

Minutes from the Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board
Performance Measurement Committee
Thursday, August 21, 2014
3:00-5:00p.m.

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

ARIOB board members present: Jordan Boulger (for Jack Cutrone), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)
ARIOB by phone: Adam Monreal, Joan Small (for Michelle Saddler)
Non ARIOB in attendance: Lindsey LaPointe, Mary Ann Dyar

Welcome and introductions

Mary Ann Dyar called roll and it was determined that there was not an in-person quorum. It was determined that scheduled votes cannot occur at this meeting (e.g., approving previous meeting minutes and electing a chair); however, agenda items could be discussed.

Election of a committee chair

Jordan Boulger is the current chair of this committee on behalf of ARIOB member Jack Cutrone. Jordan is moving on from his position at ICJIA as of August 22nd, so a replacement chair will be needed. If possible, we would like to have actual board members serving as committee chairs, which we will take up at the next meeting with a quorum.

Update on status of correction action plan – Jersey County

Mary Ann Dyar provided an overview of the Jersey County corrective action plan (CAP), which was submitted because Jersey County was at risk of not meeting its SFY14 reduction goal of 15. A declining overall program eligible population (non-violent offenders being sent to prison) was a primary factor in the inability to meet the reduction goal. Other factors included a lack of referrals from neighboring Greene County and an incident that led to a group of participants being revoked to the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC). In its CAP, Jersey County offered action steps to address these issues, and progress updates on the CAP will be provided in conjunction with quarterly data reports.

Review of SFY14 site progress toward 25% reduction goal

Mary Ann opened the discussion on SFY14 site progress, noting that progress towards the 25% reduction goal is the key performance measure in each contract and the statute. Jordan Boulger walked the committee through the charts provided in the materials that cover progress towards the 25% reduction goals for all 18 sites as of 6/30/14, noting the pro-rated reduction goals for sites that had ramp-up periods. Jordan is working on the final verifications which will be completed within the next few days. Most sites have met or exceeded their goals in SFY14. New sites exceeded their pro-rated reduction goals.

The verification process indicates that LaSalle County ARI fell short of the reduction goal by one individual. LaSalle ARI, a new site in SFY14, had several delays and had a pro-rated reduction goal to accommodate the ramp-up period. The final corrected SFY14 diversion number was eight individuals versus the prorated reduction goal of nine. It was determined that the site had been counting an ineligible individual (a parolee). The verification process yielded a few other changes to the overall numbers since the August ARIOB meeting, but none that

resulted in failures to meet reduction goals. The verification process reconciles self-reported numbers from sites with information from the database.

There was a question about what might be done differently in education or training on the front end to make sure sites are aware of eligibility requirements and do not mistakenly enroll ineligible participants that cannot be counted toward their reduction goals. The information is on the ARI website, but it may not be accessed by all of the stakeholders. Jordan suggested including eligibility requirements in all grant application, renewal and reporting materials. The Research and Analysis Unit at ICJIA also has a list of ineligible offenses, which is currently under legal review. Such a list needs to be updated after every legislative session.

Referring to the charts, Nate Steinfeld asked about the current diversions being greater than the target population in some sites. Jordan noted that in some cases this could be a function of an overly conservative target population calculation, but there is not an easy way to verify this. In some cases, this disparity could be the result of a program with a large program capacity where participants are active in more than one grant period. These participants count as diversions until they are otherwise sent to IDOC, so this can lead to the current diversions exceeding the target population. It was noted that the policy developed by this committee on integrating “carry over” individuals into the calculation of renewal reduction goals is related to the above.

Nate Steinfeld noted that including the overall ARI-eligible population on the charts is important and helps to compare programs. This could be presented as “The specific target population is XX percent of the overall program eligible target population.” The example of Cook County was utilized to show that the combined target populations of the two Cook County ARI programs is less than 10% of the overall program-eligible population for Cook County based on recent IDOC commitments. It is important to recognize that programs target specific populations with specific interventions, and that expanding services to a wider population is not necessarily the most effective or evidence-based option. Nate Steinfeld mentioned the idea of a “reach goal” or a non-contractual goal since several counties consistently exceed their 25% reduction goal. It was also noted that highlighting the successful diversions that have completed the program would be helpful (currently this is combined with current participants in the charts).

The group discussed reporting the aggregate number of individuals served in ARI (in a year) compared to the number of overall program-eligible individuals sent to IDOC (in a year), taking into account that not all program-eligible individuals are eligible for a given local program (e.g., drug court) and some are ineligible due to criminal histories. The current rough estimate is that ARI sites serve less than 10% of the overall program-eligible population, approximately 1,200 versus over 13,000; however, ARI is a young program serving only 34 counties. Mary Ann noted that the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget will be interested in metrics such as the above and in general, they will want to see a declining overall program-eligible population.

Adam Monreal inquired about looking at performance measures based on the population of the various counties. For instance, does it make sense for a smaller county sending fewer eligible individuals to IDOC to be compared with a bigger county such as Cook County sending thousands of program eligible individuals to IDOC every year? It can be more difficult for the smaller counties to meet their goals when they do not have a big target population to pull from.

Mary Ann noted that this was part of the issue in Jersey County, with an overall declining program-eligible population. And this relates to a previous committee discussion about the point at which ARI funds are no longer cost-effective in jurisdictions with declining overall-eligible populations. Adam Monreal noted this should be an ARIOB discussion and the committee agreed. Jersey County is example, and it is helpful to look at the potential consequences of ceasing funding. The idea of funding based solely on cost-effectiveness or an overall program-eligible population needs to be balanced with promoting ARI as a statewide initiative where all counties have access.

Nate Steinfeld noted the potential consequences of “penalizing success” by pulling funding from sites where the number of non-violent offenders being sent to IDOC is rapidly declining. Jordan noted that this issue was raised at a performance incentive funding (PIF) conference. In this case, the solution was to continue funding for programs to maintain their baseline numbers (of individuals going to prison) after a significant reduction. This applied to a jurisdiction that wanted to participate, but their overall numbers were so low that a maintenance contract was required instead of a contract to reduce commitment. In ARI this might manifest in separate “maintenance track.” It was noted that this issue and other issues will become more important as the overall ARI budget is strained.

Jordan noted that the site progress charts have been useful tools. It would be helpful to create a quick mechanism to identify outliers with sites, for instance, setting an upper range and a lower range of “normal” at the site level every quarter. After three years of data for some programs, there is enough data for meaningful numbers. This set-up to identify outliers allows ARI staff to see problem areas as they are developing.

Discussion of performance measurement related policies

Plan to address reduction goal shortfalls

ARI staff walked the committee through the current penalty clause for failing to meet the reduction goal, noting that a penalty is assessed *or* a corrective action plan is created and then approved by the ARIOB to avoid a penalty. The penalty is capped at one half of the marginal cost of incarceration per year for person short of the reduction goal, which is about \$2,500. In the case of LaSalle ARI, they could either give back up to \$2,500 or create and submit a corrective action plan. The ARIOB suggested examining related policies of Juvenile Redeploy (RI) and reporting back at the November meeting.

ARI staff walked through the RI process provided by staff. First, there is a site visit or conference call with the site and RI staff and board members to examine current practices related to the contractual violation. Second, the RI board reviews the information at a special board meeting. Third, the RI staff and board compile the areas of concern that led to the violations and provide information back to the site. Fourth, the RI board examines the options of assessing the penalty or reallocating funds (minimally the amount of the penalty) in the current budget to implement a plan that addresses areas of concerns, for instance, training. If a site opts for the corrective action plan and reallocating of funds, a budget revision is submitted. Although the ARIOB discussed that the funds already returned by LaSalle ARI in SFY14 as counting towards a potential penalty, this committee needs to create a more generic process for institutionalization.

ARI procedure would involve a conference call or a site visit to examine the issues leading to the reduction goal short fall. The issues of concern would be presented at the next ARIOB meeting (or call a special meeting) where the ARIOB would discuss next steps, such as assessing a penalty or requesting a budget reallocation to address the issue. In order to create a process for this for future use, it will be necessary to determine from which fiscal year grant the penalty comes, for instance, the SFY14 or SFY15 grant. Timing is important since grants close at the end of the SFY and the funds can no longer be accessed.

Mary Ann summed up the current CAP language noting that it was created to avoid a penalty whenever possible. A CAP identifies the issue(s), identifies remedial action, and is voted on and approved (or not) by the ARIOB or an authorized committee. If the ARIOB does not approve the CAP, the plan can be revised, or the site can drop out of the program before they are assessed a penalty. It was noted that the current ARI CAP process aligns with the RI example. The current ARI CAP language is robust enough for current and future application purposes, but RI ideas could be added such as integrating mandatory technical assistance through a budget revision instead of a penalty clause.

In the case of LaSalle ARI, a formal communication is needed regarding its failure to meet the reduction goal, and the ability of the ARIOB to assess a penalty. It was noted that revising the budget or assessing a penalty right now will be difficult since LaSalle's ARI budget has been reduced as far as possible. The group discussed no-cost solutions such making sure LaSalle ARI stakeholders attend the problem solving court conference or a training through the Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice (COE). Collaborating with COE in Jersey County worked extremely well.

Jordan Boulger noted that the current budgetary constraints may not apply in the future so a budget revision or reallocation could be integrated into the general plan to institutionalize. Jordan also noted that he believes that LaSalle ARI's failure to meet the reduction goal was a good-faith misunderstanding of the eligibility criteria and not a gate keeping issue. Given this, a CAP might refer to training on the eligibility criteria and a robust eligibility check on every screened individual. Depending on the CAP, the ARIOB may not wish to assess a penalty.

In sum, ARI staff will compile a general plan for the ARIOB and a specific plan for LaSalle. This committee will be called on to vote on what to do regarding LaSalle ARI at its next meeting (ahead of the November ARIOB meeting). ARI staff will verify if the ARIOB authorized this committee to approve a CAP for LaSalle County or if a special ARIOB meeting is needed.

Contract language regarding pro-ration of reduction goals

Lindsey LaPointe reminded the committee that there was previous discussion on pro-rating reduction goals for new sites contingent on a two-month ramp-up period or the paperwork approval date. This issue can be tabled for now since no new sites are currently coming on board in the fall of 2014. Joan Small looked into a similar pro-rating process at the Department of Human Services (DHS) and reported that it is rarely done and only on a case-by-case basis.

Update on implementation evaluation and plans for an outcome evaluation

Jordan Boulger reported on the status of the implementation evaluation and provided specifics from the DuPage draft report which is the first of ten to be reviewed. The draft report shows that DuPage ARI implemented eight of the 10 key components of an intensive probation supervision program. Mary Ann noted that these implementation evaluation reports can be very helpful with jurisdictions interested in certain ARI models and may be of use during a planning process.

The future outcome evaluation will be contracted out and not conducted by ICJIA. The unit of analysis will be each site since factors and programs do vary by site. The effect size should not be aggregated, but the final product could be one very long report or might be several smaller reports. Ideally, there would be a report for each site and then a report compiling all the data from all the sites. The outcome evaluation will compare ARI clients with similar clients who either went to IDOC or went to standard probation. The idea is to figure out if ARI clients have a lower recidivism rate than similar clients sent to IDOC or standard probation. Other performance measures can be tracked, such as pro-social indicators, but recidivism is the most important performance measure. The benefits of an outcome study include providing information to the funders (the General Assembly), obtaining baseline data for a cost-benefit analysis and adding to the overall research literature on diversion programs and performance incentive funding. Given the current SFY15 funding situation, the outcome evaluation timeline is unclear. Nate Steinfeld noted that the RFP process is not necessary if the outcome evaluator is a state university. It also may be possible for the Sentencing Policy Advisor Council (SPAC) to provide some funds for this outcome evaluation since an outcome evaluation is necessary for a subsequent accurate cost benefit analysis which is central to SPAC's work.

Old business/new business

The committee expressed gratitude for all the work that Jordan Boulger has done for this committee and the research arm of ARI overall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05p.m.

(Approved 11/5/14)