

Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board Meeting
Monday, February 6, 2012
1:30 to 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 (Chicago): Joe Antolin, Mike Bacula (for Jesus Reyes), Joe Bruscato, Walter Boyd, Jack Cutrone, Tony Godinez, Patricia Hayden, Cynthia Hora (for Mike Hood), Thomas Mahoney, Michael Pelletier, Michelle Saddler, Kathy Saltmarsh
Board member in attendance (Springfield): Mike Torchia

Board members absent: Christopher Garcia, Angelique Orr Gordon, Adam Monreal, James Radcliffe,

Non Board members in attendance: Brianna Baker Carvell, Jordan Boulger, Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, John Maki, Tim McGavin, Mark Myrent, Sean O'Brien, Jessica Reichert, Lindsay Riess, Daynia Sanchez-Bass

Call to order/Roll call/Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m. Director Godinez welcomed the group, and Mary Ann Dyar called roll determining there was a quorum.

Mary Ann Dyar introduced Lindsey LaPointe, the new Project Coordinator for Adult Redeploy Illinois.

Approval of the minutes of November 7, 2011 meeting

Director Godinez called for a vote to approve the minutes from the last ARIOB meeting on November 7th. Upon a motion by Joe Antolin, seconded by Joe Bruscato, the minutes from the November 7th ARIOB meeting were approved.

Report from the Program Administrator

Mary Ann Dyar, Program Administrator, provided a report on the activities in the Adult Redeploy Illinois program over the past quarter. A written report was included in the meeting materials.

As of December 2011, 207 non-violent offenders have been diverted from IDOC for total potential savings of \$3.3 million, calculated using the average cost (FY10) of incarceration in IDOC (\$22,000) minus the average cost of diversion through the pilot sites (\$5,900). Additional information is available in the 2011 annual report.

The three ARIOB committees (Site Selection & Monitoring; Outreach, Technical Assistance & Communication; and Performance Measurement) met in the past two weeks, and each will be providing reports later in the meeting.

Mary Ann showed members the "dashboard" document that was produced to highlight key indicators in the program for management and communication purposes. Information is included as of October 2011 and as of December 2011, showing increased impact in the program in the key indicators.

Approval of supplemental funding requests and planning grant processes

Secretary Saddler noted that the Oversight Board agreed at the November meeting to prioritize use of the undesignated federal funds in the form of supplemental funding for the existing pilot sites (based on need and performance to date), with remaining funds to be used for planning grants to potential new sites.

Applications were received from six sites, totaling over \$520,000, with funding recommendations for \$436,044. The group discussed the impact the funding decisions have on the amount available for planning grants. Initially the goal was to provide planning grants of up to \$30,000 each to three to four potential new sites. With the committee's current recommendations, only \$35,000 would be available for planning grants.

On behalf of the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee, Walter Boyd described the process undertaken to review the supplemental funding requests received by the sites and prepare funding recommendations. With a total of \$465,000 of undesignated federal funds available to spend by February 2013, a supplemental funding notice was sent out to the ten pilot sites with a suggested cap of \$100,000 per site application. The committee looked at how the supplemental funding would impact a site's ability to meet its reduction goals, as well as the consequences of not funding or partially funding the request. If there was a significant negative impact on cost-effectiveness (cost/diversion), the committee suggested an increase in the reduction goal in exchange for the funds. The cost/diversion is based on the site's minimum reduction goal stated in the grant agreement, which could be exceeded thereby improving cost-effectiveness. Secretary Saddler noted that three of the six funding recommendations involve a request to increase a program's reduction goals.

ARIOB dealt first with Macon County's request for \$155,560. There was concern that the request exceeded the suggested cap of \$100,000. Mary Ann noted that Macon County defended requesting a higher amount because of the comprehensiveness of their program and their ambitious reduction goal. The group felt it was a matter of fairness to the other applicants to enforce the cap, but they also discussed the consequences of partially funding Macon County's request. An additional probation officer is needed in order to meet evidence-based standards of caseload sizes for intensive probation supervision. The request also includes funds for drug testing, treatment and grant administration. The group acknowledged the fact that Macon County took on the most aggressive reduction goal, tackling their entire ARI-eligible population for the 25% reduction. This was perhaps too ambitious given the funding constraints.

It was noted that, even with additional funding, the cost/diversion for Macon County is lower than any other site. It was suggested that in the same way that supplemental funding is being used to leverage increases in reduction goals for some sites, perhaps it could warrant a suggested decrease in Macon County's reduction goal if their request is not fully funded. Sean O'Brien stated that this change requires a redefinition of their target population and a new grant agreement.

Upon a motion by Cynthia Hora and seconded by Joe Antolin, the Board voted to approve Macon County for \$100,000 in supplemental funding. Joe Bruscato was opposed.

Jack Cutrone suggested the rest of the supplemental funding requests be voted on as a group. There was a question about why Cook County's funding recommendation did not include the requested evaluation funds. Mary Ann noted that the committee deferred the decision to fund a Cook County evaluator until it can be determined how that effort would compare to the evaluation conducted by ICJIA. Cook County staff has not yet been trained about what information can be collected with the ICJIA tool. There was also a question about the possible expansion of DuPage County's target population to meet the increased reduction goal with the supplemental funding. It was noted that, in the event of a partial award, the site can determine the allocation of the funds in their budget.

Upon a motion by Jack Cutrone and seconded by Joe Antolin, the Board voted to approve the rest of the supplemental funding recommendations as a group. Patricia Hayden and Thomas Mahoney abstained.

Based on these decisions, Secretary Saddler noted that approximately \$90,000 is left for planning grants. Mary Ann suggested authorizing staff (and the Site Selection and Monitoring Committee) to make

impending funding decisions using the approved planning grant process, to avoid having to reconvene the entire Oversight Board. Staff shared information on targets for planning grants, including high-committing counties, such as Will and Kane, and judicial circuits interested in producing circuit-wide models. Joe Antolin made the motion that the remaining funds be used to provide planning grants for up to 90 days for a maximum amount of \$30,000. Cynthia Hora seconded, and the motion was approved.

Reports from two remaining Board Committees

Joe Bruscato reported on the Outreach, Technical Assistance and Communications Committee meeting on January 26th which covered three main areas: (1) providing feedback on the 2011 Annual Report to highlight the cost-effectiveness of ARI; (2) increasing public awareness and buy-in, through general outreach focusing on pilot site accomplishments and utilizing community-based organizations and local media; and (3) using the web site as a tool to share important information which must be updated frequently. At the suggestion of the committee, staff will draft an outreach plan. Mary Ann added that the committee could use more ARI representation and that members can designate staff. The non-board participation of Brianna Baker-Carvell, Cristin Evans and Lindsey LaPointe was integral.

Joe Antolin reported on the Performance Measurement Committee Meeting on February 3rd. The committee was updated on progress with the ICJIA evaluation and database and discussed the utility of the data. A critical task of the committee will be verification of the 25% reduction goal from each site. This issue is complicated, given each site has a different target population and comparison is difficult. In addition, external data sources may be necessary. Mark Myrent from ICJIA is working on a cost-benefit analysis tool based on the Washington State Institute for Public Policy model for application in Illinois to articulate returns on investments. The tool (and its analysis of Adult Redeploy Illinois) will fit nicely into the new “budgeting for results” effort in Illinois.

Discussion of FY13 Budget

Secretary Saddler stated that the FY13 budget process is getting underway, and the Governor will introduce his budget on February 22nd in Springfield. All indications are that this is a bad year for state government; and, although new revenues were passed, there is a billion dollars less in FY13 for expenditure by state agencies than last year. However, ARI has solid results already and is well-positioned to withstand scrutiny in the “budgeting for results” initiative. The juvenile Redeploy Illinois program was under consideration for cuts, but the governor’s office stated it will stay in based on its positive results over the years.

Jack Cutrone reported that the governor’s office does intend to include \$2.5 million in ICJIA’s budget to continue ARI. Mary Ann stated this will continue support for the current ten sites through June 30, 2013, and hopefully bring on up to three new sites. Mary Ann encouraged Board members to help as they are able to secure support. This morning, she and Kathy Saltmarsh had a good meeting with Senator Heather Steans to discuss ARI. Staff can provide talking points, reflecting the information on the dashboard and fact sheet in the meeting packet. Staff can also draft a sample letter of support to elected officials. Jack Cutrone suggested letters to Representatives and Senators since the Governor is already on board. Joe Bruscato suggested a draft letter reflecting the clear and singular message referenced by the Outreach, Technical Assistance and Communications subcommittee.

Presentation by DuPage County Adult Redeploy Illinois pilot site

Director Godinez introduced Deputy Chief of Probation Tim McGavin and Probation Officer Lindsey Riess to give an overview of the DuPage County ARI program. DuPage County targets probation violators. The program hired three new probation officers; two from juvenile detention with much

experience running cognitive groups and one from the intake department. The staff was trained extensively in the effective casework model, assessments, offender motivations, and the EPICS program (from University of Cincinnati). Officers first received cases in late March of 2011 and met capacity by August 2011 (90 enrolled). Referrals are received primarily through sanctions, but more recently also received from court-ordered referrals (partnered with one of six felony judges), and very recently received directly from intake. ARI officers have caseloads of about 30 clients while traditional probation caseloads carry 70-75.

Recently, the DuPage County ARI program faced layoffs due to closure of the juvenile detention center. Two of the three ARI officers have been laid off. Two new officers from juvenile detention will join the team, and DuPage County has requested a fourth officer via the supplemental funding which would allow up to 140 simultaneous participants with acceptable caseloads.

Lindsey Riess highlighted the success of two of her current clients, including a 37 year old male who, despite chronic alcohol use and several periods of incarceration, had never had the opportunity to go through treatment. Another 25 year old male had been on probation for a year before a transfer to an ARI officer and had never had the chance to sit down with a probation officer for longer than a few minutes.

The group asked about the employment status of the clients. Tim McGavin answered that the two mentioned do not have jobs, however DuPage County contracts with an employment services provider that is available to work with clients. The group inquired if the employment provider has contacts with places that hire ex-offenders and Tim McGavin answered they use a list of companies that hire ex-offenders, but the program does more job readiness rather than job placement. Mary Ann offered the experience of community restorative boards at the Macon County site and how these community gatherings have assisted with networking for clients. Tim McGavin stated that he has been in contact with Judge Sumner about involving the faith-based community.

Patricia Hayden offered that as a director of a probation department (in DuPage), she views ARI as a means to conduct probation differently with smaller caseloads and an emphasis on evidence-based practices. She hopes for a "spillover effect" that will positively impact the rest of the department.

Old business/New business

Director Godinez asked if there is any new business. Jack Cutrone stated that a response is required to the letter the Oversight Board received from Macon County about the future of the program. He recommended Mary Ann draft a letter to Macon County for approval by the Oversight Board co-chairs.

Jack Cutrone motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Cynthia Hora seconded.

(Approved 5/7/12)