HB0386 Enrolled

1 AN ACT concerning criminal law.

## 2 Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, 3 represented in the General Assembly:

Section 5. The Illinois Crime Reduction Act of 2009 is
amended by changing Section 10 as follows:

6 (730 ILCS 190/10)

7 Sec. 10. Evidence-Based Programming.

8 (a) Purpose. Research and practice have identified new 9 strategies and policies that can result in a significant reduction in recidivism rates and the successful 10 local reintegration of offenders. The purpose of this Section is to 11 ensure that State and local agencies direct their resources to 12 13 services and programming that have been demonstrated to be 14 effective in reducing recidivism and reintegrating offenders into the locality. 15

16

(b) Evidence-based programming in local supervision.

17 Parole Division of the (1)The Department of Corrections and the Prisoner Review Board shall adopt 18 19 policies, rules, and regulations that, within the first 20 year of the adoption, validation, and utilization of the 21 statewide, standardized risk assessment tool described in 22 this Act, result in at least 25% of supervised individuals accordance with evidence-based 23 being supervised in

HB0386 Enrolled - 2 - LRB101 03664 SLF 48672 b

practices; within 3 years of the adoption, validation, and 1 2 utilization of the statewide, standardized risk assessment 3 tool result in at least 50% of supervised individuals being supervised in accordance with evidence-based practices; 4 5 and within 5 years of the adoption, validation, and utilization of the statewide, standardized risk assessment 6 7 tool result in at least 75% of supervised individuals being 8 supervised in accordance with evidence-based practices. 9 The policies, rules, and regulations shall:

10 (A) Provide for a standardized individual case 11 plan that follows the offender through the criminal 12 justice system (including in-prison if the supervised 13 individual is in prison) that is:

14 (i) Based on the assets of the individual as
15 well as his or her risks and needs identified
16 through the assessment tool as described in this
17 Act.

18 (ii) Comprised of treatment and supervision
19 services appropriate to achieve the purpose of
20 this Act.

(iii) Consistently updated, based on program participation by the supervised individual and other behavior modification exhibited by the supervised individual.

25 (B) Concentrate resources and services on26 high-risk offenders.

1 (C) Provide for the use of evidence-based 2 programming related to education, job training, 3 cognitive behavioral therapy, and other programming

(D) Establish a system of graduated responses.

6 (i) The system shall set forth a menu of 7 presumptive responses for the most common types of 8 supervision violations.

designed to reduce criminal behavior.

9 (ii) The system shall be guided by the model 10 list of intermediate sanctions created by the 11 Probation Services Division of the State of 12 Illinois pursuant to subsection (1) of Section 15 13 of the Probation and Probation Officers Act and the 14 system of intermediate sanctions created by the 15 Chief Judge of each circuit court pursuant to 16 Section 5-6-1 of the Unified Code of Corrections.

17 (iii) The system of responses shall take into account factors such as the severity of the current 18 19 violation; the supervised individual's risk level 20 determined by a validated assessment tool as described in this Act; the supervised individual's 21 22 assets; his or her previous criminal record; and 23 number severity of any the and previous 24 supervision violations.

25 (iv) The system shall also define positive26 reinforcements that supervised individuals may

HB0386 Enrolled

4

5

HB0386 Enrolled

17

1receive for compliance with conditions of2supervision.

3 (v) Response to violations should be swift and 4 certain and should be imposed as soon as 5 practicable but no longer than 3 working days of 6 detection of the violation behavior.

7 (2) Conditions of local supervision (probation and 8 mandatory supervised release). Conditions of local 9 supervision whether imposed by a sentencing judge or the 10 Prisoner Review Board shall be imposed in accordance with 11 the offender's risks, assets, and needs as identified 12 through the assessment tool described in this Act.

13 (3) The Department of Corrections and the Prisoner
 14 Review Board shall annually publish an exemplar copy of any
 15 evidence-based assessments, questionnaires, or other
 16 instruments used to set conditions of release.

(c) Evidence-based in-prison programming.

18 (1)The Department of Corrections shall adopt 19 policies, rules, and regulations that, within the first 20 year of the adoption, validation, and utilization of the statewide, standardized risk assessment tool described in 21 22 this Act, result in at least 25% of incarcerated 23 individuals receiving services and programming in 24 accordance with evidence-based practices; within 3 years of the adoption, validation, and utilization of the 25 26 statewide, standardized risk assessment tool result in at

HB0386 Enrolled - 5 - LRB101 03664 SLF 48672 b

least 50% of incarcerated individuals receiving services 1 2 accordance with evidence-based and programming in 3 practices; and within 5 years of the adoption, validation, utilization of the statewide, standardized risk 4 and 5 assessment tool result in at least 75% of incarcerated and programming 6 individuals receiving services in 7 accordance with evidence-based practices. The policies, 8 rules, and regulations shall:

9 (A) Provide for the use and development of a case 10 plan based on the risks, assets, and needs identified 11 through the assessment tool as described in this Act. 12 The case plan should be used to determine in-prison 13 programming; should be continuously updated based on 14 program participation by the prisoner and other 15 behavior modification exhibited by the prisoner; and 16 should be used when creating the case plan described in 17 subsection (b).

(B) Provide for the use of evidence-based
programming related to education, job training,
cognitive behavioral therapy and other evidence-based
programming.

(C) Establish education programs based on a
 teacher to student ratio of no more than 1:30.

(D) Expand the use of drug prisons, modeled after
the Sheridan Correctional Center, to provide
sufficient drug treatment and other support services

1

2

to non-violent inmates with a history of substance abuse.

3 (2) Participation and completion of programming by
4 prisoners can impact earned time credit as determined under
5 Section 3-6-3 of the Unified Code of Corrections.

(3) The Department of Corrections shall provide its 6 7 employees with intensive and ongoing training and 8 professional development services to support the 9 implementation of evidence-based practices. The training 10 and professional development services shall include 11 assessment techniques, case planning, cognitive behavioral 12 training, risk reduction and intervention strategies, effective communication skills, substance abuse treatment 13 14 education and other topics identified by the Department or 15 its employees.

16 (d) The Parole Division of the Department of Corrections 17 and the Prisoner Review Board shall provide their employees ongoing training and professional 18 with intensive and 19 development services to support the implementation of 20 evidence-based practices. The training and professional development services shall include assessment techniques, case 21 22 planning, cognitive behavioral training, risk reduction and 23 intervention strategies, effective communication skills, 24 substance abuse treatment education, and other topics 25 identified by the agencies or their employees.

26 (e) The Department of Corrections, the Prisoner Review

HB0386 Enrolled - 7 - LRB101 03664 SLF 48672 b

1 Board, and other correctional entities referenced in the 2 policies, rules, and regulations of this Act shall design, 3 implement, and make public a system to evaluate the 4 effectiveness of evidence-based practices in increasing public 5 safety and in successful reintegration of those under 6 supervision into the locality. Annually, each agency shall 7 submit to the Sentencing Policy Advisory Council а 8 comprehensive on the success of implementing report 9 evidence-based practices. The data compiled and analyzed by the 10 Council shall be delivered annually to the Governor and the 11 General Assembly.

12 (f) The Department of Corrections and the Prisoner Review 13 Board shall release a report annually published on their 14 websites that reports the following information about the usage 15 of electronic monitoring and GPS monitoring as a condition of 16 parole and mandatory supervised release during the prior 17 calendar year:

18 <u>(1) demographic data of individuals on electronic</u> 19 <u>monitoring and GPS monitoring, separated by the following</u> 20 <u>categories:</u> 21 <u>(A) race or ethnicity;</u> 22 (B) gender; and

23 <u>(C) age;</u>

24 <u>(2) incarceration data of individuals subject to</u> 25 <u>conditions of electronic or GPS monitoring, separated by</u> 26 <u>the following categories:</u>

1	(A) highest class of offense for which the
2	individuals is currently serving a term of release; and
3	(B) length of imprisonment served prior to the
4	current release period;
5	(3) the number of individuals subject to conditions of
6	electronic or GPS monitoring, separated by the following
7	categories:
8	(A) the number of individuals subject to
9	monitoring under Section 5-8A-6 of the Unified Code of
10	<u>Corrections;</u>
11	(B) the number of individuals subject monitoring
12	under Section 5-8A-7 of the Unified Code of
13	<u>Corrections;</u>
14	(C) the number of individuals subject to
15	monitoring under a discretionary order of the Prisoner
16	Review Board at the time of their release; and
17	(D) the number of individuals subject to
18	monitoring as a sanction for violations of parole or
19	mandatory supervised release, separated by the
20	following categories:
21	(i) the number of individuals subject to
22	monitoring as part of a graduated sanctions
23	program; and
24	(ii) the number of individuals subject to
25	monitoring as a new condition of re-release after a
26	revocation hearing before the Prisoner Review

1	Board;
2	(4) the number of discretionary monitoring orders
3	issued by the Prisoner Review Board, separated by the
4	following categories:
5	(A) less than 30 days;
6	(B) 31 to 60 days;
7	(C) 61 to 90 days;
8	<u>(D) 91 to 120 days;</u>
9	<u>(E) 121 to 150 days;</u>
10	<u>(F) 151 to 180 days;</u>
11	(G) 181 to 364 days;
12	(H) 365 days or more; and
13	(I) duration of release term;
14	(5) the number of discretionary monitoring orders by
15	the Board which removed or terminated monitoring prior to
16	the completion of the original period ordered;
17	(6) the number and severity category for sanctions
18	imposed on individuals on electronic or GPS monitoring,
19	separated by the following categories:
20	(A) absconding from electronic monitoring or GPS;
21	(B) tampering or removing the electronic
22	monitoring or GPS device;
23	(C) unauthorized leaving of the residence;
24	(D) presence of the individual in a prohibited
25	area; or
26	(E) other violations of the terms of the electronic

1	monitoring program;
2	(7) the number of individuals for whom a parole
3	revocation case was filed for failure to comply with the
4	terms of electronic or GPS monitoring, separated by the
5	following categories:
6	(A) cases when failure to comply with the terms of
7	monitoring was the sole violation alleged; and
8	(B) cases when failure to comply with the terms of
9	monitoring was alleged in conjunction with other
10	alleged violations;
11	(8) residential data for individuals subject to
12	electronic or GPS monitoring, separated by the following
13	categories:
14	(A) the county of the residence address for
15	individuals subject to electronic or GPS monitoring as
16	a condition of their release; and
17	(B) for counties with a population over 3,000,000,
18	the zip codes of the residence address for individuals
19	subject to electronic or GPS monitoring as a condition
20	of their release;
21	(9) the number of individuals for whom parole
22	revocation cases were filed due to violations of paragraph
23	(1) of subsection (a) of Section 3-3-7 of the Unified Code
24	of Corrections, separated by the following categories:
25	(A) the number of individuals whose violation of
26	paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of Section 3-3-7 of the

## HB0386 Enrolled - 11 - LRB101 03664 SLF 48672 b

1	Unified Code of Corrections allegedly occurred while
2	the individual was subject to conditions of electronic
3	or GPS monitoring;
4	(B) the number of individuals who had violations of
5	paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of Section 3-3-7 of the
6	Unified Code of Corrections alleged against them who
7	were never subject to electronic or GPS monitoring
8	during their current term of release; and
9	(C) the number of individuals who had violations of
10	paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of Section 3-3-7 of the
11	Unified Code of Corrections alleged against them who
12	were subject to electronic or GPS monitoring for any
13	period of time during their current term of their
14	release, but who were not subject to such monitoring at
15	the time of the alleged violation of paragraph (1) of
16	subsection (a) of Section 3-3-7 of the Unified Code of
17	Corrections.
18	(Source: P.A. 96-761, eff. 1-1-10.)