

Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board Meeting
Monday, February 3, 2014
1:30-3:30p.m.
JRTC 100 W. Randolph, Room 2-025, Chicago
Stratton Building, Room 617, 401 S. Spring, Springfield

Board members in attendance (CHI): Joe Antolin, Joseph Bruscato, S.A. (Tony) Godinez, Patricia Hayden, Adam Monreal, Mike Pelletier, Michelle Saddler, Brent Stratton, Deborah White
Board members in attendance (SPI): Samantha Gaddy (for Kathy Saltmarsh), Mike Torchia

Non-board members in attendance: Jordan Boulger, Laura Brookes, Mary Ann Dyar, Sharrell Hibbler, Rebecca Janowitz, Simeon Kim, Lindsey LaPointe, Joshua Lettner, Daynia Sanchez-Bass

Non-board members by phone: Esther Franco-Payne

Call to order/Roll call/Introductions

Director Tony Godinez called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m. Mary Ann Dyar conducted a roll call, and it was determined there was quorum. Introductions were also made in the audience.

Approval of minutes from November 16, 2013 meeting

Director Godinez asked members to review the minutes for approval from the November 16th ARIOB meeting that were previously circulated. Joe Antolin made the motion to approve, which was seconded by Mike Pelletier and passed.

Program Administrator/Committee reports

Director Godinez asked Mary Ann to deliver the program administrator report. Mary Ann reported two corrections to the report previously circulated. At the top of the dashboard, she noted the cumulative number served, which is reported as more than 1,200 based on self-reports from the sites. When double-checking this number with Jordan Boulger, Research Analyst, according to our database records, it was closer to 1,400; however, there was not time to reconcile these two numbers before the meeting, so the more conservative number is used. The cumulative number served has been a number reported since the start of the program as it was getting off-the-ground, to show the potential impact. We continue to report this number to show how the program is growing and it will be part of the impact evaluation. Joe Antolin asked about the cost savings calculation, and Mary Ann clarified that it is based on the difference between the per capita cost of incarceration (\$21,500) and the cost of an average ARI intervention (\$4,400). The average ARI cost will be revisited periodically, and it is expected to fluctuate based on the intensity of services provided at the sites, etc. Mary Ann referred to the chart with each site's service numbers last quarter totaling 960, including those still in "ramp-up" stages.

Mary Ann reported on the work of the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee, which approved seven supplemental funding requests (Cook, Sangamon, LaSalle, Second Judicial Circuit, DuPage, Macon, and Ninth Judicial Circuit) using potentially lapsing SFY14 funds, as authorized at the November ARIOB meeting. Adam Monreal asked whether Will County has applied since he has done some outreach. Mary Ann noted that Will County has expressed interest in the current planning grant opportunity. Other jurisdictions that may submit planning grants include Kankakee, Champaign, Randolph and Brown in the 20th Judicial Circuit, 1st Judicial Circuit, Adams, Coles and Cumberland (in the Fifth Judicial Circuit). A webinar on the planning grant opportunity is scheduled for Friday, February 7th.

A press release on the increased SFY14 appropriation level was released from the Governor's Office in December, which generated more than 20 news stories around the state.

There are staffing challenges to keep up with the doubling in size of the program, which is impacting program stability. An expanded organizational chart has been developed including two dedicated grant

monitors. It is hoped that these positions can be filled by the next fiscal year. The ARI strategic planning advisory committee has taken up the issue of resources needed for the administration of the program.

Joe Antolin asked whether we are seeing any impact of the roll-out of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Mary Ann said no but referenced the new Cook County ACT Court which is dedicated to enrolling probationers in Medicaid in conjunction with TASC and CountyCare. Joe Antolin asked that the ACT Court present to the Board once it is up-and-running to talk about cost offsets, etc. Mary Ann noted that the ACT Court is positioned to be a statewide as well as national model.

Brief presentation on Correctional Program Checklist

Lindsey LaPointe, ARI Project Coordinator, presented on the recent training provided by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute on the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) for ARI and related ICJIA staff. Using ARI administrative dollars, the training was to build staff capacity to provide technical assistance to sites on the effective implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs).

Five staff participated in the four-day training, including classroom work and an off-site review at a local provider of cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT). Staff is working toward certification in use of the CPC tool. Lindsey went over the purpose of the CPC and its research base, as well as some of its advantages and limitations. The tool provides specific feedback to agencies as to how their programs align with EBPs and offers recommendations for improvement. Lindsey described uses of the tool, and the 77 different program aspects it measures related to capacity and content and how they are measured. Michelle Saddler asked about how agencies are scored for effectiveness, which is done collectively and by category.

Lindsey noted that it is important to note that of the 512 programs that have been assessed with the CPC nationwide, only 24% of programs are rated as effective; the other 76% are considered either needing improvement or ineffective. Joe Antolin asked about national comparisons and whether it makes sense to have Illinois comparisons. The CPC is currently be used in program evaluation in the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, in the California realignment initiative, and in Oklahoma.

The cost of the training was discussed (\$20,000), and that cost-sharing could be arranged to train additional staff that come on-board. In the Budgeting for Results context, Joe Antolin noted concerns by agencies receiving a “needs improvement” assessment. Mary Ann stated that she is not committed to using this tool for funding decisions, but for technical assistance and systemwide improvements. Jordan said that it is important to distinguish that this tool assesses potential results (based on implementation fidelity to EBPs) not actual results, which will be measured in an outcome evaluation.

Pat Hayden asked if the goal of the tool is to assess programs or services within programs. Mary Ann noted that the unit of measure is a specific service. Lindsey mentioned that the U of C is developing tools with broader applications to community corrections (e.g., drug courts). Michelle Saddler noted that the recommendations provide talking points for conversations with the sites about their services.

Adam Monreal asked about the current recidivism rate. Director Godinez said that it is around 47% from the perspective of IDOC. Director Godinez noted that this is the statewide average, but that it varies among different populations receiving different programming (e.g., Sheridan is lower: about 34%). Mary Ann said that it is still too early for ARI to calculate a three-year recidivism rate on ARI completers, but plans for an outcome evaluation are underway. Director Godinez suggested that those returned to prison on technical violations, which are currently counted in the recidivism rate, should be targeted for interventions. Chairman Monreal noted that the term “technical violation” encompasses a number of infractions.

Director Godinez asked why the assessment information from the CPC is not used to set up strong programs in addition to evaluating existing programs.

Strategic planning update

Secretary Saddler provided an update on the strategic planning process underway. She reported on the first meeting in November 2013 and the high-level messages from the meeting on which ARIOB feedback is requested. Mary Ann shared the draft program, resource and performance measurement goals for the plan that were developed by ARI staff and the strategic planning consultant based on initial advisory committee discussions. Board input was sought ahead of the February strategic planning advisory committee meeting at which objectives and strategies will be developed for each of the goals. Joe Antolin asked that the advisory committee streamline the language to make it more accessible.

Adam Monreal talked about a tension between protecting public safety and getting people back on track. Director Godinez said that these efforts help direct law enforcement dollars to where they are most needed by diverting non-violent offenders, thereby improving public safety. State's Attorney Bruscato talked about how limited courtroom resources (traditional prosecution) should be reserved for violent criminals, and there is a spectrum of alternative justice responses that can effectively deal with non-violent offenders, saving resources, getting greater outcomes, and contributing toward more positive views of the justice process.

Chairman Monreal suggested there is a need for public education around these issues. Mary Ann noted the important media coverage from the Governor's press release, and the upcoming release of the 2013 Annual Report as ways to increase public awareness and work with editorial boards and elected officials.

Mike Pelletier questioned whether some counties have not joined ARI due to resistance on the part of prosecutors. State's Attorney Bruscato noted that this might be an issue in smaller communities, not only because it might be viewed as soft on crime but also due to limited resources to take advantage of opportunities like ARI. Mary Ann also mentioned that there is sometimes resistance to participate from the judiciary. Chairman Monreal stressed the importance of working with local elected officials to promote ARI.

Mary Ann said the outreach targets for program expansion include the counties committing high numbers of non-violent offenders to IDOC. A second strategy focuses on preserving broad, equitable access to the program, encouraging smaller counties to join with existing sites in their circuits. Mary Ann stressed the importance of the current planning grant process, to get potential new sites in the pipeline.

Discussion of ARI spending and approval of grant modifications

Director Godinez asked Mary Ann to guide the discussion of current site spending patterns and proposed grant modifications. Mary Ann referenced a document with budget vs. actual numbers. ARI staff has been working aggressively to make full utilization of the \$7 million SFY14 appropriation and has designated funds to renew existing sites (\$3.1 million), new sites (approximately \$3 million in 2 rounds), planning grants (up to \$200,000), and administration (up to \$700,000 or 10%). Still, under-spending is anticipated in light of the number of new sites that are "ramping up" in a 12-month grant period.

Site spending is monitored monthly to prevent lapsing any funds. After reviewing the first six months of spending in SFY14, sites were behind between \$600,000-\$900,000, some of which was earmarked for future expenses and some of which might be re-purposed. A Board vote is needed to change grant designations and free up the funds. Mary Ann also noted that there is an unanticipated \$180,000 charge to these funds from lapse period spending by some sites (it was thought to come out of SFY13 funds but it will come out of SFY14 funds). There will be enough re-purposed funds left for supplemental awards and planning grants.

Following negotiation with the sites, ARI staff proposed the following grant modifications:

1. 4th Judicial Circuit – reduction from \$168,282 to \$152,282 (after internal re-purposing) – difference of \$16,000
2. Boone County – reduction from \$150,000 to \$126,526 – difference of \$23,474

3. Kane County – reduction from \$300,000 to \$275,666 (after internal re-purposing) – difference of \$24,344
4. LaSalle County – reduction from \$281,263 to \$220,000 – difference of \$61,263

There are additional sites with which we are discussing possible grant modifications that will need to be made prior to the next scheduled ARIOB meeting. Staff suggests either authorizing the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee to make those modifications in between quarterly Board meetings (using supplemental funding process as the precedent) or scheduling a special ARIOB in the next month or so. Joe Antolin asked if authorization can be provided up to \$25,000. Mary Ann noted that there is another site that is behind much more than \$25,000. She suggested authorizing negotiating a modification up to 25% of the designation amount (commensurate with a four-month ramp-up period) to be returned to the program for re-purposing, e.g., as planning grants. Joe Antolin made a motion that ICJIA staff be able to negotiate modifications up to 25% of the grant. Prior to the vote, Mary Ann noted that the recommendation had been for authorization of the staff in conjunction with the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee to include Board input. Secretary Saddler asked about the size of the committee, in order to be able to gather members for a quorum. Joe Antolin said that this is more of a mechanical action than substantive oversight. Secretary Saddler also noted the difficulties of ensuring funds are spent within the state schedule. Deborah White noted that as long as money is coming back, it can be a staff decision; but the Board needs make allocation decisions. Mary Ann acknowledged this as a distinction from the supplemental funding process which involves the ARIOB Site Selection & Monitoring Committee. Joe Antolin's motion stands to authorize the staff to make grant modifications decreasing the grant amount by up to 25%, seconded by Deborah White, and passed.

Old business/New business

Secretary Saddler asked for any old business or new business. There was none.

Adjournment

Upon a motion by a member of the Board, seconded by Joe Antolin, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 5, 2014.

(Approved 5/19/14)