



Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Technology Committee Meeting MINUTES

June 13, 2018
Teleconference

Members in Attendance:

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

Members not in Attendance:

1. Sheila Sharp Arkansas
2. Candice Alfonso Ex-Officio, New Jersey

Guests:

1. Linda Mustafa Arkansas
2. Tami Ford Connecticut
3. Mary Evans Wisconsin

Staff:

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

Call to Order

Executive Director A. Lippert called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm ET. Four voting members were present, establishing a quorum.

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) seconded. Agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes

DCA J. Lohman (VA) requested changes to the minutes from May 2, 2018.

Commissioner J. Lopez (WI) requested changes to the minutes from May 21, 2018.

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) moved to approve the minutes from March 20, May 2, and May 21, 2018 as amended. Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) seconded. Minutes were approved as amended.

Chair's Report to the Committee

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) presented the Technology Committee report to the committee:

ICOTS Helpdesk – The number of tickets submitted decreased 21.5% from May 2018.

ICAOS Website – The number of visits to the ICAOS website and the mobile website increased 1.5% from May 2018.

FY 2018 ICOTS Enhancements – The eighth and final ICOTS enhancement release is scheduled for June 20, 2018. The national office is testing the new enhancement items in the ICOTS prep environment. The new enhancements include a more system-driven process for subsequent state transfers and functionality to encourage sending state users to withdraw or resubmit for rejected transfer requests.

FY 2019 ICOTS Enhancement List – The national office is working with Appriss to document the new enhancement items added to the committee's list.

Discussion

Update on NCIC project: DCA M. Billinger (KS) will be meeting with NCIC representatives next week.

Updated on ICOTS FY 2018 Enhancements: ICOTS Project Manager X. Donnelly stated that next week, the national office will provide training on the latest ICOTS enhancements.

IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch: Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) reported the Technology Committee's findings and discussion to the Executive Committee in May. The Executive Committee approved surveying the states on what they utilize for victim notifications.

The national office modified the last victim notification survey that was sent prior to IVINS launch and presented it to the committee for review and consideration.

The committee made changes to the survey (see the addendum).

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) moved to approve the victim notification survey as amended. Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) seconded. Motion approved.

The national office will send out the survey this week. The survey will stay open for two weeks.

The committee will meet again on July 25, 2018.

Old Business

Certification of documents through ICOTS by DCA Alfonso – DCA C. Alfonso (NJ) was not in attendance, the committee plans to discuss the issue at its next meeting.

Executive Director A. Lippert stated that this matter was brought to the committee's attention a few months ago by DCA N. Latulippe (CT) and the committee had already thoroughly discussed it. She will contact DCA C. Alfonso (NJ) to clarify the matter prior to the next meeting.

Adjourn

Commissioner S. Arruti (NV) moved to adjourn. Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) seconded.
Meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm ET.

Addendum

(Added text is underlined.)

Name:

Agency:

State:

Email:

Does your state provide community supervision-based victim notifications?

- Yes
- No

If yes, ~~Which~~ which agency (or agencies) is responsible for ~~victim~~ those notifications in your state?

How does your state define a ‘crime victim’ who is required to receive community supervision-based notifications?

How are victim's notified by the agency (agencies)? Check all that apply

- Phone call
- Written notification
- Automated call system
- Email
- Text/SMS
- Do not know
- Other

Do your state's laws/policies obligate your state to provide victim notifications related to in-state offenders supervised in the community?

- Yes
- No

If so, what specific notifications are mandated for your in-state offenders?

- When an offender violates
- When an offender absconds
- When an offender is taken into or released from custody
- When a case is closed
- When an offender’s primary residence changes
- Other

Does your state currently utilize any type of automated ~~victim notification~~ technology for community supervision-based victim notifications? (i.e. SAVIN, VINE, IVINS, systems created in-house or other technology.)

- Yes
- No

If yes, what automated system do you use (Check all that apply)?

- SAVIN
- VINE
- IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch
- State-specific system
- Other

Does your state use IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch for victim notification of compact activities?

- Yes
- No

If no, why does your state not use IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch (Check all that apply)?

- Does not meet state law requirements
- Existing state system satisfies current state law requirements
- Existing state system provides more accurate information
- Existing state system provides more timely notification
- State victim services was unaware of IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch
- Lack of resources to promote its use
- Lack of training available on use of system
- Current IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch notifications don't always provide the most accurate information
- Too many notifications, which are confusing to victims
- State law does not require victim notification for offenders under supervision
- Anyone can register as a victim, including offenders or their families, creating safety issues for victims and/or officers
- Compact Offices and Victim Representatives do not have staff to manage or support its use
- Confusion regarding the system's support and who to contact with questions
- Other (Please specify)

Using the scale below, please rank each current IVINS/ICOTS VINEWatch notification for its impact on victim safety and security (Scale of 1-4, 1 being the lowest impact (or none), 4 being the highest impact):

- When a transfer request is transmitted from one state to another
- When a transfer request is accepted by the receiving state
- When a notice of departure is transmitted
- When a notice of arrival or failure to arrive is transmitted
- When reporting instructions are requested by the sending state
- When approved reporting instructions are transmitted
- When an offender engages in behavior requiring retaking
- When an offender absconds

- When a compact case is closed
- When a transfer request is withdrawn by a sending state
- When an offender's primary residence changes

Which state(s) should have the responsibility for notifying victims?

- Sending state
- Receiving state
- Both

Indicate your level of agreement with the following: ~~T~~the general public should be allowed to register for notifications in addition to the direct crime victim(s)?

- Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, ~~etc.~~

Indicate your level of agreement with the following: Allowing the general public to register for notifications creates a safety issue for law enforcement or probation and parole officers?

- Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree ~~Strongly agree, disagree, etc.~~

Indicate your level of agreement with the following: Allowing the general public to register for notifications creates a safety issue for the offender?

- Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree ~~Strongly agree, disagree, etc.~~