

Report of the Diversion Work Group

DRAFT

August 10, 2016
Authored by: Jim Moeser

Report of the Diversion Work Group

Charge to the Work Group

The work of this Diversion Work Group follows the work of work groups established in 2015 by the Public Protection and Judiciary and the Health and Human Needs Committees of the Dane County to focus on issues related to (1) Alternatives to jail confinement, (2) Reducing the length of stay for individuals placed in jail, and (3) Concerns related to the jail confinement of and use of solitary confinement for individuals with mental health issues. Within each of these areas, groups were also asked to address concerns related to the disparate levels of incarceration of individuals of color in Dane County. Each of those work groups developed recommendations for system reform and improvement, a number of which have been adopted/implemented and others that remain under consideration.

Included in the 2016 County Budget was an initiative to create a work group in 2016 to further focus on diversion of individuals from jail. The charge to the workgroup, consisting of eleven appointed individuals with system and practice level expertise, was to:

1. Review all current adult and juvenile diversion programs and the criteria for admission and successful completion;
2. Develop an equitable framework to ensure access to existing diversion programs;
3. Identify barriers to enrollment in and successful completion of the programs and make recommendations for improvements; and
4. Develop a list of large, traditional organizations and smaller, neighborhood-specific, grassroots entities that can offer services to benefit the clients enrolled and contribute to the improvement of communities and the diverse populations within them.

Appointed Members:

District Attorney Ismael Ozanne
Jail Administrator Captain Richelle Anhalt
Public Defender Dorothea Watson
Retired Judge Sarah O'Brien
Dane County Jail Re-Entry Coordinator
Jerome Dillard
Juvenile Justice Services Manager Andre
Johnson

Retired Madison Police Captain Luis Yudice
Retired Court Commissioner Todd Meurer
Madison Area Urban Ministry Director Linda
Ketchum
Reverend Joe Barrington
Paul Saeman, member of MOSES



1 Additional staff support and consultation was provided by: Carlo Esqueda (Clerk of Courts),
2 Lance Wiersma (DOC Regional Community Corrections, Region 1), and Todd Campbell (Human
3 Services AODA Services Manager)

4 Facilitation provided by Jim Moeser, former Juvenile Court Administrator

5 Staff Support: John Bauman, Juvenile Court Administrator

6 County Board Staff: Lauren Kuhl, Janice Lee, and Karin Peterson

7

DRAFT



1 Overview of Process

2 Meetings & Information Reviewed

3 Following are basic comments related to the functioning of the group:

- 4 • The group’s first meeting was February 11, and in total the workgroup held a total of 10
5 meetings;
- 6 • Initial discussions of the group focused on establishing a base understanding of the “flow”
7 of cases through the adult court system and identifying the various decision points where
8 diversion could occur. This work was supported by information from prior work
9 groups/committees that had worked through “mapping” the court/custody process;
- 10 • There was discussion about the breadth of the charge, as there are many ways to think
11 about what programs impact diversion. Ultimately the group decided, of necessity, to not
12 discuss what might be considered “prevention” programs, focusing instead on those
13 programs and processes that come into play once an individual is arrested/comes in contact
14 with law enforcement up through reentry back into the community from confinement;
- 15 • The group brainstormed and identified as many programs as possible that have some
16 impact on diversion, ranging from initial diversion into the system at all up through those
17 programs that provide support services to individuals reentering the community from jail
18 and work to promote stability in the community;
- 19 • A survey monkey instrument (53 questions) was developed and disseminated to
20 approximately 60 programs (completion approximately 40) enquiring about basic
21 demographics of who they serve, service numbers, racial/ethnic makeup of clients and staff,
22 program outcomes including how they are measured, and ideas they may have about
23 reducing racial/ethnic disparities;
- 24 • A number of meetings focused on specific programs, those programs that may be
25 considered the “big buckets” of services, e.g. Deferred Prosecution, parole/probation
26 revocation, and Sheriff’s alternatives;
- 27 • Members were provided a variety of additional intervention, including
28 information/recommendations from the 2015 work groups, examples of program models
29 that have been implemented in other locations, summaries of prior studies related to
30 system reform, and information from the Mead & Hunt review of the jail;
- 31 • As the deadline for work approached, the group began discussing recommendations,
32 identifying both some program/process ideas as well as ideas for continued
33 investigation/exploration;
- 34 • The workgroup reviewed various drafts/lists of potential recommendations, and final
35 recommendations included in this report represent a consensus of group members; that is
36 no member objected to their inclusion.



1 **Comments on Context and Challenges and Opportunities for Diversion**

2 The following comments provide additional context within which to consider the more specific
3 recommendations and potential next steps for continued system reform. Considerations
4 include:

- 5 1. The scope of the charge to the work group proved to be much more challenging than
6 anticipated. The sheer volume of programs that interact/have some connection to
7 diversion made it difficult, at best, to realistically review all the programs adequately. As a
8 result, this report will not likely meet the goals of the charge and suggests that significant
9 work remains, including that some form of more focused and sustained work needs to
10 continue. This could include expanding the focus of the Pretrial subcommittee of the
11 Criminal Justice Council to more broadly consider additional diversion/support reforms;
- 12 2. As with the work groups in 2015, the limitations of readily available data make it difficult to
13 fully assess the points of need and/or impacts of various diversion options. Credit should be
14 given to Clerk of Courts, DA, Human Service, and Sheriff's staff for gathering data that was
15 requested by the committee, but realistically projecting the impact of changes, particularly
16 as it relates to addressing concerns about disparity, will require increased data collection
17 and analysis capacity;
- 18 3. There are many "moving parts" or initiatives that are underway as it relates to addressing
19 jail diversion/justice system issues, some them supported by grants, some based on
20 implementing CJC or other recommendations related to reform. There are also many
21 recommendations made by prior work groups and/or included in system studies that
22 warrant continued attention, in particular recommendations related to developing a more
23 integrated diversion/deferred prosecution effort;
- 24 4. The biggest point of disparity continues to be at the "front end", namely arrest and
subsequent booking. There are subsequent decision points that have an impact on
disparity, and while there are criteria for some of those decision that are logical on "their
face", they also can exacerbate disparities. For example, decisions about an individuals'
suitability for various alternatives to confinement may be based on economic or
employment factors, housing stability, family stability, peer associations, or other factors
that can place low-income individuals of color at a disadvantage. The system is beginning to
utilize various screening/assessment tools that are purported to ensure that decisions are
objective and based on factors that have been conclusively researched to have an impact on
the potential for reoffending or failure to appear in court, but there is a long way to go in
terms of validity and reliability of such tools; (reference the notion of cumulative
disadvantage)
5. There are both opportunities and challenges related to funding of initiatives for reform.
Realigning and/or adding resources is not easy, even though there is often a positive cost-



1 benefit for implementing changes. There are multiple funding streams that can limit
2 reforms, while at the same time there are new funding streams emerging (e.g. CCS) that
3 may be a source of additional funding to promote change. The workgroup could not
4 adequately review issues related to funding, but staff within the county as well as other
5 advocacy partners have ideas about how to make the best use of those funding streams in
6 the most cost-effective manner;

7 6. The work group recognizes that investing in prevention efforts has the greatest potential of
8 reducing overall offending and subsequent system involvement, particularly for youthful
9 offenders. Investments that provide support for individuals with mental health issues have
10 a significant impact on future system involvement. Investments in housing, health care,
11 transportation, and employment help support family and community stability, and ensuring
12 that youth/young adults have access to educational opportunities offers a brighter future
13 for sustained economic success;

14 7. While there are many good programs already operating, there remains a sense of
15 incoherence and disconnectedness across programs and limited case management capacity
16 to help ensure that the right individuals are referred to the right diversion program(s)
17 and/or linkages that are made are followed up on to ensure sustained success and gather
18 outcome information;

19 8. Finally, it cannot be ignored that Dane County has some of the highest rates of disparity and
20 inequity across racial//ethnic lines in the nation, let alone in the state. Disparities in
21 education, employment, income, and housing too often “set the stage” for criminal justice
22 involvement. It is therefore important that any/all diversion efforts be viewed through a
23 “racial disparity” lens, even to the point of insuring there is some required “racial impact”
24 analysis completed before any system change/reform is implemented.

25

26



1 **Recommendations**

2 One of the challenges in identifying program options and coming up with recommendations is
3 the rather complicated and “non-sequential” aspects of the justice system process. In
4 particular, many of the existing programs can be “accessed” at multiple points in the process,
5 which is good. And, there are various schemes and frameworks that have been used to identify
6 various phases and/or decision points in the process. The recommendations developed by the
7 group are “grouped” according to various “phases”, but there is overlap across these phases
8 and programs that “cross” them. It is recommended that readers not spend a lot of time
9 focusing on the specifics or “correctness” of the description of the phase – rather the important
10 point is to focus on the recommendations themselves.

11

12 **Divert from Booking or Bench Warrants Issued for Failure to Appear (FTA)**

13 Goal: Reduce the number of individuals who fail to appear (fta) for court and subsequently end
14 up being taken into custody and booked in jail by implementing one or more of the following:

- 15 • Promote uniform written warn, cite and arrest policies for all Dane County police
16 agencies to limit the use of arrest to cases in which it is required by law or necessary for
17 protection of the public or suspect¹;
- 18 • Explore options to promote increased referral of less serious cases to municipal vs.
19 circuit court (e.g. sharing “jail fee” income, providing a supported community service
20 program option);
- 21 • Increase/utilize technology (e.g. text messaging) to remind individuals of pending
22 hearings;
- 23 • Promote court policy/practice so that individuals leaving court leave with a “notice in
24 hand” of their next hearing;
- 25 • Develop a process to identify individuals at “high risk” (e.g. have missed court in the
26 past, transient living situation) of fta and institute added steps (e.g. through volunteer
27 outreach) to remind individuals of upcoming court requirements and/or provide support
28 to ensure appearance at subsequent hearings. This process, creating a “court coach”
29 could perhaps also be used to support bail monitoring services;
- 30 • Develop process for screening cases of individuals referred for booking as a result of a
31 warrant that includes the ability to release prior to an initial appearance (vs.
32 automatically “hold” pending IA).

¹ Current statutes and policies provide some parameters related to arrest/booking, and any changes would have to be consistent with those statutes and policies unless modified.



1 Although not specifically discussed in detail, there is an overarching support for developing
2 some sort of diversion coordinator who can focus entirely on this specific issue and can work
3 across systems to develop a more coordinated/integrated/complete diversion program.

4 **Divert from Formal Court Processing (reducing potential for placement in jail):**

5 Goal: Reduce the number of individuals referred for formal court action, reduce the length of
6 time between offense and some form of adjudication, increase engagement of community
7 members by:

- 8 • Increasing the capacity of the Community Restorative Court to efficiently and effectively
9 address the number and range of offenses committed by 17-25 year olds. Include the
10 development of processes that can expedite the referral of individuals to CRC by law
11 enforcement;
- 12 • Expand/create a more comprehensive Deferred Prosecution program by adding a
13 position focused on expediting the deferred prosecution process and promoting the
14 development of evidence-based practices to serve deferred individuals;
- 15 • Consider expansion of the Bail Monitoring Program to provide additional
16 screening/assessment and supervision capacity.

17 **Divert Individuals with Significant Mental Health Issues from jail**

18 Goal: Decrease the number of individuals experiencing chronic and/or episodic mental health
19 issues that end up being placed in jail for behaviors that do not pose a substantial danger of to
20 others (or themselves). Options include:

- 21 • Development of a short-term crisis/stabilization program that includes the capacity for
22 short-term (up to 7 days) residential placement, crisis assessment, linking individuals to
23 other community resources, etc.. This type of program has commonly been referred to
24 as a “restoration center”, but the size/scope can vary depending on how it links with
25 other resources (e.g. case management, treatment services, etc.);
- 26 • Major system partners should act together to (1) identify individuals with mental health
27 issues have repeated and chronic contact with law enforcement and jail; and (2) develop
28 an individualized intervention and crisis plan to reduce the likelihood of placement in
29 jail;
- 30 • Creation of additional case manager/expediter/ombusperson positions in the Sheriff’s
31 Department and a position in the DA’s office focusing on mental health issues/cases, to
32 focus on shortening the length of stay for individuals placed in jail and linking individuals
33 with special needs to community-based services – create an expeditor and/or
34 ombudsman role;



- 1 • The County Board should adopt a resolution in collaboration with the city of Madison
2 and other unites of government to commit to the principles and begin the process of
3 developing and implementing programs consistent with the Stepping Up (NaCO, Council
4 of State Governments, and the American Psychiatric Foundation, NAMI) as a first step in
5 bringing key leadership, policy-makers, providers, and advocate together to commit to
6 an on-going process to reduce the use of jail for individuals with mental health issues;
7 Increase the capacity of the Community Treatment Alternatives (CTA) (currently
8 provided through Journey) by adding staff – potential caseload increase of 20 individuals
9 with mental health needs that are at high risk of repeated readmissions to jail;
- 10 • Add one or more positions dedicated to “expediting” the processing of cases of
11 individuals with mental health issues in order to shorten the length of stay AND/OF
12 create one or more “ombudsman” positions who can serve to link individuals with
13 community-based resources.

14 **Divert individuals from confinement (at sentencing or other stages)**

15 Goal: Develop alternatives to jail sentencing that would reduce the number of individuals
16 sentenced to/confined in jail:

- 17 • Develop a comprehensive community-service program to create and support additional
18 community service options/placements². Ideally this type of program could be available
19 to both municipal and circuit courts and could utilize a combination of individual service
20 projects, work crew-type projects, and could consider making use of the “time bank”
21 model/program.

22 **Divert individuals placed in jail for technical probation violations and/or pending probation
23 revocation proceedings:**

Goal: Reduce the number of and/or length of stay for individuals on state probation who are
confined through the revocation process for violations that do not rise to the level of new law
violations. Currently the Department of Corrections (DOC) has a process in place that uses a
risk tool and other criteria to determine who should be “held” for violations and then those
cases in which they pursue formal revocation (a hearing process that can take up to 60 days).
Additionally, DOC also has been working to develop alternatives to revocation that can help

² There is strong interest in expanding the capacity, whether through the Sheriff’s Office or otherwise, in expanding the capacity to accommodate more individuals who would perform community service work as an alternative to confinement (see Appendix II for basic data about the number of individuals screened/authorized and hours of community service completed in 2015). However, it should be noted that (1) the Sheriff’s Office currently does offer/screen/track a significant number of individuals already sentenced to jail who will perform community service to “earn” a reduction in a number of confinement days; (2) it is unclear what statutory authority, if any, exists for the court to order completion of community service **in lieu of** a jail sentence – there is an argument that with the exception of graffiti cases, there is no statutory authority for a court to order CS; and (3) there would need to be a more careful review of current practice/criteria for what individuals are eligible for CS to determine to what extent there are additional individuals who could perform CS if there were an expanded program.



1 reduce the number of individuals held in jail pending a revocation decision. That said, there are
2 two phases/aspects of the process that warrant further discussion. They are:

- 3 • Further development of alternatives to respond to technical (not new law violations)
4 violations of probation/parole that would not require referral of an individual for
5 confinement. This notion of a “graduated response” system can take into account the
6 nature of the violation and the risk level of the individual and provide accountability and
7 safety measures short of confinement; and
- 8 • Shortening the time of the “revocation hearing” process so that decisions related to
9 formally revoking/not revoking the probation status of an individual are accomplished
10 more quickly (now that time frame permits an individual be held for as many as 60 days
11 prior to a decision. That is a long time frame, but with more proactive, progressive
12 leadership diversion opportunities can increased;

13 Making progress in one or both of these areas has to potential to marginally impact the average
14 daily population of individuals I the jail but work should continue to help reduce the use of the
15 jail to hold this population.

16 **Improve support services for individuals released from jail that will increase the likelihood of**
17 **sustaining reentry into the community/reducing the likelihood of return to jail for technical**
18 **or new law violations:**

19 There are many programs providing support services to individuals reentering the community.
20 As one would expect, challenges to success that were identified by programs included concerns
21 about stable/affordable housing, lack of mental health services to adequately address
22 individuals’ needs, education, transportation, and meeting other basic needs. Program
23 responses also noted that these challenges were particularly acute for individuals of color,
24 decreasing the chances for enrollment in a program as well and the likelihood of successful
25 program completion.

26 The workgroup did not have time to fully consider all the programs in this category, but some
27 highlights that warrant increased attention and potential support include:

- 28 • Increasing support for:
 - 29 ○ Madison Urban Ministry programs (Just Bakery, the Journey Home, and Circles of
 - 30 Support) ,programs that serves a diverse population, have high standards but
 - 31 offer high levels of support, and have positive long-term outcomes;

- 32 ○ ?
- 33 ○ ?
- 34 ○ ?

35



1

2 The Diversions Workgroup urges the Criminal Justice Council (CJC) to consider expanding the
3 scope of its CJC Pretrial Subcommittee to broadly include diversion and support programs as
4 explored by the Diversion Workgroup and others.

5

6

7

8

DRAFT



1 Limitations and Next Steps

2 Review of the Juvenile System

3 Given the overwhelming scope of the charge to the workgroup, the group did not focus
4 on/discuss the juvenile system, and there may be some interest in further study. Having said
5 that, there are a number of characteristics and initiatives in the juvenile system that deal with
6 issues of diversion and disparity, including:

- 7 1. The juvenile system, by statute, has features that prioritize assessment, diversion, and
8 timeliness, for example:
 - 9 a. There is a statutory presumption that youth taken into custody should be
10 released to their parent(s);
 - 11 b. There is statutory authority for non-law enforcement staff (generic term is
12 “intake”; in Dane County the function is done through the Juvenile Reception
13 Center) to review referrals of youth taken in custody by law enforcement,
14 including the authority to release youth taken into custody to parents, other
15 responsible adults, and/or place in a non-secure placement³. There is no
16 comparable system/authority in the adult system⁴. There are relatively narrow
17 statutory criteria for placing a youth in secure custody, so the number of youth
18 held in secure custody is low (in fact, Dane County has one of the lowest per
19 capita youth confinement rates in the nation);
 - 20 c. Juvenile statutes provide for an assessment structure/process in which the
21 majority of youth referred to the court go through an substantial assessment
22 process prior to a determination related to formal filing of a petition in court;
 - 23 d. Juvenile statutes have relatively “tight” timelines for case processing, beginning
24 with time constraints on the assessment/filing process/determination all the way
25 through ultimate adjudication and disposition. Those timelines are even tighter
26 for youth held in confinement.
- 27 2. The juvenile system, both by statute and philosophy, emphasizes balancing community
28 safety, accountability, and competency/skill development in the development and
29 implementation of individualized plans for youth alleged and/or adjudicated delinquent.
30 Meeting these goals necessarily requires engagement with the youth’s family as well as
31 developing plans that increase the likelihood the youth will become successful in the
32 community, diminishing an emphasis on confinement as a response or “solution”;

³ In 2015, slightly less than one-half of the youth referred to JRC by law enforcement were placed in secure custody.

⁴ Law enforcement have some discretion on arrest/referral, and there is a “Uniform Bail Schedule for Misdemeanor” (and traffic) cases that provide some guidance to law enforcement and the sheriff’s regarding referral/placement in secure confinement pending further court review.



- 1 3. Under the auspices of the Juvenile Court Program, along with management of the
2 juvenile detention facility, are the non-secure Shelter Home and the Home Detention
3 programs, both providing immediate alternatives to secure confinement, both created
4 in the early 1970's.
- 5 4. The Human Services Department, the entity responsible for referral assessment and
6 supervision of youth referred for delinquency, has implemented a comprehensive range
7 of services and processes, including but not limited to:
 - 8 a. Realigning the case referral process in 2012 to provide for a more complete
9 intake assessment and an increase in the use of deferred prosecution
10 agreements prior to formal court filing;
 - 11 b. Development in 2015 of a partnership with the City of Madison and others to
12 direct referrals of youth in contact with law enforcement to municipal court and
13 other restorative justice programs vs. formal arrest and referral to formal
14 juvenile court processing;
 - 15 c. On-going evolution of a variety of alternative early intervention and supervision
16 initiatives to reduce the number of youth in out of home placement;
 - 17 d. Implementation of the Children Come First initiative to provide wraparound case
18 management and services to youth with mental health issues, significantly
19 reducing the need for confinement and out-of-home placement;
 - 20 e. Development of the Neighborhood Intervention Program (N.I.P.) in 1988 to focus
21 greater efforts on reducing the disproportionate contact, confinement, and out-
22 of-home placement of youth of color.
 - 23 f. Leadership in development of a coordinated effort to reduce disproportionate
24 minority contact across the juvenile system, beginning in the early 2000's and
25 continuing through the current time. That planning has led to some of the
changes that have been already implemented as well as identifying additional
disparity reduction opportunities;
 - g. Maintaining a variety of treatment, therapeutic, and other community-based
programs to create a continuum of dispositional options short of confinement in
a secure facility.

As a result of these efforts, Dane County continues to experience a remarkably low number of youth held in temporary secure custody (in the detention center) and a substantially decreasing number of youth in secure correctional care. However, concerns about the disparity of youth arrested, referred for intake (custody and case intake), and confined clearly suggest that continued attention to reducing disparity should be a high priority for the juvenile system.

Need for Continued Data Collection, Dialogue, and Decision-Making



1 Data

2 As referenced elsewhere, the ready availability of data to evaluate the need and/or impact of
3 various diversion efforts is a challenge. Additional data is needed even to evaluate the viability
4 and impact of a number of the recommendations contained in this report. Fundamental
5 questions about some of the recommendations simply include remain related to a reliable
6 estimate of the number of individuals that could be deferred through various means.

7 An example of this is in the area of how many individuals who held on warrants for an initial
8 appearance could be diverted through various means. Many of these are individuals who have
9 missed court, have an alleged offense that suggests the need for confinement, and/or for which
10 there is a safety concern related to confinement or not. There is no real capacity, authority, or
11 process in the adult system to “screen” law enforcement referrals and make a more
12 independent decision related to custody. What would happen, what would the numbers be if
13 there were some form of screening available (akin to the intake function in the juvenile system)
14 with the relatively independent authority to hold or release individuals referred for booking as
15 the result of a warrant (as opposed to referred at the time of arrest)? How many more
16 individuals would be held, and for how long? Would implementing such a change have any
17 significant impact on the population of inmates in jail?

18 Dialogue

19 A number of the recommendations made by the workgroup should be taken as only at the
20 beginning, and in some cases, the theoretical level. While all of them represent the group’s
21 opinion about a process or program option that could divert individuals from confinement
22 and/or the formal court system, the actual implementation of the idea is where the “rubber
23 meets the road”, and successful implementation will take the “buy in” and continued
24 collaborative work of many of the decision-makers and program staff that are much more
25 familiar with the intimate details of potential implementation (including for example funding,
26 integration with or realignment with existing services, implications for other services/programs,
27 etc.).

28 A good example is the sense of the group that there is potential for greater diversion in the
29 expansion of the capacity of the Community Restorative Court program, with that potential
30 coming both from the scope of offenses referred and developing additional referral processes
31 that could divert cases from circuit court. However, to make that work there will need to be
32 the “buy in” of key “actors”, including law enforcement, judges, the district attorney, and
33 others. Each of these “actors” have different perspectives, different responsibilities, and
34 different “accountability” factors that impact their current or future efforts to support
35 diversion, and no one “actor” may be able or willing to stand alone in pushing forward



1 potentially complicated and/or controversial programs without the support of others across the
2 process.

3 Decision-Making

4 Following the discussion on “dialogue”, it is important to recognize that there are a number of
5 key decision-makers involved in the process, each of whom are elected officials and bear the
6 ultimate responsibility for the impacts/outcomes of the variety of programmatic decisions they
7 make. Likewise, the Public Protection & Judiciary and the Health and Human Needs
8 committees include elected decision-makers that play a significant role in both the
9 programmatic and fiscal aspects of the system. Mixed into this are circuit court judges that play
10 a critical role in the process and play a significant role in potential system reforms.

11 This suggests that some form of coordinated decision-making and planning process needs to be
12 in place that brings all key decision-makers together, and a logical structure for that is the
13 Criminal Justice Council, particularly if there is a way to include an on-going focus on diversion
14 as part of their charge.



1 Appendices

Appendix I – list off programs/services identified that are working with offenders in lieu of placement in confinement and/or to support successful release from and avoid reentry to confinement. Most of these programs responded to the “diversion survey”/some did not.

Adult

Journey Mental Health - Emergency Services Unit
Community Restorative Court
MPD Mental Health Liaison Team/ Municipal Citations
Municipal Homeless Court
Emergency Detentions
Alternatives to Incarceration Program (ATIP)
Bail Monitoring
Drug Court Diversion Program
Huber Center (non-secure)
Madison Urban Ministry (MUM) - Just Bakery
Food Share Employment/Training Program
Methadone Programs
Bail Monitoring
Differed Prosecution Unit (DPU)
Chapter 51
Critical Benefit Enrollment
Department of Labor (DOL) - Windows to Work -
foodshare employment/ training program
DSCO Volunteer Program
Methadone Programs
New Beginnings
Man Up
MATC Adult Ed
Critical Benefit Enrollment
Nehemiah - Man Up
Critical Benefit Enrollment
Child First (Child Support Program)
Department of Corrections - Variety of programs
DOL- Windows to Work
Vitriol Opiate Program
Food Share Employment/Training Program
Re-entry Specialist
Huber Counselors
Methadone Programs
Residential Assessment Clinic
Comprehensive Community Services (CCS)
New Beginnings (DCSO)

Driver’s License Recovery
First Offender/Deferred Prosecution
Opiate Program
Veterans Court
Drug Court Treatment Program
OWI Court
Hope Haven - Rehab United- Pathfinders
Journey Mental Health - Community Treatment
Alternatives
Urban League - ADVANCE Employment Services
DCSO - Custody Alternatives Program
Fatherhood Program
Foundation Work Readiness Program
MUM - Circles of Support MUM - Journey Home
MUM - Just Bakery

Juvenile

Journey Mental Health - Emergency Services Unit
Juvenile Reception Center (J.R.C.) - Custody Intake
N.I.P. and Briarpatch Intensive Supervision
Electronic Monitoring
Children Come First - wraparound case management &
support services
YWCA Timebank/Briarpatch RJ Program(s)
Shelter Home (non-secure)
N.I.P Weekend Services
Various mental health, family, and other treatment
services
Municipal Citations
Home Detention Program
WFT and Parent Support Specialist
Municipal Truancy Court
Court Diversion Unit (CDU)
Post re-unification Support
Teen Courts Post and Pre-charge
SOPORT
Chapter 51



Municipal Court Services
Neighborhood Intervention Program (N.I.P) Weekend
Report Center
MMSD Youth Ed

Comprehensive Community Services (CCS)
Emergency Detentions
Critical Benefit Enrollment
Wisconsin Family Ties (WFT) and Pare

DRAFT



Appendix II

DCSO Volunteer Services Program 2015 Annual Report

Daily/Regular Volunteer Sites:

- River Food Pantry 21,820 volunteer hours
- Second Harvest Food Bank 16,892 volunteer hours
- Olbrich Botanical Gardens 3,596 volunteer hours
- Bayview Apartments 4,564 volunteer hours

Special Projects/Short Term Volunteer Sites: 3,838 volunteer hours

Total Hours for 2015 50,710 volunteer hours

Sentence Reduction:

Number of Days Worked off Inmate's Sentences: 3,985 total days for 2015
Average Number of Days Worked Off per Week: 77 days per week

Volunteer Applications:

Total applications that were screened & dealt with: 708 applications
Number of Inmates not approved to volunteer: 421 inmates
(did not fit volunteer criteria)
Number of Inmates approved & did NOT volunteer: 68 inmates
(Went out on Div., no longer interested in volunteering)

Number of Inmates approved and did volunteer: 219 inmates

Employment:

Due to the experience and work skills inmates learned as volunteers, **7 inmates were hired** as paid employees, at volunteer sites in 2015.

Recommendations to the Huber Program:

Directed two inmates to take the Accu Placer test. Suggested one inmate apply for construction job and was hired.

Significant Changes to the Volunteer Program in 2015:

- The DCSO Dog Program was started in February 2015. During the calendar year, 6 adult dogs and 4 puppies lived and were trained by inmates in B wing.
- Worked closely with Badger Kennel Club with the training of the jail dogs.

New Volunteer Sites Added:

- Several new non-profits inquired about getting inmate volunteers to help with special projects, but we did not have enough volunteers to fill those requests.
- Several former volunteer sites inquired about getting inmate volunteers, but we could not fill their requests.

New Projects Worked on During 2015:

- Implemented revised Inmate Volunteer Contracts



- Developed contracts for inmates living in the dog wing
- Developed contracts for inmates walking and training the dogs
- Developed a survey for inmates living in the dog wing.
- Organized the outdoor fence project
- Gave a presentation of the Dog Program to Badger Kennel Club
- Meet and screen potential dog adopters

DRAFT



Appendix III

DRAFT



DRAFT

