

Minutes from the ARIOB Performance Measurement Committee
Tuesday, May 10, 2016, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor – Large Conference Room, Chicago

ARIOB members present: Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood), Christine Devitt Westley (for John Maki), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)

ARIOB members by phone: None.

Non-ARIOB present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe

Non-ARIOB by phone: None

Welcome and introductions

Mary Ann Dyar brought the meeting to order, called roll, and determined there was quorum. She noted that a new Committee Chair is not yet identified and ideally the Chair would be an Oversight Board member (vs. a designee) to facilitate reporting out at ARIOB meetings. Lindsey LaPointe provided the goals of the meeting which included an update and discussion on the impact of the budget impasse on performance measurement, and update on quarterly site data, and an update on the Cook HOPE corrective action plan.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Mary Ann called for a review of the minutes from February 2nd, 2016 and Jordan Boulger noted a few grammatical corrections. Mary Ann reminded the group that there was previous direction to include action items on the minutes which will be reinserted. Jordan Boulger made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections, and Chris Devitt Westley seconded. All in favor. None opposed. Minutes approved.

Update and discussion on impact of SFY16 budget on Adult Redeploy Illinois (ARI)

Mary Ann opened the discussion on the SFY16 budget impasse, noting that staff has been in communication with sites to determine its impact on their programs, including their ability to meet reduction goals, and their plans to rebuild after the impasse. ARI may lose some programs, and even some continuing sites will need time to ramp back up. ARI staff is specifically asking how programs are operating differently from the original design. In sum, ARI is entering the 11th month without an appropriation. Sites are working to serve current participants to avoid sending them to the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC). Regarding spending, on average sites are spending at about two-thirds of budget – a few sites are spending normally and some are spending at just 20% of their budgets. Anticipated budget needs for SFY16 are \$5.5M total (\$4.7M for sites and \$800,000 in administrative costs). Any SFY16 appropriation under \$5.5M would be considered insufficient and require award reductions approved by the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee.

Lindsey provided details on how sites are dealing with the impasse, noting that this varies by county. Situations at the local level can change month to month based on decisions of county boards, Chief Judges and treatment providers. ARI staff has acknowledged to the sites that the decision to renew contracts into SFY17 is a local decision and they are under no obligation.

The committee discussed how ARI might evolve at the local and state level in the future based on lessons learned from the impasse. Local sites might be encouraged to diversify funding for their programs, with ARI funding used more for enhancements (e.g., training, evidence-based practices, connections to treatment). Lindsey said there were already examples of this. The benefits of joining

the ARI network over and above funding (e.g., technical assistance, evaluation and data feedback loops) should be highlighted.

Jordan noted that Cook County has been looking at other foundation funding and these funders often look for diversified funding in a potential grantee. Mary Ann noted that lessons learned in ARI could be well-suited to share information with funders. It was noted that a variety of funding streams could present a challenge for performance measurement and cost-benefit analysis.

Chris Devitt Westley emphasized the importance of tracking and documenting the impact on program components, in particular reductions in evidence-based practices. This is helpful information to have for several reasons, including future evaluation purposes.

The committee discussed the possibility of ARI contracting with an entity outside of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) to do performance measurement. ICJIA designed the initial performance measurement system which it has used to conduct process evaluations. It was noted that utilizing outside funding and then contracting for performance measurement could be a way for ARI to diversify funding. Staff has been unable to provide a robust data feedback loop to sites as planned. Jordan suggested reaching out to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) to see if data collection efforts, including in conjunction with the new problem-solving court standards and monthly case-level data requirements, can be aligned to reduce the burden on sites. Mary Ann noted she will follow up with AOIC on this issue. Lindsey again talked about the benefits of being a part of the ARI network to share information, convene meetings and facilitate peer visiting. Planning grants are important to these processes for current and future sites.

Mary Ann shared high-level messages from the quarterly data reports and the committee discussed what should be provided to the full board, such as reductions in new enrollments (a 45% reduction from the program's peak) in particular, which have future implications on participation levels and the ability to meet reduction goals.

Action items: ARI will take the committee's guidance on the limited slides to share with the full board and will also include the Impact of SFY16 Budget Crisis on Performance Measurement document.

Action items: ARI staff will follow up with AOIC for a discussion to explore aligning data.

Review of quarterly site data

Mary Ann opened the discussion about sites that may not meet their SFY16 25% reduction goals due to the impasse and other factors. Lindsey noted that five counties are at risk of not meeting their reduction goals including Kankakee (not renewing in SFY17), McLean (currently operating at 20% with no dedicated probation officers due to impasse), 4th Judicial Circuit (significantly reduced enrollments due to impasse), Cook ACT Court (reduced enrollments, in part due to a decreased number of individuals coming into the system), Grundy (low enrollments due to the small size of the mental health court and small number of people in the county). The committee advised that the full board will likely consider waiving penalties since no funds were disbursed to the sites. The committee reviewed the quarterly data report summary included in the meeting materials and determined it would not be useful to the full board. ARI staff asked the committee for better way to present this information, other than the quarterly report summary. Chris noted that program model should be included. Nate emphasized that a future research staff working on ARI could help with a new presentation of these documents.

Action items: ARI staff will share information with the full board on sites at risk of not meeting their 25% reduction goal and continue to track and verify this data at fiscal year-end.

Action items: ARI staff will make edits to the quarterly data summary document by adding program model and look at presenting the information by program model instead of alphabetically. Once research capacity is in place, new presentations will be explored.

Update on Cook HOPE ARI corrective action plan (CAP)

Lindsey referred the committee to the Cook HOPE corrective action plan (CAP) progress report in the materials, providing the background that funding was extended beyond December 2015 due to early progress on the CAP. At the last meeting, this committee accepted an updated CAP where some irrelevant steps were removed and one step was added (quarterly conference calls of program leadership). The current progress report was submitted in April and the next one is due in July. Lindsey noted the program has had changes and reductions, including staff loss and turnover, in large part due to the budget impasse. Lindsey noted that the program is meeting the LSI-R benchmark indicating the enrollment of moderate- to high-risk people into the program. The program conducted a quarterly conference call in April and recently held a joint program steering committee on May 3rd where both Cook programs met to discuss the future of the programs and the grant. Lindsey will work with ICJIA research staff to verify this self-reported data. Nate asked for clarification on the measurement period for the benchmarks on the current progress report and Lindsey clarified that this report covers the last quarter (January 1st through March 31st).

Action items: Lindsey will work with ICJIA research staff to verify this self-reported data and make sure to include the entire performance period in the next progress report to the committee.

Old business/new business

Lindsey noted that ARI should start planning for an outcome evaluation and that the program will likely get questions on this in the near future. Chris added that the ongoing documentation of the program and performance measures will assist with carrying out an evaluation. Given that ARI may change in the future due to the budget, Nate noted that an outcome evaluation of the first iteration of the ARI will be helpful and needed in the near future.

Mary Ann noted that ARI has a Research Director position approved although not yet posted and Nate and Jordan agreed to provide feedback on the position. Testing will be opened in the future and the group will be alerted to this.

Action items: Mary Ann will provide the Research Director posting to Nate and Jordan to review.

Adjournment

Nate made a motion to adjourn and at 4:02pm and Chris Devitt Westley seconded. All in favor. None opposed. Meeting adjourned
(Approved 7/29/16)