

**Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Regular Oversight Board Meeting**  
**Monday, February 4, 2013**  
**1:30-3:30p.m.**  
**JRTC, 100 w Randolph Street, Room 2-025, Chicago**  
**IDOC, 1301 Concordia Court, ISU Building Lab Room, Springfield**

Board members in attendance (CHI): Joseph Antolin, Walter Boyd, Joe Bruscato, Sean O'Brien (for Jack Cutrone), Patricia Hayden, Tom Mahoney, Angelique Orr, Jesus Reyes, Michelle Saddler, Mike Pelletier  
Board members in attendance (SPI): Mike Torchia, Kathy Saltmarsh, Ken Tupy (for Adam Monreal)  
Board members by phone: James Radcliffe

Non-board members in attendance: Mike Bacula, Jordan Boulger, Emily Cole, Mary Ann Dyar, Esther Franco-Payne, Margie Groot, Lindsey LaPointe, Mark Myrent, Jessica Reichert, Rebecca Skorek, Juliana Stratton, Elizabeth Tarzia

Non-Board members in attendance via videoconference (SPI): Samantha Gaddy, Karrie Rueter

**Call to order/Roll call/Introductions**

Director Godinez called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. Mary Ann went through the roll call, and it was determined there was quorum.

Director Godinez announced Board changes: Mike Hood has left the Illinois Attorney General's Office to become Chief of Investigations at the Illinois Department of Corrections and we are still working on finding a replacement for the ARIOB. Walter Boyd is now the Executive Director of St. Leonard's Ministries. Angelique Orr is the Senior Director of Economic Development Initiatives at the Chicago Urban League. In staff changes, Lindsey LaPointe has gone to full-time as Project Coordinator.

**Approval of minutes from December 3, 2012 meeting**

Secretary Michelle Saddler called for a vote to approve the minutes from the December 3<sup>rd</sup> ARIOB meeting. Joe Antolin made the motion to approve, which was seconded by Tom Mahoney, and passed.

**Report from the Program Administrator**

Mary Ann provided the Program Administrator report, noting 100 additional enrollments in the last quarter of 2012, for a total of 838 cumulative diversions since the start of the program. There are now 12 counties in the ARI program with the addition of Crawford County and McDonough County (as part of the Knox County grant). The 838 diversions represent potential corrections savings of \$13.5 million based on an average intervention cost of \$5,900 per person. Staff is looking at a new cost-savings calculation based on actual site spending, which reduces the average intervention cost to \$2,700. Joe Antolin cautioned that intervention costs may be greater due to some ARI sites utilizing non-ARI funds to pay for program components; therefore, it might be useful to have two numbers – one for an ARI cost and one for the actual intervention cost.

Staff has continued outreach, and has brought on three planning grantees (Boone, Kane and LaSalle counties) and provided ramp-up funds for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit and Lake County. High-committing counties remain targets for program expansion.

**Committee reports**

Joe Bruscato presented the report on the recent Outreach, Technical Assistance & Communication Committee meeting. Members reviewed the recent website updates and held a planning discussion for the 2013 All-Sites Summit (theme, speakers, content). The committee reviewed a draft of a new site spending tool and discussed the 2012 Annual Report.

Patricia Hayden presented the report from the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee. Members reviewed and approved five requests for supplemental funding using undesignated state funding, as authorized at the December 2012 ARIOB meeting, in the following budget categories: (1) data and technology, (2) training, (3) direct service supplements, and (4) evaluation. The committee approved:

- St. Clair County – up to \$31,000 for cognitive behavioral groups and staff training.
- Winnebago County – up to \$31,801 for increased cost of residential treatment for females.
- Cook County – up to \$50,000 for case management software, and an additional \$144,000 in federal dollars for trauma informed services and staff training. (Mary Ann noted that much of Cook County’s supplemental request was directly related to recommendations resulting from the recent site visit.)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit – up to \$108,463 for a circuit-wide drug court ramp up.
- Lake County – up to \$92,877 for staff training and expanded residential treatment capacity.

Mary Ann reported that from the \$450,000 in state funding available, these awards total up to \$314,000 (minus \$144,000 of Cook County’s award which will come out of federal ARRA funds), leaving approximately \$136,000. Staff is anticipating receiving additional requests for supplemental funding before the end of the state fiscal year (June 30, 2013).

#### **Performance measurement report/Evaluation report**

In lieu of a Performance Measurement Committee report, Jordan Boulger, Research Analyst with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, updated the Board on data collection and the ongoing ICJIA evaluation. Quarterly data pulls were conducted from the ten fully implemented sites for the period October-December 2012. Standard bullet points were provided in the meeting materials, along with graphs on diversion goals by site. This information has also been provided to the sites as part of a feedback loop. All data received through calendar year 2012 are cumulative.

Jordan reported on the 25% reduction goal verification process, which consists of comparing/reconciling data submitted to evaluators and comparing to other data sites kept separately, such as enrollment rosters, and then comparing to the online Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) inmate tracker tool. The Macon and Winnebago counts were completed last fall, but all other counts are preliminary. Five pilot sites (DuPage, Fulton, Jersey, Knox, St. Clair) will begin final verification process this week and numbers will be available at the next ARIOB meeting.

There was a discussion about how IDOC commitments/revocations of ARI clients as the result of actions and charges from outside the ARI jurisdictions were counted in relation to reduction goals. Evaluators have been removing this data (individual) from the dataset since the ARI program had no control over the revocation, and it has not counted against their reduction goals but the information is retained for analysis.

Several Board members suggested that, in the context of a statewide program, it is important that all IDOC commitments of ARI clients, regardless of location, be counted since a “failure is a failure.”

Walter Boyd stated that IDOC commitment information needs to be shared with ARI sites so they can examine their interventions in the event of failure as evidenced by an ARI client committing a new crime. Jordan responded that this feedback is provided to and discussed with the sites, and then sites can review their selection process and interventions.

Jesus Reyes noted that Cook County’s ARI program, which focuses on swift and graduated sanctions, is an example of how, due to very different ARI models, a new offense may result in a sanction within an ARI program and an IDOC sentence in a non-ARI jurisdiction.

Mark Myrent, ICJIA's Research Director, suggested that these are two different measurement issues. One is program effectiveness where a new offense is a failure in this context, and feedback to the sites is necessary for ongoing program improvement. The other is the contractual obligation of sites to meet their 25% reduction goals in the number of IDOC commitments from their target populations, which might be better measured according to those commitments over which sites have control. Joe Antolin summed up the need for a two-pronged tracking mechanism (program effectiveness and contractual obligations) and noted Performance Measurement Committee will pick up this discussion.

Mary Ann asked if the juvenile Redeploy Illinois program faces similar issues, and Karrie Rueter noted distinct differences in the way juvenile Redeploy Illinois and Adult Redeploy Illinois handle performance measurement toward reduction goals since juvenile Redeploy Illinois requires overall 25% reductions in eligible commitments to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), and ARI calculates the 25% reduction based on target populations.

In addition, Jordan gave a brief update on the ARI evaluation, which is still in the data collection phase. Client interviews, currently in draft form, are going to be added to the evaluation. Client interviews will be conducted with individuals currently in ARI programs and with individuals who have terminated successfully and unsuccessfully. This qualitative information is expected to enrich the reports and provide indication as to the "why" of performance measures. Separate evaluation reports will be completed for each site. The original evaluation completion goal of Spring 2014 may be pushed back to accommodate additional sites.

#### **Presentation by the Cook County Adult Redeploy Illinois program**

Director Godinez introduced the panel from the Cook County ARI program, which included Juliana Stratton, Director, Cook County Justice Advisory Council; Mike Bacula, Cook County Adult Probation; Emily Cole, ARI Project Coordinator, Cook County State's Attorney's Office; and Beth Tarzia, Cook County's Public Defender's Office.

Juliana Stratton reported that the Cook County ARI program really got started in late February 2012. The program has included all criminal justice stakeholders in the planning and implementation stages. Early data show that offender behavioral has improved and individuals are successfully completing the program. Cook County stakeholders want to continue to focus on offenders with a high risk of recidivism and consider jail use and county costs in future planning.

Mike Bacula discussed what ARI funding has enabled Cook County to do differently from "business as usual" and provided background on the HOPE (Hawaii's Opportunity Probation with Enforcement) model on which the program is based. In HOPE, the key is to deliver swift, certain, and predictable sanctions for all probation violations to act as a deterrent to negative behavior, which can be difficult for traditional probation to implement with limited resources. The ARI program works closely with the sheriff's department to issue quick warrants, which is also different from the way things are in the traditional system. Probationers call into a hotline daily to find out if they are scheduled to report for drug testing that day. Other program components are similar to drug court such as team collaboration (judge, State's Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, probation), frequent status hearings for both compliance and non-compliance, incentives and rewards, access to treatment dollars, smaller caseloads, cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), and transportation assistance.

Emily Cole discussed eligibility, referrals, supervision and violations. The target population consists of medium- and high-risk probationers with compliance issues. A probation officer requests an ARI transfer in lieu of filing a violation. The request is sent to the State's Attorney's Office, which performs a background check for eligibility. If eligible, a transfer order is filed from the original probation judge to the ARI judge. The case then moves to the ARI court call, and the defendant attends a "warning hearing"

(integral part of HOPE model), which describes the expectations of the program. The ARI team holds a staffing before every court call to discuss the status of each case. At court, the judge calls each individual and discusses with them their status updates, and applies sanctions or incentives as needed.

Common conditions of ARI probation include drug testing, CBT groups, educational programming, substance abuse treatment, day reporting, SWAP (Sheriff's Work Alternative Program), electronic monitoring, and/or GPS monitoring. The violation process includes swift, certain and graduated sanctions. Incentives include early termination from probation (up to 1 year), suspension of daily call-ins (if 6 months clean), longer time between court dates and probation appointments, formal recognition from judge, and gift cards. Differences between ARI and standard probation include better officer rapport (with reduced caseloads), increased accountability, and direct feedback from the judge.

Mike Bacula provided statistics showing the impact of the program on offender behavior: 209 admitted overall, 163 still active, 30 successful terminations, 13 unsuccessful terminations (3 to IDOC). Of those terminated, 70% have been satisfactory, compared to 60% in standard probation with the felony population. On first drug tests, 62% of individuals had positive results while only 28% have subsequent positive tests. Of the 28%, only half have a subsequent positive test. This is an impressive drop off that the Cook County program attributes to the testing procedures and sanctions involved. Emily Cole noted that probationers are more likely to report their own non-compliance.

Elizabeth Tarzia shared a success story regarding a lifelong drug user who initially tested positive. He was given 120 days of drug treatment followed by residence in a sober living home. During the 11 months in the ARI program, he began coming to court in a suit and sharing his resume. He recently successfully terminated the program. More generally, she reported developing good rapport with ARI clients and hearing moving speeches at CBT class graduations reflecting on camaraderie in the program.

Emily Cole summed up the program goals for the near future including expanding client transportation assistance, developing a more structured incentive program, starting community-based cognitive behavioral therapy groups, and improving communication with substance abuse treatment providers.

Tom Mahoney asked if the program assists with state identification cards, and the team noted the complications with this issue. Director Godinez noted that assistance is available through the IDOC "Summits of Hopes" which are open to all parolees and could be made available to ARI individuals. Juliana also mentioned her role on the subcommittee on identity as part of Judge Biebel's Justice and Health Initiative looking at Cook County's Medicaid waiver. Director Godinez offered to provide more information on upcoming Summits of Hope, and it was suggested that staff continue to look at this issue.

Secretary Saddler thanked the Cook County team for its presentation.

### **Update on Juvenile Redeploy Illinois**

Secretary Saddler introduced Karrie Rueter from the juvenile Redeploy Illinois program, on which ARI is based, which has been successfully operating since 2005. Karrie provided an overview of the program which now works with 28 counties with implementation grants, and four more with planning grant (Vermillion, Winnebago, Cook, and the 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial Circuit). In addition, some funds have been set aside for individual case plans from non-Redeploy sites, which Ogle has accessed. Legislation currently pending that will allow for special considerations for Cook County may make it possible to bring certain geographical subsets of Cook on as sites. Over the years, funding has been cut, and the program has incrementally reduced grants. The program reports significant positive impact, with participating counties having reduced their aggregate juvenile commitments to DJJ by 51%. The 2012 Annual Report is out, and a cost-benefit and recidivism study is almost complete. Board members have historically engaged in site visits and provided positive feedback.

### **Budget Update**

Director Godinez asked Mary Ann to provide a budget and spending update. In the interest of time, Mary Ann offered to provide a written report that would address the various issues at play, including an update on undesignated state funds, spending at sites, and how this information will shape ARI needs in FY14.

### **Old business/New business**

Secretary Saddler asked about the sites that were having difficulty meeting their reduction goals, namely Knox and Jersey counties, and whether corrective action plans were needed. Mary Ann reported that Jersey County recently increased their enrollments above their reduction goal in part by modifying eligibility criteria and accepting individuals from neighboring Greene County.

Knox County was still short of their reduction goal of 29, which was increased from 21 in January 2012 in exchange for supplemental funding to maintain cost-effectiveness. Knox County never accessed the supplemental funding and have since closed out the federal grant and moved to state dollars. Knox County stakeholders state that program capacity is currently maxed out at 24 with one probation officer and limited treatment space. ARI staff suggested Knox County be allowed to revert back to the original reduction goal of 21 since they never accessed the supplemental funding; and, as such, will have met their reduction goal as of December 31, 2012.

Joe Antolin made the motion that Knox County be able to revert back to the initial reduction goal, with the caveat that staff continues to look at cost-effectiveness. The motion was seconded by Tom Mahoney, and passed.

### **Adjournment**

Upon a motion by Patricia Hayden, seconded by Walter Boyd, the meeting was adjourned at 3:37pm.  
**(Approved 5/6/13)**