

Technical Assistance Report

Marion County, Indiana

**Funded by the National Institute of Corrections
Technical Assistance No. 07C2029**

Mark Carey
Barbara Chatzkel
Mike Brown

July 2007

Disclaimer

RE: NIC Technical Assistance No. 07C2029

This technical assistance activity was funded by the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections. The Institute is a Federal agency established to provide assistance to strengthen state and local correctional agencies by creating more effective, human, safe and just correctional services.

The resource persons who provided the on site technical assistance did so through a cooperative agreement, at the request of the Marion County Justice Agency, and through the coordination of the national Institute of Corrections. The direct onsite assistance and the subsequent report are intended to assist the agency in addressing issues outlined in the original request and in efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the agency.

The contents of this document reflect the views of Mr. Mark Carey, Ms. Barbara Chatzkel and Mr. Mike Brown. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the national Institute of Corrections.

NIC Technical Assistance Request No. 07C2029 Marion County

Background

In May 2007, the Chairs of the Marion County (Indiana) Criminal Justice Planning Council and the Marion County (Indiana) Community Corrections Board requested that the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) provide technical assistance in preparing for and implementing a programmatic audit of Marion County Community Corrections. They requested assistance in conducting:

1. an overall review of the mission and goals of the Marion County Community Corrections program
2. an assessment of the individual components of the program to determine if the program and its components meet the goals and objectives of IC 11-12-1 et seq and the governing sections of the Indianan Administrative Code, and
3. work to determine how to best coordinate the operations of Marion County Community Corrections with other programs and initiatives of the Marion County justice system

In June 2007, NIC issued technical assistance authorizations to Mark Carey, Barbara Chatzkel, and Mike Brown as members of The Carey Group to assist in conducting a gap analysis and stakeholder interviews in preparation for a broader strategic planning effort.

A two-day on site technical assistance visitation was conducted on July 2 and 3, 2007 by Mark Carey, Barbara Chatzkel and Mike Brown. Their goals for the session were to interview justice system stakeholders in order to identify strengths in program delivery as well as gaps in the provision of offender services.

Attachment A, List of Justice Systems Stakeholders Interviewed, lists the justice system stakeholders and titles that we met with, while Attachment B, Interview Questions, is the list of questions asked of each of the stakeholders.

The team's observations and recommendations are outlined in the remainder of the report.

Indianapolis, the major city in Marion County, is the thirteenth largest city in the United States. The city and county work hard to meet the challenges of providing their residents with quality services and public safety.

The County has just completed 30 years of federal oversight in dealing with jail overcrowding. It has been a recurrent issue, consuming the attention of policy makers and justice system personnel (with one interviewee describing it as the longest federal oversight project in the nation's history). It provoked an extensive amount of planning and affected many agencies including Community Corrections. The County currently operates two separate jail facilities. The first facility, run by Sheriff employees, houses 1035 males and females. The second facility, run under contract to the Sheriff by CCA, houses 1212 males.

In the recent past, as a part of a countywide initiative, Community Corrections switched its risk/needs assessment too from the LSI-R to Compas. The switch was a result of training issues, the need for extensive quality assurance, and the requirement for trainers to be certified.

Within Community Corrections, there is a total of 75 full time equivalent (FTE) staff. Based on data provided by Community Corrections, the \$9,602,898 budget is comprised of the following allocations:

State Grant	\$	3,488,171
User Fees	\$	3,527,642
County General	\$	2,074,042
County Misdemeanant Fund	\$	196,638
Pre Trial Fund	\$	271,188
Criminal Justice Institute Fund	\$	45,217
TOTAL	\$	9,602.898

Most of the budget is allocated to vendor-run programs and facilities. A rough estimate is that 70 FTE and \$3 million is contract-related expenditures.

The Community Corrections agency fulfills a critical role in diverting offenders from incarceration, both locally and at the state. Its mission statement is as follows:

Marion County Community Corrections shall coordinate the County's efforts to divert defendants from incarceration and reintegrate them into the Community by creating opportunities to modify behavior with appropriate supervision and evidence based practices. These efforts are provided with respect for all individuals while being mindful of public safety.

Its primary services include:

- Work release (pre- and post-trial) which will be transferred to the Duvall Residential Center later in 2007
- Craine House Family Living Program (residential program for female offenders with children)
- Independent Residential Program

- Day Reporting Center (a multi-phase program that includes electronic monitoring, supervision, and programming)
- Daily Reporting (a less restrictive alternative to day reporting that includes a kiosk)
- Home Detention (including RF for adults and juveniles pre- and post-trial, a less restrictive form called Home Detention Curfew, and Home Incarceration program for those released from jail early to reduce overcrowding – Juvenile monitoring was recently assumed by the Court)
- GPS Monitoring
- Alcohol Monitoring – SCRAM
- Community Transition Program (a residential setting for those offenders transitioning from the Indiana Department of Correction)
- Community Corrections Center (an alternative to jail with limited programming)
- Mental Health Program (additional supervision and services for those offenders with an Axis 1 diagnosis of a severe and persistent mental illness)

Community Corrections reports its caseloads for GPS as 55-60 and for RF as 125-130. With the filling of currently approved vacancies, the RF caseload should be decreased to 95.

Recently, the Community Corrections Advisory board held a retreat to review the mission of Community Corrections and to look at professional standards. The agency is working on implementing some of the outcomes from that retreat.

Observations

Mission

Observation: Marion County Community Corrections has experienced an expansion of the organization's chartered mission, or mission creep, which is causing internal and external questioning as to its purpose

Throughout the stakeholder interviews it was clear that the mission of Community Corrections was generally understood to be first and foremost that of reducing reliance on incarceration. However, most of the stakeholders also expected Community Corrections to address behavioral change.

Community Corrections has experienced what appears to be mission creep in its operation of what is in essence a jail (i.e., the Corrections Center) and not really a diversion program. This has had the effect of altering the culture and mission of the agency. This mission expansion is not necessarily a misstep in that the County was in dire need for jail alternatives and Community Corrections took on

this responsibility. While it was helpful to the County the effect has been to divert Community Corrections' attention from its core services (diversion and behavioral change) especially in light of the condition of the facility and difficulty in proper operations.

In conjunction with the Community Corrections Advisory Board, there was a retreat that examined the mission and vision of Community Corrections. Additional work included a SWAT analysis and the beginnings of strategic planning. A proposed revised mission statement is being developed by staff for consideration by the Advisory Board.

Continuum of Services

Observation: Marion County enjoys a comprehensive continuum of intermediate sanctions within adult corrections.

Community Corrections provides a relatively diverse and complete array of services. Figure 1, Continuum of Services, below illustrates this continuum of services by intensity. The majority of offenders served within Community Corrections are in home detention. While the County enjoys a wide continuum the goal of behavioral change is only modestly being addressed when considering total numbers of offenders served (see Direct Service Section below). Attachment C, Staffing and Client Population by Major Programs, summarizes staffing and client capacity as well as population (as of August 7, 2007) in the major programs.

Daily Reporting	Home Detention	Day Reporting	Work Release	Correctional Center
-----------------	----------------	---------------	--------------	---------------------

Lowest Intensity

Highest Intensity

Figure 1, Continuum of Services

Marion County is partly managing its population through an innovative and flexible arrangement with the courts. As a result of the court order wording, Community Corrections is able to move clients up and down the continuum of services without judicial review. This is an extraordinarily useful tool to manage the population with the least amount of resources (i.e., returning to court or modifying orders whenever an offender moves into or out of Community Corrections programs).

Community Corrections has long-term contracts with a number of service providers. An example is Volunteers of America (VOA), whose program incorporates evidence-based practice and charges a very low per client cost.

Community Corrections has been creative in adding daily reporting and a rewards system including studio apartments and family passes.

Direct Service

Observation: The stakeholder confidence in Marion County Community Corrections has been eroding due to concerns around perceived lack of effective practices, inadequate follow through on alleged violations, ineffective use of evidence based practices, and difficulties in the facility and operations at the Community Corrections Center.

Several stakeholders expressed concern that the programming provided by Community Corrections produced very little behavioral change. The exceptions noted were the work in addiction and mental health services, cog groups in the Correctional center, and the VOA contract. These services are provided to a very small portion of the total Community Corrections client base. It was outside the scope of this report to review the quantity or quality of the services provided. However, a small sampling of cases was reviewed on July 3, 2007. The case file review revealed little systematic approach toward criminogenic factors. The results of the review are presented in Attachment D. Community Corrections administration is aware of this deficiency and has expressed sincere desire to move more deliberately in this direction. To their credit (and that of the Indiana Department of Corrections) there is an increased emphasis on evidence based practices. However, it cannot be stressed enough that this approach requires a dedicated and persistent series of activities and expansion of knowledge base and that it cannot be done if the agency is too busy putting out fires.

Community Corrections and Marion County needs to make a choice: do they want Community Corrections to do many things partly well (and therefore, some things not well), or do they want Community Corrections to do a selected number of things and do them well? Based on limited on-site review and discussions, it is our opinion that the Community Corrections is in need to retool their programming around evidence-based practices and that this will take a concerted and focused effort by administration. This will require that they have sufficient control over basic operational issues (that offenders are where they are supposed to be and that responses to violations are swift and effective). Introducing evidence based practices will cause short-term disruption in staff activities and such disruption will exacerbate any existing deficiencies. A plan should be put in place to limit any short term negative side-effects of retooling the agency. Some of the activities required under evidence based practices include:

- the consistent use of the risk/need assessment in making placement and programming decisions;
- more extensive use of cognitive behavioral programming;
- identification and focus on the top four criminogenic needs through case planning;
- use of criminogenic interventions for direct line staff;
- application of responsivity factors;
- use of motivational engagement techniques; and
- quality assurance and use of intermediate measures for improvement

A large portion of the eroding credibility of Community Corrections was reportedly due to a real or perceived lack of accountability in home detention. There was not time to validate this assertion within the scope of this technical assistance. Serious problems were perceived by some stakeholders around not notifying the proper individuals (including the victim) when violations of Home Detention by Domestic Violence offenders occurred. Instances were related of the Community Supervision Manager not looking for an offender once the strap was cut. The reason given was that “we did not have good victim information” when the information was reportedly available in the file. Community Corrections has been meeting with stakeholders around these issues and, again to their credit, have been making changes. Some of the stakeholders have noted that “things have improved.” However, there was a lack of confidence that the issues have truly been resolved and concerns expressed that they may still be happening but are just unknown to them at this time.

A critical part of any correctional programming is that of quality assurance. There must be processes in place to ensure that the risk/need assessment tools are being conducted properly, that similar assessment scores are given by different assessors, that the cognitive behavioral courses are being delivered according to the model, that the top criminogenic needs are being met in case planning, etc. Community Corrections acknowledged that they were in need of implementing quality assurance mechanisms throughout the department.

Marion County Community Corrections Center (MCCCC)

Observation: Community Corrections has made improvements in the facility and operations of the Corrections Center and more are required.

Community Corrections was appropriately given accolades and credited with a “can do” attitude by stakeholders in their helping the overall county jail overcrowding conditions by opening the Corrections Center. As noted previously, however, the facility is in disrepair, and there have been contraband, staffing, and operational issues. In January, 2007 the Indiana Department of Corrections conducted a facility report indicating the need for a number of structural and operational changes.

The consultants conducted a site visit. It was observed that the Corrections Center appeared to be much improved from the impression given from the January 2007 Department of Corrections report. The facility was not crowded, the building was clean, and the noise level was reasonable. Most of the residents were on their bunks and no programming was provided while we were present. The facility still needs significant work but it appeared in decent order given the structural problems noted in the DOC report. This technical assistance did not include a detailed review of the Center's operations.

Communications and Coordination

Observation: Community Corrections is perceived to be communicating and coordinating effectively with some stakeholders and is ineffective with others

Many of the stakeholders interviewed spoke highly of the Community Corrections services and their communication, noting that they were responsive to justice system needs and eager to assist the County and Courts however they can. Many noted how deferential the agency was to the courts which was both positive (meeting their needs) and negative (not controlling the quality of services due to system overload). Most of these positive comments came from individuals who did not have personal, direct knowledge of the day-to-day operations. In fact, it was observed that the further away the stakeholder was (closer to policy but further from direct service), the more positive they felt about Community Corrections' services; the closer to direct service, the more critical the stakeholder was.

Providing information to the courts and other stakeholders as to the degree to which Community Corrections intervention is making a difference in long term public safety would help solidify its value-add to the correctional system. This will require not just statistics but an evaluation process to verify a causal link between practices and outcomes.

While Community Corrections received high marks from many stakeholders, they also were sharply criticized by those closest to the operations. Critics described Community Corrections as disorganized and rudderless. Community Corrections absence from recent meetings led to the comment that they were not a team player in some joint endeavors. In addition, multiple stakeholders interviewed cited Community Corrections' poor relationship and coordination with both the Department of Corrections (DOC) and Probation. This was reported by at least two stakeholder interviews to have affected state funding and is perceived to be creating strain at the state policy level.

The Criminal Justice Planning Council (CJPC) was created by county ordinance 283-221. Its general mission is to "identify the needs and problems of their

particular offices, agencies and courts to suggest answers and help find solutions to those needs and problems. It shall be the mission of the CJPC to study, forecast and make recommendations to the city-county council regarding both short-term and long-term needs of law enforcement and the criminal justice system. The ordinance also enumerates twenty additional goals for the Council ranging from advising agencies on improved policies to suggesting and recommending standards for the administration of the criminal justice system. None of these goals spoke directly to the goals of communication and coordination.

Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB)

Observation: The CCAB contributes to the vitality of Community Corrections through its quarterly meetings (e.g., review of mission, program additions, and funding); however, it does not provide needed day-to-day operational assistance

The Community Corrections Advisory Board is functioning as their name implies, in an advisory capacity. It is not set up as a Board of Directors where policy and personnel issues are reviewed and operational policies endorsed. As a result, it is somewhat removed from organizational details. This is consistent with their set-up in that the Board meets quarterly and does not have routine, functioning sub-committees that do work between meetings.

The Advisory Board members interviewed demonstrated a strong interest in the success of Community Corrections and commitment toward its vision. Others expressed a perception that it was primarily a “rubber stamping” Board with little influence. A review of the minutes shows relatively poor attendance at the sessions and little evidence of decisions and discussions being supported by data or outcome measures.

The fact that the Advisory Board does not function as a Board of Directors and meets only quarterly means that there is a strong reliance on the effectiveness of Community Corrections leadership. The Director has been vigorous in his pursuit of building the Community Corrections agency and in responding to the needs of the courts and County. He has reportedly added the next tier of management to reflect his vision for the agency.

However, currently, there is no process for conducting an annual performance evaluation of the Director of his progress against Advisory Board approved performance goals. Additionally, it is not clear how the Director receives work direction on operational matters requiring corrections knowledge. The statute states that the Director’s employment is nominated by the CCAB and approved by the City County Council.

\

Funding and Staffing

Observation: There are reportedly significant issues related to adequacy of funding, control over intake, staff turnover, staff training, and accountability issues

A number of issues were raised through the interviews and in the review of the documents. All of these issues were known to Community Corrections administration and efforts are underway to address them. They include the following:

Turnover: There are exceptionally high turnover rates among staff within Community Corrections. It was reported that it is not unusual for an offender to have three or more officers handling their case over time. In 2006, a startling 64.4% of the staff turned over. In the first quarter of 2007, 14.6% have already turned over. Salary adjustments were recently completed within the Home Detention area. This should improve employee retention. However, staff turnover for many reasons, salary being only one. Exit interviews are one way to determine the cause for attrition. Many organizations are able to retain their employees through strong vision, management, and intrinsic rewards. It is possible that the salary adjustment will not suffice. It is strongly recommended that this issue be addressed more fully. Research has clearly demonstrated that recidivism reduction outcomes will not be obtained if there are high attrition rates. Corrections is a relationship oriented business and change will not occur without continuity.

Funding: Given the growing caseloads and the stable budgets, Community Corrections may be under-resourced. Further work needs to be done before we can validate that this is fact (see also the paragraph below on proper workload size). Sometimes it is a matter of how staff is utilized and whether efficiency measures are in place. It should also be noted that there was some opinion that there is too heavy an emphasis on user fees, sometimes to the detriment of the best interest of client success. Funding issues will require further analysis.

Staffing and culture: Concern was expressed over the nature of the existing agency culture, namely that it was overly law enforcement in its orientation. While holding offenders accountable is a necessary part of correctional supervision it cannot be the only focus. The research has identified five key set of staff characteristics to be successful in behavioral change. As such, a review of the existing culture is necessary along with a plan to ensure that the programs are staffed by individuals who have the skills and

predispositions to reduce recidivism over the long term. This is partly a recruitment and training issue. It is also a management issue in that management staff needs to be vigilant in reshaping behaviors and attitudes that are inconsistent with the direction of the agency. This will not happen by chance but require insight and persistence. Current administration efforts are supporting this shift as, for example, even in the simple renaming of positions (from home detention officers to community supervision managers).

Training: As the agency moves toward evidence based practices, it will be critical that training needs be fulfilled. The areas below are categories of training needed if behavioral change is a goal. In addition, the Community Corrections Department was offered training on how to testify in court by the district attorney's office. It is recommended that these and other trainings that demonstrate professionalism be adopted. A training plan should be put in place that captures what is needed and what the priorities should be.

- EBP principles (introduction)
- Use of assessment tools
- Core correctional practices
- Motivational interviewing
- Effective case management
- Cog programming (specific to the intervention)
- Aftercare planning/transition
- Relapse prevention
- Line supervisor training such as a curriculum entitled ASSiSST

Accountability measures: Just as critical are issues around accountability. Most of the critical comments of Community Corrections were really about accountability. Perceptions were raised about line supervisor follow through and overall agency accountability of its staff. This requires immediate attention.

Quality assurance and fidelity: It is not enough to train staff and implement programs. Most programs that fail to reach their intended outcomes do so, in part, because they do not pay attention to the intermediate process measures and quality assurance requirements. An entire curriculum is available around fidelity for evidence based practices.

Recommendations

The reader should be mindful of the limited nature of this initial report. It is a result of a two day site visit and a review of documentation. More detailed recommendations would be forthcoming if more information could have been gathered over a longer period of time and by using additional processes. This should be viewed as a preliminary, planning report that sets the stage for what should be analyzed next and what process be used to develop specific recommendations. It is basically a plan for a plan. The recommendations below provide a pathway to establish concrete action steps.

Finally, the Marion County Criminal Justice Planning Council and the Marion County Advisory Board should be applauded for initiating this request for National Institute of Corrections' assistance. It takes courage to ask an outsider to review the inner workings of an agency to determine how things can be improved. This report is not designed as an expose, but to lay out an evidence-based plan for improved services. The Community Corrections administration and those interviewed appeared open, honest, and forthright in their opinions which made this report much easier to complete.

It is recommended that Marion County Community Corrections complete a three part process improvement plan described below. Some of these corrective actions can be implements by Marion County. Others should be done by a corrections profession(s) whose expertise is aligned with the responsibility.

Phase One: Preparation

Complete the following tasks:

- 1. Conduct a cultural assessment** by surveying staff through the web based Likert Organizational Climate Survey that measures key organizational characteristics necessary to be present in order for an agency to be highly productive and for an agency to be fully prepared to make changes toward improved effectiveness. It takes fifteen minutes to fill out and asks the respondents to mark on a scale of 1-20 how important certain organizational characteristics are to them (e.g., does communication flow both upward and downward, the degree to which ideas are listened to, etc.) Staff identifies the degree to which each of the twenty organizational characteristics (which represents the ideal work environment for them) should be present and then mark on the same 1-20 point scale what actually exists. The goal is find out how large the gaps are between ideal and what exists. If Marion County

Community Corrections is going to be successful with changes it needs to understand what the existing culture is from the staff's perspective. The data is compared to Community Corrections jurisdictions nationwide.

2. Complete a staff attitude/belief assessment such as one developed by Dr. Simourd. This survey measures the relationship between staff attitudes/beliefs and outcomes. She compiled some of the best known, validated instruments that measure correctional staff beliefs about the work they are in and the levels of job satisfaction, stress, and commitment. The total survey will take about thirty minutes to complete on the web. The specific topic areas addressed are:

- a. Beliefs/Attitudes around rehabilitation
- b. Beliefs/Attitudes around custody
- c. Beliefs/Attitudes that address how staff approach their work
- d. Attitude toward work
- e. Job Satisfaction
- f. Personal Growth and Challenge
- g. Job Stress

- h. Organizational Commitment
- i. Staff turnover

3. Provide evidence based practices training for all staff in the organization and including those under contract with Community Corrections. This two day training consists of an overview of effective correctional practices aimed at risk reduction and provides staff with knowledge and an introduction to necessary skills to affect long term behavioral change. Actual skill-based training would follow (see Phase Three). It is recommended that the administration, management, and line supervisor training receive a one-day training before the two day training is provided to the direct service staff. Additional stakeholder training is recommended at a later point.

4. Complete a final review and determination of the mission and vision statement begun by the Advisory Board at the recent retreat. Once the revised mission and vision statement is ready for distribution, hold educational sessions on the changes with all levels of the organization. On a yearly basis, review the mission statement with all staff and solicit input.

Phase Two: Data and Information Collection

1. Complete a workload analysis (i.e., time study) of the offender supervision positions. A workload analysis will determine what the proper caseload size is for each of the major supervision positions and will help

ensure quality of service, accountability measures, and funding requirements for the agency. This analysis requires a quantifiable process that examines the specific duties expected to be performed and time allotted for each duty.

2. **Conduct staff interviews** in order to determine what are the existing contributors to a positive, effective work environment and detractors. It is recommended that these interviews be done after the two staff surveys are completed and communicated.
3. **Conduct the CPAI (Correctional Program Assessment Inventory)** on the primary programs in Community Corrections that seek to change offender behavior. The CPAI is an internationally recognized process to determine to degree to which an existing programs are implementing the practices that will result in reduced recidivism.
4. **Conduct exit interviews of staff that leave the agency.** These interviews are designed to ascertain the real, practical reasons why staff are leaving. They need to be conducted in a specific environment (done by someone not in the chain of command who will provide neutral feedback).
5. **Develop a governance structure plan.** Review the existing Advisory Board structure to determine what method of governance the Board should adopt. It is currently operating in an advisory capacity. However, issues with Community Corrections may be addressed more quickly and readily with an alternative structure. If it is determined that the Advisory Board structure should remain as is, then an alternative system should be put in place to ensure that some entity beyond just the Community Corrections Director is aware of communication and performance issues.
6. **Develop intermediate outcome measures and targets.** Specific critical success factors should be adopted. These evidence-based success factors should be closely aligned with the mission of the agency. Administration and supervisors should be using these measures and targets to closely manage the operations. Measures are critical to determine the effectiveness of program delivery and utilization of funds.
7. **Conduct job shadowing and direct service observation** to determine the level of staff skills, workload, and day-to-day pressures. This observation by a consultant will provide the Director with outside expertise on the efficacy of existing staff interventions and possible solutions to any problem areas.

Phase Three: Planning and Policy Implementation

- 1. Complete a two year action plan around evidence based practices.**
This action plan should include specific, concrete steps to move the agency closer to those interventions that reduce recidivism. This plan should include skill based training around the delivery of the mission.
- 2. Develop a one-year plan around the topics of:**
 - a. Organizational development**
 - b. Communication (internal and with stakeholders)**
 - c. Training**
 - d. Staff accountability structure**
 - e. Staff retention**
- 3. Establish workload (and to the degree possible, caseload) caps** and a process to control the amount of intake for which services are provided. Professional standards and capacity targets need to be established for each primary service area.
- 4. Make a final decision on whether Community Corrections should continue to operate the Community Corrections Center. This is recommended in Phase Three because there are a number of data collection and training efforts that need to be put in place.**
- 5. Complete and implement a fidelity and quality assurance plan** so that the risk/need assessment, motivation interviewing, cognitive behavioral programs, case planning, and other key areas of intervention are being delivered in the manner required to be effective.

Attachment A – List of Justice Systems Stakeholders Interviewed

Name		Position
Robert	Altice	Judge, Marion Superior Court
Brian	Barton	Director, Marion County Community Corrections
Robert	Bingham	Chief Probation Officer, Marion County Superior Courts
Tim	Campbell	President, Volunteers of America (VOA) Indiana
Stephanie	Carroway	Deputy Prosecutor, Prosecutor's Office
David	Cook	Chief Public Defender, Chair of the Community Corrections Advisory Board, Criminal Justice Planning council member
Emil	Daggy	Captain, Marion County Sheriff's Department
Bill	Dishman	Deputy Director, Marion County Community Corrections
Chuck	Eid	Deputy Director, Marion County Community Corrections
Jack	Geilker	Justice Agency, FTA Officer
Matthew	Gerber	Marion County Public Defender, D Felony Division Leader
Aaron	Haith	General Counsel, The Council, City of Indianapolis – Marion County
Angie	Hensley	Program Manager, Community Corrections, Indiana Department of Correction
Glenn	Lawrence	Court Administrator, Marion Superior Court
Bruce	Lemmon	Deputy Commissioner, Division of Re-entry and Community Programs, Indiana Department of Correction
Linda	Major	Deputy Prosecutor, Prosecutor's Office
Jerry	McCroy	Executive Director, Marion County Justice Agency
Deana	McMurray	Director, Community Corrections, Indiana Department of Correction
Marilyn	Moores	Judge, Marion County Superior Court, Community Corrections Advisory Board member
Mary	Moriarity Adams	City of Indianapolis and Marion County City-County Council, Chair of the Public Safety Committee
William	Nelson	Judge, Marion Superior Court, Community Corrections Board member
Catherine	Parker	Grants Director, City Controller's Office, City of Indianapolis

Name		Position
Becky	Pierson-Tracy	Judge, Marion Superior Court
Kelly	Roth	Deputy Prosecutor, Prosecutor's Office
Mark	Smith	Deputy Director, Marion County Community Corrections
Mark	Smith	Deputy Director, Marion County Community Corrections
Gary	Tingle	Deputy Chief, Commander Marion County Jail, Marion County Sheriff's Department
D. Michael	Wallman	Board Member, Marion County Community Corrections Board
Sam	Walton	Justice Agency, FTA Officer
Heather	Welch	Judge, Marion Superior Court
Molly	Wright	Marion County Public Defender, Misdemeanor and Domestic Violence Supervisor
James	Wyatt	Indianapolis-Marion County Police Department (IMPD)
David	Wyser	Prosecutor's Office, Advisory Board member

Attachment B – Interview Questions – On Site July 2-3, 2007

1. From the perspective of your organization, what is the primary role that Community Corrections plays in Marion County?
2. What is Community Corrections doing exceptionally well? How do you know that?
3. What is Community Corrections doing not so well? How do you know that?
4. If you could change one thing about Community corrections, what would it be? How important is that? How urgent is it?
5. How well does Community Corrections coordinate and communicate with the rest of the criminal justice system? How well does the rest of the system coordinate and communicate with Community Corrections?
6. Anything else you'd like us to know?

Attachment C – Staffing and Client Population by Major Programs

Lowest Intensity

Highest Intensity

Daily Reporting	Home Detention	Day Reporting	Work Release	Correctional Center
-----------------	----------------	---------------	--------------	---------------------



<p>Daily Reporting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kiosk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 FTE 170 capacity 198 census</p>	<p>Home Detention</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GPS, SCRAM, RF, Home Reward</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53-53 FTE 1799 clients 1532 census</p>	<p>Day Reporting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work Release Lite/Home Detention</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 FTE 50 capacity 50 census</p>	<p>Work Release</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Riverside</p> <p style="text-align: center;">115 males post trial 101 census</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Work Release Craine</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6 females 3 census</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Work Release DuVall (not yet opened)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Potential + 15 FTE 350 capacity</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Work Release VOA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4 FTE for all Work Release 25 females 26 census</p>	<p>Jail Overcrowding Relief</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Community Corrections Center</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8 FTE 210 capacity 152 census</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Independent Residential</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Blue Triangle</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20 males & females 17 census</p>
<p>Mental Health Programming</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1.5 FTE 50 census</p>				

Census figures as of August 7, 2007

**Attachment D – Case File Review
Conducted July 3, 2007**

Review Sample -- 8 files

Case type	Chronos? + detailed - cursory	Risk/need Assessment?	PSI/psych eval?	Case plan with criminogenic needs addressed?	Notes
CC	Y+	N	N	Y	Treatment progress notes
CC	Y-	N	N	N	
CC	Y-	N	N	Y	
DR	Y+	N	Y (no crim. needs)	N	References treatment classes
DR	Y+	N	Y (PSI and psych)	N	References treatment classes
WR	na	N	Y	N	
WR	Na	N	Y	N	
WR	N	Y-LSI-R	Y	Y	Treatment progress notes

Corrections Center has an alcohol/drug addiction program and the service provider has their own case file which was not reviewed

Attachment E – Components of Community Corrections

Community Corrections Mission

