

Violation Response and Revocation
Virtual Town Hall
November 18, 2020

Zack Osell: Alright everyone it's 9:30 on the dot, let's get started. I want to begin today by welcoming you all to today's virtual town hall. We're excited to hear your feedback and share some of the changes we are making here at the Department of Corrections. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Zack Osell, I'll be moderating today's event. I'm a Communication Specialist in the Office of Public Affairs and one of my key responsibilities is stakeholder engagement. Before we dive in, I have a few housekeeping items to go over today. You should see a question and answer feature somewhere on the bottom of your screen. We will be looking at all questions and feedback submitted using this feature through today's webinar. We will have time near the end to open up the floor to our panelists to answer some of the questions that roll in during today's session.

If you attended some of our other town halls, this one is going to be structured a little bit differently. Following opening remarks from Secretary Carr, we will have a presentation from the Division of Community Corrections. This presentation will provide more detail on the changes being made to violation response and revocation. I want to encourage you all to submit your questions and feedback using the Q&A feature during that presentation. Once we get to the Q&A portion, we'll have several subject matter experts with us to help answer those questions.

I know many of you may have questions about COVID today, and although the health and safety of our staff and all those in our care is our number one priority now, we are here to talk about violation response and revocation and hope to stay on topic because of our limited time. I encourage anyone interested in learning more about DOCs COVID response, to visit our public COVID-19 page which can be found by visiting doc.wi.gov and clicking on the COVID-19 banner at the top of the page. On that page you can also look at our testing dashboard, any announcements or memos made by our agency during this crisis or navigate through our FAQ page which should answer most, if not all, of your questions.

Another housekeeping note to add, if you are using a VPN today, it may be best to temporarily disable this to ensure that all the Zoom webinar features are functioning properly. I also want to add that today's webinar will be recorded and shared at a later date. You will be able to find the recording along with the transcript and the PDF containing answers to all the questions asked, both before and during today's event by navigating to our DOC home page, doc.wi.gov and from there you would need to click on the "Town Halls" link which can be found under quick links. That does it for me. I'm going to turn it over to Secretary Carr for an introduction on today's topic.

Secretary Carr: Thank you Zack. Good morning everyone. I want to thank you for the opportunity to present to you all today. I have been a public servant for as long as I can remember, and I take the role of serving the community and the great people of Wisconsin seriously. I began my career working with troubled youth at the Milwaukee County Children's Home and the Child and Adolescent Treatment Center back in 1977. And in 1980, I joined the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Office and during the next 30 years, I was honored to serve in almost every division and at every rank in that agency including second in command for my last 8 years. In 2010, I was honored to be appointed to the position of U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Wisconsin by President Barack Obama.

Now, over the course of my career in law enforcement, I learned the importance of how holding those who break the law accountable for their actions plays a critical and substantial role in public safety. These are the tenets that I brought with me when I came to the Department of Corrections in January of 2019, when Governor Evers presented me with the opportunity of a lifetime to serve the people of Wisconsin as the Secretary of Corrections. However, during my career, I also learned that most people just want the same things that you and I want; to succeed in the community and to provide a better life for themselves and their families. I learned that through hard work, smart policies driven by data and a willingness to change, organizations can accomplish public safety, accountability and provide opportunities for those in the criminal justice system simultaneously.

At the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, one of the things that we are focused on is public safety, using established evidence-based practices as our foundation. We offer education, programming and treatment to those in our care and on supervision to enable them to be successful upon their return to the community. The department's re-entry initiative engages the persons in our care as early as possible, challenging them, motivating them and encouraging them to change. Effective offender re-entry includes a quality risk assessment and strong supervision practices proportionate to the level of

risk to public safety. Doing this means we are working to fulfill our mission of public safety. We also need to focus on key factors that help people succeed and become law abiding citizens, including employment, alcohol and drug treatment, housing, and positive support from families and other organizations. Each of our divisions and offices support the work we do to be successful to accomplish this mission.

Today, we are focusing on the work of our Division of Community Corrections. The Division of Community Corrections, or DCC as we call it, is where our hard working and talented probation and parole agents supervise clients in the community. DCC works to enhance public safety through the management and reduction of offender risk by providing supervision and collaborating with community partners to assist clients in changing their behavior and repairing the harm they have done. We have several representatives from DCC here with us today to discuss what that work looks like.

Before we move on I would like to talk about a couple of our strategic priorities. In 2019, our agency identified four priority areas. The goal of these priorities was to begin to address short-term and urgent needs within the Department of Corrections while laying the ground work for long-term reform efforts. Our mission and core values remain central tenets that guide the work within each of our strategic priorities; to achieve excellence in correctional practices while fostering safety for victims and communities. These strategic priorities align with the overall mission of our agency. If we focus our efforts appropriately, the population we seek to serve will be more equipped to be successful in the community, which means safer communities overall.

The first strategic priority I will discuss is operational excellence. This priority helps us to be more efficient in our work and align with our mission, vision and core values. We are looking at protocols for new state administrative rules, assessing healthcare delivery models for those in our care and we also created an office of internal affairs. Transparency and public accountability is the second strategic priority. This priority helps us fulfill our mission to serve the people of Wisconsin with transparency. We have enhanced our communications office and practices, streamlined our constituent services process, reorganized our open records office and created the department to focus and oversee all of the open records request that we get and we have enhanced our stakeholder engagement. The third priority or strategic initiative is workforce investments. This priority allows us to better support our staff to help us recruit new team members and do our jobs more efficiently. It's no surprise that we struggle with vacancies in DOC. We are investing in long-term recruitment and retention efforts, increasing cultural competency and diversity awareness, increasing employee wellness and engagement programs that help our employees and looking for ways to engage our staff through leadership development and additional training opportunities. Corrections reform. This priority aligns us with how we do business with court orders, national standards and modernization in corrections practices. Our agency is actively working on solutions to improve conditions inside our institutions and improve the effectiveness of our interventions and programming for those in our care. Slide five please.

One initiative our agency is working on related to corrections reform is violation response and revocation, and that's why you are all here today. Over the past 40 years, the United States has seen continued prison population growth and only recently have those numbers begun to stabilize. This is in part due to a decline in crime rate, but a large part of it has been accomplished through practical changes in public policy and initiatives related to criminal justice reform nationally. Upon my appointment as Secretary, I immediately directed Administrator Wiersma, who oversees the Department of Community Corrections, and his staff to present recommendations to my office to safely reduce revocations that are in large part responsible for a significant number of persons in our care residing in our adult facilities.

By July of 2019, our agency had already conducted a thorough review of the internal policies and procedures involved in the revocation process to create greater efficiency. Today we are holding this town hall to ensure that we hear from our stakeholders prior to taking our next steps. We also want to have your thoughts and ideas incorporated into our actions. Administrator Wiersma and Assistant Administrator Lacy will walk us through those proposed changes. We will then answer as many of your questions as we can today and we will also be providing you with an email address where you can submit your thoughts in the coming days. We recognize that this is going to be a lot of information with some pretty big changes to take in, but I know that by all of us working together we can accomplish reform that does not undermine public safety or accountability.

Criminal justice reform does not have to undermine safety or accountability. Reviewing and improving our practices in this area allows us to be consistent in our ideals as an agency and guide us using evidence-based approaches to public safety. Our recommended changes balance public safety and accountability with our responsibility as public servants to respect human dignity by providing the tools necessary to truly improve lives. I believe our state has locked up too many people for too long at too high a price to the tax payers with little to show in the way of improvement or outcomes. Our efforts will

serve to improve supervision outcomes using evidence-based supervision strategies that protect public safety, reduce cost, and help people on supervision succeed in the community and get their lives back on track.

I would like to transition this presentation over to my team of experts who will be presenting in more depth on the work we do in our agency. Today, we are lucky to have with us Lance Wiersma, DCC Administrator, and Autumn Lacy, DCC Assistant Administrator. We also have a number of subject matter experts here to help answer any questions you may have and you will meet them later on during this event. Bobbi Christopherson who is the Assistant Regional Chief in Region 4, Gina Jarr who is the Regional Chief in Region 5, and Lisa Yeates, Regional Chief in Region 2. So, thanks for your time and for now, I'm going to turn it over to Administrator Wiersma to walk us through the proposed changes before we answer your questions. Thank you all for being here today.

Administrator Lance Wiersma: Thanks Secretary Carr. Again my name is Lance Wiersma, I'm the Administrator for the Division and Community Corrections. Today, I just want to reiterate a couple things that Zack had mentioned. Uh, there is a Q&A feature; if you have questions during the presentation, please send those in. We will try to get through as many of those as we can after the presentation, but we will also have the email address up and running after the presentation if you want to submit additional questions at that time. And also this presentation is being recorded so if you want to go back over it again or if you have others that were not able to make it today you will be able to access it on our the Wisconsin DOC website, the public website.

Couple of other things I just want to talk about before we get into our draft policies and procedures is that these are drafts and so we haven't necessarily implemented any changes to our current practices. We have obviously made modifications due to COVID and some other factors, but we haven't changed any significant policies in regards to anything that we are going to be talking about today. So these are drafts. As Secretary Carr mentioned this is part of the process in which we want to engage community stakeholders and get your feedback. The other thing I want to mention is each case is unique. We are talking in macro definitions today and talking about big picture items but when you look at each case, each person that we supervise is an individual and they have uniqueness that goes into decisions that we make regarding supervision and outcomes of violations. This can be determined upon sentence structure, prior violations, a variety of factors that go into the decision making process. Also, I know many of you might have specific questions related to people that you know or situations that you might have heard about. We are obviously not going to be able to get in to talk about any specific situations that you might have encountered or you might be aware of regarding somebody who is on community supervision. But if you do ever have questions about a case that we supervise and an outcome that we made a decision on, I encourage you to talk to that person's agent or that agent's supervisor or the regional chief. We are transparent and we like to engage with stakeholders and defend the decisions that we make. Now we are restricted in some areas in regards to confidentiality and other things, but I do want to encourage people that if you have questions about specific situations to reach out locally to our staff.

So, let's talk a little bit about what is the Division of Community Corrections. DCC, or Probation and Parole, is we supervise adult persons who are on probation, parole or extended supervision in the State of Wisconsin. We are one of the three program divisions in the Department of Corrections, the other being the Division of Adult Institutions and our Division of Juvenile Corrections. We also have a Division of Management Services and other offices and programs that are overseen by the Secretary's Office. Our division is broken up into eight regions. There is a map on the PowerPoint. This map is also available on our website. Each region has a regional chief who oversees the operations locally for the region and local field offices, supervisors and agents. We have about 1,900 staff members assigned to our division, of which about 1,200 are probation and parole agents. We supervise just over 66,000 persons and we also have responsibility over the electronic monitoring center, which includes the law enforcement contact line which is a 24x7 operation and we also oversee the sex offender registry program. Next slide.

So, I want to talk a little bit about our current operations before we get into our draft policy changes. So responding to violations in an effective manners is crucial to the overall success of an individual on supervision and can have a significant impact on reducing the risk of re-offense. The ultimate purpose of responding to violations is to increase public safety by appropriately equipping clients to be successful in the community. So each time there is a violation that is made aware to the agent, the agent will complete a violation investigation. Upon learning of a violation, an agent does have the ability to place the person into custody in a county jail or house of correction or Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility or also issue an apprehension request or a warrant. Agents have a variety of options in responding to violations up to and including revocation. All revocations decisions are reviewed by a supervisor and at the regional level by a regional chief or assistant chief. Next slide.

If a person is recommended for revocation, they have several due process rights to which they are afforded. And the reason I bring this up is because I just want to be clear that agents don't make decisions in vacuums or on their own or by themselves. There are several steps in the process, which we'll talk a little bit about today, throughout the process. But during a final revocation, a client has a right to a final revocation hearing before an impartial administrative law judge, they have a right to waive the hearing, they have a right to present witnesses, the right to question witnesses, to deny the allegations, to present documentary evidence, to an attorney and to appeal the decision of the outcome of the hearing to the administrator of the Division of Hearings and Appeals. Next slide.

Our core concept of responding to violations is a system that we utilize that we call the Evidenced Based Response to Violations. We have been using the Evidence Based Response to Violations or EBRV for about the last 3 plus years and I want to go over some key components about Evidence Based Response to Violations. Utilizing a violation decision making guideline, or matrix, that takes into account the risk of the client and the severity of the violation behavior, utilizing accountability responses and intervention responses when responding to violations, so not just accountability but also intervention, sanctions and responses should be swift, certain and proportionate for all the violations. For clients who are assessed at low risk, violation responses need to be minimally intrusive so as not to disrupt the protective factors they already possess that make them low risk. So we don't want to do more harm than good. Research suggests programs that are available to incorporate sanctions combined with the use of rewards to reinforce conforming behavior will be more effective than those relying on sanctions alone. So, again when we talk about responding to violations there are really two components; one is the accountability response and the other is the intervention response, what tools can we provide the person to help them change their behavior. Next slide please.

So, this is our current Evidence-Based Response to Violation matrix and Deviated Risk chart. So, on the left hand column you will see the severity of violations. Those are categorized into low, medium, high and very high. All of our violations, any violation that you could conceive a person might engage in while on community supervision, is categorized into one of these violations. All of these are available on our public website in our electronic case reference manual, ECRM for short, and you can go in and see how our violations are currently organized. The top row is the risk level. Each person who is on community supervision has a validated risk assessment that's administered. We use the COMPAS risk assessment tool to determine the risk level of the individual. There are override options that an agent could incorporate depending on other factors including specialty case types, like sex offender and domestic violence and OWI clients, but as you can see, when we put the severity level of the violation and the risk of a client it provides us with a response level that's proportionate to those two factors and then gives an agent a list or menu of response options that they can incorporate, both from an accountability standpoint and from an intervention standpoint. So, obviously the higher risk of the person and the higher severity of the violation would lead to a higher response level up to and including revocation. Next slide please.

So as Secretary Carr mentioned, in 2019 when he was appointed he tasked our division with looking at our violation response and coming up with some ways that we can address inefficiencies and ineffective practices and how we respond to violations while incorporating criminal justice reform in our current practices. Now a big buzz word that many of you might hear is "crimeless revocations" and so while we looked at some of the factors that might lead to a "crimeless revocation," what we really did is wanted to review of our overall process in regards to all violations because while a pending charge or new conviction does have an impact on the decisions that we make, they are not contingent for us to proceed with the response to a violation. We operate simultaneously with the criminal justice process in regards to new charges, but we also operate independently through our authority in the State of Wisconsin.

So, a few things that we have done and we looked at. So, the first one is we did a complete mapping exercise of our entire violation response process from the rules of supervision, from a hold arrest, whether that's after hours, all way through our response, our investigation and the final revocation hearing and the outcome. We also reviewed our available data and our practices, our policies and procedures. We identified several areas in which we thought we can have an impact on how we respond to violations and then we created several work groups to come up with recommendations, policy recommendations for those areas. Those recommendations were reviewed with the Secretary and his other personnel within the Secretary's Office and the Governor's Office. We then reviewed our policy recommendations internally. We have done a series of stakeholder engagements with our staff in September and finally we are reviewing those today with you, with community stakeholders. Next slide please.

So our goals. The overall goal is to safely reduce the total number of persons who are revoked while on supervision, reduce the number of prison admissions related to revocations; that is a data element that is currently tracked on our public

website. Each year we update the number of persons who are admitted to prison as a result of a revocation and the other factors that go along with that revocation. We want to reduce the total number of persons in jail on a probation and parole hold. We have already begun that. Since COVID, one of our goals and our priorities during COVID is try to keep the numbers of persons in jail down and we have significantly reduced their average number of persons who are held in county jail on a probation parole hold or pending revocation since March of this year. Again, that number is also available, those numbers I should say, are also available on our public website. There is an interactive map which you can access, you can click on a county and see what the hold total are, those are updated each Monday and you can actually track those going back to March of this year. We want to increase the number of community-based alternative to revocations, community-based programming in general. We want to utilize data to drive our decisions and allocate resources. So utilize data to track trends, identify service gaps and redirect resources to those areas so we can provide the service gap, fill the service gap and ideally reduce the opportunities for persons to engage in negative behavior. Next slide please.

So, first let's start a little bit with the data. So, again we wanted to take a look at what data we had and a couple things with our data. First of all we started our Evidence Based Response, or EBRV, about 3-1/2 or 4 years ago and it was a new process for us all. And what we did know is that we have some data element gaps that were due to training and some other things and that if anything this project has really given us an opportunity to take a step back, take a look at what we are doing within our data based system, specifically to the Evidence Based Response to Violation, or EBRV, and identify some things which we knew we probably needed to improve and make changes to, one to make it easy or more consistent for agents but also to align with evidence-based practices. So we took a look at information that we had in our system in regards to prison admissions related to revocations and, again this information was commonly asked about because we display it on our public website. And many of you might have looked at a public website and asked why are so many people admitted to prison without a new pending charge. So again going back to the concept of crimeless revocation. Well, there is a few reasons for it. One of the reasons is we again identify the behavior regardless of whether or not a person has been charged criminally, or not, when we look at how we determine whether how we define the violation.

So for example, we looked at revocations data evaluated from January 1st, 2017 to June 30th, 2019. We are able to match 7,222 records. There is probably more than that but those were records that we could match from a data reliability standpoint and just for the purposes of example and have a baseline of what we are looking at. So, of those 5,260 or 72, almost 73%, were revoked by what we defined as criminal behavior. Now again that person may have been charged, may not have been charged, but we identified the behavior as criminal. One situation that is noteworthy is that our revocation process takes about 90 days on average. The average criminal court case process in this time, it's probably longer now due to COVID, but the average criminal court case takes 360 days from arrest to conviction. So our process is shorter, so somebody could have a simultaneous arrest that at the same time that we initiate a violation response and we might end our process before the criminal court case process is resolved and that person is actually admitted into prison as a result of the revocation. Now again, not all persons who are revoked for rule violations end up with a new criminal charge, but, again, we identified the behavior as criminal behavior. 1,962, or about 27.2%, were revoked for noncriminal behavior. The top two reasons were failing an alternative to revocation and for absconding, not reporting to their agent. Of the total revoked, almost 90% of the primary violations prompting revocation were considered very high severity level per DCC's Evidence Based Responsive to Violation matrix. So, again if you look at what we're doing and how we categorized the violations, persons who engage in a very severe, the highest level of violations, either high or very high, almost 90% of those ended up in revocation. One of the things we want to look at, though, as we went through this process was the 11% that were not high or very high. What were the factors behind those cases that led to that revocation and subsequent admission into Dodge or Taycheedah. Next slide please.

So, another area that we maintain and track data is what we call an ASR database. That's an internal name for a tracking system that we look at. And so those are each revocation, as I mentioned earlier, has to be reviewed and approved by a regional chief or an assistant regional chief. All of those are submitted via packet of information that is prepared by the agent and then submitted up through the supervisor to the regional office. All of that information is entered into a database at the regional level, and we looked at data that we could compile in 2018, and we found statewide there was 11,347 revocations in 2018. During that year, our average population was just under 66,000 people, which resulted in approximately 17% of the persons ended up in revocation. Of those 92%, over 10,000, were due to criminal behavior and 8% were due to noncriminal behavior. Now again this was our coding and it was not contingent on whether or not a charge was filed by a district attorney or not. We looked at strictly the behavior that the person was alleged to have engaged in. So of those, almost 50% had a prison outcome, 42 almost 43% had a jail/house of corrections outcome as a result of the revocation, 63 were still pending sentencing at the end of 2018 and 806, or 7%, had some other outcome, either they were fined, revoked directly to time served or just revoked directly by the court and ended supervision with us. Next slide

please.

So other data highlights. We looked at our after hour holds. So, I again mentioned earlier that we oversee our monitoring center which is 24x7 and also includes our law enforcement contact line. And what that means is that if a person who is on supervision has contact with a law enforcement officer after hours, they can call our law enforcement contact line and report the behavior to our monitoring center in which we can respond to the behavior that's being reported to us from law enforcement. So, again we knew that many people were being placed in jail on a probation and parole hold after hours as a result, as a call from law enforcement to our monitoring center. So we wanted to take a look at what those calls looked like and we were actually able to get some really good data. So, we had between summer of '18 and spring of '19, almost 27,000 phone calls from law enforcement to the monitoring center as a result of law enforcement having contact with somebody who is on community supervision. Of those calls, almost half were held, a little over half were held. 3,221 were identified as felony-level behavior from law enforcement. So what that means is law enforcement said this person is engaging in this behavior and we identified it as a felony-level behavior in which charges might or might not have been referred. 4,111 were identified as engaging in misdemeanor behavior; 1,629 were engaging in special rule violations, and I'll talk about special rules in a little bit, but essentially what those are, those are additional rules that are added by an agent in addition to the standard set of rules, in which the agent identified there was a nexus or risk to public harm and added a rule to that person on their case load and then it resulted in them allegedly engaging in that behavior, which then resulted in a probation and parole hold being issued. Um, 3,266 had no new charges but were engaging in some other type of behavior that was considered, um, somewhat problematic and a hold was placed. 3,640 or 13% had an apprehension request issued and 52% of those were ordinance or municipal violations or no new charges. Next slide please.

So, um, as we evaluated the mapping process, our policy review, and the data we come up with five focus areas which we felt we could have an impact through policy revisions to safely reduce the total number of revocations and provide additional opportunities for persons on supervision to help change their behavior. So, those areas are short-term sanctions, rules of supervision and after hour holds, the Evidence Based Response to Violation or the EBRV program that I talked about earlier, alternatives to revocations or what we refer to as ATRs, specialty court and treatment courts and the revocation process. Next slide please.

So the first focus area is short-term sanctions. So, again I want to reiterate that what I'm going to talk about now are draft policies; they have not gone into effect. But these are policies that we have drafted, have not implemented, and we have taken feedback internally and we are now taking feedback from, from all of you. So the first concept within sanctions from a policy standpoint is we wanted our sanctioning process to have a meaningful opportunity for the person on supervision and not just hold the person in jail for up to 90 days, is what our legally options for sanctions include, but apply some meaningful interventions. So combine the meaningful intervention with the accountability response, which again is the goal of the Evidence-Based Response to Violation; require the use of short-term sanctions for re-incarceration recommendations of less than one year rather than revocations. So I'm going to talk a little bit about what that means later on in the presentation. But essentially what we are looking at is when we have a person who is subject to revocation for extended supervision or for parole we apply a grid based on the severity level of the violation and recommend a percentage of the total time available. And if that percentage is less than one year we would like that response, the accountability response, to be a sanction versus returning that person to prison. We also looked at the guidelines for our staff for accountability response based on the severity level of the violation outcome. So we looked at, and we are recommending for a medium response level, for up to 20 calendar days for a sanction. A high level response 21 to 44 days and a very high level 45 to 90 days. Next slide please.

The next area was after hour holds and rules of supervision. So, first I want to talk a little bit about after hours holds. I mentioned earlier that agents have the opportunity to add additional rules based on the underlying conviction and the underlying behavior surrounding the convictions. So, for example if somebody is convicted of an OWI offense, an agent would likely add a "no drink" rule or "no bar" rule or "no liquor" rule type situation and what we learned, again looking at our data, is that special rules or additional rules resulted in persons being held, and we also learned that some of those rules that the person was released the next day. So, the question then lies in did that person need to go into custody in the first place. So, what we wanted to do is focus agents and ask agents to rely strictly on the risk to public safety rules that if that person were to engage in that behavior that there would be a risk to public safety if they were not removed from the community or placed on a hold. So we did create a process, this is an internal process, in which our monitoring center can identify which rules are public safety risk rules versus which rules, which still are violation, agents still would have a responsibility to respond of the violation, investigate the violation and respond to it, but may not result in that person being held while that investigation is undertaken.

The next area we looked at was eliminating automatic custody for certain curfew violations for persons who are on RF or EMP monitoring. So, again we have several different monitoring equipment that we utilize; those include alcohol monitoring equipment, radio frequency monitoring equipment which basically tells us when somebody is home and when they leave and then we have GPS tracking. And what we talked about looking at modifications to the electronic monitoring or RF tracking for curfew violations, again based on the person's risk and the prior history. Next, we looked at the rules of supervision. So we were frequently asked about rules and, um, number of rules that we have, a number of standard rules we have. Currently we have 18 standard rules that are identified and defined in our administrative code. We also have the opportunity to add special rules. Special rules are added to the standard rules in specific circumstances that they are necessary for the rehabilitation of the client and/or to protect the public. So, I'll talk a little bit about the standard rules and again, this is a question that we are frequently asked about, why does Wisconsin have so many standard rules, and there is also quite a bit of national conversation about recommendations to reduce the total number of standard rules. And I do want to say a couple of things, Wisconsin is unique compared to other jurisdictions in other states because we do have a combined system in which we have probation and post release or parole or extended supervision probation all under the state level cabinet agency. Many other jurisdiction have probation at the county level and the other post-institution release supervision at the state level; we have a combined system. Um, and again many of the recommendations are based on county level probation systems in which the judge imposes all of the rules. In Wisconsin, judges can impose conditions of supervision but they don't identify rules of supervision. So again our rules are standard for the state based on our unique setup. Next slide please.

So, we were again, though, asked to look at the total number of rules so our work group did take a look at our 18 standard rules. They did make some recommendations to actually reduce the total number of rules from 18 to 9, so cut them in half; however, we don't have any, um, immediate plans to make any changes to the standard set of rules because that process is governed by the administrative code process and we do need to go through the code to update the code to change our standard set of rules. We have initiated that process but it will take time and there are several opportunities for input and community, um, hearings and various other aspects of the code process that need to happen prior to that occurring. What we did look at is our special rules because again looking at, you know, why people were held wasn't necessarily because our standard set of rules. It was often because of our special rules, the rules that were added by the agent.

Now there is a couple of areas that we wanted to cover with our standard rules. So, one was currently an agent writes their own rules, there is no consistent pattern. So I mentioned this rule of a "no drink" rule. We had a request at one point to ask us how many people are on a "no drink" rule and I thought that would be an easy thing to go in our system and see how many persons on supervision are subject to a "no drink" rule and what we found is we had about a 100 different variations of a "no drink" rule, and from a data standpoint it was really hard to determine what those numbers were. So, what we did is we came up with some, um, recommendations to categorize the special rules based on crime typologies, and those are domestic violence, OWI, substance use, gang/high risk of violence, property, financial or electronic monitoring. We, currently we already have sets of special rules categorized for sex offenders that we implemented several years ago. So, this was kind of borrowing from that concept and to accomplish two things, one, to make it easier for agents to identify which rules are appropriate based on the person's underlying conviction and history and, two, to standardize the special rules so there would be no, um, variations based on somebody's writing style. So, also with that we have a policy, the draft policy, which would require that the rules be reviewed, read and reviewed with the person on supervision between the agent and the client every six months and that they would actually re-sign the rules once a year. So, this is again two fold; one, if there is an opportunity to remove a rule because there is no longer risk to public safety or there is no longer a need for that rule to be on but then also, so, for the agent and the client to have a clear understanding of what the rules are and what the responses might be if there is a violation of those rules. And then we also incorporated in case transfers for somebody being transferred for case load to another, one agent to another, that we would require that those rules be reviewed and signed with the new agent and the client again so there is no confusion about what the rules are for that particular case, and that particular person, and what the potential outcomes are if that person were to engage in that behavior. Next slide please.

So, the next area is the Evidence Based Response to Violations, or the EBRV, and again this is really where the rubber hits the road in how we respond to violations. It's all encapsulated in the EBRV program, so again the agent identifies the violation behaviors and they, um, identify, match it with the person's risk level and they might add aggravating or mitigating factors in the violation and then that then comes up with both accountability response options and intervention response options. So, what we really wanted to do is make sure how our system is set up is aligned with evidence-based practices and it works. And so we looked at several things. So the first thing we looked at was typology violations. So we were

asked, um, why are there overrides in the Evidence Based Response to Violation, and I had a frequent answer to the override question because I would say well a person might be a sex offender, might be a domestic violence offender, might have a substance abuse issue in which their risk level might be lower; however, we have a policy that we supervise those persons at a higher level. And so what we wanted to do is try to address that on the front end of the matrix by creating some typologies and so, um, the person, based on their typology, would have those factors considered without having to do an override or aggravating the violations. So, the typology's kind of consistent with what we did with our additional rules of supervision. We have a sex offender typology, we have an OWI typology, we have a domestic violence typology and then we also added a treatment or specialty court typology. And so again factoring in those specific typologies at the front end of the violation response matrix instead of at the back end through an override process. We also looked at our violations, how we had them categorized in the various severity levels and again wanted to look at the concept of crimeless revocation and we also wanted to look at some other factors that I'm going to talk about in a few minutes. But basically we wanted to make sure that the violations were aligned in the categories, so, for example, criminal violations, risk to public safety violations, we wanted to make sure those were all in high or very high level category. Other noncriminal non-risk to public safety were medium or low and low violations require a pattern. So, um, again anecdotal stories that are heard or talked about, person was late for an appointment they can be revoked and sent to prison, so again we wanted to look at late for an appointment, defining that, versus failure to report, versus absconding not making themselves available for 30 days or more, and really talking about if somebody is late that there must be a pattern established before a violation would be established and responded to, and that would be a low severity level versus a high level. And again the outcome would direct that response to a lower level response, some sort of community intervention versus high or very high level response sanction or revocation. We also added or removed certain violations. We removed failure to complete an alternative to revocation, or failing an ATR, as a violation; it is now an aggravating factor. And again we wanted to focus on the behavior. So, for example, being failing an ATR is not a behavior, the behavior is somebody stopped showing up for the program or they took off from the residential services program or halfway house. That's the behavior that we want to respond to not that they failed the ATR, but the fact that they're on an alternative to revocation and participating in a program or intervention that was then terminated would aggravate the response level. Added threats to a probation or parole agent and remove failure to report unless there is a pattern established. Next slide please.

So again these are some concepts that I want to go through and we talked a lot about these with our agents and our staff in September, and I want to clarify a few things for everybody on the call, and we have a variety people and a lot of diversity on the call here today, and again questions use the Q&A feature. I see we are getting quite a few questions in and we are keep going through the presentation. If we are not able to get to your questions we will be updating a Q&A document on a public website.

But the first thing, the concept that I want to reiterate, and Secretary Carr talked about this quite a bit, is balancing accountability with opportunities for persons to make changes in their lives, and I think what we are doing is the entire focus of the criminal justice system is to do just that. How do you hold somebody accountable and what's the right level of accountability while also still providing them with opportunities to engage in appropriate change behavior so they don't engage in new criminal activity in the future. And that's the goal, and so the clear message that I want to talk to you that I've talked about with our staff in regards to accountability is that if somebody is hurting somebody, if somebody is causing harm to another individual, we as a Department of Corrections, as Division of Community Corrections, have a responsibility and obligation to remove that person from the community. So, I want that to be very clear, and none of the changes that we have talked about impact that. Outcomes on the back end where they lie, that could have an impact, but again, we have a responsibility and obligation to remove people from the community who are hurting other people if they are on community supervision.

Now that being said, jail should only be used if necessary. Risk to public safety is the critical consideration. Again, that's the example that I use that hopefully is clear and concise for everybody to understand. But we can complete investigations while persons are not in jail and we can complete a revocation while somebody is not in jail. We call it out-of-custody revocation and again we want people to look at those options and look at the lowest level of intervention in which we can respond to the violation, still hold that person accountable but then also provide them with opportunities to change their behavior through an intervention response. We are creating a custody decision tree guideline for our staff. Again it's a guideline, it's not a mandated policy, but we wanted our staff to really think about which cases truly pose a risk to public safety and which situations can be investigated and responded to with that person remaining in the community.

The other part, while we have investigation holds and person could also be held pending a final revocation or serving a short-term sanction, those are our holds. Obviously the court can impose conditional jail time, that's separate and beyond

our supervision, but during the investigation we also want our agents to be thorough and efficient and when I talked early about low risk individuals, persons who are low risk, we can do actually more harm than good by holding that person in custody while performing a violation investigation, and so we want to make sure that the amount of time spent in custody during the investigation should not supersede the maximum time allowed per our evidence-based response level determination unless for unique circumstances. So again we want our violations to be thorough and efficient and keep people in jail only for as long as they need to be kept in jail. Again, with the overriding factor of public safety first and foremost. If somebody is hurting somebody else then we do need to remove that person from the community.

The next area, again this is a policy statement and it does have some impacts, and I think this is actually something that we have done and we have continued to do in the past, but we are going to making a policy statement and I'm going to read through this and I just want you to hear the caveat or the exception or disclaimer as the second part but revocation cannot be pursued as a response if the only violation is alcohol or substance use. This behavior is a treatment issue and other responses should be utilized. So again the concept is where is the best opportunity for a person who has a substance abuse issue to be provided effective intervention or effective treatment. Is that in prison or is that in the community. And I believe that our best option for persons to engage in substance abuse treatment is in the community. Now again only violation is substance or alcohol use, so often times there are several other factors that can go into that and I'll read the disclaimer because it's not a catch-all, end-all, be-all. The exception "if appropriate treatment options have been exhausted, revocation may be considered only if it was the part of the person's underlying conviction or specified as a condition or supervision on a judgment conviction". So, what does that mean? And that can mean different things in different areas and we are trying to make more consistent options for persons on supervision in regards to treatment, but if we refer somebody to treatment and they are terminated and they don't go or they continued to use those are violations, but we want to re-refer that person to treatment and we want to keep engaging that person in appropriate treatment programs, ideally so they can change the behavior because what we do know is that persons who are incarcerated aren't necessarily going to have the opportunity through treatment programs, depending on the length of the incarceration, and we want the program to be effective and so we do want to give people opportunities in the community. Now again that doesn't mean that the person might end up in custody during a violation investigation as a result of being terminated, but it could also mean that somebody is being referred back. So, just two points, again we want persons who have substance abuse issues to engage in community-based treatment programming. That's the underlying and overlying policy statement, but if those are exhausted or if the person has exhausted all the treatment options or if it's a direct link to the original offense then the agent still has the opportunity to make a referral for revocation depending on what the other factors are with that case. Next slide please.

Agent intervention responses, again we want to balance and remind our staff to focus not only on accountability response but also the intervention response so we can help the person on supervision change their behavior so they don't engage in the behavior again. So one time brief responses focused on underlying issues prompting the violation behavior, ongoing case planning and actions to address issues will continue to occur and identify the type of response. So we want to use cognitive-based intervention, so focusing on somebody's thinking and thought patterns so they can identify their thoughts that lead to behaviors which caused violations, or skill-based intervention, same two options for each response level, and document the responses that we are incorporating. So again, trying to give people tools so they can change their behavior and not engage in criminal behavior in the future. Next slide please.

So the next area, Alternatives to Revocation or ATRs. Next slide.

So again a policy statement, I believe this is appropriate now but we are going to memorialize it in a policy, we would like to memorialize it as a policy, this is a draft still, but violations must be appropriate for revocation to initiate an alternative to revocation. Again, this seems pretty simple to me in that if we were referring for somebody for revocation we believe that that behavior is significant and the response should be a significant response up to revocation, so we have other opportunities to refer people to programming and engage them in programming short of an alternative to revocation if their behavior does not warrant a revocation. So again, just trying to focus our language and be consistent with our language with our staff. We are transitioning from institution based alternative to revocation programming to community-based revocation programming. So, um, for example we had several program beds or slots at the Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility or MSDF. We have ended all programming at MSDF for Alternative to Revocations, those are for community-based DCC clients, um, but we are trying to shift the focus for those programs and beds to community-based programming, either outpatient or what we might consider through our residential services programs, and expanding those. We created a system for a statewide referral process for residential services programs, so that's not a state wide referral so people can move from one area to another, but really trying to meet the person's need with the program

availability. So a person could go and complete a program in another part of the state if there is a bed available and then return back to their home community. Again, maximize our resources and provide the best appropriate responses for persons through their intervention response. So, and also holding persons and keeping the agent engaged with somebody if they are in custody if there is a decision, a public safety risk, that they need to remain in custody pending a placement into a program, and the client agrees to that placement through signing paperwork. But as an alternative to revocation, if they are going to remain in custody pending placement in the program, we want the agent to remain engaged with that individual so they can discuss what's going to happen, when it's going to happen and what's going to happen after they complete the program. So we want, when we talk about medium supervision, that would mean that the agent would have a monthly contact with that individual while they are in custody. Next slide please.

So community resources, obviously we want to maximize the programs and services that we have now and also look for opportunities to increase the programs and services that we have now. So one of the ways we want to maximize our current purchases services dollars is to utilize TeleHealth, increase our use of TeleHealth now. Obviously all of us have experienced this during COVID and we want to build on this and expand this through programming for clients so that if a person in Northern Wisconsin does not have a viable program option or there is not enough persons in the area to start a group we can still have a group with one, two or three people through a TeleHealth option and that might be facilitated or coordinated through Milwaukee or some other area. So again that would help us maximize our slots and get people engaged in effective programming. We want to develop an alternative to revocation model that will allow for housing options to be paired with outpatient treatment programs and resources and, again, I mentioned we incorporated, we already developed our Statewide Residential or RSP or Halfway House Referral Process. Next slide please.

Now the last area, and I mentioned this earlier but I do want to clarify again, these are high level overviews. These are not all inclusive of the policy change recommendations but these have been identified as having a significant impact on our operations and that's what I'm going through today. So again I want to just reiterate that these are not all inclusive of the recommendations that we have reviewed and that we have drafted some changes for. But in regard to the revocation process, one of the areas we specifically looked at in which we have some control over internally through policy and procedure, is time forfeiture recommendations for persons who are facing revocation as a result of a sentence for an extended supervision or parole term. And so what that means is that, I'll just use an example, if somebody gets a prison term there is a confinement term and there is an extended post-release term, a bifurcated sentence, if that person has 5-year prison term and 5 years of extended supervision term, when that person is released from their 5-year prison they will have 5 years available for re-incarceration if they are revoked. And so what we are looking at is we have always had a grid in which we have recommended a percentage of the total time of re-incarceration for persons on parole or extended supervision, and so we wanted to look at our grids and make sure they aligned with what we felt were evidence-based practices and some other things. So what we looked at were forfeiture calculations of less than one year would result in a short-term sanction in county jail as a maximum response; accountability response versus revocation and admitting that person into Dodge for what we would consider a relatively short-term sentence. And what that really is, is about maximizing our resources internally within the department, and we know that when a person is admitted into Dodge or Taycheedah, the intake process and the assessment and evaluation process often leads to that person who has a relatively short sentence not being available for any programming. And so we feel that those individuals who would be facing a short period of reincarceration, one year or less, would be better served by through a short-term sanction process, keeping that person local and also having opportunities for outpatient programming that they could attend or programming available at the facility that they are being held.

So the other point I want to clarify, again, I talked about the term crimeless revocations and whether or not charges pending for us to initiate revocation, and so none of the policies that we have talked about actually require or don't require a charge to be filed for us to proceed with revocation. But again, I want to reiterate as I started, each case is different, each sentence structure is different, each person can have a variety of cases, probation, parole, extended supervision, consecutive case strings, all kinds of things that complicate matters considerably but what we are not doing is looking at the pending charges as a basis for our determination on how we respond to violations. We still are looking at the behavior and again we wanted to categorize the behavior based on the severity level, and lower level severities would have a lower level of response, higher severity would have a higher level of recommendation. However, we are going to be looking at whether or not a pending charge is filed to determine the amount of time forfeiture that we would recommend on an extended supervision or parole case.

So if you would go to the next slide, please, Zack. So this is draft, this is not our current grid but we currently use a category grid to determine the amount of time that an agent would recommend for a person who has an extended supervision or

parole case. We currently have a policy that says that if a person has less than one year available for re-confinement the agent should consider a short-term sanction. Should. So we want to change that to "shall" so that's a significant policy change. But then we also wanted to align our categories consistent with some of the concepts that we talked about today. So category 1, which would be 15% of the total time available, so we are talking really about rule violations and municipal type violations and lower level violations. Category 2 is property offenses including OWI, while the OWI-1 is still a municipal charge but it would be considered a category 2, and then category 3 is crimes against persons so that's up to 70%. Now a couple of considerations with this. Now the first thing is, for an agent to consider a category 2 or category 3 violation, we would require that a charge be filed by the District Attorney's Office. So this would be consistent with a couple of things that I'll just touch on, with the exception of absconding we left that as a category 2 because that is not a criminal offense. But looking at this, what we know first of all, again I mentioned this earlier and I just want to reiterate this. We don't make revocation decisions on our own or in a vacuum, so there is due process rights. The client has the opportunity to waive and just do their time, if you will, and there is also the opportunity to fight the allegations or challenge the allegations, if you will, through the revocation process and that determination is made by the administrative law judge. Again, independent of the Department of Corrections, impartial authority to make a decision to determine if we have enough evidence and there is enough rationale that that person should be, should be revoked and returned to prison. So, we wanted to align our categories with whether or not charges were actually filed because two things, one, even though we have less of a burden to prove allegations during revocation process than a criminal process, it is still important and we still have to prove the allegations occurred and so agents still have a responsibility to prove the allegations. Now they don't have to be "beyond a reasonable doubt", they can be "more likely than not that occurred", but we still need evidence and one of the factors is if there is not enough evidence for a prosecutor to charge a person there might not be enough evidence for us to prevail in a revocation hearing situation. So there is that.

Now what this does not include is we still have the ability to override, so overrides can be approved by the regional chief based on aggravating factors. Now one example of all of this is a person, um, you know the worst case scenario; somebody is alleged to have killed somebody. You know, whatever that might be, and so there could be a variety of factors why a prosecutor is not ready to charge that person with that crime. They might be waiting for DNA, crime lab, whatever, but we have enough evidence to believe that that person engaged in that behavior, so that would be a category 3 violation. But if there is not charges filed, the agent will not be able to make that determination on their own. In those cases, the agent would need to request an override to higher level amount of time if the original amount of time was going to be less than one year. And again, as I mentioned earlier, an overriding factor is that if somebody is hurting somebody we do have a responsibility, or caused harm to somebody, to remove that person from the community. So there is the ability to override and, as I mentioned, there is a process for review both internally and externally through the final revocation process. So again these are not necessarily made in isolated situations, but these are draft policy updates. So, um, that is the presentation. Those are the highlights. I know we have several questions and we have, uh, I am going to turn it back over, over to Zack, thank you Zack.

Zack Osell: Yes. Thanks Lance. Alright, so we do have some time and we had plenty of questions come in so we are going to transition now to the Q&A session. Again, I would emphasize that we want your feedback, so if you have any last minute questions please submit them before the conclusion of today's town hall. So, without further adieu let's start off with the question, I'll throw this one over to Gina. The question reads – "Can a person be revoked for allegations?"

Regional Chief Gena Jarr: Okay. Good morning everyone. So when we look at how we are going to respond to an alleged violation, all the alleged violation does initially prompts an investigation by the agent. An allegation does not result in a revocation; that's the short answer to the question. There is a lot that's involved. The agent will investigate the alleged behavior, determine the severity of the allegations. In order to determine that it actually is a violation, there has to be evidence to support it. So they will, you know, review police reports, they will interview any witnesses, any victims, and if the evidence supports it then that's when there is a determination that there is a violation. In order to proceed with revocation, there is a lot of other things that are looked at too. We look at, as Lance said earlier, applying the evidence-based response to violations, determining what's appropriate, applying the matrix, the EBRV matrix, and if it doesn't rise to the level that warrants revocation, the case will not be looked at for revocation and we will explore other options of intervention responses and accountability responses. So I hope that answers the question.

Zack Osell: Thank you. Alright, this next one I'll throw over to Autumn. The question reads "What is a meaningful intervention?"

Assistant Administrator Autumn Lacy: Good morning everybody. A meaningful intervention is an evidence-based

response that we know through research has the ability to reduce somebody's risk and reduce recidivism. What we use here in the Department of Corrections is the Risk Need Responsivity model and we also use the National Institute of Corrections Eight Principles of Effective Interventions. So those two models have driven our department-wide standards of treatment, for which we put into language and contracts with our community vendors.

Zack Osell: Alright, thank you. The next question can be for Secretary Carr, Secretary are you there? If not, we can.

Secretary Carr: I am.

Zack Osell: Alright. This question reads – “Aren't we putting the community at more risk for not holding people accountable for their actions?”

Secretary Carr: Well, you know there is more than one way to hold persons accountable, and historically or traditionally, the way that we have always resorted to was incarceration. But we have a lot more options now and those options suggest that, and they are based on evidence-based research, that these options could lead to better outcomes than simply using incarceration. Our agency will look to see how we are responding to these violations and it will take risk into consideration whenever we do so. So I think that the plan that we are proposing, you know, balances public safety against the ability for folks to engage in meaningful programming that will help them change their lives. And we have every intention, as I said when I became the Secretary of the Department of Corrections, being a public safety agency first. That is our first and foremost responsibility. But at the same time, I believe that we can accomplish public safety utilizing measures and activities that have been described today that produce better outcomes and treat people with dignity and respect and help us accomplish a number of our other policy objectives.

Zack Osell: Alright. Thank you, Secretary. This next question I'll throw over to Lisa. Um, this question reads – “Will the DOC follow existing law code and routinely use preliminary hearings to determine if an individual can stay in the community pending the outcome of the revocation hearing and therefore not losing their job, housing, etc? Many states do not jail people waiting for hearings before the administrative law judge and there is no evidence that this compromises public safety. What is the reasoning and evidence behind this process and will data on the number of preliminary hearings held versus waived be collected and published?” You are on mute still, Lisa.

Regional Chief Lisa Yeates: I'm sorry, thank you. Um, in addition to the administrative code, a preliminary revocation hearing isn't required, um, under a few circumstances and those include when the client is not being held in custody; if they waive the preliminary hearing; if they have given a signed written statement admitting a violation or violations; if there has been a finding of probable cause in a felony matter; and if they have been bound over for trial for the same or similar conduct or if there has been a grand jury indictment or adjudication of guilt for the same conduct. So in each of these circumstances, the field supervisor reviews the custody status of the individual that is in jail pending revocation and then makes a finding and so the preliminary hearing, um, if there is one, it is held within 15 working days of the date of custody and this hearing is held before a hearing magistrate where the decision, um, is rendered pertaining to custody. So, for revocation hearings, when a final revocation hearing is waived, the field supervisor also makes a custody decision at that time and the core factors that they consider, which are listed in the administrative code, include whether or not the client is believed to be dangerous or they are likely to flee; whether they are likely to engage in criminal behavior prior to the revocation taking place; and whether or not they have engaged in activity that does not comply with the rules of their supervision or conditions with their supervision; and then lastly, the length of the term to be served upon revocation is considered great. So the DCC has held revocation hearings out-of-custody, as the administrator had previously mentioned, and will continue to do so, but we always consider public safety when we make those decisions. And in terms of tracking of data, we are consistently monitoring the data that we have and, as you heard throughout the presentation, will continue to further drill down how many revocations are held, preliminary hearings, etc. Thank you.

Zack Osell: Alright. Thank you. Okay, this next question I'll give to Lance. Um, there have been a theme of questions asking about criminal behavior and what defines public safety violations. I just want to ask Lance if he can help clarify what defines criminal behavior and a public safety violation.

Administrator Lance Wiersma: So, when we talk about criminal behavior, it's behavior that it could be charged criminally. So, there's a couple different ways we look at that. The first one is the initiation of the violation response. We look solely at the behavior. So for example criminal behavior is anything that could be subject to a criminal charge. But when we look at applying that to extended supervision or parole cases that would mean an actual charge has been filed by a district

attorney or a prosecutor. So there is a differentiation, for example, another example is we have a rule violation of a person not reporting to the agent; that's not criminal. If we have another violation in which a person is in possession of drug paraphernalia and/or drugs that is a criminal behavior because it is illegal to possess drug paraphernalia or drugs in the State of Wisconsin. So, regardless of whether or not that charge would be filed that still would be considered a criminal violation as part of the way we have the violation severity outlined. Can you repeat the second part of that again Zack?

Zack Osell: Sure thing. They asked if you could have to clarify criminal behavior, which you just did, and a public safety violation.

Administrator Lance Wiersma: So, again, the easiest thing as far as a risk to public safety that I talked about before and reiterated is one if actual harm has been caused to another person, and then from there, is there risk of harm to be caused if that person were to remain in the community. Now there is some gray area and some nuance with all of that and we do have to use some professional judgment in making some of those decisions at times, but we do look at harm to others as public safety violation for the foremost consideration.

Zack Osell: Alright. Thanks Lance. We're going to squeeze a few more questions in here before we wrap up. I'll bring in Bobbi for this questions, um, it reads "Will there be an opportunity for the DOC to eliminate or modify any of the 18 rules for general supervision?"

Assistant Regional Chief Bobbi Christopherson: Yeah. Thank you. Um, yes we have actually initiated the process to be able to review and make recommendations to the standard rules of supervision, so as discussed today the 18 standard rules are governed by administrative codes. So in order to make recommendations or suggestions to have those changes, there is a process. So we have initiated the process, it is underway; however, until given formal approval and okay we can't actually formally move forward with the recommendations to get those changed, but that is again a long-term goal for us that we do review and amend those standard 18 rules to be a bit more concise.

Zack Osell: Alright. Thanks Bobbi. Alright this next question for you Secretary, um, "Is the DOC concerned about lack of community based resources? What is DOC doing to expand community based resources?" and one example they gave is that we are losing our resource of ATR beds at MSDF.

Secretary Carr: Thank you Zack for that question. Yeah we are always concerned about the availability of community resources for those that we care for on supervision, and we are utilizing technology; that's one of the unintended benefits of this pandemic is that it has opened up a whole world of possibilities for the use of technology to provide more programming and treatment to those that we care for on supervision throughout the state by using TeleHealth and using these types of Zoom meetings, and we are able to reach out to areas of the state that are not currently, do not have a good amount of programs and treatment and give more people opportunities to get that programming and treatment using that technology. But at the same time you know there is nothing that I think can beat a good old fashioned in-person community-based treatment or training program and we are always looking to expand those opportunities as we move forward.

Zack Osell: Alright. Thank you, Secretary. We have about three minutes left, so unfortunately we are going to have to start wrapping up, but before we end today, I want to issue another reminder that you can find more information about past and upcoming town halls at our public town halls website, which is found at doc.wi.gov/townhalls. We also ask that you watch your inbox for a survey to provide us with feedback on today's event and then I have one final reminder to you that we will have access to recordings of today's event, transcripts and then FAQ documents on our public website posted shortly after today's session. Right now I'm going to turn it over to the Secretary for his closing remarks.

Secretary Carr: Yes. Thank you Zack and before I begin, um, I just want to remind everybody that I have noticed that on my screen I see that we have gotten about 113, 114, and it's keep climbing every time I look at it, questions and you know we intend to answer those questions as quickly as we can and we will get those answers to folks as soon as we possibly can. Some of these questions however, if you have, if you asked a question and it is similar to 3 or 4 other persons questions that might just be the answer you get, you may not just get an individual answer for duplicative questions. But having said that, I want to thank everybody for joining us today to have this important discussion. I know there is a lot of information to take in but I appreciate your willingness to start these types of discussions with our agency. The objective of this project is to create a more effective and efficient violation response process that benefits every one; our staff, the public and those in our care. We hope that these proposed changes lead to a reduction in revocation and an increase in much needed

programming and positive interventions.

I also want to thank our panelists and subject matter experts. I'm always aware of the fact that while I may provide leadership and direction to this agency, it's the efforts, expertise and dedication of my staff that is responsible for getting the work done. I am also really encouraged to see the level of interest in these discussions. I'm going to break off from my remark for a second and tell you there is over 500 people that signed up to participate in this webinar today and I'm extremely pleased at the level of interest by those who think that these changes don't go far enough and some who think that they go too far, but I am extremely happy to see the level of interest in this subject. Decisions like this should not be made in a vacuum, so hearing from all of our stakeholders is incredibly important to the success of the implementation of this project and each of our strategic goals.

Our agency will continue to look at best practices that balance public safety and accountability with the need to improve processes in order to achieve better outcomes. I believe that when we find this balance we will be able to safely reduce our prison population related to revocations. Our mission and core values of achieving excellence in correctional practices while fostering public safety were made a central tenant to guide our work throughout these discussions and during our research. Now, efforts like these should not be mistaken as a substitute for bipartisan legislated comprehensive criminal justice reform. I believe that we need to continue that pursuit in order to have really significant long lasting overall reductions in our prison population and to have better outcomes in the system. Now I promise each and every one of you that we will keep you updated on our decisions moving forward in this area and I thank you all and I wish you all good health, stay safe and please wear a mask. Thank you for joining us today and good day.