

**2023 HOUSE JUDICIARY**

**HB 1264**

# 2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Judiciary Committee**  
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1264  
1/24/2023

Relating to jail and regional correctional center definitions and alternatives to physical custody of individuals; and to provide a penalty.
--

Chairman Klemin opened the hearing on HB 1264 at 11:27 AM. Members present: Chairman Klemin, Vice Chairman Karls, Rep. Bahl, Rep. Christensen, Rep. Cory, Rep. Henderson, Rep. S. Olson, Rep. Rios, Rep. S. Roers Jones, Rep. Satrom, Rep. Schneider, Rep. VanWinkle, Rep. Vetter

## **Discussion Topics:**

- Inmate population plan
- Adult mental disorder
- Individual Justice Plan (IJP) process and services
- Eligibility for IJP

Daniel Gulya, Attorney with ND Protection and Advocacy Project: Testimony #15818

Veronica Zietz, Executive Director of Protection & Advocacy. Oral testimony.

Travis Finck, Executive Director, NDCLCI: Testimony #15723

Hearing closed at 11:45 AM.

*Delores Shimek, Committee Clerk*

# 2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Judiciary Committee**  
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1264  
1/30/2023

Relating to jail and regional correctional center definitions and alternatives to physical custody of individuals; and to provide a penalty.
--

Chairman Klemin opened the meeting on HB 1264 at 3:49 PM. Members present: Chairman Klemin, Vice Chairman Karls, Rep. Bahl, Rep. Christensen, Rep. Cory, Rep. Henderson, Rep. S. Olson, Rep. Rios, Rep. S. Roers Jones, Rep. Satrom, Rep. Schneider, Rep. VanWinkle, Rep. Vetter

## Discussion Topics:

- Individual Justice Planning
- Inmate population plan
- Committee Work

Representative Satrom moved a Do Pass on HB 1264.

Representative Roers Jones seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Representatives	Vote
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Karen Karls	Y
Representative Landon Bahl	Y
Representative Cole Christensen	N
Representative Claire Cory	Y
Representative Donna Henderson	Y
Representative SuAnn Olson	Y
Representative Nico Rios	Y
Representative Shannon Roers Jones	Y
Representative Bernie Satrom	Y
Representative Mary Schneider	y
Representative Lori VanWinkle	N
Representative Steve Vetter	N

Motion carried 10-3-0.

Representative Schneider carrier.

Hearing closed at 3:52 PM.

*Delores Shimek, Committee Clerk*

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1264: Judiciary Committee (Rep. Klemin, Chairman)** recommends **DO PASS** (10 YEAS, 3 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1264 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

**2023 SENATE JUDICIARY**

**HB 1264**

# 2023 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Judiciary Committee**  
Peace Garden Room, State Capitol

HB 1264  
3/21/2023

A bill relating to jail and regional correctional center definitions and alternatives to physical custody of individuals; and to provide a penalty.
---

11:00 AM Chairman Larson opened the meeting. Chairman Larson and Senators Myrdal, Luick, Estenson, Sickler, and Paulson were present. Senator Braunberger was absent.

### Discussion Topics:

- Justice services
- Social services
- Behavior change
- Mental health services
- Individual justice plans

11:00 AM Daniel Gulya, North Dakota Protection and Advocacy Group, introduced the bill and provided written testimony. #26008

11:29 AM Travis Finck, Executive Director, North Dakota Commission on Legal Counsel for indigents, testified in favor of the bill and provided written testimony. #25936, #26134

11:19 AM Carlotta McCleary, Executive Director of Mental Health America of North Dakota, and Executive Director of the North Dakota Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health, testified in favor of the bill. #26132

11:39 AM Chairman Larson closed the public hearing.

11:39 AM Senator Estenson moved to Do Pass the bill. Motion seconded by Senator Luick.

11:39 AM roll call vote was taken.

Senators	Vote
Senator Diane Larson	Y
Senator Bob Paulson	Y
Senator Jonathan Sickler	Y
Senator Ryan Braunberger	AB
Senator Judy Estenson	Y
Senator Larry Luick	Y
Senator Janne Myrdal	Y

Motion passes 6-0-1.

Senator Estenson will carry the bill.

This bill does not affect workforce development.

11:39 AM Chairman Larson closed the meeting.

*Rick Schuchard, Committee Clerk*

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1264: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Larson, Chairman)** recommends **DO PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1264 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar. This bill does not affect workforce development.

**TESTIMONY**

**HB 1264**



HB 1264  
68<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly  
House Judiciary Committee  
January 24, 2023  
Testimony of Travis W. Finck, Executive Director, NDCLCI

Chairman Klemin, Vice Chair Karls, my name is Travis Finck and I am the Executive Director for the North Dakota Commission on Legal Counsel for Indigents. The Commission is the state agency responsible for delivery of public defense services in North Dakota.

The Commission rises in support of HB 1264. Individualized Justice Plans provide another tool to help individuals who may find themselves in a criminal court for activity that is the result of a disability. The Commission has provided training to our attorneys on Individualized Justice Plans and our attorneys have found success in helping clients utilize these plans.

Chairman Klemin, members of the House Judiciary, for the reasons stated herein, the Commission on Legal Counsel urges a DO PASS recommendation.

Respectfully Submitted:



Travis W. Finck  
Executive Director, NDCLCI

## **House Judiciary Committee**

### **House Bill 1264 – January 24, 2023**

Testimony of Daniel Gulya, North Dakota Protection and Advocacy Project (P&A)

Greetings, Chair Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee. My name is Dan Gulya and I'm an attorney with the North Dakota Protection and Advocacy Project (P&A). P&A protects the human, civil and legal rights of people with disabilities. The agency's programs and services seek to make positive changes for people with disabilities where we live, learn, work and play.

I am here to testify about our request to memorialize the Individual Justice Plan process, or the IJP (as we call it), in statute in chapter 12-44.1. The IJP is a voluntary, collaborative tool to create a plan to address the behaviors of persons with cognitive or functional disabilities, when their disabilities manifest in a way that might lead to, or has lead to, involvement with the justice system.

The IJP is used for individuals with cognitive disability(ies) tied to at-risk behavior or behavior presenting as criminal. Eligibility for an IJP is based upon a mental/cognitive impairment presenting in an individual with a:

- Developmental disability (DD)
- Brain injury
- Neurodevelopmental disorder that affects brain function
- Mental illness

The IJP planning process brings together a team of individuals involved in an individual's life. Depending on circumstances and need, this may be family, the educational system, social services, or law enforcement. The planning process starts by identifying and assessing the root of behavior, then creates recommendations utilizing the least restrictive, most effective alternative, with an identifiable outcome and review process.

For the past biennium, P&A has been involved in an effort to modernize our IJP materials and raise awareness. The IJP was developed in the developmental disability community in the 1980s. In 2004, ND P&A initiated a collaborative effort to revise the manual with a statewide group including DHS, DOCR, the AG's office, and the State Bar. In 2021, P&A revised this informational manual, and did a series of over 20 presentations statewide that reached 514 individuals in the broad spectrum of parties interested in individual justice (including to the 2021-2023 Interim Judiciary Committee in March 2022), from education and social services into the justice system. P&A hopes you will support this bill to give this concept a continuing presence in the justice system beyond the instances that come to P&A.

P&A believes that the IJP process adds value at the intersection of the educational and human services systems with the justice system, by tying together services and outlining a proactive path for the diversion of individuals with disabilities who manifest disruptive behaviors due to that disability.

Here are some examples of how this process has helped P&A clients.

A) P&A was contacted by a client and defense attorney to request advocacy services to write and submit an Individual Justice Plan to the court for charges of resisting arrest and disorderly conduct. The client has a primary diagnosis of an intellectual disability, traumatic brain injury, and mental illness. The client receives residential services through a DD provider and lives in an apartment with a parent as their full legal guardian.

Both charges were compounded by the client's language barriers and inability to engage with others due to the disability. P&A was able to assist the client's team with conducting a comprehensive assessment and development of an IJP. This was presented to the court by the client's defense attorney, with a request to dismiss the charges with an understanding that the client will continue to meet with the IJP team and follow the IJP recommendations. The judge accepted the client's IJP and agreed to a deferred sentence for six months; the client's charges were dismissed at that time. The client and guardian determined to continue with the service plans in the IJP, which will hopefully prevent any future involvement in the legal system.

B) Another client was referred to Protection and Advocacy for technical assistance with an Individual Justice Plan. The client resides in a rural area, and has a primary diagnosis of Traumatic Brain Injury, ADHD, PTSD, and Oppositional Defiant Disorder. The

client was charged with a felony related to an assault. The client had several past offenses; it is believed that the criminal behavior is a manifestation of the primary diagnosis of Traumatic Brain Injury, as there was no prior criminal activity before the injury occurred in 2001.

P&A worked with the client and the coordinator from the Brain Injury Network to apply for Community Connect services. A team met and reviewed the client's needs and their role in the Individual Justice Plan. The IJP recommendations included that the Care Coordinator will assist with scheduling medical appointments, explore services through the Aging and Disability division and assist in connecting to medical care and trauma-informed care, and apply for social security benefits. After further consultation with the prosecutor, the client's charges were dismissed.

As a result of the IJP process, the client's needs were identified, connections were made to enroll in the proper supports, with clear assistance to access the services and supports the client needs to be successful in the community.

These results may not occur without the IJP as a roadmap to suggest how and who to coordinate services. This bill aims to find a permanent home for this concept and to express its potential importance in helping to plan the diversion of individuals from justice services to social services.

My previous jobs as a prosecutor and public defender in North Dakota opened my eyes to the number of persons with cognitive disabilities that become justice-involved, and how that system is often challenged to figure out how to appropriately divert them. During five years of working indigent public defense and three years of prosecuting, I never heard of the IJP process.

Despite P&A's efforts to raise awareness, the utilization of IJPs in many cases depends on the individual actors in systems that often are somewhat siloed. Over the past year, P&A has worked on over 90 adult and individual requests for assistance on IJPs. While that is a tremendous step forward, the statistics on individual referrals from the Department of Public Instruction indicate that on average 30% of individuals referred are SPED students or have IEPs. From your other testimony you know that the CHINS and delinquency referral numbers are thousands per year, which tells us there is a population that might benefit from increased awareness of this process. This bill, in conjunction with our efforts, will hopefully give other actors that much more awareness of the IJP process and they can proactively start down this path to address some of the behavior of individual with cognitive disabilities.

I respectfully request the Committee support HB 1263. Thank you for your time and I'd be happy to address any questions.

Daniel Gulya, Attorney, Protection & Advocacy Project  
danigulya@nd.gov

HB 1264  
68<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly  
Senate Judiciary Committee  
March 21, 2023  
Testimony of Travis W. Finck, Executive Director, NDCLCI

Madam Chair Larson, members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, my name is Travis Finck and I am the Executive Director for the North Dakota Commission on Legal Counsel for Indigents. The Commission is the state agency responsible for delivery of public defense services in North Dakota.

The Commission rises in support of HB 1264. Individualized Justice Plans provide another tool to help individuals who may find themselves in a criminal court for activity that is the result of a disability. The Commission has provided training to our attorneys on Individualized Justice Plans and our attorneys have found success in helping clients utilize these plans.

Madam Chair Larson, members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, for the reasons stated herein, the Commission on Legal Counsel urges a DO PASS recommendation.

Respectfully Submitted:



Travis W. Finck  
Executive Director, NDCLCI

## **Senate Judiciary Committee**

### **House Bill 1264 – March 21, 2023**

Testimony of Daniel Gulya, North Dakota Protection and Advocacy Project (P&A)

My name is Dan Gulya and I'm an attorney with the North Dakota Protection and Advocacy Project (P&A). P&A protects the human, civil and legal rights of people with disabilities.

P&A would like your support in memorializing the Individual Justice Plan process, or the IJP (as we call it), in statute in chapter 12-44.1. The IJP is a voluntary, collaborative tool to create a plan to address the behaviors of persons with diagnosed cognitive or functional disabilities, when their disabilities manifest in a way that might lead to, or has lead to at-risk behavior or behavior presenting as criminal. Eligibility for an IJP is based on an individual having a:

- Developmental disability (DD)
- Brain injury
- Neurodevelopmental disorder that affects brain function
- Mental illness

The IJP planning process brings together a team of individuals involved in an individual's life. Depending on circumstances and need, this may be family, the educational system, social services, or law enforcement. The planning process starts by assessing the disability at the root of behavior, then creates recommendations utilizing the most effective alternative, with an identifiable outcome and review process.

P&A believes that the IJP process adds value at the intersection of the human service system with the justice system by tying together services and outlining a proactive path



for the diversion of individuals with disabilities who manifest disruptive behaviors due to that disability.

This process was developed in the developmental disability community in the 1980s. In 2021 and 2022, P&A revised our instructional manual and did a series of over 20 presentations statewide that reached 514 individuals in the broad spectrum of parties interested in individual justice (including to the 2021-2023 Interim Judiciary Committee in March 2022), from education and social services into the justice system. P&A hopes you will support this bill to give this concept a continuing presence in the justice system beyond the instances that come to P&A.

Here are some examples of how this process has helped P&A clients.

A) P&A was contacted by a client and defense attorney to request help to write and submit an Individual Justice Plan to the court for charges of resisting arrest and disorderly conduct. The client has a primary diagnosis of an intellectual disability, traumatic brain injury, and mental illness, and receives residential services through a DD provider. Both charges were compounded by the client's language barriers and inability to engage with others due to the disability. P&A was able to assist the client's team with conducting a comprehensive assessment and development of an IJP. This was presented to the court by the client's defense attorney, with a request to dismiss the charges with an understanding that the client will continue to meet with the IJP team and follow the IJP recommendations. The judge accepted the client's IJP and agreed to a deferred sentence for six months; the client's charges were dismissed at that time. The client and guardian determined to continue with the service plans in the IJP, which will hopefully prevent any future involvement in the legal system.

B) Another client was referred to Protection and Advocacy for technical assistance with an Individual Justice Plan. The client resides in a rural area, and has a primary diagnosis of Traumatic Brain Injury, ADHD, PTSD, and Oppositional Defiant Disorder. The

client was charged with a felony related to an assault. The client had other offenses; it is believed that the criminal behavior is a manifestation of the primary diagnosis of Traumatic Brain Injury, as there was no criminal history before the injury in 2001.

P&A worked with the client and the coordinator from the Brain Injury Network to apply for Community Connect services. A team met and made IJP recommendations including identifying that the Care Coordinator will assist with scheduling medical appointments, assist in connecting to medical care and trauma-informed care and applying for social security benefits. After further consultation with the prosecutor, the client's charges were dismissed.

As a result of the IJP process, the client's needs were identified, connections were made to enroll in the proper supports, with clear assistance to access the services and supports the client needs to be successful in the community.

These results might not occur without the IJP as a roadmap to suggest how and who to coordinate services. This bill aims to find a permanent home for this concept and to express its potential importance in helping to plan the diversion of individuals from justice services to social services.

Despite P&A's efforts to raise awareness, the utilization of IJPs in many cases depends on the individual actors in systems that often are somewhat siloed. Over the past year, P&A has worked on over 90 adult and individual requests for assistance on IJPs. While that is a tremendous step forward, with over 25,000 criminal charges per year going through the court system there is a population of persons with disabilities that might benefit from increased awareness of this process.

My previous jobs as a prosecutor and public defender in North Dakota opened my eyes to the number of persons with cognitive disabilities that become justice-involved, and how that system is often challenged to figure out how to appropriately divert them.

During five years of working indigent public defense and three years of prosecuting, I never heard of the IJP process.

This bill, in conjunction with our efforts, will hopefully give that much more awareness of the IJP process and trigger others to proactively start down this path to address the behavior of a justice-involved individual with cognitive disabilities.

I respectfully request the Committee support HB 1264. Thank you for your time and I'd be happy to address any questions.

Daniel Gulya, Attorney, Protection & Advocacy Project

[danigulya@nd.gov](mailto:danigulya@nd.gov)

Mental  
Health  
Advocacy  
Network



Consumer & Family Network  
Mental Health America of ND  
Youth Move Beyond  
The Arc of Bismarck

Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health  
Protection & Advocacy Project  
ND Association of Community Providers  
Fraser, Ltd. Individual Consumers & Families

**House Appropriations-Human Resources Committee  
HB 1264 Testimony  
March 21, 2023  
Senator Larson, Chair**

Good morning, Chairman Larson and Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am Carlotta McCleary, Executive Director of Mental Health America of North Dakota and Executive Director of the North Dakota Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health. Today I speak on behalf of the Mental Health Advocacy Network (MHAN). MHAN advocates for a consumer/family driven mental health system of care that provides an array of service choices that are timely, responsive and effective. Our vision is for every North Dakotan to have access to the right service—whether it be preventative, treatment, or recovery; at the right time—when the service is needed; and at the right place—as near his or her home as possible. MHAN is testifying in support of HB 1264. MHAN has continued to echo the findings of two Schulte Reports (2014, 2022) and two HSRI reports (2018, ) that North Dakota has a mental health systems crisis stemming from a lack of services, especially community-based services. A frequent consequence of community service shortages are individuals coming into contact with law enforcement and the justice system. Our law enforcement and justice system partners are often at a loss for what to do with individuals who are presenting with significant mental health needs, or may not even be aware of an individual’s needs. As we are collaborating on CIT trainings with our law enforcement community, we have been hearing from them and other first responders that they have a better handle on those who have substance use issues and how to help them but are caught unaware of those with mental health and/or brain injury issues.

As Dan Gulya, Attorney from North Dakota Protection & Advocacy Project (P&A) previously testified, the Individual Justice Plan (IJP) model originated in the developmental disability community as a means to divert those individuals from involvement with the justice system when issues arise from behaviors that are as a result of their cognitive disabilities. For a number of years, MHAN's member organizations have partnered with P&A to promote the IJP model and the updated materials that P&A has created. We have continued to see the IJP model as having great promise for addressing the needs of people with mental illness, brain injuries, and their families.

For a number of years, Mental Health America of North Dakota and the North Dakota Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health have partnered with local law enforcement and first responder agencies to provide CIT training to their and other related workforces through a consumer panel. This panel provides CIT trainees the opportunity to listen to people with lived experience with mental health needs, brain injuries, and/or addiction issues discuss their story and provide information about how they perceive events during a crisis. The intention is for our law enforcement and first responder workforce to have greater awareness of the needs of these citizens and help them better interact with persons who have a behavioral health needs or cognitive difficulties due to a brain injury or a developmental disability.

During these interactions, it has been common for this workforce to be unaware of the existence of IJPs. It has also been common for this workforce to be enthusiastic about the prospect of having such a tool to utilize before they even arrive on scene with someone who has a behavioral health disorder or a brain injury. Not only would they have a better idea of how to interact with them, they would have a better idea of how to better serve them. They also believe that through the IJP process, there are a number of individuals who would not need to be criminally charged in the first place.

In North Dakota, we have over 30,000 adults with Serious Mental Illness (SMI) and over 18,000 children with Serious Emotional Disorders. That's nearly 50,000 North Dakotans, the overwhelming majority of whom are not receiving community-based mental health services. When individuals are not receiving the help they need, they tend to have increased contact with law enforcement and are involved in the justice system. Over the

last decade, North Dakota saw that in both the adult and juvenile corrections systems. While most people with serious mental health issues who do not need IJPs, there are many who could benefit from them. We urge the passage of HB 1264.

Thank you and I would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Carlotta McCleary  
Spokesperson  
Mental Health Advocacy Network  
Phone: (701) 222-3310  
E-mail: [cmccleary@ndffcmh.com](mailto:cmccleary@ndffcmh.com)



**INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE PLANNING****What is an Individual Justice Plan (IJP)?**

An Individual Justice Plan (IJP) is a voluntary plan intended for individuals whose disability can manifest behavior that looks criminal, and individuals whose disability in some way limits his or her ability to interact with and obtain a fair result from the criminal justice/juvenile justice system. An IJP will identify the individual's disability as well as specific supports and services designed to prevent justice involvement or further justice involvement while still holding the individual accountable for his or her behavior using a "least restrictive" consideration. This means implementing the most effective consequence for the individual to maximize the potential for success.

**Who is involved with IJPs?**

An IJP is centered around the youth or adult who is at risk of justice system involvement or who is already involved with the justice system. IJPs may be initiated by anyone who encounters the youth or adult. This includes family members, guardians, health professionals, human service workers, service providers, education professionals, law enforcement officers, attorneys, judicial officers, and parole/probation officers, among others. Once the need for an IJP is identified, a team of support persons, along with the individual, will create the Plan and set parameters for ongoing Plan review and oversight.

**How does an IJP work?**

The IJP is a collaborative process resulting in identification and documentation of the individual's disability as well as the least restrictive and most effective services that should be implemented for the youth or adult. These can range from positive behavioral supports to case management to incarceration. The Plan should also identify needed accommodations for the individual's disability(ies) to ensure that he or she can meaningfully participate in the justice process and receive a fair result.

**Please contact Protection & Advocacy for an alternative format of this handout.**

(October 2022)



## INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Identifying the need for an IJP at the individual's earliest point of contact or potential point of contact with the justice system is crucial to limit the individual's involvement. However, an IJP can be initiated at any stage of the criminal justice system, even upon re-entry into the community.

### **What does an IJP look like?**

Sample IJPs and an IJP template can be found in the [Individual Justice Plan \(IJP\) manual](#) at Protection & Advocacy's website. The IJP Manual explains the process in further detail and contains contact information for persons who may be able to provide support or services as part of the IJP process.

### **Why are IJPs important?**

An Individual Justice Plan (IJP) is a valuable tool which may be used proactively and reactively by individuals with disabilities, their families, schools, law enforcement, courts, and other entities or systems to assist individuals with disabilities in navigating the world of disabilities and criminal justice. IJPs help secure accountability and appropriate consequences for the individual's behavior after consideration of an individual's disability(ies). This can ease burdens on the criminal justice systems while also supporting individuals with disabilities to live successfully within their communities.

**ND PROTECTION & ADVOCACY PROJECT  
400 E. BROADWAY, SUITE 409  
BISMARCK, ND 58501**

**1-800-472-2670 OR (701) 328-2950**

[www.ndpanda.org](http://www.ndpanda.org); [panda\\_intake@nd.gov](mailto:panda_intake@nd.gov)



**Client name**  
**IJP Recommendations Worksheet**

Recommendations regarding resources available to the individual should be identified, clearly organized, and an integration of the CJS and community-based services. The least-restrictive, most effective services should be recommended for implementation. Specific service providers/responsible parties should be identified for each recommendation.

The following support options should be considered (see attached flowchart for reference):

**Positive Behavior Supports:**

Are there systematic use of reinforcements or strategies that would strengthen appropriate alternative behaviors and consequences to help suppress the illegal behavior?

Yes No

What is it? Be specific.

**Counseling**

Would the individual benefit from a therapeutic effort such as one to one counseling or group therapy?

Yes No

How and why? Be specific.

Would counseling or therapy provide a level of service or support that is not currently being met in the individual's life?

Yes No

How and why? Be specific.

**Supervision/case management**

Would increased supervision or case management services assist with preventing the behavior from occurring?Yes No

How and why? Be specific.

### **Community Service**

Would the option of community service (e.g. engaging in a relatively less desirable activity) serve to suppress the problem behavior?

Yes No

How and why? Be specific.

Is this a recommendation that should be made to the courts?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

### **Hospitalization**

Is there a need for inpatient psychiatric services?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

Is there a need for out-patient or partial care services?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

### **Agency Transfer**

Would another facility be better equipped to provide more specialized treatment to address the behavior?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

### **Other treatment/training**

Is there a need for further treatment or training?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

### **Psychotropic medication management**

Are there medication management issues that need to be addressed to ensure compliance?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

Are there any unaddressed questions about the appropriateness of medications being taken?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

Is there a need for ongoing review by a physician?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

**Restitution**

Is it appropriate for the individual to make some type of restitution to the victim or do some type of service for the victim?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

**Fine**

Would the imposing of a monetary fine may have the desired impact on the individual and result in suppression of the problem?

Yes No

Why? Be specific.

**Probation**

If probation is imposed by the court, are there any recommendations regarding the level of supervision?

Yes No

What? Be specific.

**Incarceration**

If incarceration is court-ordered, are there any risks or services that are needed to ensure the safety and well-being of the individual?

Yes No

What? Be specific.

Are there any disability-related accommodations that are needed during a period of incarceration?

Yes No

What? Be specific.

Are there any alternatives that should be presented to the court in lieu of incarceration?

Yes No

What? Be specific.

Are there any other recommendations that should be considered as part of this IJP?

Yes No

What? Be specific.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Assessor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date