



Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Training, Education, & Public Relations Committee MINUTES

**May 26, 2021 · 1:00 p.m. ET
Teleconference**

Members in attendance:

1. Joselyn López (WI), Chair
2. Martha Danner (MD)
3. Sally Reinhardt-Stewart (NE)
4. Roberta Cohen (NM)
5. Katrina Ransom (OH)
6. Jim Parks (VA)
7. Tracy Hudrlik (MN), Ex-officio

Members not in attendance:

1. Russell Marlan (MI)
2. Patricia Coyne-Fague (RI)
3. Mark Patterson (OR), Ex-officio
4. Tanja Gilmore (WA), Ex-officio

Staff:

1. Ashley Lippert, Executive Director
2. Allen Eskridge, Policy and Operations Director
3. Barno Saturday, Logistics and Administrative Coordinator
4. Mindy Spring, Administrative and Training Coordinator
5. Xavier Donnelly, ICOTS Project Manager
6. Kelsey Moore, Web Applications and Tech Support Manager

Call to Order

Chair J. López (WI) called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. ET. Six out of eight voting members were present, a quorum was established.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner M. Danner (MD) seconded. Agenda approved.

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) moved to approve the minutes from April 7, 2021, as written. Commissioner M. Danner (MD) seconded. Minutes approved.

Discussion

Chair J. López (WI) stated that at today's meeting, the committee will test the polling and breakout room features in Zoom. The national office plans to utilize these interactive features at the upcoming Annual Business Meeting.

She updated on the two round table discussions on *Remote Sentencing/Hearings* and *Electronic Signatures* hosted by the national office. The discussions were well received and the national office plans to hold another set of round tables - one this summer and the second one in the fall. She presented a list of potential topics to the committee for review. She asked the committee members to choose their top two choices.

Polling results for round table ideas for summer & fall sessions:

1. *State Councils*: Discuss toolkit resources, the state council's role, and its benefit to states, as well as scenarios for involving a state council. **Received 1 committee vote.**
2. *Victim Engagement*: Discuss the obstacles and recommendations discovered through the NIC Post-Conviction Victim's Rights Project that aimed to move post-conviction services and systems toward affording victims their rights and recognizing victims as integral actors in, and consumers of effective post-conviction systems. **Received 0 committee votes.**
3. *Warrants*: Discuss what procedures states currently use to manage warrants and how will that change when/if the rule or enhancement passes. What progress have states made in tracking warrants and what lingering challenges exist. **Received 3 committee votes.**
4. *Reducing Revocations*: Highlight the importance of involving stakeholders. Discuss what revocation thresholds states employ. Invite CUNY Institute to talk about their Reducing Revocations Challenge. The Challenge supports action research in 10 jurisdictions around the country to explore in-depth the drivers of probation failure and use that information to identify new policy and practice solutions. **Received 3 committee votes.**
5. *ICOTS*: How states can improve on data entry training and enforcing the Privacy Policy requirements. Discuss options for Data Exports. **Received 1 committee vote.**
6. *Ex Officio Engagement*: Invite Ex officio members to join in a discussion on their pandemic response. **Received 0 committee votes.**
7. *Retaking Challenges*: Invite National Sheriff's Association to weigh in on retaking challenges. Engage states in how they comply with Rule 5.105-Retaking within 30 days. Share practices states have implemented to work around the pandemic to conduct extraditions. **Received 6 committee votes.**

Executive Director A. Lippert stated that based on the polling results, the national office would focus on *Retaking Challenges* topic this summer and *Reducing Revocations* topic in the fall. She advised waiting on the Warrants round table discussion until after the full Commission's vote on the warrant related rule and ICOTS enhancement proposals at the Annual Business Meeting.

The committee noted that the Zoom polling feature was self-explanatory and easy to use.

Executive Director A. Lippert presented the Remote Sentencing & Hearings whitepaper drafted by Legal Counsel Travis. The paper also included remote hearing for sex-offenders and absconders. Based on the comments received from the Executive Committee, the national office put together a Q&A section. She asked the Training Committee members to provide their commentary on the Q&A part and decide if any additions or clarifications were necessary.

The national office randomly divided the committee into two groups to discuss the Q&A part. The committee agreed to set aside 6 minutes for breakout rooms.

Training Coordinator M. Spring stated that her group discussed sex-offender supervision and issues with obtaining residence eligibility.

Executive Director A. Lippert noted that her group discussed stakeholders involved in the remote hearing process.

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) stated that she saw incorrect rule referencing when she first read the paper a couple weeks ago. She could not locate the error at the meeting. If she finds the error again, she will send it to the national office for consideration.

Chair J. López (WI) complemented the national office for putting together the Q&A section as it clarified the application and implications of the white paper.

The committee reached a consensus on the Q&A part of the paper, which will be published on the Commission's website by the end of the week.

The committee discussed the breakout feature of zoom and noted that it was easy to use. The committee agreed that 6 minutes was not enough for an in-depth discussion on such complex issue as the Remote Sentencing & Hearings.

Chair J. López (WI) asked the committee members about the probable cause waivers and rule requirements for holding offenders in custody on a waiver. If an offender waived a probable cause hearing, was the receiving state required to hold the offender in custody or not.

Commissioner R. Cohen (NM) noted that New Mexico kept offenders in custody unless the court released them on new charges. Then, they continued to supervise these offenders until the charges were adjudicated. With the behavior requiring retaking, if PC was found, they would place the offender in custody.

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) said that Nebraska Parole held PC hearings automatically. If they send the violation reports, they inform the other state that PC had been found or the offender signed the waiver admitting one of the violations had occurred. They usually keep offenders in custody. She only could recall two cases when they allowed the offender to remain in the community.

Commissioner K. Ransom (OH) stated that Ohio worked with the jails to allow out of custody hearings. They placed offenders in custody if PC was found.

Commissioner J. Parks (VA) stated that Virginia kept offenders in custody. He had not experienced any problems with this process.

DCA T. Hudrlik (MN) stated that if offenders waived their PC hearing and had a violation in Minnesota, they remained in the community. They were treating interstate compact offenders the same way as they treat their own offenders.

Commissioner M. Danner (MD) noted that Maryland did not have issues with this process as they hold their own PC hearings. They keep offenders in custody if probable cause is found.

Old/New Business

There was no old/new business.

Adjourn

Commissioner R. Cohen (NM) moved to adjourn. Commissioner M. Danner (MD) seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m. ET.