

**Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board
Performance Measurement Committee Meeting**

Monday, October 26, 2015

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

At the following public site:

ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor – Large Conference Room, Chicago

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

Non-ARIOB: Mary Ann Dyar, Rebecca Frale, Roger Franklin, Lindsey LaPointe, Cindy Puent

Non-ARIOB by phone: Amir Anthony, Judge Thomas Sumner, John Waters

Welcome and introductions

Mary Ann Dyar opened the meeting at 2:06 p.m. She noted the goals of the meeting were to prepare a recommendation to the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB) regarding Kankakee County's failure to meet its SFY15 ARI reduction goal, provide updates on site corrective action plans (CAP), discuss the impact of the state budget impasse on sites, and brainstorm ideas about possible performance measurement modifications due to the impasse. After a roll-call, it was determined there was a quorum.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Committee members reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting on September 23, 2015. Although no changes were requested, Nate Steinfeld recommended that meeting minutes include for the record the discussion by the committee members and any concerns they have, e.g., regarding site progress on corrective action plans. Nate Steinfeld motioned to approve the minutes, and Walter Boyd seconded. All in favor, none opposed, minutes passed.

Update of sites under or at risk of corrective action plan (CAP)

This agenda item was moved up since it requires a vote and quorum may not be maintained throughout the meeting.

Kankakee County - development of recommendation to board

Mary Ann Dyar opened the discussion of Kankakee County, referencing the site visit report in the materials. Kankakee County missed its SFY15 reduction goal of seven because of delays in hiring dedicated probation staff to implement the program. The committee discussed whether to assess a penalty for SFY15 and provide full funding in SFY16. Previously, the committee had discussed that a penalty might not be appropriate since the program was not implemented. At the site visit, Kankakee reported plans to add a new probation officer in October (with another funding source) who would start reviewing ARI-eligible cases. A committee member asked if the site has spent any money, and ARI staff noted that in SFY15 the site spent about \$10,000 on equipment and data collection infrastructure to prepare for implementation but no SFY16 funds had been spent prior to October 1st. Lindsey LaPointe reminded the committee that all sites are operating at a "maintenance" budget in SFY16 and the release of funds and full execution of the grant is based on a sufficient appropriation in the SFY16 state budget.

Nate Steinfeld offered that this site never started and used minimum funding in SFY15 therefore it is best to recommend that the typical penalty (for failing to meet the SFY15 reduction goal) be waived and to ensure items purchased in SFY15 be used in SFY16 for program implementation. Other committee members expressed agreement since factors outside of the site's control presented a barrier to implementation. ARI staff spoke with this site about specific implementation barriers such as a lack of capacity within probation to start the program without a dedicated officer. Jordan Boulger noted that the Kankakee model entails working with high-risk individuals and can be problematic for already overburdened staff, can lead to burn-out and a breakdown in standards and evidence-based practices.

Mary Ann Dyar re-capped the committee's discussion to substantiate the recommendation. The recommendation to waive the penalty is based on the following: (1): the barriers to implementation were outside of the site's control; (2): all SFY15 purchases are used for implementation of the ARI program; (3) minimal funds were spent in SFY15 to prepare for implementation; (4) the site visit provided ample evidence that the site is ready to implement having hired an officer to begin the program; and (5) a recognition that implementing the program before a sufficient probation infrastructure was in place would have been counter to evidence-based practices.

Nate Steinfeld motioned to recommend to the ARIOB to waive the SFY15 penalty, Christine Devitt Westley seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

The committee decided that a recommendation regarding SFY16 is not necessary since the funding situation is unknown. Kankakee ARI will continue to provide data and reporting as is the normal process and ARI staff and the committee will track implementation, in the absence of SFY16 funding.

Action items: ARI staff will prepare the recommendation for the November ARIOB meeting.

LaSalle County

Lindsey LaPointe opened this discussion, noting that unless the board committee decides otherwise, this will be the last CAP progress report for this site, which has completed a 12-month CAP cycle. The CAP initiator for LaSalle was missing its SFY14 reduction goal when starting a new program, similar to the case in Kankakee. LaSalle ARI has been discussed in two regular ARIOB meetings and the site has made significant progress in enrollments. Roger Franklin and Nate Steinfeld both asked to clarify a few specific items on the CAP update, including the site's engagement with the community. The site has made sharing information with the public a component of their program. Nate Steinfeld also inquired about the LSI-R scores of program participants and suggested comparing these scores to other sites (which has been done in the past at these committee meetings). Program data show that 57% were moderate risk, 31% were high risk and 12% were missing. The committee will receive full data for LSI-R scores by site at the late January 2016 meeting. As the overall ARI program grows, Nate Steinfeld suggested making comparisons of risk levels at some sites, especially for this committee, in the absence of presenting data for all the sites at once. This will avoid spending a lot of effort and committee time on sites under CAPs at the expense of less time on other sites.

Action items: ARI staff will alert LaSalle ARI that they are no longer under a CAP.

Cook HOPE

Lindsey LaPointe opened this discussion, providing some background on the CAP and noting that the site submitted a CAP progress report in mid-October that covered the last few months. The next progress report is due on Tuesday, December 15th. Upon receipt of the December progress report, the committee will look at all the data gathered and make a decision whether to continue funding beyond December 31, 2015. ARI staff noted that the data on the October CAP progress report is being reconciled with the database data, and the initial review shows some discrepancies, which may be the result of variations in definitions of cases and the timeframes under analysis. Nate Steinfeld noted that language on the CAP progress reports should be checked for understanding with the site (e.g. enrollments versus referrals on CAP step #2). ARI staff will follow up on this since the program completes the actual report.

Jordan Boulger noted that any apparent improvements and beginnings of a shift in numbers due to progress should be considered for the next reporting period. Jordan Boulger also noted the increase in LSI-R scores over 25 is substantial. The committee agreed that it looks like progress is being made and the last CAP progress report will be important for analysis.

Lindsey LaPointe summarized that the information gathered from the site visit, self-reports, database and a stakeholder survey will be shared at the next meeting, which is planned for December 21st.

Action items: ARI staff will prepare data for the next committee meetings.

Discussion of impact of SFY16 budget on performance measurement

Lindsey LaPointe opened this discussion and asked for committee input on ways to present information to the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB) at the meeting on Monday, November 2nd. The various impacts of the budget impasse on the sites were discussed including reduced staff, unfilled positions, a decrease in service and treatment availability, decreased spending, and decreased or stoppage of enrollments. ARI staff has recently collected this fairly uniform information from the 21 sites during the quarterly data report process which covered at time period through September 30th. Lindsey LaPointe went over the specific data gathered on a one-page document that can be provided to the ARIOB. Roger Franklin asked if counties are offsetting the ARI funding hole and Lindsey clarified that some counties have been “floating” funds to keep the ARI programs running temporarily, but this could change at any time especially since many counties are currently in their budgeting processes. ARI staff discussed what might happen if the eventual SFY16 appropriation is less than anticipated and less than the current programs have either budgeted or have been spending. The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee has been historically authorized to make funding reduction decisions and staff will ask the ARIOB for this authorization at the November meeting to prepare for decisions between board meetings.

ARI staff asked for ideas on how to best present this information to the ARIOB. Nate Steinfeld suggested presenting the information in an infographic form, to be supplemented with the detail on an additional page. Chris Devitt Westley suggested highlighting the number of sites that anticipate problems meeting their reduction goal and why. This committee may need to know specific dates and timelines by site to accurately present the impact of the budget on the ability to

meet contractual goals. Additional suggestions were offered for staff to consider in the presentation to the ARIOB.

Action items: ARI staff will integrate suggestions of this committee to a document for the ARIOB that presents the impact of the budget on the 21 ARI sites.

Review of quarterly site data

Due to a lack of time, the quarterly site data reports were not discussed.

Old business/new business

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

Adjournment

Nate Steinfeld made the motion to adjourn at 4:05 p.m., which was seconded by Christine Devitt Westley. All in favor, none opposed, meeting adjourned. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Monday, December 21, 2015 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

(Approved 12/21/15)