

Minutes from the ARIOB Performance Measurement Committee
Tuesday, February 2, 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: Kathy Starkovich (for Pat Hayden), Judge James Radcliffe (Ret.)

Non-ARIOB present: Reshma Desai, Mary Ann Dyar, Rebecca Frale, Lindsey LaPointe

Non-ARIOB by phone: Judge Thomas Sumner (Ret.),

Welcome and introductions

Lindsey LaPointe opened the meeting at 2:13 p.m. After a roll call, it was determined there was a quorum. Lindsey mentioned that the board is in the process of identifying a new board member following the resignation of Joe Antolin, who also served as chair of the Performance Measurement committee. Mary Ann Dyar acknowledged Joe's valuable contributions to the committee.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Committee members reviewed the minutes from the joint committee meeting with the Site Selection & Monitoring (SS&M) Committee on December 21, 2015. No changes to the minutes were requested. It was decided that the minutes will be tabled then submitted and voted on during the next full Oversight Board meeting to enable members of the SS&M Committee to participate in the vote.

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

Committee members were given an infographic outlining the state budget impasse's impact on ARI sites. ARI staff provided numbers on where sites are in terms of crucial aspects of their programs such as meeting their reduction goals, accepting new client enrollments, and staff layoffs. Mary Ann noted that there is no indication of when the impasse will end. All 21 sites were still open at the end of 2015; however, one site – Kane County – closed in January 2016. Mary Ann emphasized that these county situations are tenuous and the ability of counties to maintain programs could change at any time.

Lindsey LaPointe reviewed themes of the most recent round of status phone calls to sites (mid-January), which were summarized in a chart included in the meeting materials. Sites are working hard to keep their programs running, including utilizing creative strategies to maintain programs or access other funding (e.g., delaying funding to other county line items, holding non-ARI positions open, probation officers carrying higher caseloads). Local situations can change at any time and county fiscal years and board meetings factor into these decisions. Each county is dealing with the situation uniquely. In some sites, counties are able to "float" funds temporarily to contractual providers; in other counties, contractors are working without pay. In these instances, if large contractors pull out, it will have a severe negative effect on the ability of sites to maintain programs.

Planning for SFY17 is rapidly approaching (typically in late April). Because the budget situation may change at any point, it is unknown how counties will respond to the renewal process. At least six sites have reported that they do not expect to be able to stay open past June 30, 2016 without state funds.

Christine Devitt Westley suggested it could be helpful to provide summary, non-duplicative information about all 21 sites in addition to the additional duplicative information provided in the

infographic. Also for the infographic, Reshma Desai suggested highlighting the number of people served last year compared to the number of people served this year, in terms of dollars saved, to highlight the negative impact of the budget crisis.

The difference between suspending and shutting down completely was noted. The main difference is that in “suspension,” paperwork remains open until the end of the fiscal year. The potential for increased IDOC commitments and recidivism rates are a major concern. On this topic, Mary Ann discussed and displayed graphs showing an increase in IDOC commitments greater than the same quarter in the previous year.

ARI staff and committee members provided some detailed site information. Kathy Starkovich spoke about DuPage County and how most of the budget impasse’s impact has resulted in the need to hold open a few vacant staff positions within probation overall. DuPage is spending at a normal pace. As another example McLean County is only operating and spending at a 20% rate. McLean is not staffing the program with dedicated probation officers, is holding these grant funded probation positions open, and is doing only the basics to keep the basic structure of the program alive for when funds do come in. Overall, all sites are spending at approximately 70% of the normal rate. The committee members inquired about what expenses are being paid, how contractors are working with sites, how many contractors are waiting for payment, and how actual spending compares to budget.

ARI staff has developed an internal process to follow when or if ARI receives a SFY16 appropriation. If the appropriation is insufficient, it may require budget amendments based on decisions of either the full Oversight Board or the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee. Mary Ann noted that, if sites maintain their current spending rates (which have been decreasing over last few months), ARI would need \$4.8 million as opposed to the over \$7 million originally budgeted. With administrative costs included, the total would be closer to \$5.5 million. This would be only for continuing sites, and Kendall and DeKalb counties have been put on hold, despite an approved October 1st start date. Both programs have noted to ARI staff that they are ready to continue if/when funding becomes available. These situations are subject to change. Jordan Boulger stated that these new sites will have to pay attention to and plan for the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC) problem-solving court standards.

Staff noted that sites are continuing to meet reporting obligations; however, some – most notably Kane County – are having difficulties due to reduced staff. Currently, sites are not provided much feedback on the data submitted due to lack of staff capacity at the Authority to perform analysis. The committee agreed that providing data back to sites in a feedback loop is important and ARI staff noted some sites do ask for this. Jordan Boulger noted that Cook County probation has some internal data feedback loops and Nate suggested it could be helpful for this committee to see this as an example for what might be useful to other counties.

Action items: Review information provided in Cook County Adult Probation Department feedback loops to determine what might be helpful for sites.

Update on Cook HOPE ARI corrective action plan (CAP); approval of updated CAP

Lindsey opened this discussion, pointing committee members to the updated CAP for February 2016. Three items were proposed to be removed, and a new timeline for reporting was included. Lindsey reported on developments since the December 21st meeting where continuation of funding for Cook was approved through June 30th based on CAP progress with a few contingencies. The

three contingencies included verifying the data submitted in November via the database, extending the CAP for the full 12 months, and adding plans to improve coordination and communication within the program. ARI staff met with the Cook HOPE team on January 25th to collaboratively update the CAP. Based on the meeting and follow-up, the Cook HOPE team proposed some changes to the CAP which need committee review and approval. Changes proposed are to limit the LSI-R benchmark to probation transfers and establish other procedural changes, such as institute quarterly phone conferences (i.e., steering committee meetings) and eliminate steps in the case referral process. ARI staff, and Jordan, assured the committee that less tracking is required as the desired referral processes have been integrated into the program.

Nate Steinfeld stressed the criticalness of ensuring all ARI sites are serving an IDOC-bound population, reminding the group of the CAP matrix and process for its use when it appears a site is not adhering to fundamental ARI principles. The group discussed when risk information is collected that is a proxy for being prison-bound. Jordan provided background information on the pre-trial risk assessment in use in Cook which provides information earlier in the process but is very different from the LSI-R risk assessment.

Nate and Kathy Starkovich both noted that a vote may need to be tabled to ensure the CAP truly represents a roadmap to get the program where it needs to be (regarding serving an IDOC-bound population) and how that would be reported to ARI. The group discussed the need to develop global metrics for what constitutes IDOC-bound. It was noted that the Cook HOPE CAP represents an effort to work closely with a site to determine and then enact local metrics. With Cook HOPE, all data points show they have shifted their program to serve an IDOC-bound population, and there is a staff reluctance to make too many changes to the Cook HOPE CAP at this point. Kathy Starkovich agreed that local practices can determine a path to IDOC which can include medium-risk people.

Nate Steinfeld motioned to approve the updated draft of the Cook HOPE CAP with a highlight to the site emphasizing that the CAP moves towards serving an IDOC-bound population in accordance with the goals of ARI. The ARI Oversight Board will continue to hold this site and all other ARI sites accountable to this fundamental goal of ARI. Christine Devitt Westley seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed, Jordan Boulger abstained.

Action items: Return updated CAP to Cook HOPE for implementation. Begin to develop overall ARI metrics regarding a truly IDOC-bound population that can be utilized with sites and for other purposes.

Review of quarterly site data

Committee members received the quarterly data report summary from October 2015 through December 2015. There was not enough time to review this during the meeting.

Old business/new business

Mary Ann asked for any old business or new business, and there were none.

Adjournment

Nate Steinfeld made the motion to adjourn at 4:06 p.m., which was seconded by Christine Devitt Westley. All in favor, none opposed, meeting adjourned.

(Approved 5/10/16)