

*D r a f t    5 - 6 - 99*

**Intermediate Sanctions  
for Women Offenders**

**Project Overview and Analysis**

**1991 - 1999**

# **Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders**

## **Project Overview and Analysis**

**1991 - 1999**

**Prepared for The National Institute of Corrections  
by Lori Kenney  
with assistance from Teri Martin, Ph.D. and Anne McDiarmid**

Guidance and editorial oversight provided throughout by Phyllis Modley, Community Corrections Division, National Institute of Corrections

This report has been prepared under NIC Cooperative Agreement #99C07GIE7. Opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the official position of the United States Department of Justice or of the National Institute of Corrections.

### **Acknowledgements:**

Special thanks go to all the individuals at the various sites who contributed their time and thoughtful review in phone interviews with the author discussing the intricacies of undertaking a policy driven process on Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders.

Heartfelt thanks also go to all the faculty and advisors who contributed their time and energy in thoughtful analysis of what worked and how to improve this process for future users. Linda Adams deserves a special acknowledgement for providing a conceptual framework and dynamic facilitation for the project's first three rounds.

Lori Kenney, Mediator/Facilitator  
3252 N.E. Flanders Street  
Portland, OR 97232  
Phone: (503) 235-6645  
Fax: (503) 235-6585  
E-mail: KENNEY@coho.net

Teri Martin Ph.D., Principal  
Law & Policy Associates  
1315 N.W. 185th Street, PMB 120  
Aloha, OR 97006  
Phone: (503) 690-6110  
Fax: (503) 645-2170  
E-mail: LPATKM@cs.com

Anne McDiarmid  
former Project Officer for NIC;  
currently: Criminal Justice Consultant;  
Supervisor, Program Unit  
Dakota County Community Corrections  
201 N. Concord Exchange  
South St. Paul, MN 55075  
Phone: (651) 552-3087  
Fax: (651) 552-3070  
E-mail: ANNEMCD@surfree.com

## Table of Contents

Statement from George Keiser, NIC	<b>6</b>
I. Executive Summary	<b>7</b>
II. Suggestions for Using This Document	<b>10</b>
III. Scope of the Project	<b>12</b>
Why Get Involved in Intermediate Sanctions For Women Offenders?	12
Project Benefits/Outcomes	13
Developing a Common Language	15
Project History	16
Directory of All Sites/Timeframe	18
IV. Project and Process Description	<b>21</b>
Clarify Project Purpose and Outcomes	21
Establish the Policy Group	22
Attend to Meeting Logistics	24
Build Information to Support the Change Process	25
Select and Advocate for Change Targets	28
Develop and Market Change Proposals	29
Implement Changes in Policies, Practices	

	and Programs	30
V.	Site Experiences	<b>32</b>
	National Meetings and Other Training Opportunities	32
	Site Experiences, Rounds 1 - 3	33
	Update on Current Round/Sites	48
VI.	Summary/Analysis	<b>55</b>
	Challenges Encountered and Insights Gained	55
	Findings and Recommendations for Future Sites and Others Considering Undertaking A Similar Process	69
VII.	Reference List	<b>75</b>
VIII.	Appendices	<b>78</b>
	A. Contact List	78
	B. National Meetings	87
	C. Site Descriptions	91
	D. Glossary of Common Terms	118
	E. List of Sample Documents	123

George Keiser  
Chief, Community Corrections Division,  
National Institute of Corrections

Though women offenders comprise a relatively small percentage of the entire offender population (roughly 21% of those under community supervision), this does not justify using the same approaches with women that are used with the larger male offender population. It is clear that men and women do not respond in the same way to traditional sanctioning approaches, and that increasing the effectiveness of our interventions with both men and women requires that we pay attention to these differences.

Prior to coming to the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), I had first-hand exposure to the striking differences between men and women offenders while serving in five different Iowa correctional institutions in various roles from correctional officer to superintendent of a women's reformatory. At NIC, it became clear that as the number of women supervised by local, state and federal corrections systems was rapidly increasing, so too was interest in finding better ways to intervene with women. NIC chose to invest in the Intermediate Sanctions for Women (ISWO) project in response to this emerging concern. The primary goal of the ISWO project is to assist jurisdictions in their efforts to enhance the likelihood of women offenders' success.

NIC challenges our nationwide clientele to analyze and articulate the policies underlying their justice system decisionmaking and program development. We want offenders to be successful in meeting meaningful requirements of their sentence, and therefore we need to design sanctioning approaches that are fair and just, and increase the likelihood of successful outcomes. We also need to collaborate with our communities to define "success" for offenders, for agencies and for our society.

The ISWO project is based on this fundamental premise: that sound policy must inform and drive all criminal justice and corrections systems. The project provides guidance for jurisdictions to develop policies which define desired outcomes and then shape program and service delivery strategies to achieve those outcomes for women offenders. By demonstrating the power of this policymaking process in designing sanctions and services that work for women offenders, the ISWO project is intended to serve as a model not only for designing gender-responsive approaches but also for thoughtful policy development processes that can improve outcomes for all offenders.

# **I. Executive Summary**

The Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders (ISWO)<sup>1</sup> project, in process at this writing for almost ten years, was initiated by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to address the needs and risks of an expanding population of offenders that had gone relatively unnoticed. The purpose of this project is to develop effective policy to increase the success of women offenders, based on a better understanding of the impacts of current sanctioning systems on women offender's success, and an increased awareness of the particular characteristics and circumstances of women offenders. NIC's specific goals are to build capacity and support jurisdictions as they 1.) examine women offender issues on a system-wide basis, and 2.) craft and implement policies that will support the success of women offenders.

NIC promoted accomplishing these goals through a systems planning process supported by rigorous analysis of information about women offenders and the policies, practices and programs that affect them. It became clear to NIC that few jurisdictions had any significant data on women offenders in the community, and most jurisdictions were making decisions about them based on assumptions derived mainly from anecdotal evidence. While sites varied in their ability and willingness to fully engage in policy development in a systems context, they all cited benefits from the work, some of which were unforeseen by both the site and NIC. This process has been and continues to be an enormous learning experience for everyone involved, including NIC.

The thirteen jurisdictions that have participated in this project to date include counties and states, both urban and rural, ranging in population from under 200,000 to over five million. The criminal justice systems of these sites vary widely in their organizational structures and statutory frameworks. Though the differences among the jurisdictions explains some of the variance in their experiences of the ISWO process, the adaptability of the process in a wide range of contexts has also been demonstrated.

The framework for the process is conveyed to jurisdictions' participants both through on-site technical assistance and through multi-site training meetings. Trainings build on one another and include a blend of skill and capacity building as well as work sessions for the sites and opportunities to share information among the sites.

Sites are asked to first clarify their purpose in participating in the project by identifying desired outcomes, including both product and process outcomes. The primary product is to develop articulated policy on sanctioning women offenders to enhance their success. Interim product outcomes include:

1. creating a decisionmaking map<sup>2</sup>
2. assembling data on the flow of women offenders through the justice system
3. developing a profile of women offender characteristics
4. developing a resource inventory
5. developing change strategies and ways to measure success

Process outcomes include:

1. building capacity and learning how to engage in systems planning
2. establishing networks for sharing information, locally and nationally

Once jurisdictions clarify their purposes, they establish a policy group comprised of key decisionmakers and stakeholders, and identify leadership and project staff support. Workplans are developed to provide roadmaps for progress, and regular meetings are scheduled for work sessions and monitoring of progress. The core of the process involves building information to support the change process. Information on the flow of women through the criminal justice system and on rationales and processes for decisionmaking, profiles of women offenders and inventories of available resources are analyzed to identify change target areas. Proposals for change are developed, costs and benefits are clearly

defined and tested, and those proposals are marketed to policymakers. A successful culmination of the process is implementing well-founded changes in policies, practices and programs that demonstrably improve outcomes for women offenders.

While sites varied widely in the extent to which they implemented such system-wide changes, a universal outcome has been greater understanding of the particular needs and circumstances of women offenders. In many cases, judges and other key decisionmakers found that through the ISWO process they learned a great deal about the ways their decisions interacted with others to create sometimes unintended consequences. In most jurisdictions, significant progress was made toward articulating and implementing clear policy to more effectively sanction and serve women offenders.

This structured, policy-making process pulls together the multiplicity of people, agencies and organizations who affect and serve women offenders and engages them in a collaborative decision-making process. This process draws on their collective wisdom, and challenges them to continuously question assumptions and search for creative system-wide strategies to improve their success with women offenders. Continuing alliances and trust-based relationships are established and strengthened, and

lines of communication that can enhance the quality of decisions are opened.

Perhaps the single greatest challenge participants experienced in this project was to leave their normal task/program oriented approaches behind and to reframe their thinking to allow engagement in a system-wide planning process. Policy development in a systems context requires policy makers to educate themselves about the circumstances of women offenders and how the current system treats them at each decision point. This process takes patience and the courage to challenge deeply held assumptions. Those who were successful in this endeavor found it personally gratifying and professionally enlightening. While the primary beneficiaries of this project are women offenders, their children and the jurisdictions that serve them, this process has proven to be a powerful means of formulating and advocating system-wide change that can be productively applied across a broad range of policy areas.

1. There has been some discussion about whether to refer to women in conflict with the law as women offenders or female offenders. While the term 'female offender' is grammatically correct, many think it is too impersonal, and find the term 'woman offender' richer and more respectful. For this reason, the term 'woman offender' is used throughout this document.

2. See Chapter IV., "Build Information to Support the Change Process," for a description of a 'decisionmaking map'.



## II. Suggestions for Using This Document

### Audience

This document is intended for policymakers interested in replicating the process developed by NIC on Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders, or in implementing any other structured policy change process. It may also be useful to practitioners, trainers and service providers.

### Methods

The information presented in this document is the result of the following:

- a review of file documents spanning the life of the project
- interviews with participants from all sites, faculty, consultants, and NIC staff
- the author's participation in a national meeting to get feedback from current sites

Information learned from the above activities was analyzed and synthesized to identify common themes, recurring issues, and keys for success.

### Organization of Document

The document begins by laying out a general framework for the ISWO process in Section III. "Scope of the Project" by describing the purpose, benefits, outcomes, and a historical context. An ideal process is described in Section IV. "Project and Process Description", followed by the real life experiences of participating sites in Section V. "Site Experiences". A summary of what we learned by doing this process, including recommendations for future sites and others considering undertaking this process is found in Section VI. "Summary/Analysis." A reference list is presented in Section VII. and Appendices in Section VIII. include a "Contact List" of all participants, including faculty, consultants and NIC staff, further information on "National Meetings", detailed "Site Descriptions", a

"Glossary of Common Terms", and information on where to obtain "Sample Documents".

### Purposes

This document has four central purposes:

1. Historical/Informational Review. To provide a detailed account of the ISWO project for criminal justice professionals and other individuals interested in learning more about developing sanctioning policies and programs which will achieve better outcomes for women under supervision.
2. Scope of Work. To provide a realistic sense of the work involved in this policy driven approach and to understand both the potential benefits and stumbling blocks.
3. Guidance. To provide a roadmap for jurisdictions who wish to embark on a similar process, whether working with women offenders or any population being served through a combination of government and community service providers. Information included in this document provides background on how to initiate and sustain system-wide change efforts.
4. References. To link persons interested in undertaking a similar process to the experiences of other jurisdictions by providing contact names and references for additional materials.

### **III. Scope of the Project**

#### **Why Get Involved in Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders?**

It is this initiative's focus on women that distinguishes it from most other NIC-sponsored projects. Though the collaborative policy development process encouraged by the project has been productively applied in diverse policy arenas, it is essential to developing cohesive systems change strategies beneficial to women offenders. The multifaceted needs of women offenders require the kind of collaborative planning efforts and the crossing of traditional agency boundaries that are encouraged and sustained by the project.

The ISWO project also focuses on applying knowledge about women's particular developmental pathways. The work of Carol Gilligan in 1982, Jean Baker Miller (1976), and others from the Stone Center at Wellesley College has increased knowledge and awareness of the psycho-social development of women. Miller first challenged the assumption that the goal of all adult development is to become autonomous and independent. She emphasized that women develop through connection rather than through individuation. Therefore, changing women's lives for the better requires changing their relationships with community, family, friends and others. Many women offenders benefit greatly from having a mentor; however, women offenders often have a lack of trust in other women, including women authority figures.

Later researchers point out that differences in style and expression between men and women must not be confused with differences in men's and women's capacities or abilities (Tavris, 1992). Meda Chesney-Lind, Stephanie Covington, Joanne Belknap and Barbara Bloom are researchers and writers who have worked to define gender-specific

programming that is responsive to the particular developmental and relational characteristics of women and girls in the criminal justice system.

Increasing awareness of the particular characteristics of women offenders in comparison to men offenders further underscore the need to develop policies and programs tailored to women's risk and need profile. Women offenders are more likely to have alcohol and drug abuse problems. BJS reports that three-fourths of women inmates in state correctional facilities are the primary caretaker of children. Women offenders are more likely to be receiving welfare assistance than men offenders, and are more likely to have changed jobs multiple times before going to prison. At least half of women offenders in prison for violent offenses were abused physically or sexually prior to their imprisonment. In general, women offenders have greater needs and present a lower risk of violence than men offenders, predominantly having convictions of drug abuse, forgery and welfare fraud.

Some of the impetus for the ISWO project also came from the high rate of growth of women offender populations. In 1989, two years before the beginning of the ISWO project, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reported that women inmates in federal and state prisons had increased 202% since 1980, and comprised 4.7% of the country's total inmate population. In contrast, men inmates increased by 112% during the same time period. Mandatory drug laws came into effect during the span of this project, and resulted in an increase in drug arrests for all offenders, including women.

#### **Project Benefits/Outcomes**

The purpose of this project is to encourage local jurisdictions "to study the effect of the current overall sanctioning system on women offenders, to assess the effectiveness of current practices in achieving sanctioning outcomes with women, and to design policies and practices to close identified gaps".<sup>3</sup>

The primary goal is to develop articulated policy on the processing and sanctioning of women offenders in order to increase their success in the community. Specific goals include:

1. To stimulate the use of an expanded range of intermediate sanctions and services for women offenders.
2. To clarify what is appropriately viewed as a sanction and what are primarily supportive services and interventions.
3. To define and encourage development of gender-specific intermediate sanctions.
4. To establish more effective criminal justice processes for making decisions about the sanctioning of women offenders.
5. To document the process of policy development, analysis and achievements.
6. To learn more about how policy development work can best be accomplished.

This project yields a number of benefits and outcomes; some are tangible "product" outcomes and some are "process" oriented and less easily measured. The process outcomes are important because they contribute to institutionalizing the work of the project in very important ways and provide a foundation for new ways of doing business that contributes to desired results.

### **Process Outcomes**

The following "process" outcomes exemplify the benefits of engaging in this work. Not all were achieved by each site.

- Establishing networks for sharing information (both inside and outside the criminal justice system), locally and nationally
- Establishing a productive policy team, determining *what* will be accomplished and *who* will participate, through open dialogue
- Building capacity of the team and its staff to do this work
- Developing leadership and support
- Establishing policymaker and staff roles and decisionmaking structures
- Understanding what strategic planning is (and what it isn't)
- Building a common language
- Identifying strengths in the criminal justice system upon which to build new strategies
- Establishing a commitment to continue this work after the project ends

### **Product Outcomes**

The following is a comprehensive listing of products which can be achieved through this policy development process. Typically a site focuses on generating those products which are most essential to its planning goals.

A positive vision statement that describes the preferred future "intermediate sanctions" system for women defendants and offenders who are sanctioned, supervised and served by community-based supervision and treatment programs.

Statement of issues, concerns and problems that motivated policymakers to initiate this planning process.

A detailed description or "map" of the justice system's decisionmaking process, focusing on how it affects the flow of women offenders through the system. For each decision point, the map should describe:

- who makes the decision
- what information they use
- formal and informal decision rules
- decision options
- impacts of the decision on non-justice agencies
- number and type of decisions made during recent years

A glossary of terms that can promote a common understanding of the language used by those making decisions about or providing service to women offenders (e.g. "gender-specific", "sanctions", "risk", "needs", "criminogenic").

A library of reference material on women offenders and promising approaches to their sanctioning and treatment that can enhance understanding and promote positive changes in policies and programs.

A directory of the jurisdictions' available sources of information on its women offenders that can provide a guide for improving the reliability, relevance and efficiency of existing automated and paper record-keeping systems.

A comprehensive quantitative and qualitative profile of the demographic, criminal history, risk

and need characteristics of women offenders, focusing on women passing through the decision points most relevant to the jurisdiction's identified issues and goals (e.g., arrest, pretrial release, sentencing, and/or probation/parole sanctioning).

An inventory of programs and services available to women offenders that assesses not only their capacity but also the extent to which they are gender-specific in their service delivery.

Forecasts of the impacts of policy options detailing the number and type of women affected, costs and savings, and other resource implications, so that policymakers can select the most cost-effective options for an optimal change strategy.

Development of new or improved criminal justice processes and sanctioning options for community supervision of women offenders.

## **Developing a Definition of Intermediate Sanctions**

There is no single, standard definition, but rather multiple meanings of the phrase 'intermediate sanctions.' Some of these are listed below to illustrate the diversity of meanings and factors that affect the ways 'intermediate sanctions' is understood.

- 'Intermediate sanction' sometimes means a stand-alone or complete sanction imposed as a sentencing disposition and not a feature of a sentencing sanction. For it to be 'intermediate', this sanction must be positioned along a continuum of severity (degree of punishment and/or intensity of supervision, incapacitation, or treatment) somewhere between the traditional sanctions of regular probation supervision and a jail or prison term.

- Often 'intermediate sanction' refers to a feature of a sanction or program, or a mechanism by which the sanction is enforced/monitored, e.g., electronic monitoring as an aspect of house arrest or home detention.
- Sometimes 'intermediate sanction' is used to refer to additional conditions which are imposed on top of less intensive sanctions, e.g., week-end jail or community service as conditions of probation. In some jurisdictions it means responses to violations which impose more onerous or restrictive conditions.
- In many jurisdictions, an 'intermediate sanction' is defined by **who** has the authority to impose it. Because many participate in imposing intermediate sanctions, definitions can vary within a jurisdiction. For example, in Oregon, "structured sanctions", which are intermediate between probation and a prison term, can be imposed by prison and parole officers. In some jurisdictions, 'intermediate sanction' refers to any sanction imposed by someone other than a judge.

Because there currently are no well established **standard** definitions, it is important that every jurisdiction invest the time and energy to establish working definitions that make sense and can be used consistently.<sup>4</sup>

## Project History

Concern about the complex issues related to the management and supervision of women offenders in the community has continued to increase as have the numbers of women involved in criminal justice systems nationwide. Criminal justice agencies are attempting to understand the

particular nature of women offenders and to develop strategies to reduce their criminal activity, often without solid information about the characteristics of women offenders, current sentencing practices and their outcomes, or available programs and services which may address women's needs.

Because there had been little effort to examine sentencing practices and policies regarding women in the criminal justice system, in 1991 the Community Corrections Division initiated the ISWO project to focus on the development of effective intermediate sanctions for women offenders in the community.

The National Institute of Corrections and the State Justice Institute had already spearheaded a larger Intermediate Sanctions project in 1989 in response to dissatisfaction by both the courts and corrections agencies about the availability and use of intermediate sanctions for all offenders.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently, the Division recognized that little of the innovative work done nationally with intermediate sanctions had focused on improving outcomes for women. A special emphasis was warranted and indeed required in order to make progress in this important area. Patterns of women's criminality, particularly their disproportionately high involvement in non-violent property and drug offenses, make them good candidates for community-centered control and treatment options. Though they may be at high risk of reoffending, they are most likely to commit "low stakes," non-violent crimes which present little risk of serious harm to the public. Also, since many women offenders are single parents, underemployed or on public assistance, and have histories of domestic violence victimization and substance abuse, they are likely to be involved with many community-based social service systems.

During fiscal 1991, the Community

Corrections Division worked closely with three community corrections agencies in a first round of the project. A second round of the project took place in fiscal years 1992 and 1993, with four additional sites; a third round, with two additional sites, began in 1994 and continued through 1997; and a fourth round began in June 1997 and is ongoing at this writing.<sup>6</sup> Assistance was provided through national meetings involving all sites, and on-site technical assistance tailored to the particular needs and pace of the jurisdiction. The funding structure for the project initially involved providing small direct grants plus technical assistance to jurisdictions. The second and later rounds of the project were supported by targeted technical assistance and national meetings with no

direct grants to jurisdictions.

In 1997, the scope of the ISWO project was expanded to include criminal justice responses to women as pre-trial defendants as well as those sentenced to local sanctions (community-based and jail). The current focus is on counties with large populations. The population of Round 4 sites ranges from 847,000 to over five million. The first three rounds were managed by NIC personnel; in 1997, NIC chose to provide project management and technical assistance services through a cooperative agreement between Law & Policy Associates and NIC.<sup>7</sup>

## Directory of All Sites/Timeframe

The following tables provide a brief description of each site involved in the four rounds.

<b>ROUND 1</b>	<b>APRIL 1991 - AUGUST 1993</b>
----------------	---------------------------------

Jurisdiction	Population	Rural/Urban Proportion	Number of Policy Group Members
Allen County, Indiana	302,000 (1990)	Urban; some Rural	16
Dakota County, Minnesota	274,016 (1990)	Combination of Rural and Suburban	13
Johnson County, Kansas	353,771 (1990)	Suburban	50

<b>ROUND 2</b>	<b>MARCH 1993 - MARCH 1995</b>
----------------	--------------------------------

Jurisdiction	Population	Rural/Urban Proportions	Number of Policy Group Members
Dallas County, Texas	2,600,000 (1991)	Urban	14
York County, Pennsylvania	339,547 (1995)	Urban core; Suburban and Rural areas	27
State of Oregon	2,979,000 (1992)	Urban, Suburban, Rural	15
Racine County, Wisconsin	175,034 (1991)	Urban, Rural	15

<b>ROUND 3</b>	<b>JANUARY 1994 - DECEMBER 1996</b>
----------------	-------------------------------------

Jurisdiction	Population	Rural/Urban Proportions	Number of Policy Group Members
Dauphin County, Pennsylvania	275,000 (1995)	Urban, Suburban, Rural	21
State of South Carolina	3,760,181 (1997)	Urban, Rural	15

<b>ROUND 4</b>	<b>JUNE 1997 - IN PROGRESS</b>
----------------	--------------------------------

Jurisdiction	Population	Rural/Urban Proportions	Number of Policy Group Members
Cook County, Illinois	5.1 million (1998)	Urban, Suburban	15
Hampden County, Massachusetts	440,974 (1997)	Urban, Suburban	18
San Francisco County, California	789,600 (1998)	Urban	30
Hamilton County, Ohio	847,403 (1998)	Urban, Suburban	22

For a list of contact names for each site, see Appendix A, "Contact List".

3.U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections Working Paper 3: *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders "Recruitment Criteria Checklist."*

4.U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections Working Paper 1: *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders, Developing a Common Language on Intermediate Sanctions for This Project.*

5.For further information, see McGarry, Peggy (September 1990). *The Intermediate Sanctions Process, What Are Intermediate Sanctions?* and *What It Takes*, Attachment A, Center for Effective Public Policy.

6.See Chapter IV. "Project and Process Description" for a description of the purpose of the project.

7.Much of the text for "Project History" was taken from U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections Working Paper 5: *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders*, Intermediate Sanctions Process and Accomplishments.



## **IV. Project and Process Description**

The framework described below is an outgrowth of the understanding of NIC staff, consultants and policy group members from each of the jurisdictions involved in this project over the past ten years. It reflects our evolution to date, where we are after a great deal of learning, and is an idealized description of the key components of the process.

Although the following description is laid out in linear form, in reality this process is very organic and does not necessarily follow a linear path. Sites found themselves revisiting steps as new information was learned. For example, identifying change targets, building information and getting stakeholder buy-in may require further work as the process evolves.

### **Clarify Project Purpose and Outcomes**

#### **Identify the Issues**

An increased awareness of specific presenting problems is what usually prompts jurisdictions to address women offender issues. Those presenting problems and the driving force(s) motivating development of a policy group should be explicitly identified. Identification of key issues will allow the preliminary definition of change target areas. As new information is brought to bear on the analysis of these problems, and policy group members increase their understanding of the system, the critical issues and change targets often are reformulated.

Jurisdictions have come to the project for a variety of reasons. Common reasons include an increase in the number of women in jail or prison and a perceived lack of gender-specific resources. The State of Oregon's primary issue was a large

number of women in prison because they were being revoked from probation or parole. Whatever the motivating reasons, gathering information will enlighten the process and greatly increase the knowledge and understanding of policy group members, and the issues and preliminary change targets could change throughout the life of the process. Participants may find themselves repeating parts of the process if new information changes their understanding about particular issues.

#### **Clarify the Policy Group's Purpose**

Jurisdictions need to clearly define and understand their purpose as a policy group early in the process. Undertaking a systems planning process is about change; it is about problem identification and problem solving. Because problem solving often involves change that impacts many people, this work also involves making a "case" for why change is needed and marketing the proposed changes to stakeholders not directly involved in the policy group. Making certain that all policy group members understand the policy group's purpose is critical to keeping the policy group focused.

#### **Identify Desired Outcomes<sup>1</sup>**

Another key to ensuring the work of the policy group stays well-directed is identifying desired outcomes. Outcomes will include both product and process outcomes which will be achieved throughout the life of the project. Those outcomes should be acknowledged and celebrated when achieved. Examples of product outcomes include conducting an inventory of available services and sanctions or developing a profile of women offenders. Examples of process outcomes include

establishing a productive policy team and engaging all key decisionmakers in a discussion about women offenders or forming networks for sharing information.

### **Develop a Work Plan**

Work plans that are carefully crafted give group members a sense of where they are going and what they should expect to accomplish within a certain timeframe. The work plan should be monitored and adjusted regularly and include long and short term tasks.<sup>2</sup>

## **Establish the Policy Group**

### **Identify Leadership**

The careful selection of group leadership will set the policy group on a path much more likely to result in success. The sources of leadership, authority, enthusiasm, commitment and resources for change among those agencies or people represented in the policy group should all be taken into consideration before choosing a leader. The chair or leader of the policy group should be a key decisionmaker, and should have convening authority, leadership abilities, and the required time and energy to devote to this process. The leader should also understand or be willing to learn how to facilitate a consensus-building process. If a proposed chair does not have all these skills or qualities, the policy group might consider appointing a co-chair with complementary skills and abilities. Leaders should be able to commit to leading the policy group for a minimum of two years.

### **Identify Membership**

This systems planning work usually begins by establishing a policy group comprised of policymakers, key decisionmakers and influential people responsible for the design, funding and daily use of sanctions and services for women offenders. The core policy group members should therefore be representatives from each sector of the criminal justice system. Representatives of other public and private sector agencies may also be included, especially those which provide services to women offenders or their children. Members of relevant funding bodies, such as county boards, city councils and other organizations should also participate. This group of policy representatives becomes the primary vehicle for inquiry, assessment and analysis, policy development and decisionmaking. When the policy makers or key decisionmakers are not themselves available to be a part of the policy group, members who are persuasive and have the power to influence those who develop policy and make decisions should be selected. The policy group should be committed to frank and regular communication and organized to effect change in a coordinated fashion.

Each jurisdiction's policy group will have a different structure and varying numbers of participants. Some will have a large group that meets infrequently and a very small, active core of members who direct the work of the policy group. The composition of each policy group is significantly affected by local politics and power structures. In many cases, a strong public figure such as a judge or district attorney chairs the policy group, and, because of his/her stature, draws interest from a wide range of system, community and service people. Some groups have worked together previously, sometimes even on women offender issues; in other cases, some members of the group have never met and the process of getting comfortable with one another and establishing a basic trust becomes an important

first step. All sites find bringing together individuals from in and outside the criminal justice system to be valuable, sometimes simply because they become familiar with one another. Working relationships may be formed and understanding of mutual strengths, limitations and resources can be added benefits.

A complete listing of individuals in each policy group can be found in Appendix C, "Site Descriptions". Further discussion and analysis of the dynamics of policy group personnel can be found in Section VI, "Summary/Analysis".

### **Identify Project Support Staff**

Staff support for the policy group should be identified from the agencies represented in the policy group. Support will include organizing meetings, sending notification, and coordinating and monitoring various tasks and projects. Other roles include documenting the process, assembling written products and serving as the primary liaison with NIC and technical assistance resources. Staff support is critical to the effective functioning of the policy group.

### **Identify Facilitator for Policy Group Meetings**

Policy group meetings are much more productive with the assistance of a skilled facilitator who can help ensure that all points of view are fully aired, and that every member has opportunities to be heard. Facilitators also assist group members in exploring their options, laying out their rationales for decisions and coming to consensus. Another responsibility that they may undertake is to help document the process and outcomes of meetings. The role of facilitator may in some circumstances be filled by the chair of the policy group, or by another policy group member with facilitation skills who is appointed by the group to fill the role. However, when controversial issues arise, a neutral facilitator who

is not a member of the group may be better able to defuse or avoid tensions and conflict. The policy group may also want to bring in an outside facilitator for meetings when it is important that all group members fully participate in the discussion, e.g., when the group is developing its vision and goals. Some policy groups have chosen to hire an outside facilitator to assist with their entire process, while others make use of outside facilitators for selected meetings or events. Other groups have called on staff of participating agencies (who are not group members) who have process facilitation skills. NIC's technical assistance providers have frequently served as facilitators as part of their collaboration with project sites.

### **Identify Stakeholders Outside the Policy Group**

Stakeholders include people in political positions and other positions of influence who will need to "buy in" to proposed changes for them to be effectively implemented. Stakeholders also include the community at large and any other constituencies who will be impacted by the proposed changes or who have interests in those changes. These people should be identified and, in some cases, invited to participate in the work of the policy group at critical junctures where their expertise and opinions can contribute to the policy and development process. In other cases, they will simply need to be kept informed about policy group work.

### **Clarify Roles and Responsibilities**

The roles, relationships and responsibilities of project staff, policy group members, site coordinators and NIC staff should be clearly understood by all concerned. A shared understanding of responsibilities and expectations that is developed early in the process will reduce the likelihood of interpersonal conflicts. The chair/leader of the policy group and staff

designated for the project should establish a regular means of communication among group members.

## **Attend to Meeting Logistics**

### **Agree on Ground Rules**

A set of ground rules describing how policy group members will work together and how meetings and work will be conducted will help clarify expectations and keep policy group meetings on track. For example, most policy groups agree to keep policy group discussions confidential to allow members candid discussion of political or sensitive issues.

### **Develop Agendas, Take Care of Meeting Logistics**

A schedule of meetings should be established taking policy group members' schedules and timing needs into consideration. Agendas should be prepared for each meeting that state the purposes of the meeting and expected outcomes as well as indicating meeting place, date and times. Task assignments and progress on already assigned work should be discussed at each meeting. Along with agenda preparation, a staff member should make provisions for members' comfort at meetings, including arranging for food or snacks, as appropriate, inviting special guests or speakers, and arranging for technical equipment if required.

### **Document the Process**

Each site will benefit from maintaining a record of its work, products, decisions and learnings. This documentation lets the policy group and others know where they started, their steps and accomplishments along the way and where they want to go. It informs those not directly involved in the process and helps everyone

recognize when interim objectives are reached. Recognizing progress and celebrating accomplishments and successes along the way keeps the process alive and motivating for everyone.

## **Build Information to Support the Change Process**

### **The Purpose of Building Information**

Good baseline information establishes a common frame of reference about the way a jurisdiction's justice system currently works, and how women offenders are sanctioned and served by the system. Until a comprehensive information base is assembled, a policymaking group may be forced to make choices based on opinions rather than facts, on anecdotes rather than systematic observations.

The five types of information most useful in supporting the work of the policy group are described below; they encompass both quantitative ("data") and qualitative ("stories") dimensions. The cost of building a comprehensive information base and the time required depend on the scope, quality and ease of access to information, and on the breadth of inquiry chosen by the policy group. Information development is an evolutionary process that both directs and is shaped by the policy group's selection of change targets.

### **Assemble Data on the Flow of Women Through the Justice System**

In the course of defining the issues that motivate them to engage in this problem-solving process, jurisdictions often compile information about the numbers of women that are sanctioned and served by their justice system. This information can take various forms, including:

- Counts of women offenders passing through a decision point (e.g., arrest, jail booking, sentencing) over a specified period of time (e.g. per month or annually)
- Counts of women offenders by particular characteristics, (e.g., age, ethnicity, offense type) passing through a decision point
- Counts of women incarcerated or under correctional supervision on a given date, or averaged over time (e.g., average daily populations or caseloads)

If these counts are converted into rates per 10,000 women in a jurisdiction's general population, a policy group can examine changes over time in the rates of arrest, conviction or incarceration of women for various types of crimes. Policy groups can develop a timeline that correlates past shifts in policies, practices, programs and system capacities with historic trends in the flow of women through the justice system. With this analysis, policy groups will enhance their understanding of how changes in policies, practices and resource availability affect the ways women are sanctioned and served by their local justice system.

### **Develop Decisionmaking "Map"**

To understand how decisions are made about women defendants and offenders, policy groups should examine not only the current flow of women through the justice system but also decisionmakers' reasons for choices that affect this flow. Although NIC calls this "decision mapping", it need not result in a visual representation of the decisionmaking process. The primary goal of decision mapping is to clarify the formal and informal criteria that affect decisions made about women offenders at every decision point in the justice system, from arrest through sentencing and release. A central benefit of decision mapping is the enhanced understanding of the complex, interwoven, and sometimes unintended impacts of

their decisions on women offenders and on the efficiency and effectiveness of the justice system.

Criminal justice decisions are made within statutory frameworks, and decisionmakers usually have several goals and desired outcomes in mind when they make decisions about defendants/offenders. For example, in deciding whether to detain or release a defendant prior to trial, risk management is usually the central goal (and is often specified by statute), and the presence of the offender at trial/sentencing is the desired outcome of this pretrial release decision process. As defendants penetrate further into the justice system, the decision process becomes increasingly complex, with multiple purposes and desired outcomes that very often are not clearly articulated. In addition, because of the adversarial nature of criminal justice proceedings, various decisionmakers often have different and sometimes conflicting decision goals and preferred outcomes. When cases reach the point of sentencing, decisionmakers' concerns for equity and fairness in punishment/sanctioning and for effective risk management sometimes do not mesh well with their desire to serve the many-faceted needs of women offenders.

By engaging in candid and open discussions about their decisionmaking policies and practices, criminal justice officials can better understand the intended and unintended impacts of their choices, and can act to ensure that their decision processes have the desired outcomes. Thus, decision mapping can point the way to making low- or no-cost changes in decisionmaking criteria or processes that will help ensure the multiple goals of the justice system can be effectively met.

High-quality information is the foundation of effective decisionmaking. Criminal justice decisionmakers must have valid, reliable information about offenders and the continuum of available decision options in order to effectively

match offenders to appropriate sanctions and services. This information can come from a variety of sources, including stakeholders outside the policy group, especially women offenders and line staff through focus groups or "presentations" to the policy group. Decision mapping helps policy groups assess the quality of information currently available. Based on this assessment, strategies for improving information quality can be designed.

### **Develop Profiles of Women Defendants/Offenders**

To better understand the ways that decision policies and practices affect women offenders, policy groups must carefully examine the characteristics of women in the justice system. This "profile" of women offenders should be developed by the policy group based on its definition of key issues for that jurisdiction and the preliminary identification of change targets.

One of the central purposes of gathering data on the characteristics of women offenders is to ascertain their risk and needs profiles, and to examine ways that various types of women offenders could be better matched to appropriate sanctions and services. Policy groups must determine the profile characteristics of interest, select a target population to be described, determine whether the requisite data elements are available in existing records or must be collected, and assemble and analyze data on a representative sample of the target population. Accomplishing these tasks usually requires the assistance of information system and statistical research specialists.

### **Develop Resource Inventory**

A comprehensive inventory of programs and services available to women offenders can serve a number of purposes, including documenting the

capacities of various types of programs, identifying gaps in the continuum of services, and establishing the degree to which available programs are gender-specific. To accomplish the latter objective, policy teams must carefully define the desired characteristics of a gender-specific service or program, and assess existing programs or services using that same "yardstick". Obtaining information from each program or service using an objective inventory format can be the best way to ensure that programs are described and compared using a common language.

Site visits to existing facilities, programs and/or presentations by program staff can provide invaluable information about available resources. Through assembling a resource inventory, policy teams can learn about the eligibility criteria and assessment processes currently used by programs and can examine the ways that programs and services define "success". All of this information can then be used to develop strategies to improve the effectiveness of existing programs and to augment the continuum of resources as needed.

### **Document Costs and Benefits of Sanctions and Services**

By determining the costs of "doing business as usual" with the set of sanctioning options currently employed, policy teams can better understand the cost impacts of potential changes in sanctioning policies. To the extent possible, costs should be described using the same unit of measure, i.e. cost per person-day, or per person served. Documenting that costs can be saved or avoided by implementing recommended changes in policies, practices or programs can be one of the most effective advocacy tools for promoting system-wide improvements in the ways women offenders are sanctioned and served.

## **Select and Advocate for Change Targets**

### **Identify Change Targets**

After gathering and analyzing essential information regarding factors which tend to support women offenders' success and those which have a negative impact on their success, policymakers can clarify their understanding of key issues that first motivated them to engage in this policy development work. With a more detailed and objective understanding of the way their justice system currently impacts women offenders, policymakers can target specific policies that must change to improve their system's effectiveness with women offenders. Some of the target change areas identified will affirm ideas policy group members brought to the process, while other change targets will grow out of the information-building process. Policy groups should thus try to remain open to the possibility that final change targets may be very different from those members originally envisioned. For example, after obtaining information that ties low success rates for women probationers to the number and nature of conditions of their supervision, a jurisdiction may target for change its policies related to setting probation conditions.

### **"Market" Proposed Change Target Area(s) to Stakeholders Outside the Policy Group**

ISWO stakeholders include all those who could be affected by proposed changes, and they are usually identified early in the policymaking process. Potential stakeholder groups include criminal justice policymakers and practitioners, decisionmakers and service providers outside the criminal justice system and a wide range of community members. Policy group members must obtain the approval of and support for proposed changes from these stakeholders. Much of this should already have been accomplished by including a wide range of agency representatives in

information-building and policy development activities. Additional "marketing" efforts might include lobbying by influential policy group members as well as providing information regarding issues about which there is not general consensus on the need for change. In the process of marketing proposed change targets, policy group members may be asked questions for which they have no immediate answers. This will spark efforts to collect additional, needed information.

## **Develop and Market Change Proposals**

### **Develop Proposals**

The policy group will propose specific changes both in policies and in the continuum of programs and services for women offenders. Policies range from those decisions expressed formally in statutes and written in policy and procedure manuals to more informal "rules of thumb" and are the guidelines and criteria that decisionmakers, service providers, and corrections professionals follow in doing their work. Policies define why we are engaging in a particular set of activities, and provide the instructions for how we are to carry out those activities.<sup>3</sup>

In the case of intermediate sanctions, policy includes a statement of purposes and goals, and motivation for the policy. Intermediate sanctioning policy should specifically define the following:

- categories of cases that are to be directed to intermediate sanctions
- detailed description of the offense and offender characteristics of cases in each category
- outcomes or goals for each category
- description of responses that are appropriate for each group

Policy related to intermediate sanctions must also describe the means by which this sanctioning will be carried out:

- How will a jurisdiction ensure that sentencing practices actually reflect the matching of offender group and sanction?
- How will sentencing practices affect the day-to-day behavior of prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and probation officers writing presentence recommendations?

Policies describe how resources will be utilized for women offenders, and form the basis for evaluating whether sanctions and services are achieving their desired goals. All change proposals should specify desired outcomes and benefits, expected impacts on each stakeholder group, and resources required to implement the changes. Individuals and agencies responsible for implementing and financing recommended changes should also be outlined.

### **Compare Costs and Benefits of Proposed Changes in Policies and Programs**

Expected costs and benefits should be forecasted to ascertain the feasibility of proposed changes and the magnitude of expected benefits. Completing this analysis is vital for policymakers and others who need to approve and advocate for the change proposals.

### **Market Change Proposals**

Once the policy group has formulated specific change strategies in agreed-upon target policy areas and tested their impacts, the group must persuade those with the power to effect the proposed changes to collaborate in implementing them. Some of these individuals and agencies will have been involved in, or at least will have been

periodically updated on, the policy group's work. Although it is clearly important to engage individuals who are in positions of power and authority, the policy group should also make every effort to reach out to the middle managers and line staff of agencies that must act to implement changes on a day-to-day basis.

For those who have not been involved at all, the policy group should be prepared to present the information on which its recommendations are based, as well as the results of any feasibility or cost-benefit analyses, and any other information that their audiences may request. Marketing approaches can range from making individual contact with key actors to "broad band" dissemination of written and oral presentations of change recommendations and their underlying rationales. At an individual level, policy group members may be most effective in influencing their peers (e.g. judges working with other judges, agency leaders with their equivalents in related agencies). Successful marketing of policy and program changes usually requires a carefully designed multifaceted approach. When the policy group has established a broad base of support for its change recommendations, it can then act as a catalyst for and monitor of implementation efforts.

## **Implement Changes in Policies, Practices and Programs**

### **'Institutionalize' the Policy Group's Process**

Having developed and nurtured a new way of doing business through multidisciplinary collaboration, consensus-building and targeted fact-finding, the policy group will be in a position to encourage others to join with its members in pursuing this new approach to mutual problem-solving. If the process has been relatively productive and its results are sound, it is likely that



policy group members and others will continue to be committed to interactive, information-driven approaches to policy development and program design, not only on behalf of women offenders, but in wide array of policy arenas.

### **Advocate for Recommended Changes**

Even after stakeholders have adopted the policy group's recommendations, the continued interest and support of policy group members is essential to ensuring that changes made have the intended impacts. Developing a strategy for change is a lengthy, complex and demanding process that is akin to nurturing a pregnancy. After the policy group has 'given birth' to a new vision and strategies for achieving it, the group must commit to nurturing the change process through inevitable challenges and crises if the group's goals are to be achieved.

### **Monitor the Impacts of Changes Made**

Fundamental to any successful change strategy is a mechanism for ongoing evaluation of the outcomes and impacts of the changes put in place. The policy group or its successor can play a vital role in monitoring the short-term and long-range effects of policy and programmatic changes implemented as a result of its work. Change strategies developed by the policy group should include outcome measures and suggested methods for assessing whether desired outcomes are achieved. From this, ongoing monitoring should flow naturally into continuous retooling of change strategies, and perhaps even into redefining the meaning of 'success' as warranted by careful analysis of the impacts of new policies, practices and programs.

1. See Chapter III, "Project Benefits and Outcomes" for further detail on outcomes.

2. McGarry, Peggy (September 1990). *The Intermediate Sanctions Process, What Are Intermediate Sanctions? and What It Takes*, Attachment A, Center for Effective Public Policy, and McGarry, Peggy, and Carter, Madeline (October 1993). *The Intermediate Sanctions Handbook: Experiences and Tools for Policymakers*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections and State Justice Institute.

3. Description on 'policy' taken from McGarry, Peggy, and Carter, Madeline (October 1993). *The Intermediate Sanctions Handbook: Experiences and Tools for Policymakers*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections and State Justice Institute, page 12.

## **V. Site Experiences**

### **National Meetings and Other Training Opportunities**

National meetings were the primary vehicle for delivering technical assistance, and for facilitating cross-site contact. From the beginning, the primary objectives of the national meetings were to provide a framework for policy development which site teams could apply immediately to their work, and to invite peer consultation and joint problem solving. As NIC staff and consultants became more knowledgeable about the natural pace of the projects and the tremendous variability in the politics, economics, structure and organization of each jurisdiction, national meeting agendas were tailored more to the specific needs of participating sites.

Most national meetings were convened at one of the participating sites, to reduce travel costs and allow observing that jurisdiction's programs and facilities. This also allowed more personnel from the host jurisdiction to participate in the meeting.

Training at national meetings included:

- policy development framework
- leadership capacity building and policy group dynamics
- information building
- decision mapping
- sanctioning purposes

With feedback from the teams, national meetings became more focused on specific, identified needs of the jurisdictions and joint problem solving activities. The objectives have evolved to include the day to day practical changes in policy and practice which are accomplished as the projects move forward. The evolution

continues as the Project learns more about the process and the needs of jurisdictions.

For further detail on topics, location and dates of national meetings for all four rounds, see Appendix B, "National Meetings".

### **Site Experiences, Rounds 1 - 3**

The following "site experiences" are based on information gained from extensive interviews with site participants, faculty, consultants and NIC staff, as well as file reports. It is a summary of the individual perspectives and opinions of those interviewed, and makes no attempt to be a representative sample of perspectives.

#### **ROUND 1**

##### **Allen County, Indiana**

The ISWO project in Allen County was initiated by the Community Corrections Program which is under the jurisdiction of the Allen County Board of Commissioners. Allen County's initial impetus for undertaking the project was concern about the rapidly rising numbers of women offenders relative to men offenders. There was also recognition that the many needs of women offenders dramatically increased their risk of reoffending. One of the policy group's primary objectives was to fully identify and understand those needs. The policy group wanted to understand how women offenders' behaviors impacted their families, as well as the overall financial impact on the community of their involvement in the criminal justice system.

The Community Corrections Program had been formed in 1985, primarily through the efforts of an

energetic staff member who effectively garnered funds and political protection for the community corrections program. However, key decisionmakers were not an integral part of the process of forming that program and had never taken effective ownership. This same dynamic carried over into the ISWO policy group.

At the time Allen County's policy group began its work, there existed a fundamental structural challenge in the county caused by a split between probation and community corrections functions. Although the probation department, under the jurisdiction of the courts, pledged their support for the project, they were not a full partner in the effort. Their independent operations created significant tensions and fall-out from the struggle for resources between community corrections and probation.

As with other jurisdictions, Allen County had difficulty keeping its policy group on track. The policy group functioned as a staff-run group more than a policy-making body. Although the group leader, the same individual who led the creation of the community corrections program, had an outstanding ability to gather support for the project, she had many other duties that pulled her focus from the policy group. Key decisionmakers were not involved in the policy group and a natural policy leader did not emerge. A core work group of six members undertook primary responsibility for mapping the criminal justice system and designing a dispositional study of women offenders. This group developed excellent rapport toward the end of the project.

Allen County became involved in a special project just prior to the ISWO project. That project involved a multi-disciplinary group addressing pregnancy issues for women offenders, and the group associated with the project succeeded in securing funding for a specific program. It proved very difficult to switch from

that program design focus to a systems planning process. Some members in the policy group came with expectations of receiving answers, rather than having to grapple with issues and develop solutions.

Because of limited resources, the research consultant for the project was available only on a part-time basis and important data was difficult to obtain because the probation department was not a full partner in the project. Despite the fact that Allen County had to collect data on women offenders manually, they were successful in collecting 1989 data on all women sentenced for felonies in Allen County.

Policy group members attribute the policy team's work for much of today's attention to addressing the needs of women offenders. One of the central outcomes of the ISWO work was establishing the groundwork for developing gender-specific programs. Case management teams address women offenders' needs and a risk assessment instrument is used to develop a better understanding of the needs and risks of their home detention population. Women drug offenders are being treated differently in the plea agreement process now, with their plea agreements being mitigated based on their substance abuse history. At this writing, Allen County is waiting to hear if they received 3/4 of a million dollars in funds to work with women offenders in transition from prison to the community with a structured residential program.

Other benefits of the process were that the policy group learned about the characteristics and needs of women offenders from NIC and its technical advisors, and was able to share information with other jurisdictions. A core group completed the mapping process, and the map is still in use.

## **Dakota County, Minnesota**

Dakota County filed their application for the intermediate sanctions project with a powerful team of three "principals", all of whom had either a great deal of experience working with women offenders or a strong interest in them. However, before the project could begin, the group lost its leader. After some time with other group members filling in as unofficial leaders, and some confusion over roles, a new chair was selected. The new chair, a county attorney, although personally very interested in the project, was not fully supported by her agency and had to undertake much of her work on the project through her own initiative. However, she was able to coalesce the group better than the interim leadership and garnered the respect of other system professionals.

At the same time the ISWO project began, another broader intermediate sanctions project that encompassed all offenders (male and female) was also undertaken. This second project demanded much time and energy from key ISWO policy members and created questions about how the two groups would and should relate. The larger policy group somewhat upstaged the efforts of the smaller, women offender policy group. Eventually, a situation evolved where key decisionmakers served on the larger project and their designees served on the women offender project.

After the difficult first year, a core work group formed which undertook most of the responsibility for project activities as a whole, gathering information and setting the agenda for meetings. Although this work group was dedicated to the project and made progress, they were not able to maintain the interest of its larger policy team. The core group worked for more than a year to formulate and clarify the appropriate objectives and questions the group should pursue. By that time, much of the larger group had lost interest.

Another challenge at the beginning of the project for Dakota County was the growing tensions between the county commissioners and judges over the Commissioners' plan to enter the Community Corrections Act, which would remove authority for the Dakota County Court Services from judges and place it with the County. Although the judges and county commissioners had some very difficult dynamics initially, they did resolve those differences through their mutual participation in the County Intermediate Sanctions Taskforce.

Dakota County Community Corrections supported participation in the project and restructured staff responsibilities to accommodate participation. Those staff members had a high level of commitment, talent and vision in the process and rapidly learned a great deal about their own system. They earned respect for their growing expertise among other agencies, building bridges and relationships that have persisted long since the conclusion of the project.

Participation in the ISWO project was particularly valuable for a prosecutor who had regarded the "successful completion" of a case to be closing the file, generally after a plea or finding of guilt. The ISWO project viewed the prosecution process as a key part of sentencing but by no means the conclusion of its concerns. The prosecutor began to see the importance of clarifying the purposes of sanctions and evaluating their outcomes.

The ISWO process emphasizes consensus building rather than a prosecutor's normal role as an advocate -- persuading others to her point of view. One of the National Meetings involved building participants' skills in consensus building; in listening carefully, discussing viewpoints without advocating for them, and respecting and acknowledging other's roles and perceptions. Other learnings for the policy group as a whole included recognizing their approach had been to

attempt to rehabilitate the woman offenders' entire life rather than to address a more limited set of factors underlying her criminal behavior.<sup>1</sup>

Dakota County benefitted from a strong resource person from Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines who provided invaluable assistance assembling data and analyzing that information to better understand women offenders. Although there were some problems with missing and incomplete data, enough information was available to profile offenders on a variety of factors.

Because of the difficult start of the project, Dakota County filed an extension and was allowed to work on the project over a three year period. Many group members were unfamiliar with the policy approach of the project, previously focusing primarily on program development. Most people did not understand how much time would be required to develop policy options and became frustrated with the slow progress. Still, Dakota County in general was more experienced with a policy-driven process than other sites and managed to effectively grapple with some very fundamental policy decisions. For example, they tackled the problem of defining sanctioning purposes and desired outcomes versus prescribing sanctions for all the needs of women offenders. The policy group worked hard to differentiate sanctioning of women offenders based on criminal conduct from requiring or encouraging services based on need. Women offenders had been required to participate in parenting classes and classes to build self-esteem which was not expected of their male counterparts. The ISWO policy group spent considerable time rethinking how they were tying services to sanctioning orders.

Because Dakota County's judges are decentralized, conveying new information and awareness to the courts is difficult. There were also some snags in communication between policy group members and staff in "the ranks" who

worked directly with women offenders. Line staff were not fully informed of issues addressed and conclusions arrived at through the policy group's work.

Although the policy group had its difficulties, there have been changes as a result of the process. There is more ease talking interdepartmentally about gender-specific programs. A women's program called Expanded Life Choices, focused on skill building and attitude changes, is now offered to women in the jail and on probation. Gender-specific, cognitive restructuring groups for women offenders have been utilized to work with that population's core issues. Although the larger Intermediate Sanctions Task force is still in operation, it only includes one member from the women's task force. Other members of the women offender policy group have continued their commitment to women's issues on an individual basis. Some are still known throughout the system as valuable resources on women's issues. On a system-wide basis, women's issues continue to be a lower priority even though one third of offenders are women. Although the bench has become more aware of gender issues in dealing with felons, offenders still tend to be sanctioned in a standardized fashion, without regard to gender-related factors.

## **Johnson County, Kansas**

Johnson County entered into the ISWO project because of an increase in women offenders, particularly in jail. The County was committing more women to state prison than any other county in the State and there was concern that women offenders were being imprisoned for less severe offenses than men offenders. The policy group's objectives included simply wanting to learn as much as possible about women offenders, as well as identifying gaps in the range of sanctions and services and developing policy on intermediate sanctions.

Although several astute community corrections staff members initiated the ISWO project, it was never a high priority for the agency, primarily because a major legislative initiative intended to remove probation from the community corrections umbrella consumed the time and energy of the agency's key policymakers for much of the project's duration. The original project director transferred leadership of the ISWO project to another staff member early in the process, and leadership challenges continued to affect the policy group's progress throughout the project. Policy group members whose job security was threatened by the proposed reorganization did not feel comfortable speaking out on some issues, further dampening support of the project within the community corrections agency.

Additional challenges grew out of the organizational fragmentation of key functions, with the courts and parole services being State-funded and administered, and community corrections a County responsibility. Judges were not interested in evaluating their sanctioning policies, preferring instead to view the ISWO project as an opportunity to have staff design new gender-specific programs which they could then review and approve. Lack of judicial involvement from the outset impeded development of a system-

wide perspective on sanctioning of women offenders.

The County assembled a 50-member policy group which included many key justice system decisionmakers as well as individuals representing allied agencies and lay citizen members. Though members represented a breadth of perspectives and interests, the policy group's size made in-depth discussion of controversial policy issues difficult, and likely contributed to the project's focus on marketing and education rather than policy development. The County had recently held a successful series of public forums and seminars on another public policy issue, and this experience also influenced the policy group's process choices. Mutual education and discussion of current issues is a critical part of the ISWO process, but the Johnson County group was not able to move beyond this into selection of change targets and development of policy recommendations.

Johnson County is affluent, with many justice system resources, but was challenged in the ISWO project by a lack of experience in policy group processes and policy analysis. Many policy group members were focused from the beginning on using the project to justify the establishment of a work release center for women. This programmatic focus stymied efforts to broaden the policy group's analysis to larger questions about how women offenders were being sanctioned and served.

Objective information gathering was not well-integrated into the project process from the outset. Many policy group members had little or no direct experience with women offenders, and so chose to focus their initial information-gathering efforts on direct interviews with Johnson County women in jail and prison. While this was valuable for members, increasing their motivation to improve conditions for these women, it also diverted attention from collection and analysis of more

objective information about all women offenders in the County. About a year after the project began, a consultant was provided by NIC to assist the County in designing an offender profile survey process. This required the group to discuss project goals and the key issues that they wanted to resolve regarding women offenders. For some, this return to fundamentals that they felt were already established was frustrating. Many policy group members did not understand the importance of their participation in survey design and data analysis, preferring to see it as a "technical" task that could be done by an expert *for* them, rather than as an integral part of their policy analysis work.

Another consultant who contributed much energy and expertise to the process from its inception may have inadvertently discouraged policy group members from taking ownership of the process by doing too much. Because of the group's over-reliance on this consultant, many policy group members did not take responsibility for setting their own agendas, and for building their own capacities to analyze issues and develop solutions. Johnson County's experience illustrates the importance of clearly defining consultant roles, and establishing ground rules for when and how they are brought into the policymaking process.

Despite its shortcomings, the ISWO process generated a number of positive outcomes in Johnson County. Policy group members, and the judiciary, developed a better understanding of how imposing an overwhelming number of conditions on women probationers can set them up for inevitable failure. The County has developed more gender-specific programming, particularly around parenting skills and domestic violence, and has expanded a minimum-security residential program to include women offenders. Probation officers now involve women in designing their own case plan, so that their chances for successful compliance can be maximized.

## ROUND 2

### Dallas County, Texas

The Dallas County policy group included many key decisionmakers who worked well together, with everyone directed toward the same objectives. Although there was some initial discussion about why things had to be different for women than for men, those reservations soon dissipated. One of the co-chairs of the policy group was a judge who was critically important to the overall work of the policy group. That judge served as a valuable link to educating other judges who soon began using some of the information learned in the policy group in their own campaigns for re-election. One of the work group members was a prosecutor who eventually resigned that position and ran for the judiciary. She credited much of her effectiveness as a judge to being a participant in the ISWO process.

A core work group of five individuals undertook the responsibility of doing most of the work, serving as staff support and providing information for the larger policy group. Dallas County benefited from the facilitator support provided by NIC. Initially, the extensive and comprehensive data gathered on women offenders was too much for the policy group to absorb. Later, the data was streamlined and presented in summary format which was much more accessible for the policy group.

Although many policy group members were focused on adding specific programs, the group was successful in conducting some analysis, and policy evolved out of the group's work. They held a day-long workshop focused on sanctioning purposes which was extremely valuable for policy group members in understanding why it is important to consider how women are being sanctioned in their communities. Judges now have



more options available for women offenders than before.

Dallas County criminal justice professionals believe their system is more inclusive since undertaking the project. Women spend only one month in jail, compared with the 4-6 months they used to wait for services. Women were being shipped 500 miles away to jail but now 20% of the local Dallas jail is dedicated to women offenders, allowing women offenders to re-integrate into the community much more easily after leaving jail. At this writing, a new assessment center, funded by state grants, is being opened for women. The center has 26 staff members, including 4 psychologists, a psychiatrist and group treatment for substance abuse. Dallas County is still working toward developing a risk assessment process for women. Although the county has a pretrial release program, the conditions are quite restrictive, which limits the number of women who might benefit from the program.

### **York County, Pennsylvania**

York County's awareness of women offenders had been heightened for several years prior to undertaking this project. The County had a 20-year history of operating Atkins House, a residential program for women offenders, and the Probation Department chose to create specialized caseloads of women offenders, consisting of substance abuse treatment and intensive supervision. The County undertook a study two years earlier on women on parole and probation. Because of this awareness, effective staff leaders, and another very supportive group member, with excellent organizational skills, York County's policy group moved through its process smoothly. The staff did an excellent job of modeling the proper way to bring stakeholders together to examine their purposes and practices.

Rather than undertaking systemic policy development, the policy group built a solid foundation of sharing information amongst agencies and developed a spirit of cooperation in better serving women offenders. For example, most women coming out of jail were only given a 48 hour supply of medication. Service providers did not have that information previously and the policy group created a case management environment for determining how that information should be made available to all agencies serving the offender. The policy group made recommendations regarding the kind of data that needed to be gathered on women entering the criminal justice system and those recommendations were quickly implemented. Refining sentencing policies for women offenders never became the core of their work even though they were a competent group and accomplished a great deal of coordination with other efforts and programs. Because of the strength of the staff group, they functioned as a quasi-policy group themselves, and were instrumental in maintaining the momentum of the entire process.

The policy group chose a well-respected judge for their chair who helped draw people from within the system, the community and service providers to the group. The policy group benefited from good internal relations, and broad representation, including an assistant district attorney, public defender, judges, the heads of Welfare and Drug and Alcohol, the warden of the prison and strong participation from a sentencing commissioner who had great interest in intermediate sanctions. The core work group, comprised of the Director of Atkins House, an additional staff member from Atkins House, the chief probation officer, the public defender and several probation officers effectively kept the full group energized. The policy group never held a meeting that lagged and they managed to effectively maintain interest among participants by providing lunch at every meeting, parceling out tasks, involving all

members in the project and regularly providing new information and ideas, including a sanctioning workshop. Having all critical decisionmakers present helped everyone to see they were all serving the same clients and that they could do so more effectively by collaborating. The group struggled to maintain minority representation in the group, which remained sporadic. The group succeeded in convening a focus group of minority community representatives which served as an advisory group to the board.

Policy group leadership took the time to allow community members to develop a basic understanding of the system and resisted the pressure from criminal justice members to get down to business and move forward quickly with specific changes. In the midst of the ISWO project, York County became aware of the "balanced approach" to criminal justice. The policy group saw women offenders as a good test population for restorative justice practices.

The policy group had difficulty retrieving data to develop a profile of women offenders because the county was not fully computerized. A statewide effort to develop a computerized data system for men and women was going on at the same time the policy group was engaged in the ISWO project. During the data collection phase, the policy group struggled with how to determine what was important to know about women on parole and probation. York College was a tremendous help in gathering data, though there were some communication problems arising from the need to maintain multiple contacts at the college. In addition, when data collectors began pulling data from men's case files, they found reports on men were often not complete. There was also some resistance from the probation department to gathering data on men resulting in some weaknesses in the comparisons between men and women. Although some resources were devoted to building computer files, they were not

adequate to develop the comprehensive data needed by the policy group. There is currently little standardization, inter-agency communication capacity, and no central point of entry for data in York County. Consequently, the county is not able to do program evaluation at this time. A strategic planning process underway at this writing appears to be increasing attention on the need to more fully implement a computerized data system. York County used their mapping process as a work-in-progress throughout the project, adding new information to the map at every meeting. This process was valuable to all members and particularly to those outside the criminal justice system.

York County's well respected judge chair was the catalyst for judges consenting to be involved in a survey regarding judges' sentencing purposes and philosophies. From the survey, it became evident that judges had widely varying levels of understanding and perspectives on women offenders. Although the policy group recommended some education for judges, there was no follow-through, a typical problem for nearly every site.

Because they valued the opportunity to discuss issues and impact policy, the policy group continued to meet for some time after formal conclusion of the ISWO project. Two individuals critical to the policy development process have since left York County and although an implementation committee was formed, it has not made much progress. The momentum of the ISWO process was not institutionalized enough to carry over with a new department director. New staff members had other agenda issues at the forefront, including a departmental reorganization, and women offenders have received less attention.

There were many benefits from the ISWO project.<sup>2</sup> Changes were occurring in the welfare system at the same time the policy group was

engaged in its work, and the policy group helped impact welfare policy decisions that affected women and children. In the course of policy group discussions, Public Welfare learned that Parole and Probation had information they needed on women offenders and other issues, resulting in a cooperative work arrangement between the two agencies. Pennsylvania was in the process of undertaking a larger project to work with intermediate sanctions and the foundation of relationships established through the ISWO project helped develop a spirit of cooperation between Probation and Drug and Alcohol in the larger project. The ISWO policy group reached out to the community and provided some public education on women offender's issues. Services for women offenders have improved, including some support from the District Attorney to do more presentence assessment of women offenders even though that has a significant impact on court scheduling. Other benefits occurred as a "spin-off" from the policy group's work, including the formation of a drug court and an intermediate punishment team which created a video on intermediate punishment. Those projects both benefitted from the teamwork and links established in the policy group.

At this writing, the Director of Probation has shown strong interest in utilizing a process such as that used during the ISWO project to develop profiles on all offenders and to use that information as a basis for a strategic plan. The County has been guessing at men's recidivism rates and wants to utilize the same process used with women offenders to develop a clear understanding of men offenders.

## **State of Oregon**

Oregon's policy group had a difficult start due to several factors; they faced the usual challenges of finding the appropriate person to chair the project and getting commitments to participate in the process from potential policy group members. Leadership changed midway through the project because the process took longer than expected, and conflicted with other demands. In addition, Oregon was in the midst of serious on-going budget cuts because of a property tax limitation measure, which resulted in declining revenues for correctional programs and administration.

Policy group members entered into the project unaware how much time and effort would be required. While policy group meetings were held regularly and were well-attended by key decisionmakers, the opening of the legislative session drew the attention of some members away from the policy group. While there were some men in the policy group, women were the primary movers and shakers in the process. Although the policy group included judges, it was difficult to carry information back to colleagues in the courts because the structure of the courts did not provide for much interaction between judges. Policy members now see that new information should be conveyed to the courts through the State Judicial Education Committee.

Although some policy group members were inconsistent in attending meetings, the chair made every effort to make each monthly four-hour policy group meeting worthwhile. At the end of each meeting, the chair set the following meeting's agenda, assigned responsibilities, and marked progress along the way. Progress seemed especially tenuous toward the end of the project, after most of the work had been done but not completely synthesized. In Oregon's case, having a new chair come into the process midway with new energy may have contributed to its success.

Although data-gathering presented a number of challenges, Oregon had a long-standing commitment to compiling useful data for planning purposes. That commitment was reflected in the content of their offender records. Although the policy group still concluded that insufficient data was being collected, the data collection system in place contributed largely to Oregon's accomplishments with the ISWO process. Thus, Oregon was able to develop a data base that enabled the policy group to explore the factors correlated with women's success and failure on probation and parole. The data was incomplete because the historic paper files did not contain all the information needed by the policy group. Available data was painstakingly collected from paper case files by a large team of probation and parole officers, entered into a flat-file data base, and analyzed by a consultant in collaboration with the policy group. Gender-specific, quantifiable information was difficult to find, but they were successful in putting the data in useable form and making it accessible and meaningful so discussion could take place in the policy group. Data analysis took an enormous amount of energy and while many policy group members had experience with data analysis, those who did not had a difficult time keeping up with the analysis and discussion.

Many aspects of a policy-driven process were in place in Oregon already. Because of the funding structure for community corrections, advisory committees comprised of key players and decisionmakers were already functioning. Policy group members thus had experience in systemic decisionmaking (i.e. sentencing guidelines, administrative probation and structured sanctions). Oregon was especially successful in directing the efforts of their work by selecting a focused change target, i.e., improving the success rates of women on probation and parole. Oregon also wrestled with some of the underlying basics of sanctioning practices and produced a vision, mission and

guiding principles, comprehensive recommendations, and system strategies. Policy group members didn't fully distinguish between services and sanctioning, although they were very willing to be challenged and take up the issues.

Oregon undertook an extensive decision mapping process that resulted in a comprehensive visual flow chart detailing the decisions that are made with regard to offenders in the criminal justice system. The mapping includes information on decision options, the decisionmakers, factors influencing decisions, information upon which decisions are based, unspoken rules guiding decisionmaking and stated rules and policies. This process resulted in some "incredible eye-openers" for policy group members. One member described learning through discussion with the District Attorney that he had no mandate for a particular charge other than that the District Attorney "can charge." She suddenly recognized this as a critical decision point, where the DA had full decisionmaking discretion. Other profound awarenesses came from interviewing offenders and putting a personal face on the tragedies and successes of women offenders and seeing more clearly how the policy group's work was impacting lives.

Some policy group members felt more time should have been devoted at the beginning of the project to fully understanding the process, what they were going to be doing and how they would do it. Some policy group members felt unprepared to participate in analysis because they had limited expertise and understanding of quantitative and qualitative methods and the values and limitations of each method. Some members felt they would have benefited from more directive assistance from NIC with regard to forming the policy group and selecting a leader, along with a better understanding of how much previous work policy members had accomplished in a collaborative manner. The first activity was a NIC directed

workshop on sanctioning purposes that was not well-received by policy group members because they had already been through this process with local and state groups.

Oregon received a six month extension from NIC and especially appreciated that NIC allowed them to successfully complete their process. Oregon produced one of the most comprehensive final reports of any of the ISWO sites. It continues to be a reference not only for Oregon policymakers but also for other jurisdictions engaged in this work. Because many of the key policy group members are no longer with the Department of Corrections, it has been difficult to assess the long term changes that have occurred as a result of this process. However, because of a change in Department of Corrections policy, most probation and parole violators are being sanctioned in the community rather than being revoked to prison. In addition, although there were serious challenges in collecting data, policy group members learned through focus groups with women offenders that the single factor that makes a significant difference whether women offenders are successful is having someone in their life who cares about and believes in them, whether that person is a grandmother, a judge or someone else. Although the Oregon Court system does not support assigning all cases for an individual offender to the same judge, some judges took it upon themselves to see women they had originally sentenced who came back for subsequent offenses. One judge influenced the Drug Court to rotate their judges less frequently to allow the possibility of developing relationships with offenders (men and women) after her work with the ISWO project.

## **Racine County, Wisconsin**

At the time of the Project, Wisconsin had a state system for corrections and a county-based delivery system for services. These separate and somewhat isolated systems had not yet experienced collaboration. The State initiated involvement with the ISWO project and had to face the significant challenge of trying to overcome resistance at the county level to perceived state interference in their process. There were also problems with limitations on Department of Corrections staff presence in Racine County. Key state policy group members were located one to three hours drive from Racine County and did not have a Racine County identity. The State also had difficulty in coordinating staff support. Although the State might have taken the lead early to clarify roles and purposes of the project, this was a new process for them and they did not recognize the importance of such early action until later. Adversarial attitudes in the policy group were particularly strong in Racine County and crippled progress; tensions arose between the State and the County and almost derailed the project at one point. The group was not amenable to remedial team building and no effort to try to cooperate emerged from the group. The initial goal was to form separate policy groups in two adjacent counties. However, given the resources that were available, the project was reduced to focus solely on Racine County.

A state effort undertaken at the same time as the ISWO project, to provide \$360,000 for women offender programs, initially distracted participants' attention from the ISWO project. However, this allocation ultimately provided strong support for the intermediate sanctions project. Joint application was made by the Department of Health and Social Services and the Division of Parole and Probation. Some policy group members bought into the ISWO project because it was tied to the \$360,000 set aside by the legislature for women

offender programs, not realizing the money had already been earmarked for a specific program. Many key decisionmakers were initially involved in the policy group, but became less interested after discovering no significant monies were tied to the ISWO project.

As with many of the policy groups, leadership issues were problematic. The project suffered as a result of local leadership not making a commitment or taking ownership in the project. Selection of the first leader for the policy group occurred early and without full consideration of all the political factors with which the group would have to contend. The second leader, a judge, held the group together through difficult circumstances but even she could not require cooperation. The result was that both leaders were unable to overcome the problems the group started with and help the group establish an effective working team. It took an especially long time to begin accomplishing anything. A core group attempted to involve judges and county and state members, but those members who were active did not want to take a leadership role. Group leadership had a difficult time buying into the model proposed by NIC which influenced the entire group membership.

As with most policy groups, Racine County's policy group struggled to deal with issues at the conceptual, analytical level and naturally gravitated toward a desire for concrete discussion and more immediate action. Many policy group members were reluctant to address systems issues and examine how and why things were done because they didn't see anything wrong with what they were doing and believed the system was already working well. It was also detrimental to Racine County's process to begin by discussing sanctioning issues. All these factors contributed to the policy group not ever functioning as an effective working group and not achieving the needed focus to engage fully in important issues.

This group in particular would have benefitted from more guidance and clearer instructions from NIC.

Initially Racine County's timetable for data collection was unrealistically short. However, they used an outside consultant effectively to design a data collection effort and effectively involved the local criminal justice technical school in helping with the labor intensive task of pulling data on women offenders from case files. Some policy group members felt it was unrealistic to ask key decisionmakers who had very busy schedules to collaborate closely with staff in data gathering and analysis.

With all the difficulties, policy group members did have the opportunity to see more of what corrections was all about and policy group members learned about the availability of additional community resources. It was valuable to have players from all aspects of the system sit down together in a room to discuss issues. Some personal relationships were developed and a tolerance of one another emerged that facilitated learning about each other's self-interests. Outcomes include the following: alcohol and drug abuse services were developed for men and women in jail; some monies have been earmarked to assist with transportation issues and provide bus tokens for all offenders; all staff are being trained in cultural diversity and sensitivity; and women offenders on parole and probation have better access to alcohol and drug abuse services, anger management classes and planning for pre-employment training. Improved relationships with the police department were developed, supporting joint problem solving.

## ROUND 3

### **Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

The Dauphin County policy group had many committed members and good internal working relations. The policy group functioned primarily in a constituent-building mode and this obviously drew people because attendance at meetings was high. Dauphin County's general atmosphere was that of a very political environment, with considerable focus on maintaining control of individual turf. Though the leader was especially effective at drawing a wide range of people to the group, a core policy team never emerged. Key decisionmakers and core group members were inconsistent in attending meetings, resulting in the policy group having difficulty working as a team and keeping a collective sense of the scope of their work. The project was more staff-driven than policy team driven with a dominant leader who allowed group members to primarily identify the project with its leader. At the time of the ISWO project, the leader was also involved in a major facilities building campaign that distracted his attention. Some key decisionmakers in the policy group were strongly resistant to making any changes with regard to women offenders, though this was somewhat counter balanced by group members from Mental Health, Social Services and community organizations who were vocal in their support for change and in identifying gaps in services.

A group outside the probation department, The Program for Female Offenders, initiated a great deal of support for attention to women offenders, focusing primarily on those in jail. Women on probation did not receive the same attention. A member of The Program for Female Offenders was an active participant in the policy group. A good data base was developed on women offenders in

jail, but the same information was not gathered regarding women on probation.

Progress of the policy group was seriously hampered by a difficult dynamic that developed between two key group members which resulted in a shut-down of the process. Though most policy group members appreciated the training and assistance provided by NIC, some members never understood the objectives and didn't grasp what a systems planning process was, feeling that a clearer understanding of goals and more definition of the steps that should have been taken would have been helpful.

Dauphin County policy group members generally benefitted from the information gained through meetings and especially valued the opportunity to understand what each agency, department or service organization's role was in the system. Despite the fact that many members worked closely together, the mapping process was an eye-opener regarding the work everyone did. Work on the project stopped before it was complete; however, heightened awareness and the projects' momentum had some positive impact. Because of the participation of a member of The Program for Female Offenders in the ISWO policy group, an "Enhanced Life Skills" program for high-risk women offenders on intensive supervision was expanded in The Program for Female Offenders to help them deal with some core issues including self-esteem, dysfunctional relationships and to generally establish independence. As a result of data analysis, Dauphin County recognized a need to provide training for judges with regard to coordination of services at the time offenders come before the court. A sentencing form was designed for judges that helped eliminate the practice of split-sentencing.

### **State of South Carolina**

The catalyst for the State of South Carolina's involvement in the ISWO project was a statewide grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation to study and revamp the entire sentencing structure. There was a growing recognition that some of the State's sentencing practices impacted women differently than men, that there were no gender-specific services for women, and little understanding of the differences between men and women. The ISWO project was initiated by the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (DPPPS), and necessarily narrowed its focus exclusively to women on probation and parole. The Clark Foundation sentencing structure project captured the attention and energy of key decisionmakers and the ISWO project basically involved staff from DPPPS. Their objectives included learning more about women offenders, available services, gaps in services and to generally raise awareness of the differences between men and women.

Although team leadership changed in the State of South Carolina, this turned out to be positive because the original leader was not flexible in managing the process in the way originally specified by the grant. Early on, the team faced a fundamental issue regarding purpose and scope of the effort, and there was ambivalence about how comprehensive their approach to policy development should be. They had more interest in operating as a blue-ribbon commission which would study issues rather than grapple with and develop policy. The disagreement on focus -- department based (i.e. probation and parole) or systemic -- was never fully resolved.

South Carolina staff formed two groups, a "task force" that was comprised of probation and corrections, and a "policy group" that sought to engage a broad range of criminal justice decisionmakers. The task force was an "in-house" group that took a close look at Probation and Parole's treatment of women offenders. They

discovered a strong culture for serving women that also imposed a lot of conditions on women, some unrelated to their offense. The group did not succeed at completing an in-depth analysis of women on probation. A seminar on sanctioning purposes was primarily attended by members of the task force; they found the information helpful in establishing evaluative measures to determine whether they were accomplishing their objectives for women offenders.

The policy group never effectively engaged judges or other top-level decisionmakers. Meetings were not well attended and the group in general had difficulty completing significant work. Work was further complicated by the wide variety of corrections structures in the state: state-operated parole, court-administered probation, many legislatively mandated sanctions, and a mix of state and local institutions. South Carolina suffered from trying to fit into what they perceived as a model for smaller jurisdictions, which did not seem to work well when applied to their combination of state-wide and local systems.

Positive outcomes from the process in South Carolina included a tremendous increase in awareness of women offender issues among policy group and task force members. South Carolina gathered information on women offenders and conducted some analysis of that information. Their long-term goal is to support the Sentencing Guidelines Commission in passage of a sentencing guidelines structure that will continue to raise awareness of women offenders and how they differ from men. The hope is that this will help raise awareness of gender issues with judges, which could positively affect their sentencing decisions.



## Update on Current Round/Sites

All four sites are making progress, each taking a different path and working with somewhat different issues. Unlike the first three rounds, Round 4 sites continue to receive assistance as they implement their policy and change recommendations.

ROUND 4	Progress to Date
---------	------------------

A brief description of the work done to date in each jurisdiction follows.

### Cook County, Illinois

Cook County began dedicating time and resources to the issues associated with women offenders in April 1996 when the Sheriff formed the Female Offender Advisory Council. Numbers of women in jail were rising faster than male jail offender populations and there were no supervised programs or sanctions for women other than a combination of day reporting and an electronic monitoring program. However, a range of intermediate sanctions were available for men. As the Female Offender Advisory Council began grappling with the issue of women offenders, they became aware of the ISWO project.

Cook County's project is in its third year, the implementation phase. The policy group undertook a great deal of initial work to obtain the support and buy-in of key decisionmakers and organizations. A five-member policy group comprised of the sheriff, chief judge, president of the county board, the public defender and a state's attorney was formed. That group designated a steering committee comprised of ten individuals in key positions from all the agencies which dealt with women offenders. They were responsible for doing the majority of the work and bringing

information and change targets to the policy group for review. This arrangement appears to be working well. Six sub-committees were formed to provide further support to the steering committee; data, resources, assessment, academic, training and co-morbidity committees. The County held a symposium on Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders for all agencies.

An early major finding for the policy group was the extent to which duplicate information was collected by multiple agencies and how limited automated communication was among those agencies. A result of the change targets will be a review of the new automated juvenile offender system. With this information a consensus may be developed for a re-design of the adult system.

In Cook County, the Sheriff garnered a great deal of respect for the ISWO project, and was instrumental in getting other elected officials to participate and cooperate in the collaborative process. As with all sites, one of its challenges was to grapple with the natural impetus to try to accomplish something quickly, through focusing on program development, rather than staying with the policy/systems approach. Already, collaborative efforts have occurred as a result of this process, such as accelerating the opening of the jail boot camp for women offenders as an intermediate sanction for sentenced women who otherwise would go to prison. Another off-site intermediate sanction created as a result of the ISWO project was the MOM'S program for pregnant, pre-trial, addicted women offenders.

The Cook County project, through its data and resource committees, discovered a general lack of information as the offender flows through the system. Each agency pays attention to the offender at their point of responsibility, but once their responsibility to the offender is terminated, she moves on to the next decision point in the system. Decisions are being made without adequate or

accurate information. They learned how necessary it is to know what resources, services and sanctions are available at each agency's decision point.

Through the two and one half year process of the ISWO project, the Steering Committee identified several change targets which will be recommendations for systems policy change. One of the significant change targets deals with Request for Proposals (RFP's) and contracts that formulate the specification criteria required for women's treatment programs in Cook County. The Sheriff of Cook County took the lead and created the RFP for Drug and Alcohol programs which detailed the gender responsive criteria required of program providers. For the first time in Cook County, proposals were evaluated on gender responsive content; cost was no longer the primary criteria. The Steering Committee will recommend to the Cook County policymakers that all requests for proposals and contracts be gender responsive and follow the guidelines established in the gender responsive RFP. This change alone, significant by its nature, will change current policy.

Because the Sheriff placed such value on doing "what works" for women offenders, in late 1999, he created the new Department of Women's Justice Services and appointed the ISWO project manager as the Executive Director. This department now has administrative responsibility for all women offenders in the custody of the Cook County Sheriff's Office.

The Cook County Steering Committee believes that it is critical for all agencies to change the traditional way of "doing business" with women offenders. A special effort was made by the Cook County Steering Committee to educate a number of entities about the need for a gender responsive focus, including the Cook County Adult Probation Department, Illinois Legislators, Cook County Executive Staff and others.

The Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders project has identified change targets which are driven by data and guiding principles. Collaboration among agencies involved in the project is of critical importance and will provide the vehicle to effective intervention for women offenders.

### **Hampden County, Massachusetts**

Hampden County has done well pulling a policy group together comprised of key decisionmakers and key community members. To date, one member of the Sheriff's Department and community members have evidenced the greatest loyalty to the project, being most consistent about attending meetings and doing a great deal of the work. Other key systems decisionmakers have been involved, but have sometimes been unable to attend meetings where key decisions were made. Some members of the policy group understand that their work is supposed to be policy-directed while others are still more program-oriented.

At this writing, Hampden County has completed its data gathering on women offenders in jail and in the state criminal justice system. A survey was conducted to gather demographic information and service needs for women in the county prison. Focus groups were held for women offenders and for service providers and systems people who work with women offenders to better understand women offender's service needs. The policy group has provided training on gender-specific programming for staff from probation, the community corrections center, and has presented workshops on the project for several statewide conferences. The County is in the process of writing their final report and making policy recommendations, one of which will be to require a potential service provider interested in serving women offenders to show its capacity to provide gender-specific services.

Hampden County is experiencing a great deal of political change at the state level with many county functions being transferred to the State. State probation and state community corrections departments have been created in response to a mandated expansion of intermediate sanctions. The current ISWO work is creating the possibility of a separate track for women offenders in the larger state-mandated intermediate sanctions work.

### **San Francisco City and County, California**

San Francisco faced some serious leadership challenges from the beginning of its involvement in the ISWO project. San Francisco's application to ISWO was initiated by a judge who was very supportive and knowledgeable about the project, but she left the project before it got underway because her presiding judgeship expired. A key issue for San Francisco was the tenure of judge members since they were appointed to the ISWO project by presiding judges who served for only one year. This was not compatible with the long-term, policy-driven nature of the ISWO project. The original intent was to have collaborative project leadership between the courts and the adult probation department, with adult probation taking the lead. Four months after the project began, the Chief of Adult Probation retired. The courts stepped in to take the lead during the transition with the two presiding judges appointing two other judges to lead the project. The new leadership, although informed about women's issues, took on that responsibility without a full understanding of the commitment required and without a personal initiative to become involved. The lead judges since determined they could not devote the necessary time and asked the new Chief of Probation to take over the project, which he did willingly and with a collaborative approach. However, his energies were necessarily focused on learning about a new system and process in the County. Because of changes in policy group

leadership, much time was spent trying to develop a sense of direction and to determine what tasks should have been undertaken first. Project staff devoted considerable time and effort to keeping the project on line.

The 30-member policy group was comprised of a diverse spectrum of decisionmakers and system and community professionals, including six judges. Many key people were very program-oriented and had a difficult time understanding the nature of a policy-driven process. The courts initially resisted undertaking the task of decision mapping, believing it was unnecessary because they already understood how the system functioned. Other policy group members also did not fully understand the value and reasoning behind the mapping process. The San Francisco policy group, representing both political and justice concerns, was unable to support the commitment required for the long-term ISWO project. This was due in part to previous involvement in other grant-funded projects and community support of a programmatic rather than a policy-driven approach to change.

After struggling with leadership and direction issues for many months, and with the departure of a key staff member, NIC and San Francisco City and County jointly concluded that the timing was not right to continue in the project. NIC continues to offer technical assistance to San Francisco for specific need areas.

### **Hamilton County, Ohio**

Hamilton County has assembled a very active team of 22 members and is grappling with the fundamental issues presented by understanding current systems practices and identifying their most critical problems. They are pleased with policy group members' heightened awareness and understanding of women offenders. They have been involved in the ISWO project for about two

years at this writing. Some policy group members believe the group has needed this much time to lay the groundwork for more effective decisionmaking regarding women offenders.

Hamilton County's policy group feels a valuable trust has been developed amongst team members that is allowing candid discussion about issues. They have most of the key players involved in the project, and continually work toward that goal by bringing in new members as additional issues and stakeholders are identified. A judge involved in the policy group sees this forum as the only place they are aware of to get all stakeholders, both inside and outside the system, together to talk honestly. That judge believes the policy group is an especially valuable vehicle for them to ask questions because they might feel more vulnerable about asking "dumb questions" in an all peer group. Outsiders are also more likely to ask challenging questions that insiders don't ask of judges. Although they now have to explain why they do everything they do (even if it is for a political reason), the participating judge welcomes the process and finds it stimulating. Judges in Hamilton County see one of their next tasks to be working toward expanded "buy-in" regarding women offender issues and proposed changes from other judges.

In Hamilton County, perhaps the most valuable outcomes of this process to date are not necessarily tangible products but rather the process of bringing people together to talk about mutually relevant issues where there has been no previous dialogue. The County has established a framework within which components of the criminal justice system and elements of the community such as education and religious organizations have come to the same table to talk. Barriers have come down, turf issues have dissipated and people are working together in ways they have never before. In some of the

discussions, the issues were secondary to the desire for dialogue. The efforts of the policy group have had a "tentacle affect" on the entire County, modeling a process for both community and criminal justice members. For example, a former non-believer in treatment, the Sheriff now requires treatment as a condition of performing work in the jail. In a policy group meeting, the Sheriff's office complained about the difficulty of finding minorities to work in the jail. An African American minister in the policy group responded by providing the Sheriff's Office with a list of

minority candidates who were interested in such a position. Other progress includes discovering that while men get credit for work detail, women do not have that same opportunity, primarily because there is a shortage of women officers to oversee women.

As another result of the Project, the Hamilton County policy team has managed to divert 100 women from the jail to a secure residential facility in the community where they receive comprehensive assessment and substance abuse treatment. The team has also designed a special mental health docket for both women and men that allows more time for decisionmakers to consider both individual circumstances and community resources in sanctioning.

The policy group's approach has been to identify areas about which they have questions and to invite those who have control over that area to help provide the group with information and answers. For example, if a question arises about a treatment program that those present are unable to answer, the head of the program is invited to the next meeting to help answer questions. A jail committee was formed to develop a better understanding of what occurs in the process of

booking women. A policy group member made a powerful presentation about what typically happens to women in the booking process. Many of those present, including judges, were not aware of strip searching and other privacy issues that are very difficult for women offenders. As a result of that presentation, the intake area is being redesigned to allow for more privacy.

The policy group meets once a month from 12:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. A box lunch is served at 12:30 p.m. and the meeting begins at 1:00 p.m. which gives group members time to socialize prior to doing business. Fridays were chosen because Hamilton County judges tend to have lighter dockets that day.

Hamilton County attributes much of the success of this process to NIC's involvement. Experienced technical assistance from NIC has provided invaluable insight into the best ways to assemble a policy group and maintain an effective political balance. NIC's presence also helps provide a thread of stability and continuity for the work. Hamilton County anticipates continuing to hold policy group meetings indefinitely after the NIC project support ends.

1. Knapp, Kay (December 1994). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders: The Development of Policy Processes*.

2. Additional benefits, including learnings by the policy group are listed in Appendix C, "Site Descriptions" under York County, "What Was Learned."

## VI. Summary/Analysis

### Challenges Encountered and Insights Gained

The following analysis takes a look at situational and political factors that helped facilitate an effective project and those which hindered progress. The impacts of NIC's collaboration with the sites are also considered. While sites had varying degrees of success from the standpoint of NIC's original objectives, each site accomplished some important tasks and identified in their own terms the benefits accrued from participation in the ISWO project.

#### Clarifying Project Purpose and Outcomes

Driving Forces for NIC. NIC had several goals and objectives for this process that are described in Section III, "Scope of the Project". NIC saw this process as a partnership between itself and the jurisdictions that courageously agreed to undertake policy development on improved sanctions for women offenders with a systems approach. NIC envisioned this process as one that must be informed by a thorough analysis of current system practices in sanctioning and supervising women offenders and factual information which supports the development of policies that define desired outcomes of sanctions for specific groups of women offenders. In other words, the ISWO process should be policy-driven and data-informed. NIC felt strongly that those who make decisions must take ownership of this process by participating in data analysis and grappling with complex and often controversial issues. Ultimately, NIC wanted each jurisdiction to build its capacity to plan in a systems context across a broad range of policy areas, not only for women offenders.

Driving Forces for Jurisdictions. Jurisdictions participating in this project were motivated by similar circumstances as well as unique factors. All sites were experiencing an increase in the number of women offenders in their criminal justice system and very few had programming or services designed specifically to address women's needs. Most recognized they had very little hard data on women offenders or the programs and sanctions available to them, so that policy decisions were often based on anecdotal information or unsupported assumptions. Further detail on each sites' motivation to engage in this work can be found in Appendix C, "Site Descriptions".

Making the Project a Priority. The nature of policy planning requires a much longer process than most program development projects. Neither NIC nor most sites were prepared for how long this process would take. Sites often needed time to learn how to work in a policy planning venue before they could actually begin to accomplish tasks associated with the ISWO process. Many sites were prepared to devote the required time and energy to this process, and some even restructured staff responsibilities for the duration of the project to allow greater concentration on the project. Other sites engaged in the process without the full commitment of the sponsoring agency to make the process a priority. In these sites, sometimes a few policy group members attempted to take on the responsibilities of staffing the policy group, causing tensions when personal commitments conflicted with their work responsibilities. Some sites did not allocate sufficient financial support for the project to provide, for example, needed staff support or meals for meetings. In a few instances, failure to prioritize the ISWO process resulted in stalled or ineffective work plans, and

limited the overall impact of the ISWO project for the site.

Lack of Clear Goals, Outcomes. While all jurisdictions were motivated to address issues concerning women offenders, most policy groups did not clearly establish project goals and desired outcomes in the early stages of their work. NIC expected sites to engage in an information-based policymaking process, and provided process facilitation and technical expertise, but left it to sites to define more precisely their expected outcomes. Because of the complexity of the project, some policy group members felt they never clearly understood the key issues, NIC's expectations, or what the project was intended to accomplish. They would have benefited from clearer guidance by NIC and their own group leadership in defining goals and objectives. Some said that a timeline with monthly milestones and goals outlined would have helped them more clearly visualize their destination and the path to it.

Expected Outcomes. Expected outcomes can be both products and processes. It is essential that jurisdictions undertaking policy development with a systems approach identify both process and product goals that they want to accomplish (see Chapter III., "Project Benefits/Outcomes", for a listing of both types of potential outcomes). NIC has found, through ISWO and other policymaking projects, that process outcomes are important in themselves and critical to achieving the more tangible, concrete products. Many sites achieved some of the expected outcomes; other outcomes are more difficult to categorize and define, but contribute nonetheless to improvements in ways women offenders are sanctioned and receive services. For example, judges may be more reflective and frugal in ordering services as part of a probation sanction. In another site, groups of service providers and agencies who previously did not collaborate may begin working together,

utilizing resources more effectively and assisting women offenders more successfully.

It is also important that jurisdictions engaging in the ISWO process recognize and celebrate 'outcomes' and accomplishments achieved on the way to project completion. Though some desired changes are more long-term, and are implemented after the ISWO Project period end, many are attained during the course of the project.

Understanding A Policy Driven Process. At the outset, some sites had little understanding of what a policy development process was, and a few never did grasp its core elements. Almost all jurisdictions had a natural tendency to gravitate toward program design, and those who were unable to persevere in making a transition to a policy-driven process continued with program-related work. The tremendous shift in mind set required to actively engage in policy development in a systems context was difficult for most sites to achieve. Most of those involved in policy groups were designers, implementers, or users of programs and sanctions for women offenders. Many came to their projects with the preconceived idea that developing new programs was the only solution for identified issues. Some policy groups never moved beyond that focus. Asking everyone, including those in influential positions, to step back and reflect on what they do, how and why they do it, and whether they are arriving at desired outcomes, is no small undertaking. Judges, agency administrators, and even line staff do not normally question the assumptions on which they base their day-to-day behavior. Those who were successful in negotiating the tension of self-analysis and truly grappling with underlying issues described it as an intermittently painful process that sometimes seemed to stagnate. Because the process can be so slow, policy groups can feel as if they aren't making progress. For those that persevered, fruits of their systemic work surfaced in many ways later.

A systems approach to sanctioning policy development can be described abstractly step by step, but in practice is a more organic and iterative process. The process of bringing people together to discuss issues begins to build understanding, draw out information, and identify assumptions. Then new information is needed to test these assumptions. Sites may find themselves cycling through some planning steps when new information requires the revisiting of earlier objectives and change targets.

NIC originally expected that the goals of this project could be accomplished in one year. However, all sites required much more time to learn a new way of doing business (the systems approach to planned change) and to effectively examine their intermediate sanctioning purposes and practices. Electoral pressures on some of the key decisionmakers, coupled with issues of shifting power and authority, also tended to lengthen the time required to achieve the open and safe atmosphere necessary for effective self-examination. Later sites devoted at least two years to the project, and many said even more time would have been beneficial, especially for implementation of identified changes.

NIC's original focus was the systematic study of current sanctioning practices (broadly defined) with women offenders, and the development of policies regarding desired changes in intermediate sanctions for the short and long term. Now NIC is devoting more attention to the implementation of policy changes and development of monitoring/evaluation approaches.

Training and Technical Assistance. In the first two rounds of the project, small planning grants were provided directly to applicant jurisdictions. Although the grants specified expected outcomes, most jurisdictions had difficulty staying focused

and negotiating the complexities of the various projects' various tasks and processes. Beginning with Round Three, the approach was modified to focus on improving policy development through an integrated training and technical assistance effort. The ISWO project began by offering introductory workshops to jurisdictions interested in developing policy and programs regarding intermediate sanctions for women offenders. These trainings were followed by substantial on-site technical assistance, tailored to the needs of each jurisdiction. This permitted the technical assistance providers to attend to the organizational climate of each jurisdiction and to consider the differing capacities of the project teams. This approach also provided an opportunity for peer consultation and problem-solving, and the use of information and materials from the efforts of the earlier sites.

Trainings included the following:

- a common framework for policy development
- problem-solving opportunities through peer consultation
- the roles of information in policy development, and hands on experience with



data collection and analysis

- development of workplans, including plans for further technical assistance needed from the project

Sites generally praised NIC's technical assistance<sup>1</sup>, finding it very helpful in a number of ways, particularly in designing and defining the systems process and in helping sites build a team. The opportunity to learn with other jurisdictions was especially helpful for some sites and others particularly benefitted from NIC's training and modeling in group process and described how it carried over into their work with other issues. As sites participated in the work, it became clear that timing and sequencing of trainings and key elements of the project were very important. It would have been helpful in some cases to receive more targeted assistance from NIC in learning how to shift from a program to a policy focus at the outset of the ISWO work. A few sites reported they could have used more direction from NIC and wished they had asked for more help. In one case, the site thought NIC was too directive and seemed to want jurisdictions to follow an already developed agenda and come to the same conclusions as NIC. There were a few reports of receiving technical assistance that was not well-directed and a concern by one site that NIC did not seem to fully anticipate nor appreciate the challenges their policy group faced. Others mentioned how important it was to have a single

contact at NIC who was readily accessible by phone. In the few jurisdictions where key decisionmakers felt they already knew a great deal about policy development and women offenders, NIC trainings were not well-received.

NIC managed the projects for the first three rounds, providing intermittent on-site technical assistance from NIC staff and outside consultants. Because this was a new endeavor, NIC did not allocate sufficient technical or financial support services at NIC for project administration.

Beginning with the fourth round, NIC secured project management services through a cooperative agreement with an organization with technical expertise. The service provider assigned one site coordinator (facilitator) to each site. In the first three rounds, technical assistance was provided in specialized task areas by different individuals. Each site might see three or four different technical assistance providers over the course of their work. In Round 4, most technical assistance has been provided by the site coordinator (facilitator), who is involved in the process on an on-going basis. When coordinators see a specialized need, they can request additional consultant expertise to meet that need. Because coordinators are much better informed about each site's progress, trainings can be more readily focused on the needs of the participating sites. Everyone has expressed greater satisfaction with this form of management.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: CLARIFYING PROJECT PURPOSE AND OUTCOMES</b>	
-	The sponsoring agencies for in participating sites must make the ISWO process a priority
-	NIC must provide clear instructions to policy groups regarding key steps in the policy development/systems approach
-	NIC must provide on-going, competent, readily accessible technical expertise and training for this complex process
-	Most jurisdictions need to develop capacity and skills for policy analysis
-	General goals should be developed prior to assembling the policy group to help determine who should participate
-	Policy group members must develop a vision, clear goals, objectives and desired outcomes for the ISWO process
-	Policy group members must be prepared to devote the needed time to the project
-	Jurisdictions must set aside preconceived ideas about specific programs and a more familiar program development planning mode to participate in the ISWO process

### **Establishing the Policy Group**

**Ownership.** Ownership of this process is critical to finally implementing any proposed changes. Split responsibilities within departments and a mixture of state/county control offer particular challenges to defining clear roles for all participants and building ownership of both problems and solutions. Turf battles can seriously impede the progress of

policy groups. Power struggles may exist or develop in the course of the project, involving conflicts between agencies over decisionmaking practices, competition between programs for scarce resources, or questions of state versus local policymaking authority. Nonetheless, a few statewide teams were successful in developing commitment to and ownership of the work and its policy changes/solutions.

## **KEYS TO SUCCESS: ESTABLISHING THE POLICY GROUP**

### **Ownership**

- Because ownership is so critical to the ISWO process, this work is generally more successful at the county level where the key actors are easier to identify, assemble, and become committed to local solutions.
- Jurisdictions with split authority for components of the criminal justice system undertaking the ISWO process must find strategies to clarify roles and ownership of the process, and to deal with the inevitable conflicts that arise

Leadership. Sites had a wide range of approaches to leadership, and experienced various degrees of success as a consequence. Those sites which had a change in policy group leadership during the project were usually particularly handicapped, although two sites actually benefitted from the fresh energy of new leadership midway through the project. The greatest successes came with leaders who were personally interested in women offender issues, had some knowledge about the issues and were committed to the project throughout its duration. Those leaders who were generally fulfilling an obligation were much less effective. Leaders whose energies were divided among numerous roles and responsibilities were much less effective than those who could devote needed time and attention to the project. Although all sites affirmed the critical importance of including all key decisionmakers in the policy group, there were mixed reviews about having a key decisionmaker chair the policy group. Though they can engender much respect and participation on the part of other individuals, some lacked organizational skills and the ability to remain focused on the objectives of the group. In some cases, other group members would defer to a powerful decisionmaker, thereby reducing the value and influence of the broad spectrum of participants. When a chair may unduly influence the group, the role of outside facilitators in setting agendas and assisting with meeting process is critical to ensuring effective collaboration and

consensus-building.

It is also not helpful to select a group chair who functions as a "figurehead" who is not prepared to "roll up his/her sleeves" along with everyone else. In sites where the real, operational leadership rested with staff rather than the chair(s), both the process and products of group work were more limited in scope and effectiveness.

The political power and resources of the agency sponsoring the ISWO project is very important to project success. If key decisionmakers are not effectively involved in the policy group, it is critical to have representatives in the group who have immediate access to influence with the decisionmakers. For the policy group's work to be effective, decisionmakers, particularly judges, need to be fully informed about that work.

The work of policy development and change in a systems context is incredibly time-consuming. When undertaking the ISWO process, policy group leadership should plan on a minimum of two years. In most cases, a longer time frame will allow greater success. Some sites reported it took two years to get to the point where real progress could begin. Even with experienced policy professionals involved, the problem of analysis and policy development takes a considerable amount of time. Because most professionals are focused on program planning, it can take several months or

more for a group to find its true direction and to learn how to work together in a systems planning fashion.

At a personal level, policy group chairs should be prepared to devote approximately 10-15 hours

per month throughout the project, and staff coordinators will need to set aside perhaps double that time. Other members should be prepared to put in additional time beyond attending monthly meetings.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: ESTABLISHING THE POLICY GROUP</b>	
<b>Leadership</b>	
-	Leadership role(s), (chairs of policy group and committees), should be clearly defined
-	Because authoritative leaders may inhibit the full and open participation of all members, it is critical that leaders respect and encourage the voicing of diverse perspectives
-	Leaders/chairs who are enthusiastic about their roles are critical
-	Leaders must make a commitment to devote the needed time and attention to the ISWO project for the duration of the process
-	A well-respected leader helps draw membership
-	Because it is rare for one individual to possess all the needed organizational and leadership skills needed to chair the policy group, sites may want to consider a joint leadership role (i.e. co-chairs)
-	When decisionmakers are not active participants in the policy group, strategies must be developed to keep them fully informed

Membership. Most sites were successful in pulling together a diverse membership which generated great benefits. However, every jurisdiction experienced challenges in establishing and maintaining their policy groups. With a broad cross-section of justice system and other members, questions were raised that would not have been considered by "insiders", and a wide breadth of expertise and knowledge was contributed to the process.

Since NIC encouraged justice system policymakers to develop links with community resources which also provide services to women, most ISWO policy groups included human

services and community members with widely varying degrees of understanding of criminal justice issues. It took some time for these diverse policy groups to become focused and to develop clear problem definitions and project goals and vision.

Most jurisdictions invited experienced criminal justice professionals, including judges, prosecutors and corrections staff to participate in ISWO policy groups. When judges and other "insider" professionals were active participants, policy group members learned much about how decisions were made, and were more likely to be focused on critical change targets.

As already mentioned, perhaps the most important group of decisionmakers to involve in the project is the judiciary. Although already emphasized, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of judges' active participation, since they make many of the key decisions that impact women offenders most. Because judges are usually influential members of the criminal justice system, their buy-in and active involvement is key to pulling other players along. If the bench is skeptical about becoming involved, other policy group members must persuade them that their involvement in the process is critical and help them to see how improving the success of women offenders can make a difference in their professional and political life.

Some jurisdictions were not successful in bringing key decisionmakers to the group. In a few jurisdictions, those who attended did so because they were appointed and not because they were committed to the work. A few key decisionmakers were very resistant to change, saying the system was already working well for women offenders and did not need to be modified. Others expected to be given answers by experts

rather than grapple with the issues and engage in a process of analysis, discovery and consensus-building.

Because key decisionmakers are sometimes uninformed about the details of day-to-day operations, involving line staff in the policy group is important. Line staff and ex-offenders also are critical to implementation of any proposed changes. Line staff are also essential in conveying information between the policy group and other line staff. In some cases, line staff feared that speaking out on particular issues might affect job security. The policy group was most successful when it was open to hearing everyone's concerns.

Women professionals working in the justice system often have a particular interest in improving the system's effectiveness for women offenders. They are often the most knowledgeable about this population, sanctioning practices and available resources. Frequently these women do not have the authority to change sanctioning policy or allocate resources for implementing new policies or programs.

## **KEYS TO SUCCESS: ESTABLISHING THE POLICY GROUP**

### **Membership**

- Key decisionmakers must be included in the policy group
- The involvement and support of the judiciary is critical to the ISWO process
- A varied membership, including service providers outside the criminal justice system, is beneficial to the ISWO process
- The policy group must attend to the wide variation in understanding of the issues by providing education about the criminal justice system and women offenders to its members
- Policy group members should be encouraged to speak out on sensitive issues and be reassured their speaking out will not jeopardize their job security
- Women professionals often are among those most knowledgeable about women offender issues. They are not always the top policy officials; therefore care should be taken to include men and women with decision-making authority as well as those most informed about women offender issues.
- Policy group members must develop strategies to work with one another in spite of competition for scarce resources and authority regarding women offender issues
- Key decisionmakers reluctant to support change must be shown how change will benefit women offenders, themselves professionally, and the organization they represent
- All policy group members must be committed to grappling with the with hard issues
- Line staff should be involved in the policy group as needed to provide detail on the intricacies of day-to-day operations
- The simple act of coming together can result in new understandings, alliances and networks

Staff Support/Resources. Whether this process is being undertaken with the aid of outside technical assistance or solely with inside expertise, adequate resources are essential to its overall success. The most valuable resource is the time given by leadership, staff and members. Dedicated staff support available throughout the process is critical. Sites generally did not have adequate staff support. Those who had more than one competent staff person able to share responsibilities fared much better.

Adequate financial resources must be made available in the jurisdiction to support the process. Most jurisdictions needed to devote resources to collecting needed information. This required a significant investment in personnel, expertise and equipment. Other costs include the release time of staff to do file analysis, data gathering and interviews with women offenders. For most sites, this project highlighted the need for further work on their information systems as a whole.

### **KEYS TO SUCCESS: ESTABLISHING THE POLICY GROUP**

#### **Staff Support/Resources**

- Competent staff who can devote the needed time and energy to support the ISWO process are critical
- Adequate financial resources must be available to support the ISWO process; i.e. for data collection and analysis; meeting expenses, etc.

#### Attending to Meeting Logistics

Sites with dedicated staff were more consistent in developing well-planned and facilitated agendas for policy group meetings. Many sites suffered from meetings that meandered and left participants feeling as if not much was accomplished. This may account for some of the sporadic attendance in various policy groups. Sites that set meetings taking the schedules of key

decisionmakers into consideration had more consistent attendance. Other keys to success included:

- making certain everyone knew what the policy group intended to accomplish at each meeting

- strictly observing meeting start and end times
- serving meals in conjunction with meetings
- addressing specific issues or tasks at each meeting
- making certain policy group

members were active participants with specific responsibilities

Participants were more motivated if their overall interests were taken into consideration and they felt they received something of value for the time spent. In some cases this involved bringing in speakers on relevant topics of interest to everyone, e.g. a talk on chemical dependency.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: ATTENDING TO MEETING LOGISTICS</b>	
-	Agendas detailing expected accomplishments should be prepared for each meeting
-	Maintaining each participant's active involvement and enthusiasm in the policy group, making each meeting productive and meaningful, and marking and celebrating accomplishments along the way are keys to maintaining interest and regular attendance
-	Key decisionmaker schedules should be considered when setting meeting schedules

### **Building Information to Support the Change Process**

From the outset of the ISWO project, NIC emphasized the importance of developing policy change strategies based on factual information about 1) women offenders; 2) the quality and availability of services and sanctions for them; and, 3) the ways that jurisdictions make decisions to place women offenders in sanctions and services. NIC provided technical assistance to jurisdictions to develop relevant information while

also developing sites' capacity to continue compiling and using information after the ISWO project ended.

Although participating sites were generally committed to building an information base on women offenders and the sanctions and services currently in use for them, the task proved to be far more complex and challenging than many groups anticipated. Most jurisdictions discovered that information about offenders routinely available to their decisionmakers was not sufficiently detailed



or comprehensive to allow them to adequately explore new ways of making decisions about women. New decision criteria usually could not be addressed using old recordkeeping systems.

Thus, many sites found that they had to resort to some form of original data collection on a sample of women offenders in order to obtain data useful for modeling the potential impacts of changes in decisionmaking policies and practices. This work required technical expertise in sampling, survey design and data analysis, which was provided to many sites by NIC-funded consultants, and augmented by local experts in data systems and statistical analysis. Jurisdictions also found that such data collection efforts usually require a significant investment of local staff time to collect data and enter it into a data base. Some jurisdictions were able to augment justice system staff efforts with assistance from local university researchers and students.

Jurisdictions interested in assessing not only the capacity of existing sanctions and services, but also their "gender specificity" as encouraged by NIC, frequently found that information on program quality and effectiveness was not uniformly available across the full range of sanction and service options. Several sites designed an inventory format that permitted the collection of uniformly defined information on staffing, service delivery approaches, outcome indicators and other factors important to understanding the continuum of available options.

Profiling women offenders and inventorying available programs are labor-intensive and time-consuming tasks that should be streamlined as much as possible by focusing on particular target populations and/or decision points. However, some sites proceeded to collect detailed information about women offenders and the programs available to them without first

defining the change targets on which their information collection should focus. These sites often found that they had expended considerable effort to assemble information that was ultimately not relevant to their policy development process, a frustrating experience at best. One of the central lessons learned by most sites was that information should not be collected simply for general purposes. Information collection and analysis should be driven by the policy group's definition of key issues and targets for change.

Nearly all sites discovered that the qualitative information they compiled was as important as the quantitative data in enhancing their understanding of the way their current system operated. Mapping the way decisions are made was a key information-building activity that for many sites was the centerpiece of their systematic analysis of the impacts of current intermediate sanctioning policies and practices on women offenders. Decision mapping helped jurisdictions clarify their sanctioning goals, document the types of information about offenders and sanctions available to decisionmakers, and understand the criteria used to make decisions about women offenders at different points in the system. However, some sites resisted engaging in decision mapping, either as a result of over-emphasizing program design at the expense of policy development, or because some decisionmakers were wary of having their decisions scrutinized or challenged by others inside and outside the justice system. In these jurisdictions, policy development efforts were often stalled or thwarted by a lack of systematic knowledge about current decision policies and their intended and unintended impacts.

For most sites the process of information building was very enlightening, even if the data they were able to compile during the ISWO project was not fully satisfactory for policy development purposes.

All sites learned about gaps in their recordkeeping and information systems, and as a result, some chose to focus their change strategies on improving the quality and accessibility of information for

decisionmakers and practitioners, with the aim of enhancing the positive impacts of their decisions on women offenders.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: BUILDING INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE CHANGE PROCESS</b>
--

- |  |
|--|
| - Policy group members responsible for gathering information must develop strategies to work with organizational, political and technological barriers           |
| - Competent technical support is critical for information assembly   |
| - To build accurate and meaningful information to support the change process, policy group members must question the way things are done and uncover assumptions |

#### Selecting and Advocating for Change Targets

Many sites began the project with change targets already identified. After gathering information and developing a data base, those change targets were often modified. While the preliminary identification of change targets serves a useful purpose, sites needed to be open to the possibility that further analysis of information might require different or additional change targets.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: SELECTING AND ADVOCATING FOR CHANGE TARGETS</b>
---

- |   |
|---|
| - While members may come to the policy group with pre-conceived ideas of needed change, they must remain open to considering other proposals after building information to support the change process |
|---|

#### Developing Change Proposals and Forecasting Impacts

Most sites lacked the time and other resources necessary to assess costs and benefits of proposed changes in policies and programs. Sometimes, proposals for change were not specific enough to lend themselves to analysis of their potential impacts. This impact modeling is critical to building a case to get further buy-in from constituencies and communities outside the policy group who will be impacted by the proposed change.

## **KEYS TO SUCCESS: DEVELOPING CHANGE PROPOSALS AND FORECASTING IMPACTS**

- The policy team must follow through on implementing proposed changes by developing change proposals and forecasting the impacts of proposed changes
- Resources must be available to develop change proposals
- Forecasting and modeling the impact of proposed changes is critical for buy-in of proposed changes

### **Implementing Changes in Policies, Practices and Programs**

In the first three rounds of the ISWO project, support from NIC did not extend to the stage of implementing comprehensive policy changes. Many sites found it difficult to follow through on their work and implement even a few of the necessary changes they identified. Sometimes there were difficulties institutionalizing the knowledge gained and policy recommendations, leaving only a small group of ex-policy group members with the new information and expertise gained. There were also various snags in relaying information on decisions made by the policy group to line staff. However, even in the absence of formal implementation, participants found themselves utilizing the process for other projects and referring back to their work with the policy group at a later date. They could often point to how their decisions about women offenders were informally influenced by the time spent in the policy group.

Several jurisdictions said they had particular difficulty conveying new information and understanding about women offenders to the judiciary, even when judges were represented in the policy group. Barriers to effective communication included decentralized arenas of control for individual judges and lack of a judicial communication network, all complicated by a

general reluctance on the part of some judges to consider new information about women offenders. Because judges are so critical to the effective implementation of proposed changes and policy, policy groups would do well to take up the challenge of how to communicate and work effectively with judges. This is a critical step in the process that cannot be overlooked.

Some sites were fortunate to have leadership adept at facilitating change. Those individuals had credibility with judges, county commissioners and corrections staff. They knew how to persuade key individuals and influence others. They also knew how to work with key people to facilitate decisionmaking processes. They were able to bring out the best in people, to challenge them and get their ownership of proposed changes.

Although the definition of desired outcomes is a critical element of the ISWO process, most sites in the first rounds did not pay much attention to outcomes. The process of defining measurable outcomes should take place early in the process of identifying change targets. Those outcomes should be woven into the process of policy development to provide a benchmark for on-going evaluation and improvement of outcomes.

<b>KEYS TO SUCCESS: IMPLEMENTING CHANGES IN POLICIES, PRACTICES AND PROGRAMS</b>
- Effective change agents are essential for facilitating change
- The support and endorsement of key decisionmakers is critical to implementing proposed change
- Ownership by those responsible for day-to-day operations is necessary for implementation of proposed policy changes
- Strategies must be developed to convey information and provide education to all decisionmakers not involved in the policy group, particularly judges
- Strategies must be developed to effectively relay information to the "ranks" and to institutionalize the ISWO policy group work



### **Findings and Recommendations for Future Sites and Others Considering Undertaking A Similar Process**

A review of the ISWO work done to date must acknowledge the difficulty of promoting change in the complex and adversarial systems which characterize the criminal justice world. This work is especially challenging because it asks decisionmakers to focus on women, a relatively small segment of the total offender population. All sites deserve recognition for engaging in this process and achieving the changes that resulted from their efforts.

In reviewing the overall experiences of the sites participating in this project, the following findings and recommendations emerged as critical variables for future success. These findings and recommendations highlight learnings by NIC and the selected sites and point to areas that call for special attention. Although some of the recommendations are based on recurring barriers to success, many are based on a recognition of key factors for success.

#### **1. Use lessons learned from the ISWO project for other policy development processes and projects.**

The process described in this document can readily be used to examine the underlying premises and effectiveness of a system working with any population of offenders, or for studying other problem foci such as teen mothers or homeless people who are also served by a collection of government, other public and private agencies. The original focus on women offenders was undertaken both because NIC established a priority on improving intermediate sanctions for women offenders, and because the relatively small size of the population made it an effective "test" population for this process.

#### **2. Secure a commitment from the sponsoring agency to make the process a priority.**

The sponsoring agency and its key players must make this process a priority in order for it to be most successful. The agency should be prepared to juggle responsibilities to free staff time from regular responsibilities in order to participate

in the policy group. Other resources should be made available to support the process as needed.

### **3. Develop clear goals and objectives.**

Prior to assembling the full policy group, the presenting problems and general goals for the project should be clarified. General preliminary goals will make it possible to describe the process to potential participants and will help clarify who should be invited to participate. Once the policy group has been assembled, sites must involve the full group in developing a vision, setting clear goals, identifying desired outcomes (including process outcomes) and identifying critical questions that face the jurisdiction. With a shared understanding of where they are going, policy groups will be able to begin making progress much earlier.

### **4. Select leadership with commitment, skills and credibility with others.**

Because leadership changes are so disruptive, selection of the policy group chair should be made thoughtfully, with careful consideration of ability to convene and shepherd a diverse membership through a lengthy, politically sensitive process. Ideally, the chair (as well as all members) should be able to devote a minimum of two years to this process. Leaders must fully understand what is expected of them. Individuals with inflexible commitments, or divided attention or loyalties are not likely to be effective policy group leaders. Leaders should volunteer, rather than being appointed. In order for this process to work, the policy group leader should enter the project with considerable interest and commitment.

Experience has shown that policy group leaders with personal stature and positional authority are most likely to draw in other key players. However, while these qualities are highly desirable, they do not substitute for effective leadership. Effective leadership traits include

being open to hearing from all constituents and considering the full range of issues regarding women offenders. Authoritarian leaders may inhibit line staff from speaking out, and create a dynamic where other group members defer to them. Some jurisdictions may find leaders with good leadership skills, organizational skills and professional respect. Because it is rare to find all those qualities in one individual, policy groups might consider a joint chairing of the policy group with an effective organizational leader and a well-respected professional leader.

### **5. Secure the participation and commitment of key decisionmakers in the policy group.**

All key decisionmakers should be actively involved with the policy group. If they are unable to participate themselves, they should appoint representatives who have direct and immediate access to them. While varied policy group membership that includes service providers and interested parties in the community is essential to the ISWO process, it also means that there will be a wide range of understanding of criminal justice system issues among members. This can be addressed through additional educational opportunities and through an open and inclusive group process. Women professionals and citizens are often the most knowledgeable about women offender issues, and many are willing participants in the ISWO policy groups. However, when women are not in key decisionmaking positions, those key decisionmakers must be sought out and brought into the process as full, committed participants. Line staff are also critical partners in this process because they often are most aware of details of daily operations, and they will ultimately be implementing any proposed changes.

**6. Maintain active participation by keeping the policy group meetings purposeful and interesting.**

Policy group meetings must be kept lively and interesting for group members to ensure consistent attendance and commitment. Each group will need to determine the qualities that will maintain the interest of their membership by asking group members why they are drawn to this process and what they hope to get out of participating in it. There are a wide variety of approaches that can keep meetings vibrant, including bringing in speakers to address topics of interest, providing meals at each meeting, making certain meetings use everyone's time and expertise effectively and keeping all group members engaged by continuously involving them in and giving them credit for accomplishing the various tasks associated with the process.

**7. Help key decisionmakers reluctant to change understand the benefits of proposed changes.**

Resistance to change by key decisionmakers might grow out of concerns about power or authority to set policy, political pressures, lack of understanding of issues, or unwillingness to take the risks involved in making changes. Whatever the reason, policy group members must develop an understanding of key decisionmakers' concerns and self-interest regarding changes, and an appreciation of factors that motivate these decisionmakers. Benefits of proposed new policies and practices will have to be clearly delineated in order to persuade those resistant to change of their value. Influential policy group members should be ready to devote considerable time and energy to lobbying those who are resistant to change, helping them understand the benefits of proposed changes, both to them and to the system as a whole.

**8. Identify an effective change agent to facilitate change and implement new policies, practices and programs.**

When policy groups strategize ways of implementing proposed changes, they should identify an effective "change agent" or group of "change agents" to spearhead those efforts beyond the tenure of the policy group. That individual or group of individuals may not necessarily have been a member of the policy group to date. The best change agent will be an individual or group with credibility with judges, county commissioners and corrections staff. A successful change agent is adept at both challenging and encouraging others, and bringing out the best in people to ensure that changes will be implemented as designed and will have the intended results.

**9. Attending to women offenders' unique patterns of risk factors and needs is essential to improving the effectiveness of sanctions and services for them.**

It is important not to confuse the call for developing 'gender-specific' approaches with retreating from a commitment to equitable sentencing of offenders. The choice of levels of punishment to be imposed on offenders should be based on principles outlined in a jurisdiction's sentencing statutes and guidelines, which ought to be uniformly applied to both men and women. To the extent that mitigating and aggravating factors may be considered in sentencing, these should also be consistently applied across all offenders. However, because the risk and needs profiles of women and men are on average quite different, the types of supervision, supportive services and treatment offered for women and for men may justifiably be quite different. If the goals of effective risk management and long-lasting behavior change are to be achieved, women offenders must receive supervision and services

that are 'gender-specific' in both content and mode of delivery.

#### **10. Solicit the active participation of judges.**

Because the decisions of judges have an enormous impact on the success of women offenders, their active participation and buy-in is critical to the ISWO process. Judges need to be brought into the process as willing participants. If judges are initially reluctant or disinterested, other policy group members must "sell" them on the importance to them of improving the justice systems's effectiveness with women offenders. Judicial involvement affects the level of commitment of other key players.

#### **11. Include providers who provide service to women offenders in the policy group.**

Women in the criminal justice system often have a broad and significant impact on many other systems, including mental health, welfare, social services and emergency rooms. Including these providers in the policy group at some point or in some way ensures that all issues and needs relating to women offenders and their children can be adequately addressed.

#### **12. Develop strategies to convey information, educate and communicate with the judiciary.**

Because judges are such critical players in the criminal justice system, effective ongoing communication with them must be a priority. Many jurisdictions do not have a system to routinely convey policy-relevant information to judges collectively or individually. The ISWO policy group must develop strategies for communicating with and educating judges regarding women offender issues. If the policy group's recommendations are to be implemented, judges must understand and endorse them. The

policy group should develop strategies to eliminate identified barriers to communication with the judiciary.

### **For NIC and other Technical Assistance Providers**

The following recommendations must acknowledge that undertaking a policy process is enormously complex. It is impossible to develop a template or a predetermined curriculum to guide jurisdictions in their work because every jurisdiction has its own issues, political structure, complexity of working relationships and decisionmaking systems. NIC undertook this project in part to learn from experience how best to assist local jurisdictions in this work. Recommendations for technical assistance providers are not a criticism of assistance given, but rather a recognition of factors that appear to be keys for success.

#### **13. NIC must provide a coherent framework for policy groups to engage in planned change.**

For a variety of reasons, some sites needed clearer instructions from NIC and their own group leadership in defining goals and objectives. Because of the complexity of the process, many sites would benefit enormously from working with NIC to develop a timeline and outline of steps to be taken and projected progress within defined periods appropriate for their jurisdiction.

Sites also need the assurance that good technical assistance is readily available from NIC in several areas, including:

- team development
- understanding how to engage in a systems planning process
- collaborative decisionmaking

- understanding how to assemble and analyze data and information to support the change process
- understanding how to implement change within the system and in the larger community
- understanding how to market change to all stakeholders and obtain buy-in

Other technical assistance may be needed, depending on each jurisdiction's situation. NIC must advise sites that they will inevitably need technical assistance and that they should learn to ask for help. Responsibility for recognizing when additional technical assistance is needed should be taken by both the site and NIC.

**14. Provide on-going information/training for the policy group that supports developing a clear understanding of process/policy work.**

Early in the process, training should be provided on the value of policy development in a systems context, and how to engage in this work. Most policy group members will be accustomed to program design efforts, and will need periodic reminders and support for the steps in this process. Because policy planning is foreign to most participants and because it is a complex process, the policy group will benefit from blending on-going training with direct experience with the process in their own sites.

1. Many people specifically mentioned their heartfelt appreciation of Anne McDiarmid.



## VII. Reference List

### Final Reports, By Jurisdiction:

Dallas County, Texas (May 1995). *The Dallas County Female Offender Project, Draft Final Report*, Funded by the National Institute of Corrections.

Department of Corrections, Divisions of Probation & Parole and Intensive Sanctions (August 1995). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders, Racine County, Wisconsin Female Offender Project, Final Report*, National Institute of Corrections.

Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders Policy Group (March 1995). *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders*, Prepared for Oregon Criminal Justice Council and the Department of Corrections, State of Oregon.

The Intermediate Sanctions Task Force of Dakota County, Minnesota (May 1994). *Final Report: Intermediate Sanctions Project, A Policy Framework for Decision Makers*.

York County, Pennsylvania (1997). *York County Female Offenders Intermediate Sanctions Policy Team Final Report*.

### Other Site Information/Reports:

Anderson, McGuire, Field, Hill, Willhite and Nelke (October 1991). *White Paper: Oregon's Women Offenders*, Oregon Department of Corrections.

Gido, Rosemary (November 1998). *An Assessment of Jail Use and Intermediate Programming for Women in a County Jail*, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

Kanche, Peggy, and Nesbitt, Charlotte (January 1991). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders*, for Johnson County, Kansas.

O'Brien, Pat, and Nesbitt, Charlotte (May 1993). *Intermediate Sanctions for Johnson County, Kansas Female Offenders*, Johnson County, Kansas.

(Spring 1995). *Racine County Female Offender Project, Study of Female Offenders Sentenced in 1992-93*.

(August 7, 1995). *Summary of Findings - Analysis of Focus Group Proceedings: York County Residents' Attitudes Toward Intermediate Sanctions*, Center for Opinion Research, Millersville University.

(1995). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders: Oregon Project Report*.

### Site Working Papers:

Paper 1. (Round 2, 1993-1995). *Wisconsin Information Source Assessment and Examples of Reports Generated*

### Articles/Handbooks:

Bloom, Barbara (May 3, 1995). *Women Offenders and Substance Abuse*, Presented at Missouri Department of Mental Health, Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, 1995 Spring Training Institute, Columbia, Missouri.

Bloom, Barbara, and Covington, Stephanie (November 1998). *Gender-Specific Programming for Female Offenders: What is it and Why is it Important?*

Daly, Kathleen (November/December 1995). "Gender and Sentencing: What We Know and Don't Know From Empirical Research." *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, Volume 8, Number 3, pp. 163-168.

Harris, M. Kay (May 1993). *In Her Best Interests: Imposition of Needs-Based Sanctions of Female Offenders*, Keynote Address for the Summit on Female Offenders, Johnson County, Kansas.

Knapp, Kay (December 1994). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders: The Development of Policy Processes*.

Knapp, Kay (March 1992). Institute for Rational Public Policy, Inc. *Monitoring Information on Sentences*.

Knapp, Kay (February 1994). "Planning Intermediate Sanctions For Female Offenders," *Overcrowded Times*, pp. 4, 14.

Knapp, Kay (Round 2, 1993-1995). *Policy-Driven Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders: The Critical Role of Data*.

McGarry, Peggy, Center for Effective Public Policy, (May 1992). *Improving the Use of Intermediate Sanctions: Lessons from the Intermediate Sanctions Project*.

McGarry, Peggy, Center for Effective Public Policy. (September 1990). *The Intermediate Sanctions Process, What Are Intermediate Sanctions? and What It Takes, Attachment A*.

McGarry, Peggy, and Carter, Madeline (October 1993). *The Intermediate Sanctions Handbook: Experiences and Tools for Policymakers*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections and State Justice Institute.

Rooney, David (June 1992). *Thinking About Sentencing: Are There Differences Between Men and Women?*, Second National Meeting, Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders, Dakota County, Minnesota.

Weis, Joseph G. and Von Cleve, Elizabeth (1988). *The Role of the Family in Female Crime and Corrections*, Committee to Study Sentencing and Correctional Alternatives for Women Convicted of Crime, Maryland.

U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections Working Papers:

Paper 1. (1990-91). *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders, Developing a Common Language on Intermediate Sanctions for This Project.*

Paper 2. (1990-91). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders, Program Goals and Project Approach.*

Paper 3. (1990-91). *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders "Recruitment Criteria Checklist".*

Paper 4. (July 13-14, 1989). *Women Offenders Under Community Supervision: Identifying Issues, Needs and Trends.*

Paper 5. (1994). *Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders, Intermediate Sanctions Process Accomplishments.*

Paper 6. (1991-92). *Solicitation for a Cooperative Agreement: Documentation of the Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders Projects.*

## VIII. Appendices

### Appendix A Contact List

The following is a contact list of individuals -- NIC staff, outside faculty and frequent technical advisors and group leaders, decisionmakers or influential participants for each site that participated in the project.

#### NIC Staff

George Keiser  
Chief, Community Corrections Division  
National Institute of Corrections  
320 1st Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20534  
Phone: (202) 307-3995 ext. 135  
Fax: (202) 307-3361  
E-mail: GKEISER@bop.gov

Phyllis Modley  
Correctional Program Specialist  
Community Corrections Division  
National Institute of Corrections  
320 1st Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20534  
Phone: (202) 307-3995 ext. 133  
Fax: (202) 307-3361  
E-mail: PMODLEY@bop.gov

#### Faculty and Frequent Technical Advisors

Linda Adams  
former Facilitator/Consultant  
P. O. Box 510  
Cape May Point, NJ 08212  
Phone: (609) 884-1122  
Fax: (609) 884-9114

Sally Anderson  
Consultant  
16 Oregon Yacht Club  
Portland, OR 97202-6460  
Phone: (503) 232-9932  
Fax: (503) 231-7251  
E-mail: SALLYAANDERSON@hotmail.com

Barbara Bloom, Ph.D.  
Criminal Justice Consultant  
Administration of Justice Department, San Jose State University  
P.O. Box 866  
Petaluma, CA 94953  
Phone: (707) 778-7270  
Fax: (707) 778-7145  
E-mail: BLOOM@sonoma.edu

M. Kay Harris  
Chair and Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Justice  
Affiliated Faculty in Women's Studies,  
Temple University  
509 Gladfelter Hall, 025-02  
1115 W. Berks St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19122  
Phone: (215) 204-5167  
Fax: (215) 204-3872  
E-mail: MKAY@astro.ocis.temple.edu

Lori Kenney  
Mediator/Facilitator and Part-time Faculty  
3252 N.E. Flanders Street  
Portland, OR 97232  
Phone: (503) 235-6464  
Fax: (503) 235-6585  
E-mail: KENNEY@coho.net

Kay Knapp  
Consultant  
2756 West River Parkway  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
Phone: (612) 724-6523  
Fax: (612) 725-9517  
E-mail: KAYKNAPP@msn.com

Cecelia Levisky  
Consultant/Part-time Faculty  
403 Stonegate  
York, PA 17404  
Phone: (717) 764-4569  
E-mail: CLEVISKY@aol.com

Marie Mactavish, Ph.D.  
Mactavish Consulting  
P.O. Box 4487  
Boulder, CO 80306-4487  
Phone: (303) 444-0942  
Fax: (303) 444-8847  
E-mail: MMACTAVISH@worldnet.att.net

Mary Mande  
Consultant  
4867 Dakota Boulevard  
Boulder, CO 80304  
Phone: (303) 939-8464  
Fax: (303) 939-8096  
E-mail: MARYMANDE@aol.com

Teri Martin, Ph.D.  
Principal, Law and Policy Associates  
1315 N.W. 185th Street, PMB 120  
Aloha, OR 97006  
Phone: (503) 690-6110  
Fax: (503) 645-2170  
E-mail: LPATKM@cs.com

Anne McDiarmid  
former Project Officer for NIC;  
currently: Criminal Justice Consultant and  
Supervisor, Program Unit  
Dakota County Community Corrections  
201 N. Concord Exchange  
South St. Paul, MN 55075  
Phone: (651) 552-3087  
Fax: (651) 552-3070  
E-mail: ANNEMCD@surfree.com

## Site Personnel

Diane Aisenbrey                      **Dakota County, MN, Round 1**  
Probation Officer and Planner  
Dakota County Community Corrections  
201 N. Concord Exchange  
South St. Paul, MN 55075  
Phone: (651) 438-8297  
Fax: (651) 438-8340

Sally Anderson                      **State of Oregon, Round 2**  
former Director of Administration and Planning,  
Oregon Department of Corrections  
Currently: Consultant  
Project Site Coordinator              **Cook County, IL, Round 4**  
16 Oregon Yacht Club  
Portland, OR 97202-6460  
Phone: (503) 232-9932  
Fax: (503) 231-7251  
E-mail: SALLYANDERSON@hotmail.com

Judge Karen Asphaug              **Dakota County, Round 1**  
Dakota County Judicial Center  
Hastings, MN 550033  
Phone: (651) 438-4318  
Fax: (651) 438-8162

Jan Cummings                      **Racine County, WI, Round 2**  
Regional Chief, Sector 2, Milwaukee  
819 N. Sixth St. , First Floor  
Milwaukee, WI 53203  
Phone: (414) 227-4592  
Fax: (414) 227-5043

Dennis Danner                      **Racine County, WI, Round 2**  
Region 2 Chief  
Department of Corrections  
Division of Community Corrections  
9531 Rayne Road  
Sturtevant, WI 53177  
Phone: (414) 884-3785  
Fax: (414) 884-3799

Terry Davis                               **Dauphin County, PA, Round 3**  
Director Dauphin County Adult Probation, and  
Administrator, Male Release Program  
Veterans Memorial Building, 5th Floor  
112 Market Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
Phone: (717) 558-1068 ext. 3002  
Fax: (717) 558-1083

Elaine Deck                               **San Francisco County, CA, Round 4**  
Former Project Director, Women's Treatment Network  
City and County of San Francisco  
Currently: Project Coordinator  
International Association of Chiefs of Police  
515 N. Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone: (703) 836-6767, ext. 262  
Fax: (703) 836-4543  
E-mail: DECKE@viacp.org

Tony Dukes                               **State of South Carolina, Round 3**  
Chief, Office of Research and Evaluation  
South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services  
P.O. Box 50666  
Columbia, SC 29250  
Phone: (803) 734-3503  
Fax: (803) 737-3154  
E-mail: TDUKES@ppp.state.sc.us

Carol Ganss                               **York County, PA, Round 2**  
Adult Probation Supervisor  
York County Probation  
100 West Market Street  
York, PA 17401  
Phone: (717) 771-9816  
Fax: (717) 771-9846

Dr. Rosemary L. Gido                   **Dauphin County, Round 3**  
Social Research and Evaluation  
1301 Springfield Circle  
Boalsburg, PA 16827  
Phone: (814) 466-2343



Phyllis Grubb                      **Dakota County, MN, Round 1**  
Supervisor, High Risk Adult Unit  
Dakota County Community Corrections  
201 N. Concord Exchange  
South St. Paul, MN 55075  
Phone: (651) 552-3084  
Fax: (651) 552-3070

Tamara Holden                      **State of Oregon, Round 2**  
former Project Chair for Oregon  
Currently: Consultant  
6805 SE Ash Street  
Portland, OR 97215  
Phone: (503) 235-3396  
E-mail: HOLDEN5080@aol.com

Sheila Hudson                      **Allen County, IN, Round 1**  
Executive Director  
Allen County Community Corrections  
109 E. Superior St.  
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802  
Phone: (219) 449-7252  
Fax: (219) 449-7308

Cecelia Levisky                      **York County, PA, Round 2**  
former Director, Atkins House  
Currently: Consultant/Part-time Faculty  
Project Site Coordinator              **Hampden County, MA, Round 4**  
403 Stonegate  
York, PA 17404  
Phone: (717) 764-4569  
E-mail: CLEVISKY@aol.com

William Long                      **York County, PA, Round 2**

Co-chair and former Chief Probation Officer,

York County Probation

Currently: Director of Social Work,

Margaret Moul Home

2050 Barley Road

York, PA 17404

Phone: (717) 767-6463

Fax: (717) 764-8711

Home Address/Phone:

2310 Seneca Drive

York, PA 17404

Phone: (717) 767-4011

Teri Martin, Ph.D.

Project Coordinator    **All Sites, Round 4**

Project Site Coordinator    **San Francisco County, CA, Round 4**

Principal, Law and Policy Associates

1315 N.W. 185th Street, PMB 120

Aloha, OR 97006

Phone: (503) 690-6110

Fax: (503) 645-2170

E-mail: LPATKM@cs.com

Terrie McDermott                      **Cook County, IL, Round 4**

Project Manager and Special Assistant to the Sheriff

Cook County Sheriff's Office

3026 S. California Avenue

Chicago, IL 60608

Phone: (773) 869-7726

Fax: (773) 869-7740

Anne McDiarmid                      **Hamilton County, OH, Round 4**

Project Site Coordinator

Criminal Justice Consultant, and

Supervisor, Program Unit

Dakota County Community Corrections

201 N. Concord Exchange

South St. Paul, MN 55075

Phone: (612) 552-3087

Fax: (612) 552-3070

E-mail: ANNEMCD@surfree.com

Jim Mills                               **Dallas County, TX, Round 2**  
Assistant Chief  
Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department  
133 N. Industrial Blvd., 9th Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75207  
Phone: (214) 653-5201  
Fax: (214) 653-5217

Jeanne Phelan                       **Racine County, WI, Round 2**  
Corrections Field Supervisor  
Department of Corrections  
Division of Community Corrections  
600 W. Walnut  
Milwaukee, WI 53212  
Phone: (414) 265-7729  
Fax: (414) 265-7744  
E-mail: JEANNE.PHELAN@doc.state.wi.us

Helene Polanichka                   **Dauphin County, PA, Round 3**  
Community Corrections Specialist  
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency  
P. O. Box 1167  
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1167  
Phone: (717) 787-8559 Ext. 3082  
Fax: (717) 772-0551  
E-mail: POLANICH@pccd.state.pa.us

Pam Riddle                           **Dallas County, TX, Round 2**  
Public Information Officer  
Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department  
133 N. Industrial Blvd.  
Dallas, TX 75207  
Phone: (214) 653-5294  
Fax: (214) 653-5217

Mike Walton                         **Hamilton County, OH, Round 4**  
Hamilton County Court Administrator  
1000 Main Street, Suite 410  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
Phone: (513) 946-5800  
Fax: (513) 946-5907

Judge John Andrew West      **Hamilton County, OH, Round 4**  
Hamilton County Courthouse  
1000 Main Street, Room 124  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
Phone: (513) 946-5122  
Fax: (513) 946-5124

Judge Janice Wilson      **State of Oregon, Round 2**  
Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge  
1021 S.W. Fourth  
Portland, OR 97204  
Phone: 248-3069  
Fax: (503) 248-3425  
E-mail: JANICE.R.WILSON@ojd.state.or.us

Michael Youngken      **Johnson County, KS, Round 1**  
Director of Corrections  
Johnson County Department of Corrections  
135 S. Kansas Ave.  
Olathe, Kansas 66061  
Phone: (913) 829-5000  
Fax: (913) 829-0107

## Appendix B National Meetings

National meetings include training and information in the following:

- Policy Analysis
- Developing a Policy Group
- Team Building
- How to Create Policy
- Information Building
- Profiling of Women Offenders
- Dispositional Studies
- Decision Mapping
- Flow Charts
- Service Inventories
- Aggregate Data
- Sentencing Purposes
- Peer Consultation and Networking
- Action Plan Development
- Documenting
- Collaborative Decisionmaking
- Marketing, Education and Public Relations

Specific topics covered, dates and locations of national meetings for the four rounds follows:

<b>Round 1</b>
----------------

**Meeting 1: November 6-8, 1991 Washington DC**

1. Detailed overview of the project
2. Policy group development
3. Sanctioning purposes and goals
4. Characteristics of women offenders
5. Information support and development

**Meeting 2: June 22-24, 1992 Apple Valley (Dakota County), MN**

1. Explore information and policy development activities
2. Clarify sanctioning purpose analysis
  - a. Revisit earlier "orientation"/introduction to sanctioning purposes.
  - b. Assess sanctioning interest in your jurisdiction.
  - c. Outline a plan/strategy for initiating "general education" work with policy group.
3. Share information with each other
4. Become familiar with the documentation process

**Meeting 3: November 15-17, 1992 Lenexa, KS**

1. Review progress on project information development efforts in each jurisdiction.
2. Design and discuss effective strategies for using information with work groups (policy groups).
3. Design sanctioning purposes work session for each jurisdiction.
4. Identify and problem-solve project management and policy process issues affecting each jurisdiction.
5. Explore the distinction between crime-related and non-crime related need for services among women offender population. Design a specific activity to engage this effort in the project.
6. Develop work plan for each jurisdiction.

**Meeting 4: October 23, 1993 Tulsa, OK\***

1. Identify what worked; what did not work
2. Closure

\*Held in conjunction with a national conference

<b>Round 2</b>
----------------

**Meeting 1: April 26-29, 1993 Apple Valley (Dakota County), MN**

1. Site introductions and information exchange
2. Overview of intermediate sanctions for women offenders -- lessons learned
3. Policy group approach and development
4. Conceptual framework and tools for critical thinking
5. Information component and development
6. Clarification of sanctioning purposes

**Meeting 2: October 10-13, 1993 Portland, OR**

1. Team building
2. Information gathering
3. Sanctioning purposes revisited

**Meeting 3: March 28-30, 1994 Washington DC**

1. Sharing information regarding policy development, information development, sanctioning purposes and project management.
2. Information Building -- Problem assessment -- Looking at current practice (overlay: how does it support the policy group activity?).
  - a. Information sources
  - b. Basic concepts
  - c. Describing system performance

**Meeting 4: January 19-20, 1995 Dallas, TX**

1. Grand finale of the project. What is our best sense of what we advise to new projects developing intermediate sanctions for women offenders? What have we learned about women offenders as opposed to general offenders?
2. NIC wants to assist in charting the future of the projects and gather ideas about how the Institute can be supportive in this endeavor.
3. Focus first on policy group approach and the policy analysis process as well as the process of managing the project.
4. The meeting will operate through expert panels that cross jurisdictional projects. The two newest participants are to be participant/observers and will not present or perform in the same manner.

<b>Round 3</b>
----------------

**Meeting 1: May 11-12, 1995 Myrtle Beach, SC**

1. Share information about data design and development
2. Provide assistance in managing and facilitating policy group discussions

**Meeting 2: July 1995 Washington DC\***

\*Held in conjunction with another project, developing "Local Sentencing Policy on Intermediate Sanctions."

<b>ROUND 4</b>
----------------

**Meeting 1: September 3-6, 1997 Longmont, CO**

1. Exploring the characteristics of "learning organizations."
2. Building a shared vision.
3. Exploring information needed to make good decisions.
4. Introduction to decision mapping.
5. Defining "gender-specific."

**Meeting 2: February 9-11, 1998 San Francisco, CA**

1. Progress reports by site.
2. Sanctioning orientations and their implications for action.
3. A framework for information building.
4. Presentation: San Francisco's NETWORK project.
5. Site workplan development.

**Meeting 3: February 17-20, 1999 San Diego, CA**

1. Developing collaborative decisionmaking and leadership skills, and discussion of leadership styles.
2. Identifying change targets and using information to support the need for change.

## Appendix C Site Descriptions

Detail on each site follows, including:

**Policy Group Members:** A listing of personnel (by titles) in each policy group.

**Motivation to Engage in the Work:** The driving forces and identified issues motivating sites to participate in the project.

**Policy Group Objectives:** Objectives as stated in each jurisdiction's application. Those objectives may have changed over time and are noted in those cases.

**Project Challenges:** Stumbling blocks and challenges faced by the site as they engaged in the policy and data-driven process.

**What was Learned:** Learnings for the jurisdiction.

**Outcomes/Products:** Those products and outcomes which met the objectives of the grant, plus additional outcomes not necessarily foreseen by the grant.

<b>ROUND 1</b>
----------------

### Allen County, Indiana

#### Policy Group Members

- District Project Director
- Public Defender
- Director of Court Operations, Allen County Prosecutor's Office
- Judge, Superior Court
- TASC (Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime) Program staff member
- Executive Director, Community Corrections
- ACIS/DCIS, Community Corrections
- Bail Commissioner
- Captain, Allen County Sheriff's Department
- Director of Operations, Allen Superior Court
- Chief Probation Officer, Adult Probation
- Director of Public Welfare
- Administrative Assistant, Community Corrections
- Assistant Professor, SPEA
- Director, Women's Alcohol and Drug Education
- Director, Women's Treatment AWAC Program



### Motivation to Engage in the Work

- Steady increase of women offenders in state prison and local jails
- Concern about women in home detention with non-suspendable offenses continually rotating through the system
- No special services for women
- No case management structures designed for women offenders
- Very few intermediate sanction options available; none specifically for women
- No information about sentencing practices for women offenders
- Results of study on women in state prison/jail
- Community corrections is funded by DOC and is separate from probation
- Community service orders tend to have a less than rehabilitative or reparative purpose

### Objectives

- To convene a work group
- To develop sound information on women offenders, including information on current sentencing practices
- To develop a profile of women offenders sentenced in Allen County
- To develop a risk-needs assessment tool based on the data collected
- To expand the range of intermediate sanctions available in the county for women offenders
- To better meet the unique needs and circumstances of the woman offender
- To better understand the overall and financial impact of women offenders on the community because of all the family issues connected with many women
- To provide more programs and services to women offenders and their dependents

### Project Challenges

- Integrating key decisionmakers into the project
- Legislative separation of Probation and Community Corrections which led to competition for resources
- Many responsibilities of the project leader
- Another major initiative in progress with a program rather than policy focus
- Data collection was difficult because it had to be collected manually. The research consultant for the project was only available on a part-time basis and important data was difficult to obtain because the Probation Department was not a full partner in the project.

### What Was Learned

- Identified major issues for women in Allen County such as a large proportion of women of color, and possible racial disparity in sentencing.
- There were significant differences in the ways men and women were treated.

### Outcomes/Products

- Interviewed system representatives/offenders
- Profile of women offenders
- Criminal justice mapping
- No final report

- Laid the groundwork for developing gender-specific programs
- Plea agreements with women offenders are being mitigated -- for example, with drug offenses, the plea agreement is now based on drug usage

## **Dakota County, Minnesota**

### Policy Group Members

- Director of Planning for Women Offenders, State Department of Corrections
- Adult Manager, Dakota County Community Corrections
- Director of Non-Residential Services, 180 Degrees Inc.
- Supreme Court Justice
- Director, Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission
- Director, B. Robert Lewis House (shelter)
- Director, Dakota County Human Services
- Dakota County Jail Administrator
- Assistant County Attorney
- District Court Judge
- County Commissioner
- Public Defender
- Dakota County Criminal Justice System staff

### Motivation to Engage in the Work

- Increased population of women offenders
- Many service needs of women offenders are not specifically addressed
- No special programs or services for women offenders
- No specific intermediate sanctions for women offenders
- Some prison sentences appear disproportionate to the crime
- Women offenders are being housed in jail in an adjoining county
- Dakota County encompasses a large geographic area with no centralized public transportation
- A rapidly expanding population in the county has overburdened the service delivery system in the county
- Lack of knowledge and understanding about the unique needs of women offenders
- Case classification is based on risk factors for men offenders which do not correlate to those of women offenders
- Increasing number of drug-related offenses by women
- Few available parenting and child-care resources for women offenders, resulting in intergenerational cycles of dysfunctional families
- New director and a manager were very interested in how Community Corrections was a part of the criminal justice system

### Objectives

- To develop comprehensive policies which specifically address sanctioning options for women offenders.

- To meet the specific human service needs of women offenders
- Conduct critical data collection and analysis
- To understand more about the specific needs of women and men and the differences in what works for women and men
- Conduct educational work with the policy group and key public and social service agencies

#### Project Challenges

- Leadership change and resulting confusion over roles
- New leadership not fully supported by agency
- Another larger intermediate sanctions project drew energy of key participants
- Key decisionmakers not present
- Core group took over most of the work; difficulties sustaining interest of larger policy group
- Lack of familiarity with policy driven process
- Members not prepared for how long the process would take
- Snags in implementation between policy group members and staff in "the ranks"
- Only one member of larger intermediate sanctions task force was a former participant in the women's intermediate sanctions process
- Women's issues not at the forefront

#### What Was Learned

- Raised awareness of women offender's issues and how they differ from men's issues
- Women offenders are often treated in a paternal manner
- The core of the policy group needed to have a better idea of where they were going before assembling the entire policy group
- It is very difficult for professionals to shift from a program focus to a policy focus and to understand how much more time consuming that process is.
- The process itself taught policy group members to question how things are done; to ask if it is the best way and whether it makes sense given desired outcomes
- Their traditional approach had been to focus on the broad issues a woman offender faces rather than just concentrating on her criminal behavior
- Importance of system response

#### Outcomes/Products

- Developed a comprehensive policy statement including recommendations for sanctioning women offenders which was presented to a larger Intermediate Sanctions project taskforce. (Because that task force encompassed all offenders, policy group members serving on the ISWO project were only able to make policy recommendations. Implementation was the responsibility of the larger Intermediate Sanctions policy group.) Recommendations included:
  - Make gender specific services available to women offenders because such services have proven to be effective.
  - The use of resources should be clearly linked to stated outcome measures.
  - Case processing and decisionmaking should be consistently applied, predictable and appropriate, regardless of social status, income, race, gender or other socio-economic-cultural factors.

- Access to services should be equitable, regardless of race, gender or any socio-economic-cultural factors.
- When an offense occurs, every effort should be made to restore the community to its pre-crime status.
- When evaluating programs and policies, all key offices in the criminal justice system should be represented when the analysis takes place.
- Added a member from the ISWO policy group to the larger Intermediate Sanctions Taskforce who was the "guardian" of women's issues
- Conducted focus groups with women offenders to better understand their experiences
- Final report

## **Johnson County, Kansas**

### **Policy Group Members**

- Director, Johnson County Community Corrections
- Director, Corrections Projects Development, Correctional Services Group, Inc.
- Chief Court Service Officer
- Court Services Staff (3)
- Civil Service Judge
- Criminal Court Judge
- County Commissioners (2)
- Community Corrections staff (7)
- Deputy Warden Women's Prison, Topeka
- Program Consultant, Kansas Department of Corrections
- Member, League of Women Voters
- Member, Governors Staff
- Community Corrections Advisory Board members (5)
- Member, Electronic Media
- Representative, Adult Education, Johnson County Community College
- District Attorney
- Chair, Parole Board
- Defense Attorney
- Sheriff
- Representatives, Sheriff's Department (2)
- Regional Parole Director
- Staff, Parole Division, Kansas Department of Corrections (2)
- Representatives, Cities of Olathe and Overland Park
- Members of Print Media (2)
- Citizen Commission Appointments (5)

### **Motivation to Engage in the Work**

- Increasing numbers of women offenders
- The service needs of women offenders are not being specifically addressed

- Increase in population of women in jail
- High proportion of African American women in prison populations relative to the general population
- Concern that women offenders were being imprisoned for less severe offenses than men offenders
- Johnson County was committing more women to state prison than any other county in the State
- Women offenders have no work release provisions
- Judges may be taking "a certain and definite" action when they see repeat women offenders
- Significant number of women offenders were from outside of the county and not eligible for all sanctioning options leaving many women with unaddressed service needs
- An information system which is primarily non-automated
- No easy access to court records

### Objectives

- To convene a working group to learn as much as possible about women offenders
- To develop a sound information base on women offenders to include information on available community resources, current county supervision processes and programs and current sentencing practices
- To examine sanctions, programs and services for women offenders to understand the impact they have on women offenders and to identify gaps in the range of sanctions and services
- To develop improved and expanded services and programs for women offenders
- To assist in the enhancement of intermediate sanctions
- To develop policy on intermediate sanctions and an action plan for implementing that policy
- To develop an advocacy group to exert pressure on criminal justice policymakers to expand existing residential programs for women offenders.

### Project Challenges

- Project not a high priority for community corrections
- Several disruptive leadership changes
- Leader mostly focused on marketing and education
- Staff driven process
- Members came to policy group with preconceived ideas and interest in building a work release center and adding beds for a women's facility
- County was struggling with issue of whether to separate community corrections and probation
- Fear over job security hampered speaking out
- Failure to involve judges
- Judges saw their role primarily as that of reviewing a completed product
- Large size of policy group may have contributed to difficulties focusing on policy driven process
- Initial information gathering centered around policy group members interviewing women probationers; result was subjective data

### What Was Learned

- Adding court-ordered programs to women's conditions for probation was overwhelming to the offender and a set-up for failure

- The use of consultants for key roles in the policy group hindered institutionalization of the ISWO process

#### Outcomes/Products

- Judicial survey to understand sentencing philosophies, criteria used in making sentencing decisions and views on the current continuum of intermediate sanctions available
- Survey of treatment needs for incarcerated women
- Approval from the county commissioners for additional correctional residential program beds for women offenders.

## ROUND 2

### **Dallas County, Texas**

#### Policy Group Members

- Assistant Director of the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD)
- Public Information Officer, CSCD
- Criminal District Court Judge
- County Criminal Court Judge
- Assistant District Attorney
- Deputy Chief of Police
- Program Director, Council of Churches
- psychiatrist
- Deputy Chief Sheriff
- former T.V. journalist
- defense attorney
- Director, Dallas Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
- citizen member of the state Judicial Advisory Council
- Representative, Child Protective Services

#### Motivation to Engage in the Work

- High proportion of African American women
- Women offenders waited longer in jail before being assigned and served longer sentences in prison than men
- Women offenders have fewer sanctioning options
- Women had less access to services than their male counterparts and wait longer to obtain counseling and treatment
- Sanctions and programs used for women were designed for men
- Women offenders had gone un-noticed; little was known about their needs and the risks presented by this group; planning was done primarily for men offenders
- New woman judge heightened awareness of women's issues

- Women were absconding faster than men from a recently opened co-ed substance abuse treatment center

### Objectives

- To understand why more women offenders were on probation than men offenders
- To understand how women's risk and needs differ from men's and how to meet women offender's needs
- To develop a better understanding of the profile of women offenders, to develop a good demographic picture of women and to know the number of women under community supervision in Dallas County
- To understand what services existed for women in the continuum of sanctions
- To ascertain whether women were being punished more severely than men for similar offenses
- To ascertain whether women and men were being supervised differently
- To develop a better understanding of the underlying punishment philosophies that drive sentencing in the criminal justice community
- To develop a better understanding of the extent of paternal attitudes toward women and what the ramifications of such attitudes might be
- To develop services, facilities, programs and sanctions to better address the risks and needs of women offenders in the future

### Project Challenges

- Some group members wanted to focus on developing programs
- Initial data collected was too unwieldy and complex for the policy group to absorb

### What Was Learned

- Women have fewer sanctioning options and wait longer for sentencing. They serve longer periods of time in jail, prison and on waiting lists for treatment and services.
- Men and women have significantly different needs and behaviors, such as women more often needing child care assistance and generally being more vulnerable to relationships than men
- A paternalistic attitude toward women offenders was prevalent in the judiciary
- Although this is an unscientific observation by Dallas County, there is speculation, based on some experience with various women offenders, that many women on probation would do much better if they were taken out of jail, provided safe living quarters, job skills and other needed support. This approach has cost the county \$20,000 versus the \$100,000 spent by taking women through the system in the traditional manner.

### Outcomes/Products

- Survey of probated offenders (in conjunction with a state study)
- Mapping of the criminal justice system process
- Draft of final report
- Highly useful exchange of information and ideas between policy group members; better understanding of the components of the criminal justice system and how women offenders are viewed; better understanding of the unique challenges presented by women offenders
- Introduction to the use of intermediate sanctions for women offenders



- Serious thought by all participants regarding punishment philosophies and desired accomplishments from various punishment or sanctioning options
- Planning and developing new or enhanced services for women offenders, including services for their children
- Educating the public about the unique needs of women offenders and the risks presented by women offenders

Incorporation of the following into the Community Justice Plan:

- Substance abuse treatment facility for women and their minor children
- Assessment center for women and men to assess risk and needs at the time of probation
- Pre-trial diversion and supervision for low risk women and men offenders

## **York County, Pennsylvania**

### **Policy Group Members**

- Judge, Court of Common Pleas
- District Judge
- Executive Director of Atkins House
- Supervisor, York County Probation ALPHA Unit
- Warden, York County Prison
- Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
- Associate Director of Atkins House
- staff member, Atkins House
- Supervisor, Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
- Assistant Public Defender
- Assistant District Attorney
- Director, York County Human Services
- York County Intermediate Sanctions Coordinator
- York College computer expert
- York County probation officer
- staff member, Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing
- staff member, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
- staff member, York County Assistance Office
- 2 staff members, York/Adams Counties, Drug and Alcohol
- Director, Crispus Attucks Association
- Director, York Spanish American Association
- staff member, York Office of Employment and Training
- York County Clerk of Court
- physician, York County Bureau of Health
- Director, York County Probation Department
- staff member, York Victim Assistance Center

### **Motivation to Engage in the Work**

- Awareness of women offender issues had been heightened by creation of the Probation Department's Alpha Unit and having had the Atkins House in operation for 20 years. This led to some questioning about treatment of women offenders and the differences in women compared to men.
- Desire to better understand the differences between men and women offenders
- Only rough data was available to determine the patterns of utilization of sentencing options; concerns about how women are sentenced
- Lack of capacity for women offenders in terms of both facilities and community options, except for Atkins House
- Little understanding in the community of the effectiveness of sentencing options in reducing incarceration rates or impacting recidivism of women offenders
- Concern about increasing minority women offender population, particularly over issues of fairness
- Concern about why some women offenders received certain sentences and others did not
- A study done a few years earlier found women on parole and probation were returned to court more frequently for failure to pay fines and other economic reasons than for crimes. There was concern about why this was occurring and what could be done.
- Women in prison had far fewer program options than men
- Women offenders were at risk for "going unnoticed" amidst the state's larger programming initiative: the York County Intermediate Punishment Plan and Pennsylvania's implementation of a new sentencing guidelines focusing on intermediate punishment
- Concern about the intergenerational impact of women offenders because women have more responsibility to children and greater impact on children

## Objectives

- To design and plan for the implementation of a continuum of intermediate sanctions for adult women offenders
- To understand what sentencing practices were currently in use
- Identify gaps in the sentencing options available for women offenders
- Establish a community advisory task force to assist in identifying, planning, developing, and marketing new sentencing options for women offenders
- To design, develop and implement a data collection system providing needed information to track women offenders in York County's criminal justice system; to evaluate effectiveness of that system; to understand what options were available.
- To develop a central location for dissemination of research material, media presentations and information on resources for women offenders.
- To develop a profile of York County Women offenders to study sentencing patterns
- To develop a central repository of data on women offenders
- To better meet the needs of women offenders
- To develop a strategy to inform the larger community about intermediate sanctions and women offenders and to secure acceptance of options
- To present a plan to county government, the intermediate punishment policy board, and the county court for the implementation of sanction options for women

- To educate and inform criminal justice professionals, including police, judges, prosecution and defense attorneys, jail personnel, probation officers and treatment professionals of the implications of the project

Additional objective, after the process began:

- To provide members of the policy group with a basic knowledge of the York County criminal justice system and how it operates day to day

#### Project Challenges

- Shifted to a program focus rather than a broad systems planning focus
- Unable to effectively grapple with sentencing system redesign
- Lack of minority representation in the policy group
- Data collection was difficult for several reasons; the County is not fully computerized; Probation resisted allowing data gathering on men; difficult communication channels with numerous York College contacts
- Inadequate resources available for development of effective information systems
- Significant variation in understanding of women offender issues on the part of judges
- Lack of follow-through on recommended education for judges
- Implementation has suffered due to attrition of two key members of the policy group
- Process was not institutionalized enough to carry forward with a new department director

#### What Was Learned

- A lack of data kept them from effectively understanding what factors played a part in sentencing and determining what new sanctions were needed. Some basic summary data and information on resources was difficult to find and there was a lack of uniformity in entering computerized data.
- There is a need for an automated, fully integrated criminal justice information system that can communicate with other human services systems as needed.
- There is a lack of intermediate sanctioning options for state women offenders and women offenders may not be targeted for the most appropriate sanctions in accord with defined offender risks and needs.
- Individualized presentencing assessments are not done on most women offenders.
- The ratio of technical violations to new offense violations is much higher for women offenders than for men offenders. Women may receive more non-criminogenic sentencing conditions than men, which may lead to frequent technical violations. Conditions of supervision need to be reasonable related to criminal behavior. There is a difference between necessary conditions and desired conditions. There is a limited range of sanctioning responses for technical violations.
- The success of women offenders was greatly enhanced by the woman having a personal advocate who would go to bat for her
- Women whose first language is not English or whose culture is not understood are sometimes served as well
- There is a need for non-incarceration sanctions for violators, particularly since women offenders appear more often for technical probation/parole violations

- Cases involving women offenders are particularly prone to plea bargaining, resulting in issues being overlooked. (During a one year period, only three women went to trial.)
- Racial disparity may be occurring in terms of the ratio of minority women arrested and entering the criminal justice system, but it is not evident at sentencing.
- Public transportation services in the County are limited.
- There is a lack of sufficient job training opportunities.
- Child care can be expensive and difficult to secure.
- Low income housing for women offenders is scarce.
- The relapse rate for women offenders' drug and alcohol usage is high.
- Probation caseloads are too high to provide desired levels of service.
- Judges have very different perspectives and levels of understanding about women offenders.

#### Outcomes/Products

- Conducted a revealing focus group of former offenders in which women talked of their feelings of isolation and each woman identified a significant woman in their life who impacted them in making positive changes.
- Survey of criminal court judges regarding their sentencing purposes and philosophies
- Held a sanctioning purposes workshop
- Developed a profile of women offenders based on 600 women from a risk and needs assessment
- Identified computer system limitations and began developing a computerized data system
- Collected information on gender differences
- Systems map; an enlightening exercise for community members, criminal justice personnel and outside agencies. Many of these individuals understood the "nuts and bolts" of the system for the first time and are now facing the challenge of processing "the system" on a more informed level.
- Prepared a glossary of terms
- Developed a listing of sentencing options and programs
- Created a number of desired measurable outcomes for the system that will help understand how well the system, programs and offenders perform.
- Developed a list of value-oriented operating principles to guide sanctioning
- Networking among community service providers and criminal justice personnel
- Education of both the community and criminal justice personnel of where values and goals coalesce and where perceptions of purpose sometimes diverge
- Networking amongst community service providers and criminal justice professionals to address issues common to their respective agencies.
- Final report

#### Recommendations:

- Modify the Clerk of Court's criminal management information system to include basic additional data
- Fully automate the probation department's Alpha Unit to include profile, assessment, program, violation and recidivism data.
- Evaluate program and sanction effectiveness and resources on an on-going basis.
- The ALPHA Unit and York College be designated central sites for data collection and dissemination of information regarding women offenders.

- The policy group report and recommendations be presented to various groups: including key leaders (judges and commissioners); individual groups including victim's agencies, district justices, the prison; taxpayers, service clubs, women's groups.
- Make drug/alcohol education more available and meaningful; increase support for community involvement in drug/alcohol services; coordinate services between the county prison and community drug/alcohol treatment agencies
- Educate the public and the justice system about relapse and the path to recovery for drug/alcohol abusers
- Provide centralized intake and tracking of criminal justice system substance abusers
- Reactivate on-the-job training opportunities with paid training
- Establish employment mentoring programs for women offenders
- Enhance child care availability
- Provide transport and supportive services for employment
- Increase the number and range of sanctions for technical violations.
- Increase capacity to do pre-sentencing assessments
- Define success by measurable outcomes
- Implement the balanced approach model for women offenders
- Improve the risk/need assessment process
- Examine the current usage of intensive probation for women offenders
- Reduce overall caseloads in the probation department ALPHA Unit

## **State of Oregon**

### **Policy Group Members**

- Director, Multnomah County Department of Community Corrections
- Vice Provost, Student Affairs, Oregon State University
- Oregon Department of Corrections, Assistant Director, Community Corrections
- Legal Counsel, Association of Oregon Counties
- Director, Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency
- Director, Oregon Criminal Justice Council
- State Representative
- Commander, Program Division, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office
- Program Administrator, Women's Transition Services, Multnomah County Department of Community Corrections
- Oregon Department of Corrections, Assistant Director, Administrative Services
- Branch Manager, Multnomah Branch, Children's Services Division
- Chair, Board of Parole, and Post-prison Supervision
- Superintendent, Oregon Women's Correctional Center
- Judge, Multnomah County Circuit Court
- Director, Lane County Justice Services

## Motivation to Engage in the Work

- Tremendous overcrowding in women's prison because sentencing guidelines required more men and women formerly on probation to be sent to prison. Parole and probation revocations were increasing at a substantial rate. Over 85% of women and men offenders entering Oregon prisons were coming from probation or parole revocations.
- Concern over the increasing population of women offenders on parole and probation with limited sanctions, programs and services.
- Women's prison always received budget "left-overs"
- Passage of Ballot Measure 5 cancelled building of a new women's prison (8 prisons for men were being built).
- Concern about the intergenerational impact of women offenders because women have more responsibility to children and greater impact on children
- Lack of accessible, appropriate intermediate sanctioning options and interventions for women offenders
- Concern about how women are sentenced
- Lack of capacity for women offenders in terms of both facilities and community options
- Little information on women offenders under community supervision
- Approximately 70% of supervised women offenders have alcohol and drug problems. Women offenders and their children need affordable drug-free housing to successfully transition from supervision to the community.
- There is a serious need for day care for women offenders with young children.
- Women offenders who give birth to babies in prison receive no nursery time with their babies after delivery, resulting in no bonding between mother and baby.
- Women offenders need marketable job skills in order to function effectively in the community.
- Women offenders do not have adequate medical and dental care.

## Objectives

- To examine the characteristics of women offenders on probation or parole and to identify which factors appear related to success on community supervision
- Conduct a critical case review of both revocations and successful examples of intermediate sanctioning
- Reduce the use of prison
- Review the current practices in responding to poor community behavior toward reducing the number of offenders in prison
- Break the intergenerational cycle of dysfunction of women offenders and their children
- Involve communities in addressing the needs of women offenders.

## Criminal Justice System Goals:

- Sanction offenders equitably, consistently and humanely.
- Apply the least restrictive sanctions necessary to reduce the risk of re-offending.
- Impose the least intrusive interventions necessary to change behaviors that lead to criminal activity.
- Hold offenders accountable for harm to victims and the community.
- Facilitate offenders' integration into a healthy and supportive environment.

- Promote system accountability, efficiency and cost-effectiveness.
- Utilize a holistic approach to addressing the special needs of women offenders
- Practice prevention and early intervention; provide a continuum of sanctions and interventions to respond to offenders at every stage in the criminal justice system
- Provide programs of a significant duration and continuity to have a desired impact; should include an aftercare component
- Create opportunities to improve parenting skills and preserve the family unit
- Provide gender-specific services focusing on the needs of women offenders; focusing on those needs should not result in incarceration or supervision beyond the time that is otherwise required by criminal justice system sanctions
- Provide substance abuse treatment for women offenders in prison and on community supervision
- Conduct broad based staff training to increase awareness of gender-specific issues
- Conduct analysis of information regarding the effectiveness of particular sanctions and interventions with specific types of women offenders
- Develop structure for improved coordination among private and public women's service providers
- Conduct an on-going evaluation of the sanctioning and intervention process, so decisions can be based on outcomes of successful intervention programs

#### Project Challenges

- Leadership changes
- Lack of understanding on the part of policy group members at the beginning of the process about their goals and objectives
- Lack of understanding how long the process would take
- State-wide budget cuts impacted available resources to devote to the process
- Convening of the legislature drew attention away from the policy group
- Difficulties finding good quantitative data
- Inability to fully grapple with the tension between sanctions and services
- Decentralized structure of the courts made communication of information to judges difficult
- Many group members knew little about the various data study methods and collections methods
- The first sanctioning purposes workshop was not well-received by the policy group

#### What Was Learned

- The criminal justice system is not an integrated system.
- A sharper understanding of the ways decision policies and practices may either constrain or enhance the criminal justice systems's effectiveness in achieving its goals with both women and men offenders. Unwritten or informal decision rules were cited as the most likely sources of inequitable or ineffectual decision outcomes.
- There are few services and sanctions designed specifically for women nor do they take into account the real differences in men and women's learning, relationship styles and life circumstances. Women offenders tend to have the following issues:
  - chemical dependency
  - need long term treatment to effectively deal with chemical dependency
  - sexual, emotional and/or physical abuse

- because most women offenders are mothers, they need support for --effective parenting, both for themselves and for their children
- the presence of one supportive, caring individual often has a critical role to play in ensuring the woman offender's success
- There is widespread lack of awareness and understanding around issues related to pregnancy and children.
- The process of collecting and analyzing data on women offenders will provide insights useful to future analysts and information system designers
- Many of the profile elements identified by the policy group as critical to a full understanding of women offenders (i.e. marital and family status) are not reliably available in paper or automated case records
- There are technological and organizational barriers to information-sharing that hamper coordinated delivery of services and sanctions to women offenders
- More conditions are imposed on women than men
- There is racial disparity in sentencing
- Women are incarcerated disproportionately to men and more for revocation than men

#### Outcomes/Products

- Profile of Oregon's woman offender
- Mapping of twelve key decision points in Oregon's criminal justice process
- Resource inventory of sanctioning options, treatment and resources available to women offenders in Oregon's various counties
- Designed a data collection form
- Developed a core value vision statement: "To preserve personal dignity, honor diversity and support families and communities while promoting public safety."
- Glossary of common terms<sup>1</sup>
- Final report
- Panel of women offenders, both current prison inmates and women on community supervision, to better understand and optimize approaches for intervening successfully with women offenders
- Panel of parole/probation officers to better understand how line staff approaches increase women offenders' probability of success on community supervision
- A valuable dialogue between key actors in the criminal justice and human service systems
- Developed a list of Criminal Justice System Goals and the following System Strategies and Methods:
  - Balance commitment to individualized responses to offender behavior with concern for consistency and uniformity.
  - Provide interventions that are both tolerant of and provide for measured, appropriate responses to the phenomenon of relapse.

#### Policy Group Recommendations:

- Comprehensive and accurate information about women offenders and the sanctions and services offered to them must be routinely available to practitioners and policymakers.
- Adequate resources must be allocated to provide for gender-specific programming for women offenders.



- An array of effective sanctions and services for women offenders that can help to break the intergenerational cycle can best be provided through collaborative partnerships that include criminal justice and human service agencies and other service providers and community organizations.
- Policymakers and researchers should continue to craft policies and programs that consider the unique characteristics of women offenders and should continuously monitor their effectiveness.
- On-going professional training should be provided to criminal justice personnel in issues about women offenders.
- Incorporate processes for efficiently collecting essential data about women offenders as new automated information systems are developed.
- System designers should develop standard definitions of terms and variables to ensure consistency throughout the state.
- Collect data on women offenders that is essential to planning, designing and evaluating sanctions and services for women.
- Information systems that can provide for inter-system communication and information-sharing by agencies and providers.
- Streamlined information collection requirements and information systems that serve the needs of decisionmakers, planners and case managers.
- Provide for continuity in case management throughout offenders' involvement with the justice system.
- Develop and implement programs that are gender and culture-relevant.
- Identified several areas where legislative action is necessary to enable implementation of suggested reforms.
- Resources should be allocated to support several types of research on issues affecting women offenders.

## **Racine County, Wisconsin**

### **Policy Group Members**

- Director, Racine County Human Services Department
- Southeast Regional Chief, Division of Probation and Parole
- Unit Supervisor, Division of Probation and Parole, Ozaukee County
- Adult Services Specialist, Division of Probation and Parole, Central Office
- District Attorney
- Chief Public Defender
- Victim/Witness Director, District Attorney's Office
- Manager, Program Planning/Evaluation, Human Services
- Sheriff
- Sector Chief, Division of Intensive Sanctions
- Unit Supervisor, Division of Intensive Sanctions
- Jail Chaplain
- Executive Director, Center for Community Concerns
- Chief of Racine City Police

- Circuit Court Judge
- volunteer citizen representative

#### Motivation to Engage in the Work

- Significant increase in admissions for women offenders and in women on parole or probation
- High numbers of African American women and minorities on parole and probation
- Proportionately more women than men being incarcerated
- Lack of community options, including diversion programs for women
- Concern about women offenders' impact on families and children and related complications in designing appropriate treatment
- Special legislative committee was looking at women offender issues and was interested in developing community programs
- Racine County was chosen because of its size, urban population and diverse racial make-up

#### Objectives

- To evaluate Racine County's policy and procedures at each step in the decision process; to truly engage in a systems analysis process
- To identify the sanctioning options available to women offenders in Racine County
- To obtain an accurate profile of Racine County's women offenders, including information related to children being affected by sanctioning
- To describe the characteristics of offenders who receive certain dispositions
- To analyze the impact of sanctioning on out-of-home placements for children of women offenders
- To identify what non-correctional community based services are available to women offenders and their children in this county
- To identify whether certain offenders could be serviced in a community setting or could be considered for different dispositions/conditions
- To develop policies and procedures which promote and expand options for community-based sanctions for women and for services for these women and their children in this county and to identify a specific approach to change the service response system to women offenders and their children in the county.

#### Project Challenges

- Early disruptive leadership changes
- Selection of leadership was made without adequate consideration of all the factors
- The project was initiated by the State. Wisconsin has a state system for corrections and a county-based delivery system for services. The County felt the State was telling them how to do business and resulting tensions were never resolved.
- Project staff was mostly state-based and located out of the county.
- Project staff (state-based) took on the project in addition to their regular work load. Driving to and from Racine County thus was a significant issue in terms of time and became a deterrent to more frequent contact.

- Lack of informal networking because of geographic distance between staff and the core of the policy group. That informal networking and easy access to one another outside of scheduled meetings would have helped with many of the tasks required for the process.
- The State initiated the project by tying it to legislative monies set aside for women offender programs. Policy group members were drawn to the project believing the money was theirs to spend when it had already been earmarked for a specific program -- wrap-around home services for women offenders. Many policy group members never recovered from the misconception that the project was tied to having a large chunk of money available.
- Key decisionmakers functioned primarily as observers
- Reluctance on the part of many policy group members to address systems issues
- Group leadership did not "buy-in" to NIC's model for the process
- Parallel project providing legislative monies for women offender programs distracted attention
- Unrealistic timetable for data collection

#### What Was Learned

- This collaborative effort has resulted in some networking that would not otherwise have occurred between state agencies, law enforcement and human service agencies.
- Much has been learned about the workings of criminal justice in Racine County.
- This project would have had much greater success had local community justice personnel been involved at the beginning and had more thought been given to selection of a chairperson for the project.
- Given Wisconsin's government structure for corrections, the State should have taken more leadership initiative in getting this project organized properly
- Women offenders do not have the same support system for bail that men have.
- It was difficult to feel supported by other jurisdictions at National Meetings because most of them had such different governmental structures compared to Wisconsin and Racine County.

#### Outcomes/Products

- Survey of 250 case files of women receiving disposition for a felony or misdemeanor in 1992 and 1993.
- Designed a data collection instrument to capture information not included in other information systems, including questions related to both misdemeanor and felons, habitual offenders and those who are committing crimes of escalating seriousness.
- Created a database of Racine County women offender demographics (previously not available on a county-wide basis).
- Final report
- Better cooperation among people who were in the policy group; for example human services and corrections staff
- Held a public forum that included other agencies and private providers to present findings and recommendations of the intermediate sanctions project
- Brought together people who would not otherwise have a forum for discussing women offenders' issues and programs. Key players met other key players; this facilitated networking.

- Facilitated better communication amongst policy group members, helped break down barriers, increased understanding of roles and responsibilities and allowed participants to learn one another's language.
- Provided an opportunity to present information on the new DOC Division of Intensive Sanctions (DAIS) program. This allowed for discussion regarding use of DAIS as a dispositional option in Racine County and statewide.
- Implemented a cooperative team approach for providing staff services to the policy group by assigning joint tasks to staff from different agencies at the local and state levels.
- Involved Racine County's premiere, private community advocate agency (Center for Community Concerns) in a leadership role in garnering support for the project and sharing information with the community.
- Provided a vehicle for agencies to increase their awareness of issues affecting the women offender and her children and to expand the working relationships developed during the project into other specific needs areas.
- Involved faculty and students from the local private technical college and the university in data collection and analysis.

#### Recommendations/Outcomes:

The following are recommendations made by the policy group, and outcomes.

- Recommendation to pilot a pretrial diversion, monitoring and intervention project for women felony offenders booked in the Racine County Jail.
  - Outcome: Not implemented. Jail has not completed a study of offenders in jail.
- Recommendation to encourage predisposition access to enhanced education, employment preparation and alcohol and drug abuse services for women in the county jail. Encourage staffing arrangements and facilities in the jail to support access to these services.
  - Outcome: Services for alcohol and drug abuse are available through a 15 day program in jail followed by 9 months of aftercare.
- Recommendation to address transportation as a barrier to program access and program completion in the community; encourage programs to provide or arrange transportation or provide more services in close proximity to or in the women's home.
  - Outcome: Partially implemented. Some monies have been designated to provide assistance with transportation, i.e. bus tokens.
- Recommendation to provide services which have culturally-specific contents and ensure that staff have training in cultural diversity and sensitivity.
  - Outcome: Implemented. All staff go through cultural diversity and sensitivity training.
- Recommendation to change criteria for the Division of Intensive Sanctions (DAIS) program to include drug offenders who are prison-bound. Monitor the need to additional residential programming for women offenders in the DAIS program.
  - Outcome: Not implemented. Intensive sanctions program was suspended.
- Recommendation to develop or sustain community-based alcohol and drug abuse services and educational and employment services for women offenders. Provide training or technical assistance to existing community-based programs and services to increase their capacity to serve women offenders.

Outcome: Implemented for women offenders on parole and probation.

-Recommendation to coordinate a public education initiative and advocate on behalf of women offenders in Racine County, to include a collaborative effort between local service and advocacy agencies, local law enforcement, school districts, technical college, DA's office and the Department of Corrections' Division of Probation and Parole and Division of Intensive Sanctions.

Outcome: Not implemented.

-Recommendation to encourage collaboration and cooperation in the service system so services are more integrated and key players are more aware of all services available to women offenders and their families.

Outcome: Not implemented.

-Recommendation to share data from the Racine County women offender project with local agencies and encourage them to use that information to make changes in their own programs to address the issues and needs of the woman offender.

Outcome: Not implemented.

### **ROUND 3**

#### **Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

##### **Policy Group Members**

- Judge
- Director, Dauphin County Probation and Parole Office
- Intermediate Punishment Coordinator, Adult Probation
- Probation Officer, Dauphin County Probation and Parole Office
- 3 County Commissioners
- Warden, Dauphin County Prison
- Human Services Director
- Director of Mental Health Services
- Director, Dauphin County Human Services
- District Attorney
- Director, Drug/Alcohol Services
- Chief Public Defender
- Executive Director, Dauphin County Pretrial Services
- Executive Director, The PROGRAM for Female Offenders, Inc.
- Director, Domestic Violence Services, YWCA
- Administrator, PROBE/New Choices, Tri-County
- Department of Public Welfare/Case Worker
- Dauphin County Prison Deputy Warden
- Executive Director, Victim/Witness Assistance Program

##### **Motivation to Engage in the Work**

- Expanding population of women offenders, especially those with drug related offenses

- A rapidly expanding population of women in prison was overburdening the prison as well as the county's service delivery system
- Higher proportion of women in jail than men
- Women offenders were being sentenced to time in jail and prison for "bad checks" and drug related offenses
- Women were serving longer average lengths of stay than men inmates in an urban county jail
- No special programs for women offenders, including few parenting and child care resources
- No intermediate sanctions for women offenders
- No gender-specific classification systems; current system is based on men offender characteristics and risk factors
- General lack of knowledge and understanding about the unique problems of women offenders by local service providers, the judiciary, social service systems and other county personnel.
- Dauphin County encompasses a large geographic area with little centralized public transportation

### Objectives

- Develop an information system to support the development of a sound conceptual intermediate sanctions plan and on-going policy for women offenders.
- Develop an automated management information system to collect data on women offenders demographic characteristics, offense patterns, sentencing practices and trends, supervision processes, human service and community corrections agencies resources and programs.
- Provide information to promote greater understanding of, support for and cooperation in sanctioning of women offenders in Dauphin County.
- Develop comprehensive policies in the Dauphin County criminal justice system which specifically address sanctioning options for women offenders.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the policies and procedures of the work release center for women and their children.

### Project Challenges

- Inconsistent attendance by key decisionmakers
- Dominant leader resulted in staff driven process
- Parallel facilities building campaign drew attention of leader from this process
- Resistance on part of key decisionmakers to make any changes regarding women offenders
- Attention to issues and data gathering focused primarily on women in jail
- Difficult dynamics between two individuals shut down the process completely

### What Was Learned

- Opened many to the fact that women offenders present issues many had never considered. Heightened awareness of women offender's issues, particularly the ways women were handled in the system and how they got into the system
- There were many gaps in services and facilities for women offenders
- Survey of criminal court judges revealed that although most supported the use of intermediate punishment, mandatory minimum drug laws prohibited it
- Detainers were more likely for women offenders for failure to comply with requirements such as attending parenting classes. Men offenders did not have the same requirements.

- Pre-trial services were not being provided for women offenders until after they were in jail
- There was no screening of women's critical needs
- 99% of women offenders have drug and alcohol issues; most have mental health issues
- There is no coordinated effort amongst agencies, treatment providers and the criminal justice system in the delivery of services
- The cycle of crime is a key concern with regard to women offenders

#### Outcomes/Products

- Completed 90% of mapping process
- Developed relationships and linkages with criminal justice, community and service professionals
- Survey of criminal court judges regarding rehabilitative punishment philosophies
- Conducted focus groups of probation officers
- Design of a sentencing form for judges, eliminating the practice of split sentencing
- Developed the following policy recommendations:
  1. To sentence more women offenders to intermediate punishment
  2. After arrest, aid in making plans for the care of children of women offenders
  3. Provide family reintegration services
  4. More coordination amongst agencies, service providers and the criminal justice system

#### State of South Carolina

##### Policy Group Members

- Administrator of Intervention Services, South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
- Administrator of Specialized Field Services, South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
- Deputy Regional Administrator, South Carolina Department of Corrections
- Regional Director, South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
- Director Women's Services, Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services
- staff member, Governor's Office, Division on Women
- Coordinator for Volunteer Services, South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
- Administrator for Stayin' Straight
- staff member, State Health Department
- Professor, University of South Carolina Criminal Justice School

##### Motivation to Engage in the Work

- Increasing numbers of women offenders
- No programs and services designed to meet the needs of women offenders
- Lack of information on the needs of women offenders
- Lack of recognition that women were different than men

- Interest in how needs create risk
- Interest in understanding sentencing patterns and community based intervention for women offenders

### Objectives

- To collect data and information to create a complete picture of what the needs of the woman offender are and how such needs affect risk.
- To learn more about available services for women offenders and where there were gaps in services.
- To identify effective intervention strategies to reduce the risk associated with unmet needs.
- To raise awareness of the differences between men and women offenders.
- To develop a long term strategic plan to meet the needs of women offenders

### Project Challenges

- South Carolina had a very difficult time fitting into NIC's model for several reasons. NIC's model was based on a more centralized decisionmaking system. While services in South Carolina are delivered from a centralized system, the courts are totally decentralized.
- Any major systemic change must occur through the political system by garnering support individually with judges and the legislature.
- More than a third of South Carolina's delivery of services is funded through fines and fees which are collected by the county clerk of courts. Passing the funding through to delivery agencies does not occur smoothly, partially because there is no centralized data system to track collection and disbursement of funds.
- Some momentum has been lost because of delays and difficulties in pulling together data and analyzing the data.
- The policy group had a fundamental issue in agreeing on the project purpose and scope
- Inability of the group to grapple with policy issues
- The process suffered as a result of local perception that the state was telling them what to do

### What Was Learned

- Many women offenders in the system are not necessarily responsible for children as had been thought
- The group was able to focus attention on women offenders by first focusing on men offenders through funding from Edna McConnell Clark Commission
- Some of the services for women offenders in rural areas may actually be services for men offenders, simply renamed for women. That is, they have not actually been designed for women offenders.

### Outcomes/Products

- Conducted a survey of women offenders
- Increased awareness about women offenders and their issues for some
- Motivation to pursue additional assistance through a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Commission to accomplish the following with regard to sentencing guidelines:
  1. General education on sentencing guidelines in the State



2. Statistical modeling on sentencing practices and outcomes based on offense and prior history
  3. Provide training for judges on sentencing guidelines
  4. Staff development in research and evaluation.
- Development of a data base (through Edna McConnell Clark Commission grant
  - Development of internal data and analysis of that data

1. Much of that glossary can be found in Appendix D, "Glossary of Common Terms."

## Appendix D Glossary of Common Terms<sup>1</sup>

**CLASSIFICATION:** A system used to decide how much supervision an offender needs based on her criminal history, supervision performance and other risk-defining criteria.

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS:** The system of supervising people living in the community who are on probation, parole or post-prison supervision. By using classification tools, treatment and support programs, community corrections professionals help preserve public safety while helping offenders make the transition to useful citizenship.

**COMMUNITY SERVICE:** A probation sanction under which a convicted offender is allowed to "work off" his/her fine by volunteering for unpaid work at a community agency for a specified number of hours. These programs usually assign offenders to work for government or private nonprofit agencies. Manual labor chores might include chopping wood, serving food at senior centers, weeding around public buildings or helping with park maintenance. Those with specialized skills might undertake more technical tasks such as compiling land record inventories or cataloguing books.

**COMMUNITY SUPERVISION:** Provided by community corrections agencies for offenders on probation, parole or post-prison supervision.

**CONDITIONS OF PROBATION:** Community-based sanctions imposed on an offender who has been placed on probation by the court as the result of being convicted of a misdemeanor or felony offense. These conditions vary widely depending upon the nature and circumstances of the offender. Examples include paying restitution to victim(s) or completing substance abuse treatment.

**CRIME RATE:** The number of index crimes per 10,000 population.

**DAY REPORTING:** An offender reports at a central location every day. There she files a written daily schedule showing how each hour of the day will be spent - at work, in treatment, in school, etc. A case manager spot checks to see if the offender is where she is supposed to be. The offender must obey a curfew, do community service and submit to random drug tests. Day reporting is often program-intensive, offering such services as alcohol and drug group treatment, employment readiness and job training.

**ELECTRONIC MONITORING:** In lieu of county jail or work release center time, an offender spends most of the time at home or work with a small transmitter attached to her wrist or ankle. A very specific schedule is required and a computer notifies staff when the offender is not where she is supposed to be.

**FELONY:** A crime that can be punished by a prison sentence.

**GENDER-SPECIFIC OR GENDER-RESPONSIVE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES:** Those that take into account objective differences between men and women's learning and relationship styles and life circumstances. Gender-specific programs and services are designed to meet the particular needs of

women offenders; they value the perspective of women; they respect and take into account women's development; and they work to empower women and change established attitudes that prevent or discourage girls or women from recognizing their potential.<sup>2</sup>

**HOUSE ARREST:** Offender serves part or all of her sentence at home without electronic monitoring. A specific schedule is required and verification may occur by telephone or random, unannounced home visits.

**INCARCERATION:** Confinement in jail, prison, or a secure treatment program.

**INDETERMINATE SENTENCING:** The court stipulates only a maximum term of imprisonment with the actual time served determined later by the board of parole and post-prison supervision.

**INDEX CRIMES:** Those significant crimes selected by the FBI as indicative of the general crime rate. They include violent crimes such as homicide, aggravated assault, rape and robbery and property crimes such as burglary, larceny, arson and motor vehicle theft.

**INTENSIVE SUPERVISION:** A highly intensive program of supervision in the community for certain convicted felons operated either by local or state correctional agencies or private vendors.

**INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS:** This term carries more than one meaning. For many it means imposition of some type of "just deserts" punishment somewhere between a prison term and "regular" probation. For others, intermediate sanctions are mechanisms with varying degrees of risk control somewhere between regular probation and confinement. In many jurisdictions, an intermediate sanction may be a penalty associated with offender non-compliance in the community. Still others see intermediate sanctions for women as including a specialized array of services. In some jurisdictions, an intermediate sanction is a discrete independent sentence or disposition; in others, it is a feature that may overlay existing sentencing structure. An obvious example is a special condition imposed with probation. Intermediate sanctions can also be defined according to which agency has authority to administer them. A primary task of the project work group will be to define and clarify what is meant by "intermediate sanctions" as a means of establishing the project goals and objectives.

**JAIL:** A facility under the jurisdiction of local government, usually a county, intended for incarceration terms of less than one year. Jails are traditionally used for three purposes: pre-trial detention, short-term incarceration of sentenced offenders, and incarceration of probationers as a sanction for violations of supervision conditions.

**MISDEMEANOR:** A crime that can be punished by incarceration in a local jail, usually for one year or less.

**OFFENDER:** Anyone convicted of a crime, whether sentenced to incarceration, probation or intermediate sanctions.

**PAROLE/SUPERVISED RELEASE:** Refers to the status of a convicted felon who has been conditionally released from a state correctional facility into the community.

**POLICY:** Policies define *why* we are engaging in particular activities, and provide guidelines for *how* we should carry out the activities.<sup>3</sup>

**PRISON:** A state correctional facility used to incarcerate offenders, usually for sentences longer than a year; these offenders have usually been convicted of felonies.

**PROBATION:** A court-ordered sanction that places a offender released into the community under the supervision of a probation officer, often with conditions that require participation in treatment, employment, or other rehabilitation programs. In many jurisdictions, probation is given as a suspended sentence to prison that may be reinstated if the offender violates conditions of supervision. A probation sentence may include a jail term to be served prior to placement on community supervision.

**PROBATION/PAROLE OFFICER:** A person employed by the state or a county who supervises and counsels people who have been convicted of a crime and have been placed on probation by the court, and who is also responsible for the supervision of convicted felons released from prison.

**PROPERTY CRIME:** Involves the theft or destruction of property.

**RECIDIVISM:** A key outcome measure for corrections programs, which refers to the proportion of offenders who commit additional crimes either while under community supervision or after their sentences have been served.

**REHABILITATION PROGRAMS:** Designed to strike at the root causes of offending behavior, such programs include drug/alcohol treatment, anger management, cognitive restructuring, sex offender treatment, life skills training, and job training and placement.

**RESTITUTION:** A sanction ordered by court as a part of a sentence to probation or incarceration, usually involving compensation to a victim from an offender to repair harm caused by crimes.

**REVOCATION:** The process by which a convicted offender is removed from community supervision, a probationer is sent to prison, or a parolee is returned to prison as a sanction for violating conditions of their supervision.

**SANCTIONING:** Holding people accountable through conditions or actions imposed to achieve punishment, rehabilitation, restoration and/or deterrence.

**SENTENCE:** An order imposed by a judge or judicial authority.

**SENTENCING GUIDELINES:** A system of determining presumptive sentences for persons convicted of crimes that provides greater uniformity across judges and geographic areas in sentencing offenders. The recommended sentence is determined using a grid that considers the crime and past criminal behavior to assign either a prison or a probation sentence and determine the length of sentence. Sentencing judges retain discretion to depart from sentencing guidelines' recommendations if aggravating or mitigating factors are present.

**STRUCTURED SANCTIONS:** In some jurisdictions, structured sanctions are imposed as a consequence when an offender fails to abide by the specific terms of supervision. These sanctions may include jail time, community service, house arrest or inpatient drug/alcohol treatment. The structure is a statewide decisionmaking grid that recommends the severity of the sanction to impose and whether the probation/parole officer or the court should intervene, based on specified circumstances and offender behaviors.

**SUPERVISION FEES:** A fee charged monthly to each person on parole, post-prison supervision or probation to offset some of the costs of supervision. These are assessed by a judge, and may be waived due to offender inability to pay.

**SUPERVISION LEVEL:** Supervision level is determined through a risk assessment process that determines an offender's likelihood of committing a new crime or risk of dangerous or violent behavior.

**TRANSITION SERVICES:** Services that 'reach in' to prisons or jails to 'hook' offenders to housing, treatment, employment and other services before release, to increase the likelihood of success in the community.

**VIOLATION:** Failure of a probationer, parolee or supervised releasee to comply with one or more of the specified conditions of community supervision.

**VIOLENT CRIME:** Involves direct contact or confrontation between the offender and the victim. Examples include murder, rape, assault and robbery.

**WORK RELEASE CENTER:** A minimum custody residential facility that houses offenders in a structured setting, allowing them to leave for work, court ordered restitution, or other approved activities such as drug treatment. May be used as a direct sentencing option, or as a transitional placement for offenders being released from jail or prison settings.

1. Based in part on the Glossary from the State of Oregon's Final Report, (March 1995), *Intermediate Sanctions for Women Offenders*, pp. 73-76.

2. For more detail on gender-specific issues, see Bloom, Barbara, and Covington, Stephanie (November 1998). *Gender-Specific Programming for Female Offenders: What is it and Why is it Important?*

3. A more detailed description of "policy" can be found in Chapter 4 under "Develop and Market Change Proposals".



## Appendix E List of Sample Documents

A packet containing examples of technical assistance reports, data collection forms, survey results and final project reports developed by consultants and jurisdictions for this project is available through the National Institute of Corrections Information Center. The packet includes the following examples:

### Introductory Documents

1. Introductory Documents
  - a. Cook County, Illinois
  - b. Hamilton County, Ohio

### Data Collection Forms

2. Surveys to Profile Women Offenders
  - a. Racine County, Wisconsin
  - b. State of Oregon
3. Structured Format for Interviewing Judges
  - a. Johnson County, Kansas
4. Resource Inventory
  - a. San Francisco City and County, California

### Decision Mapping Format and Results

5. Decision Mapping Format and Results
  - a. State of Oregon

### Survey Results

6. Survey Results
  - a. Johnson County, Kansas

- b. Racine County, Wisconsin
- c. State of Oregon (see final report, pages 33-64)

#### Technical Assistance Reports

- 7. Technical Assistance Reports
  - a. Dakota County, Minnesota
  - b. Johnson County, Kansas
  - c. Rounds 1 and 2; Knapp, Kay, *Policy-Driven Intermediate Sanctions for Female Offenders: The Critical Role of Data.*

#### Annotated Bibliography

- 8. Annotated Bibliography
  - a. Hampden County, Massachusetts

#### Final Reports

- 9. Final Reports
  - a. Dakota County, Minnesota
  - b. Dallas County, Texas
  - c. Racine County, Wisconsin
  - d. State of Oregon
  - e. York County, Pennsylvania

In addition, all the background informational articles referenced in the Bibliography are available. To receive any of these materials, call the NIC Information Center at 1-800-877-1461 or (303) 682-0213 and ask for Pat Scholes. You may also write to the NIC Information Center at 1860 Industrial Circle, Suite A, Longmont, CO 80501.



