

Minutes from the ARIOB Performance Measurement Committee Meeting
Tuesday, March 31, 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, John Maki, Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood), Walter Boyd, Mystik Miller (for Kathy Saltmarsh)

ARIOB by phone: Kathy Starkovich (for Patricia Hayden), Judge Jim Radcliffe

Non-ARIOB present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, Sara Wasserteil, Chris Devitt, Ashley Blair (Intern), LaTayia Sias (Intern), Reshma Desai, Ernst Melchior, Lynne Mock

Non-ARIOB by phone: Judge Tom Sumner

Welcome and introductions

Committee Chair Joe Antolin called roll at 2:35p.m., and it was determined there was quorum. It was noted that the corrective action plan matrix document was adopted by the ARI OB at the February 2nd full board meeting.

Approval of previous meeting minutes – January 27, 2015

Committee members reviewed the minutes from the January 27th meeting. Mystik Miller motioned to approve the minutes with one typo acknowledged, and Walter Boyd seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Review of decisions made - Corrective action matrix

The focus of this discussion was how to implement the corrective action matrix adopted by the ARIOB in February 2015. The matrix will be used as a tool to inform the development of corrective action plans, but it was acknowledged that there is not a one size fits all response to issues raised via the matrix. It was decided that the matrix should be distributed to current sites to clarify expectations, and to prospective sites to set a framework to help them understand the minimum requirements for implementing an ARI grant. Upon discussion on the importance of defining “evidence-based practice” and “fidelity,” ARI staff confirmed that the definition of evidence-based practices has been and will continue to be included in the request for proposals (RFP) and that sites are provided a myriad options of evidence-based practices to choose from. Fidelity is more difficult to define concretely since it varies by model (e.g. drug court, *Moral Reconation Therapy*). It was noted that if a site falls short of its 25% reduction goal, fidelity to the various models within the program is one measure ARI staff will analyze for potential corrective action.

Decisions: “Fidelity” will not be defined, but analyzed if a site fails to meet its 25% reduction goal.

Action items: Distribute corrective action matrix to all current sites to set expectations – ARI staff
Distribute corrective action matrix to prospective sites to set grant expectations – ARI staff (e.g. include in RFP).

Review of decisions made – Thresholds of LSI-R risk scores

The thresholds the committee agreed upon in January 2015 were 66% of participants having moderate-to-high LSI-R scores by June 2015 and 80% by June 2016. It was noted that evidence-based practices state 70% of participants in a correctional intervention program should be moderate-to-high risk so ARI is squarely within range. At present, most sites are in the 80% range. This is the first time that ARI is setting number thresholds (aside from the 25% reduction goal) so it will be important to communicate these new standards to current and future sites when and if the board adopts them. For instance ARI has a general de-factor cost-effectiveness threshold, but it has not been codified and is not in the contracts.

ARI must consider if potential sites will be intimidated by a threshold, making counties less likely to engage in ARI. The other consideration is exceptions (e.g. mental health courts in smaller jurisdictions). For example, a rural mental health court serving a small amount of low risk and high need individuals may put the site under the threshold even though the site may be serving high-need prison-bound offenders.

A few clarifications were made: the failure to meet the LSI-R score thresholds will initiate an inquiry by ARI staff; this committee will review this data quarterly; the local county standards for risk levels will be utilized; and if and when the full board approves the thresholds, they will be worked into the actual contracts.

John Maki motioned to adopt the LSI-R thresholds and Walter Boyd seconded. No objections or abstentions. Motion passed.

Decisions: LSI-R standards adopted to bring to the ARIOB for approval

Review of data for benchmarks - IDOC revocations of unsuccessful exists by site

Lindsey opened this discussion, explaining that this document is another proxy to determine if a participant was truly prison-bound (e.g. how many of those who unsuccessfully exited the program went to IDOC). The methodology was modeled after Dr. Dave Olson's analysis of an ARI program last year. The chart provided is not updated with current numbers and will be updated after April 15th.

The committee discussed data integrity issues and Research and Analysis (R&A) staff noted that inconsistencies have been found in the legacy data and the form of presentation may change. Members asked if a certain number of participants have to have exited a program to render this a reliable trigger (for an inquiry on if participants are prison-bound which may lead to a corrective action plan). Chris Devitt noted that there has been some integrity issues with specific numbers and participants county as committed to IDOC and R&A is actively working on accuracy. It was clarified that this document (and measure) does not deal with program diversion goals, but instead is a proxy to determine a prison-bound population. It was noted that this proxy was Dave Olson's recommendation during his work for Cook HOPE and he has volunteered to do it for any additional ARI sites. The program will continue to analyze whether this is a useful measure to determine whether a site's participants were truly prison-bound – especially since ARI dosage could decrease a person's risk score, reducing their likelihood of going to prison. Notes on why these participants existed will be an helpful addition to this document.

The program will continue to analyze whether this is a useful measure to determine whether a site's participants were truly prison-bound – especially since ARI dosage could decrease a person's risk score, reducing their likelihood of going to prison. ARI staff will bring another version of the document to the next meeting with suggested additions that could include background on the measure, the methodology, number of people in a program to make this a useful measure, a note on the start-date for every site (for context), and possible background on non-IDOC dispositions for unsuccessful exits.

Decisions: Before ARI uses this data to make decisions or initiate inquiries, it will analyze and focus on data from sites with more numbers and longer histories to understand its strength as a proxy. Background and methodology is important to include – ARI staff/R&A

Action items: Compile background on this document and measure, including on Dave Olson's methodology – R&A and ARI staff.

Update on sites under corrective action plans (CAP)

Mary Ann provided an update on the three sites under corrective action plans. Jersey has met its stretch reduction goal and LaSalle is on track to meet its reduction goal for next quarter, demonstrating the effectiveness of the CAP process. The Cook HOPE program is different since the question is whether they are serving a prison-bound population. Background was provided on the corrective action plan thus far with Cook HOPE. In sum, it is the responsibility of ARI staff to ensure that all ARI funds are serving a prison-bound population.

Most recently, ARI staff followed up with Chief Judge Evans and Cook HOPE stakeholders confirming that the CAP was approved and that the site would report on its progress in April 2015 for consideration in the renewal funding process. Judge Sumner will follow up with Chief Judge Evans to see if another meeting is necessary. It was noted that Cook HOPE's low rate of sending unsuccessful participants to IDOC could be the result of a lag

(between the termination date and the IDOC commitment date) due to administrative delays. It will be important to look at timeframes for how long it takes for a person who unsuccessfully exits ARI to be committed to IDOC and to be clear on any data integrity issues related to the data on IDOC revocation rates of unsuccessful exits by site.

The Performance Measurement committee will discuss progress on the CAP and renewal funding at their next meeting once we have more data when the April deadline for the CAP progress report has passed. Ultimately, the committee needs to understand whether the policies that serve as barriers for high-risk individuals entering Cook HOPE can be dismantled, and if not, consider the type of action that will be taken during the next funding cycle (e.g. funding for a probationary period). This process should also allow Cook HOPE to identify other funding sources if renewal dollars are no longer available.

The committee discussed the general timeline for renewal funding decisions, noting that the full board will vote on May 18th based on recommendations of the Site Selection & Monitoring committee which will meet the week prior. At this point, the committee knows that some progress has been made and other progress has not been made. It was decided that this committee will make a recommendation to the Site Selection & Monitoring committee based on an analysis of progress on their CAP at the next Performance Measurement committee meeting. ARI staff noted that an analysis of CAP progress can focus on written policy changes and a change in LSI-R scores. Joe Antolin noted that if a six month grant was a possibility, ARI staff and the board should be very clear on what changes are needed during the probationary period.

Decisions: Six months of probationary funding would be a reasonable option given the lag in results likely to occur if CAP recommendations have been implemented.

Action items: Judge Sumner and ARI staff will follow up with Chief Judge Evans to see if another meeting is necessary and re-emphasize that non-action will be a factor in renewal funding decisions.

Old business/New business

Highlights from the DuPage ARI Implementation Evaluation were provided and the full report is available online. Kathy Starkovich offered information on the importance of cognitive-behavioral training for the probation officers and she also noted that during the last six months of the measurement period there was significant staff turnover in the program. The report (full or highlights) will be provided to the full ARIOB at the May 18th meeting.

Joe Antolin thanked John Maki, the new ICJIA Director, for being a part of this meeting.

The next meeting will be Friday, May 8th from 2-4pm.

Adjournment

Mystik Miller made the motion to adjourn, which was seconded by John Maki. All in favor, none opposed, meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

(Approved 9/23/15)