

Nebraska Parole Transition Implementation Plan

Submitted to:

Rosalyn Cotton
Chair
Board of Parole

and

Scott Frakes
Director
Department of Correctional Services

Prepared by:

William D. Burrell
Corrections Management Consultant
Lawrenceville, NJ

June 1, 2016

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Organization of the Plan.....	2
Background and History.....	2
Transition Legislation.....	3
Transition Process.....	4
Parole Officer Compensation.....	6
Risk and Need Assessment.....	9
Electronic Records.....	10
Board Structure and Organization	10
Budget.....	14
Policies and Procedures for Parole Supervision.....	14
Treatment and Behavioral Health Services.....	15
Vision, Mission and Role of Parole.....	17
Performance Management System.....	18
Information Technology.....	19
Parole Field Operations.....	20
Evidence-Based Practices for Parole Supervision	21
Parole Officer Training.....	23
Conclusion.....	24
References.....	25
Appendices.....	27

Acknowledgements

Planning for a major organizational restructuring is a difficult task. Many people and agencies are involved, either directly or indirectly, and the contributions of all are necessary to ensure success. The development of this Transition Plan was supported and facilitated by many such people and agencies. It is important to highlight the contributions of a number of people whose involvement and support has been critical.

Rosalyn Cotton, chair of the Board of Parole, gave generously of her time and expertise, and arranged for meetings and interviews that enabled key information to be collected.

Vice Chair Rex Richard, Board members Teresa Bittinger, Virgil Patlan and Randall Rehmeier also gave freely of their time and added valuable information and perspectives.

Newly hired staff Julie Micek, Director of Supervision and Services and Nicole Miller, Staff Attorney, joined quickly and completely in the planning process and have proven invaluable.

Scott Frakes, Director of the Department of Correctional Services and his staff were important sources of information and insight, demonstrating a strong commitment to the success of the transition.

The existence of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) in parallel to the transition provided in-depth analysis of Nebraska correctional data and policies. JRI Coordinator Amy Prenda proved an able guide to and resource on the myriad JRI activities and legislation. Staff from the Council on State Governments, including Catherine McVey, Jennifer Kisela, Sara Friedman and Bree Derrick, were also helpful at many stages along the way.

Many other staff, including parole officers and supervisors, support staff and others, shared their time, experience, concerns and suggestions.

This plan was prepared under tight time constraints (four months) so the support of all those who participated and contributed, no matter what their role, made this a better plan for the transition of parole. For all their contribution, I am extremely grateful.

Any errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of the author.

William D. Burrell

Introduction

This document is the *Nebraska Parole Transition Implementation Plan*. It was prepared for the Chair of the Nebraska Parole Board and the Director of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services for submission to the Governor and Legislature pursuant to the requirements of Legislative Bill 598. The purposes of the Plan are:

- To facilitate the orderly transition of the parole supervision function (Adult Parole Administration) of the Department of Correctional Services to the Board of Parole.
- To ensure continuity of parole operations before, during and after the transition process.
- To provide guidance and recommendations on steps to build the administrative and management capacity of the Board of Parole through the development of management infrastructure and addition of staff positions.
- To identify areas where additional work is needed to fully accomplish the transition, including clean-up legislation and budget revisions.
- To identify strategic priorities for continuing work following the transition, including the implementation of evidence-based practices, design and implementation of a performance measurement system, development of a comprehensive staff training program and a complete review and revision of existing policies and procedures.
- To develop a strategic plan for parole, including a vision statement, mission, operational goals and performance measures to clearly define the role of parole in the Nebraska criminal justice system.

This Plan serves not only as a guide to the current transition activities but also sets forth a vision for the future that will guide the new, expanded Board of Parole into the future.

Methodology

This document was prepared for the Board of Parole and the Department of Correctional Services by William D. Burrell, who is an independent corrections management consultant from Lawrenceville, NJ. Mr. Burrell consults with probation and parole agencies across the country at the federal, state and local levels. He currently serves as a consultant on parole supervision to the *National Parole Resource Center* and to the Urban Institute's *Justice Policy Center*. Mr. Burrell served for 19 years as the chief of adult probation services for the New Jersey state court system. In that role, he was part of a team that managed the transition of all county court and probation staff to the state budget in 1995.

Mr. Burrell's work on this project included four multi-day site visits to Lincoln, interviews with all Board members, key Department of Correctional Services staff and Adult Parole

Administration staff, meetings with field parole officers and supervisors, discussions with consultants from the Council on State Governments regarding Justice Reinvestment Initiative activities, attending planning meetings and training sessions, and review of legislation and documentation from the Board of Parole, the Department of Correctional Services, the Adult Parole Administration and the Justice Reinvestment Initiative. A list of individuals interviewed and meetings attended is contained in Appendix 1. Source and background documents are listed in Appendix 2.

Organization of the Plan

The plan provides information on the transition and also identifies areas where action is needed to fully effect the transition. As can be expected, a reorganization of this type has links to many different aspects and agencies of government. The plan starts with the background of the transition and then describes briefly the specific statutory requirements related to parole. That is followed by a description of the process and status of those legislative mandates. The next section addresses four areas which are effected by the transition legislation. The last section details several strategic issues that should be addressed as the transition is implemented.

Background and History

The current (prior to July 1, 2016) organizational structure of parole in Nebraska has parole functions housed in two agencies of state government. The parole release, condition setting and revocation process are the responsibility of the Board of Parole and the parole supervision functions are the responsibility of the Adult Parole Administration, a unit of the Department of Correctional Services.

Parole release was established in Nebraska in 1893 and the power to release was vested solely in the Governor. In 1968, the Nebraska Constitution was amended to provide for the establishment of an independent Board of Parole as a constitutional agency. In 1969, legislation was adopted to establish the Adult Parole Administration within the Department of Correctional Services to provide supervision of parolees released to the community by the Board of Parole.

The Parole Board, while an independent entity, is located for administrative purposes “in but not of” the Department of Correctional Services. The Department provides myriad administrative

services to support the Board's operations, including human resources, budget and accounting, procurement and contracts, information technology, training and office space.

The staff of the Board of Parole and the Department of Correctional Services work closely together, due to their physical proximity (in the same building) but more importantly to the interdependence of their agency responsibilities. The working relationships that have been developed and the institutional knowledge that has accumulated served as a good base for the transition process.

Transition Legislation

On May 27, 2015, the Governor signed Legislative Bill 598 into law. The law provides for a number of wide ranging changes to correctional practice in Nebraska. This plan addresses the aspects of the law that have implications for the duties and activities of parole release and parole supervision. There are two major changes with direct impact on parole mandated by the law and several others which are not direct parole responsibilities but have important implications for parole operations.

The first major aspect of the law creates the Office of Parole Administration, which is initially housed within the Department of Correctional Services but on July 1, 2016, that office and all staff are transferred to the Board of Parole. Stated simply, this provides for the transfer of the existing Adult Parole Administration and all of its functions and staff from the Department of Correctional Services to the Board of Parole. (Section 27, Section 83-188, Section 28, Section 83-1,100 (1), Section 37, Section 83-933)

Included in this section of the law is a provision for the creation of three new staff positions for the Board, a legal counsel, a fiscal, policy or data analyst and a staff person to assist with the daily supervision and training of employees. (Section 83-188(2)(b-d)). The legal counsel has been hired. The staff person for supervision has been hired as well, the Director of Supervision and Services. An administrative assistant will be hired by June 1, 2016. The remaining analyst position is under development at this time.

The second major component of the law requires that parole officers "be compensated with salaries substantially equal to other state employees who have similar responsibilities, including

employees of the Office of Probation Administration” within the Nebraska Judiciary. (Section 28, Section 83-1,100 (2))

There are also several aspects of the law that have additional implications for the Board of Parole. The Department of Correctional Services is required to adopt a risk assessment system which will also have implications for the Board of Parole release decision-making and field supervision operations. (Section 25, Section 83-180 (4))

The Department of Correctional Services is also mandated to create a complete electronic records system, which would include information that the Board and the supervision staff would rely on regularly in the execution of their duties. (Section 24, Section 83-173 (8))

The next sections of the Plan address the major items required by the law, transition of the Adult Parole Administration, its staff and responsibilities, to the Board of Parole, and the compensation of parole officers.

The Transition Process

The current structure of the correctional and parole system has the Board of Parole heavily dependent on the Department of Correctional Services for a wide variety of administrative services, including as noted above such services as human resources, budget and accounting, procurement and contracts and information technology. These services are essential to the effective operation of any state agency and therefore steps must be taken to ensure continuing provision of these services under the new organizational structure.

Since the passage of the transition legislation, staff at the Board of Parole and the Department of Correctional Services have been working collaboratively to ensure continuity of services and operations. A Transition Working Group¹ was formed and in its early work, meet weekly to address these issues. As the transition planning progressed, the meetings were reduced to monthly. The efforts of the Working Group have resulted in a number of important products.

¹ The members of the Working Group Members are listed in Appendix 3.

Currently, state statute requires that a number of specific administrative services are to be provided to the Board of Parole by the Department of Correctional Services at no expense to the Board. (83-1,127.01) Services included are accounting, budgeting and payroll services.

To address the other required services, the Transition Working Group has developed a *Memorandum of Understanding* (MOU) which has been signed by the Director of the Department of Correctional Services and the Chair of the Board of Parole. The MOU covers the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017, at which time the MOU shall be reviewed to determine if and in what form it will continue in effect. The language of the MOU states that: "...the NDCS will provide services to the BOP and Adult Parole Administration at the level currently being provided to Adult Parole Administration."

The MOU covers administrative services, including:

- Information technology support,
- Data analysis and reports,
- Behavioral health programming,
- Training for parole officers,
- Special services,
- Absconder returns,
- Security for hospitalized parolees in custody,
- Interpreter services,
- Laboratory services for drug testing,
- Procurement and purchasing,
- Human resources,
- Payroll, and
- Business manager services (accounting, bill payment, audit).

The MOU also states that the Department will provide office space at its Central Office Campus, and that the Board will retain the use of all tangible property owned by the Department of Correctional Services and used by the Adult Parole Administration as of July 1, 2016. A copy of the MOU is attached as Appendix 4.

The Working Group has also identified a number of statutory changes that are needed to complete the transition. These will be prepared and presented to the Legislature when it reconvenes in January 2017.

The budget of the Board of Parole will require restructuring to accommodate line item expenditures for the Office of Parole Administration. The Working Group and Board of Parole staff have been working with Department of Correctional Services staff to identify and quantify all of the parole-related expenditures in the Department's budget. These and other items will have to be incorporated into the Board's 2017-2019 biennium budget request. Additional discussion of the budget is contained later in this document.

Parole Officer Compensation

The current salaries of parole officers in the Adult Parole Administration are substantially below those of other state employees performing similar functions, most notably the probation officers employed by the Nebraska Judiciary. This is a fundamental issue of fairness and equity within the system. This disparity in compensation has been as serious morale issue for parole staff. Remedying it will remove the issue and contribute to the success of the transition.

The legislation provides that the parole staff be compensated at levels "substantially equal". In addition to the compensation issue, the current structure of parole officer titles (there is one title, senior parole officer) provides no avenue for advancement other than to a supervisory position, of which there is a limited number. Parole and probation systems across the country routinely feature at least two and sometime three levels of line officer titles. Nebraska Probation has four titles in the probation officer series. These titles are typically structured to allow advancement within the parole officer job series (providing supervision and case management services to parolees) based on skills, experience, performance, advanced training or degrees and other factors. The duties and responsibilities of the more advanced titles are more demanding and require knowledge, skills and experience beyond those of the entry level position.

A new series of parole officer titles has been developed and approved by the Department of Administrative Services. The titles are *entry level parole officer*, *parole officer* and *specialized parole officer*. New parole officers would be hired as *entry level parole officers*. The *parole officer* position would be the journeyman title and the *specialized parole officer* would be a mastery level position.

The duties of the new parole officer positions are generally consistent with those of other parole and probation agencies nationally, and with those of Nebraska's probation officers. One major

addition to the parole officer duties is *case management*. This is a multi-component approach to supervising offenders, managing the requirements of parole and working to achieve offender behavior change and risk reduction. Case management duties include: intake, assessment, classification, referral, interventions, monitoring, evaluation and advocacy.² It is important to note that case management activities are at the core of the evidence-based practices models for parole supervision.³ These case management duties represent a substantial addition to and redefinition of the duties of a parole officer in Nebraska. These changes will require training, coaching and feedback to staff.

An additional significant change is the requirement of a bachelor's degree for the parole officer positions. This again is consistent with national practice⁴ and national standards⁵ but it represents a departure for Nebraska parole staff. Review of the educational levels of the current staff of the Adult Parole Administration reveals that the majority have a bachelor's degree. See Table 1 for the details.

² Healey, Kerry Murphy (1999) *Case Management in the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

³ Solomon, Amy L., Jenny W. L. Osborne, Laura Winterfield, Brian Elderbroom, Peggy Burke, Richard P. Stroker, Edward E. Rhine & William D. Burrell (2008) *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Bogue, Brad, Nancy Campbell, Mark Carey, Elyse Clawson, Dot Faust, Kate Florio, Lore Joplin, George Keiser, Billy Wasson, & William Woodward (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Jannetta, Jesse & William D. Burrell. (2014) "The Principles of Effective Supervision in Probation and Parole". In Bruinsma, Gerben and David L. Weisburd, editors. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: Springer.

⁴ American Probation and Parole Association (2006) *Adult and Juvenile Probation and Parole National Firearm Survey, Second Edition*. Lexington, KY: author.

⁵ American Correctional Association (2010) *Performance-Based Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services*. 4th ed. Alexandria, VA: author.

Table 1 - Nebraska Parole Staff Educational Levels

Title	BA Degree # (%)	AA Degree # (%)	No Degree # (%)	Total # (%)
Parole Officer	26 (66.6)	3 (7.6)	10 (25.6)	39 (100)
Supervisor	7 (87.5)		1 (12.5)	8 (100)
PO/Training	2 (100)			
PO/Inter. Compact	.5 (33.3)	1 (66.6)		1.5 (100)
PO/Hearing Officer		.5 (100)		.5 (100)
	35.5 (69.6)	4.5 (8.8)	11 (21.5)	49 (100)

Given that the duties of the new positions are based on a bachelor’s degree educational level, there could be concerns about the ability of the current staff to meet the requirements of the new titles. This is especially critical in agencies which are implementing *evidence-based practices*, as Nebraska has (in probation and to a lesser degree in parole). Offender supervision under an evidence-based model involves much greater emphasis on the techniques and strategies of behavior change and a firm grounding in the social/behavioral sciences through an undergraduate major is increasingly considered desirable for parole and probation officers. The experience of the existing staff and their overall educational levels suggest they should be able to learn and master these new skills. It should be a consideration, however in the design and delivery of training and coaching of the parole officers as evidence-based supervision practices are implemented.

All line level (non-supervisory) parole staff currently carry the title *senior parole officer*. This title will not exist once the new title structure is implemented and a process will be needed to place the existing staff in the proper title in the new series.

The new parole officer title series has been approved and salary levels have been determined for each title. The final step for implementation will be to secure funding for the implementation.

Risk and Need Assessment

The legislation (LB 598) requires the Director of the Department of Correctional Services to implement a risk assessment instrument. Subsequent legislation (LB 605) requires the Board of Parole to consider risk of reoffending for each inmate eligible for parole, using a validated risk and need assessment provided by the Department of Correctional Services. Additionally, parole supervision staff are required to use a risk and need assessment at the commencement of supervision and at six month intervals thereafter. The Department has selected the Static Risk and Offender Needs Guide for Recidivism (STRONG-R) instrument, developed by the University of Washington and the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The Department has contracted with Assessments.com for instrument customization, validation, programming and staff training.

Implementation of a risk and needs assessment (RNA) in the correctional institutions feeds important information an offender's risk of recidivating and on treatment needs to both the Board of Parole for release decision-making and to the parole supervision staff for supervision planning and case management. Such an instrument is ideally embedded in the correctional information management system, building a comprehensive case record for the inmate from the point of intake and feeding that entire record forward electronically from corrections to parole. This reduces the need for redundant data collection, increases the reliability of the information and ensures that parole will have access to the offender's full record.

At the present time, the instrument customization process is still underway and the final version of the instrument for Nebraska is not yet available. An aggressive schedule has set training on the STRONG-R for parole staff in early June. When the training is completed, the parole staff will have to manually collect data on and score almost three-quarters of the instrument's 92 variables. Only then will the risk and needs scores be available to guide parole supervision planning and case management. The case scoring process will be extremely time consuming and will divert parole officers from supervision activities. It is essential that the plan for data collection and scoring accommodate the delivery of critical supervision services by the parole officers.

In the future, the instrument will be incorporated into the Department of Correctional Services automated case management system and there will be minimal data collection required for parole officers.

A major concern with adoption of a risk and need assessment is validation on a Nebraska specific population to ensure that the instrument correctly classifies Nebraska inmates. An initial validation of the STRONG-R is part of the process of building the instrument. Unlike other risk and need tools that require implementation and use prior to validation, the STRONG-R rolls out with a level of validation already established. A sample of Nebraska inmates were matched to a comparable group of inmates from Washington State, who have been assessed with the STRONG-R, to determine preliminary cut-off scores for each risk level and create a Nebraska-specific tool. There will be another validation process in three to four years to assess how well the STRONG-R predicts recidivism among parolees in Nebraska and make adjustments, if necessary.

The Board of Parole is concurrently working with the Council of State Governments staff to develop parole guidelines as part of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative work. Risk scores are a central element of parole guidelines and the development and pilot testing of the guidelines is being delayed by the lack of risk information. The Department of Correctional Services will assist with this process, initially focusing staff resources on those inmates with pending parole hearings as well as new arrivals at Diagnostic and Evaluation Center. Ultimately all institutional case management staff will be trained, and all offenders currently incarcerated will be assessed.

Electronic Records

While the creation of an electronic records system is not a critical element of the transition for the Board of Parole, it should be a priority. Such a system would increase efficiency, reduce staff requirements, reduce costs for paper, file folders, photocopying, file cabinets and office space. An electronic records system would enable Board members and parole officers to remotely access files, saving time and expense.

Board Structure and Organization

The transition will result in a sevenfold expansion in the staff complement of the Board of Parole – from ten staff to 70. With this growth in staff come numerous new responsibilities, the largest is the responsibility for the direct oversight and management of the parole supervision operation. Additionally, the Board will have to assume some direct administrative functions beyond those that will be provided by the Department of Correctional Services under the MOU.

The Board is in the process of developing its managerial and administrative capacity, and will continue to build that through and after the transition.

It would be prudent to undertake a review of the Board workload, including that of the Chair. The increased administrative duties of the Chair associated with parole supervision will reduce the time available for release and revocation decision-making. The Board finds the periodic reviews of cases generally not a value-added function. Review of this practice, required by statute, should be undertaken.

Table of Organization – The proposed Table of Organization (TO) (see Appendix 5) sets forth structure and organization for the newly expanded Board, focusing particularly on the Office of Parole Administration. The TO is based on the principle of unity of command, which provides direct authority and accountability of operations to a single administrator (Director of Supervision and Services) for parole supervision and services and for that administrator to the Board of Parole.

Board of Parole – The Board, in addition to its power to grant parole, has administrative duties enumerated in statute (83-192). These duties include:

(g) Appoint and remove all employees of the board as prescribed by the State Personnel System and delegate appropriate powers and duties to them; and

(h) Exercise all powers and perform all duties necessary and proper in carrying out its responsibilities of the board under the Nebraska Treatment and Corrections Act.

In addition to these duties, the Board should serve as a *policy team*, working with the Chair and the staff, to develop and promulgate policy for all Board operations, monitor operations, assist with budget development, make recommendations for legislation and other matters as determined by the Board.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Chair

The duties of the Chair of the Board of Parole are also enumerated in statute (83-192) and include:

(2) The chairperson of the board shall:

(a) Supervise the administration and operation of the board;

- (b) Serve in an advisory capacity to the director in administering parole services within any facility and in the community;
- (c) Interpret the parole program to the public with a view toward developing a broad base of public support;
- (d) Conduct research for the purpose of evaluating and improving the effectiveness of the parole system;
- (e) Recommend parole legislation to the Governor;
- (f) Adopt and promulgate rules and regulations for the administration and operation of the board; and
- (g) Exercise all other powers and perform all other duties necessary and proper in carrying out his or her responsibilities as chairperson.

This provides the Chair with the responsibility for daily operations of the Board's decision-making, and following the implementation of the transition, for parole supervision functions. It is anticipated that there will be regular and routine communication between the Chair and the Board on matters related to the management and operation of parole supervision. Item (b) in the duties above should be eliminated via legislative change, as the Board will be responsible for parole supervision.

Vice Chair – The title of Vice Chair of the Board has been established administratively by the Board to provide a designee who can act in the absence of the Chair. The Vice Chair is not provided for in statute, receives no additional compensation and has no legally prescribed duties. As the scope of responsibilities and workload of the Board's increase with the transition, it would be timely to examine the role of the Vice Chair to determine whether it should be established by statute, what duties would be entailed, define the relationship to the Chair and other Board members and determine if additional compensation is warranted.

Director of Supervision and Services – This position was established by the Board pursuant to the provisions of LB-598 which authorized "(a)t least one staff member to assist with the daily supervision and training of employees of the board". (83-188) The director is the head of the Office of Parole Administration and will perform all of the duties of the Adult Parole Administrator, bearing responsibility for the management of all aspects of parole supervision and services. The

director reports to the Chair on the Board of Parole for daily operations and provides regular reports and information to the full Board.

Staff Attorney – The staff attorney position was also provide for by LB-598. The attorney provides legal counsel and guidance to the Board of Parole, the Chair and the Director of Supervision and Services.

The Board has decided to add legislative liaison responsibilities to this position in order to support the independence and effectiveness of the Board of Parole. The duties of the Chair include recommending parole legislation to the Governor. This should be broadened to include working with the Legislature. The Legislature is active, interested and engaged in parole and corrections, and it is important that the Board of Parole be responsive to and engaged with them in return.

Business Manager – The Business Manager is a new position which will need to be established. Even with the administrative support which will be provided by the Department of Correctional Services under the MOU, the Board, as an independent agency, will need to develop its own robust administrative capacity to operate effectively. After the term of the MOU expires, it would be preferable to have the Board assume as many of the administrative functions as possible. This position would be responsible for budget preparation and administration, accounting, audit preparation, procurement, disbursements, payroll and human resources. It is anticipated that additional staff support will be needed as the administrative functions are assumed by the Board staff.

Management Analyst – LB-598 also authorizes an analyst position, either fiscal, policy or data. The recommended title is Management Analyst, which would include policy and data functions. The newly expanded Board should seek to be evidence-based, data-driven and results-oriented. Such an agency requires regular access to accurate, timely and focused data for management at all levels. The need is particularly acute at the executive management level, and as a result the Management Analyst position reports directly to the Director of Supervision and Services. The analyst will produce and analyze data, make recommendations to executive staff and the Board, respond to queries and issue regular management reports. The Management Analyst will also serve as the Board's liaison to the state Office of the Chief Information Officer and to the Department of Correctional Services information technology operations.

Budget

The budget of the Board of Parole will need to change, in both its structure and its size. Line items will have to be created in the budget for expenditures that support field operations and have not been required by the Board in the past. This will include expenditures such as electronic monitoring, drug testing services and supplies, training for parole staff, treatment services, equipment and supplies, and many others. It is critical that all of these expenditures be identified and current spending levels quantified. Those levels should be examined closely to ensure that they are adequate. In a small budget of the size of even the expanded Board of Parole, there is not the degree of *slippage* that would be found in the budget of the Department of Correctional Services. Slippage is the difference between budgeted amounts and actual expenditures. Such slippage can be used to cover unanticipated expenditures, but the smaller the budget, the smaller the amount of slippage there is to draw upon.

Staff from the Board of Parole and the Department of Correctional Services have begun the process of reviewing the budgets of the Adult Parole Administration, the Department and the Board to construct a consolidated statement of budget and expenditures. That will form the basis of the consolidated Board of Parole budget submission for the 2017-2019 Biennial Budget.

The Parolee Cash Fund is a supervision fee-supported fund which is used for various purposes. The available information suggests that this fund should be analyzed and restructured. Services for parolees would appear to be the primary purpose for this fund, but other expenditures, such as parole officer training, have been made from this fund. If these other expenditures are recurring costs such as training, should be allocated to the appropriate budget line item

It is likely that the size of the Board's budget request will increase as expenditures not currently visible in the budget are identified and assigned to a specific line item.

Policies and Procedures for Parole Supervision

There is a substantial body of policies, directives, procedures and other material that guide the work of both the Board of Parole and the Adult Parole Administration. These will have to be reviewed to determine if each is still needed, whether cosmetic changes (e.g. agency name change) or substantive modifications are needed, determine where new policies are needed, eliminate redundancies and generally clean up the documents. This is a process which can wait until after

the transition, but one critical document is needed. An omnibus directive needs to be created and issued by the Chair of the Board of Parole and the Director of the Department of Correctional Services, stating that all policies and directives related to the administration and operation of the Adult Parole Administration remain in full force and effect. The directive also will identify specific changes in authority, such as where policy identifies the Director of the Department as the decision-making authority, that now is transferred to the Chair of the Board of Parole or the Director of Supervision and Services for the Board of Parole. This directive is being prepared by a Board member and the Board's staff attorney.

The Board has implemented a process by which to promulgate rules, regulations, policies, procedures and the like that comports with Nebraska's Open Meetings Act. This process allows the Board to conduct the public policy component of its function with transparency and also allows for stakeholders to have an opportunity to provide input.

Treatment and Behavioral Health Services

The parolee population in Nebraska, as with all states, presents a range of behavioral health problems that are related to their criminal behavior. Most prominent among these needs are substance abuse treatment and sex offender treatment. Reducing the risk of recidivism requires that parole officers and parole agencies address these behavioral health needs.

The Adult Parole Administration currently utilizes a number of strategies to address these needs, including Department of Correctional Services staff, other state/county human service agency staff, contracts with private service providers and collaboration with Nebraska Probation.

Department of Correctional Services Behavioral Health Staff – A number of behavioral health staff (e.g. social workers) are assigned to parole field offices in Omaha and Lincoln. These staff work alongside the parole officers and provide valuable treatment services on site. This co-location of treatment and parole staff provides for excellent communication and collaboration. During site visits to the Omaha and Lincoln parole offices, both parole officers and the behavioral health staff spoke positively about the benefits of co-location.

Vouchers - A meeting was recently held between staff of Board of Parole and a representative of the Office of Probation Administration to establish procedures for utilization of vouchers for substance abuse treatment and mental health treatment resources for parolees. These procedures

include referral, assessment, supervisory review and approval and tracking and payment. The entire process will ultimately be electronic.

Probation Programming – The Office of Probation Administration has historically collaborated with Adult Parole Administration and made services available to parolees. These include substance abuse evaluations and treatment (out-patient and intensive out-patient), participation in the Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS) program, and attendance at classes and other services at the Probation Reporting Centers (PRC) established by probation across the state. The PRCs are a valuable resource, particularly in rural areas where other service providers are scarce if they exist at all.

There have been some administrative difficulties recently and service availability was terminated. However, the Deputy Probation Administrator has expressed a willingness to renegotiate an agreement with the Board of Parole and re-establish a mechanism for this service access for parole. The Board's Director of Supervision and Services recognizes the value of this partnership and is fully committed to establishing an even greater level of collaboration.

The MOU will ensure that the Department of Correctional Services behavioral health staff will continue to provide services to the parole population for at least the next year. Looking forward, the Board of Parole will need to be more systematic and disciplined about determining service and treatment needs and then budgeting for those services. The implementation of the needs assessment portion of the STRONG-R assessment instrument will provide regular and comprehensive information about treatment needs and that will help significantly with the planning process.

The geographic distribution of the parolee population in Nebraska poses challenges for the delivery of behavioral health services. Population centers such as Omaha and Lincoln have a much greater concentration of services and public transportation that makes accessing them manageable for parolees who do not have their own transportation. In the more rural parts of the state, the situation is much different. The number and types of treatment and service providers is much smaller, and in some areas no services are available at all. Where services do exist, accessing them is made difficult by the lack of public transportation. Parole officers are creative and resourceful, but they are limited by time, resources and skills (they are not licensed therapists). As evidence-

based practices are implemented and officers learn new skills, they will be able to assume far more direct behavior change roles in providing supervision.

The Board of Parole will have to explore a full range of options including collaboration with Department of Correctional Services, the Administrative Office of Probation, other state and local agencies, non-profit organizations and private service providers to ensure that adequate types and quantities of high-quality services are available.

Vision, Mission and Role of Parole

The transition process provides an ideal opportunity for the Board of Parole to engage in strategic planning. Setting forth the agency mission, defining the vision, adopting operational goals and developing strategic priorities will provide vital guidance and information for staff and key stakeholders.⁶ During the transition planning, the Board adopted revised vision and mission statements.

Mission

It is the mission of the Nebraska Board of Parole and the Division of Parole Supervision to continue its research, understanding and implementation of evidence-based approaches as it pertains to the release of clients who have appropriately been prepared for community supervision. The Board and the Division of Parole Supervision are dedicated to maintaining public safety, reducing recidivism, and addressing the needs of victims, while integrating clients into society through a balance of best practice supervision and treatment strategies.

Vision

The Nebraska Board of Parole and the Division of Parole Supervision are committed to serving and protecting the public. The Board will strive to make informed and appropriate parole decisions by giving due consideration to and utilizing the resources of the Division of Parole Supervision, including innovative case management, for the successful re-entry of clients back into the community to become productive and responsible citizens.

⁶ Stroker, Richard P. (2011) *Paroling Authorities' Strategic Planning and Managing for Results*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

The strategic direction of the Board has clear implications for the role that parole supervision will play in the justice system and in the community. As the first of the 13 evidence-based strategies developed by the Urban Institute for parole supervision states: *Define success as recidivism reduction and measure performance*. “Parole agencies – like all agencies – should be clear about their mission, define criteria for success and set benchmarks for performance. There is now an emerging consensus that parole should adopt risk reduction and behavior change strategies in order to accomplish its public safety mission.”⁷ The Board’s vision and mission make it clear that parole has embraced the balanced approach for supervision – an approach that integrates helping and behavior change with accountability and enforcement of Board conditions and requirements. Parole officers will be agents of change as well as agents of accountability.

Performance Management System

To put the strategic vision of the Board of Parole into action, it is necessary to develop a performance management system. The management system includes operational goals, measureable objectives, performance reporting and feedback mechanisms and proactive management involvement. Such tactics are essential components of any evidence-based system. As noted above, the Urban Institute’s evidence-based parole supervision model starts with defining success and measuring performance. The evidence-based practices model for community corrections developed by the National Institute for Corrections calls for agencies *to measure relevant processes/practices and to provide measurement feedback*.⁸

Building on the vision and mission, the Board of Parole should develop a series of *operational goals*, which provide a description of the desired future state of affairs that can be unambiguously compared to the present of affairs⁹ and *measureable objectives*, which flow from the goals and provide quantifiable assessment of performance. The goals, objectives and measures provide information about performance at the four levels: agency, managerial, supervisory and the case management levels. At the agency level, performance measures drive annual reports, budget and planning documents and public education and information efforts. At the managerial and

⁷ Solomon, et al 2008, p. 8.

⁸ Bogue, et al 2004.

⁹ DiIulio, John J. Jr., ed. (1993) *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. p. 145.

supervisory levels, the measures provide vital information on operations. At the case management level, the measures provide staff with information about the effectiveness of their efforts and programs.

Effective performance measurement and management system are critically dependent on having access to accurate and timely information. As discussed immediately below, the Board of Parole will have access to a management information system that appears able to meet their information needs.

Information Technology

The information technology aspect of the Board of Parole will also increase significantly with the transition. Currently, the Board has access to inmate files in the Department of Correctional Services' *Nebraska Inmate Case Management System* (NICaMS) for the purposes of preparing for the parole reviews and hearings. The process of accessing information, preparing calendars and reports and related functions to support the Board of Parole's release and revocation decision-making should all be thoroughly reviewed to determine if they are fully exploiting the capacity of the automated systems. The increased duties and responsibilities of the members of the Board and staff post-transition requires that all functions be as efficient as possible and full automation is critical to that goal.

The parole supervision operations are supported by the *Parolee Information Management System*, or PIMS. It is not an independent, stand-alone system, but rather a component of the NICaMS and is structurally and functionally integrated into that larger system. As a result, the Board will continue to utilize this platform for information management needs of both parole release decision-making and parole supervision.

A review of PIMS functions with a parole supervisor revealed that it is a robust system that is user-friendly, comprehensive and well-integrated into the line (parole officer) functions and supervision and management of parole. The system has a report generator which allows the users to develop new reports from the system to support management and line operations. The supervisor who provided the system review consulted with his colleagues and they agree that the system works well.

The transition and related legislative changes will require changes to PIMS, and there are a number of additional changes that the parole staff have identified as beneficial. Historically, the Adult Parole Administration has had a standing committee of supervisors and line officers that would recommend changes to the system and work with the information technology staff to develop and implement them. This committee should continue. It no doubt contributed to the high level of functionality of the system and the staff's support and use of it.

The policy side of information technology will also need to be addressed. Funding for parole information technology projects will now flow from the Crime Commission to the Board of Parole. The Board will need to develop a policy infrastructure to determine how to utilize the Crime Commission funding and identify other funding needs for system programming and development, equipment, and other information technology services. The transition provides a unique opportunity to examine all aspects of the Board's operations and to build the capacity to enhance and expand automation of Board operations.

The Board of Parole should participate in the Information Technology Governance Committee which determines priorities for development work. An invitation to join the Committee has already been extended and should be accepted.

Parole Field Operations

The field parole operations are well-organized and staffed. Caseloads are organized geographically, assigning all paroles in a given geographic area to one parole officer. This is efficient, as it reduces travel time and expense. It also enables officers to get to know their area better, including local law enforcement agencies, treatment and service providers, employers, housing, and training and educational resources. Within this structure, specialized caseloads have been established for sex offenders, also with a geographic basis. These organizational patterns are consistent with national practices in parole and probation.¹⁰

¹⁰ Burrell, William D. (2005). "Trends in Probation and Parole in the States." In Keon S. Chi (ed.), *The Book of the States*, 37. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments, pp. 595-600.

The table of organization provides for a span of control (the ratio of officers to one supervisor) for the non-specialized caseloads of 1:7. This is a manageable span of control and is consistent with practice nationally.¹¹

The caseloads of the individual parole officers are relatively low by comparison with a recent national survey of parole supervising agencies.¹² The national average is 38 active parolees per officer, the Nebraska average was 30.3 as of January 2016. This average is also lower than the caseload standards of the American Probation and Parole Association,¹³ but those standards are driven by risk levels and that information is not yet available for Nebraska parolees.

The workload of the parole officer is influenced by more than the number of parolees to be supervised. In a state such as Nebraska where there are large rural areas, officers spend more time traveling than they would in urban areas like Omaha and Lincoln. The rural areas also lack treatment programs and service providers, shifting the burden of interventions to the parole officer. The lack of public transportation and jobs in the rural areas also contribute to the officer workload.

Evidence-Based Practices for Parole

For more than a decade parole and probation agencies have been exploring and implementing a body of research and practice known as evidence-based practices (EBP). These are practices which have been empirically tested through rigorous scientific research and been shown to be effective at achieving the desired outcome. This development has implications for both the strategies and techniques of parole supervision but also the mission or purpose. The adoption of EBP in parole and probation signals a return to the behavior change function of the mission of parole supervision. During the 1980s and 1990s, risk control strategies came to dominate

¹¹ Armstrong, Gaylene with Doug Dretke & Cassandra Atkin (2011) *The Importance of Low Span of Control in Effective Implementation of Evidence-Based Probation and Parole Practices*. Huntsville, TX: Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

¹² Bonczar, Thomas P. (2008) *Characteristics of Parole Supervising Agencies*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

¹³ Burrell, William D. (2007). Issue Paper on Caseload Standards for Probation and Parole. *Perspectives* 31(2) pp. 37-41.

community supervision, with an emphasis on monitoring and enforcement of conditions to the exclusion of risk reduction efforts.

The research that supports EBP in corrections demonstrates that correctional treatment can be effective. The abandonment of correctional treatment as a result of the infamous “nothing works” study¹⁴ has now largely been reversed and community and institutional corrections agencies nationally and in Nebraska¹⁵ are again pursuing treatment, risk reduction and offender behavior change as a core element of their mission.

Parole in Nebraska has made efforts to implement evidence-based practices in supervision, but these efforts have been fragmented and scattered, and the results less than optimal. This experience is not unusual in parole and probation. Implementation of EBPs is a major challenge that few parole and probation agencies have met successfully.¹⁶ The EBP models for parole and probation are complex with multiple components which are interrelated and interdependent.¹⁷ (See Appendix 6 for elements of EBP in community corrections)

The efforts at evidence-based practices include:

- Risk and Need Assessment – In 2005-6, a risk and need assessment instrument was developed and validated for the Department of Correctional Services reentry initiative.¹⁸ Use of this instrument was discontinued and the parole supervision operation had no risk assessment. A *Parole Supervision Inventory* is used, and is a needs assessment type of instrument. It does not appear to be an actuarial instrument. Use of validated actuarial risk and need assessment is a core evidence-based practice.
- Motivational Interviewing training – Parole officers have been trained in Motivational Interviewing, an evidence-based practice for enhancing client motivation for change. The extent of use of the MI techniques is unknown
- Cognitive Behavioral Interventions - There are two curriculum-driven, classroom-based cognitive behavioral programs in use. The Department of Correctional Services uses the

¹⁴ Martinson (1974) “What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform.” *The Public Interest*. Lipton, Douglas S., Robert Martinson & Judith Wilks (1975). *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

¹⁵ Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (2014) *Strategic Plan, 2014-2015*, Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (2015) *Annual Report July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015*.

¹⁶ Burrell, William D. (2008) “Implementation: The Achilles Heel of EBP” *Community Corrections Report* 15(3) pp. 35-39

¹⁷ Solomon et al (2008), Bogue, et al (2004), Jannetta & Burrell (2014)

¹⁸ Hardyman, Patricia L. (2006) *Design and Validation of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services Community Risk Reassessment Instrument*. Middletown, CT: Criminal Justice Institute (mimeo)

Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) model in the institutions and the MRT classes are also facilitated by parole officers in the community. Thinking for a Change (T4C) classes are also provided by parole. Both MRT and T4C are evidence-based programs.¹⁹

There is a critical need for the Board of Parole to assess the extent of EBP implementation in parole supervision operations, develop a strategy to achieve full, high-quality implementation, design and deliver the necessary training and coaching of staff, institute a quality assurance component and develop a dynamic performance management and feedback system. This will be a multi-year effort but it is essential if the potential of EBPs for risk reduction and recidivism reduction are to be achieved.

The work of the Council of State Governments Justice Reinvestment team will be very helpful in this area. Preliminary plans for parole officer training on risk and need assessment, case planning and community resources, and the *Effective Practices in Community Supervision* (EPICS) model. EPICS is a state-of-the-art model for providing parole officers with the most effective tools and techniques in community supervision.²⁰

The immediate priorities should be implementation of risk and need assessment, strengthening the staff skills on and utilization of MI and the development of a case planning component/strategy. Given the emphasis in the new job specifications on *case management duties*, the development and delivery of training on this subject should be a priority.

Parole Officer Training

There is an urgent need for a comprehensive state-of-the-art training program for parole staff. Historically, parole officers received the same basic training as institutional correctional officers. Parole-specific training was “on-the-job”.

A basic training program is needed for all new hires to equip them with the knowledge and skills they will need to perform the job effectively. Annual training is required for all staff,

¹⁹ Milkman, Harvey and Kenneth Wanberg. (2007) *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment: A Review and Discussion for Corrections Professionals*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

²⁰ Wogan, J. B. (2015) “The Changing Relationship Between Ex-Criminals and Their Parole Officers” *Governing* October 2015 issue.
Crime Solutions.gov (2016) *Program Profile: Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS)*.

regardless of level. Specific additional trainings must be provided for new initiatives such as the STRONG-R risk assessment, case planning, EPICS and the sanctioning guidelines.

The training approach cannot be limited to classroom instruction alone. Staff should be trained in natural work groups and given the opportunity to learn and practice the new skills, developing mastery with feedback and coaching. Supervisors should be provided training in coaching and feedback and they should be trained on new initiative before their staff. This enables them to be prepared for the questions they receive.

Conclusion

A major organizational restructuring is a complex and challenging task. The commitment to success of those involved in the Nebraska parole transition has resulted in an effective transition process with strong indications of immediate and long term success.

The provisions of statute and of the MOU ensure that basic operations will continue seamlessly after July 1. The Board of Parole has begun to build its internal management capacity. It has identified strategic priorities that will be addressed post-transition to further enhance its management capacity. The Board is preparing a new budget and has identified needed statutory changes. The management structure for parole supervision has been developed and will be in place at the time of the transition. A process has begun for review of all policies and procedures governing parole supervision.

While much has been accomplished since the passage of the transition legislation, much still remains to be done to complete the transition and ensure the long term success of Nebraska's new, expanded Board of Parole. The products of the transition process – a firm statutory foundation, a sound management structure, an effective leadership team and a system-wide commitment to making the transition work – all provide clear indications that the transition will be a success.

References

American Correctional Association (2010) *Performance-Based Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services*. 4th ed. Alexandria, VA: author.

American Probation and Parole Association (2006) *Adult and Juvenile Probation and Parole National Firearm Survey, Second Edition*. Lexington, KY: author. Available at: http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/Resources/Surveys/National_Firearms/docs/NFS_2006.pdf

Armstrong, Gaylene with Doug Dretke & Cassandra Atkin (2011) *The Importance of Low Span of Control in Effective Implementation of Evidence-Based Probation and Parole Practices*. Huntsville, TX: Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

Bogue, Brad, Nancy Campbell, Mark Carey, Elyse Clawson, Dot Faust, Kate Florio, Lore Joplin, George Keiser, Billy Wasson & William Woodward (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Bonczar, Thomas P. (2008) *Characteristics of Parole Supervising Agencies*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Burrell, William D. (2008) "Implementation: The Achilles Heel of EBP" *Community Corrections Report* 15(3) pp. 35-39.

Burrell, William D. (2007). "Issue Paper on Caseload Standards for Probation And Parole." *Perspectives* 31(2) pp. 37-41.

Burrell, William D. (2005). "Trends in Probation and Parole in the States." In Keon S. Chi (Ed.), *The Book of the States*, 37. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments, pp. 595-600.

Burrell, William D. (1998) "Probation and Public Safety: Using Performance Measures to Demonstrate Public Value." *Corrections Management Quarterly*. 2(3) 61-69.

Burrell, William D. & Edward E. Rhine. 2013. "Implementing Evidence-Based Practices in Community Corrections: Review Essay" *Justice Research and Policy*. 15(1) pp. 143-157.

Crime Solutions.gov (2016) *Program Profile: Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS)*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Available at: https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=465&utm_source=Twitter&utm_medium=Social-Media&utm_term=Corrections&utm_content=CSprog465-05252016&utm_campaign=Csreleases

DiIulio, John J. Jr., ed. (1993) *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Hardyman, Patricia L. (2006) *Design and Validation of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services Community Risk Reassessment Instrument*. Middletown, CT: Criminal Justice Institute (mimeo)

Healey, Kerry Murphy (1999) *Case Management in the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice

Jannetta, Jesse & William D. Burrell. (2014) “The Principles of Effective Supervision in Probation and Parole”. In Bruinsma, Gerben and David L. Weisburd, editors. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: Springer.

Lipton, Douglas S., Robert Martinson & Judith Wilks (1975). *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Martinson, Robert (1974). “What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform.” *The Public Interest*, (35), 22-45.

Milkman, Harvey and Kenneth Wanberg. (2007) *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment: A Review and Discussion for Corrections Professionals*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (2015) *Annual Report July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015*. Lincoln, NE: author.

Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (2015) *Strategic Plan, 2014-2015*. Lincoln, NE: author.

Solomon, Amy L., Jenny W. L. Osborne, Laura Winterfield, Brian Elderbroom, Peggy Burke, Richard P. Stroker, Edward E. Rhine & William D. Burrell (2008) *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Stroker, Richard P. (2011) *Paroling Authorities’ Strategic Planning and Managing for Results*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Wogan, J. B. (2015) “The Changing Relationship Between Ex-Criminals and Their Parole Officers” *Governing* October 2015 issue. Available at: <http://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-probation-parole-states-community-supervision.html#.VhKOnlBsqEY.email>

Appendices

1. Interviews and Meetings
2. Background and Source Documents
3. Transition Working Group Members
4. Memorandum of Understanding
5. Proposed Table of Organization
6. Evidence-Based Practices in Community Corrections.

Appendix 1

This is a list of the major interviews conducted and meetings attended during the preparation of this Transition Plan. For a comprehensive list of activities, consult the monthly Progress Reports.

Interviews:

Board of Parole:

Rosalyn Cotton, Chair

Rex Richard, Vice-chair

Teresa Bittinger, Member

Virgil Patlan, Member

Randall Rehmier, Member

Julie Micek, Director of Supervision and Services

Nicole Miller, Esq., Staff Attorney

Department of Correctional Services:

Scott Frakes, Director

Abby Carbaugh, Ph.D., Research Administrator

Cathy Gibson-Beltz, Administrator, Adult Parole and Transition Coordinator

Anne Hansen, Assistant Administrator, Adult Parole

Quintin Penner, Regional Parole Supervisor

Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI)

Amy Prenda, Justice Reinvestment Implementation Coordinator

Catherine McVey (Council of State Governments - CSG)

Jennifer Kisela (CSG)

Bree Derrick (CSG)

Sara Friedman (CSG)

Legislative Ombudsman Staff

James Davis

Jerall Moreland

Office of the Chief Information Officer

Beth Boal

Meetings:

Full Board of Parole

Transition Working Group

Parole Staff at Lincoln Regional Parole Office, Trabert Hall

Parole Staff at the Omaha Field Office

Parole Staff from Western Region and Central Office

CSG training session on Violation Response Guidelines with APA parole staff.

CSG policy session on Parole Guidelines with the Board of Parole

Strong-R Implementation Team Meeting

Appendix 2

Source and Background Documents

Administrative Office of Probation (2013) *Job Descriptions for Probation Officer Trainee, Probation Officer, Senior Probation Officer, Specialized Probation Officer and Treatment Probation Officer*. Mimeo.

Barnoski, Robert & Elizabeth K. Drake (2007) *Washington's Offender Accountability Act: Department of Corrections Static Risk Instrument*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Council of State Governments Justice Center (2015) *Justice Reinvestment in Nebraska: Analysis and Policy Framework*. Available at: <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/JusticeReinvestmentinNebraska.pdf>

Council of State Governments Justice Center (2015) *Justice Reinvestment in Nebraska; Analysis and Policy Framework*. Nebraska Legislative Symposium, January 14, 2015.

Council of State Governments Justice Center (2014) *Presentation to the Third Meeting of the Justice Reinvestment Working Group – October 22, 2014* Available at: <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Nebraska-Justice-Reinvestment-Third-Meeting.pdf>

Council of State Governments Justice Center (2014) *Justice Reinvestment in Nebraska: Fourth Working Group Meeting - December 11, 2014*. Available at: <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Nebraska-Justice-Reinvestment-Fourth-Meeting.pdf>

Daly, Reagan & Maggie Peck (2007) *Considering Consolidation: The Nebraska Probation and Parole Services Study*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Drake, Elizabeth K. (2014) *Predicting Criminal Recidivism: A Systematic Review of Offender Risk Assessments in Washington State*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Hamilton, Zachary, Alex Kigerl, Michael Campagna, Robert Barnoski, Stephen Lee, Jacqueline Van Womer & Lauren Block. (2016) "Designed to Fit: The Development and Validation of the STRONG-R Recidivism Risk Assessment" *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 43(2) pp. 230-263.

Hardyman, Patricia L. (2006) *Design and Validation of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services Community Risk Reassessment Instrument*. Middletown, CT: Criminal Justice Institute

Labor Contract between the State of Nebraska and the Nebraska Association of Public Employees, Local 61 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (NAPE/AFSCME) July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2017.

Nebraska Board of Parole and Department of Correctional Services (2016) *Mandatory Discharge Report March 2016*. Lincoln, NE: authors.

Nebraska Crime Commission (2015) *Community Supervision in Nebraska: A Report to the Governor and Legislature on Information Submitted by Criminal Justice Partners within the State of Nebraska*. Lincoln, NE: author.

Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (2016) *Adult Parole Authority Monthly Report for January 2016*. Mimeo.

Nebraska Department of Administrative Services (2015) *Position Description Questionnaire – Entry Level Parole Officer, Parole Officer, Specialized Parole Officer*. Mimeo.

Nebraska Legislature (2014) *Department of Correctional Services Special Investigative Committee – Report to the Legislature, December 15, 2014*. Mimeo.

Nebraska Legislature (2015) Legislative Bill 598.

Nebraska Legislature (2015) Legislative Bill 605.

Nebraska State Constitution, Article IV-13. (Board of Parole)

Nebraska Revised Statutes - Chapter 83, Sections 188 to 1,125.

Weiner, Richard L. (2015) *Interim Report: Transition Project*. Mimeo.

Appendix 3

Transition Working Group Members

Rosalyn Cotton, Chair, Board of Parole

Scott Frakes, Director, Department of Correctional Services

Mike Rothwell, Deputy Director, Programs and Community Services, Department of Correctional Services

Teresa Bittinger, Board Member

Randall Rehmeier, Board Member

Cathy Gibson-Beltz, Adult Parole Administrator, Transition Coordinator

Amy Prenda, JRI Coordinator

Appendix 4

Memorandum of Understanding

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE
NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
AND THE
NEBRASKA BOARD OF PAROLE**

This Memorandum of Understanding (herein after referred to as MOU) is made by and between the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (hereinafter referred to as NDCS) and the Nebraska Board of Parole (hereinafter BOP) in order to facilitate the collaborative effort to transfer supervision of the Adult Parole Administration from the NDCS to the BOP.

WHEREAS, the Adult Parole Administration is currently a division of the NDCS;

WHEREAS, in accordance with Laws 2015 LB 598 §28 (NRS 83-1,100), as of July 1, 2016, the Office of the Parole Administration will transfer from the NDCS to the BOP;

WHEREAS, multiple NDCS departments provide services to the Adult Parole Administration;

WHEREAS, the Adult Parole Administration will continue to need those NDCS services for a limited period of time after its transfer to the BOP;

NOW THEREFORE, it is hereby agreed:

I. TERM OF MOU

This MOU shall be effective from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017, at which time this MOU shall be reviewed by the parties.

II. AGREEMENTS

A. For the term of this MOU, the NDCS will provide services to the BOP and Adult Parole Administration at the level currently being provided to Adult Parole Administration. Those services include but are not limited to:

1. Information Technology support;
 - a. Any programming or other IT support that incurs costs by OCIO will be paid by BOP/APA, including PIMS maintenance and support.
2. Data analysis and Reports from information stored in the Nebraska Inmate Case Management System (NICAMS) and the Static Risk and Offender Needs Guide – Revised (STRONG-R) databases;
3. Behavior Health programming for parolees;
4. Training for Parole Officers, at NDCS' Staff Training Academy (STA) to include:
 - a. CPR;
 - b. First Aid;
 - c. Use of Chemical Agents;
 - d. Defensive Tactics; and
 - e. STRONG-R administration
5. Special Services support to include:
 - a. Transporting parolees and absconders;

- b. Teletype services
- 6. Salary, air fare and lodging expenses in accordance with NDCS policy and applicable General Services Administration rates for NDCS Investigators to return absconders from out of state;
- 7. Security coverage for parolees hospitalized upon arrest;
- 8. Interpreter services;
- 9. NDCS laboratory drug screens on parolees' urine specimens and confirmation testing in accordance with NDCS policy;
- 10. Procurement services;
- 11. Human Resources support including but not limited to, job advertising, applicant screening, employee benefits enrollment; security background checks; employee drug screens; and processing employee grievances through Step 2;
- 12. KRONOS support for Adult Parole Administration staff and BOP staff;
 - a. Any additional or replacement of Kronos clocks will be the financial responsibility of BOP/APA, as well as any direct costs incurred for repair or maintenance of the Kronos clocks for BOP/APA
- 13. Financial and inmate/parolee accounting services, to include, but not limited to:
 - a. Processing and payment of bills, IBTs, reimbursements; parole programming fees, etc.; and
- 14. Business Manager services.

B. NDCS will pay delinquent parolee electronic monitoring bills received through June 30, 2016. These payments will cover any parolee electronic monitoring services through December 2015, which the parolee has failed to pay. The BOP will be responsible for paying any delinquent parolee accounts that become due on or after July 1, 2016.

C. NDCS will provide office space in its Central Office for the BOP members and support staff and Adult Parole Administration administrators and support staff.

D. The BOP Adult Parole Administration shall retain the use of all tangible property owned by NDCS and used by APA in its operations on July 1, 2016. This property includes, but is not limited to, office furniture, computers, printers, refractometers, and vehicles. BOP/APA will work with NDCS to ensure that proper inventory records are maintained for all NDCS equipment used by BOP/APA

III. AMENDMENTS TO THE MOU

Any changes to this MOU must be agreed upon in writing and signed by the parties.

IV. TERMINATION OF MOU

Either party may terminate this MOU upon sixty days written notice to the other party.



 Scott R. Frakes
 Director
 Nebraska Department of Correctional Services



 Rosalyn Cotton
 Chair
 Nebraska Board of Parole

5/11/2016

Date

5/11/16

Date

Appendix 5

Table of Organization

The following chart sets forth the recommended Table of Organization for the parole supervision component of the Board of Parole. Boxes shaded in blue are existing filled positions. The boxes shaded in gray are not filled. The Management Analyst position being developed, the Business Manager position is a new position which will need to be created.

Nebraska
Board of Parole
Proposed Table
of Organization



Appendix 6

Evidence-Based Practices for Community Corrections

Two models for evidence-based practices for parole and probation supervision were published in 2004 and 2008. The first, published by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) presents a model for both probation and parole supervision that consists of eight principals.

The 8 Principles of Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections

1. Assess Risk and Needs with Actuarial Methods
2. Enhance Offenders' Intrinsic Motivation
3. Target Interventions
4. Train for Skills with Directed Practice
5. Use Positive Reinforcement
6. Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities
7. Measure Relevant Processes and Practices
8. Provide Measurement Feedback

Greater detail on the principles can be found in Bogue, Brad, Nancy Campbell, Mark Carey, Elyse Clawson, Dot Faust, Kate Florio, Lore Joplin, George Keiser, Billy Wasson & William Woodward (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

The second model of EBP, designed specifically for parole supervision, was published by the Urban Institute in 2008. The model consist of thirteen strategies, organized into two groups, organizational level strategies and case management level strategies.

The 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes

Organizational Level Strategies:

1. Define success as recidivism reduction and measure performance;
2. Tailor conditions of supervision;
3. Focus resources on moderate and high-risk parolees;
4. Front-load supervision resources;
5. Implement earned discharge;
6. Implement place-based supervision; and
7. Engage partners to expand intervention capacities.

Case Management Level Strategies:

8. Assess criminogenic risk and need factors;
9. Develop and implement supervision case plans that balance surveillance and treatment;
10. Involve parolees to enhance their engagement in assessment, case planning, and supervision;
11. Engage informal social controls to facilitate community reintegration;
12. Incorporate incentives and rewards into the supervision process; and
13. Employ graduated, problem-solving responses to violations of parole conditions in a swift and certain manner.

Detail on the thirteen strategies can be found in Solomon, Amy L., Jenny W. L. Osborne, Laura Winterfield, Brian Elderbroom, Peggy Burke, Richard P. Stroker, Edward E. Rhine & William D. Burrell (2008) *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute