE CASE PLANNING**: Establish behavioral objectives that address the individual’s risk and needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic Risk/Needs</th>
<th>Example case plan objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal thinking</strong> (e.g., “My crime didn’t hurt anyone. They had insurance and will probably get a new car now.”)</td>
<td>☐ Attend program to address criminal thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete behavior chain analysis activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abusing drugs</strong> when upset or frustrated</td>
<td>☐ Build emotion regulation skills in therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Complete cost/benefit analysis of drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Practice 5 new self-regulation techniques this week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanging around with old friends</strong> who I used to use drugs with</td>
<td>☐ Set up a weekly meeting with my peer support specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Attend one activity at the recovery center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. RESPOND TO BEHAVIORS: Address positive and negative behaviors swiftly, certainly, and fairly

**Swift:** Sanctions are quick. Limit the time between violation and consequence.

**Certain:** Sanctions are predictable. Consequences are not random. There are set responses for certain violations.

**Fair and Appropriate:** The severity and duration of a response to a violation is proportionate to the violation.

7. HOLD PEOPLE ACCOUNTABLE:

Washington
*Technical violators can be held for 2–3 days for low-level violations and up to 30 days for high-level violations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Incarcerated</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>-65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Days</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Georgia
*Prompt sanctions to correct behavior of troublesome probationers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days in Jail</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>-74%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Days</td>
<td>POM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Days</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Carolina
*Swift and certain “dips” of brief jail sanctions and “dunks” of prison sanctions in response to violations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison Admissions</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>-51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,188</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measuring outcomes for people on supervision is about more than just reincarceration, or even rearrest...

Other “measures” inform success while on supervision, including:

- Passing drug/alcohol screens
- Maintaining employment
- Paying toward legal financial obligations such as restitution or court costs
- Maintaining positive relationships with family
For successful reentry, system actors should be familiar with and trained on key concepts of behavior change.

**Must be** educated about and appropriately trained in principles of changing behavior:

1. Assess risk, need, and responsivity
2. Target the right people
3. Frontload supervision and treatment
4. Invest in and build active linkages to proven programs
5. Use case planning to facilitate positive behavior change
6. Respond to both positive and negative behaviors
7. Hold people accountable
8. Measure outcomes

**System actors and resources:**
- Courts
- Law Enforcement
- Prosecutors and defense bar
- Probation and parole officers
- Community programs/treatment
- Institutional parole officers
- Parole board members and staff
- Institutional programs/treatment
Overview

1. Reentry and the Challenge of Changing Behavior
2. Missouri’s Reentry Reality
3. Moving Missouri Toward Structured Reentry
Assessing Missouri’s approach to changing behavior requires looking at key parts of the system charged with carrying out reentry.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assess risk, need, and responsivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Target the right people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frontload supervision and treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Invest in and build active linkages to proven programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use case planning to facilitate positive behavior change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Respond to both positive and negative behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hold people accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Measure outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the right approaches being taken with the right people?

> Multiple areas of the system should be coordinated around evidence-based practices:

- **Behind the walls**—front-end assessment by MDOC (IPOs and IPO Supervisors) and communication with parole board
- **Parole Board**—qualifications and training of members; type and quality of information used in decision making
- **Supervision in community**—is reentry making a positive difference?
Over the last decade, supervision revocations have accounted for half of all admissions to prison.

Ironically, new prison sentences account for the least frequent reason for admission to prison in Missouri.

- Fewer than 15 percent of admissions in FY2016 were for new prison sentences.

Source: MDOC prison admissions data.
Reasons for admission to prison raise key questions about effectiveness of what is done in the community.

Total Admissions = 18,872

- **Treatment**: 6,550 (35% of total)
  - What treatment, and is prison the best setting for desired outcomes?

- **Revocation**: 9,551 (51% of total)
  - What is being done while on supervision?

- **New Prison**: 2,771

**Female Admissions to MDOC:**
- 45% were for treatment
- 46% were for revocations

Source: MDOC prison admissions data.
Missouri statutes set forth multiple forms of prison-based treatment that can be ordered by the courts

- **Section 217.362**
  - Long-Term Substance Abuse Treatment

- **Section 217.785**
  - Post-Conviction Institutional Treatment

- **Section 559.036**
  - Court-Ordered Detention Sanction (CODS)

- **Section 559.115**
  - Institutional Treatment

  

- **Section 559.115**
  - Shock Incarceration

However, while judges can order people to complete 120-day programs in MDOC under the statutes above, practical necessities within MDOC pose challenges…

- Once in MDOC, placement in programs is **dependent on available slots**, so people may not get the programming or treatment ordered if programs are already full.

- Due to the intake process, movement between facilities, and other factors, 120-day treatment programs actually consist of **only 84 days of treatment**.
Missouri has 533 beds statewide that are oriented toward providing community-based services to people on supervision.

- **Community Supervision Centers**
  - Statewide Capacity: 360 beds
  - Six facilities across the state of 60 beds each.
  - Generally co-located with probation and parole offices and providing programming and services.
  - Farmington
  - Fulton
  - Hannibal
  - Kennett
  - Poplar Bluff
  - St. Joseph

- **Contracted Reentry Beds**
  - Statewide Capacity: 173 beds
  - Facilities for people on supervision operated by agencies contracting with MDOC, mainly in more urban areas.
  - St. Louis
  - Kansas City
  - Columbia

- MDOC has inadequate processes for ensuring that these 533 beds are actually generating positive impacts for people accessing the services.
Most “behind the walls” treatment is delivered to people who violate the terms of their supervision.

Total Admissions = 18,872

- Treatment: 6,550
- Revocation: 9,551
- New Prison: 2,771

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Sentence (22%)</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Sanction (78%)</td>
<td>15,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 91% ordered to 120-day treatment that delivers 84 days of programming
- Most programming is “institutional treatment” related to substance abuse and alcohol addiction
- Almost 15% of programming is “shock incarceration”—questionable effectiveness

Source: MDOC prison admissions data.
Interventions offered in the community are more effective at changing behavior than those offered in prison.

**Programming During Incarceration**
-5 to -10% Recidivism

**Required**
- Assessment
- High-quality programs and treatment
- Transition planning

**Programming in the Community**
-20 to -30% Recidivism

**Required**
- Assessment
- High-quality programs and treatment
- Effective supervision

---

Thirty-four people involved in the criminal justice system offered insight into how the criminal justice system is, and is not, working.

The quality of the relationship with the parole or probation officer is crucial.

- It feels good to have my PO tell me, “I’m proud of you.”
- She’d heard of me before and I was nervous, but she treats me better than she had thought about me, with respect.
- My PO got a pass for me on her day off. She wants me to succeed.
- You’re a felon, You’re a liar. They would never talk to me like that if they met me out on the street at the grocery store.
- “I want to send you back to prison, give me a reason.”
- I was sold out over a Subway sandwich. They started talking while they ordered and I was sold out by the time they paid. The sandwich wasn’t even toasted.

Questions were about:

- Overall supervision experience
- Relationship with their probation or parole officer; and
- What is most important to be successful
Barriers to employment and quality programming are evident

Employment is difficult to get and keep, and there are other barriers to reintegration

Having a felony has disqualified me for positions. I was told I was overqualified for the position. They were like, this looks good we just have to run the background check. Then I got the email saying the position was filled.

Effort should be made to start paperwork for ID, housing/living situations before we get out. I haven’t had an ID for a year.

I had a job that I liked, but my PO didn’t like it because I got handwritten checks. She keeps telling me to work as a cook. I hate to cook. I want to do something I like, but it’s not good enough for my PO.

I’m so far away from my family.

I’ve lived in the country my whole life. I get out and they send me to the city. Away from my family, away from everything I know.

There were varying opinions about programming and supervision terms

The [drug court] works if you let it. Drug court isn’t a set up if you want to quit.

The punishment should be different depending on how long and how well I’ve been doing.

Sometimes the requirements don’t fit me, there should be flexibility so that because I’m going to school and doing good, it shouldn’t matter what the Department requirements is. I’m doing good. I’m doing what they “want.”

I take these classes on nutrition…but I can’t even buy the good food with my food stamps. And, I need help writing a resume; not on nutrition.

It would be better to drive us in the van to places to interview.

One group had several members who had taken Pathways to Change 4, 5, and 6 times (both while incarcerated and upon release from prison).
Missouri has room to improve its current supervision practices

### Risk Assessment

- Reassessment occurs annually for females and every 6 months for males
- Risk/needs level is not consistently used to refer to programming

### Treatment and Programming

- Officers have authority to issue referrals, but options are limited due to long wait times for programs
- Insufficient use of evidence-based CBT programming

### Sanctions and Incentives

- Separate policies exist on applying sanctions and incentives
- Range of sanctions used by officers is limited due to waitlists for many programs
- When treatment is delayed, officers often rely on electronic monitoring as a sanction
- Swift and certain sanctions and timely receipt of treatment are hindered by waitlists

### Data about Revocation and Recidivism

- MDOC collects data on revocation rates, but officers are unaware of their clients’ success rates
- QA data outside of statewide recidivism rates is not collected on program providers
Almost half of people on supervision who are revoked to prison are revoked for technical violations of their supervision.

**Total Admissions = 18,872**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>New Laws Violation (51%)</th>
<th>Technical (49%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>9,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Prison</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Two-thirds of those revoked were not connected to any community-based treatment while on supervision.**
- **However, of those revoked for technical reasons, 64% had “moderate to severe” substance abuse issues and 17% had “mild to serious” mental health problems.**
- **Of females revoked to prison, 58% were revoked for technical violations.**

*Note: Above does not address whether those revoked for technical reasons had any arrests while on supervision. Pending analyses by CSG will address this and be presented in October 2017.*

Source: MDOC prison admissions and supervision terminations data.
Current cost to Missouri for imprisoning technical probation and parole violators represents almost $75 million annually.

Technical Violators Revoked to Prison in FY2016

3,477

Excludes absconders

Average length of stay in prison of 12 months

Requires 3,477 prison beds on a daily basis

Cost per day of $58.85

$74.7 Million Annually

Excludes absconders
Going from admission to MDOC to the parole hearing involves many steps

After sentencing, people serving a prison sentence in Missouri are transferred to the custody of the Missouri Department of Corrections (MDOC). People entering MDOC are (typically) received, classified, assessed, and prepared for a parole hearing in the following way:

1. People entering prison are brought to one of MDOC’s Reception and Diagnostic facilities where the **intake process is initiated**. The intake process includes security classification and assessments for substance abuse, mental illness, and more.

2. People ordered by the court to complete programming or treatment are **placed in the queue for the applicable program**.

3. Parole **hearing scheduled** based on the length of the sentence imposed.

4. One month prior to the scheduled hearing, the assigned **Institutional Parole Officer (IPO)** begins assembling information for the **pre-hearing report**. This process includes an interview with the person being considered for parole. The pre-hearing report is completed and provided to the parole board before the hearing.

5. Parole **hearing is conducted**. Immediately following the hearing, the three-person hearing panel confers on a release decision, a release date (if applicable), and any conditions for release.

6. The **decision of the board is relayed to the person** six to eight weeks after the hearing.
Institutional Parole Officers are critical to the parole decision-making process

Institutional Parole Officers (IPOs) play a key role in the parole process. IPOs work inside the walls of Missouri’s prison facilities.

IPOs prepare the pre-hearing report (right), which is used by members of the parole panel to conduct the hearing. These intensive reports often require 3–5 hours to complete, depending on a variety of factors. Once complete, the report must be approved by the Institutional Parole Supervisor.

In addition to pre-hearing reports, IPOs are also tasked with:

- Completing a number of other reports, including court reports for people serving 120-day sanctions, violation reports, investigation requests, sentencing assessment reports (SARS), special reports, and more
- Booking treatment beds
- Submitting home plans
- Corresponding with people in prison and their families
- Various other duties as assigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-hearing Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sentencing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dates for possible release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incident or violation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk of recidivism assessment information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substance abuse information and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-prison treatment and/or programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hobbies and post-release goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IPO recommendation on release date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parole hearing

Parole hearings generally last between 10 and 20 minutes. The Missouri Board of Probation and Parole (MBPP) is represented by a hearing panel, which includes three members (at least one of whom must be an appointed member of the MBPP). Other members are generally Board staff, such as Parole Analysts or Institutional Parole Officer Supervisors.

1. One of the hearing officers explains the process to the person being considered for release.

2. The panel member leading the hearing generally begins by asking questions of the person about the offense or violation of supervision that led to incarceration, then works through the report while asking the person questions about his/her criminal history, substance abuse needs, any in-prison programming that was completed, plans for release, and more.

3. If someone is present in support of the person being considered for parole, he or she is allowed to make a statement near the end of the hearing.

4. The person being considered for parole is asked if there is anything else they would like to state for the record. Upon completion of this statement, the hearing is concluded and the person is told that a decision will be made and relayed in 6–8 weeks by the IPO.

5. Panel members confer on a date for release and any conditions that they will require of the person before release or while on community supervision.
There are more than 10,000 parole release hearings annually, the majority of which are “initial” parole hearings.

There are currently two vacancies on the board.

Source: Missouri Board of Probation and Parole hearings data.
Initial parole hearings tend to occur more than 6 months beyond the parole board’s own targets.

5,961 Initial Parole Hearings

FY2016

Hearing *prior to* "Target Date"
14%

Hearing *after* "Target Date"
86%

Actual hearing occurs average of 6.4 months after board target.

Source: MDOC Research Division; Missouri Board of Probation and Parole hearings data.
In assessing key components of reentry system, important to look at staff, practices, and resources in place to advance goals of behavior change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Part of System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behind the Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>Are staff properly trained to their mission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; Practice</strong></td>
<td>Are policies oriented around research and are they clearly established and communicated to staff? Does practice properly follow policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Do staff have adequate tools to help achieve their mission?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Practices “behind the walls” are inefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Part of System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behind the Walls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>• Staff are qualified, incredibly hard-working, and devoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training beyond initial basic is minimal and not properly geared toward mission of reentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; Practice</strong></td>
<td>• Policies poorly captured into single resource for staff, making clarity and accountability difficult to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Practices geared around paper-driven, narrative style documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>• Screening/assessment tools need to be evidence-based and validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information technology deficiencies create major obstacles for staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parole Board Decision Making

### Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of System</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>Board members and staff are qualified, incredibly hard-working and devoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training specific to mission is lacking, e.g., role of risk/needs in continuation of criminal behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; Practice</strong></td>
<td>Hearings are facilitated through lengthy paper reports, with excessive information often unrelated to readiness for release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parole “guidelines” mirror historical practice but don’t actually <em>guide</em> decision making in relation to individual’s readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Board currently dealing with two vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members and staff must navigate multiple databases during hearings, adding to inefficiencies and scattered nature of info.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probation and parole supervision is hampered by lack of training, poor use of risk assessment information, and outdated IT resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Practice</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|            | • Staff are qualified, incredibly hard-working and devoted  
             • Training beyond initial basic is minimal, antiquated, and not properly geared toward mission of behavior change | • Risk inconsistently used in prioritizing programming/treatment  
             • Uncoordinated policy around use of sanctions and incentives  
             • Limited use of swift & certain sanctions, i.e., jail sanctions | • Risk assessment tools inconsistent in application and in need of validation across more robust measures (e.g., re-arrest)  
             • Lack of community-based programming and treatment, particularly in addressing cognitive behavioral issues |
Overview

1. Reentry and the Challenge of Changing Behavior
2. Missouri’s Reentry Reality
3. Moving Missouri Toward Structured Reentry
### Policy options related to training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Require regular training on how to complete risk assessments</th>
<th>Behind the Walls</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
<th>Supervision in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require core correctional practice training so officers understand how risk should factor into decision making</td>
<td>Behind the Walls</td>
<td>Parole Board</td>
<td>Supervision in Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement training for officers on how to maximize client interactions and use of case plans</td>
<td>Behind the Walls</td>
<td>Parole Board</td>
<td>Supervision in Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on communication and understanding others’ communication styles</td>
<td>Behind the Walls</td>
<td>Parole Board</td>
<td>Supervision in Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy options related to screening and assessment tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behind the Walls</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
<th>Supervision in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a streamlined, validated risk/need assessment process for men and women</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have policy in place to guide re-administration of risk assessment to ensure all probationers and parolees have opportunity to drop down supervision levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate tools study every 5 years to include predictive validity across gender and racial groups</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop parole guidelines oriented around readiness for reentry</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy options related to resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Behind the Walls</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
<th>Supervision in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemic IT modernization to coordinate and streamline</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt evidence-based cognitive behavioral programs like Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure CSCs to more effectively respond to violations and prevent revocations</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding to enable more drug testing and ensure resources are available for people testing positive</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand availability of treatment services for people in the community</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy options related to policy and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behind the Walls</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
<th>Supervision in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish structured and consistent criteria for admission into programs</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that risk levels are used to prioritize access to programs and treatment</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop behavior response policy incorporating sanctions and incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline and modernize information assembly relating to parole release readiness</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix ECC issues around revocation if restitution owed at end of early discharge opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End practice of earning ECC credits while on absconding status or while in custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Policy options related to quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behind the Walls</th>
<th>Parole Board</th>
<th>Supervision in Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor recidivism rates and assess effectiveness of treatment and programming</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure performance of CBT programs to ensure proper administration and outcomes</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop mechanisms to collect data on quality assurance from community-based behavioral health treatment</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop performance dashboards that reflect supervision outcomes</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure staff performance against best practices</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of key takeaways from today’s presentation

- What works in changing behavior is informed by research—qualified staff with adequate resources
- Missouri is facing high costs—state prisons and county jails are overcrowded, and recidivism rates are driving the costs higher
- Fortunately, there is a roadmap for addressing these challenges:
  a. Assessment and triage of resources to highest risk
  b. Strengthening community-based services
  c. Better structuring parole decision making
Coming in the October meeting

Understand victim services and resources in the state; analyze crime victim compensation benefits and restitution processes

Review opportunities for employment and housing and the impact of criminal records on employment and housing

Identify drivers of crime and prison/jail populations; consider opportunities for MDOC and law enforcement to share information

Consider strategies to improve underlying issues of distrust in communities heavily impacted by crime
Proposed timeline for justice reinvestment in Missouri

Data Analysis
- Initial Analysis
- Detailed Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

Stakeholder Engagement
- Stakeholder Engagement and Task Force Presentations
- Policy Option Development

Timeline:
- Launch Presentation: July 11
- 2nd Presentation: September 20
- 3rd Presentation: October 24
- Policy Options Presentation: November 28
- Briefings for Legislators and other Stakeholders (as necessary/requested)

Pre-filing Opens
- Legislative Session Begins

Legislative Session Begins
- Pre-filing Opens

Initial Analysis
- Detailed Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

Stakeholder Engagement and Task Force Presentations
- Policy Option Development
Thank You

Ben Shelor, Policy Analyst
bshelor@csg.org
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