

# COMMENT SHEET

Fulough Violations - 12/7/15 - Public Comment

Comment #:	Page #:	Line #:	Comment:	Response:
<i>Mary Jane Ainsworth</i>				
1	2	38	Replace violation with violating.	Completed
2	2	43	Shouldn't directive 410.02 be referenced here not 410.01?	Completed
3	3	1	Insert to between the and violation	Changed language
4	3	17	This sentence sites that there is a report in the database....I do not believe this is true.	Being built.
5	3	23	Capitalize Sanctions	Completed
6	5	4-25	Is directive 410.02 on the map to be revised as this criteria doesn't match that directive?	Thank you, we will mark that this needs updating to be consistent.
7	6	14-26	This section seems to be out of place. Seems to fit better in the Sanctioning Report section. Also, why so much detail here vs in the sanctioning report section. I would recommend revising the next to last sentence of the sanctioning report section to state: "A record of all graduated sanction components must be entered into the violation and incident section of the OMS." Then you can add the incidents OMS Reference Document to the directive along with the violations one.	Changed language
8	6	33	OMS Database reports are cited here. Has any draft reports been created yet so these could potentially be built along side with the directive going live?	To be discussed with OMS Administrator.
<i>Jeffery Cobb</i>				
1	2	30	Change "incidents" to "behaviors"	Completed

2	2	1c	add "v" "Severity of violating behavior" after line 36	Completed
3	2	Procedu	Goes from 1. Response to Furlough Violations to 3. Graduated Sanctions no "2"	Completed
4	3	38	add space after "Level 1" and before sanctions	Completed
<i>Phil Damone</i>				
1	OMS		My only feedback is around having a sanctioning report available in OMS. If it is I'm not aware of it. I assume it's just an attachment to the directive we would then scan in. If it was part of OMS it would be better. I like the Supervisor discretionary override to a higher sanctioning level being part of this.	Yes, sanctioning report will be part of OMS. This will be included in the technical document.
<i>David Bellini</i>				
1	General		Furlough and parole seem parallel from the 10,000 foot level. DOC should consider combining all furlough legal statuses and parole into a "21 <sup>st</sup> century parole" taking the best aspects of parole and furlough, creating one legal status and one entity with purview over release/revocation. Since parole is recognized by most or all states this would serve as a better noun than "furlough."	This is not within DOC's authority.

2	General	<p>As to release “violations” : To the degree possible, I encourage DOC to switch the model from, a violation based revocation,,,,,, to a model of merit based release with bright line standards for continued community residence. One example could be: eligible inmates can earn release by demonstrating a clean drug screen. Clear expectations and transparency would help offenders and assure the public. Provide released inmates with social supports to continue pro-social behavior. The DOC should publish quarterly, the number and reason for all release/return decisions. The DOC should measure which release decisions are successful and which are not. Goals, metrics and transparency should be included in a renewed effort to improve outcomes.</p>	Thank you for your feedback.
3	General	<p>As to the specific documents sent out:</p> <p>There is no redline version making the changes visible.</p> <p>What is the reason for the changes?</p> <p>What will improve with the changes?</p> <p>How will this improvement be measured?</p> <p>As to the specific documents sent out:</p>	This is a change in policy and has been through the policy development process.
4	General	<p>When documents are sent out for review like this, what percentage of total DOC employees provide feedback?</p>	All public comments are available on the website.

5	General	What percentage of total DOC employees provided feedback to this specific request for feedback?	All public comments are available on the website.
<i>Greg Hale</i>			
1	General	<p>Sarah I reviewed this directive. The directive itself is fine, my concern is more of a semantics one. Mike I think this issue should be discussed as a general approach to policy development.</p> <p>I understand the wish to force people to use OMS by putting the requirement into directive however I believe this is a mistake. If at some point OMS is no longer our database system or in this case if incidents are not part of the OMS at some point we will need to adjust directive. Why would we not use generic language that simply states: "An incident report will be electronically submitted for all violations....." (Page 6 Lines 14-17) or "...the decision will be electronically documented." (Page 5, Lines 44-48)</p> <p>Be generic and produce guiding documents for enetering these items into OMS.</p> <p>Just my 2 cents, I am not invested either way but this seems to be an error in our approach to writing guiding documents.</p>	All electronic databases would be called the OMS as it describes the system not a specific software.