



Corrections and Community Supervision

Community Supervision Staffing

Legislative Report

2018

**Community Supervision Staffing
Legislative Report
2018**

This report was produced in accordance with Chapter 361 of the Laws of New York, 2017 (Appendix A), which requires the Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) to provide a report to the Governor and the Legislature that details the staffing of Parole Officers and other DOCCS employees assigned to community supervision. This staffing summary includes a comparison of Community Supervision staff and responsibilities before and after the 2011 merger between the Department of Correctional Services and the Division of Parole. In addition, this report provides information about parolee activity in the previous calendar year, including parolee releases and characteristics of parolees under supervision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
SECTION 1 - National Standards of Community Supervision	1
SECTION 2 - NYS DOCCS Community Supervision Caseload Description	3
SECTION 3 - NYS DOCCS Community Supervision Standards	7
SECTION 4 - NYS DOCCS Community Supervision Staffing	9
SECTION 5 - NYS Community Supervision Background.....	15
SECTION 6 - NYS DOCCS Community Supervision Public Safety Outcomes.....	18
Appendix A Chapter 361 of the Laws of NY, 2017	22
Appendix B ACA Performance Based Standards & Expected Practices Accreditation Department	27
Appendix C NYS DOCCS ParoleSTAT Summary.....	37
Appendix D NYS DOCCS Directive for Supervision Standards for Community Supervision	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) parole staffing is based on a ratio that is principally driven by the parolee population served in a particular geographic area. This formula allows DOCCS to make pro-active staffing adjustments, as needed, on an on-going basis. As a result, DOCCS is able to staff in accordance with changes in the law, parolee demographics or in response to other external factors.

A review of nationally recommended parole/probation caseload standards from the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and National Institute of Corrections (NIC) results in a finding that DOCCS meets or exceeds their recommended staffing ratios. Additionally, DOCCS is one of only a few Community Supervision agencies nationally to be Accredited by the American Correctional Association (ACA). In fact, in 2017 DOCCS reported a compliance rate of 99.37%, based on the rigorous national standards for community supervision established by the ACA (Appendix B). This represents the highest score DOCCS has achieved for Community Supervision since seeking ACA accreditation as the former Division of Parole in 2005. Finally, DOCCS continuously evaluates staff and parolee performance and outcomes (warrant/ discharge/ programming, etc.) based on a monthly ParoleSTAT summary report (Appendix C). Staff performance is now regularly reported in the 90% or above range on these important performance measures.

Based on the above findings, DOCCS parole staffing is clearly sufficient to meet the Department's Mission.

Section 1 - National Standards of Community Supervision

The question of what constitutes an optimal community supervision caseload size, that balances both effective supervision and public safety with available resources, has been ongoing in the community corrections field for many years, without a definitive conclusion. In fact, some experts in the field argue that caseload ratios, workload, and supervision practices should be determined individually by each community supervision agency based on their unique circumstances. This is because, “the diversity of size, structure, geographical area covered, organization and clientele that characterizes probation and parole in the United States and Canada makes it very difficult to make definitive statements or recommendations that will apply to all, or even to a majority of the agencies” (Burrell, 2006).

Establishing appropriate caseload standards and sizes is a process that involves a thorough review and analysis of an agency’s individual workload, resources, and policies. It is commonly accepted that while caseload size is an important component of effective community supervision, it is not the only critical aspect of successful supervision, which also depends on Parole Officers using the principles of evidence-based practices. Cases should be classified into categories based on criteria such as risk of re-offending, offense type and criminogenic needs. This differentiation of cases based on relevant criteria is critical in ensuring that parolees are matched with the appropriate level of supervision and services.

Although there is not one nationally recognized model of caseload standards, it is useful to look at proposed standards by different organizations as benchmarks for comparison. In a report issued by the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) in 2006, the recommendation was made to supervise the highest risk offenders at a 20:1 ratio, moderate to high risk offenders at 50:1, and those at the lowest risk at a 200:1 ratio. The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has similar recommended standards (as illustrated in Table 1).

TABLE 1: RECOMMENDED SUPERVISION STANDARDS

Proposed APPA (2006)	
Case Type	Cases to Staff Ratio
Intensive	20:1
Moderate to High Risk	50:1
Low Risk	200:1
Administrative	No Limit
National Institute of Corrections (NIC)	
Case Type	Cases to Staff Ratio
High Risk	40:1
High-Moderate Risk	60:1
Low Risk	120:1
All Risk	60:1

Section 2 - New York State DOCCS Community Supervision Caseload Description

DOCCS supervision standards exceed or are within the established APPA and NIC recommended standards. Moreover, DOCCS uses an evidence-based risk and needs tool to allocate supervision and treatment resources. DOCCS is also accredited by the American Correctional Association and achieved a 99.37% compliance rate in 2017.

As described below, parolees are supervised according to identified risks and needs:

COMPAS Supervision Level

In accordance with established best practices, the COMPAS supervision model was implemented at DOCCS in January 2012, based on a validated risk instrument. A COMPAS Re-Entry Assessment is administered to all inmates scheduled to be released to supervision and the Parole Officer is required to supervise offenders based on the determined supervision level. The four supervision levels and the accompanying supervision ratios and reporting requirements were determined based on a number of risk factors, specifically, risk of absconding, risk of any arrest, and risk of Violent Felony Offender (VFO) arrest. Level 1 represents the highest level of risk with a supervision ratio of 25:1; Level 2 reflects a moderate to high level of risk with a 40:1 supervision ratio; Level 3 represents a moderate to low level of risk with an 80:1 supervision ratio; Level 4 reflects a low level of risk with a supervision ratio of 160:1.

The Parole Officer reassesses risk level using the COMPAS Supervision Review instrument after a parolee has served 12 months of unrevoked parole supervision and every period of 12 months of unrevoked parole supervision thereafter.

Field staff override the calculated supervision level individuals meeting the criteria for specialized caseloads, including Strict and Intensive Supervision and Treatment (SIST)¹ cases, registered and discretionary sex offenders, mental health cases and enhanced supervision cases in Monroe County. A parolee's supervision level can also be changed in other instances where it is determined that there are aggravating or mitigating factors that warrant a change in the level with approval from the Assistant Regional Director.

Specialized Caseloads

In New York, there are specialized caseloads with more intensive supervision that parolees are assigned to, as appropriate. These caseloads are designed for parolees who pose additional risk to the community and/or have additional needs that require more attention from the Parole Officer. Parolees supervised at a ratio of 25:1 or less are supervised as Level 1.

Strict and Intensive Supervision and Treatment (SIST) sex offender cases are supervised at a 10:1 ratio. In 2015, mental health caseloads were expanded and individuals identified by the NYS Office of Mental Health as being Seriously Mentally Ill or an OMH Level 1 or 2 at the time of release began being supervised at a 15:1 supervision ratio for the first six months following release and at a 25:1 ratio after six months have passed, for the duration of their time under supervision. In Monroe county, an enhanced supervision pilot began in 2015 after several high profile events occurred in the City of Rochester. The parolees identified with a particularly high risk of committing violent crimes receive enhanced supervision with Global Position System (GPS) technology at a 20:1 supervision ratio.

Other Supervision Status ratios

¹ Sex offenders serving a sentence with NYS DOCCS or the NYS Office for People with Development Disabilities (OPWDD) for qualifying offenses under the Sex Offender Management and Treatment Act (SOMTA) who have also been determined by a NYS Supreme Court to suffer from a mental abnormality that predisposes them to commit sex offenses. Subsequent to that designation the court determines whether they are dangerous sex offenders requiring confinement or strict and intensive supervision.

Parole staff responsibilities also extend to offenders who are in different stages of being released to, or returned from, the community, and resources are allocated for this work accordingly.

Inmates who are within 60 days of release to community supervision are in the Community Preparation phase of supervision. During this phase, facility, field and re-entry staff work with inmates to establish housing, programming and other resources in the community. The staffing ratio for these cases is 100:1. Parolees in non-reporting status are supervised at a 125:1 ratio. Parolees in the final violation hearing process are assigned to a Parole Revocation Specialist (PRS) at a 100:1 ratio. PRS responsibilities include representing the Department's interests in hearings before an Administrative Law Judge, much like a prosecutor in a criminal trial. Staff conduct field work searching for absconders on their caseloads and are credited at a 200:1 ratio for these offenders. Individuals who are deported, supervised in other states through the Interstate Compact, or who are incarcerated out of state remain on caseloads at a staffing ratio of 750:1, so that they may be monitored in the event that they subsequently return to New York State.

The required number of Senior Parole Officers is based on the number of Parole Officers at a ratio of 7:1 within a field supervision Bureau. The required number of Supervising Parole Officers (Bureau Chiefs) is based on the number of parolees, at a 1,500:1 ratio. The tables below show the staffing level and parole supervision distribution by caseload type on December 31, 2017. As of that date, there were a grand total of 51,433 offenders in the various supervision categories, for whom 1,633 staff were responsible for various aspects of their supervision, 850 of these were field staff (see Table 2).

TABLE 2: FIELD STAFFING AND CASELOAD CALCULATION

December 31, 2017

Staffing			
	Required	Actual	Difference
Parole Officers	683.7	670	-13.7
Senior Parole Officers	98.3	101	2.7
Supervising Parole Officers	28.7	31	2.3
Parole Revocation Specialists	39.5	32	-7.5
Total Community Supervision Staff	850.2	834	-16.2

Calculated Caseloads							Total Field Staff Required
	Supervision Ratios	Parolees	Parole Officers	Senior Parole Officers	Supervising Parole Officers	Parole Revocation Specialists	
Strict and Intensive Supervision (SIST)	10:1	149	14.9	2.1	0.1		17.1
Sex Offender Registrants	25:1	2,610	104.0	14.9	2.1		121.0
Discretionary Sex Offenders	40:1	289	7.2	1.0	0.2		8.4
Mental Health	15:1	303	19.9	2.8	0.2		23.0
Mental Health	25:1	1,949	74.9	10.7	1.5		87.1
GPS	20:1	158	7.9	1.1	0.1		9.2
Supervision Level 1	25:1	3,725	146.8	21.0	2.9		170.6
Supervision Level 2	40:1	4,190	103.0	14.7	3.3		121.0
Supervision Level 3	80:1	7,002	85.9	12.3	5.5		103.7
Supervision Level 4	160:1	7,502	46.5	6.6	5.9		59.0
Pending COMPAS Assessment		313			0.2		0.2
Community Prep 60 Days or Less	100:1	3,488	34.9	4.9	2.7		42.5
Non-Reporting	125:1	1,885	13.7	1.9	1.4		17.0
Absconders	200:1	3,230	16.0	2.3	2.6		20.8
Interstate	750:1	9,003	8.1	2.0	0.0		10.1
PRS Delinquent	100:1	3,951				39.5	39.5
Total		49,747					850.2

Community Prep More than 60 Days

1,686

Grand Total

51,433

Section 3 - New York State DOCCS Community Supervision Standards

Parole Officers

DOCCS establishes supervision standards based on assessed risk of re-offending, supervision intensity, and the case-specific factors delineated in the case plan pursuant to DOCCS Directive 9210 (see Appendix D). Depending on Supervision Level, required contacts between the Parole Officer and the parolee vary from four monthly face-to-face contacts for Level 1 parolees to two face-to-face contacts every four months for Level 4 parolees. Parole Officers are authorized to increase the number of contacts with a parolee in response to public safety considerations, reintegration efforts, and needs such as housing, treatment, and employment.

The number of criminogenic needs identified in the COMPAS case plan that must be addressed by the Parole Officer in conjunction with the parolee also varies based on supervision level. For example, a parolee supervised as Level 1 should have their top three criminogenic needs addressed, while a Level 4 parolee's needs are addressed on an as-needed basis. Drug testing requirements are determined by the level of the Substance Abuse Need from the COMPAS assessment.

Senior Parole Officers

Senior Parole Officers are responsible for ensuring that Parole Officers provide the necessary level of supervision and comply with standards to foster public safety, and assist the parolee to successful completion of Community Supervision. In addition to observing Parole Officer and parolee interactions in the field, in the office and reviewing entries in the Case Management System, they are required to conduct Supervision Standards Conferences with Parole Officers to review the assigned cases as follows:

- Supervision Status I Monthly
- Supervision Status II Monthly
- Supervision Status III Every two months
- Supervision Status IV Once every four months

Supervising Parole Officers (Bureau Chiefs)

Bureau Chiefs are responsible for the overall operations within a Bureau and ensuring that Senior Parole Officers and Parole Officers are supervising parolees to ensure successful completion of Community Supervision. Some of their responsibilities include reviewing requests for supervision level overrides, conducting technical warrant and arrest analysis, making referrals to Parole Diversion Programs, evaluating and approving recommendations for early discharge from supervision, and participating in various regional initiatives to include: Co-chairing the County Re-entry Task Forces, attending monthly GIVE Executive Team meetings, and working with community-based providers and the NYS Department of Labor to create job fair and other employment opportunities.

Section 4 - New York State DOCCS Community Supervision Staffing

This section will describe Community Supervision staffing and job responsibilities prior to and after the merger between the Department of Correctional Services and the Division of Parole.

Pre-Merger Department of Correctional Services and Division of Parole

Facility Staff

Prior to the merger, Facility Parole Officers were assigned by the Division of Parole to serve in correctional facilities and were responsible for Community Preparation work. They helped inmates prepare for Parole Board interviews and general re-entry into the community. Before the merger, there were 105 employees in the Facility Parole Officer 1 title and 41 individuals in the Facility Parole Officer 2 title (See Table 3).

Prior to the merger, there were 591 Correction Counselors and 140 Supervising Correction Counselors assigned to DOCS. Correction Counselors had a primary responsibility to provide comprehensive counseling to inmates to assist them in becoming aware of alternative choices and to take responsibility for their behaviors. Additionally, counselors worked with inmates to assess their programming needs, advise and direct inmates regarding program activities, and monitor and evaluate their progress in programs. Their responsibilities also included working with inmates to obtain documents needed for reentry to the community, such as birth certificates and social security cards.

Field Staff

Prior to the merger, there were 741 Parole Officers, 115 Senior Parole Officers, and 36 Supervising Parole Officers. Among these Parole Officers, there were eight Parole Officers and one Senior Parole Officer who were assigned exclusively to re-entry duties, including working with the County Re-Entry Task Forces. Additionally, there were 34 Parole Revocation Specialists.

Re-Entry Staff

There were eight Assistant Parole Services Program Specialists and five Parole Services Program Specialists. There were also seven individuals in the Parole Substance Abuse Counselor 1 title and one was a Parole Substance Abuse Counselor 2. These individuals work with other Community Supervision staff to identify and address parolees' needs for housing, employment, and treatment in the community.

Post-Merger Department of Correctional Services and Division of Parole

Following the merger of the Division of Parole and the Department of Correctional Services, DOCCS was charged with executing the Governor's vision of a creating a more effective department that could provide seamless case-planning and discharge services to assist inmates transitioning from prison to the community. To that end, DOCCS submitted a title structure change request to the New York State Department of Civil Service, which was subsequently approved, merging the titles of Facility Parole Officer and Correction Counselor (all levels) to create the new Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator (ORC).

Executive Law § 259 e places the responsibility of institutional parole activities under the direct supervision of the Deputy Commissioner for Program Services. As a result, in 2014, the responsibility for supervising this staff shifted from Community Supervision to Program Services, and all ORCs became responsible for work preparing inmates for Parole Board appearances, along with their traditional counselor duties.

In 2016, Program Services expanded the number of ORCs at several facilities to reduce caseloads due to increased workload with the Parole Board preparation process.

In 2018, a new Assistant Deputy Superintendent for Programs position was created, along with five regional Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator positions, whose responsibilities will include working to improve the Parole Board and community preparation processes. At the time of this report, individuals have not yet been hired to fill these positions.

Facility Staff

Since the responsibilities of all 655 Offender Rehabilitation Coordinators and 124 Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinators who work directly on community supervision tasks also include other tasks unrelated to community supervision, there is not a direct comparison to pre-merger Community Supervision staffing in the facilities. An approximation is a comparison of the total numbers of all facility staff and Facility Parole Officers pre- and post-merger, which indicates an 11% reduction in staffing numbers. However, during this time period, the inmate population also declined by 13% from 56,645 at the end of 2010 to 49,473 at the end of 2017. As a result of the decrease in the inmate population, 13 DOCCS correctional facilities have been closed since 2011, resulting in a reduction in the required number of ORCs and SORCs.

Field Staff

Currently, the authorized Community Supervision Budgeted Fill Level is 1,334, which includes Regional Directors, clerical staff, and Institutional Safety Officers (whose job is to provide security in parole offices).

On December 31, 2017, the calculated Total Field Staff Required for all offenders under DOCCS Community Supervision's jurisdiction, based on the supervision ratios, was 850.5 (see Table 2). This included 670 Parole Officers, 101 Senior Parole Officers, 31 Supervising Parole Officers, and 32 Parole Revocation Specialists (see Table 3). These numbers represent a decline in the total number of field staff since the merger, consistent with the 8% decline in the parolee population during that period.

Re-Entry Staff

On December 31, 2017, there were 14 Assistant Parole Services Program Specialists and six Parole Services Program Specialists, which is an increase from the pre-merger numbers.

As of December 31, 2017, there were 856 DOCCS staff working directly with parolees (see Table 3).

TABLE 3: DOCCS COMMUNITY SUPERVISION STAFFING LEVEL COMPARISON

DOCCS Staff Performing Community Supervision Tasks	Actual Fills	
	Pre - DOCS/Parole Merger ¹	12/31/2017
Community Supervision Staff		
Supervising Parole Officer	36	31
Senior Parole Officer	115 ²	101
Parole Officer	741 ³	670
Parole Revocation Specialist	34	32
Parole Substance Abuse Counselor 1	7	-
Parole Substance Abuse Counselor 2	1	-
Facility Parole Officer 1	105	-
Facility Parole Officer 2	41	-
Offender Rehab Coordinator	-	2
Assistant Parole Services Program Specialist	8	14
Parole Services Program Specialist	5	6
Program Services Staff		
Corrections Counselor	591	-
Supervising Corrections Counselor	140	-
Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator	-	653 ⁴
Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator	-	124 ⁴
Total	1,824	1,633

¹Data from 2010 and 2011 reports

²Includes 1 Re-Entry Senior Parole Officer

³Includes 8 Re-Entry Parole Officers

⁴Includes Guidance, Transitional, FRP, ASAT and Temp Release ORCs. All ORCs at facilities work on Parole Folders.

Staffing Review

Staffing levels vary as employees are promoted, retire, or otherwise vacate their positions. Community Supervision staffing requirements and needs are evaluated by DOCCS on an ongoing basis to ensure appropriate staffing levels. Every two weeks, the Community Supervision Human Resources Management Committee (HRMC) meets to examine staffing needs. This committee is comprised of staff from Budget & Finance and Human Resources, as well Community Supervision executive staff. For example, if a Parole Officer retires or is promoted, the bureau will submit a request to the HRMC to have that position backfilled, along with a justification for the position. Based on available staffing reports, which are produced weekly, the committee will make a determination regarding the need to backfill the position based on the caseloads of the bureau.

In addition to the bi-weekly HRMC meetings, which deal with staffing on a case-by-case basis, staffing is also reviewed more globally every quarter. At this meeting, which is attended by executive staff and Budget staff, broader staffing issues are discussed. The purpose of this meeting is to determine Budgeted Fill Levels (BFL) for each bureau based on population trends and supervision needs. For example, due to the shifting of the parolee population from downstate to upstate, recently a decision was made at this meeting to consolidate a downstate bureau and establish a new bureau upstate. Using this active management approach to staffing allows DOCCS to redeploy staff as needed to ensure adequate caseload coverage.

By monitoring routine staffing reports to manage staffing, supervision and caseload needs are addressed regularly.

Since the merger in fiscal year 2011-12, there have been eight Parole Officer training classes with between 40 - 50 recruits per class, which has kept staffing levels at appropriate levels.

**Table 4: Parole Officer Training Classes Fiscal Year
2013-14 through Fiscal Year 2017-18**

Fiscal Year	Number of Classes	Recruits Per Class	Total Recruits
2013-14	1	40	40
2014-15	1	40	40
2015-16	2	40	80
2016-17	2	45	90
2017-18	2	50	100

Section 5 - New York State Community Supervision Background

In 2017, there were 20,695 releases to parole supervision, a 1% decline from the number of releases in 2016 and a 20% decline from 2011.

On December 31, 2017, there were 51,433 individuals on community supervision under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections and Community Supervision. This was a decline of 4,477 parolees (-8%) from December 31, 2010, prior to the merger (see Table 5). The majority of parolees (69%) were actively supervised in New York state, meaning they were being supervised in the community, absconders at large, or in the violation process.

Among the remaining individuals, 18% had been deported, transferred to another state for supervision, or were incarcerated out of state. Ten percent were incarcerated in DOCCS facilities in the Community Preparation process pending a decision to grant release by the Board of Parole or a Conditional Release. Two percent were parolees participating in parole diversion programs. A small number of individuals were participating in the Temporary Release program and the remainder were undergoing review for transfer to supervision in New York State via the Interstate Compact.

TABLE 5: COMMUNITY SUPERVISION POPULATION ALLOCATION

December 31

	2010		2017		Change	
Total Streeted Parolees	29,174	52.2%	27,274	53.0%	-1,900	-6.5%
Absconders	3,975	7.1%	3,203	6.2%	-772	-19.4%
Other ¹	72	0.1%	36	0.1%	-36	-50.0%
In Violation Proceedings	5,408	9.7%	5,018	9.8%	-390	-7.2%
Total Active Parolee Population	38,629	69.1%	35,531	69.1%	-3,098	-8.0%
Temporary Release	652	1.2%	396	0.8%	-256	-39.3%
Community Preparation	5,605	10.0%	5,143	10.0%	-462	-8.2%
Coop Investigation	142	0.3%	98	0.2%	-44	-31.0%
Incarcerated Parolees in DOCCS Facilities	450	0.8%	798	1.6%	348	77.3%
Out of State Parolees ²	10,432	18.7%	9,467	18.4%	-965	-9.3%
Total Parolee Population	55,910	100%	51,433	100%	-4,477	-8.0%

¹ The majority of these parolees are in Unverified Death status. There are a few parolees who are in the historical "Inactive" supervision status.

² Parolees who have been deported, transferred to another state via the Interstate Compact or are incarcerated out of state.

Among parolees under supervision, more than half reside in New York City and Long Island. The largest proportion are supervised as Level 1 (29%), the highest level of risk based on a COMPAS assessment, followed closely by Level 4 (28%) and Level 2 (26%). Over half of offenders under supervision are serving sentences for A-1 and Violent Felony Offenses (53%).

TABLE 6: COMMUNITY SUPERVISION OFFENDER FACTS**December 31, 2017**

Ethnicity	COMPAS Supervision Level
47% - African American	29% - Level 1
23% - Hispanic	15% - Level 2
26% - White	26% - Level 3
4% - Other	28% - Level 4
	1% - Pending
Sex	
93% - Male	
7% - Female	
	Residence
	51% - New York City
	7% - Long Island
	42% - Upstate
Age	
Median - 38	
Mean - 40	
Conviction Crime*	
53% - A-1 Violent and VFO Offenses	
20% - Drug Offenses	
17% - Property/Other	
8% - Other violent	
2% - YO/JO	

*All conviction crimes reflect top charge.

**A-1 violent offenses include Murder, Attempted Murder 1st, Arson 1st and Kidnapping 1st. VFOs include other legislatively-designated violent felony offenses.

Section 6 - New York State Community Supervision Public Safety Outcomes

Research has demonstrated that not only does the use of risk and needs instruments to determine supervision level results in better decision-making, but that states that use actuarial tools have a greater impact on recidivism (Taxman, Yancey, and Bilanin 2006; Lowencamp, 2004). For all outcomes measured, New York State parolees supervised at the highest levels are the most likely to have a negative outcome. Parolees supervised at Level 1 and 2, who are the riskiest, are more likely to be returned to custody or have a warrant issued than Level 3 and Level 4 parolees.

During 2017, warrants were issued predominantly for parolees at the highest two risk levels as assessed by the COMPAS. As of December 31, 2017, 44% of parolees were supervised at Level 1 or 2, while 65% of the 2017 warrants were issued to parolees supervised at Level 1 and Level 2. This finding was consistent among the different warrant types (see Table 7).

TABLE 7: 2017 WARRANTS ISSUED BY SUPERVISION LEVEL

	Type of Warrant								Supervision Level for Parolees in the Community December 31, 2017	
	Absconder		New Arrest		Rule Violation		Total			
Supervision Level	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
1 (25:1)	2,183	37%	1,922	36%	2,398	51%	6,503	41%		
2 (40:1)	1,615	27%	1,197	22%	958	20%	3,770	24%		
3 (80:1)	1,502	26%	1,528	29%	940	20%	3,970	25%		
4 (160:1)	556	9%	658	12%	388	8%	1,602	8%		
Pending	23	0%	34	1%	42	1%	99	1%		
TOTAL	5,879	100%	5,339	100%	4,726	100%	15,944	100%		

*Percentage total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Returns to prison also occurred predominantly among the riskiest parolees, those supervised on smaller caseloads. In 2017, at the time of return, 44% of all returns were supervised at Level 1, 25% at Level 2, 22% at Level 3, and 8% at Level 4. The fact that the majority of individuals returned (69%) were identified as Level 1 and Level 2 indicates the effectiveness of the Department's use of the COMPAS Supervision tool to manage caseloads (see Table 8).

The data demonstrates the Department has continued to manage the parolee population effectively, while ensuring DOCCS' critical mission to maintain public safety and the parolees' ability to successfully re-enter society are achieved.

TABLE 8: PAROLEES RETURNED TO PRISON DURING 2017 BY SUPERVISION LEVEL

	Return Reason						Supervision Level for Parolees in the Community	
	New Court Conviction		Violating Conditions of Parole		Total			
							December 31, 2017	
Supervision Level	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
1 (25:1)	508	38%	3,501	45%	4,009	44%	1 (25:1)	29%
2 (40:1)	325	25%	1,972	25%	2,297	25%	2 (40:1)	15%
3 (80:1)	338	26%	1,648	21%	1,986	22%	3 (80:1)	26%
4 (160:1)	146	11%	609	8%	755	8%	4 (160:1)	28%
Pending	5	<1%	72	1%	77	1%	Pending	1%
TOTAL	1,322	100%	7,802	100%	9,124	100%	TOTAL	100%

Final Recommendation

DOCCS has been able to meet our critical Community Supervision mission by maintaining Parole Officer, Senior Parole Officer, Re-Entry Services and Community Supervision Management staffing levels to match the parolee population across the state. To ensure DOCCS is always able to achieve our public safety and re-entry goals, it is recommended that DOCCS continue to regularly be approved for Parole Officer Recruit classes, consistent with the levels of attrition within the ranks due to separation of service, promotion or other causes.

References

Burrell, W.D. (2006). Caseload standards for probation and parole. Report to The American Probation & Parole Association.

Lowencamp, C.T. (2004). Correctional program integrity and treatment effectiveness: A multi-site program-level analysis. The University of Cincinnati: Doctoral Dissertation.

Taxman, F.S., Yancey, C., & Bilanin, J.E. (2006). Proactive Community Supervision: Changing Offender Outcomes. Baltimore, MD: Division of Parole and Probation.

Appendix A: Chapter 361 of the Laws of New York, 2017

A 7687 Weprin Same as S 5987
 GALLIVAN
 Correctional Services
 TITLE.....Authorizes the study of parole officer staffing
This bill is not active in the current session.
 05/09/17referred to correction
 05/16/17reported referred to ways and means
 06/06/17reported referred to rules
 06/12/17reported
 06/12/17rules report cal.166
 06/12/17ordered to third reading rules cal.166
 06/13/17passed assembly
 06/13/17delivered to senate
 06/13/17REFERRED TO RULES
 06/21/17SUBSTITUTED FOR S5987
 06/21/173RD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17PASSED SENATE
 06/21/17RETURNED TO ASSEMBLY
 10/11/17delivered to governor
 10/23/17signed chap.361

S5987 GALLIVAN Same as A 7687 Weprin
 Correctional Services
 TITLE.....Authorizes the study of parole officer staffing
This bill is not active in the current session.
 05/09/17 REFERRED TO CRIME VICTIMS, CRIME AND CORRECTION
 05/16/17 REPORTED AND COMMITTED TO FINANCE
 06/06/17 REPORTED AND COMMITTED TO RULES
 06/21/17 ORDERED TO THIRD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17 SUBSTITUTED BY A7687
A07687 Weprin
 05/09/17 referred to correction
 05/16/17 reported referred to ways and means
 06/06/17 reported referred to rules
 06/12/17 reported
 06/12/17 rules report cal.166
 06/12/17 ordered to third reading rules cal.166
 06/13/17 passed assembly
 06/13/17 delivered to senate
 06/13/17 REFERRED TO RULES
 06/21/17 SUBSTITUTED FOR S5987
 06/21/17 3RD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17 PASSED SENATE
 06/21/17 RETURNED TO ASSEMBLY
 10/11/17 delivered to governor
 10/23/17 signed chap.361

Chapter	Bill No.	Signed Date	Effective Date
361	A7687	10/23/2017	and shall expire and be deemed repealed thirty days after the delivery of the report to the governor and the legislature as provided for in § 2

LAWS OF NEW YORK, 2017

CHAPTER 361

AN ACT authorizing the study of parole officer staffing; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof

Became a law October 23, 2017, with the approval of the Governor.

Passed by a majority vote, three-fifths being present.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. The department of corrections and community supervision shall conduct a study and issue a report regarding the staffing of parole officers and other employees of the department assigned to community supervision. Such study shall consider national standards and standards set by the American Correctional Association in addition to any other published best practices in examining the adequacy of current staffing levels. Such study shall include, but not be limited to, a review of the number of parole officers in the field and in facilities, the number of persons released to community supervision, the caseloads assigned to parole officers, and whether such staffing is sufficient to achieve the public safety goals of the department and the reentry objectives of community supervision pursuant to section 201 of the correction law.

§ 2. Six months after the effective date of this act, the commissioner of the department of corrections and community supervision shall deliver a copy of the report with the findings of the study conducted pursuant to section one of this act and any legislative recommendations he or she deems to be necessary to the governor, the temporary president of the senate, the speaker of the assembly, the chairman of the senate crime victims, crime and correction committee and the chairman of the assembly committee on correction.

§ 3. The commissioner of the department of corrections and community supervision may request, and is authorized to receive, any information from any state agencies that is relevant and material to the completion of this study and report. Such information received by the department shall be subject to the same requirements for confidentiality and limitations on use, if any, as are applicable to each such state agency's use of such information.

§ 4. This act shall take effect immediately and shall expire and be deemed repealed thirty days after the delivery of the report to the governor and the legislature as provided for in section two of this act.

The Legislature of the STATE OF NEW YORK ss:

Pursuant to the authority vested in us by section 70-b of the Public Officers Law, we hereby jointly certify that this slip copy of this session law was printed under our direction and, in accordance with such section, is entitled to be read into evidence.

JOHN J. FLANAGAN
Temporary President of the Senate

CARL E. HEASTIE
Speaker of the Assembly

EXPLANATION--Matter in italics is new; matter in brackets [-] is old law to be omitted.

A 7687 Weprin Same as S 5987
 GALLIVAN
 Correctional Services
 TITLE....Authorizes the study of parole officer staffing
This bill is not active in the current session.
 05/09/17referred to correction
 05/16/17reported referred to ways and means
 06/06/17reported referred to rules
 06/12/17reported
 06/12/17rules report cal.166
 06/12/17ordered to third reading rules cal.166
 06/13/17passed assembly
 06/13/17delivered to senate
 06/13/17REFERRED TO RULES
 06/21/17SUBSTITUTED FOR S5987
 06/21/173RD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17PASSED SENATE
 06/21/17RETURNED TO ASSEMBLY
 10/11/17delivered to governor
 10/23/17signed chap.361

S5987 GALLIVAN Same as A 7687 Weprin
 Correctional Services
 TITLE....Authorizes the study of parole officer staffing
This bill is not active in the current session.
 05/09/17 REFERRED TO CRIME VICTIMS, CRIME AND CORRECTION
 05/16/17 REPORTED AND COMMITTED TO FINANCE
 06/06/17 REPORTED AND COMMITTED TO RULES
 06/21/17 ORDERED TO THIRD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17 SUBSTITUTED BY A7687
A07687 Weprin
 05/09/17 referred to correction
 05/16/17 reported referred to ways and means
 06/06/17 reported referred to rules
 06/12/17 reported
 06/12/17 rules report cal.166
 06/12/17 ordered to third reading rules cal.166
 06/13/17 passed assembly
 06/13/17 delivered to senate
 06/13/17 REFERRED TO RULES
 06/21/17 SUBSTITUTED FOR S5987
 06/21/17 3RD READING CAL.2169
 06/21/17 PASSED SENATE
 06/21/17 RETURNED TO ASSEMBLY
 10/11/17 delivered to governor
 10/23/17 signed chap.361

WEPRIN, SEPULVEDA

Authorizes the study of the staffing of parole officers and other employees of the department assigned to community supervision; provides such study shall include, but not be limited to, a review of the number of parole officers in the field and in facilities, the number of persons released to community supervision, the caseloads assigned to parole officers, and whether such staffing is sufficient to achieve the public safety goals of the department and the reentry objectives of community supervision.
 EFF. DATE 10/23/2017 (SEE TABLE)

Same-As History:

Bill Version	Same-As Bill
A 7687	S 5987
Current Same-As	
A 7687	S 5987

STATE OF NEW YORK

7687

2017-2018 Regular Sessions

IN ASSEMBLY

May 9, 2017

Introduced by M. of A. WEPRIN -- read once and referred to the Committee on Correction

AN ACT authorizing the study of parole officer staffing; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 Section 1. The department of corrections and community supervision
2 shall conduct a study and issue a report regarding the staffing of
3 parole officers and other employees of the department assigned to commu-
4 nity supervision. Such study shall consider national standards and stan-
5 dards set by the American Correctional Association in addition to any
6 other published best practices in examining the adequacy of current
7 staffing levels. Such study shall include, but not be limited to, a
8 review of the number of parole officers in the field and in facilities,
9 the number of persons released to community supervision, the caseloads
10 assigned to parole officers, and whether such staffing is sufficient to
11 achieve the public safety goals of the department and the reentry objec-
12 tives of community supervision pursuant to section 201 of the correction
13 law.

14 § 2. Six months after the effective date of this act, the commissioner
15 of the department of corrections and community supervision shall deliver
16 a copy of the report with the findings of the study conducted pursuant
17 to section one of this act and any legislative recommendations he or she
18 deems to be necessary to the governor, the temporary president of the
19 senate, the speaker of the assembly, the chairman of the senate crime
20 victims, crime and correction committee and the chairman of the assembly
21 committee on correction.

22 § 3. The commissioner of the department of corrections and community
23 supervision may request, and is authorized to receive, any information
24 from any state agencies that is relevant and material to the completion
25 of this study and report. Such information received by the department

EXPLANATION--Matter in italics (underscored) is new; matter in brackets
[-] is old law to be omitted.

LBD11502-01-7

Appendix B: Performance Based Standards & Expected Practices
Accreditation Department



REPORT NUMBER

(STAFF USE ONLY)

**PERFORMANCE BASED
STANDARDS & EXPECTED
PRACTICES ACCREDITATION
DEPARTMENT**

ANNUAL REPORT

Each accredited program must submit an annual report to the ACA Performance Based Standards & Expected Practices Accreditation Department. The Annual Report is due by the anniversary of accreditation. The accreditation date is noted on the Final Accreditation Report and on the Accreditation Certificate that is awarded at the panel hearings.

I. INTRODUCTION

- a.** Governing/Parent Agency: New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision
- b.** Facility/Program Name: Community Supervision
- c.** Date of Audit: November 16 - 19, 2015
- d.** Date Accredited: January 24, 2016
- e.** Contact Person: Steven Claudio, Deputy Commissioner
- f.** Contact Person's Phone Number & Email Address: (518) 485-1388 and steven.claudio@doccs.ny.gov

II. DEMOGRAPHICS

a. Current Operational Capacity: N/A

(Number of beds or program slots authorized for the safe and efficient operation of the facility/program)

b. Average Daily Population/Program Participation for the reporting year:

50,227

c. Average Length of Time Current Population has been assigned to Facility/Program: The average length of time on community supervision (parole, post-release supervision, and conditional release) is two and a half years.

III. COMPLIANCE TALLY UPDATE

a. Current Compliance Level (as defined in Agency Manual on Accreditation)

99.37%

b. Changes in Compliance Level Since Last Annual Report (include both “compliance” to “non-compliance” and “non-compliance” to “compliance” changes).

None

c. Plan of Action (POA) Update

i. Plans of action completed

ii. Plans of action in progress (on schedule/proceeding as approved by CAC)

Expected Practice 4-APPFS-3D-06 - The Department (DOCCS) has made considerable progress in this area via the publication of new Community Supervision directives, the replacement of policy and procedure manual items produced and maintained by the former Division of Parole (DOP), and the removal of outdated and obsolete written procedures and protocol documents. With regard to "expected practices" and the associated written protocols, all core Community Supervision directives, publications, and business forms have either been approved and published or are pending approval

by executive direction. The Department anticipates completion and publication of all required protocol and procedural documents well in advance of the October 2018 ACA audit.

iii. Plans of action revision needed/requested

None

d. Summary of approved Waivers

None

IV. ORGANIZATION UPDATES

a. Major Change in Agency Administration and/or Major Staffing Changes

During calendar year 2017, the Department (DOCCS) appointed seven (7) new Assistant Regional Directors in an effort to strengthen the management of day to day operations within the seven geographically established Community Supervision Regions. The Assistant Regional Director position is a new management position within the Community Supervision command structure. The Assistant Regional Directors report directly to the Regional Directors and are responsible for the supervision of field personnel and the management of all physical assets and resources within the assigned region. The Assistant Regional Directors engage in policy development, program implementation, and collaborate with the Department's law enforcement partners at the Federal, State, and local levels. The Assistant Regional Directors monitor and ensure staff compliance with regard to the supervision of offenders in the community setting, investigations, revocation, and discharge from sentence or the period of supervision.

b. Mission change or significant program revisions

none

c. Significant changes in program participant population.

none

d. Major physical plant renovations (including effect on current capacity, if any).

none

e. Other Accreditation/Certification Received (i.e PREA)

none

f. Number of Staff Certified as a Certified Correctional Professional (CCP), if

available

none

V. **SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT SUMMARY** (if applicable) shall be attached as Attachment

A.

☐ Attached

VI. **Outcome Measures** (if applicable) shall be attached as Attachment B.

☒ Attached

VII. **SUMMARY OF CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORTS** (if applicable) shall be attached as Attachment C.

☐ Attached

4OMs REVISED	09-2017	New York State Department of Corrections & Community Supervision – Community Supervision Outcome Measures	ACA AUDIT	09-2017
Standard	Outcome Measure	Numerator/Denominator	Value	Calculated O.M
1A	(1)	Number of offenders who are arrested for any offense in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	9,866	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	19.68%
	(2)	Number of offenders who were convicted of any offense in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,347	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	2.68%
1B		None		
1C	(1)	Number of individual volunteers who provided services in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	(2)	Total number of volunteer hours delivered in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	(3)	Total number of hours of community service delivered by offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	(4)	Total number of hours of community service delivered by offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	N/A
	(5)	Number of community entities (committees, boards, etc.) on which agency staff served in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	24	
	(6)	Number of presentations (speeches, panels, etc.) provided to the community by agency staff in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	44	
2A	(1)	Number of offenders who successfully completed supervision in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	11,347	
	divided by	Number of offenders removed from supervision in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17 (Discharged and Revoked)	20,593	55.10%
2B	(1)	Number of offenders found in violation of a new offense during the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,347	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	2.68%
	(2)	Number of offenders found in violation of a technical violation only in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	7,903	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	15.73%
	(3)	Number of offenders who absconded during the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	5,283	
	divided by	Number of offenders who were under supervision in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	10.52%
2C		None		

2D	(1)	Number of offenders who were employed on a specified day in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17 (One day count)	11,027	
	divided by	Total agency active caseload on that specified day	26,969	40.89%
	(2)	Number of offenders who were employed upon discharge in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	4,151	
	divided by	Number of offenders discharged in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	11,347	36.58%
	(3)	Number of offender substance abuse tests for which the results were negative in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	112,582	
	divided by	Number of tests administered in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	135,120	83.32%
	(4)	Number of offenders who showed improvement as measured by the objective assessment instrument prior to release from supervision in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	N/A
	(5)	Number of offenders referred to drug treatment in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	16,702	
	divided by	Number of offenders who successfully completed drug treatment in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	4,218	25.25%
	(6)	Number of offenders referred to education programs in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	329	
	(7)	Number of offenders referred to behavioral programs in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	N/A	
	divided by	Number of offenders successfully completing behavioral programs in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	N/A	N/A
2E	(1)	Number of offenders who had "stay away from" or "no contact with" or "no violence toward" orders during the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	11,881	
	divided by	number of offenders who violated these orders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	N/A
	(2)	Amount of restitution collected in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	(3)	Amount of restitution ordered in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	(4)	Number of offenders whose cases were closed with total restitution paid in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	N/A	
	divided by	Number of offenders whose cases were closed with restitution ordered in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	N/A	N/A
2F	(1)	Amount of court costs, fines, and fees collected in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	\$371,907	
	divided by	Number of offenders who had court cost, fine, and fee obligations in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	22,453	16.56%
	(2)	Number of offenders whose cases were closed with total costs, fines, and fees paid during	799	

	divided by	Number of offenders whose cases were closed with costs, fines, and fees ordered in the past 12 months	8,788	9.09%
	(3)	Total number of hours of community service performed by offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Total number of offenders ordered to perform community service in the past twelve months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	N/A	N/A
	(4)	Total number of offenders who performed community service work in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	N/A
	(5)	Total number of offenders who participated in victim(s) awareness programs in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Total number of active offenders supervised in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	N/A
2G	(1)	Number of offender grievances regarding discrimination filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	0%
	(2)	Number of offender grievances regarding discrimination resolved in favor of offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total number of offender grievances filed regarding discrimination in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	0%
	(3)	Number of other offender grievances filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	56	
	divided by	Total agency caseload in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	.11%
	(4)	Number of other offender grievances resolved in favor of offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	2	
	divided by	Total number of offender grievances filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	56	3.57%
	(5)	Number of adverse judgments or consent decrees against the agency by offenders in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
3A	(1)	Number of formal complaints against staff alleging improper conduct that were upheld or found valid in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	9	
	divided by	Number of formal complaints against staff that were filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	29	31.03%
	(2)	Number of court decisions that found staff had acted improperly in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	(3)	Number of administrative decisions finding that staff acted improperly in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	9	
	(4)	Number of hours of professional development attended by professional staff in the period 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	

	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent professional staff positions in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,334	N/A
--	------------	---	-------	-----

3B	(1)	Number of injuries to staff requiring medical treatment in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	92	
	divided by	Total number of full-time equivalent staff in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,269	7.25%
3C	(1)	Number of disciplinary actions against staff in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	10	
	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent staff positions in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,334	.75%
	(2)	Number of staff terminated for disciplinary violations in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1	
	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent staff positions in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,334	.07%
	(3)	Number of staff, contractor, intern, and volunteer substance abuse tests passed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Number of substance abuse tests administered in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	N/A
3D	(1)	Number of material audit findings by an independent financial auditor at the conclusion of the last audit 10/01/16 – 09/30/17.	0	
	(2)	Number of objectives achieved in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	
	divided by	Number of objectives established for the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	N/A	N/A
3E	(1)	Number of grievances filed by staff against the agency or its representatives in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	39	
	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent staff positions in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,334	2.9%
	(2)	Number of staff grievances decided in favor of staff in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total number of staff grievances filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	39	0%
	(3)	Total number of years of staff members' experience in the agency as of the end of the last calendar year	19,200	
	divided by	Number of staff at the end of last calendar year.	1,280	15%
	(4)	Number of staff terminated or demoted in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	12	
	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent staff in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17.	1,269	.95%
	(5)	Number of staff who left employment for any reason in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	127	
	divided by	Number of full-time equivalent staff positions in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1,334	9.52%
3F	(1)	Number of fires that resulted in property damage in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	

	(2)	Dollar amount of property damage from fire in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	(3)	Number of code violations cited in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
3G	(1)	Number of grievances against staff alleging improper use of force upheld or found valid in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total agency caseload for the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	0%
	(2)	Number of grievances against staff alleging improper use of force upheld or found valid in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Number of grievances alleging improper use of force filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	4	0%
	(3)	Number of court decisions against staff alleging improper use of force upheld or found valid in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1	
	divided by	Total agency caseload for the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	0%
	(4)	Number of court decisions that found staff had used improper force in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	1	
	divided by	Number of court decisions alleging improper use of force filed in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	4	25%
	(5)	Number of administrative decisions finding that staff used improper force in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total agency caseload for the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	0%
	(6)	Number of injuries to offenders or others that required medical attention resulting from staff use of force in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total agency caseload for the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	50,227	0%
3H	(1)	Number of motor vehicle accidents resulting in property damage in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	0	
	divided by	Total number of miles driven in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	4,503,045	0%
	(2)	Number of motor vehicle accidents resulting in injuries requiring medical treatment for any party in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	6	
	divided by	Total number of miles driven in the past 12 months 10/01/16 - 09/30/17	4,503,045	0%

Note: The term “total agency caseload” reflects the number of people who spent at least some time under active supervision over the course of the year. The term “active caseload” refers to offenders assigned to DOCCS Community Supervision within New York State who are currently in the community and regularly reporting to parole officers.

Appendix C: ParoleStat Summary

ParoleSTAT
Statewide Summary
February 2018

Community Preps	Community Preps Due	Completed On Time	Percent Completed on Time
Statewide Total	1,496	1,362	91%

Merit Discharges	Total Due During the Month	Completed on Time			Total Percent Completed on Time
		Merit Discharged	Deferred	Total	
Statewide Total	355	206	120	326	92%

Case Conferences	Cases Requiring Conference	Cases Meeting Conference Standard	Percent Meeting Standard
Statewide Total	24,134	23,084	96%

SIST Case Conferences and Contacts	Total SIST Cases*	SIST Cases with Case Conferences	Percent Meeting Statutory Requirements	SIST Cases with Face-to-Face Contacts	Percent Meeting Statutory Requirements	SIST Cases with Collateral Contacts	Percent Meeting Statutory Requirements
Statewide Total	112	111	99%	110	98%	110	98%

* Number/percent meeting statutory requirements is calculated only for those SIST cases who had been released to Community Supervision prior to October and for those cases streeted at the end of the reporting month.

**Appendix D: New York State Corrections and Community Supervision
Directive for Supervision Standards for Community Supervision**

 Corrections and Community Supervision DIRECTIVE	TITLE Supervision Standards for Community Supervision		NO. 9210
			DATE 2/12/2018
SUPERSEDES DOP P&P 9203.01	DISTRIBUTION A B	PAGES PAGE 1 of 8	DATE LAST REVISED
REFERENCES (include but are not limited to) Directives #8500, #9025, #9030, #9301, #9432, #9504; ACA Expected Practices 4-APPFS-2A-04, 4-APPFS-2E-01, 4-APPFS-2A-07		APPROVING AUTHORITY 	

- I. **PURPOSE:** The purpose of this directive is to establish a system of supervision standards for parolees under supervision based on risk assessment, re-assessment, and the case plan. The assessment tools utilized by the Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) determine the case management requirements by developing case plans and establishing contact standards.
- II. **POLICY:** Supervision standards have been established as guidelines for Parole Officers (PO) and Senior Parole Officers (SPO) in an effort to ensure the effective supervision of individuals released on parole, conditional release, presumptive release, or release to a period of post-release supervision. Supervision standards are intended to establish compliance requirements for Community Supervision (CS) personnel based on assessed risk of re-offending, supervision intensity, and the case-specific factors delineated in the case plan. Contacts with parolees must be relevant, consistent with the case plan, and responsive to criminogenic needs. Supervision standards provide the Parole Officer with a structured approach to monitoring behavior in the community setting, and enable the Parole Officer to immediately respond to public safety concerns and non-compliant behavior. The supervision standards defined in this directive are minimum standards. Parole Officers are authorized to increase the number of contacts with a parolee in response to public safety considerations, reintegration efforts, and needs such as housing, treatment, and employment. The primary goal of the supervision standards and case contacts are to encourage and support law abiding behavior, as well as, compliance with the conditions of release.

Parole Officers must document all contacts related to the parolee in accordance with Directive #9025, "Case Management System (CMS)," and include sufficient details to fully describe what occurred during the contact, as well as any supervision needs identified.

III. DEFINITIONS

- A. **Contact:** Any communication, interaction, or observation made by or on behalf of the assigned Parole Officer during the supervision of the parolee including telephone calls, written correspondence, surveillance, and electronic information transmissions.
- B. **Office Report:** A face-to-face office interview with a parolee at the Area Office or report station for the purpose of evaluating adjustment in the community.
- C. **Positive Contact:** A face-to-face contact where a parolee is personally observed by a Parole Officer in a location that would serve case-specific supervision needs.
- D. **Home Visit:** A visit to the approved or proposed residence by a Parole Officer.

- E. Verification: Any positive contact, or communication with trusted sources, that establishes the compliance or noncompliance of the parolee with the conditions of supervision. Examples of trusted sources are police agencies, service providers, and official documents.
- F. Case Conference: A case conference is a meeting or communication between a Community Supervision staff member and a supervisor to discuss a parolee's behavior, supervision adjustment, and/or level of compliance with conditions of release. Other types of case conferences can occur between CS staff and Parole Violations Unit (PVU), Reentry Services, or Service Providers as outlined in Directive #0504, "Case Conference."

Note: Community Supervision staff shall utilize the "Supervision Standards Conference (SSC)" Case Management System code for purposes of monitoring compliance with the requirements of this directive. (See Section IV-A-7 of this directive.)
- G. Supervision Standards Conference (SSC): A regularly scheduled formal meeting, between a Senior Parole Officer and a Parole Officer, to discuss administrative responsibilities and case management issues. A Supervision Standards Conference permits case review, personal instruction, and the ability to provide feedback to staff. Supervision Standards Conferences shall be held in accordance with standards issued for COMPAS based supervision.
- H. Curfew Visit: An unannounced home visit by a Parole Officer to verify parolee compliance with a curfew.
- I. Curfew Verification: An unannounced verification utilizing telephone or other electronic methods (e.g., FaceTime, Skype) by a Parole Officer to verify parolee compliance with a curfew.
- J. Supervision Status Level: Supervision Status is the outcome of the assessment tool which assists in determining the intensity of supervision and managing the criminogenic and stabilization needs. There are four COMPAS Supervision Status Levels: Status 1 - Highest Risk; Status 2 - High Risk; Status 3 - Moderate Risk; Status 4 - Low Risk. All UBER, GPS, Mental Health, Sex Offender and SIST cases are to be supervised as per their required standards as delineated in the respective directive or procedural memorandum.
- K. E-Justice Portal: The Integrated Justice Portal provides a highly secure, single point of entry for authorized users to access a variety of NYS criminal justice data systems, including ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT, NYSPIN, the Pre-Sentence Investigation Repository, and numerous other public safety related applications.
- L. Failure to Report: An unexcused failure by the parolee to keep a scheduled office report with a Parole Officer.
- M. Employment/Program Visits: Visits conducted to verify participation and/or adjustment. These may be face-to-face visits with the parolee or with someone other than the parolee. Acceptable forms of verification are reviewing an official pay check, telephone call to employer, letter from employer, telephone call to/from program, program discharge letter/certificate, or a status report.
- N. Bi-Monthly Contact: A contact that occurs once every two months not to take place in the same month.

- O. Senior Parole Officer Review: A review of the CMS contacts of assigned cases by a Senior Parole Officer to assess risks, needs, and details to ensure appropriate supervision and compliance with the supervision standards for the designated COMPAS Supervision Level.
- P. Place-Based Supervision: A positive contact between the Parole Officer and the parolee within an agency or community based organization in the neighborhood where a parolee resides, that offers natural and informal supports. Examples are service providers, employers, faith based institutions, and police agencies.
- Q. Collateral Contact: A qualitative contact made by or on behalf of the assigned PO with an entity that provides information pertinent to the management, supervision and/or treatment of the parolee, including but not limited to law enforcement, treatment providers, family members and/or significant others, Senior Parole Officer and other DOCCS Staff, service providers, and education or vocational programs, etc.

IV. PROCEDURE

A. Parole Officer Responsibility

1. New Releases, Newly Restored, and Newly Transferred Cases
 - a. Parole Officers must conduct a home visit on all new releases within eight business days of release to supervision. This includes releases from State prison, Willard Correctional Facility, and local jail.
 - b. Parole Officers must conduct a home visit on all cases newly transferred to their caseloads within eight business days of the parolee's first report to the receiving Parole Officer.
2. Supervision Status I (25:1) - Parole Officers must conduct contacts as follows (see Attachment A):
 - a. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of two office reports each month;
 - b. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one home visit positive each month;
 - c. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of two other contacts, one of which must be positive;
 - d. One curfew visit will be conducted each month. A curfew home visit may also count as a mandated monthly home visit;
 - e. If the parolee is participating in a residential treatment program, a residential program visit may also count as a mandated monthly home visit;
 - f. If the parolee is participating in a treatment program(s), one program verification, by visit, must be conducted each month. If attending multiple treatment programs, the monthly program visit will be made on a rotating basis. All program participation shall be verified on a monthly basis;
 - g. If the parolee is employed, employment verification will be conducted each month, and a visit to the employer is the preferred method of verification;
 - h. The Parole Officer will refer cases to Re-entry staff in the event of an outstanding service need;
 - i. Parole Officers must verify that all registered, level three sexual offenders have made their required 90 day in-person report to local law enforcement;

- j. The case plan must address the top four criminogenic or stabilization needs as identified on the Assessment Instrument. The Supervision plan will first prioritize a parolee's need for a stable residence; and
 - k. When addressing a criminogenic and/or stabilization need, staff will use the designated activity codes and provide detail in the contact narrative of CMS.
3. Supervision Status II (40:1) - Parole Officers must conduct contacts as follows (see Attachment A):
- a. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one positive office report each month;
 - b. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one home visit positive each month;
 - c. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one other positive contact each month;
 - d. One curfew visit each month. Telephone curfew checks are permissible; however, a home visit curfew check must be done at least bi-monthly. A curfew home visit may also count as a mandated monthly home visit;
 - e. If the parolee is participating in a treatment program(s), one program verification, by visit, must be conducted each month. If attending multiple treatment programs, the monthly program visit will be made on a rotating basis. All program participation shall be verified on a monthly basis;
 - f. If the parolee is employed, employment verification will be conducted each month, and a visit to the employer is the preferred method of verification;
 - g. The Parole Officer will refer cases to Re-entry staff in the event of an outstanding service need;
 - h. The case plan must address the top three criminogenic and/or stabilization needs as identified on the Assessment Instrument; and
 - i. When addressing criminogenic and/or stabilization needs, the Parole Officer will use the designated activity codes and provide detail in the contact narrative of CMS.
4. Supervision Status III (80:1) - Parole Officers must conduct contacts as follows (see Attachment A):
- a. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one positive office report bi-monthly;
 - b. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one positive home visit bi-monthly;
 - c. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one other positive contact bi-monthly;
 - d. If the parolee is participating in a treatment program(s), one verification, by visit, must be conducted bi-monthly. If attending multiple treatment programs, the bi-monthly program visit will be made on a rotating basis. All program participation shall be verified on a bi-monthly basis;
 - e. If the parolee is employed, employment verification will be conducted on a bi-monthly basis, and a visit to the employer is the preferred method of verification;
 - f. If a curfew special condition is imposed, a Parole Officer must conduct one curfew verification bi-monthly;

- g. The office report and mandated home visit positive should not occur during the same month, unless dictated by supervisory needs. Caseload compliance contacts are to be evenly divided over the two-month supervision period (50% of the caseload each month);
 - h. The case plan must address the top two criminogenic needs as identified on the Assessment Instrument;
 - i. The Parole Officer will refer cases to Re-entry staff in the event of an outstanding service need; and
 - j. When addressing criminogenic and/or stabilization needs, staff will use the designated activity codes and provide detail in the contact narrative of CMS.
- 5. Supervision Status IV (160:1) - Parole Officers must conduct contacts as follows (see Attachment A):
 - a. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one office report positive every four months;
 - b. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one home visit positive every four months;
 - c. Parole Officers will conduct a minimum of one other positive contact every four months. This positive contact MUST be of sufficient duration to ascertain the status of the parolee's program in the community;
 - d. The Parole Officer will address the top criminogenic or stabilization need;
 - e. When addressing a criminogenic and/or stabilization need, staff will use the designated activity codes and provide detail in contact narrative of CMS;
 - f. The Parole Officer will refer cases to Re-entry staff in the event of an outstanding service need;
 - g. If the parolee is participating in a treatment program(s), one verification, by visit, must be conducted quarterly; and
 - h. If the parolee is employed, employment verification will be conducted on a quarterly basis, and a visit to the employer is the preferred method of verification.
- 6. Failure to Report: Upon the parolee's failure to report as directed, the Parole Officer must attempt to re-engage the parolee within 24 hours. Failing to make contact with the parolee by any means within 24 hours, will necessitate a home visit being conducted, by the Parole Officer, to the approved residence within 48 hours.
- 7. Supervision Standards Conference (SSC): The Senior Parole Officer will meet with the Parole Officer to conference on a regular basis no less than the schedule below. Supervision Standards Conferences will be entered in CMS using Contact Code "SSC" – Supervision Standards Conference.

Supervision Standards Conferences will occur minimally as follows:

- Supervision Status I Monthly
 - Supervision Status II Monthly
 - Supervision Status III Every two months
 - Supervision Status IV Once every four months
8. The Senior Parole Officer will review the CMS contacts of assigned cases to assess risks, needs and details to ensure appropriate supervision and compliance with the supervision standards for the designated COMPAS Supervision Level. Upon completion of the review and assessment, the SPO will advise the assigned Parole Officer of any issues in need of attention. A SPO review can be substituted for a Supervision Standards Conference for COMPAS Level 3 and 4 cases only, and cannot be done consecutively.
 9. Substance Abuse Testing: In all cases where there is a COMPAS identified substance abuse need, the Parole Officer will administer Department approved substance abuse testing in compliance with the testing frequency as outlined in Directive #9432, "Substance Abuse Testing" and the Supervision Standards grid (see Attachment A).
 10. COMPAS Level Override: Not to include SIST, Registered and Discretionary Sex Offenders, OMH 1, 1S, 1SY, 2, 2S, and UBER cases, which are to be overridden to COMPAS Level 1, without the need for approval from the Assistant Regional Director.
 - a. For any case where the Parole Officer, Senior Parole Officer, or Bureau Chief wish to change the current supervision level prior to the parolee completing 12 months of unrevoked supervision, a recommendation with rationale must be submitted by the Bureau Chief to the Assistant Regional Director. Upon reviewing the provided recommendation and rationale, the Assistant Regional Director will approve or reject the recommendation. If the override is approved by the Assistant Regional Director, the Bureau Chief shall access the most recent COMPAS Re-entry Assessment on the Person Summary screen located on the E-Justice Portal, and then enter the Actual Recommended Supervision Level in the Supervision Recommendation section.
 - b. For any case where an override is approved by the Assistant Regional Director, and where the parolee is in the Community Preparation process, the Case Supervision Review (CSR) instrument will be utilized by the Parole Officer six months from the date of the parolee's release from the correctional facility to determine whether the Supervision Level should be raised, lowered, or maintained.
 - c. Additionally, for any case where an override is approved by the Assistant Regional Director during the first four weeks of supervision after a parolee's release from a correctional facility, the CSR instrument will be utilized by the Parole Officer six months from the date of the override to determine whether the Supervision Level should be raised, lowered, or maintained.

- d. After reviewing the CSR recommendation and CMS, the Bureau Chief will enter the COMPAS Level in the Actual Recommended Supervision Level section of the CSR (see Directive #9030, "COMPAS Case Supervision Review"). Absent any serious mitigating or aggravating factors to the contrary, the Bureau Chief is expected to abide by the CSR recommendation.
 - e. In the event an override is requested during a parolee's supervision after 12 months of supervision, but before the next CSR is due, staff are to utilize the CSR instrument. The Bureau Chief will then follow the steps described in Section IV-A-10-c above. Assistant Regional Director approval is not required for overrides after 12 months of supervision.
 - f. All efforts must be documented in CMS.
- B. Senior Parole Officer Responsibility: The Senior Parole Officer is responsible for ensuring that the Parole Officer provides the necessary level of supervision to foster public safety, and assist the parolee to successful completion of Community Supervision.
- 1. Senior Parole Officers will meet with the Parole Officer to conference cases, to ensure compliance with the standards of supervision, or as needed. Cases will be reviewed to determine if the Parole Officer has developed and addressed the criminogenic and stabilization needs identified within the case supervision plan, and is adequately managing their caseload;
 - 2. Senior Parole Officers will observe the Parole Officer and parolee interaction both in the field and in the office. This type of observation(s) affords the Senior Parole Officer an opportunity to personally assess a parolee's adjustment; and
 - 3. Senior Parole Officers will routinely review CMS to ensure that the Parole Officer is providing the case-specific level of supervision required.
- C. Bureau Chief Responsibility: Bureau Chiefs will ensure that the Senior Parole Officers and Parole Officers are assisting parolees to ensure successful completion of Community Supervision.
- D. Regional Director/Assistant Regional Director Responsibility: The Regional Director/Assistant Regional Director will ensure that all cases in their region are supervised at all times, focusing on assisting parolees towards successful completion of Community Supervision.
- The Regional Director/Assistant Regional Director or authorized designee has the discretion to adjust the standards accordingly, if needed, to assist parolees to the successful completion of Community Supervision.
- All adjustments to the standards must be documented and detailed in CMS by the approving supervisor.

SUPERVISION STANDARDS

Level 1	Monthly (4 Face to Face Contacts Required)	
	2 Office Reports 1 Home Visit Positive 2 Other Contacts (1 must be positive) Program Visit Employment Visit Curfew Visit Required Scheduled Case Conference	Address at least three (3) criminogenic needs as identified on COMPAS case plan
Level 2	Monthly (3 Face to Face Contacts Required)	
	1 Office Report 1 Home Visit Positive 1 Other Positive Contact Program Visit Employment Visit Curfew Visit Required Bi-Monthly Scheduled Case Conference	Address at least two (2) criminogenic needs as identified on COMPAS case plan
Level 3	(3 Face to Face Contacts/Every Two Months)	
	1 Office Report 1 Home Visit Positive (Can't be the same month as Office Report) 1 Other Positive Contact Program Visit Employment Visit Scheduled Case Conference/SPO Review, SPO Review cannot be consecutive Curfew Verification (If Curfew imposed)	Address at least one (1) criminogenic needs as identified on COMPAS case plan
Level 4	(2 Face to Face/Every Four Months)	
	1 Office Report 1 Home Visit Positive (Can't be same month as Office Report) 1 Other Positive Contact (Every Four Months) Program Visit Employment Visit Scheduled Case Conference/SPO Review, SPO Review cannot be consecutive	Address criminogenic needs as identified on COMPAS case plan if presented.

NOTE: All UBER/SIST/GPS/Mental Health/RESET/Sex Offender cases are to be supervised as per their required standards.

LOW = SEMI-ANNUALLY

MEDIUM = QUARTERLY

HIGH = MONTHLY

(Minimum Frequency)

DRUG TESTING STANDARDS
 Based on the COMPAS Identified Substance Abuse Need

Prepared by:
Marco Ricci, Assistant Commissioner
Jennifer Bryant, Chief of Population Projections &
John Van Wormer, Program Research Specialist II
Program Planning, Research & Evaluation

March 2018