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OBJECTIVES

1. Define Chronic Recidivists
2. Identify the impact on resources
3. Develop solutions
4. Improve Public Safety

THE PROBLEM

- High Risk offenders are a heterogeneous group
- Dangerous offenders (guns, gangs etc.)
- Sex Offenders
- CHRONIC OFFENDERS

CHRONIC OFFENDERS ARE PART OF OUR RECIDIVISM REPORT EVERY YEAR

- 84 individuals (23 women, 61 men) were incarcerated twice within the first year post release, a significant increase from the previous year. One man and one woman were reincarcerated three times and one man four times.

- These chronic recidivists commit drug, property, domestic, motor vehicle or prostitution offenses, or violate probation or parole. Many have unaddressed substance abuse and/or mental health issues that perpetuate criminal behavior.

- HCSD Recidivism Report March 2015

SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT PERSPECTIVE
To examine and define the issue, we began by compiling a list of anyone released from a sentence 2 or more times within an 18 month period.

We then gathered data on demographics, assessment and program history.

**WHO ARE THE CHRONIC OFFENDERS?**

- Predominantly male
- Mean age = 32
- Mean sentence = 5.5 months
- 73% Nonviolent offenses
- 54% score as high risk to recidivate on LSI
- 57% released from lower security

**CRIMINOGENIC FACTORS**

- Juvenile History: 50%
- Unemployed: 74%
- Criminal Associates: 90%
- Substance Abuse: 93%
- Personal-Emotional Issues: 86%
- Poor Family Support: 60%

**SUBGROUPS**

- **People who avoid treatment**
  - Most get work in the facility
  - Manage to only complete psychoed programs avoid tx
- **People who have done all of the treatment programs multiple times**
  - Very compliant, tend to be good “inmates”
  - Move through the system very quickly
  - Likely to get parole

Many are CHRONIC RELAPSERS

**CHRONIC RECIDIVIST (CR) DEFINITION**

3 or more SENTENCED incarcerations in the last 5 years (prior to current incarceration)

**POLICE PERSPECTIVE**

Chronic offenders are demoralizing for the Police

Negative impact on neighborhoods
INITIAL PROBLEM

- Chronic offenders serving short periods of incarceration and no mandated programing
- Confirmation from Prosecution Data
- Confirmation from Sentencing Data
- Options
  - Indict
  - Probation
  - Programing

CURRENT COURT CONDITION

- What Information is most valuable
  - BOP
  - Probation conditions
  - Program access
  - Program success
  - Age
  - Gang Affiliation
  - LSI score/educational background
  - High Risk or Prolific Violent Offender

WHO IS THE TYPICAL CR?

- Candidate #1
  - 15 Prior Convictions
  - All sentences for less than 1 year to HOC
  - No Probation on and after or split sentences
  - Early straight probation resulted in VOP’s
  - No programing while incarcerated

  Result: Defendant released after serving short sentence; no programing or after incarceration supervision

WHO IS OUR TYPICAL CR?

- Candidate #2
  - 8 Prior Convictions
  - Maximum incarceration 1 year
  - Probation sentences resulted in VOP’s
  - Some programing while incarcerated

  Result: Defendant given direct sentence with probation on and after and mandated batterer’s program

WHO IS OUR TYPICAL CR?

- Candidate #3
  - 7 Prior Convictions
  - Maximum sentence of 6 months HOC
  - No program participation while incarcerated

  Result: Defendant was indicted on most recent charges
PROSECUTION POINT OF VIEW

• Defendants with lengthy criminal history
• Often not charged with crime resulting in likely Prison Sentence
• Repeat/Prolific Offenders
• Multiple HOC sentences
• Offered opportunities for growth, improvement, rehabilitation within the HOC
• Public Safety concerns

PROBATION POINT OF VIEW

• Defendant’s are not probationary candidates
• Already served multiple HOC sentences
• Inability to comply, setting them up for failure
• Inability to pay fees
• Not employable
  — No ss#
  — No permanent address
  — No training

JUDICIAL POINT OF VIEW

• Maximum Sentence
• Type of Crime
  — Gun
  — Gang
  — Domestic Violence
• Jail resources and availability
• Non Residential Program availability
• Probation Resources

SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT SOLUTIONS

• We stopped allowing them to “hide” in work
• We made plans up front that included case manager, classification and parole
• We made sure they were engaged in treatment (Off’s receive an average of 33 hours of substance abuse tx and ed vs. 27.8 hours overall)
• We slowed the movement
• We realized we needed to reach out to outside agencies

SHARING INFORMATION

• Release Data
  — Jail report
  — CR report

COLLABORATION

The Sheriff’s Department
The District Attorney’s Office
The Springfield Police Department
CHANGES

- What we’ve seen
  - Better discussion on reasonable and realistic conditions
  - Improved sentences
  - More indictments
  - Improved communication

C3 POLICING MODEL

Mission Statement

The SPD & MSP C3 teams facilitates unity of effort and criminal intelligence gathering by, with, and through interagency, community, and private enterprise cooperation in order to detect, disrupt, and dismantle criminal activity in Springfield, MA.
Springfield Blazes
New Trail for U.S.
in Modern Policing Services

Hub & COR Model

How is this in the US Today?
Police-Community Relations

Downstream, Upstream

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RA-4K2kuO0U
Or
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xYeAmafTSCA
(2 minutes each)

Defining the Problem: start with WHY...

WHY
How
What

Crime Problem
Marginalized People Problem

How Does It all Fit Together?

• Hub & COR
• C3
• Neighborhood Watch

What percent of police calls are criminal in nature?
A Shift in Paradigm:

- From incident-based crime suppression
- To risk-based multi-sectorial collaborative intervention

New Concept in Prevention:

- Primary (broad-ranging)
- Issue-specific
- Acutely Elevated Risk

Think-Back Exercise:

- Who observed something beforehand?
- What did they know?

Old Concepts in Human Service Delivery:

- Agencies as Silo’s
- The Common Client
  - Barriers to Collaboration
  - Turf battles

Data Sharing:

- Do no harm
- Duty of care

Consistent purpose; Consent (or implied); PRINPNA; Consensus of experts; Due diligence; Opportunities for Regulatory Reform
Four Filters

1) Managerial Review
   * * * * * * * *
2) De-identified discussion (MSAER)?
3) Is family connected? …what does family need? * * * * * * * *
4) Offline exchange (need to know only)

Community Mobilization

Toward community safety & responsibility

Smart on Crime

COLLABORATIVE ANALYTICS

What a Hub Might look like in Springfield

Single Purpose:
- Expedited Discussion of Multi-Sectorial Acutely Elevated Risk Situations in Springfield
- Rapid Response Time (48-72 hrs)

Hub Chair
Hub Tracking Database (de-identified)

Structure of Collaboration

Centre Of Responsibility (COR)

Senior Management (body could be comprised of SPD, BHN, HCSD, BHS, EMS, Roca, DMH, DCF…)

Immediate next step)
HUB, alternately called a Situation Table

Collaborative analytics
Strategic data-driven direction for Springfield and Chelsea
COURT CHALLENGES

• Sharing the information
• Becoming involved at police level
• Support from all Collaborators
• Consistency in arrests
• Consistency in sentencing
• Consistency in probation

COURT CHANGES

• What we hope to see
  — Effective probation
  — Program participation
  — Team approach from law enforcement community
  — Less recidivism

SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES

Not enough money $
Not enough staff
Everyone doesn’t buy in
(Frustrating group to work with
CR’s can be very manipulative)
Confidentiality – mental health
Not enough treatment beds
Lack of motivation to change

FUTURE GOALS

Dedicated staff to work with CR’s in the Institution
Increase collaboration with probation and parole
Incorporate and train C3 Officers
Lower recidivism rates
Increase public safety