



Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Technology Committee Meeting MINUTES

May 21, 2018
Teleconference

Members in Attendance:

1. Gary Roberge Chair, Connecticut
2. Sheila Sharp Arkansas
3. Shawn Arruti Nevada
4. Mac Pevey Washington
5. Joselyn Lopez Wisconsin
6. Natalie Latulippe Ex-Officio, Connecticut
7. Timothy Strickland Ex-Officio, Florida
8. Mathew Billinger Ex-Officio, Kansas
9. Candice Alfonso Ex-Officio, New Jersey
10. Felix Rosa Ex-Officio, New York
11. Julie Lohman Ex-Officio, Virginia

Guests:

1. Linda Mustafa Arkansas
2. Tami Ford Connecticut
3. Robert Maccarone New York
4. Matthew Charton New York
5. Mary Evans Wisconsin

Staff:

1. Ashley Lippert, Executive Director
2. Allen Eskridge, Policy and Operation Director
3. Barno Saturday, Logistics and Administrative Coordinator
4. Mindy Spring, Administrative and Training Coordinator
5. Kevin Terry, Website Analyst
6. Xavier Donnelly, Project Manager

Call to Order

Executive Director A. Lippert called the meeting to order at 11:00 am ET. All members were present, establishing a quorum.

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner M. Pevey (WA) moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) seconded. Agenda was approved.

Discussion

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) stated that the purpose of the meeting was to have further conversations about IVINS and its utilization and finalize the committee's recommendation to the Executive Committee.

Probation Compact Coordinator T. Ford (CT) stated that in her recent testing of IVINS she encountered system errors such as email, text and voice notifications inverting the sending and receiving states and/or listing the receiving state as "another agency". In addition, there are times the notifications do not provide the receiving state's phone number, but rather repeat the sending state's phone number.

ICOTS Project Manager X. Donnelly stated that many IVINS issues had been fixed, and some of the issues listed by T. Ford could have been new issues that have arisen. He added that IVINS did not have a reliable testing environment and the Appriss development team was not familiar with the compact process, thus making testing difficult.

At the March meeting, the Technology Committee created a workgroup to look for an alternative method of victim notification that complies with ICAOS Rules.

ICOTS Project Manager X. Donnelly stated that the national office can produce external reports and track the following notifications required by ICAOS Rules: *Reporting Instructions requested by sending state, Request for transfer initiated by sending state, Request for transfer initiated by receiving state, Approved Reporting Instructions transmitted, Transfer request accepted by receiving state, Offender engaged in behavior requiring retaking, Offender departed sending state, Offender arrived in receiving state, Compact case closed, and Request for transfer withdrawn by sending state.* The national office does not have a good method of tracking the *Offender's primary residence changed* notification. He added that the elements for triggering this notification could be added to the ICOTS enhancement list.

ICOTS Project Manager X. Donnelly stated that IVINS had other notifications in place that technically were not required by ICAOS Rules. He added that the external reports data would be refreshed on daily basis to provide the most accurate external report data.

Executive Director A. Lippert stated that last year, the commission signed an 18 months IVINS contract extension that expires at the end of this calendar year. The reason behind the extension was to determine if there is any usage increase after opening the public portal. She added that since self-registration opened, the number of states using and offenders being registered against in IVINS had not changed.

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) noted that the committee should take into consideration IVINS annual cost of \$43,400 and its total cost to date of over \$220,000 and that only a handful of states utilize the system.

DCA J. Lohman (VA) asked how states that did not use IVINS complied with Rule 3.108 Victims Notifications.

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) stated that Connecticut reaches out to victims to provide notifications as the case progresses.

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) stated that Nevada had an interstate specialist who monitored the outbound cases and served as the point of contact for victims. He added that Nevada would use the victim notification external reports as an additional resource. He noted that based on Rule 3.108, the burden was on the sending state to notify the victims and each state had its own process in place for handling notifications. He stated that Nevada did not use IVINS.

DCA J. Lohman (VA) stated that Virginia's code and laws did not require them to provide any notifications on community based offenders. She noted that the compact rules were not clear about providing notifications in accordance with state's law. In absence of IVINS, Virginia would not provide notification unless an additional staff position was created. She added that the states that did not have a local requirement to provide notifications would be the most impacted by this decision, and would not be able to comply with rules.

DCA J. Lohman (VA) stated that her main concerns were around the definition and rules related to victim notification and the victim sensitive indicator. She fears that if the commission were to terminate IVINS prior its review and revision of Rules 1.101, 3.108, 3.108-1, states would be left without an automated system to use, if the understanding of their requirement to provide victim notification changed.

DCA T. Strickland (FL) stated that Florida uses VINE for primary notifications for local offenders. The compact notifications are not required at the state level and Florida is able to comply with compact rules only by utilizing IVINS. Florida is not equipped to provide the victim notifications to compact offenders on its own. He also added his concern about the delay in receiving information if the commission chooses to use the external reports instead of IVINS. He stated that if a west region state enters information at 5 pm ET, it could be multiple days before Florida receives it and notifies the registered victim.

The national office stated that in this situation, the same type of delay would occur within IVINS.

DCA C. Alfonso (NJ) stated that New Jersey was a bifurcated state and probation had no involvement in victim notifications, which was handled by the prosecutor's office in the executive branch. She was concerned about not understanding the victim notification process in New Jersey and she scheduled a conversation with the office of attorney general to discuss this issue.

Commissioner R. Maccarone (NY) stated that victim notification was one of the essential reasons the national compact was formed. He added that the Rules Committee was going to review Rule 3.108. He stated that many states, such as Virginia and Florida, were not equipped to provide the notifications on their own even with the help of external reports due to lack of human resources and funding. He noted that absconders posed the greatest risk to the victims and many states would not be able to provide notifications on absconded offenders without IVINS.

Commissioner R. Maccarone (NY) stated that the committee needs to resolve the IVINS' management issues and fix the system as well as reduce the number of notifications received. In addition, he suggested surveying the states on what they utilize for victim notifications. He urged the committee to work toward a unified national victim notification system and make it a requirement to utilize it for compact notifications.

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) stated that if the commission decides to continue with the IVINS contract, it needs an implementation plan to enroll states into the system and possibly create a position at the national office to maintain the system.

DCA M. Billinger (KS) asked what states had been using to comply with the victims notification rule prior to IVINS being in place.

DCA N. Latulippe (CT) asked if the states notify victims when offenders abscond in their state for non-compact cases.

DCA T. Strickland (FL) stated that they send out an absconder notification on outgoing cases via VINE, but not on incoming offenders.

DCA N. Latulippe (CT) noted that it made sense that FL's VINE system provides absconder notifications on outgoing cases as those are FL cases as the sending state and their VINE system would not have the incoming case information.

DCA M. Evans (WI) stated that Wisconsin had a robust victim services in place. Wisconsin did not fully implement VINE in ICOTS due to lack of staff resources at the time. Wisconsin did announce IVINS is available for victims to self-register.

DCA J. Lohman (VA) stated that Virginia did not provide any notifications on community based offenders. The compact office had attempted to provide this service manually and found it time consuming and difficult.

DCA N. Latulippe (CT) stated that she polled the East Region DCAs and the majority were not using IVINS in their state and there was interest in having an external report about victim notification.

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) noted that the committee's opinion on IVINS was split down the middle. He decided not to vote on any official recommendation and will report the committee's findings and discussion to the Executive Committee instead.

Executive Director A. Lippert noted that it was a worthwhile discussion that raised concerns and other issues that need to be looked at such as revising the victim notification rules, reducing the number of victim notifications, and auditing data entered in ICOTS.

The committee will meet again on June 13, 2018.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm ET.