

Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board  
Performance Measurement Committee

Tuesday, April 23, 2013  
3:00p.m.-4:30p.m.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), 300 w Adams St., 2<sup>nd</sup> fl, Chicago, IL 60606  
Small Conference room

ARIOB board members present: Joe Antolin, Kathy Starkovich (by phone, for Patricia Hayden)  
Non-ARIOB members present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, Jordan Boulger

Goals of meeting:

- Review previous performance measurement issues discussed and codified by PMC committee and ARI staff and prepare to report to the full ARIOB
- Update of site progress and representation of ongoing progress for dashboard
- Discussion of establishment of sites' 25% reduction goals for FY14

Update of site progress and dashboard presentation:

- Discussion of what information will show trends, be high quality, and useful to ARIOB.
- Two methods of data collection - quarterly data pull and quarterly data report.
- At end of CY12 cumulative diversions were reported (838), but with a more sustained program we need more granular information within specified time periods.
  - Granular time periods can reflect the off-setting of what Illinois could have spent to incarcerate. Date ranges presented can align with fiscal year instead of CY if necessary.
- Cost per person presented in 2012 Annual Report was based on how much sites spent, not amount budgeted.
- Joe Antolin brought up the Governor's recent announcement of the Pay for Success initiative:
  - <http://www3.illinois.gov/PressReleases/ShowPressRelease.cfm?SubjectID=3&RecNum=11072>
  - Last month the Federal Reserve of San Francisco released several papers on the model
- Information was provided to PMC on numbers served (based on quarterly data report –self report)
- Idea to message data as “98% of population served in first quarter of 2013 was not committed to IDOC.” (14/689 served)
  - 2% of those served in recent quarter went to IDOC
  - 78% of all terminations in recent quarter did not go to IDOC (14/64) or 22% did go to IDOC
- Discussed the current numbers as a burgeoning track record due to youth of program. Expectation that unsuccessful and successful terminations will increase until an equilibrium of individuals starting and completing the programs is hit.
- In general researchers would frown on a lack of control group however ARI-eligible individuals who went straight to IDOC operate as a comparison group. Comparisons must be done within counties due to program variation and inability to compare programs across counties.
- Multi-site studies often aggregate similar programs and ARI staff and committee has discussed aggregating ARI program models for evaluation purposes – aggregate models could be compelling to stakeholders, such as legislators.

#### Managing ongoing data

- \$2,233 cost per person last year based on spending and numbers served – concern that this will change/increase and thus look negative as cost per person goes up. What could be highlighted on a dashboard for internal and external purposes?
- ARI always wants to be under or around the marginal cost of prison.
- 450 diverted can close an IDOC cellblock.
- It is meaningful to highlight both commitment rates from all terminations and from all numbers served
- The old dashboard (CY 2012) can suffice the general public (state savings, numbers diverted), however more granular documents useful for other audiences.

#### Guiding principle documents:

- Documents are a follow up to previous PMC meeting to codify principles and process for counting reductions goals – continuing and new sites.
- Documents lay out steps for counting and verifying the reductions
- Currently, individuals who deceased are not counted against the reduction goal, or, they are counted as a diversion from IDOC – does this need to be changed?
  - Granular data on deceased individuals exists and currently classified as “other” termination.
- Joe Antolin and Kathy Starkovich offer that the documents are clear and straight forward, charts could benefit from color, clear to people unfamiliar with the program.
- Kathy Starkovich offers documents very helpful to ARI programs – encourages sharing documents with sites for day to day or managerial use.

#### Discussion of establishment of sites’ 25% reduction goals for FY14:

- Brief report on technical assistance provided to DuPage County to assist with establishing FY14 reduction goals.
- Previous “overshot” of reduction goal was a result of big counties enrolling large numbers in programs who remain active due to a long program duration.
- Program capacity has to be a factor before any new 25% reduction number is established.
- The future approach to establishing reduction goals for renewing sites will involve the ARI evaluator suggesting a reduction goal based on performance and a discussion of the possibility and identification of gaps, such as program capacity.

#### Next steps:

- Analyze granular data on “other terminations” quarterly
- Add color to Guiding Principle documents and explore providing to ARI programs, especially new programs
- Ensure an analysis of program capacity when calculating new 25% reduction goals
- Continue to explore indicators to highlight on a dashboard for internal and external purposes.

#### Old business/new business:

- None

**(Approved 10/24/13)**