



Minutes

Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy
House of Delegates Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
December 11, 2018

Commission Members in Attendance:

Honorable Glenn T. Harrell, Jr., Chair
Honorable Shannon E. Avery, Vice-Chair
LaMonte E. Cooke
Martha Danner, *representing Secretary Stephen T. Moyer*
William M. Davis, Esquire, *representing Public Defender Paul B. DeWolfe*
Honorable Brian L. DeLeonardo
Barbara Dorsey Domer
Elizabeth Embry, Esquire, *representing Attorney General Brian E. Frosh*
Richard A. Finci, Esquire
Honorable Patrice E. Lewis
Colonel William M. Pallozzi
Honorable James P. Salmon
Delegate Joseph F. Vallario

Staff Members in Attendance:

Sarah Bowles
Stacy Najaka, Ph.D.
David Soulé, Ph.D.
Molly Triage

Visitors: Angelina Guarino, Senior Director of Justice Reinvestment, GOCCP; Don Hogan, Chief of Legislation, GOCCP; Danielle Gaines, Reporter, Maryland Matters

1. Call to order

Judge Harrell called the meeting to order.

2. Roll call and declaration of quorum

The meeting began at 5:29 pm when attendance reached a quorum.

3. Approval of minutes from the September 17, 2018 MSCCSP business meeting

The Commission approved the minutes as submitted.

4. Update on Justice Reinvestment Act – Angelina Guarino and Don Hogan

Angelina Guarino and Don Hogan presented an update on the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA) including outcomes at the one-year mark and next steps. Statewide intakes and returns to prison declined slightly and technical revocations decreased by 1.2% since fiscal year



2017. On the local level, the sentenced population declined and the pre-trial population increased. The average placement time for Health General Article, § 8-507 beds was 97 days in early FY 2017. This figure improved to 10 days and remains around the 10-day mark.

Ms. Guarino explained that administrative release is a new form of parole established under the JRA. Seven hundred inmates were screened for administrative release eligibility. Twenty-one percent were deemed eligible, and 60% of those were released. The JRA also expanded medical and geriatric parole. Medical parole applications increased over pre-JRA years. Seventy-two percent of applicants were eligible, and 45% of those were granted some form of parole. None of the applicants for geriatric parole have qualified, and Judge Long requested that the Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board (JROB) investigate potential barriers for those individuals. The JROB determined that few individuals meet the criteria necessary to qualify for geriatric parole.

The JRA addressed several supervision elements of parole and probation, including risk screening, earned compliance credits, and graduated sanctions. Ms. Guarino reported that agents administered over 11,000 LSI-R assessments to active supervision clients at the intake stage. Currently, agents first administer a shorter preliminary screener and only administer the LSI-R to individuals who score moderate- to high-risk on the preliminary screener. The LSI-R is not currently used during the preparation of pre-trial investigation reports. Eighty-two percent of supervision clients earned compliance credits, meaning a majority of individuals on parole or probation fulfill the requirements of their sentence. Agents applied graduated sanctions in 1,365 instances that would previously be grounds for technical revocation.

Ms. Guarino addressed the cost-saving initiatives of the JRA. The Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board (JROB) will direct funding on the state- and local-level to programs that prioritize reinvestment in evidence-based treatment, re-entry and diversion programs, restitution collection, medical beds, and training of criminal justice actors. JROB identified a significant gap in evidence-based recidivism reduction programs in county-level detention centers across the state. JROB will direct funding towards closing such gaps. JROB plans on monitoring length of stay changes and revisiting priority benchmarks established by the Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. JROB will also monitor program availability and capacity across the state.

Judge Harrell commented on statutory citations with respect to restitution. Judge Harrell noted a recent Maryland Court of Appeals case (*Ingram v. State*, 2018) that addressed an exception to the Criminal Procedure Article governing restitution as an example of one of the many issues with restitution in the state. Judge Harrell noted that that the JROB and/or General Assembly may want to review statutory references to restitution and specifically examine conflicting language from the Criminal Law Article that requires mandatory restitution for cases involving theft convictions. Mr. Hogan responded that JROB will investigate ways to streamline restitution.

Judge Avery asked if any JRA initiatives address violence reduction or if any research initiatives will investigate how the criminal justice system processes violent offenders. Judge



Avery specifically asked about case studies that trace violent offenders back through the criminal justice system to see if and/or when changes in the law (such as the JRA) or in corrections/supervision policy made a difference for that individual. Mr. Hogan said that JROB engaged in partnership with Johns Hopkins to study issues of gun violence in Baltimore City. Ms. Guarino added that reinvestment into the re-entry and recidivism reduction infrastructure, including abuser intervention and anger management, will benefit those individuals who are at-risk of both violent victimization and also potentially committing violent crimes.

Brian DeLeonardo asked how the JROB is investing cost-savings into local pre-trial programs. Mr. DeLeonardo asked if a local official must write grants to acquire funding and expressed concern that local agencies may lack the structure for such a process. Ms. Guarino responded that JROB hosts informational webinars before the funding is released to help jurisdictions through the process, and that 15 jurisdictions requested grant funding. Mr. DeLeonardo asked if funding could be distributed consistently across the state, for example by court commissioners.

Elizabeth Embry asked what population the parole and probation agents screen with the LSI-R assessment. Ms. Guarino answered that agents administer the LSI-R to clients who do not screen as low-risk on a preliminary risk assessment tool. Agents began screening new active supervision clients and as capacity builds, can expand beyond that population. Ms. Embry asked Ms. Guarino and Mr. Hogan what they believe are the biggest challenges to improving supervision to better suit re-entry needs. Ms. Guarino responded that one of the biggest challenges in shifting towards qualitative case management is appropriate sized caseloads.

Judge Harrell thanked Ms. Guarino and Mr. Hogan for their presentation.

5. Guidelines Subcommittee Report – Judge Shannon Avery

Judge Avery indicated that the Guidelines Subcommittee had a very productive meeting, and voted unanimously in support of the staff's recommendations. Judge Avery stated that Dr. Soulé would present the details of the Guidelines Subcommittee report.

a. Proposed revisions to corrections options (Action Item)

Dr. Soulé referred the Commission to the corresponding memo, *Proposed Revisions to Corrections Options*. Dr. Soulé noted that pursuant to the JRA, the MSCCSP conducted a study of alternatives to incarceration in Maryland. This report included seven recommended actions. Recommended action #4 advises that the MSCCSP should collect additional information on sentences utilizing corrections options to inform potential revisions to its definition. In accordance with recommended action #4, staff submitted to the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) a list of updates to the Maryland Automated Guidelines System (MAGS) that will enable the MSCCSP to collect additional information on alternatives to incarceration. This process prompted staff to review with the Guidelines Subcommittee the current definition of corrections options. Dr. Soulé noted that it is important for the Commission to carefully review what alternatives to incarceration are defined as a “*corrections options*” because by guidelines



rules, a judge may impose these specific alternatives in lieu of an imprisonment sentence while remaining compliant with the sentencing guidelines.

Dr. Soulé noted that after review with the Guidelines Subcommittee, four potential revisions regarding what are defined as corrections options were identified. By addressing these proposed revisions, it is hoped that the Commission will establish a more clearly defined boundary for what does and what does not qualify as a corrections option. The MSCCSP staff can then work to better inform the judiciary and criminal justice practitioners about what guidelines-consistent alternatives to incarceration may be utilized.

Dr. Soulé noted that the first and third proposed actions are more in line with “housekeeping” or “clean-ups” with respect to the definition of corrections options, while the second and fourth proposed actions are policy-related questions. Therefore, he would address the proposed actions in that order.

Proposed Action # 1: Remove HIDTA Substance Abuse Treatment Programs from Definition of Corrections Options

Dr. Soulé noted that HIDTA is a grant program administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy that provides assistance to federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. HIDTA grants include funding and other forms of assistance, such as intelligence and information-sharing resources provided by the Drug Enforcement Agency. The HIDTA provides funding for drug courts in Anne Arundel County, Prince George’s County, and Baltimore City, and jurisdictions outside Maryland, but is not directly involved in the provision of substance abuse treatment programs. Given that the existing HIDTA-funded substance abuse treatment programs in Maryland include only select drug courts, participation in which would be defined as a corrections option under the current definition, the Guidelines Subcommittee recommends that HIDTA substance abuse treatment programs be removed from the definition of corrections options, as their current inclusion is really just a secondary way to indicate drug court.

Mr. DeLeonardo made a motion to adopt proposed action #1. Mr. Cooke seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #1.**

Proposed Action # 3: Revise the Language Referring to Other Programs

Dr. Soulé noted that the current definition of corrections options includes corrections options programs, similar to home detention or inpatient treatment, established under law involving terms and conditions that constitute the equivalent of confinement, and programs established by the State Division of Correction, if the program meets the Commission’s criteria. This language was borrowed from the definition of “custodial confinement” outlined in Senate Bill 91/Chapter 356 (2001). Inpatient/residential substance abuse treatment and inpatient/residential mental health treatment are commonly cited examples of other corrections options programs that would meet the criteria provided by the Commission.



To provide for better data collection and increased clarity, Dr. Soulé reported that the Guidelines Subcommittee recommends that residential treatment be explicitly noted in the definition of corrections options. Additionally, the Guidelines Subcommittee recommends that the final bullet point in the definition be revised to read, “Corrections options include programs established by the *Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) and/or local correctional agencies*, if the program meets the Commission’s criteria, as described above” (emphasis added), rather than “programs established by the State Division of Correction.”

Ms. Embry made a motion to adopt proposed action #3. Mr. DeLeonardo seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #3.**

Proposed Action # 2: Add Additional Problem-Solving Courts to the Definition of Corrections Options

Dr. Soulé noted that the current definition of corrections options includes drug courts. Drug courts involve enhanced supervision (compared to standard probation), substance abuse treatment, are evidence-based, and have been found to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for participants when compared to traditional criminal courts. Maryland offers additional problem-solving courts in select jurisdictions, including family/dependency drug court, DUI/drug court, mental health court, truancy court, veterans court, re-entry court, and Back on Track. Though not included in the current definition of corrections options, these additional problem-solving courts, like drug court, generally involve close supervision, are evidence-based, and have been found to improve outcomes for participants when compared to traditional criminal courts. Given their similarity to drug court and the body of evidence that generally supports the effectiveness of other problem-solving courts, Dr. Soulé reported that the Guidelines Subcommittee recommends that a sentence to any Maryland problem-solving court, as defined by the Administrative Office of the Courts’ (AOC) Office of Problem Solving Courts, be included in the definition of corrections options.

Ms. Domer made a motion to adopt proposed action #2. Mr. Cooke seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #2.**

Proposed Action # 4: Include Work Release and Weekend (or Other Discontinuous) Incarceration in the Definition of Corrections Options

Dr. Soulé noted that the final proposed action is to consider whether work release and weekend (or other discontinuous) incarceration should be defined as a corrections option. Work release is presently offered in 23 of 24 Maryland jurisdictions. These programs vary in their exact content, but generally provide opportunities for inmates to build skills that will assist in the reentry process. In Anne Arundel County, for example, inmates are assigned to jobs inside or outside the secure part of their holding institution based on security level. This program is available to newly sentenced offenders or inmates currently serving a sentence who meet eligibility criteria. In Montgomery County, the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation houses up to 143 inmates in their Pre-



Release Center (PRC). The PRC features work release components, as well as other treatment options and services.

Dr. Soulé noted that evaluations of work release programs in Maryland are scarce, but as noted in the memo, the Montgomery County's Pre-Release Center (which includes a work release component) did report lower recidivism rates compared to those who did not participate in the program. A larger evaluation of the work release program under Florida's Department of Corrections found significant differences between those who graduated from the program and those who did not participate. Program completers were significantly less likely to be arrested or convicted of a new felony within the 3-year follow-up timeframe. This group also had a significantly higher rate of employment over the follow-up period. An evaluation of work release programs in Minnesota reached similar findings, and also found that program completers worked more hours and earned higher wages than inmates who did not participate in the program.

Dr. Soulé noted that discontinuous incarceration is offered in all Maryland jurisdictions. The most common form of discontinuous incarceration, weekend incarceration, involves a defendant reporting to a local detention facility for one or more weekends, defined as Friday evening through Sunday. In some instances, due to employment or other obligations, a defendant may be ordered to serve his or her sentence on weekdays, for instance Monday to Wednesday. Weekend or other discontinuous incarceration is generally offered to defendants as an alternative to straight jail time to allow the defendant to maintain employment and parenting responsibilities in the community.

Dr. Soulé noted that, due to space constraints, the term will be listed as "discontinuous incarceration" on only the hard copy of the guidelines worksheet. The term will be listed more thoroughly as "weekend incarceration or other discontinuous incarceration" in MAGS and in the Maryland Sentencing Guidelines Manual (MSGM) where there are no space constraints.

Dr. Soulé noted that both work release and weekend (or other discontinuous) incarceration involve a term of confinement (thereby offering greater supervision than standard probation) and evidence shows that work release, similar to other current corrections options may reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for participants. Therefore, Dr. Soulé reported that the Guidelines Subcommittee recommends that work release and weekend (or other discontinuous) incarceration be added as Commission-defined "corrections options," thereby making sentences to work release and weekend (or other discontinuous) incarceration compliant with the sentencing guidelines.

Dr. Soulé additionally noted that, at sentencing, judges generally recommend an offender be allowed to participate in work release, but ultimately the local corrections authority determines if an offender may participate in work release. However, this is also true of home detention. Specifically, the MSGM instructs that a recommendation for home detention that is pending approval should be recorded as a home detention sentence, thereby qualifying that sentence as one utilizing corrections options.



Mr. Cooke made a motion to adopt proposed action #4. Mr. DeLeonardo seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #4.**

b. Proposed revisions to the sentencing guidelines worksheet (Action item)

Dr. Soulé referred Commissioners to the memo, *Proposed Revisions to the Sentencing Guidelines Worksheet*, and noted that the memo summarizes the proposed revisions and illustrates how the relevant sections of the current worksheet would change.

Proposed Action # 1: Separate *Reconsideration* and *Review* from the disposition types

Dr. Soulé noted that the first proposed guidelines worksheet revision is to separate *Reconsideration* and *Review* from the disposition types. Currently the disposition section of the worksheet lists several plea and trial disposition types as well as *Reconsideration* and *Review*, though the latter two are not technically disposition types. Separating out *Reconsideration* and *Review* would allow users to indicate both how the case was disposed (plea or trial) as well as whether or not the sentencing was a reconsideration or review. Currently these responses are mutually exclusive. Staff has identified a number of reconsideration and review cases that were coded on the worksheet as pleas or trials (rather than as reconsiderations or reviews). This is problematic because Criminal Procedure Article (CP), § 6-209 requires that the Commission review changes in original sentences that have occurred because of reconsiderations of sentences imposed under § 14–101 of the Criminal Law Article. The proposed revisions would enable staff to better identify such cases.

Judge Lewis asked why the language referring to the Commission’s statutory charge would not be explicitly stated on the worksheet. Dr. Soulé noted that space constraints limit the language that may be included on the worksheet. The MSGM and MAGS, however, would include additional information related to the reconsideration/review field.

Mr. Finci suggested that the language on the worksheet read “Is this a reconsideration or review,” instead of “Reconsideration or review.” Ms. Bowles confirmed that there is space to include that additional text.

Judge Lewis stated that the worksheet should read “Reconsideration imposed under 14-101 of the Criminal Law Article.” Judge Harrell made a motion to propose that the text, “crime of violence only” or “COVs only,” be added after the text “Reconsideration.” Mr. DeLeonardo seconded Judge Harrell’s motion to amend the proposed action.

Mr. DeLeonardo made a motion to adopt proposed action #1, as amended. Mr. Finci seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #1, as amended.**



Proposed Action # 2: Revise the racial categories so that they mirror those required by State Government Article (SG), § 10-603

Dr. Soulé noted that the second proposed revision to the guidelines worksheet is to modify the racial categories so that they mirror those required by State Government (SG) Article, § 10-603. SG, § 10-603 specifies that forms requiring the identification of individuals by race include the following racial categories:

- (i) American Indian or Alaska Native;
- (ii) Asian;
- (iii) Black or African American;
- (iv) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; and
- (v) White.

While the worksheet's current categories are similar to those of SG, § 10-603, several minor differences exist. For example, the current worksheet lists Black but not African American. The proposed revisions are consistent with the racial categories specified in SG, § 10-603 and provide for multiracial responses.

Ms. Domer asked whether respondents would be able to select more than one race. Dr. Soulé confirmed that respondents would be able to select more than one race.

Judge Avery noted that the Guidelines Subcommittee agreed that the State Government Article might not reflect most modern understanding of people's identities, but that the worksheet should be consistent with State law.

Mr. Finci made a motion to adopt proposed action #2. Mr. Cooke seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #2.**

Proposed Action # 3: Specify the "other" corrections options programs, and collect additional data on sentences utilizing other alternatives to incarceration

Dr. Soulé noted that the third proposed revision to the guidelines worksheet is to specify the "other" corrections options programs, and collect additional data on sentences utilizing other alternatives to incarceration. Currently the worksheet captures whether the offender's sentence included "drug court" and/or an "other" corrections options program, but it does not capture the nature of the "other" program. The proposed revisions to the worksheet would specify the "other" corrections options and would also capture other alternatives to incarceration.

Dr. Soulé noted that the revised corrections options field specifies options consistent with the memo the Commission just reviewed, including:

- Drug court;
- Other problem-solving court (specify);
- Home detention;
- Suspended sentence per CR, § 5-601(e);



- HG, § 8-507 order;
- Work release;
- Weekend or other discontinuous incarceration;
- Inpatient substance abuse treatment;
- Inpatient mental health treatment; and
- Other (explain).

Additionally, the other alternatives to incarceration field provides the following list of other alternatives:

- Outpatient substance abuse treatment,
- Outpatient mental health treatment, and
- Other (explain).

Dr. Soulé explained that this more detailed data, in combination with recidivism data, may be used to identify effective and promising alternatives to incarceration and to possibly expand the definition of corrections options.

Ms. Danner asked if the corrections options field would break out the different problem-solving courts or collapse them into one option. Dr. Soulé stated that, due to space constraints on the worksheet, all of the problem-solving courts (except for drug court) would be collapsed into one option, with a text box provided for users to indicate the specific problem-solving court.

Mr. DeLeonardo made a motion to adopt proposed action #3. Mr. Cooke seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #3.**

Proposed Action # 4: Remove *Subsequent Offender Filed* and *Restitution Requested*

Dr. Soulé noted that the fourth proposed revision to the guidelines worksheet is to remove *Subsequent Offender Filed* and *Restitution Requested*. The current worksheet provides space for sentences for three convicted offenses, and within each of those three sections includes the following Yes/No items:

- *Subsequent Offender Filed*,
- *Subsequent Offender Proven*,
- *Restitution Requested*, and
- *Restitution Proven*.

The proposed revisions would remove the *Subsequent Offender Filed* and *Restitution Requested* fields from each of the three convicted offenses sections.

Dr. Soulé noted that these fields are rarely filled out and offer little value. Additionally, removing these fields provides a counter-balance to the addition of items to collect more information regarding corrections options and alternatives to incarceration.



Mr. DeLeonardo made a motion to adopt proposed action #4. Mr. Finci seconded the motion. **The Commission voted unanimously to adopt proposed action #4.**

6. Executive Director Report – Dr. David Soulé

Dr. Soulé noted that he had four items to review.

a. Follow-up on recommendations from the JRA report on alternatives to incarceration (Status report)

Dr. Soulé noted that the MSCCSP report on alternatives to incarceration was submitted to the Governor and the JROB on January 1, 2018. The MSCCSP report included seven recommended actions. The first four recommendations were to be completed by the MSCCSP. Dr. Soulé reported that the Commission has taken the necessary steps or is currently working to complete these four recommended actions. As it has been close to one-year since the MSCCSP submitted its report on alternatives to incarceration, Dr. Soulé stated that he would report on activity related to the final three report recommendations (i.e., recommendations related to other State or local agencies).

Dr. Soulé reported that the Local Government Justice Reinvestment Commission is likely to take action on two of the recommendations from the report: (1) to create an online locator tool for alternatives to incarceration; and (2) to conduct a gap/needs analysis of available programming for offenders. Dr. Soulé noted that Ms. Guarino advised him that the Local Government Board, while they did not have a quorum at their last meeting, will likely vote to recommend to the Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board that the GOCCP fund these two actions using in-house funds or performance incentive grant funds. The GOCCP is building a similar online inventory of victim service programs and jail programming. The GOCCP is exploring the practice of annually revalidating the jail program inventory and has advised that they could expand that action to include the alternatives to incarceration inventory.

Dr. Soulé reported that the Guidelines Subcommittee discussed these actions by outside agencies during its November 29, 2018, teleconference and decided that no MSCCSP action was necessary. Given that the MSCCSP made the recommendations, however, the Guidelines Subcommittee suggested that MSCCSP staff should reach out to the GOCCP and ask if the MSCCSP may serve in an advisory role on these actions and particularly in relation to the development and upkeep of the online locator tool for alternatives to incarceration.

Dr. Soulé noted that the third recommendation for outside agencies was to expand the scope of the presentence investigation (PSI) report to include a validated risk-needs assessment (RNA). Dr. Soulé noted that he was previously in communications with Joe Clocker, then-Director of the Division of Parole and Probation (DPP), regarding this recommendation. Mr. Clocker retired on December 1, 2018, and referred Dr. Soulé to Walter Nolley, the Acting Director of the DPP, and Marcy Plimack, project manager for the JRA implementation, to continue discussions regarding the PSI. Dr. Soulé reported that he and Judge Avery participated in a conference call with Mr. Nolley and Ms.



Plimack on December 11, 2018, to hear about DPP's use of actuarial risk/needs assessment (RNA) tools and to maintain a line of communication about the final recommendation in the MSCCSP report to incorporate an RNA tool into the PSI.

Effective October 1, 2017, DPP is conducting an initial screening instrument for all individuals on community supervision. For those individuals assessed as moderate- or high-risk by the initial screen instrument, a comprehensive risk/needs assessment (the LSI-R instrument) is completed within 30-45 days of the start of supervision. DPP uses the RNA as a case planning tool to identify appropriate supervision levels and to identify appropriate programming based on the offender's needs. DPSCS plans to conduct a validation study on the LSI-R instrument now that it has been implemented for just over a year on a Maryland population.

Dr. Soulé reported that Mr. Nolley and Ms. Plimack have agreed to continue communications with the MSCCSP regarding their use of actuarial risk/needs assessment and to continue dialogue about the feasibility of using RNA to inform sentencing decisions.

Judge Avery noted that there is a difference in assessing the risk of recidivism and the risk of violence. Different tools are used for each. While DPSCS uses both types of tools, Judge Avery noted that they primarily use the LSI-R, which assesses a defendant's risk of recidivism and needs, rather than violence. The former tool focuses more on the defendant's current convicted offense than on the defendant's history. Judge Avery noted that when practitioners refer to non-violent offenders, they are often referring to non-violent offenses, and not the entirety of the defendant's offense/criminogenic or social history. Judge Avery expressed that it is important to have an evidence-based risk assessment within the PSI that evaluates the risk of violence.

b. Update on recent/upcoming feedback meetings and trainings (Status Report)

Dr. Soulé reported that the staff has been busy with multiple meetings and trainings since the last MSCCSP meeting in September. Dr. Soulé reported that he met with the circuit court judges in Anne Arundel County, Carroll County, and Montgomery County. The purpose of these meetings was to provide feedback on sentencing guidelines data specific to each jurisdiction, to educate on corrections options and how they impact sentencing guidelines compliance, and with respect to Anne Arundel and Carroll Counties, to plan for upcoming MAGS deployments.

Dr. Soulé reported that, as suggested at the July MSCCSP meeting, he conducted a presentation at the Maryland State's Attorney's Association's conference on November 6, 2018, to provide information and training regarding the sentencing guidelines.

Dr. Soulé reported that Sarah Bowles from the MSCCSP staff, has been filling in while the MSCCSP's training coordinator, Katharine Pembroke, is out on maternity leave. Ms. Bowles provided a training on the sentencing guidelines for the Baltimore City State's Attorneys' Office on October 10, 2018. Ms. Bowles also provided a MAGS training for



the law clerks in Montgomery County on October 18, 2018, and for the law clerks in Baltimore County on November 9, 2018. Finally, on December 7, 2018, Ms. Bowles conducted a MAGS orientation session for practitioners from Carroll County as they prepare for MAGS deployment on January 1, 2019.

c. Update on the Maryland Automated Guidelines System deployment (**Status Report**)

Dr. Soulé reported that Carroll County is scheduled for MAGS deployment on January 1, 2019, becoming the 22nd jurisdiction to utilize MAGS. Anne Arundel County is next on the deployment schedule, with a planned April 1, 2019, launch date. Finally, the MAGS deployment cycle is scheduled to be completed in the upcoming year when Baltimore City becomes the final jurisdiction to launch MAGS on October 1, 2019.

d. Update on MSCCSP annual report (**Status report**)

Dr. Soulé reminded Commissioners that the MSCCSP 2018 annual report is due on January 31, 2019. Dr. Soulé reported that the staff has begun preparations for this report and expects to send a draft for Commissioners to review by January 21, 2019. Dr. Soulé asked that the draft be kept internal to the MSCCSP and for Commissioners to send feedback, questions, or concerns relative to the annual report directly to him.

7. Proposed MSCCSP meeting dates for 2019 (Action Item)

Judge Harrell presented the meeting dates for 2019.

Tuesday, May 7, 2019

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

Tuesday, September 17, 2019

Tuesday, December 10, 2019

No objection was made concerning the proposed meeting dates for 2019.

8. Old business

None.

9. New business and announcements

None.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.