TO: Board Members

FROM: John J. Talaber, Esq.
      Board Secretary

DATE: September 18, 2017

RE: Minutes – Board Meeting
    August 16, 2017

In compliance with Act 175, known as the Sunshine Law, effective September 17, 1976, the Office of Chief Counsel provided notification to the public of the scheduled meeting on August 16, 2017 of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. on August 16, 2017 with Chairman Dunn presiding.

Board Members Leslie Grey, Linda Rosenberg, Mark Koch, Ed Burke, Everett Gillison, Ted Johnson, Mike Potteiger, and Anthony Moscato were present.

Also in attendance were Alan Robinson, Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel; Laura Treaster, Director, Office of Communications; John J. Talaber, Board Secretary, Office of Board Secretary; Luis Rosa, Director, Office of Re-Entry and Quality Assurance; Scott Woolf, Director, Internal Affairs and Special Services Office; Jennifer Storm, Victim Advocate, Office of the Victim Advocate (OVA); Edie Letherby, Director, Office of Administrative Services; Victor Wills, Director, Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs; Christian Stephens, Director, Office of Field Probation and Parole Supervision; and Meghan Dade, Executive Director, Sexual Offenders Assessment Board (SOAB).

Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission Dr. Diane Shoop also attended the meeting.

Chairman Dunn introduced Board Member Anthony Moscato.

I. APPROVAL OF JULY 19, 2017 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Burke made a motion to approve the board minutes as written. Board Member Johnson seconded the motion. Victim Advocate Storm suggested a revision to the minutes concerning the Face-to-Face pilot; specifically, that there was a reference to September 2017. Chairman Dunn sought a motion to approve the revised minutes. Board Member Burke made a motion to approve the revised board minutes as written. Board Member Johnson seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the board unanimously approved the minutes.
II. STAFF REPORTS

All reports referenced in public session were previously disseminated to board members and senior staff for review and will be made available upon request.

A. Office of Re-Entry and Quality Assurance

Director Luis Rosa and Executive Assistant Kimberly McGriff provided general information about the Department of Corrections (DOC's) swift, fair and certain pilot concerning inmate misconduct. Board Member Burke asked Ms. McGriff if this model was part of an institutional setting or field study; to which she replied a field study. Ms. McGriff reported that Pennsylvania started this pilot January 1, 2016. Board Members Burke and Grey expressed disappointment that the parole board was not aware of it. Director Rosa indicated that this occurred before he was in his present position. Chairman Dunn noted that he was not aware of the implementation of this program.

Board Member Grey asked Director Rosa why the board members were not aware of swift, fair, and certain blocks within the state correctional institutions. Board Member Grey asked Director Rosa to direct the staff at the institutions to provide the board members with this information, and to alert board members of the inmate's conduct within the swift, certain, and fair block. Board Member Grey noted that inmate behavior is a relevant piece of information for board members to use in their decision making process.

Chairman Dunn noted that the board should know that DOC is doing this program. Board Member Koch also felt the board members needed to know. Board Member Burke stated that the board members should know what behavior caused them to go into swift, certain, and fair model. Board Member Potteiger inquired if this was the direction the board was going with field supervision, and Director Stephens replied “not at this time.” Board Member Potteiger also asked if there were any results from Chester County as to the swift, fair, and certain model. Director Rosa stated he would inquire about the results.

Board Members Burke and Grey wanted a quick resolution on this matter. Board Member Rosenberg inquired how the board members would receive the information. Chairman Dunn stated institutional staff would work with DOC staff, and the information would be uploaded into OnBase.

B. Office of Victim Advocate

Victim Advocate Jennifer Storm extended her welcome to Board Member Moscato. Victim Advocate Storm requested that the “Face-To-Face” discussion on the agenda be moved to a different time on the agenda so she could be in attendance. The Chairman agreed to do so. Victim Advocate Storm also reported that she is sitting on the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) victim services sub-committee and planning committee,
and in 2018 their national convention will be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

C. Sexual Offenders Assessment Board

Executive Director Meghan Dade reported that the next SOAB training is Friday, September 8, 2017 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Board Member Grey noted she attended one in the past and it was fantastic. Chairman Dunn stated he was making an exception to the rule concerning conferences; specifically, that board members may attend one (1) out-of-state conference per fiscal year requiring an overnight stay, and one (1) in-state conference per fiscal year requiring an overnight stay. Chairman Dunn stated that for board members who have not attended an SOAB training before, they may attend SOAB training and it would be an exception to the aforementioned "training rule." There was a general discussion among the board members who attended the trainings in the past concerning their excellent quality.

D. Office of Chief Counsel

Chief Counsel Alan Robinson reported that the board was still waiting for decisions in: Young v. Pa. Bd. of Prob. & Parole, Pa. Cmwlth. Ct. on the issue of sentence credit for time at liberty on parole and awarding and taking away credit; and Smith v. Pa. Bd. of Prob. & Parole, Pa. Supreme Court, on sentence credit for cases where the offender is incarcerated in federal custody.

Chief Counsel Robinson explained that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court found that the Sexual Offender Notification and Registration Act (SORNA) registration requirements were unconstitutional under the Pennsylvania Constitution and United State Constitution for anyone who committed their crime before the effective date of December 20, 2012. Chief Counsel Robinson requested that as issue develop, the Office of Chief Counsel will provide advice on a case-by-case basis.

Chief Counsel Robinson introduced Assistant Counsel Jocelyn Schultz to the board as the newest attorney in the Office of Chief Counsel. The Board welcomed Jocelyn. Board Member Potteiger stated that August 16, 2017 was also "Tim Keating" day. Assistant Counsel Tim Keating was throwing out the first pitch at the Harrisburg Senator Baseball game that night at 6:15 p.m. Board Member Potteiger encourage all to go to the ballgame to support Mr. Keating. Chief Counsel Robinson had nothing else to report and was available to the board as needed.

E. Office of Board Secretary

Board Secretary Talaber stated for purposes of clarification that when voting on parole, the "most restrictive condition" prevails, with the exception of when the issue is the "time of release," in which case, the majority who agree on
the time of release is what is recorded. Board Member Potteiger provided as an example: If two board members vote to refuse parole and review the inmate again in 2019, and the third board member refuses to parole, but wants to see the inmate in 2020, the "most restrictive condition" of 2020 would apply. Board Member Koch noted that the first two board member votes would then be "2020" because the third board member added the "most restrictive" condition.

Board Member Johnson, as an example, asked if he wrote that he wanted to see the offender in one year, but the next board member wrote he wanted to see the offender in two years, would he get the opportunity to see that change. Chairman Dunn and Board Member Burke stated “no.” Board Member Johnson indicated that he would like the opportunity to change his vote. Board Member Potteiger suggested that when this occurs, the previous board member should be advised in the change of the date. Chairman Dunn noted we discuss this every year, but Board Member Potteiger noted that we never really clarified it for how it would be processed.

Board Member Koch asked if we could do something like providing a memo back to the original board member. There was a general discussion on the parameters of this example. Chairman Dunn provided the example of a situation where five board members voted for parole, four people voted for standard outpatient treatment and employment, but the fifth person voted that the inmate also needs 120 days of GPS, should this be recirculated? The general consensus of the board members was “no” it should not be recirculated.

Chairman Dunn, as a second example, if board member one writes he wants to review the inmate again in 2018, but the second board member writes he wants him to serve his maximum sentence date, does the first board member only get advised, or should it go to a third board member for a tie breaker vote. Board Member Potteiger stated that once the time changes from 1 year to 2 or 3 years, it should be sent back to the original board member so they can decide if they want to change it to 2020, or if they want to change their vote to parole that person. Board Member Potteiger noted that this will allow the original board member to know his opinion so he can reconsider the vote. Board Member Burke said the only thing the original board member could do is change the vote from “no” to “yes” to parole. Board Member Gillison stated that at this point, the first board member may decide that he is not willing to have the inmate remain incarcerated for 3 years, but instead decide to parole him or “parole upon completion.”

Chairman Dunn stated if we have a case that the inmate is being denied parole, and the reviewed is being changed to make it longer, then the case goes back to the first board member for review to see if they want to change their decision or not. Chairman Dunn sought a motion to that effect. Board Member Burke made the motion which was seconded by Board Member Johnson. Board Members Gillison and Koch sought clarification on the
motion, confirming that it would be to recirculate the case back to the original
decision maker. There was a general discussion among the board members.

Board Secretary Talaber requested that the board do this as a resolution
rather than a motion so we can spell out the details. The motion was
withdrawn and it was agreed that a draft resolution would be presented at the
September 20, 2017 meeting. Board Secretary Talaber would work with
Chief Counsel Robinson and Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth to draft the
resolution.

Board Secretary Talaber stated that from the Joint Resolution Committee
(JRC) that Vivitrol is a voluntary not a mandatory condition. Board members
could suggest the use of Vivitrol and details would be placed on the PBPP
15A for staff to understand. Board Members could suggest the use of Vivitrol.
Board Member Grey suggested adding the condition “if recommended by a
physician.” Chief Counsel Robinson indicated he would not be comfortable
discussing this issue with the board while in public session. Chairman Dunn
asked if anyone had any issues with the Board Secretary and Chief Hearing
Examiner using PBPP-15As, and if they see a concern to call the board
member and ask if it is ok to handle the matter in a PBPP-15A. Board
Secretary Talaber explained that the board decision is a PBPP-15, and a
PBPP-15A is a document that goes along with the board decision that does
not go to the inmate, but explains to staff a concern surrounding the board
decision. Chairman Dunn and Board Member Burke noted that on the 361
there is a box for directions to staff, which will generate a PBPP-15A. The
board generally agreed to this process.

F. Hearing Examiners Office

Chief Hearing Examiner Chad Allensworth reported that there would be a
statewide hearing examiner’s meeting on September 13, 2017 and solicited
topics or areas to address. Chairman Dunn stated that Hearing Examiner
Mike Barone was retiring in October 2017 after 43 years of service. Board
Members Burke and Potteiger requested details on any events when they
became known. Board Member Johnson asked if there would be a vacancy
for this position. Chairman Dunn indicated “possibly.” Board Member
Johnson asked if there was an opening, would it be posted inside only. Chief
Hearing Examiner Allensworth and Chairman Dunn stated it is a civil service
position and the candidate would have to be civil service eligible. Board
Member Burke indicated that it involved a “test” and Chairman Dunn stated
that the civil service examination was not currently open. Chairman Dunn
noted that there was a workload review and that the docket is currently
trending downward.

Board Member Burke told Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth that his
hearing examiners are doing an excellent job. Board Members Koch and
Potteiger agreed with the opinion. The board considered ways to honor
Hearing Examiner Barone for his service.
G. Statistical Reporting and Evidence-Based Program Evaluation Office

Executive Assistant William Otis, in his capacity as agency statistics liaison, had nothing to report. Chairman Dunn noted that “data reporting” was a topic listed later in the agenda.

H. Office of Administrative Services

Office of Administrative Services Director Edie Letherby stated that she had no additional information to report other than what was submitted other than it incorrectly had July’s date in the header, and she was available to the board as needed. Board Member Rosenberg had a question about civil service positions and the desire to increase diversity in its workforce as a goal, and inquired what was going on to do so.

Chairman Dunn stated that the legislature 2 or 3 years ago passed a law changing the Civil Service Act, to try and force the civil service process to be more open, easier to get people in, and to be more vacancy based. Chairman Dunn stated that in 2016 the Civil Service Commission drafted regulations, to which the board responded, and the regulations were not well received by the Legislature, the Governor’s Office, or the Regulatory Review Commission. The Civil Service Commission met with board staff on Friday, August 11, 2017 to discuss the board’s desires. Chairman Dunn noted that except for statewide clerical positions, there was a movement away from test-based civil service positions to vacancy based positions without the need for a written test. The model would be based on “education and training,” where a vacancy would be posted with education and training requirements; the agency human resource office and civil service would review the candidate’s resume to see if they meet the requirements; if so, then they go on to an interview list while if not, they get a letter saying they do not meet the minimum qualifications.

Chairman Dunn stated that the new process would be based on actual vacancies, it would be more open and understandable from the outside, and would help the board diversify its workforce. Board Member Rosenberg thought it was great that this new system would help, but we should also ask the civil service commission to open the examinations. Board Member Rosenberg noted that as we are filling all the open positions with internal candidates, we are missing the opportunity to diversify with outside candidates and excluding a large population. Chairman Dunn noted that if we have not opened a test in a long time, for the civil service commission to approve the test, means that a job study would need to be done. Board Member Rosenberg disagreed. Board Member Johnson sought clarification if the board or civil service needed to do a job study. Chairman Dunn asked Director Letherby to provide additional background on the issue.
Director Letherby discussed how the civil service commission and application process work. Board Member Rosenberg asked why we did not ask the civil service commission to open the exam now so that we can get more diverse agents while we are currently hiring the agent positions. Chairman Dunn stated that the agent test is up-to-date. Director Letherby stated that most of our other position exams have been opened 2 or three years ago. Director Letherby stated the civil service commission is not opening any new exams, and are in the process of changing to an education and experience model. Chairman Dunn stated the Civil Service Commission is putting the testing on hold until the regulations are completed. Director Letherby stated it is a major change to civil service’s process.

Board Member Rosenberg asked if our policy as an organization is where possible, we will expand as many applicants on the list so we have a large pool of applicants, so we are not just looking at trying to promote from within. Chairman Dunn stated we are trying to encourage the openness as much as possible, to get any qualified candidate into any job description, whether they come from within the agency or without. Chairman Dunn noted that his philosophy is to promote the best candidate for the position. Board Member Burke noted that we have done that in the past. There was a general discussion on this topic among the board members and Director Letherby. Chairman Dunn stated we are moving to the model that Board Member Rosenberg described by January 2018.

Board Member Johnson asked if he or Board Member Koch, to the extent possible, could sit-in on some of the meetings concerning the above mentioned issues. Chairman Dunn said it will depend on how schedules work.

I. Office of Communications

Director Laura Treaster had nothing to add to her report, and she was available to the board all day. Chairman Dunn noted the 100% for agent contact list, and we have an agent who has almost reached 1-year of 100% contacts. Chairman Dunn wanted to make everyone aware that more agents are being added to the 100% contact list.

J. Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs

Director Victor Wills reported that there was no news on having a spending plan; nothing on mergers; and nothing on JRI II. Board Member Johnson inquired on the status of a possible change to legislation that would allow board members to teach college or to have other outside employment. Board Member Johnson asked how we can move that legislation, or at least have discussion on that legislation because there is a great amount of knowledge on the board to be in those positions. Chairman Dunn indicated that it was presented to the Governor’s Office and they said they would
consider it if there was appropriate legislation. The Governor’s Office has not acted upon it at this point. Chairman Dunn stated it will be brought back-up to the Governor’s Office as a board concern.

K. Internal Affairs and Special Services Office

Director Scott Woolf reported that the request for the OnBase mobile application is in place, but it will take several months to get certificates to have it in place, so we are in a hold pattern until then. Director Woolf reported that the remainder of the board members will be transitioned to Office 365, and that there would be BIT people available to assist at 8:15 a.m. There was a brief discussion among board members and staff on the changes to the email and calendar process. Director Woolf had nothing else to report and was available to the board as needed.

L. Office of Field Probation and Parole Supervision

Director Christian Stephens stated that he had no additional information to report other than what was submitted, and he was available to the board as needed. Director Stephens noted that Project Safe Return for Harrisburg is scheduled for September 21, 22, and 23 2017; and for Philadelphia’s Peaceful Surrender, November 9, 10, and 11, 2017. There was a general discussion among board members about the logistics and advertising of the events.

Board Member Potteiger expressed his thanks to Press Secretary Maria Finn and Director Treaster for their hard work. Board Member Potteiger described the advertising process associated with the Harrisburg event. Board Member Potteiger said the goal is to resolve a lot of the issues at the event since the offender come forward and turned themselves in. Board Member Potteiger said each case will be looked at, and a determination be made if he or she should be detained. Chairman Dunn noted that if any board member wanted to attend the event to work with Farrah to schedule overnight accommodations, and thanked Board Members Gillison, Potteiger, and Director Stephens for their hard work on the project. Director Stephens noted that there will be service providers at both events, and high-end absconders have been identified in both areas; and after both events there will be an after-action review. Board Member Gillison asked about advertising and media for the event. Press Secretary Finn described the plan. Board Member Gillison noted that radio was where it was most effective in Philadelphia targeting the communities. Board Member Potteiger noted the close cooperation between the City and County for this project.

Board Member Potteiger noted that he received information that New York Interstate is going to start utilizing documents similar to our 257 series. Kudos to Director Stephens and his staff for how they do business.
Staff reports were completed.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Sentence Credit Issues-Resolution 2017-04

Chairman Dunn noted the draft resolution and called upon Chief Counsel Robinson to answer any questions. Chief Counsel Robinson noted that Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth, Board Secretary Talaber, Director Marci Johnson and himself, met and drafted the suggested chart to go along with the resolution. Chief Counsel Robinson explained that the chart is a guideline for readily ascertainable events. Chief Counsel Robinson suggested that the field be directed to include the events in the supervision history paperwork. Chief Counsel Robinson provided numerous examples of how the chart could be utilized. Chief Counsel Robinson stated that it should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and utilized as a guideline.

There was a general discussion among the board members about how to utilize the chart. Chief Counsel Robinson explained that a reason needed to be provided for not giving credit, but it did not have to be a long statement. Board Secretary Talaber suggested that when the board members want to provide partial credit, to check the "yes" box on the 361, provide the date range, and provide a reason that credit is being denied. There was a general discussion among the board members on the sufficiency of the reason.

Board Member Koch provided an example for Chief Counsel Robinson to explain how to complete the process in line with the draft resolution and chart. Chief Counsel Robinson emphasized that as long as what the board member writes down is captured into the board action. Director Stephens asked the board if there was additional information in the Supervision History that the field needed to add. The board members noted that the quality of the Supervision History Report has been better over the past year. Chairman Dunn explained that the field would provide the relevant dates; the hearing examiner would place the relevant dates on the report; the board member would check the "yes" box and note a reason that could be recorded on the board decision.

Board Member Burke asked if the board could provide credit for delinquent time. Chairman Dunn stated that we can award credit for delinquent time. Chief Counsel Robinson stated under the law we can give credit for delinquent time. Chief Counsel Robinson stated it is a policy decision if the board wants to give credit for delinquent time.

Board Member Gillison moved that the board adopt the resolution, which was seconded by Board Member Koch. There was no further discussion on the resolution. The board unanimously approved resolution 2017-04.

B. Data Reports Discussion
Topic was moved to the September 2017 meeting, so that the committee could have another meeting. Board Member Rosenberg suggested Executive Assistant schedule a committee meeting to discuss.

C. Face-to Face and Training Schedule

Victim Advocate Storm wanted to clarify the schedule. Chairman Dunn noted that the board had discussed spreading out F2F to two days, and we could not make the adjustments until November 2017. Chairman Dunn explained that Tuesday a.m. would be F2F, and Tuesday afternoon would be Board Training; Wednesday a.m. would be the Board Meeting, and Wednesday afternoon would be F2F; Thursday would be F2F times as needed.

Board Member Rosenberg asked why we were changing, and Chairman Dunn indicated that he thought that was what the board wanted from the July 2017 discussion and vote. Board Member Grey noted that the justification was to help the board by limiting the number of interviews per day. Board Member Koch noted that if we are going to have 2 days, why stay to 6:00 p.m. for one of them, where 3 days would make it easier. Board Member Rosenberg and Burke noted that the load shifted to Thursday.

Chairman Dunn asked if they really wanted to change from how we do it now. Chairman Dunn asked if anyone had concern with the trainings listed, and Board Member Burke stated he did not see the PCLR in the schedule. Chairman Dunn indicated in October 2018 is Dr. Logan. Chairman Dunn wanted to know if the board wanted to keep F2F on Tuesday and Thursdays with Board Meeting and training on Wednesdays. There was a general discussion on the merits of each.

Chairman Dunn asked if they wanted to keep the current model. Board Members Johnson and Burke noted that board members also vote cases while they are in during board week. Board Member Burke asked Victim Advocate Storm if the victims are clearly being told about the use of videotapes. Victim Advocate Storm cautioned not to discuss details of cases. Chairman Dunn went around the room of board members to keep it as is, or split victim testimony half on Tuesday morning and half Wednesday afternoon.

Board Member Koch noted that they still need to work to 6:00 p.m. on both F2F days. Board Member Johnson stated the F2F day is emotional and exhausting, and does not want three straight days of it. Board Member Rosenberg asked if the F2F packets can be received earlier. Board Secretary Talaber indicated we can get the packets out and emailed on Friday. Board Member Gillison moved that for the next 10 months we go to a Tuesday and Thursday F2F, with the board meeting on Wednesday morning, and the board training on Wednesday afternoon. Chairman Dunn asked that the
motion be amended from 10 months to all of 2018. Board Member Gillison agreed to modify the motion.

Victim Advocate Storm asked if the board wanted more cases on Tuesday, and to use Thursday for the remainder or to spread the cases evenly on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Board Member Potteiger noted that when Tuesday and Thursday are almost filled, OVA and the Board should discuss having a third day. Victim Advocate Storm noted the pilot in Pittsburgh in September will help reduce the cases in Harrisburg.

Chairman Dunn re-stated Board Member Gillison’s motion to: (1) rescind what the board decided to do with F2F days at the July 2017 meeting; (2) F2F days will be Tuesdays and Thursday until December 2018; and (3) the cases will be balanced between Tuesday and Thursday. Board Member Potteiger seconded the motion. There was a brief discussion on the matter concerning the need to have the 2018 dates for board meetings approved. The board voted unanimously to adopt the motion.

Victim Advocate Storm explained the logistics surrounding the F2F being held in Pittsburgh. Board Member Potteiger asked if the board members really needed the ICSA as part of the packet, since there is a synopsis of the case already provided. There was a general discussion among the board members about the merits of having the ICSA in the F2F packet.

Chairman Dunn asked Victim Advocate Storm to explain the purpose of F2F. Victim Advocate Storm stated the sole intent is for the decision maker to hear the effect of the crime from the victim’s perspective. Victim Advocate Storm recommended that the board have as little in front of them as possible, because it is not an interview, interrogation, or fact finding mission. Victim Advocate Storm noted that during the F2F process the victim may bring-up information that is not in any paperwork the board has previously seen. Victim Advocate Storm stated that questions should be limited to the impact on the victim of the crime and their concerns so that appropriate stipulations could be in place. Board Member Grey recalls that the original F2F days were very paper limited. Chairman Dunn asked if it was fair to the victim to be reviewing papers rather than listening to what the victim was stating.

Board Member Gillison likes to know the context of what he is about to hear, so he likes to have a synopsis of what happened. Board Member Gillison noted that he can get information off of OnBase. Victim Advocate Storm indicated that her office does the victim summary, and the Board Secretary’s Office provides the remainder. Board Member Koch believes that the summary is good enough. Board Member Grey is fine with the summary and the DOC-16E. Victim Advocate Storm indicated that the victim summary is also presented to make the board aware of some details (i.e. an agitated victim or a person with special needs or considerations).
Board Member Johnson stated he does ask questions, but they are related to how it affects the victim. Victim Advocate Storm indicated that her staff provides information to the victim about the parole process and works with them about the benefits of supervision. Chairman Dunn stated that we need to avoid situations where we ask questions that may indicate that we already decided to parole.

Board Secretary Talaber noted that parole managers are available on F2F days with a tablet to answer questions that board members may have about a case on F2F day. Victim Advocate Storm noted that it is the inmate’s job to convince you why he or she should be paroled, and the victim’s purpose is to provide you with the emotional impact of the crime, and to talk to you about any stipulations they desire.

Chairman Dunn stated that the packets would now be the OVA summary of the interview and the DOC 16E, and they will come out on Fridays via email. The email will come from the Office of Board Secretary. The board agreed by consensus to this new process.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Overview of GPS

Director Vance VanOrder provided the board with a handout and presentation on GPS and the board’s policies and procedures involving the same. The board members asked numerous questions regarding the same.

Board Member Rosenberg asked about a report concerning how many offenders are on GPS, and how they are doing in terms of technical parole violators and convicted parole violators. Board Member Rosenberg noted that we should be expanding the use of GPS as we are closing Community Corrections Centers. Director VanOrder stated we do not have reports that go into the items mentioned. Board Member Potteiger stated we should have reports about: (1) How many offenders have been on GPS this year; (2) How many successfully completed GPS this year; (3) If the offender successfully completed GPS, what is their recidivism rate; (4) If the offender failed GPS, what did they fail for (e.g. was it a technical reason or CPV). Board Member Burke added that we need to understand the success rate for GPS.

Chairman Dunn, in the interest of time, stopped the discussion so that we could move to the Face-to-Face schedule topic, in order to allow Victim Advocate Storm to participate in the conversation before her next meeting.

The board returned to this topic, and Chairman Dunn asked Director Stephens to report on what is currently happening with GPS. Director Stephens reported about 6 months ago, due to DOC bed reduction, the decision was made that the board would utilize GPS to offset the change. At
that time the board had about 300 GPS units. The use of GPS has increased to 650 to 700 inmates. Director Stephen noted that we have an active GPS with a passive response. Currently we do not have agents who are specifically tasked with or trained just for GPS; however, in Harrisburg, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh there will be GPS Units that will focus on GPS. Director Stephens discussed in detail how inmates on GPS will be supervised.

Director Stephens reported that they are gathering statistics and using them in designing the new GPS Units. Director Stephens stated that he can provide a monthly report to the board members including the statistics recently gathered. Director Stephens noted that a new GPS policy was being drafted. There was a general discussion among the board members and staff on the details of the new policy. Director Stephens will provide the board members copies of the GPS policy.

B. Reassigning Cases When Inmate Has Been Refused Multiple Times

Board Member Rosenberg stated there are certain inmates that a board member may interview two times and refuse parole. Board Member Rosenberg would like to have a new board member do the third interview. There was a brief discussion among the board refreshing their minds on what was discussed at the July 2017 meeting on this topic. Chairman Dunn would like to see this into a policy, and to provide clear direction to senior staff. Board Secretary Talaber will work with Director Rosa to establish the details of how this will work. Board Member Johnson asked if this policy would apply to hearing examiners. Chairman Dunn stated the use of board members should minimize the impact on the hearing examiners.

Board member Burke made a motion that cases would be reassigned to a different board member after the inmate was denied 3 times by the same board member. Board Member Grey seconded the motion. The board passed the motion. The board also agreed that the 3 cases need not be consecutive cases.

C. Board Awards

The board discussed the awards program and possible candidates for awards. Chairman Dunn stated viewpoint on awards: (1) we should have the awards go to the field rather than central office employees; (2) the awards go to different areas of the state every year; (3) we should not give an award to someone who has recently won an award; (4) we should not give awards to someone who was recently recognized for their leadership and achievement some other way (i.e. sent to a state leadership development training); and (5) we have enough employees that we should not be giving awards to the same one. Chairman Dunn submitted two names for possible awards and asked for board members to concur, which they did by general consensus.
D. Board Memos & Administrative Appeals

Board Member Gillison asked the board members if it is necessary to get the files attached with the white memos to make decisions. Board Member Gillison noted that the memos could be sent and the board member could go onto OnBase to get the information. The same would go for administrative appeals. Board members want the complaint, memo, or response and not the physical file.

Board Member Gillison made a motion to no longer send paper files with memos to the board and administrative appeals. Board Member Johnson seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

E. Board Sitting as a Whole

Board Member Gillison suggested the board sit as a whole once a year on a: (1) homicide case; (2) a sex offender case; and (3) a juvenile lifer case. This would give the board the opportunity to learn from one another. Board Member Grey agreed with this suggestion. There was a general discussion on the concept among the board members. Chairman Dunn also suggested we do five cases where the board split 4 to 4. Board Member Grey also suggested we include an incapacitation case. Chairman Dunn indicated that he and Board Secretary Talaber would work that into the schedule sometime early next calendar year.

Chairman Dunn asked if Dr. Diane Shoop, attending from the general public, had anything to share, which she did not.

Board Member Gillison moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Board Member Burke. The board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

JJT