



MINUTES

ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS OVERSIGHT BOARD PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 10, 2018, at 10:00 a.m.
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, Suite 200, Small Conference Room
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Welcome and Introductions

Committee Chair Nate Inglis Steinfeld called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. and took roll.

ARIOB Member Attendance	Present	Telephone	Absent
Jordan Boulger, designee for Lavone Haywood	X		
Kristin Davis, designee for Mark Ishaug	X		
Kathy Starkovich		X	
Nate Steinfeld (Committee Chair), designee for Kathy Saltmarsh	X		
Lynne Mock, designee for John Maki	X		

Also present were:

- Megan Alderden, ICJIA Research Director
- Mary Ann Dyar, ARI Program Director
- Adriana Perez, ARI Program Manager
- Judge James Radcliffe (Ret.), ARI Technical Assistance Advisor (Telephone)
- Khyrah Simpson, ARI Intern
- Judge Thomas Sumner (Ret.), ARI Technical Assistance Advisor (Telephone)

Mr. Steinfeld opened the meeting and introduced the newest committee member, a designee of Mark Ishaug, Kristin Davis, Ph.D., Director of Program Evaluation for Thresholds.

Mr. Steinfeld shared the goals for the meeting:

1. Review draft operational definitions for the program.
2. Review two sets of meeting minutes.
3. Receive an update on ARI research activities.

Approval of previous meeting minutes – August 11, 2017, and November 7, 2017

Due to lack of in-person quorum at the November 7th meeting, there were two sets of meeting minutes for the committee to approve.

Mr. Steinfeld asked for clarification in the minutes for August 11, 2017. The minutes stated “Ms. Dyar asked Ms. Pieper to confirm...” but it was unclear whether or not Ms. Pieper responded. Ms. Dyar clarified that the statement was meant to convey a request for future confirmation and agreed that it should be reworded for clarification. Mr. Steinfeld suggested approval of the minutes with the contingency that ARI staff clarify that sentence.



Motion: Dr. Mock moved to approve the minutes for August 11, 2017, with contingency that staff clarify the aforementioned sentence, and the minutes for November 7, 2017. Mr. Boulger seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Research Update

Dr. Mock reported that ARI has secured an external evaluator: Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIU-C), with Dr. Daryl Kroner, to complete a process evaluation with four ARI intensive supervision probation with services (ISP-S) sites. Dr. Mock said the sites were selected because they have a large service population and ISP-S model research was needed. Dr. Mock reviewed the Description of Services for Request for Quotes (RFQ) document, summarizing the project goals and deliverables, including site logic models, a research report, and a presentation to the Oversight Board. She said based on performance, ARI may continue working with SIU-C to develop a plan for an ISP-S outcome evaluation. Mr. Boulger inquired about the timeline for this evaluation and Dr. Mock stated the timeline of January 1 to June 30, 2018, is brief due to a delay in getting the process started and the need to complete work by the end of the state fiscal year. A full year would be allowed for an outcome evaluation, she said.

Dr. Mock noted the process evaluation will include a focus group at each site, client surveys, staff interviews, client interviews, if needed, and the use of an intervention assessment tool. Dr. Mock said evaluators proposed 24 site visits so they are able to spend an adequate amount of time with the sites. Dr. Alderden stated the survey will assess differences between probationer experiences on the ISP-S program and their experiences on other kinds of probation programs and determine the extent to which the program makes a difference. Dr. Mock said the external evaluators will be visiting ARI in February and submitting monthly progress reports. Ms. Dyar added the evaluators will begin looking at ARI's administrative data as soon as possible.

Dr. Mock also reported on an analysis of program demographics, including gender, race, median age/age distribution, as requested by Angelique Orr.

Dr. Mock discussed the 2018 research agenda for ARI. She described using site data to create dashboards with key performance measures for the ARI sites, starting with the ISP-S programs involved in the evaluation. In addition, Dr. Mock described several possible research projects, such as one exploring differences between race, gender, region, and model being used and short-term ARI outcomes. Another proposed project is an exit survey of ARI clients. ARI staff will conduct annual analyses of successful and unsuccessful client program exits, with a focus on whether they were incarcerated in the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC). Dr. Mock also described efforts to assemble and present data for an annual report on the state fiscal year.

Discussion of Operational Definitions

Mr. Steinfeld opened the discussion about developing operational definitions to guide data analysis. He noted that certain key terms will need to be prioritized. He encouraged committee members to offer edits and suggestions.

Mr. Steinfeld started with the definition for "ARI participant" as "a person accepted and enrolled into a program and who has received any program services until s/he departs from the program." Ms. Starkovich stated that she did not agree with the use of the word "any" as the definition should reflect substantive work with the person. Dr. Mock suggested the starting point could be once an individual has been enrolled, assessed, assigned a case plan, and starts working on their case plan. Ms. Starkovich stated that may not be practical because there are instances when someone may have had an assessment before they entered the program.



Ms. Starkovich suggested that participant is defined as an individual who has had at least a certain number of meetings with their probation officer, having completed orientation and begun working in the program. Dr. Alderden stated it would be important to be able to identify critical drop-off periods for participants and ways to improve engagement.

Judge Sumner asked about the necessity of distinguishing levels of participation within the definition. Ms. Starkovich stated that the distinction may be important to provide context for data. Dr. Davis stated that the importance of the distinction depends on what information is sought, for example, in a comparison of differences between individual characteristics at intake and those at enrollment. Dr. Alderden stated forming multiple definitions into one is not a good strategy; there should be a single definition for every layer of data as the pool of participants gets narrowed. Dr. Alderden suggested instead of using “ARI participant,” focus on defining enrollment and other distinctions within levels of participation. Dr. Mock concurred with Judge Sumner’s suggestion to define “ARI participant” simply as a person accepted and enrolled until he/she departs the program and then defining other things elsewhere. With committee agreement, Mr. Steinfeld suggested ARI staff consider the aforementioned recommendations to modify the definition and distribute the modifications to committee members for feedback. Moreover, Dr. Alderden suggested that “ARI participant” should instead be worded as “participant of ARI-funded program” due to the fact that ARI itself is not a program, but instead funds a multitude of different services that are provided through separate programs.

Action Item: ARI staff will revise and circulate the “ARI participant” definition for review.

Mr. Steinfeld moved on to the separate definitions for “ARI eligible” as a “non-violent felony,” and “prison bound” as “a person at a moderate to high risk of recidivism, typically with a lengthy criminal history, conviction for a serious non-violent offense, and/or significant criminogenic needs.” Dr. Alderden noted it may be problematic to separate “ARI eligible” and “prison bound” since both are required for ARI eligibility. Ms. Dyar clarified she asked for the two to be separated because staff talk in terms of “ARI-eligible offenses” and “ARI-eligible persons.” Dr. Alderden stated preference for the term “ARI-eligible offense” because it more appropriately fits the definition given. The committee agreed the term should be changed from “ARI eligible” to “ARI-eligible offense.” Mr. Steinfeld stated that “prison bound” should be amended to “prison-bound person.”

Ms. Starkovich asked who would be the consumer of the operational definitions being created. Mr. Steinfeld stated the definitions are not meant to be ARI policy, but used to measure performance and guide research and data collection. Dr. Mock stated the definitions could be used by ARI’s external evaluators to make sure they are aware of what staff are talking about when using these terms.

Ms. Starkovich addressed the part of the “prison bound” definition stating individuals must have a “lengthy criminal history.” She noted that some individuals accepted into ARI programming are in the “emerging adult” population and do not have a criminal history because they have aged into a new system and what might be a significant juvenile history is not public. Ms. Starkovich suggested that the definition also include “a pattern of behavior indicative of future offending” in order to capture this population, which might be helpful when ARI sites are trying to decide who is eligible for programming. Dr. Alderden suggested that the definition is edited to state “lengthy criminal history and/or pattern of behavior indicative of future offending.”

Action Item: ARI staff will revise the definition for “ARI eligible” and circulate the definition for review.



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

Judge Sumner began discussing the term “prison bound,” defined as a “person at a moderate to high risk of recidivism, typically with a lengthy criminal history, conviction for a serious non-violent offense, and/or significant criminogenic needs.” He asked what the definition means by “serious nonviolent offense” and asked for staff to expand upon this at a later date. Judge Sumner also stated that given the way the “prison bound” definition is written, it seems as if a person is required to meet all of the conditions mentioned. Judge Sumner suggested that “and/or” is added between the different conditions to convey that meeting any of them would fulfill the “prison bound” requirement. Mr. Steinfeld stated staff will consider the suggestions and revise definition.

Action Item: ARI staff will revise the definition “prison bound” and circulate the definition for review.

Mr. Steinfeld moved on to discuss the definition for “target population,” which is “locally defined service population of ARI-eligible, prison-bound individuals. The target population can be the entire eligible population, but should match the intervention type.” Mr. Steinfeld stated this is a subpopulation of the eligible population. No edits were suggested.

Mr. Steinfeld moved on to discuss the definition for “year,” which is “state fiscal year.” No edits were suggested.

Mr. Steinfeld moved on to read the definition for “recidivism” as an “ARI participant sent to Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) within one year of exiting the ARI program” and asked for edits or suggestions. Ms. Dyar suggested editing the definition to state “ARI-funded program.” Mr. Boulger said he did not think the definition captured what was intended to be capture because some ARI cases going to IDOC are not technically recidivism but revocation for other than a new offense.

Mr. Boulger stated that recidivism is not the correct word for an individual who did not comply with the program; “failure” would be more appropriate. He went on to state the definition is too broad for what the word “recidivism” means in Illinois and suggested another layered definition to capture those who fail out of the program and go to IDOC versus those who successfully complete the program, or receive an unspecified termination and subsequently go to IDOC. This would capture two different ideas, he said: one is that the person may not have been an appropriate candidate for the program or ready for change or the program does not work as intended, and the other is the program may not have a lasting effect on participants. Mr. Steinfeld stated that distinguishing these two ideas would be important as the purpose of ARI funding is to reduce recidivism rates and divert individuals away from prison.

Dr. Alderden stated that a good recidivism rate should be a function of three things: new arrests, new convictions, and sentences to incarceration. She said she would define incarceration as completely new offenses, not program-generated incarceration. Program-generated incarceration would be when the program discovers wrongdoing by an individual and then actively seeks incarceration for that person, versus when a person goes out on their own and commits a new offense that results in another period of incarceration.

Mr. Boulger pointed out that the current definition could lead to identical program recidivism rates resulting from different modes of failure. For example, in one program clients may succeed and complete it but fail six months later by pickup up a new arrest. In another program, everyone’s probation is revoked and they are sent to IDOC. He noted there would be two different interventions for these programs. He said one intervention is to fix the program or assess whether the program is working with the appropriate population. The other is an examination of aftercare, he said.

Dr. Alderden stated this information also could be used to assess the culture of program officers—



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

whether they are geared more toward supervision compliance than toward treatment, particularly as it relates to working with a high-need population. Mr. Steinfeld suggested distinguishing these two ideas would be important for operational improvement, but having two definitions is less important for the purposes of ARI funding, since the point of ARI funding is to reduce traditional recidivism rates (as defined by IDOC) and divert individuals away from prison

Mr. Boulger suggested using the terms “program success” or “program failure” rather than recidivism. Dr. Mock noted state statute indicates ARI must track recidivism rates. Mr. Boulger said recidivism rates should include only reoffending and that revocations should not be included if it had nothing to do with new offenses. Dr. Mock suggested terms “post probation” and “during probation” also should be defined. Dr. Alderden recommended staff edit the definitions and redefine recidivism and revocation and present them at the next committee meeting. Ms. Dyar suggested the committee reconvene soon so that the operational definitions could be presented at the next quarterly oversight board meeting February 20.

Action Item: ARI staff will review the operational definitions document and provide edits and comments to Ms. Perez or Ms. Dyar.

Old business/new business

Mr. Steinfeld discussed the scheduling of future meeting dates to align with quarterly ARIOB meetings..

Action Item: Committee members will review proposed dates for future meetings.

Mr. Boulger shared that Cook County announced a new acting chief probation officer at the Adult Probation Department. Mr. Boulger noted that ARI staff may need another designee letter.

Action Item: Ms. Dyar will schedule an orientation with the new chief.

Adjournment

Mr. Boulger moved to adjourn. Dr. Mock seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote. Meeting adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

(Approved 2/13/18)