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Preliminary Outcomes and Phase II Plan
December 2009 Report Presented a Plan to Address the Major Operational Dysfunctions of the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Modernization</th>
<th>Need to Strengthen Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deploy a computerized case management system</td>
<td>Re-organize the PSI Unit into a Central Diagnosis Unit and improve assessments by the use of research-based tools and protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-organize caseloads from court-based assignments to departmental risk-based assignments</td>
<td>Re-organize training and supervision practices to support and promote EBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create department-wide supervision and sanctioning policies</td>
<td>Re-design the personnel evaluation and incentives system to encourage best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more effective services to the courts by re-organizing Court Liaison system</td>
<td>Create accountability and quality control systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Was Endorsed by Local Officials

We the undersigned County Court at Law Judges would like to show our support of your resolution and the acceptance of the findings in Dr. Fabelo’s report. We also would like to see positive changes and updates in the department in order for it to more efficiently and successfully serve our community in Bexar County.

Statutorily we are not allowed to participate in the management of the CSJD; we can only appoint the director, fiscal officer, and approve the budget. However, in light of the recent attention surrounding the Fabelo report, we believe it is important to express our support for modernization of the department and our desire to see the Community Supervision and Corrections Department efficiently and effectively serve our community.

Commissioners Court fully supports the full implementation of the work plan contained in the Council of State Governments Justice Center’s Assessment of Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department; and
Plan Was Supported by State Officials

San Antonio state Sens. Jeff Wentworth and Leticia Van de Putte say the proposed reforms are crucial, and they predict that Bexar County’s judges will support them despite the loss of turf.

http://www.mysanantonio.com/opinion/Overhaul_Bexars_probation_system.html

The TDCJ-CJAD is requesting a follow-up action plan which includes corrective action, objectives, measures, and detailed timelines for improving the outcomes of the department by:

- Addressing departmental inefficiencies identified by the Organizational Assessment and Modernization Plan of Bexar County’s Community Supervision and Corrections Department report, specifically an organizational structure which does not allow for risk-based assignments/supervision and geographic case management that would promote both EBP as well as efficiency of government,

Carey A. Welebob, Director
TDCJ-CJAD
Re-assessment of Progress Presented Here for Each of the Critical Areas Listed Before

Team returned during March – May 2011 to determine progress in accomplishing plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernization Tasks</th>
<th>Organization Strengthening Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups and Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of Documents/Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review with Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review with Key Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identification of Milestone
Key Pending Tasks in Each Area
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Preliminary Outcomes and Phase II Plan
Court Probation Assignment System was the Root of the Dysfunctions and Needed to Change

19 Different “Probation Departments” Did Not Reflect Evidence-based Practices
CLOs and Court Managers Costs Alone Consumed 15% of Basic Supervision Budget While Not Supervising Probationers
Main Modernization Goals in the Process of Being Accomplished

- Evidenced Based Diagnosis
- Risk and Crimogenic Profile

Cases Placed on Probation by the Courts Referred to Probation Department

- Mainly accomplished

- In Process of Implementation

- Work to accomplish goal still significant

- Department Assigns Caseloads Based on Risk and Crimogenic Profiles
- Uniform Court Policies and Department-wide Supervision and Sanctioning Strategies Guide Supervision
- Reasonable Departures from Unified Conditions of Supervision and Sanctions Part of Supervision Strategies as Necessary

- Computerized Case Management
- Effective Training

- Outcome Accountability Systems
- Effective Personnel Evaluation Strategies
Risk-Based Case Assignment System

Identification of Milestone
Key Pending Tasks in Each Area

In Planning Stage
25% or Less

Implementation On-going
50%

Significant Progress
75% or More

No Significant Progress
10% or Less

Basic Goal Accomplished
100%

Milestones

Abolished case assignment system in early 2011 and transition to department wide assignment of cases based on risk and geographical locations (six regions)

Abolished dual supervision cases

Streamlined paper forms and various court policies

Key Pending Tasks

Review quality of intake process and risk assessment

Explore opening additional reporting locations
(Six regions but still one reporting location)
Cases Divided Now Among Different “Regions” for Supervision

Before

Cases assigned by court regardless of location

Officers supervising cases spread all over Bexar County

Now

Cases assigned to officers based on risk classification and residence of the probationers in six regions

Officers supervising cases within region

One office location still an issue under new system as in prior system
## Deployment of Computerized Case Management System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Key Pending Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System operational on May 2010 and operated by Corrections Software Solutions or CSS</td>
<td>Computer Manual Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms streamlined and paperwork reduced due to computerization</td>
<td>Off-site backup procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More effective computerized information sharing strategies with police and district attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Identification of Milestone
Key Pending Tasks in Each Area

- **No Significant Progress 10% or Less**
- **In Planning Stage 25% or Less**
- **Implementation On-going 50%**
- **Significant Progress 75% or More**
- **Basic Goal Accomplished 100%**
Direct Benefits of Computerized Case Management System

- Elimination or reduction of time spent printing and sorting out documents
- Elimination of redundant internal databases and their related maintenance costs
- More efficient scheduling strategies freeing up personnel capacity
- Pre-populated forms to maintain data integrity
- Accurate reporting to the state preventing lost of state funds due to misreporting
Department Wide Administration of Supervision and Sanctioning Strategies

Identification of Milestone
Key Pending Tasks in Each Area

**Milestones**

- Department wide administrative manual
- Uniform program referral forms
- Department wide progressive sanctions guidelines

**Key Pending Tasks**

- Supervision Manual with evidence-based framework
- Continue working with judicial officials to achieve more consistency in the setting of conditions of supervision and in the administration of progressive sanctions
Benefits of Department Wide Administrative Policies

- Culture of fragmentation slowly receding into a department-wide culture
- Standardization of forms and processes increasing efficiencies
- Elimination of “dual supervision” (same person supervised by two officers) freed up supervision capacity
- Increased agreement on what are effective supervision and sanctioning strategies
- More targeted program referrals
More Effective Court Services

Identification of Milestone
Key Pending Tasks in Each Area

**Milestones**

- Computer hardware in each court
- “Paperless” system in all county courts
- Creation of Court Liaison Unit reducing the number of managers and increasing flexibility to meet the needs of the courts

**Key Pending Tasks**

- Expansion of paperless system to all district courts
- Review possibility of physically locating Court Liaison Unit in the court building
Overall Department Environment Seems to be Better

Perception of Focus Groups of Overall Department Culture and Environment

- Improved Somewhat: 3
- Making Progress: 5
- Better Than Before: 8
- Major Improvement: 10

Prior Feelings Stated by Personnel
- “This is Bexar County and nothing will change”
- “The judges would not agree on anything”
- “The management of the department has been in turmoil and this is frustrating”
- “Stone-age computers will not allow us to move forward”

Most Recent Feelings Stated by Personnel
- “So much change in a short time, but changes have been towards the positive”
- “Right tools are in place but we need to learn how to use them”
- “The place feels better but we still have kinks that need to be worked out”
Organizational Support Structures Still Need Improvements in a “Phase II” of the Project

Need to Strengthen Organization

- Re-organize the PSI Unit into a Central Diagnosis Unit and improve assessments by the use of research-based tools and protocols
- Re-design the personnel evaluation and incentives system to encourage best practices
- Re-organize training and supervision practices to support and promote EBP
- Create accountability and quality control systems

Identification of Milestone Key Pending Tasks in Each Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Planning Stage</th>
<th>Implementation On-going</th>
<th>Significant Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Significant Progress 25% or Less</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75% or More</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Goal Accomplished 100%
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Preliminary Outcomes and Phase II Plan
Examples of Improved Outcomes

- Department used to have two officers supervising the same person when they had a felony and misdemeanor probation case (“Dual Supervision”).
- “Dual Supervision” eliminated; 2,510 cases would have been in “dual supervision” with two officers.
- Judges previously referred probationers to drug treatment assessments without the benefit of pre-screening.
- Pre-screening in place; average number of monthly assessments declined by 13% in average TAIPs conducted in FY 09 vs. FY 11 (527 vs. 457).
- Waiting list for TAIP services declined from a fiscal year average of 374 in FY 09 to 92 in FY 10, a decline of 75%.
Examples of Improved Outcomes (cont.)

Department lost about $250,000 annually in state funding for the last five years for incorrectly reporting the number of people under supervision to the state.

Reporting errors have been eliminated and the department should not lose state funds for misreporting information.

Department’s Court Liaison services were administered by 25 managers and 25 Court Liaison Officers.

Same Court Liaison services are being provided with a centralized Court Liaison Unit with one manager.

Court manager positions were eliminated and re-structured to other management capacity.

Number of managers in the department was reduced by six.
Department Handling Larger Population with Fewer Staff

19% increase in the number of felons under supervision since September 2007 with average population under misdemeanor supervision staying stable

Total number of employees declined from 460 in January 2009 to 415 in March 2011, a 10% decrease
## Caseload Increasing and Demand for More Efficiencies to Increase with State Budget Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Caseload Carrying Non-Specialized CSO's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Served (Dir)</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>21,332</td>
<td>21,919</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caseload</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Non-Caseload CLO, PSI, Field Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Served*</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty Federal/County Grant Funded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Served</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversion Programs See List Below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Served</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support/Admin Managers, administration, support staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Workforce</strong></td>
<td>467</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Monthly average for PSI only; no workload data available for CLO Unit and Field Team (there was approximately 6,000 in FY 19)

Budget cuts likely to affect the size of caseloads
Fewer administrators require more effective systems

Diversions program include: TAIP, Mentally Impaired Caseloads, Aftercare, Gang, Sex Offender, Residential Facilities, and Electronic Monitoring
State Performance Report Notes Decrease in Felony Revocations Despite Increase in Felony Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>27,457</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>14,702</td>
<td><strong>7.1%</strong></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td><strong>-6.6%</strong></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>11,322</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>10,473</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>9,313</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Performance Report Notes Lower Percentage of Revocations for “Technical” Reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSCD</th>
<th>Percent of Statewide Felony Direct and Indirect Population</th>
<th>Felony Revocations to TDCJ</th>
<th>Percent of Statewide Felony Revocations to TDCJ</th>
<th>Felony Technical Revocations to TDCJ</th>
<th>Percent of Statewide Felony Technical Revocations</th>
<th>Percent of Felony Revocations to TDCJ for Technical Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>24,239</td>
<td>11,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical = Cases revoked with no new charges
Key Milestones for Phase II Improvements

- Training Survey and Plan
- New Personnel Evaluation System
- Evidence-based Supervision Plans/Strategies
- District Courts Paperless
- Computerized PSIs
- Quality Protocols for Risk Assessment
- Validate Risk Assessment or Determine New State System
- Quantitative Quality Control/Fidelity Protocols
- Phase III Central Diagnosis Plan
Reports to Judicial and County Officials Critical to Maintain Momentum and Accountability

Report Format

- For each of the areas, report should list improvement goals for Phase II, activities during the period, milestone accomplished and explanations for delays or changes from the original plan.

Phase II Progress Report One

Phase II Progress Report Two

Phase II Progress Report Three
Thank You

http://www.justicecenter.csg.org/

This material was prepared for the Bexar County CSCD by staff or consultants of the Council of State Governments Justice Center. Presentations are not externally reviewed for form or content and as such, the statements within reflect the views of the authors and should not be considered the official position of the Justice Center, the members of the Council of State Governments, or funding agencies supporting the work.