



THE ADVOCATE

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Marthas and Marys..... 1
 The Burns Case..... 1
 Facebookin..... 2
 Doing His Time Ministry..... 2
 The Sex Offender Test..... 3
 RSOL Conference..... 3
 Citizen’s Advocacy Meeting..... 4
 CCJJ Mandatory Parole Committee. 4
 Are You an SVP? Probably Not..... 5
 Benchmark Chart..... 7

AFC MISSION STATEMENT

AFC supports those with a sex offense and their families by:

- Advocating for change in sex offense laws and policies, and for the adherence to constitutional rights;
- Educating the public, lawmakers, and the judiciary;
- Promoting the successful treatment and reintegration of those with an offense into the community, thus reducing victimization and enhancing the safety of all.

• **CONTACT AFC**

Mail:

P. O. Box 103392
 Denver, CO 80250

Phone:

720-329-9096

Email:

advocates4changeafc@gmail.com

Website:

www.advocates4change.org

MARTHAS AND MARYS

A MESSAGE FROM THE AFC CHAIR

During his time on earth Jesus had among his many friends Martha and Mary. Martha was the ‘doer’ always busy keeping things in order, being a great hostess etc. Mary was the quiet one contemplating and praying. We at AFC are the ‘Marthas’ attending committee meetings such as CCJJ (Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice), SOMB (Sex Offender Management Board), their numerous subcommittee meetings, conferring with legislators, and attending their town hall events, meeting with DOC executive team members and staff, and doing hours of research and writing. Our BAG (Breakfast Action Group) meets once a week. We disseminate information from the many meetings various members have attended as well as report on upcoming meetings and events. We discuss how we will proceed with the many projects we have going. Over the past few weeks we have increased our attendance at these BAG meetings and best of all we have greatly increased the amount of participation and help we receive from these wonderful additions to our group. We do have a lot of really smart and knowledgeable people at the table who are willing to take the time and effort to advance our cause.

For those in prison and those unable to spend countless hours working with us, you are the ‘Marys’. You provide the desperately needed prayers and provide us funds and words of encouragement. We appreciate you! CCJJ has a committee looking at reducing parole time and we are hoping and praying that they will include S.O.’s. The SOMB has a committee looking at revising the SVP Assessment. Our hope and prayer is for the committee to look at reassessing the inmates who have been burdened wrongly by the SVP label.

There are many issues at stake right now so the Marthas and Marys need to forge ahead and keep working to make all of our lives better.

Carolyn Turner, Chair

Advocates for Change

The Burns Case

A new Colorado SOMB subcommittee, temporarily called Contact with Children, has been formed to discuss the local impact of a recent US Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit decision regarding constitutional rights of parents with sexual offenses. Even though this is a federal ruling, the Colorado State Court expects to be affected by the ruling since Colorado is a part of the Tenth Circuit.

As a response to the Burns case, the court has prefaced that special condition with the phrase “Except for the immediate family members...” They also included this footnote: “Immediate family member is defined as siblings, grandchildren, persons to whom the offender stands in *loco parentis*, and persons living in the offender’s household and related by blood or marriage.

Because the Colorado SOMB Standards and Guidelines ALSO restrict offenders’ contact with anyone under 18 *including their own children*; this is being looked at for revision as well. Treatment providers are expressly prohibited, under current guidelines, from treating anyone who has contact with **anyone** under 18. The SOMB has created a short-term solution to this issue by creating a “Variance” that the

therapist or offender can apply for and receive, which waives this restriction from treatment.

AFC believes there will be broader ramifications from this ruling as well including a complete revision of the section in the Standards and Guidelines about contact with persons under 18 and, most likely, a revision to DOC AR's concerning visitation rights for offenders with their children. The guidelines that prevent treatment providers from offering treatment to those who have contact with their children are the same guidelines DOC has been using to justify restricting offenders from having visits with their children.

The SOMB as well as treatment providers inside and outside of prison are examining this issue and determining their potential actions. AFC will keep you posted.

Facebookin'

By Jim Lenzini

AFC is constantly searching for more effective methods to inform our membership of information surrounding sex offense issues. Through our affiliations with such groups as Colorado CURE, RSOL (Reform Sex Offender Laws), Nebraskans Unafraid and others, we get emails and news stories from around the country and, literally, around the world about these issues.

AFC already has this newsletter, our website and the occasional "Blast" emails we send out with important updates but, just recently, we have started something new: we created a Facebook page! With this page we can post links to news stories and other information our membership can use. To find us simply search for "Advocates4Change" and choose the one (there are several groups using that name) that shows the scales of justice next to the name.

There are actually two Facebook pages: one is a Community page called Advocates4Change; the other is called Advocates Change. The difference in the two is that with the community page you don't need to "friend" us to read our postings. On the community page you can still "like", comment or even share a story. The other page is called Advocates Change and on this page you CAN friend us which allows you to receive our postings as part of your regular Facebook news feeds.

Below is just a *tiny* sampling of the many news stories we have posted in the past few weeks:

12 Reasons to worry about our criminal justice system, from a prominent conservative federal judge

Washington Post July 14, 2015 –A prominent conservative federal judge lists 12 reasons we need to worry about our criminal justice system. He feels much of what is done in the law is guesswork. He cites unreliable eyewitness accounts, fingerprint evidence that uses latent fingerprints, unreasonably low standards for the accuracy of other forensic evidence, and excessive reliance on flawed human memory. The beliefs that innocent people don't confess, juries follow instructions they understand, prosecutors play fair, a case must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, and police investigations are objective also contribute to wrongful consequences to the defendant. Many cases are resolved with a guilty plea, which may or may not be accurate. Many believe in the fallacy of long sentences deter crime.

Judge: Sex offender GPS monitoring lawsuit can proceed Delaware online July 16,2015 – A judge has refused to block a lawsuit challenging a state law requiring certain sex offenders to wear an ankle GPS monitor. The ACLU filed suit against the state stating the GPS monitoring law enacted in 2007 is unconstitutional because it is being applied to those convicted of crimes committed **before** 2007.

Tulsa Sex Offenders Avoid Detection By Listing Their Address As "Homeless" NewsOn6.com July 17, 2015- After a sex offender is released from prison, they are supposed to register their home address with law enforcement. Those addresses are put into a statewide map so the public can know where they're staying. But some Tulsa offenders are avoiding detection by simply registering as "homeless."

From The Los Angeles Times - State laws on sex offenders should not be crafted by emotion. This article cites Jessica's Law which established the National Sex Offender Registry and residency restrictions, stating that the unfocused application of sex offender laws hurts rather than enhances public safety.

From The New York Times – A front page New York Times story highlighted some of the many cruelties that sex offender registry statutes visit upon people *after* they have served their duly imposed prison sentences.

Does public shaming guarantee public safety? National Public Radio July 10, 2015-There is increasing evidence that public registries of convicted sex offenders may be doing more harm than good. Rehabilitation has become almost impossible for some 800,000 people, many of whom – including teenagers – don't really belong on the lists.

Doing His Time Ministry

By former Colorado Inmate Jim

On Tuesday, February 17th, 2015, the Advocates for Change general meeting had as its guest speaker Chris Mays, the Operations Manager for Doing His Time Prison Ministry.

Chris is a self-described "former knucklehead" who spent 31 calendar years in CDOC. He says he sold drugs, brought in contraband and a lot of the other "stupid stuff" guys get into in prison. Chris also liked to take "vacations" from prison life and would either climb the fence or find other ways to leave the prison grounds – once for as long as 18 months! Those escapes added an additional 55 years to what was originally a four year prison sentence.

Early in the 90's Chris realized he'd become a man he did not respect and cried out to God for a changed heart and a new life. He became a prison chaplain at Limon and then at other facilities for over 19 years. Chris was finally sent to community corrections in 2011 and then paroled. Recently, the parole board decided to forgive Chris' past foolishness and instead focus on the great work he has done for Doing His Time Ministry and released him from his parole 16 months early! Chris' story is living testimony that a person can change if they want to, bring that knowledge to others and prove to society that people can and do change if given the chance. Chris took over as Operations Manager of Doing His Time in 2011 and has been vital in assisting offenders and family members as they deal with their ordeal. Chris' experience inside and in the

THE SEX OFFENDER TEST – THE ABEL SCREENING/ Perspective of a layman

By Peggy Martin

community gives him a unique insight into the needs of the offender and their families.

Doing His Time Prison Ministry was founded by a man named Jim Vogelzang, a Christian man. When Jim asked the Lord how best to use his resources, the Lord told him to mentor prisoners. While unexpected, since Jim had never been involved with the law himself nor did he have family members who had, Jim dug in and began writing, visiting and mentoring inmates. He didn't stop there. Jim also co-wrote the Doing His Time devotional, a compilation of meditations and prayers written in language commonly used by inmates. The devotional has a foreword by Charles Colson, a former senior Nixon aide who went to prison over the Watergate scandal, became a Christian and dedicated the rest of his life teaching others how to turn their lives around. To date the ministry has donated over 300,000 copies of the devotional to prisons all over the world and it has been translated into six languages. Copies of the devotional can be found in all prison chaplain libraries or purchased through Amazon.com

Jim didn't stop there. He also saw a need to help families who could not visit their loved ones inside prison so he created the Barn-a-Bus ministry; the name derived from the apostle who liked to "take trips" and minister the teachings of Christ. Since 2000, Barn-a-Bus has taken thousands of family members to visit their loved ones (1,505 in 2014 alone) inside, logging an average of 55,000 miles a year with its "fleet" (currently four) of vans. Barn-a-Bus makes regularly scheduled trips on weekends to a number of prisons throughout the state as well as the Canon complex. Barn-a-Bus asks for a small donation from its passengers but will not turn anyone away who cannot afford to pay. To find out more information about this service and its schedule, call 303-300-3670 or check out the website at doinghistime.org and click on the Barn-a-Bus page.

And Jim kept going. He became discouraged by the recidivism rates for offenders and started looking into the many reasons offenders return to prison. One he identified was how little assistance there is for offenders in their first days and weeks out of prison so he created the 72-Hour Fund. This is a ministry dedicated solely to assisting parolees, probationers and those in halfway houses with some basic necessities. Items such as clothing, hygiene, bus coupons, backpacks, ID's and medication vouchers help make the offender's transition just that much easier to endure. Last year (2014), the 72-Hour Fund had over 1,600 client visits to its office; everyone walking out with something from clothes to bus coupons, hygiene, etc. as well as some encouraging words and prayer. To find out more about this service or to set an appointment call 303-292-2304.

Doing His Time Ministry and all its components are funded exclusively by private donations yet has still managed to meet the needs of those who need help. Doing His Time is a 501(c)3 non-profit and is always grateful to those who see, as they do, this need that must be met. If you can offer assistance in the way of clothes, hygiene products or money or would just like to visit the ministry and share a prayer, contact them at 303-292-2304. Also check out the Doing His Time website at doinghistime.org to read about their services, excerpts from the devotional, how to donate and hear testimony from the founder and the people who have benefited from this service.

After reading the article about the ABEL Screening test (The Sex Offender Test, The Marshall Project, July 9, 2015), I had the following reaction:

The ABEL screening test, used in virtually all assessments and PSI's of persons convicted of or accused of sexual offenses, "is based on a theory called 'visual reaction time.' Slides depict men, women, boys and girls of different ethnicities and ages. At its most basic level, it records how long the subject looks at each image and assumes that the longer a subject focuses on a slide, the greater the sexual interest in the slide's content.

Almost every scientific article about the usefulness of the questionnaire and test of 'visual reaction time' has been written by Abel or others who work directly with him.

My husband recently underwent an intake screening at a SO therapy treatment provider and described for me the tests he was subjected to. The Abel screening was included. It made me wonder how I would score on such a test.

I would probably linger on the pictures of children and be assessed as a danger to children. I love kids and truly appreciate their beauty and innocence. The last thing I would ever do is harm a child in any way. I would linger on their photos because I would take the time to appreciate their nuances and the expressions in their faces.

I love cats. If they threw in a couple photos of cats I would surely linger on these to appreciate the markings each cat has that makes them individuals. I love the expressions on their faces. I call seeing a picture of a cat my cat fix (Level III). Level II is seeing a live cat, and Level I is actually petting a cat. Am I sexually attracted to cats? Mr. Abel would conclude so.

I also love birds and am called a bird nerd by many of my friends. Any picture of a bird (especially owls) would cause me to linger on it to make a proper identification, and then a little longer to appreciate its awesomeness. Am I sexually attracted to birds (especially owls)? Mr. Abel would again conclude so.

Just because someone spends a little longer looking at a picture of anything does not constitute a sexual attraction. What is amazing to me is that Mr. Abel, the SOMB, the courts, and therapy groups even consider this type of screening as valid. How long would the aforementioned people spend looking at different photos? What would be concluded about their sexual attractions? I believe I have demonstrated how ludicrous the theory behind this test is.

RSOL Conference

AFC members attended the 7th Annual Conference in Dallas, Texas. It was the largest conference to date with over 170 people there. The conference has been held the last two years at the Skillman Church of Christ whose pastor generously allows RSOL to meet there. There were two and half days of speakers and opportunities to meet advocates from around the nation. It's a wonderful experience with an exciting educational opportunity.

The conference is such a good time for learning what is happening currently in areas of research, litigation, residency restrictions, criminal law, registries, and advocacy tips. There were speakers from California, Janice Bellucci (Getting Rid of Presence Restrictions); Maryland, Nancy Forster (Challenging State Registries); University of Arkansas, Julie Baldwin and Tusty ten Bensel (Collateral Consequences of SO Laws); Paul Rigney (registrant travel and international Megan's Law); Massachusetts, Eric Tennen (Are Risk Based Registration Schemes Worth the Risk?), Texas, Richard Gladden (Online Identifiers and the Constitution) and from New York the Keynote Speaker, Emily Horowitz ([Protecting Our Kids? How Sex Offender Laws are Failing Us](#)).

Emily Horowitz, PhD, is a sociologist from New York and declared that the RSOL Conference was the best conference she had ever attended. Her PhD dissertation was on domestic violence. She had heard that the police weren't taking the domestic violence cases seriously and wanted to see how judges handled these cases. While sitting in many court hearings she learned that batterers were not monsters and that victims were complicated. She did learn that judges were severe in their sentencing. Emily started thinking more critically about the criminal justice system where she learned about the Jesse Friedman case in New York City. Mr. Friedman was the topic of an Academy Award Nominated film called "Capturing the Friedman's". Jesse Friedman was charged with child sex abuse after his father had been accused of the same thing while giving computer lessons to young people. Jesse's father, Abraham, was found to have child pornography and when parents of the students found out about this, a parent accused him of abuse. Jesse Friedman confessed under pressure.

While studying a variety of cases, Dr. Horowitz began to notice that the climate around sex offenses was weird and warped. She said people are more comfortable with serial killer studies. She said that child sex abuse began to decline in 1992 but the hysteria led to Megan's Law in 1996 (the first registry legislation) and the Adam Walsh Act in 2006. She states that it's clear from the early decline of abuse cases that these acts did nothing to cause a decline in child sex abuse. Dr. Horowitz states that there is no research that the registry works and she says it is not effective.

The United States is going on 30 years of sex panic. Looking back at the 60's child molesters were considered a joke but as the awareness of child abuse grew a moral panic began. In order to show how important children were, one response to help victims was to punish people as much as possible. People believe that child sex abuse is the worst thing that can happen to a child so great punishment is OK.

With all the laws created in this area, Dr. Horowitz states research shows these laws don't make children safer. The laws themselves are destructive to offenders and their families who live with a sense of fear, shame and loneliness. In order to explain her point of view and to address research in this area, Dr. Horowitz has written a just published book, [Protecting our Kids? How Sex Offender Laws are Failing Us](#). She explores whether the laws create unfair practices that can lead to vigilante justice and other problems. Her research shows that because of current policies and laws with the help of the media, sex offenders have come to loom as greater than life monsters.

She shows how sex offender laws are not effective and engender destructive fear and anxiety. The book helps people to understand the impact by sharing interviews with people with a sex offense and their families describing day-to-day realities of living on the registry. She has found in her studies that undue panic is preventing policymakers from addressing the true threats to children – poverty and growing inequality.

CDOC July 8th Citizen Advocacy Meeting

Editor's Note: Due to limited space, the editor was forced to limit the notes published here to issues concerning S.O.'s Apologies.

Steve Hager, Director of Prisons, ran the meeting. Of note, Executive Director Rick Raemisch, Deputy Executive Director Kellie Wasko, and Parole Board Chair, Brandon Shaffer were not in attendance.

The question was raised of why safety plans aren't being approved by the Parole Officer and Treatment therapists inside the prison in advance of being released. This would make it possible for new parolees to hunt for a job, drive, and do other necessary things immediately upon release. Right now new parolees are not allowed to do many of the necessary things they need to do until treatment has begun, generally about a month later. Then safety plans have to be approved by both the therapist and parole, frequently taking another month or more. This causes undue hardship on the parolee who needs to get a job, find housing, etc. (*Editor's Note: AFC learned later at the Continuity of Care Committee meeting that SOMB has developed a safety plan form that some parole and probation officers are now using to help mitigate this issue.*)

An AFC member wrote to us asking about getting married while an inmate. The AR that allowed proxy marriages has been revised, and no longer allows them. Inmates that wish to marry can still utilize the absentee procedure. DOC staff will not be witnesses to the marriage, nor will they witness signatures.

Only 4 SOs that have met criteria have been up before the parole board at CMRC. 3 were full-boarded, 2 were released on parole, and 2 were set back a year.

There have been 9 requests requesting contact through the new VOD (Victim/Offender Dialogue).

The information on the Global Wait List for SOTMP treatment is very accurate. Both determinate and indeterminate inmates are getting into treatment.

The last five years of SO parole:

- 7,098 paroled between 6/1/10 and 5/31/15
- 3,136 have been revoked on technical violations
- 367 have been revoked for a new crime, not necessarily a new sexual crime

Many SOs are finding they cannot get paroled because there is such a backup to do PCCs and disclosures through treatment. These are frequently taking months to complete. SOTMP is now allowing facility supervisors to lead disclosures. There were only two persons allowed to lead disclosures in the past, now there are four. Hopefully this will allow disclosures to be done in a more timely manner.

CCJJ MANDATORY PAROLE MEETING MINUTES

Editor's Note: This was the first meeting of the CCJJ Mandatory Parole subcommittee held back in March 2015. It is published here to give the readers a picture of the attendees and the philosophies they are bringing to the meeting.

Attendees:

Doug Wilson, Public Defenders Office, CHAIR
 Brandon Shaffer, Parole Board
 Charles Garcia, Colorado Bar Association
 Kate Horn-Murphy, Victims Advocate, 17th Judicial District
 Michael Dougherty, Jefferson County District Attorney's Office
 Christie Donner, Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition
 Alison Morgan for Kellie Wasko, Parole, DOC
 Daniel Kagan, State Representative, House District #3
 James Quinn, Attorney General's Office

Absent:

Ellen Roberts, State Senator, Senate District 6
 Members were asked to share their initial expectations about where the group will go over the next 6 months, and what they will report back to the full CCJJ. A brief summary of their replies:

Brandon Shaffer wants to explore whether we are actually keeping communities safer with mandatory parole. He wants to know why revocation rates are so high and why more people aren't succeeding.

Charles Garcia believes that currently there's no real incentive to do well on parole. Parolees are stuck with their entire parole sentence whether they do great or do poorly.

Kate Horn-Murphy wanted to make sure that the group incorporated victim notification issues and to include enhanced victim participation issues into any changes regarding the parole process.

Michael Dougherty wants everyone to have a true understanding of what a sentence (with parole) will actually be like, to establish a more accurate date at the start of someone's sentence how long they will be on paper.

Christie Donner believes there are problems at an operational level and significant structural problems as well. The bottom line is that nobody knows what a sentence actually means in this state.

Alison Morgan believes the technical violation revocation process is broken and that there is too heavy a reliance on the Division of Adult Parole for revocations. A technical violation does not make an offender better when they return to the community and it likely makes them worse.

Representative Kagan would like to see an increase in overall effectiveness of parole, making discretionary parole more available.

James Quinn wants everyone to understand the actual purpose of parole. Is it to reintegrate, to monitor someone, or is it punishment? The defined purpose is essential in terms of directing resources.

Christie Donner pointed out that Colorado does in fact have a "Purpose of Parole" statute (17-22.5-102.5) that highlights the following three resolutions:

-To punish a convicted offender by assuring that his length of incarceration and period of parole supervision are in relation to the seriousness of his offense;

-To assure the fair and consistent treatment of all convicted offenders by eliminating unjustified disparity in length of incarceration, and establishing fair procedures for the imposition of a period of parole supervision; and

-To promote rehabilitation by encouraging the successful reintegration of convicted offenders into the community while recognizing the need for public safety.

The group then went on to discuss the history of parole, both nationally and in Colorado. For many years, parole boards didn't want guidelines to impede their discretion. In 2008/2009 CCJJ recommended guidelines be developed, and those guidelines have been in place in Colorado since 2010.

It is significant to note that there are three different release guideline instruments in Colorado. One is for sex offenders, one for non-sex offenders, and the third is used for those being revoked off of parole. Brandon stated they can't use the PBRGI (Parole Board Release Guidelines Instrument) for sex offenders because it incorporates the CARAS score. It was noted that the guidelines instrument also includes the LSI score and the CARAS has predictability for sex offenders. The PBRGI was designed for the parole board in Colorado to provide a consistent framework for the board to evaluate and weigh the statutory release-decision factors and based on a structured decision matrix, to offer an advisory release decision recommendation according to Statute CRS 17-22.5-107(1).

Regarding parole in Colorado:

- When the board is looking at a case they consider risk scale, conduct violations, age, and escape history.
- The way things are set up currently, COPD violations result in a "double hit" because violations are included in the CARAS and again on PBRGI.
- Research shows that static factors provide the best indicator of risk for reoffending.
- The original goal for the PBRGI was to balance risk and readiness.
- The risk info is attainable and verifiable, but it's more difficult on the readiness side to quantify things like treatment participation, parole plans, etc.
- Parole Board decisions for FY 2014:
 - The board designated 25% of offenders for release and 75% for deferral
 - The PBRGI recommended 46% offenders for release and 51% for deferral
 - 68% of all decisions agreed with the PBRGI and 32% of all decisions departed from the PBRGI.
- Brandon stated he makes up his mind during a parole interview and uses the PBRGI score as a tie-breaker" when he can't make up his mind.
- The board agreed with the PBRGI decision to DEFER 93% of the time
- The board agreed with the PBRGI decision to RELEASE only 43% of the time.
- In 2013 **Colorado had a high of 47%** admissions that were parole violators. The average for ALL other states in the nation was 27%

ARE YOU AN SVP? PROBABLY NOT

By Mike Dell

There are currently two ways in which you can challenge your Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) status.

It was previously upheld in the Colorado courts that a person designated as an SVP could not challenge their status because the SVP Assessment was revised by the SOMB. However, in 2013, the Colorado Court of Appeals in three cases (*People v. Gallegos*, 240 P.3d 882 (Colo. App. 2009), *aff'd*, 2013 CO 45, 307 P.3d 1096; *People v. Hunter*, 2013 CO 48, 307 P.3d 1083; *People v. Tunis*, 2013 COA 161, 318 P.3d 524) found that the SOMB had exceeded their authority in interpreting the statute.

(C.R.S. 18-3-414.5 ANNOTATIONS)

Currently the two entities responsible, the SOMB and the Div. of Crim. Justice, Office of Research & Statistics (DCJ/ORS) have taken no action to rectify their actions except to re-draft the SVP Assessment. As the revision is based upon a legal decision, there are grounds to challenge.

The second issue is that the Colorado Department of Corrections SOTMP program was performing SVP Assessments retroactively up until or at least through 2012. The above was confirmed by members of the SOTMP in 2012 and resulted in a revision to AR 700-19.

Retroactive assessments were performed on individuals with a prior sexual offense but serving a non-sex offense period of incarceration. The statute does not provide for this and no opinion was provided by the Attorney General.

We have been advised that the proposed remedy in either case is to file a 35C Illegal Sentence for a court imposed designation under the first situation and a Rule 106 filing (CRCP 106(a)(4) is the exclusive remedy for determining whether a governmental body exercising a quasi-judicial function has abused its discretion or exceeded its jurisdiction. In addition – (b) *Limitations as to Time*. Where a statute provides for review of the acts of any governmental body or officer or judicial body by certiorari or other writ, or for a proceeding in *quo warranto*, relief therein provided may be had under this Rule. If no time within which review may be sought is provided by any statute, a complaint seeking review under subsection (a)(4) of this Rule shall be filed in the district court not later than 28 days after the final decision of the body or officer. A timely complaint may be amended at any time with leave of the court, for good cause shown, to add, dismiss or substitute parties, and such amendment shall relate back to the date of filing of the original complaint against the Dept. of Corrections and Parole Board for either situation.

There may be time limitations depending upon the action but part of the consideration is the inaction by the Department of Corrections and the Dept. of Public Safety (which houses the SOMB and DCJ/ORS) to rectify.

The Colorado Judicial system has established an online location where you can obtain information on different types of legal forms and the instructions for completing them.

Colorado Judicial Branch Self-Help Center

https://www.courts.state.co.us/Self_Help/Index.cfm

If you don't see what you are looking for, then you want to choose "All Court forms and instructions".

There will be several selections, including Appeals, which will take you to the following page.

<https://www.courts.state.co.us/Forms/SubCategory.cfm?Category=Appeals>

Remember that the information covers both Civil and Criminal, so make sure you are in the right area.

GEO owns and operates SO therapy classes in Indiana that are mandated for registrants. In GEO's F10 statement, they quote:

"Competition for inmates may adversely affect the profitability of our business. We compete with government entities and other private operators on the basis of cost, quality and range of services offered, experience in managing facilities and reputation of management and personnel. Barriers to entering the market for the management of correctional and detention facilities may not be sufficient to limit additional competition in our industry. In addition, some of our government customers could assume the management of a facility currently managed by us upon the termination of the corresponding management contract or, if such customers have capacity at the facilities which they operate, they may take inmates currently housed in our facilities and transfer them to government operated facilities. **Since we are paid on a per diem basis with no minimum guaranteed occupancy under some of our contracts, the loss of such inmates and resulting decrease in occupancy could cause a decrease in both our revenues and our profitability.**"

Detaining people for profit is a dangerous precedent...

The chart on the next page is called a "Benchmark Chart" to help offenders and those interested in ascertaining how they are doing. It was provided by Dianne at CO-CURE.

Benchmarks for People Coming Home from Prison and Jail

Levels of Success/ What to Measure	<u>On the Way Back to Prison</u>	<u>In Trouble</u>	<u>Barely Making It</u>	<u>Doing OK</u>	<u>Doing Well</u>	<u>Thriving</u>
Criminal Thinking	Commits serious crimes; has no qualms about hurting others.	Commits minor crimes; has reservations about hurting others.	Avoids committing crimes.	Sees obeying the law as a fair price for living in society.	Avoids risky situations that could lead to crimes.	Helps others to live crime-free.
Substance Abuse	Addiction drives committing new crimes.	Substance abuse impairs ability to hold a job or attend school.	Uses substances but not in ways that interfere with everyday living.	Avoids harmful and illegal substances.	Avoids situations that lead to using harmful and illegal substances.	Helps others avoid using harmful and illegal substances.
Housing	Lives on the street.	Lives in shelters or transitional housing.	Lives in subsidized housing.	Provides stable housing for one's self.	Provides stable housing for self and family.	Provides attractive, safe housing for self and family.
Legal Employment	Unemployed for a long time; does not try to find work.	Tries to find work, unsuccessfully.	Works occasionally.	Works regularly, at or near minimum wage.	Earns more than minimum wage, but in a dead-end job.	Has a career with good pay and a bright future.
Associations	Leads others to commit crimes and use illegal substances.	Associates with others who commit crimes and use drugs.	Has almost no positive family and personal ties.	Has some personal contacts, but none close.	Has close relationships with supportive family and friends.	Is a resource and positive influence for family and friends.
Finances	Depends on others for food, clothing and medical care.	Is deeply and uncontrollably in debt.	Barely earns enough to meet personal needs; often is in debt.	Except for a home mortgage, is debt free; earns enough to meet personal and family needs.	Saves enough to meet emergency needs.	Saves enough money to support a comfortable retirement.

This chart is based on one developed by the Center for Research and Evaluation, Massachusetts Commonwealth Corporation.

Editorial Policy

The Advocate is published by Advocates for Change. We provide information on our efforts to affect change in legislation, treatment, and re-integration into the community, primarily for those who have been convicted of a sex offense. Nothing offered by AFC is intended to be legal advice, and any information provided should never be a substitute for obtaining counsel and/or conducting your own research.

Submissions from inmates/offenders, parolees, and members, are encouraged. Please limit articles to 300 words. The editor reserves the right to publish all, part or none of the contributions submitted. Send contributions for publication and/or comments on the newsletter to: Advocates for Change, Newsletter Editor, PO Box 103392, Denver, CO 80250.

PLEASE JOIN US

Membership Fee is \$20 for family membership, \$5 per year for returning citizens, and 8 stamps for those on the inside. Any additional donations are gratefully accepted.

Today's Date: _____

Name: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

Email: (optional) _____

- Newsletter preference: regular news letter
 plain newsletter in plain envelope
 email
 do not sent a newsletter

Please feel free to share an application with a friend or a family member. Call 720-329-9096, if you have any questions or comments.

**Send membership applications to: AFC Membership
P. O. Box 103392
Denver, CO 80250**



**Advocates for Change
P. O. Box 103392
Denver, CO 80250**