

Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board  
Performance Measurement Committee  
Monday, June 9, 2014  
12:00-2:00p.m.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), 300 W. Adams, Ste. 200, Chicago, IL 60606  
Small Conference room

ARIOB board members present: Joe Antolin, Jordan Boulger (for Jack Cutrone), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)

Non-ARIOB present: George Blakemore (member of the public), Mary Ann Dyar, Simeon Kim, Lindsey LaPointe, Mystik Miller

ARIOB by phone: Joan Small (for Michelle Saddler)

### **Welcome and introductions**

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

### **Approval of previous meeting minutes**

The minutes from the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting were presented for review and approval. Joe Antolin made the motion to approve the minutes from the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Nate Steinfeld seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed, minutes approved.

### **Review of corrective action plan**

Mary Ann opened the discussion by reviewing the corrective action plan language established by the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board (ARIOB). In the event that a site is having difficulty meeting its 25% reduction goal, the site will be asked to submit a corrective action plan to the Oversight Board with plans for remediation. If the Oversight Board does not accept the plan, it can be modified or the site can withdraw from the program prior to a penalty being assessed. A site with a corrective action plan will report on progress to the ARIOB every quarter.

Jersey County recently submitted a corrective action plan. At its May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Oversight Board authorized the Performance Measurement Committee to review and accept/approve the plan in between Board meetings. It was noted that Jersey County had a reduction goal higher than 25% of the identified target population in State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2014, which would have been nine. There was a discussion of why that is sometime the case, which generally has to do with achieving cost-effectiveness. In Jersey County, the overall program eligible population and target population (based on a three-year average) have decreased over the past few years from 57 to 17. Upon review of SFY14 grant renewal materials, the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee recommended that Jersey ARI increase the number of people served and the reduction goal in order to maintain program cost-effectiveness. In talks with the site, Jersey County agreed to work with neighboring Greene County to identify drug court-eligible program participants. Ultimately, Jersey ARI submitted a reduction goal of 15, which was equal to 45% of the ARI-eligible population. It was noted that not all of the ARI-eligible population are necessarily eligible for a drug court program. In terms of the corrective action plan, a lower reduction goal of 13 was proposed (equal to 39% of the ARI-eligible population) with a cost-per person diverted of \$9,520.46 which is considered cost-effective and is not an outlier when compared to other jurisdictions. Mary Ann suggested the bottom line of this corrective action plan should be cost-effectiveness.

Joe Antolin summed up the discussion noting that a cost-effectiveness threshold is important, the site has already instituted several changes due to technical assistance through an ARI and Center of

Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice (COE) site visit, and the need for Jersey (and other sites) to avoid establishing an unrealistic reduction goal in the future. The corrective action plan under review provides detail on changes underway, such as a new Greene County probation officer participating in staffings and an additional phase to drug court to increase proximal goals.

Joe Antolin suggested exploring how the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is increasing access to ancillary services and treatment. Jersey ARI recently reported at the April 2014 site visit that the drug court is seeing people with dual substance abuse and mental health disorders, but there is not the local capacity to treat these individuals. Tele-psychiatry as an option was discussed to access treatment rural jurisdictions. Jordan Boulger noted that Jersey ARI's treatment provider wants to become licensed in dual-disordered treatment. The ARIOB should encourage the provider to become a vendor for Medicaid which may reduce the treatment line item (and increase cost-effectiveness) in the future.

The committee discussed the integration of Greene County and the need to engage the Judge and the State's Attorney. It was noted that the integration of Greene County individuals will not likely have a large effect since in SFY13 Greene County only sent five program eligible individuals to IDOC.

Since the ARIOB approved Jersey County ARI for renewal funding, the corrective action plan will carry into the SFY15 grant year. Reports on progress with the corrective action plan will be submitted quarterly, as an addendum to the quarterly data report.

Nate Steinfeld noted that Jersey ARI was initially aiming for an almost 50% reduction goal on a downward trending number (the overall program-eligible IDOC commitments) which is easy to overlook since the three-year average does not indicate if the numbers are trending upwards or downwards. (Recent ARI-eligible data for Jersey show an increase from 17 to 30 in SFY13.) ARI staff noted that at the prior meeting the committee discussed planning for jurisdictions with declining overall program-eligible populations.

Mary Ann inquired about the option of making changes to the boilerplate contract in the future, specifically Exhibit A, to reflect a specific reduction goal followed by a clause such as "or as otherwise authorized by the ARIOB." The committee is comfortable with this language and Simeon Kim indicated this is possible per the ICJIA Fiscal and State Grants Unit. The committee reviewed and suggested revisions to the reduction goal calculation for Jersey ARI's SFY15 grant, using the newly authorized policy for integrating "carry over" individuals into the target population and reduction.

Joe Antolin suggested that the Jersey County corrective action plan be summarized in a one-page cover sheet with the key elements of the plan, as a template for the future. It was noted that elements of the corrective action plan could be incorporated into the SFY15 Exhibit A. It was suggested that the quarterly updates on the corrective action plan should include feedback on the implementation of specific technical assistance. This can be a mechanism for both Jersey County to learn what is working, and also for the ARIOB to see what technical assistance is being administered and what course corrections are being made.

Joe Antolin made a motion to accept the corrective action plan as presented to decrease the SFY14 reduction goal from 15 to 13, summarize the corrective action plan in one page, and monitor the plan through quarterly reporting over the next four quarters. Nate Steinfeld seconded. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

Nate Steinfeld suggested that the ARIOB codify the cost-per person cost-effectiveness threshold. It was noted that this type of prescription has been avoided in the past. In regards to a corrective action plan, a future plan may have to be more prescriptive with the specific domains addressed such as cost-effectiveness, target population/reduction goal, or evidence-based practices.

### **Update on implementation evaluation**

Jordan Boulger provided an update on the implementation evaluation, noting a draft of the DuPage County ARI report is complete, however the review process can be quite lengthy. It is possible the DuPage report could be published by the end of 2014, although this is a conservative estimate. The implementation evaluation reports are designed to be modular for use as a template or a boilerplate. The timeline for the remaining nine implementation evaluation reports is unclear at this time.

Joe Antolin inquired if it was unusual for funding entities to evaluate the programs they fund. Jordan Boulger noted it would be unusual for a funder to conduct an outcome evaluation; however, a funder conducting an implementation or process evaluation makes sense and is not atypical. The primary questions in the implementation evaluation are: Is the program being implemented according to the plan and what lessons have been learned?

ARI staff and the ARIOB are eager to see these reports. It was noted that the reports will not have details on marginal costs of the programs.

### **Old business/new business**

Joe Antolin inquired about the role of the committee in the procurement or request for proposals (RFP) process for identifying an evaluator for an outcome evaluation. Jordan Boulger suggested ICJIA has expertise with this and it also makes sense for the Performance Measurement Committee or the ARIOB to be involved with, for instance, reviewing the RFP.

A member of the public in attendance, George Blakemore, presented the following comments and questions to the committee: How are ARIOB members selected when there are vacancies? How does the representation of the ARIOB and committees reflect the demographics of the incarcerated population in Illinois? Are all contracted service providers listed publicly such as on the ARI website? It would be helpful to note what funds are going to what community providers and how much. What mechanisms are in place to make the service providers accountable? How does the ARIOB and this committee make sure clients are getting strong services, such as employment, education, mental health and substance abuse treatment? It would be helpful to know about funding overall from year to year. It would be helpful to know about ARI staff and how administrative funds are being spent. Mr. Blakemore noted that accountability with state dollars is very important. The committee thanked Mr. Blakemore for the comments. Additional information will be provided to Mr. Blakemore after the meeting.

Joe Antolin made a motion to adjourn. Nate Steinfeld seconded. All in favor, none opposed, meeting adjourned at 1:32p.m.

**(Approved 11/5/14)**