Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board
Performance Measurement Committee
Friday, May 16, 2014
3:00p.m.-5:00p.m.
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), 300 W. Adams St., 2nd fl, Chicago, IL
60606
Small Conference room

ARIOB board members present: Joe Antolin, Jordan Boulger (for Jack Cutrone), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)
Non-ARIOB present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe
ARIOB by phone: Kathy Starkovich (for Patricia Hayden), Joan Small (for Michelle Saddler)

Mary Ann Dyar opened the meeting and determined there was quorum.

Update on sites' progress in FY14
Jordan Boulger presented charts with sites' progress toward their diversion goals as of March 31st, from the latest quarterly data pull. The charts allow ARI staff and the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB) to see which sites are on track in enrolling and diverting clients and which sites may need technical assistance.

The charts include the 25% reduction goal and enrollment figures towards that goal. Some sites have a reduction goal that exceeds 25% of the target population due to the need to maintain cost effectiveness and program capacity issues. A separate service goal is included, too, which is the number the sites expect to serve to be sure to meet their reduction goal. The group suggested including the target population number in the chart, as well as the overall program-eligible population which will highlight the potential of bringing programs to-scale. Additionally, including information on the site-specific target population would be helpful. Most sites have one ARI program with one target population although some jurisdictions work with different target populations with more than one program (Cook, Winnebago) or more than one type of service (Lake). The committee discussed the importance of targeting populations at high risk of recidivating, as well as focusing on high-need individuals (e.g., behavioral health, substance abuse).

The information on the charts is provided to the ARIOB and to the sites as a feedback mechanism on a quarterly basis. Committee members asked about projected enrollment trends for the next quarter to determine if some sites were likely to be short of their goals at June 30th, the end of the fiscal year.

The committee discussed ways to encourage current sites to divert more of the program-eligible population, for example using a planning grant process to determine possible program enhancements for greater impact. This year, the Cook HOPE program received a planning grant to discuss its effectiveness reaching its target population.

Joe Antolin suggested presenting a menu of evidence-based practices to show specifically how programs could expand to different target populations with specific tools and interventions. ARI staff could use this information in outreach activities to show a jurisdiction, for example, how existing diversion options can be leveraged or expanded upon with evidence-based practices to target the numbers of non-violent offenders being committed to IDOC.

Kathy Starkovich provided the example of DuPage County to demonstrate the difference between the service goal and the reduction goal, both of which are used to measure the cost-effectiveness of the program. In DuPage County, the service goal is based on program capacity between four officers

(caseload of 35, average service goal of 130). The SFY14 reduction goal is 47, based on the estimated target population of probation violators sent to IDOC over the prior three years. In a 12-month grant period in DuPage County, there may be considerable turnover in ARI caseloads since a mechanism was recently developed to move eligible participants off of ARI (intensive) probation and onto standard probation when warranted. The charts do not indicate the turnover rate in a program based on the intensity of intervention and the characteristics of the program clients. Data show the cumulative enrollment towards the reduction goal but not the current number active in the program at a given time. Kathy Starkovich pointed out that the current chart masks DuPage's struggle with enrolling participants in the program since it shows DuPage is exceeding their reduction goal, however current active participation is 91, which is low considering program capacity and the service goal of 130. Joe Antolin noted that a program with significant turnover within a grant period might exceed their reduction goal, not necessarily as a function of successful terminations, but just due to turnover and serving more within a 12-month period.

There was a discussion about the inclusion of "carry-over" clients in the progress charts. Carry-over clients are active clients remaining in the program when one grant period ends and the new grant period – with a new reduction goal – starts. Jordan Boulger provided context on why the ARIOB and ARI staff count current or active enrollments as diversions which is due to interventions for clients lasting longer than a 12-month grant period. If these current or active clients were not counted as diversions, some sites would not be able to meet reduction or services goals within a 12-month period. ARI staff drafted a policy on how to count carry-over clients toward reduction goals, which will be discussed later in the meeting.

Joe Antolin suggested adding the statewide diversions to the monthly and quarterly statewide charts. Nate suggested adding the admissions and exits to the site level charts. In sum, the committee noted that for strong oversight, the ARIOB needs to know the overall program-eligible, the specific target population, the diversion goal, and number of unsuccessful. It was suggested to include an explanatory note with the charts for the ARIOB outlining some of the assumptions, the differences between program models, and the definitions of the lines. Jordan Boulger noted a near term goal of incorporating basic charts into site snapshots.

Mary Ann Dyar opened a discussion of sites that are struggling to meet their 25% reduction goals. First, Jersey County is not likely to meet its SFY14 25% reduction goal. Jersey had a self-declared "bad six months" during which several drug court participants were revoked to IDOC due to drug use. This issue was examined along with the need to increase referrals, especially from neighboring Greene County, during a recent site visit by ARI staff. The site visit also included a training from the Illinois Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice (COE) about the use of evidence-based practices in drug court. They have increased enrollments since the site visit and COE training.

Another factor in Jersey's difficulties meeting its reduction goal is the declining numbers of overall program-eligible individuals committed to IDOC from Jersey County. The current reduction goal is based on a three-year average while the SFY13 overall program-eligible commitments is only 22, not all of which are drug court eligible. This presents a situation where it is hard to meet the reduction goal of 15 and service goal of 20 due to the decreasing number of program-eligible participants. The committee discussed how reduction goals might be revised to reflect declining target populations. Joe Antolin suggested creating a policy about continuing funding to jurisdictions that do not have a target population to serve due to declining IDOC commitments.

Joe Antolin recommended that Jersey County submit a corrective action plan describing the situation and the difficulties meeting the reduction goal. It was suggested that the ARIOB empower a board committee to review corrective action plans so that it can be done in an expeditious manner between quarterly

ARIOB meetings. This empowered committee, likely the Performance Measurement Committee, can vote on the corrective action plan from Jersey County prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Jordan Boulger suggested that information from the corrective action plan also be shared with the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee in advance of SFY15 funding decisions. Joe Antolin suggested not funding Jersey County until their corrective action plan works.

Approval of previous meeting minutes
The committee reviewed the minutes from October 24, 2013. Joe Antolin made a motion to approve the minutes, Nate Steinfeld seconded, all in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Discussion of policies – calculation and verification of target populations and reduction goals
Pro-rating reduction goals for new sites
Mary Ann Dyar noted that all the other sites at risk of not meeting their SFY14 reduction goals are new sites that got off to late starts with their programs. With past funding streams, new sites had built-in ramp-up periods in their grants, with pro-rated reduction goals. Additionally, last year the Performance Measurement Committee approved a policy pro-rating reduction goals for new sites with less than 12-month grants.

ARI staff is proposing a new policy that pro-rates reduction goals for new sites regardless of the length of grant period by incorporating a ramp-up period. The committee discussed the appropriate length of a ramp-up period (and pro-ration of a reduction goal) based on experience in the program. It was determined that, instead of using a standard period of four months, it should be based on either the date of paperwork approval or the date of first enrollment. The committee suggested that using the paperwork approval date could create an incentive for swifter hiring at the program level.   Lindsey LaPointe raised a question on the difficulty of prorating the reduction goal (in the grant agreement) based on approval date of the grant agreement since approval is contingent on a reduction goal and cost-effectiveness. The approval process through the Oversight Board and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority needs a reduction goal to evaluate based on cost-effectiveness. Joe Antolin suggested a clause in the contract that prorates the reduction goal based on the grant approval date, noting that the Illinois Department of Human Services may have an example.   Joan Small will try to locate example language for this. ARI staff will follow up on this and Joe Antolin can provide language if necessary. The committee discussed a possible policy integrating a two month ramp-up period after paperwork approval date. Joe Antolin suggested presenting the existing policy to ARIOB with proposed changes, asking the ARIOB to authorize the Performance Measurement Committee to approve the policy, and allowing the policy to be finalized before the August ARIOB meeting.

Counting "carry-over" clients in renewal reduction goals
Mary Ann opened a discussion on the proposed policy for calculating reduction goals for renewal grants. Continuing sites start calculating their renewal reduction goals by looking at the most recent three-year average of program-eligible commitments to IDOC. This number, however, does not take into account the program-eligible individuals already "in process" in the program, carried over from one grant period to the next. Lindsey LaPointe provided rationale for the need to integrate this carry-over population in the renewal reduction goal calculation: 1) A participant is diverted from IDOC regardless of funding period, 2) This method encourages continuous enrollments, and 3) This method avoids penalizing programs with longer term interventions.

Joe Antolin reminded the committee that the reduction goal is a floor, not a ceiling. The proposed policy recommends starting with the three-year average of program-eligible IDOC commitments from the target population, and adding the number of carry-over clients "still in process" in the program, and then multiplying this renewal target population by 25% to arrive at the renewal reduction goal. Incorporating

carry-over clients in the renewal reduction goal will increase the cost-effectiveness of the program. Joe Antolin made motion that the draft policy be presented to the ARIOB, Nate Steinfeld seconded. All in favor, none opposed, motion passes.

Update on implementation evaluation
Due to meeting time constraints, Mary Ann suggested Jordan provide a brief evaluation update by e-mail.

Old business/new business:
The next committee meeting will involve approving a new chair person.

Nate Steinfeld noted that the statute lays out the minimum of what could be done regarding performance measurement, but that more is possible with the amount of data collected, depending on staff capacity to review and analyze the data. The discussions at this meeting will help guide future performance measurement activities.

Adjournment
Joe Antolin made a motion to adjourn, Nate Steinfeld seconded. All in favor, none opposed, meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

(Approved 6/9/14)