



## Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision Victim's Notification Survey Results

**May 2011**

1. Name of Respondent- List attached
2. Identify state

Arizona	Nebraska
Arkansas	New Hampshire
California	New Mexico
Connecticut	New York
Florida	North Dakota
Hawaii	Ohio
Iowa	Pennsylvania
Kansas	Rhode Island
Kentucky	South Carolina
Louisiana	South Dakota
Maine	Tennessee
Maryland	Virginia
Michigan	Washington
Minnesota	Washington D.C.
Mississippi	Wisconsin

3. For purposes of victim notification under the ICAOS rules, how does your state define "victim"? Included in separate document.
4. Which agency (or agencies) is responsible for victim notification in your state? Included in separate spreadsheet.

**5. How are victims notified by the agency (agencies)? Check all that apply**

<b>Phone Notice by Advocate</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>Written Notification</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>Automated Call System</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>Email</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>Text/SMS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Do Not Know</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Other, please specify</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12%</b>

- a. For post conviction release, victims notified by jail or DOC; for predatory offenders, victim notified by phone call or letter from law enforcement agency.
- b. We will soon be getting SMS for our ND SAVIN program.
- c. Release dates and other general information about an inmate is public record. Victims may request information by writing or calling the department's Victims' Assistance Program or electronically at Corrections' web site.
- d. Internet accessible database

**6. Does your state notify victims if supervision is extended or if offender receives an early discharge?**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34%</b>

**7. Does your state currently utilize any type of automated victim notification technology? (i.e.SAVIN, VINE, systems created in-house or other technology.)**

<b>Yes</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23%</b>

**Results by State**

New Hampshire	<b>SAVIN</b> Applied to BJA for an FY '11 Discretionary Grant
Louisiana	<b>VINE LAVNS</b> Louisiana Automated Victim Notification System
Arizona	<b>VINE</b> Some Counties
Iowa	<b>VINE</b> only notifies of offender movement. It does not operate in place of statutory requirements of notification by various agencies. It does not notify of pending parole hearings or pending release - only after movement.
Maine	<b>No Automation</b>
Arkansas	<b>VINE</b>
Nebraska	<b>VINE</b> Victims have to sign up for the services. Once someone is on parole or probation, and no automated system or other system in place that notifies ALL victims about changes while on supervision
North Dakota	<b>SAVIN</b> is used so the answer to #6 would be yes for ND if they are registered, but it is not required by law. SAVIN system covers Custody, Courts, Parole/Probation, Protection Order, Sex Offender
Virginia	<b>VINE</b> Change in custody status of inmates in Virginia local/regional jails and DOC. Local / regional jails provide automated notification when an offender is released, transferred, or escapes. DOC provides automated notification when a State sentenced offender is released, transferred, escapes, dies, or has a parole based event.
Maryland	<b>VINE</b> District and Circuit criminal court case hearings; inmate's release, transfer or escape from all city, county and state jails and facilities; offenders under the supervision of the Maryland Probation and Parole; sex offender's compliance status. Protective orders
Ohio	<b>VINE</b> Offender's custody status notification; notification when offender is discharged.
Wisconsin	<b>VINE</b> Offenders incarcerated, or recently released from, a DOC I facility or who are in the custody of the County Sheriff if the status of the offender changes
South Carolina	<b>SAVIN</b> Specific change in the custody status of an offender.

South Dakota	<b>No automated system</b>
Kansas	<b>No automated system</b>
Hawaii	<b>VINE</b>
Florida	<b>VINE</b> Notified, by Phone, E-Mail, or TTY, about changes in the custody status of inmates within Florida's 62 participating County Jails DOC
Kentucky	<b>VINE</b> . Three comprehensive services, KY VINE Services (Offender Status, Courts, Protective Order).
Mississippi	<b>SAVIN</b>
Rhode Island *	<b>VINE</b> 24-hour hotline and website about the custody status and expected releases dates of offenders in custody
California	<b>VINE</b> DOC statewide and some counties
Washington D.C.	<b>VINE</b> Notified when offender is released, transferred, or escapes.
Connecticut	<b>SAVIN</b> Provides victims, victim advocates, and other concerned citizens free and confidential notification about a specific criminal court related events.
New York	<b>VINELink:Online</b> resource that allows anyone registered to search for information regarding an offender's custody status in, transfer between or release from NY City Dept. of Corrections, NY State DOCCS, and 60 County correctional facilities
New Mexico	<b>VINE</b> is currently being used in various county jails. On June 30, 2011 due to the grant period ending as well as lack of funding sustainability NM will no longer have VINE
Tennessee	<b>VINE</b> Felony Offender Inmate Lookup ( <b>FOIL</b> ). Tennessee Sheriff's Association uses <b>SAVIN</b> for county jail notifications.
Pennsylvania	<b>SAVIN</b> service includes offenders under the supervision of county jails
Michigan	<b>VINE</b> Michigan Crime Victim Notification Network.
Minnesota	<b>VINE</b> notification of the offender's release from a county jail or detention facility. Special notice regarding offenders in a DOC facility: victims have rights to notification and information; including notice of conditions of release, additional notification related to released predatory offenders, notification of transfers to a less secure facility, and, if the offender re-enters a facility, that offender's subsequent release. This notification is not automatic: victims must make a request to the DOC.
Washington	<b>SAVIN</b> -Notification when offender is in custody, released, transferred, escapes or dies

## 8. What events trigger notification?

Top number is respondents Bottom % is percent of the total respondents	Never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always
When an offender requests to transfer from one state to another	7 23%	13 43%	3 10%	7 23%
When an offender departs the original receiving state to transfer to a subsequent state	6 20%	10 33%	5 17%	9 30%
When an offender requests to return to the sending state	7 23%	10 33%	6 20%	7 23%
When an offender is issued a travel permit	10 36%	10 36%	3 11%	5 18%
When an offender changes address	11 38%	13 45%	2 7%	3 10%
When an offender commits significant violations of his or her conditions of supervision	8 28%	10 34%	6 21%	5 17%

## 9. To what extent do you believe that a separate victim notification protocol is needed for many compact cases given the unique nature of offenders transferring from state to state?

	Responses	Percentage
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	0	0%
<b>Disagree</b>	1	3%
<b>Neutral</b>	3	9%
<b>Agree</b>	9	28%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	19	59%

10. Under the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision rules, when victims receive a notification regarding a change in the offenders status they are provided the opportunity to comment and respond to the Compact office. What do you think is an appropriate amount of time for a victim to reply from the date of the notice being sent?

Number of Days	Respondents	Percentage
10 days	5	16%
15 days	8	23%
20 days	6	16%
30 days	11	34%
I do not know	0	0%
Other	3	9%

**Other Responses:**

60 days, gives the victim time to collect petitions and letter for protest if they want to.

10 days from the time they receive the notice not when it is sent

5 working days- So many transfers are initiated at sentencing that time is of the essence.

11. Please identify if you believe victim autonomy, safety, and security are enhanced by notification of the following events.

Respondents selecting the option. Bottom is percent of the respondents.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
When an offender requests to transfer from one state to another	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	11 34%	20 62%
When an offender departs the original receiving state to transfer to a subsequent state	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%	8 25%	22 69%
When an offender requests to return to the sending state	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	4 12%	27 84%
When an offender is issued a travel permit	1 3%	2 6%	3 9%	6 19%	20 62%
When an offender changes address	1 3%	2 6%	6 19%	10 31%	13 41%
When an offender commits significant violations of their conditions of supervision	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	6 19%	23 74%

12. To what extent do you believe that victim notification occurs consistently and uniformly across all states?

	Responses	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	10	32%
Disagree	6	19%
Neutral	9	29%
Agree	6	19%
Strongly Agree	0	0%

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

<b>Sending State</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Receiving State</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Both State</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>65%</b>

**14. Do you believe an automated victim notification system tied to Interstate Compact Offender Tracking System (ICOTS) events would improve and enhance uniform notification for victims and their families and contribute to public safety when offenders are moving and traveling from state to state?**

	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>I do not know</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12%</b>

**15. Would you like to be kept apprised of survey results and issues related to victim notification through ICAOS?**

	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>94%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>

**16. Additional Comments**

1	<p>Many victims aren't registered with our state Office of Victim Services, so they are never notified.</p> <p><b>Many times they aren't registered because no one informs them of their right to register, especially on non-violent felonies. It is a pretty fragmented system.</b></p> <p>Notification to victims on misdemeanors is even more problematic, since the state Office of Victim Services primarily serves victims of felony crimes whose offenders have been sentenced to prison.</p>
2	<p>I strongly support development of an automated victim notification system tied to ICOTS, though I believe there is a role for the sending state to serve as a "gatekeeper" regarding who can register for the service. Should avoid the system becoming a tool for stalkers.</p>
3	<p>Rules regarding notification of victims should also clarify procedures to take when the safety of the offender is an issue. Sometimes, offenders are moved from one state to another for</p>



	purposes of their safety. How confidential should this information be for the victims?
4	I am not sure about the consistency of ICAOS notifications.
5	Virginia has excellent policies in place for post release victim notification and interstate notification but the funding necessary and procedures necessary to make this happen are not yet in place.
6	<p>I am aware of one problem that has not been resolved. When an offender has committed a violation after being allowed to go to another state, the sending state does not necessarily have enough funding to retrieve the offender.</p> <p>Example: the offender has been allowed to leave Maryland to be supervised in California. When a violation occurs and the offender must return to MD, the States Attorneys' office is responsible for the cost of returning the offender. There is not adequate funding by the state of MD to cover the costs. <b>As a result,when travel is too expensive, the offender is not returned. There should be provision for funding by the state.</b></p>
7	Question #14 creates a double bind: while automated notification is better than none, personal notification is much better and could create the greatest level of improvement if it were used everywhere.
8	<p>Comments Question 9. Victim notification requirements should be consistent, regardless of whether the offender transfers out of state or not, but <b>due to differences in opinion in each state regarding events that should trigger victim notifications, this is not occurring.</b></p> <p>Comments question 11 (4). Notification when an offender is issued a <b>travel permit</b> This would depend on where the offender is traveling and the location of the victim – <b>suggested that “outside the supervising state” be added to the rules.</b></p> <p>Question 13 -The receiving state should be responsible for notifications for address changes or temporary travel permits issued to travel to another state. The sending state should be responsible for all other notifications. The challenge is where to house the victim information so that both the sending and receiving states have access to the current victim information.</p> <p>Question 16. <b>Improvements</b> -1. Obtaining more detailed victim identifying information, email addresses, cell phone numbers, etc. from the State Attorney’s Office at sentencing in order to locate victims in the future.</p> <p>2. Obtaining an initial consent from the victim with the types of events they would like to be notified of during the supervision period, with the preferred method of notification (email, mail, phone call).</p>
9	In question number 8, I responded as "sometimes" because not all cases are flagged as victim sensitive to trigger victim notification. <b>If a victim does not come forward to advise of their safety concerns of the offender transferring to another state, the case will not be marked victim sensitive.</b> However, if a victim comes forward and advises of their safety concerns, then the case is flagged as victim sensitive and notification will be provided. If there is notification to be made, I work closely with the district attorney's office victim advocates to locate the victim to advise of the offender's status.
10	This survey request was forwarded to me on 5/11/11 and was submitted on 5/11/11. Apologies for NH's delayed response....

Note on #8 (third question) - When an offender departs the original receiving state to transfer to a subsequent state -**Notification if the offender does return to Michigan.** Note on #8 (last question) - When an offender commits significant violations of his or her conditions of supervision – **Notification -Only if the offender is returned to prison.**

## **National Commission – Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision**

### **Victim Notification Ad Hoc Committee Members**

Arizona	Dan Levy	Director Victim Services
Florida	Jenny Nimer	Commissioner
Florida	Pat Tuthill	ICAOS Ex-Officio Victim Rep
Kansas	Keven Pellant	Commissioner
Maine	Denise Giles	Victim Services Coordinator
Michigan	John Rubitschun	Commissioner
Minnesota	Suzanne Elwell	Director, Crime Victim Justice Unit
Puerto Rico	Raquel Colon Esteves	Commissioner
Virginia	Jim Camache	Commissioner
Washington	Scott Blonien	Commissioner
Washington DC	Anne Seymour	National Advocate