

**Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB)
Performance Measurement Committee
Wednesday, November 5, 2014
1:30-3:30p.m.**

**Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), 300 W. Adams, Ste. 200, Chicago, IL
60606
Large Conference Room**

ARIOB board members present: Joe Antolin, Nate Inglis Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh), Rebecca Skorek (for Jack Cutrone)

ARIOB by phone: Joan Small (for Michelle Saddler), Judge Jim Radcliffe (non-voting member),

Non-ARIOB present: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, Mystik Miller, Sara Wasserteil

Non-ARIOB by phone: Judge Thomas Sumner

Welcome and introductions

Mary Ann called roll and it was determined there was quorum.

Approval of previous meeting minutes – June 9, 2014 and August 21, 2014

Due to a lack of quorum at the last meeting, minutes from the June 9th meeting, as well as those from the August 21st meeting, were up for approval. After members reviewed the minutes, Joe Antolin motioned to approve both meetings' minutes. Nate Steinfeld seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

Election of committee chair

Mary Ann reported that Jordan Boulger was previous chair of the Performance Measurement Committee prior to leaving the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA). Going forward, the goal is to have the committees chaired by Board members. Mary Ann previously discussed the chair-person role with Joe Antolin due to his active participation in the committee's work. No other nominations were provided. Nate Steinfeld motioned to approve the nomination, which was seconded by Rebecca. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

Review of SFY15 site progress toward 25% reduction goals

ARI received data reports from the first quarter of SFY15, and Lindsey provided a brief, qualitative overview of sites' report highlights. A reports summary is provided to the Performance Measurement Committee and the full ARIOB. Nate Steinfeld suggested reviewing the reports for not only *what* is happening but *how* it is going at the site level, which would be an appropriate role for this committee.

A few highlights included Jersey County getting its Community Restorative Board underway, Kane County scheduling a no-cost motivational interviewing training with the Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice, and Peoria County developing a mechanism to share information with the full adult probation department on *Thinking for a Change (T4C)*. The Performance Measurement Committee is interested in how the probation officers reacted to this training where ARI clients presented on T4C. Lake County recently obtained Medicaid certification through the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA) for outpatient and intensive outpatient at the Adult Probation Department Office, provided by Haymarket.

On the topic of Medicaid, Joe Antolin noted that under Governor James Thompson, prisons and jails assisted inmates to gain Medicaid eligibility before they left the facilities. Given the recent expansion of Medicaid in Illinois, this should be happening again. Lindsey noted that the pace of Medicaid enrollment varies by county and that ARI has surveyed sites on the roll-out of the Affordable Care Act. A summary of survey findings was produced, which will be shared with the committee and ARIOB. Cook and

Winnebago counties are conducting deliberate initiatives to help enroll people when they get out of jail, and are also documenting enrollment and also following up to ensure that individuals are connecting with Medicaid services. TASC is leading the way on this initiative and has worked with the Administrative Offices of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) to conduct trainings with probation officers to help them navigate the ACA. TASC, ARI and ICJIA are having focused conversations about using local ARI experiences to codify what information/services are needed to be more effective to fully utilize the ACA. Joe Antolin noted that getting people enrolled systemically is important and of value for three main reasons: (1) it increases access to healthcare, (2) it reduces state outlay for those under custody (in system or out of the system - presently a 98% federal match), and (3) it allows ARI to reallocate substance abuse funds for other purposes.

Regarding the survey to sites on ACA implementation, Lindsey noted some sites have been able to shift funds to other budget categories due to the Medicaid expansion covering treatment and Mary Ann noted that a few sites have seen reductions in treatment budgets. Joe Antolin discussed the possibility of an ARI performance metric on Medicaid enrollment and its effects on the program. Mary Ann suggested continuing this ACA discussion at the next ARIOB meeting which aligns with the Cook ACT Court presentation (at the February 2015 meeting). Nate noted the recent meeting of the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council (SPAC) included a discussion of Medicaid enrollment upon release from jails and the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC).

Rebecca Skorek provided an update on the quarterly data pull of the sites conducted by ICJIA Research & Analysis (R&A) staff. R&A has created an Access database of all the sites so queries can be run for quicker access to data going forward. The eventual plan is to go web-based and to make this process more efficient and standardized. Joe Antolin noted that if this is a new direction or requirement for the sites, it should be included in the RFP and grant agreements as an expectation of receiving ARI funds, making clear that counties need to address capacity issues in order to fully comply. Mary Ann noted that the grant agreement included a list of required data elements to be collected by sites; however, it may need to be more prescriptive in terms of data format.

Joe Antolin noted the importance of putting together a graphic representation of the data, a dashboard to help the ARIOB understand more about individual site performance. Standardizing information reporting should make this easier. He asked about the role of ARI staff or committees in assessing why sites are failing or struggling to meet their targets, and suggested that the committee or a special subcommittee focus on this more closely and define program impact.

Although the full data from the quarter is not yet available, according to self-reports, all sites but one are on their way to exceeding their goals in SFY15, including "stretch" goals. ARI staff explained the difference between baseline and renewal or stretch goals, and will send around the definition and policy previously approved by this committee and the ARIOB.

Review of corrective action plan process and submitted plans

Mary Ann explained that at the end of the SFY14, two sites appeared to be falling short of their 25% reduction goals, but a full verification could not occur until after the August 2014 ARIOB meeting. The ARIOB tasked this committee with reviewing the verified numbers for failure to meet reduction goals, reviewing the procedures in juvenile Redeploy Illinois for addressing reduction goal shortfalls and seeing if they would apply, and developing a corrective action plan (CAP) policy to present to the ARIOB.

The CAP language previously approved by the ARIOB states that, if the grantee falls short, the ARIOB can assess reimbursement provision or penalty. The reimbursement provision was subsequently capped at up to 50% of the marginal savings of incarceration (approximately \$2,500 per person). It was noted that

there is a lot that grantees can do to prevent a penalty from being assessed when shortfalls are anticipated and corrective action is taken.

The 25% reduction goal stated in the grant agreements is the most important contractual goal because it is stipulated in ARI's governing statute. The committee reviewed a draft corrective action plan policy provided by staff suggesting broader application of the CAP language. Joe Antolin noted the difficulty in evaluating "falling short" of contractual goals other than the 25% reduction goal without knowing what the specific goals are for each site, which vary depending on the local program model.

Joe Antolin recommended that staff identify other goals/requirements that must be measured quarterly (i.e., IDOC-bound nature/risk level of participants, utilization of/fidelity to evidence-based practices), to use as a benchmark of whether a CAP is warranted in the same way as when the site is falling short of its 25% reduction goal. If using an evidence-based practice is essential to the success of the program, then this measurement should be done consistently. Currently this is a factor used to determine whether a grantee should be considered for renewal funding.

LaSalle County corrective action plan

After full verification, it was determined that only LaSalle County missed its SFY14 reduction goal, by one person in part because a parolee was mistakenly enrolled in the ARI program (prohibited by statute). The committee must present a recommendation to the ARIOB regarding the reimbursement provision. Mary Ann noted that a potential SFY14 reimbursement would have to come from the SFY15 grant, which was cut by 10% due to funding constraints. In juvenile Redeploy Illinois, a site can either reimburse the stated fee or come up with plan to spend the penalty amount technical assistance to address the specific issue. Joe Antolin asked whether there should be a threshold before assessing a penalty since LaSalle missed the goal by one person. It was noted that the ARIOB is not mandated to impose a penalty, but has the flexibility to determine a reimbursement amount (up to \$2,500 per person) while considering mitigating factors.

Mary Ann reported that ARI conducted a site visit to discuss what led to the failure to meet the reduction goal and devise proposed corrective action steps, included in the draft CAP. Penalties were not discussed directly with the site. The State's Attorney's Office reported a steep decline in felony filings, especially for Class 3 and 4 offenders, which is the ARI target population. Joe Antolin and Nate Steinfeld agreed this is a strong mitigating factor. The LaSalle County SAO data showed a marked decrease in felony filings since January of 2014, but it was suggested that these data be corroborated with arrest data by ICJIA, if possible.

Mary Ann noted that LaSalle voluntarily returned some its SFY14 funding since it was slated to be unspent due to a delayed program start date which resulted in a pro-rated reduction goal. There was a discussion about whether this could count toward a reimbursement provision. Joe Antolin explained that spending is not usually a performance metric for state grants. Lindsey noted that since the Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice (COE) provided training for free, redirecting the amount of the penalty would not apply in this case, should that option be considered.

The committee agreed that the reduction in the eligible population in LaSalle County qualified as a mitigating factor and the fee should be fully waived; however, the CAP would still be in effect. ICJIA staff will verify the 2014 data, and if numbers align, this recommendation will go to the ARIOB. Joe Antolin noted that the committee now has a process on how they would deal with mitigating circumstances in the future.

Joe Antolin suggested that the CAP steps need to be more actionable and less subjective to avoid confusion on how success is defined. It is important for the grantee to know what is expected of them and for what they are accountable. Joan Small offered to provide examples of other CAPs.

Cook HOPE corrective action plan

Mary Ann provided background of the Cook HOPE planning grant that included a data analysis of their target population. The data indicated that the large percentage of program participants did not appear to be prison-bound. ARI staff met with Cook HOPE after the data analysis was complete and requested a CAP on the principle that it appears the program is not meeting a substantive contractual goal of serving IDOC-bound individuals, which is a requirement for ARI funding. The draft CAP submitted included what the program would do to adjust who they are bringing into the program, focusing on high-risk individuals. Cook HOPE is not necessarily facing a penalty since it is exceeding its 25% reduction goal; however, it is on notice that this may affect renewal funding. In light of the data analysis, Joe Antolin suggested a need for the committee to: (1) determine a percentage criteria threshold for individuals terminated and sent to IDOC that would trigger a more in-depth data analysis and a possible CAP and (2) determine if data indicating that a program is serving a non IDOC-bound population is a breach of contract. He also suggested requesting a revised CAP from Cook HOPE with more actionable language.

Joe Antolin noted that it is critical to show that ARI is saving the state money by diverting prison-bound individuals. It was suggested that data for other sites be reviewed, and Rebecca Skorek noted ICJIA staff now has the ability to quickly see IDOC commitments for individuals that were enrolled or terminated, however it is very difficult to see IDOC commitments for individuals screened but not enrolled. LSI-R scores can be pulled as a proxy as well.

LaSalle and Cook HOPE have been informed that their corrective action plans may be discussed at the November 10th ARIOB meeting, should they choose to be there to answer questions. The committee has ARIOB authorization to approve the CAPs, and another committee meeting was scheduled for November 24th to discuss this further.

Update on implementation evaluation

Not discussed. A document will be provided in writing.

Old/New Business

Mary Ann called for old business/new business and there was none.

Rebecca Skorek motioned to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Nate Steinfeld. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m.

(Approved 11/24/14)