

Washtenaw Equity Partnership (WEP) Post Sentencing and Reentry Subcommittee

November 11, 2022 2:30 – 4:00pm

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Ariana Gonzalez

Devin Dailey

Alma Smith

Alex Roth (Vera)

Tara Dhanraj Roden (Vera)

Angie Carpio (Vera)

- Working as a group on the implementation document.
- Reviewing what is currently in each row and comments subcommittee members have made to date.
 - Recommendation 1 – Subcommittee member doesn't think it's about collecting better data, rather that the public cannot extract the data that the MDOC has. Another subcommittee member thinks MDOC needs to collect better data and agrees to keep as is.
 - Discussion about Florida's database
 - Do we want to gain access to data from CJARS? If County Commission requests access to data at CJARS – this would change recommendation to MDOC giving access to County to CJARS. This might be more realistic than current recommendation.
 - Recommendation changed to: Ask MDOC to approve CJARS to allow Washtenaw County to access data – will tweak to be more clear.
 - Letter from County Commissioners to MDOC asking for approval to access CJARS data.
 - Recommendation 2 – Legislative representation – create subcommittee of commissioners to work with Senator Irwin to achieve what is needed.
 - Recommendation 3 – question if they can consider doing a pilot at the county level. Added pilot project into recommendation.
 - Need to highlight concern about heavy reliance on risk assessments
 - Removed recommendation 4.
 - New recommendation 4 – (requires that PSI writers consistently document...) no comments
 - Recommendation 5 – need to hire more people to accomplish anything.
 - Recommendation 6 – change to work with legislative delegation
 - Recommendation 7 – encourage county to work with MSHDA with their statewide housing plan – opportunity for people to participate on advisory committee. Vera staff member mentioned some of the restrictions that MSHDA has for people with criminal records.
 - Atlanta example – made people with criminal records a protective class for housing? Suggestion to integrate into front end and prevention subcommittee recommendations.
 - Change recommendation to provide more funding for subsidies for housing...

- Affordable housing accommodating returning citizens? Find out and include in front end and prevention.
 - Recommendation 8 – members decide to drop this recommendation.
 - Recommendation 8 now – push MDOC and the legislature to make sure that analysis of the effects of parole guidelines by race...
 - Worth considering have a university partner.
 - Change to: work with the legislature to make sure that the MDOC does the required analysis....
 - Recommendation 9 – what are we referring the client to? Is it therapist or someone else outside of parole and will this become a requirement that can violate someone?
 - Specify that field office should have required steps for this to happen rather than being ad hoc/discretionary
 - Maybe suggesting a pilot for this recommendation to prove that this would save money that it would cost – preventative services.
 - Change recommendation to “create a pilot project to refer technical parole violations...
 - Add in coalition of entities – local MDOC field office, local CBOS and county commissioners
 - Recommendation 10 –
 - Public Act 511 of community action corrections? Get funding for this – reference public act 511 money for community corrections –
 - Recommendation 11 – short team goal.
 - Recommendation 12 – discussion about screener risk assessment/scoring
 - Screener developed by reentry team.
 - Recommendation 13 – an item the subcommittee wanted to explore but unclear if MDOC has this data; add in legislative delegation.
 - Recommendation 14 – change to: county should be more involved in advisory council
 - Recommendation 15 – add in legislative delegation to work with MDOC; would need more staff and funding for this from the state.
 - MDOC needs to reevaluate qualifications for OS funding for type of MDOC supervision.
 - Probation, parole, max out, discharges from parole or probation.
 - Recommendation 16 – should this be combined with other recommendation that said same thing – could combine all recs that say conduct analysis...
 - Will combine recommendations
 - Recommendation 17 – should this be a pilot project? Yes. Purpose to be able to better address peoples needs and barriers they face. Use this information to inform programming?
 - Recommendation 18 – eliminate charges for phone calls for incarcerated people; this goes with grouping of things for legislative delegation to achieve? Part of recommendation is for county to subsidize costs; this wouldn't be for legislative delegation- could split this recommendation into 2.
- Working group going to ask if the recommendations align with working group's goals, such as racial disparities. Do we need to do justification of some of the recommendations for how they work with the guidelines of the working group?

- Some recommendations they are not specified, but there are such disparities with incarceration, recommendations will help people of color since they are disproportionately affected.
- Difference between MI state technical violation and Vera's definition of technical violation – go with MI statutory definition.
- Next step: Vera staff person will circulate changes/updates to entire subcommittee next week.