



# ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

## MINUTES

### ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS OVERSIGHT BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Monday, August 14, 2017, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

At the following public sites:

Thompson Center, Room 2-025, 100 W. Randolph, Chicago

Stratton Building, Room 621, 401 S. Spring, Springfield

#### Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair John Baldwin welcomed members and guests to the quarterly Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB) meeting. Director Baldwin called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. and asked ARI Program Director Mary Ann Dyar to call the roll. (Videoconferencing with Springfield did not work; members joined by phone, not counting toward quorum.)

<b>ARI Oversight Board Member Attendance</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Absent</b>
John Baldwin, Acting Director, IDOC	X		
Walter Boyd, Community Representative			X
Lori Roper designee for Amy P. Campanelli, Public Defender of Cook County	X		
Jason Chambers, McLean County State's Attorney		X	
Emily Cole, Deputy Supervisor, Alternative Prosecution and Sentencing Courts, designee for Kim Foxx, Cook County State's Attorney	X		
Khari Hunt designee for James T. Dimas, Secretary, IDHS	X		
Craig Findley, Chairman, PRB	X		
Lavone Haywood, Chief Probation Officer, Adult Probation Department, Circuit Court of Cook County	X		
Mark Ishaug, Chief Executive Officer, Thresholds			X
Randy Kurtz designee for John Maki, Executive Director, ICJIA	X		
Angelique Orr, Director, PSI Correspondence	X		
Michael Pelletier, Illinois State Appellate Defender	X		
Hon. James M. Radcliffe (Ret.), Associate Director, Lawyers Assistance Program		X	
Kathy Saltmarsh, Executive Director, SPAC	X		
Kathy Starkovich, Deputy Director – Probation, 18 <sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, DuPage County	X		
Brent Stratton, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General	X		
Michael Torchia, Director, Sangamon County Court Services Department		X	

\*Quorum was established

Also present were:

Megan Alderden, ICJIA Research Director

Kimberly Chorney, Cook ACT-HOPE Resource Coordinator

Siena Cragie, Illinois Justice Project Intern  
Mary Ann Dyar, ARI Program Director  
Yasmine El-Gohary, SPAC Research Analyst  
Lynne Mock, ARI Research Director  
Adriana Perez, ARI Program Manager  
Katie Pieper, Cook ACT-HOPE Program Manager  
Lorena Roque, Senior Research Associate, Office of the Chief Judge  
Laura Scherkenbach, ARI Policy & Project Coordinator  
Nate Inglis Steinfeld, SPAC Research Director  
Hon. Thomas R. Sumner (Ret.), ARI Technical Assistance Provider  
Angie Weis, ICJIA General Counsel and Chief of Staff  
Paula Wolff, Illinois Justice Project, Director

Director Baldwin stated the three main goals for the meeting: (1) review Cook County's HOPE program and its progress with its corrective action plan (CAP); (2) review the SFY17 data, including a presentation on quarters 1-3 from the ARI Research Manager; and (3) discuss SFY18 plans and approve an administrative budget that reflects priorities in ARI's strategic direction. Director Baldwin also made two new introductions. First, Kathy Starkovich, Deputy Director, as the new designee to the ARIOB from the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit/DuPage County Probation Department. Also, Adriana Perez was introduced as the new ARI Program Manager, who started August 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### Approval of Meeting Minutes

Co-chair Khari Hunt asked for a motion to approve minutes from the May ARIOB meeting, noting that the format for presenting the minutes has changed.

**Motion:** Ms. Orr moved to approve the minutes from the ARIOB regular meeting from May 15, 2017. Mr. Kurtz seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### Program Director and Committee Reports

Ms. Dyar briefly highlighted activities since the May ARIOB meeting, referencing the Program Director report in the meeting materials. She noted staff changes--the former Program Manager, Lindsey LaPointe, left ICJIA to join a local not-for-profit, and Adriana Perez, who brings 16 years of grant making experience at ICJIA, was hired. Ms. Dyar acknowledged the team effort of grant monitors, legal staff, and fiscal staff in the SFY17 close-out progress. The highlight of the quarter was the All-Sites Summit, which was attended by over 200 people representing 53 counties, including existing and potential sites. ARIOB members received copies of the "Bridges to Justice: A Community Involvement Toolkit," which features innovations at ARI sites focused on restoration and reintegration in diversion programs, and was released at the summit.

Director Baldwin moved the discussion to committee reports. Ms. Cole provided an update on the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee which met on June 21<sup>st</sup> to vote on changes regarding SFY18 designation requests from Boone, DeKalb, and Lake counties, as well as on the local plans submitted by SFY17 planning grantees: 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, the 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit, Adams County, LaSalle County and Sangamon County. Ms. Cole reported that the substance of the local plans were approved by the committee, some with contingencies. Future funding of the plans would be subject to a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). The committee also discussed clarifying ARI's stance on funding programs that do not dismiss charges or convictions upon successful completion of the program, which will be brought before the ARIOB at a future date. Ms. Dyar shared that the planning grantees are anxiously awaiting

funds. There are five such grantees that could expand the ARI network to ten additional counties primarily through circuit-wide rural expansions, which is salient to ARI's strategic plan.

Ms. Saltmarsh shared that the Outreach, Technical Assistance & Communication (OTAC) Committee did not meet this quarter, but will convene soon to develop a technical assistance schedule for sites.

Mr. Inglis Steinfeld provided an update on the Performance Measurement Committee, which met on August 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss the corrective action plan (CAP) with the Cook HOPE program. The committee focused on the August 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for submitting the policies and procedures manual (PPM), which was not met, and the results of a stakeholder survey that showed the issues that created the need for the CAP remain concerns. Following extensive discussion, the committee's recommendation was to continue the CAP, conduct a site visit, and closely monitor site reporting.

Ms. Dyar noted that she and Ms. Perez will be focusing on expanding committee membership.

#### Discussion of and Vote on Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

Mr. Hunt opened the CAP conversation up for continued discussion among ARI/OB other members. Mr. Haywood asked for clarification about the November 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, and Mr. Inglis Steinfeld explained that the committee's recommendation is to allow the CAP to continue through November 1<sup>st</sup> by which point the PPM must be finalized and implemented. The CAP started in March 2017 to address issues raised in December 2016 and January 2017 about fidelity to evidence-based practices (EBPs). This is the second CAP for the Cook HOPE program; the first CAP addressed different issues related to the intake process and target population. Mr. Inglis Steinfeld noted that the PPM development will help confirm the EBPs in use and measure their effectiveness.

Ms. Dyar explained that the second CAP resulted from strategic planning conversations at the program level that raised concerns among team members about issues with EBPs, particularly the swift-certain fair (SCF) principles, as well as procedural justice and leadership/collaboration. Ms. Dyar acknowledged the hard work of Cook HOPE staff to comply with rigorous CAP reporting requirements. Staff also collected information through a stakeholder survey, using the research-supported Wilder Collaboration Inventory. Eight out of 13 responded to the survey due to some reticence to participate out of concern for retribution from the judge. There were generally positive findings about the implementation of EBPs and procedural justice. However, there were still concerns with SCF principles and how sanctions are being implemented; and comments about teamwork and collaboration were negative, demonstrating continued problems with communication and trust.

Mr. Inglis Steinfeld added that the negative survey results were concerning to him as the PMC chair. Ms. Cole shared that the survey may have given different results had it been implemented after the PPM was put in place and had time to go into effect, noting that the PPM was very nearly complete and the sanctions and incentive grid was in use. Ms. Cole and Mr. Inglis Steinfeld both acknowledged the aggressive timeline of the CAP. Ms. Saltmarsh asked if the PPM was expected to improve the trust issues in the program, which are not easily measured by data and are of great concern to the OTAC Committee. Ms. Cole noted that the CAP is focused on implementation of EBPs, and that the proposed site visit and interviews could gather useful information about administrative issues. Mr. Inglis Steinfeld stated the need to access expert technical assistance, for example from the national SCF Center and the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). Ms. Dyar suggested using the survey results as a baseline against which to gauge progress, particularly with respect to the sanctions and incentives grid.

Judge Sumner asked for clarification on what has yet to be completed on the PPM. Ms. Cole stated that standardized consent forms and termination procedures still need to be finalized. Judge Sumner expressed concern over collaboration and communication issues that impact finalization of the PPM and stressed the

urgent need to move forward. He questioned whether current methods could adequately measure the core issues in both CAPs: collaboration and leadership.

Director Baldwin shared his knowledge of implementing EBPs and specifically SCF/HOPE. In his experience, HOPE programs are most effective in areas without highly structured services for offenders; he inquired whether this describes Cook County. He also stressed the importance of working with the appropriate target population (or else risk making them worse off – the opposite of what ARI is trying to do) and asked for clarification regarding the HOPE program’s target population and risk level. Director Baldwin suggested giving the program some time to demonstrate effectiveness or else lose funding.

Ms. Dyar stated that the first Cook HOPE CAP addressed the risk level issue based on concerns that the program was not serving a prison-bound population. Working with the Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) assessment process, risk levels were increased for a moderate- to high-risk population. The core issue in the second CAP involves sanctions. Sanctions impact participants directly. Sanctions are agreed upon by the team, but the judge has the ultimate authority. Deviations from the agreed-upon sanctions and incentives grid in the PPM could indicate issues with collaboration and trust within the group. Moreover, Ms. Dyar referenced ARI’s enabling legislation, the Crime Reduction Act, which states that ARI exists to reduce incarceration in state prisons and also local jails; therefore, jail sanctions, which are part of the HOPE model, should be examined. She noted that the committee proposed assessing how prior versus current sanctions align with the agreed-upon grid.

Ms. Dyar asked the Cook stakeholders about the feasibility of demonstrating progress by the November 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, and Ms. Cole, Mr. Haywood, and Ms. Roper agreed it was possible. Ms. Cole commented that Cook HOPE targets high risk (LSI-R score of 23 or above), low-need individuals for which the model (not a treatment court) seems to be effective. Implementation dynamics, such as varying opinions on sanctions, are the problem. She described the program’s referral and assessment processes to get the appropriate target population. Judge Sumner articulated concerns that given the survey responses and ongoing challenges, the true problems are not being addressed. Ms. Cole stated that if the PPM is implemented and the grid is followed, it should be clear whether the HOPE program’s challenges still exist. Ms. Orr expressed concerns about recurring issues in the program, which take up staff resources.

Mr. Hunt noted that the proposed process should determine if objective benchmarks are met or not by November 1<sup>st</sup>. Moreover there are established standards and it should be apparent quickly whether these standards are followed. Ms. Cole requested that the CAP process be allowed to play out. She stressed the fact that this is the only program in Cook County that serves this population, which is why stakeholders are trying hard to make it work.

Ms. Saltmarsh inquired as to whether Cook HOPE staff meetings have become more inclusive, with all members (including probation officers) present. Ms. Cole stated that it is a work in progress. Director Baldwin shared the IDOC experience of having to cut programs that do not work, and he reminded the ARIOB of the importance of ensuring funded programs are aligned with evidence-based programs.

As suggested by ICJIA Director John Maki at the PMC meeting, Ms. Dyar shared with the ARIOB a draft letter to Chief Judge Evans articulating clear expectations for Cook HOPE by November 1<sup>st</sup>, as well as fair and certain consequences. Ms. Cole asked whether this letter would be supplemented by an in-person meeting, to which Ms. Orr and Ms. Saltmarsh believed that it should. Ms. Saltmarsh also suggested that the letter reference the Crime Reduction Act mandate to ensure implementation of EBPs as well as reductions in prison admissions. Judge Sumner also suggested the letter discuss possible actions by other committees. Ms. Orr noted that the SS&M Committee has also discussed Cook HOPE. Mr. Findley recommended that the letter include the current ARIOB discussion, as well as previous actions taken, and

acknowledging progress made while identifying that more is needed. Judge Radcliffe offered to help with finalizing the letter.

**Motion:** Mr. Kurtz moved to create a sub-committee of ARIOB co-chairs and committee chairs to approve the finished letter informing Chief Judge Evans of the CAP process and deadline. Mr. Findley seconded the motion. Ms. Roper, Ms. Cole, and Mr. Haywood recused themselves. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**Motion:** Ms. Saltmarsh moved to continue the CAP process for Cook HOPE until November 1<sup>st</sup>, per the recommendation of the Performance Measurement Committee. Ms. Orr seconded the motion. Ms. Roper, Ms. Cole, and Mr. Haywood recused themselves. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### Review of SFY17 Activities

Ms. Dyar reported on SFY17 activities in the areas of grants, data, training, technical assistance, and policy. Grant funds were used to reimburse sites for SFY16 expenses, as well as provide SFY17 renewal grants for 20 sites covering 39 counties. Sites spent about \$5.1 million, or 80% of their awards, ramping back up from the budget impasse (first quarter: 40% spending; mid-year: 60%). ARI hired a research manager, Dr. Mock, who has spent time analyzing a program data. Administrative funds were moved around to provide regional trainings, which benefited about 80 site staff. ARI staff and stakeholders also worked on eligibility expansion (House Bill 3905 did not pass, but work will continue) and on implementing the recommendations of the Criminal Justice and Sentencing Reform Commission, especially coordinating council development. Ms. Orr asked about how ARI can increase current sites' sustainability, fidelity, and quality while ensuring adequate staffing and resources internally. Ms. Dyar replied that capacity issues will be addressed in the next section.

Dr. Mock gave a brief presentation on ARI data, offering several caveats. She discussed the challenges of comparing IDOC admission rates to other recidivism figures, working with small frequencies from rural counties, and analyzing exits. Her presentation included SFY17 data through March 2017 (quarters 1-3) and looked at the following research questions:

1. How many clients entered ARI funded programs?
2. What were their characteristics?
3. How many clients were served in ARI funded programs?
4. How many clients exited ARI funded programs?
5. What percent were terminated successfully?
6. What happens to ARI clients 1 year after exiting the program?

Dr. Mock stated that the data included 415 new enrollments during quarters 1-3; 1,243 clients served; and 436 exits. Fifty-two percent of those exits were unsuccessful, with 43% successful, and 5% were other types of exits (deaths, transfers, etc.). There was an increase in the individuals newly enrolled, but it was less than in prior years. The Intensive Supervision Probation with Services (ISP-S) programs accounted for the largest number of new enrollments. Males accounted for approximately two-thirds of clients newly enrolled in ARI programs. Most entered during their mid-30's with varied racial make-up. About 60% of new enrollments were medium- to high-risk, but that reflects a significant number of missing scores. The number of clients served was down from prior years. The percent of individuals who exited successfully was similar to prior years, with slight variation by program type.

In regards to the exit analysis, Dr. Mock reported that 64% of all participants who exited (whether successful or unsuccessful) had no IDOC admission within one year; the majority of admissions were within the first 30 days of program exit, likely as a result of program termination. Only 3% of successful exits went to IDOC within a year. Findings vary across program types.

Dr. Mock shared the plan to create an online dashboard that could provide summary information about enrollments, participant characteristics, participants served, participant exit status, and fidelity measurements for the different types of ARI programs. The goal of the dashboard is to provide user-friendly feedback to ARI programs, as well as provide information to anyone interested in ARI program processes and quarterly reports.

Ms. Dyar noted that ARI does not yet have verified information for the fourth quarter, so data on reduction goals is still in progress. Working more closely with the Research & Analysis (R&A) Unit at ICJIA has been very helpful, including looking at a new way to calculate reduction goals. She reported that it appears sites were able to attain service levels that put them in the range of being able to meet their reduction goals. Diversion verification will be reported in November.

#### Discussion of SFY18 Plans

Ms. Dyar reminded the Board that at the meeting in May, the SFY18 appropriation level was unknown. ARI's appropriation of \$8.2 million is the largest annual appropriation thus far. Of that, \$6.2 million is for the renewal awards approved by the ARIOB for the current 20 sites. The administrative budget will consist of approximately \$1 million, with the remaining \$1 million for further investment in current sites and/or expansion via new planning and implementation grants. It is expected that last year's planning grantees will apply for implementation grants.

Ms. Dyar presented the administrative budget, requesting a lift of the 10% cap on administrative expenses to allow the flexibility to work on ARI's current priorities. Budgeted administrative expenses are \$880,400, which is about 11% of the appropriation level and would make it possible to hire two additional staff people (second grant monitor and program administrator), and increase training and support for sites. This compares to last year's budget of approximately \$990,000 due to higher fringe obligations and a greater share of ICJIA overhead costs. Ms. Dyar proposed applying an additional \$100,000 to be used for an external outcome evaluation, bringing the total administrative budget to \$983,600 (12% of the appropriation level).

**Motion:** Ms. Orr moved to approve the SFY18 administrative budget. Mr. Pelletier seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### Strategic Plan Update

Ms. Dyar reminded the Board of ARI's recommitment to the strategic plan. This also involves investigating how Board members can support staff. While the last two years were fiscally uncertain, progress has been made. An ARIOB retreat may be useful in discussing staffing in further detail, developing messaging around research findings, and increasing ARI's presence in Springfield with legislators. Finally, a more general discussion on culture change could take place. Members agreed that a retreat would be useful.

#### Old/New Business

Ms. Dyar reminded the Board that the next meeting is November 13<sup>th</sup>. An adjusted data reporting and committee/Board meeting schedule may be needed to allow for more time to analyze quarterly data. This will also need to be aligned with the funding schedule.

#### Adjournment

**Motion:** Mr. Haywood moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:33 p.m. Mr. Kurtz seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**(Approved 11/13/17)**