Minutes from the ARIOB Performance Measurement Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
ICJIA Large Conference Room, 300 W. Adams, Ste. 200, Chicago, IL 60606

ARIOB board members present: Joe Antolin, Rebecca Skorek (for John Maki), Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood), Walter Boyd, Nate Inglis Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)

Non-ARIOB present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, Sara Wasserteil, Mark Powers, Chris Devitt, Ashley Blair (Intern), LaTayia Sias (Intern), Kali Patrice (member of the public)

ARIOB by phone: Kathy Starkovich (for Patricia Hayden)

Welcome and introductions
Committee Chair Joe Antolin called roll at 2:35p.m., and it was determined there was quorum.

Approval of previous meeting minutes – December 9, 2014
Committee members reviewed the minutes from the December 9th meeting. Rebecca Skorek motioned to approve the minutes, and Walter Boyd seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Review of quarterly site data
Lindsey shared highlights from the quarterly data report compilation, which is self-reported data and is cross-checked with database data, which included:

- DuPage's implementation of a new intervention, the *Moving On* curriculum. The group discussed tracking the impact of a new intervention on outcomes for future evaluation purposes. It was noted that this may be easier to track at some sites than others (e.g. Access database or funded services). ARI staff noted that recommendations to replicate evidence-based or promising practices are frequently made by ARI staff or between sites.
- LaSalle's recent efforts to enroll more clients as the result of implementing changes on its corrective action plan.
- Several sites planning to conduct quality assurance checks at contractors. The group discussed coming up with a standard template or guidelines for sites to review the evidence-based practices the subcontractors are implementing. This may create a paperwork burden which ARI staff is always mindful of and the idea of a mandate (for sites to do QA on their own treatment providers) was discussed, but not recommended.
- Four sites specifically noted a request to make the database more user-friendly.

==Action items:== Track impact of new interventions for evaluation purposes.
Survey sites as to whether they visit contracted treatment providers to check quality of services provided.
Come up with means for sites to track quality assurance when visiting contracted providers.

Update on database and evaluation
Rebecca provided an update on data collection from the 18 current sites and the additional four sites coming on board. Research staff (R&A) is working to develop an automated web-based system that can provide a feedback loop to sites. These efforts are complicated by the fact that some sites use the ICJIA-created Access database, and others use Tracker or proprietary databases which require data matching and cleaning. R&A is focusing on a few data elements (LSI-R scores, enrollments, active clients, and IDOC commitments), and is beginning to look at treatment engagement (substance abuse, mental health, cognitive-behavioral therapy, employment services, etc.) which has been more challenging. R&A is preparing queries that will assist sites to complete their quarterly data reports. Kathy noted the need to provide instructions for accessing data that directly match the quarterly data report.

There was a discussion about the amount and type of data that are being collected, and the need for such data. Some data elements are specifically mandated for collection in the Crime Reduction Act, to be used to gauge program impact on recidivism reduction. These data are included in the contracts signed by the sites. Certain data elements have been used by R&A for the compilation of implementation evaluation reports on the first 10 pilot sites.
Joe noted that sites may only be reporting services that are ARI funded and may not include services covered by Medicaid.

The group talked about the need to collect the information to answer research questions (to be determined, possibly by this committee), as well as to determine where extraneous data are being collected that is burdensome to sites. Currently R&A is in the process of determining what data are being collected and how well they are being collected, with the goal to improve accuracy and close gaps in reporting. Chris noted that we should be asking sites what data is useful for them to run their program. Joe noted that this is important work for the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) and in the future it would make sense for ICJIA or IDOC to use these data for a social impact bond.

Mary Ann will check on ability for this committee, per the Open Meetings Act, to provide feedback on the necessity of data elements over e-mail, and committee members will need to see all the data elements collected again (data dictionary).

==Action items==: Share data dictionary with committee members to familiarize them with data being collected.
Provide instructions to sites on using database to extract information to complete quarterly data reports.
Complete review of ARI database for consistently missing or inaccurate data.
Develop research questions to guide data collection in the future, particularly as it relates to treatment engagement.

Discussion and review of proposed corrective action plan process and policy
Mary Ann opened the discussion on the corrective action plan policy matrix, noting that initiators of correction action plans (CAP) need to be expanded to areas fundamental to ARI as listed on the matrix (high risk, prison-bound, evidence-based practices, etc.) While ARI should have a general idea of how it will measure the added metrics (which could be incorporated into

the policies and procedures manual), these need not be included in the matrix so as to maintain flexibility, especially since the sites vary so much in size and program model. The committee discussed the matrix and necessary edits.

The matrix identifies *potential* initiators (triggers) for CAPs as they relate to fundamental principles outlined in site contracts. The matrix makes it clear what measures we are tracking, what initiates technical assistance, and what can be used to guide funding decisions. **It was determined that the Oversight Board needs to adopt this matrix and it should be shared with sites as to what is expected.** Jordan made a motion to approve the matrix with a removal of the asterisk, a removal of the "note" and the addition of the basic reduction goal contractual measure. Nate seconded. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

An update on the Cook HOPE CAP was provided. The committee reviewed the plan in order to develop a recommendation to the full board. Nate inquired on the cost per person, and ARI staff clarified that it is not a high cost per person. Joe noted that the plan is strong with specific, actionable steps. R&A staff will be asked to pull some LSI-R data by quarter to review the progress on the plan. Rebecca moved to approve the Cook HOPE CAP, Walter seconded. All in favor, none opposed, Jordan abstained, motion passed.

==Decisions==:   The CAP matrix was approved and will be forwarded to the Oversight Board for review and approval.
The Cook HOPE CAP was approved and will be forward to the Oversight Board for review and approval.

==Action items==: Share matrix with sites.
Pull LSI-R scores and other information to track progress with the Cook HOPE CAP – R&A.

Old Business/New Business
The committee will move the discussion about the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to a different venue.

The next meeting will be after the April 2014 data pull but before the May ARIOB meeting.

Adjournment
Rebecca made the motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Nate. All in favor, none opposed, meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.
(Approved 3/31/15)