

**Minutes from the ARIOB Joint Committee Meeting
Performance Measurement Committee (PMC)
Site Selection & Monitoring Committee (SS&M)
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor – Large Conference Room, Chicago
Monday, December 21, 2015 2:00p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

ARIOB in attendance: Patricia Hayden (PMC and SS&M), Lisa Castillo (for John Maki, SS&M), Chris Devitt (for John Maki, PMC), Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood, PMC), Angelique Orr (SS&M), Lori Roper (for Amy Campanelli, SS&M)

ARIOB on phone: ARIOB Co-Chair, John Baldwin; Kathy Saltmarsh (PMC)

Others in attendance: Mary Ann Dyar, John Greenlees, Shataun Hailey, Shai Hoffman, Lindsey LaPointe, Gwen Maxwell, Mystik Miller

Others on phone: Judge Thomas Sumner (Ret.)

Welcome and introductions:

Angelique Orr called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m. It was determined that there was a quorum for both committees of the joint meeting. ARI staff provided an overview of the need for this joint committee meeting and the scope of work for both committees.

Approval of previous meeting minutes:

Angelique Orr asked for review of the previous meeting minutes, two for Site Selection & Monitoring and one for Performance Measurement.

Patricia Hayden made a motion to approve both sets of Site Selection & Monitoring Committee meeting minutes and Lisa Castillo seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Jordan Boulger made a motion to approve the Performance Measurement Committee meeting minutes and Chris Devitt Westley seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Update and discussion on impact of SFY16 Budget on Adult Redeploy Illinois

Mary Ann updated the committee on the impact of the state budget crisis on the sites. Although no SFY16 funding has been disbursed, sites are operating on budget plans that maintain their SFY15 programs. Through November 2015, the sites are spending at about 65% of their maintenance budgets and have been serving approximately 1,400 individuals collectively at this point in time. Mary Ann reminded the group that the Governor's proposed SFY16 budget included \$10M for ARI while the House's proposed budget included \$8.5M for ARI.

It is important for ARI the ARIOB, ARI staff and the local sites to be prepared for all possible budget scenarios. Through November 2015, there is \$1.9 million owed to the ARI sites and it is estimated that this amount will be \$2.3 or \$2.4 million by the end of the calendar year. In contrast, \$3.5 million would be owed if the sites were operating at full capacity.

If an appropriation for ARI were \$7 million, ARI could reimburse the sites through December and fund them for the next 6 months at 100% of budget, cover administrative costs and still have funds available for the ramp up of DuPage, DeKalb and Kendall counties' plans. If an eventual appropriation for ARI were under \$6 million, things would more challenging and there would be a need to make different decisions.

In the past several months, ARI staff has maintained regular contact with the sites and provided monthly updates to the ARIOB. The sites have expressed concerns about the ability to meet the 25% goals due to a decrease in services provided and a decrease in participants referred and enrolled into the local programs. The budget impasse has resulted in sites decreasing their overall services and decreasing evidence-based practices and services. ARI staff is aware that recidivism may increase. Lindsey noted that the ARIOB will be prepared to look at prorating reduction goals. If some sites have closed their doors or made acute service cuts, the ARIOB will need to know specifics to determine if the lack of ability to meet the reduction goal is a consequence of the budget issues. Chris Devitt Westley noted numbers on returns to IDOC is another pertinent piece of the information to add to the compiled data for these analysis and decisions. ARI staff should track these numbers to gauge increases.

Mary Ann added that some sites are still operating at 100% spending and service levels while other sites have made major reductions. McLean County for example is spending at 21% of their maintenance budget. Most sites are operating at about 50-60% of their maintenance budgets and ARI staff anticipates an effect from these reductions in spending and services. In terms of information on a future SFY16 appropriation for ARI, there is nothing new about the state budget to report.

ARI staff provides information on the status of ARI sites to the executive staff at the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) and the Governor's Office. ARI staff plans to send a year-end email to all sites to encourage and thank them for their hard work and provide an update on the status of the program. The sites are still providing data on a quarterly basis, which will be assembled and shared with the committees and full ARIOB in late-January and early-February after the January 15th data pull.

Lori Roper did not have specific information to share on the impact of the impasse on the two ARI programs in Cook County; however, there is concern about the lack of ARI funds to potentially start mental health courts in Skokie and Bridgeview where there is interest. Lindsey noted that the service provider in Randolph County (in the 20th Judicial Circuit) has to pull out as of December 31st. The program, which serves a small number of people, will essentially be suspended.

Discussion of Cook HOPE ARI Corrective Action Plan (CAP) progress

Lindsey provided the background of Cook HOPE, the CAP and the contingencies of their SFY16 funding, which required progress on the CAP in order for funding to go beyond December 31, 2015. The CAP covers changes in the eligibility criteria and the case referral process to ensure the program participants are prison-bound to align with ARI goals.

Lindsey shared highlights from the stakeholder survey which was a part of the CAP, noting that 13 responses were received. The survey was another data point for a committee of the ARIOB to gather information about the program's progress.

The program representatives shared that the Cook HOPE program has made tremendous progress on the CAP, and the CAP helped the team to address issues with changes to the referral process as they arose. Program representatives also shared that the program sometimes becomes aware of high needs (drug or mental health issues) after program enrollment. Individuals with high mental health needs can be moved to mental health probation fairly easily, however high need drug offenders are harder to shift out of the program and into drug courts in Cook County because those programs take referrals on the front end of the system and not transfers from probation.

In response to a committee member question, the program noted that opening up the eligibility criteria created some issues with the LSI-R assessment. Due to the CAP, bond court referrals now are screened off of arraignment. While the assistant state's attorneys (ASA) in bond court are directed to only refer

prison-bound individuals to the Cook HOPE ARI program, some of the referrals have been found to score lower than 25 on the LSI-R (the threshold established by the CAP) once the assessment is conducted by probation and/or have very high needs (which are not assessed in bond court) that are not appropriate for the program. The team is trying to develop methods to determine appropriateness of referrals from bond court, aside from the general prison-bound nature of the individual per the ASA. Internal procedures are still being worked out.

Mary Ann noted the general HOPE model is one model on a continuum of diversion programs and it targets a high-risk and low-need population. The program representatives agreed that the Cook HOPE program is best-suited for this population, but they noted that the program has managed to address high need offenders when necessary. Based on the CAP process, the program has done a good job of screening out low-risk offenders. The program representatives noted that a high-risk and low-need population may have an LSI-R score of under 25, in part because the LSI-R only accounts for up to three convictions. Kathy Saltmarsh expressed some concerns about the validity of the LSI-R to measure risk given this individual example shared by the program.

The program representatives offered that the bond court process in regards to Cook HOPE may need to be changed by adding an earlier assessment. No TASC assessment is available at bond court and probation is not able to complete an LSI-R assessment on direct bond court referrals since individuals are not on probation at that point. If funding were available, a TASC officer could do the needed assessment to ensure appropriate referrals. ARI staff recognized that these discussions about risk and need are productive and a big change from prior practices that were characterized by a lack of information sharing or discussion about LSI-R-risk assessment levels.

Lindsey went over more of the CAP progress report, with data through November 30th. The CAP step related to LSI-R scores is a proxy for prison-bound, and the CAP outlines a benchmark of 50% of enrollees from June 1st onward would have an LSI-R score of over 25. This benchmark was based on an analysis of similar programs in the most similar jurisdictions. Data through November 30th indicates the data shows 48% in relation to the benchmark of 50%. Overall during October and November referrals were down and the program representatives noted that this was due to screening out low-risk individuals as the target population was modified.

The program representatives noted that the team is clear on the target population now, but there are still changes needed to the case referral process, in particular the direct referrals from bond court. The committee discussed the need for more information on the defendants at the bond court referral stage, including the role that probation screening or presentence investigations (PSIs) could play. The HOPE ARI program was added to the list of options that bond court ASAs refer to (ACT Court, RAP Court, etc.). Kathy Saltmarsh suggested that the program should explore probation resources for better screening at bond court. Jordan Boulger offered he will bring this up with the probation stakeholders of the team.

Mary Ann noted that the percentage of enrollments with a 25 or above on the LSI-R has been ramping up due to a focus on enrolling higher risk individuals and we would expect this to level off in the near future. ARI staff summarized the discussion and noted the need to vote on continuation funding for the program. ARI staff asked for further discussion before a vote and if enough information had been provided.

Lindsey reminded the group that the CAP progress report is self-reported and the data has not yet been verified with the data pull data. Coordination, communication and scheduling issues made it impossible to verify the data. There is no reason to believe the data would be inaccurate, although sometimes there are discrepancies due to definitions of "enrollments." It was noted that there are some coordination and communication challenges in Cook HOPE and it may be a result of the size of the county and the multiple

departments that are a part of the program. There is room for improvement in overall coordination and data collection.

Angelique Orr summed up that the verification of data would make an appropriate contingency for continued funding, recognizing that the team has made great progress. ARI staff continued that there has been good, foundational changes, but the CAP process is usually for 12 months so the CAP should be extended to a full 12 months (since the May 2015 updates) and perhaps expanded to improve coordination in a move away from a focus on improving the risk level of enrollees. Board members expressed support for this and the possibility of decreasing CAP progress reports to quarterly instead of monthly. The coordination and communication issues are beyond just receiving data on time (which has mostly occurred) and more about assisting the site to improve coordination and communication processes so the process is less burdensome on all departments.

On the topic of coordination, the program representatives reported that the program does not have any sort of steering committee structure and there is little time for this due to staffings four days per week in which the coordinator participates once per week and supervisors are “in and out.” It was noted that some mechanism like a steering committee (or a retreat as in June 2014) would be helpful, especially due to staff turnover within the program. Lindsey noted that a consistent convening of major stakeholders can be helpful. The program representatives noted that in the past there was a mechanism for this.

Site Selection & Monitoring Committee Chair Angelique Orr asked for a motion from the SS&M Committee to continue the funding for Cook HOPE ARI through June 30, 2016 with the contingencies of extending the CAP through June 30, 2016, the verification of data, and improvements to coordination within the program. Patricia Hayden made a motion and Lisa Castillo seconded. All in favor, none opposed, motion passes. Lori Roper abstained.

Update on evaluation work

ARI is working with the research and analysis unit at ICJIA on implementation evaluation reports of the 10 initial pilot sites. A drug court model evaluation was published in December and is included in the meeting materials. Mary Ann provided background on this.

Old business /new business

Lindsey will send out suggested dates for the performance management committee to meet before the February 8th ARIOB meeting.

Adjournment

Upon a motion to adjourn by Chris Devitt Westley and seconded by Jordan Boulger, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58p.m

(Approved 2/8/16)