

**Minutes from the ARIOB Site Selection & Monitoring Committee Meeting
August 9, 2013, 10:00-11:30a.m., at ICJIA, 300 W. Adams, Suite 200, Chicago, IL**

In attendance: Patricia Hayden, Sean O'Brien (for ICJIA), Angelique Orr, Walter Boyd
ARIOB by phone: Mike Torchia, Ken Tupy
Non-ARIOB members: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe

Sean O'Brien opened the meeting at 10:00am and determined there was quorum.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Two suggestions were made to the meeting minutes regarding word choice.

Motion: Recommendation to approve the minutes from June 6, 2013 Site Selection & Monitoring Committee with two suggested corrections. Passed upon motion by Angelique Orr, seconded by Patricia Hayden (none opposed, all in favor).

SFY14 implementation grantees and SFY14 funding timeline

Sean O'Brien opened the discussion and referred to the funding chart and spending timeline. Mary Ann Dyar noted the August 5, 2013 ARIOB meeting has been rescheduled for September 16 to accommodate responses to the current SFY14 ARI implementation RFP (closes 8/30/13). The Illinois General Assembly appropriated \$7 million for SFY14 and the current RFP is the primary means new jurisdictions will access funding, other than rolling planning grants and a possible supplemental funding opportunity. RFP responses are expected from Cook County (for a 2nd program with a current planning process for an Access to Community Treatment, or ACT, Court led by Judge Biebel), Winnebago (2nd program for a mental health court currently running on expiring federal funds), Kane County (former planning grantee), and LaSalle County (reviewing today). Committee will reconvene the week of September 9, 2013 to review RFP responses. A supplemental funding opportunity will likely be added to the SFY14 timeline in December, subject to ARIOB approval at the November 4, 2013 ARIOB meeting where the board could divide supplemental funds into available pots.

Walter Boyd asked if Cook's 2nd grant proposal will lead to collaborations with more providers due to enrollment in Medicaid and engaging individuals newly ensured with the Cook County Medicaid waiver and the Affordable Care Act. Mary Ann Dyar noted that this is an integral component of Cook's proposal and the team is visiting model programs in Brooklyn, NY and has hired a facilitator from the National Center for State Courts. Angelique Orr noted the strong impact of an outside facilitator in planning processes.

A planning grant notice went up on the ARI website in July with a rolling deadline. Rolling deadlines facilitate ongoing relationship-building to maximize responses. The ARIOB has designated \$200,000 for planning grants. ARI staff has learned that planning grantees submit stronger implementation proposals. Mary Ann Dyar noted the possibility of the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee's writing up a "lessons learned from planning grant process" memo.

Review and funding recommendation – LaSalle County

Lindsey LaPointe provided a summary of LaSalle County's proposal. LaSalle went through a planning process consisting of two site visits to existing ARI programs, two outside facilitators, and training at the American Probation and Parole Association conference. The proposal is for an intensive probation supervision program (\$281,263 for a 9 month grant) with a target population of 135 and a reduction goal of 34. Sean O'Brien noted LaSalle's proposal targets an entire class of felony offenders (much like Macon County ARI).

Key components consist of two new probation officers with the ability to work non-traditional hours, drug treatment through North Central Behavioral Health Systems, increased drug testing, a partnership

with a local employment training provider, a community service element, and cognitive-behavioral therapy (EPICS or *Thinking for a Change*). Other evidence-based practices include Moral Reconation Therapy (at treatment provider) and swift and graduated sanctions. The Criminal Court Judge in charge of felonies will make decisions on eligibility, a process which differs from other ARI programs who utilize a team approach and/or team consensus.

Sean O'Brien offered comments and concerns:

- Supplanting issues with two supervisory positions on grant (cannot lower other funds due to the availability of grant funds). Director of Probation and Director of Court Services are on the grant for 5% and 10% of their time. To avoid supplanting, LaSalle must show that this percentage of time will be backfilled or employ a matching process where time is devoted to program, but county provides funds.
- Lack of .25 FTE program coordinator position
- Need more detail on the \$20,000 requested for equipment related to Moral Reconation Therapy (in contractual)
- Specific role of criminal justice consultant (4 hours per month) – may relate to coordinator?
- May be difficult to get program up and running/staff hired by October 1.

Walter Boyd offered comments:

- Judge will be intimately involved so program will need to ensure the judge's calendar allows for him/her to attend to program matters expediently. Unclear if this program will operate like a drug court where a judge is allocated to court.
- Ancillary items and funds may be needed related to the employment component, such as transportation assistance and job-related clothing.

Lindsey LaPointe offered comments and concerns:

- Inclusion of sanctions without incentives which is counter to the evidence of using incentives with sanctions in a ratio of 4-to-1 to increase behavior change.
- Lack of collaboration on eligibility decisions. In other programs the final decision rests with a judge or the State's Attorney following a collaborative discussion.
- LSI-R screen occurs after individual enters program so some mechanism to measure risk as part of eligibility decision is needed.

Mary Ann Dyar commented this program may lead to future buy-in into a problem-solving court model from various stakeholders, including the judiciary.

Patricia Hayden noted that it is very positive the program has the Chief Judge's support and the proposal highlighted a gap in services that the proposal addresses.

Sean O'Brien summarized by noting that no concerns or comments raised would drastically change the funding level and budget changes could be addressed by repurposing.

Recommendation: Approve LaSalle County up to \$281,263 with a request to address the comments and concerns raised by the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Walter Boyd seconded (none opposed, all in favor).

Site monitoring and spending

Sean O'Brien opened the discussion, noting that ARI and ICJIA staff meets on site spending biweekly. A draft of spending monitoring questions was distributed to the committee covering barriers to spending (county-level and ICJIA); activities to overcome barriers; fiscal reporting technical assistance needs;

general technical assistance needs; unexpected costs associated with the program; and if some expenses are easier to incur than others. The final two questions seek to prompt sites to compile a list of program elements that can be readily accessed through a supplemental funding opportunity or unanticipated unspent funds.

Angelique Orr asked if a quick reference list of allowable and expeditious expenses could be compiled for sites of useful program elements and/or elements that other sites have integrated. ICJIA's standard on expenditures is "is it reasonable and necessary for the program?" The proposed spending monitoring questions can create an initial list that the Legal Department at ICJIA can review for allowability. The draft spending monitoring questions could be tailored to each site and sent out in a survey format.

Mary Ann Dyar noted that a site spending tool was previously created by ARI staff and incorporates much of the above. Lindsey LaPointe offered details on this site spending tool to the committee which is designed for a conversation rather than a written survey to tease out needs, opportunities and information from sites. The tool references what other ARI sites have spent funds on. Sean O'Brien noted that the tool can be utilized now (since most grantees have budgeted \$3,000-\$4,000 under ARIOB approved funding) and during a supplemental funding opportunity. Mary Ann Dyar summed up that ARI staff will utilize the tool or a related survey during the likely supplemental funding opportunity in December and in final budget negotiations with grantees.

Mary Ann Dyar mentioned plans for upcoming site visits. Site visits have already occurred with the first 10 pilot sites and ARI staff wants to enhance overall monitoring activities due to increased scrutiny with increased funding. ARI staff wants to engage ARIOB members (in particular those serving on the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee) in site monitoring visits. ARI staff aims to align site visits with grant monitoring visits which occur biannually. Dates will be shared soon.

Mary Ann Dyar noted the centrality of fidelity in evidence-based practices and addressing fidelity in site visits. Often the developers of evidence-based practices, or "national disseminators," create fidelity checklists. ARI staff aims to obtain and utilize fidelity checklists in the future and is currently looking into a Corrections Program Checklist training offered through the University of Cincinnati.

The ARI database is also a helpful monitoring tool. For example, a round of client interviews at one site related to the ICJIA process evaluation indicated treatment may not be occurring as planned. The ARI database showed staff that referrals were well-documented, but treatment was not. Technical assistance is currently being provided to assist this site in entering data and ensuring treatment is occurring. Walter Boyd asked that direct service staff may provide pushback on providing detailed data, such as number clean days and case notes, and staff clarified the less-detailed level of data collected in the database. ARI staff noted that data collection needs to be balanced with the local control and design of the programs. The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee will continue to be utilized as a mechanism to vet site monitoring activities.

Mary Ann Dyar went over the new quarterly report snapshot that will now be provided to the ARIOB. The Committee offered positive feedback on the presentation of data which provides high-level messages on all current implementation and planning grantees.

Old business/new business

Sean O'Brien noted that ICJIA is collaborating on the creation of a problem-solving court database with the Division of Mental Health (DMH). ICJIA has worked with ARI on sharing information to ensure the databases can be utilized together.

Walter Boyd mentioned the Risk Assets and Need Assessment tool (RANA) and how this may relate to the ARI and DMH database. ARI staff participates in a weekly call with the Gladys Taylor (who is managing RANA implementation) and shares information for collaboration.

Patricia Hayden suggested that supplemental funds could be used to provide larger trainings for all sites as individual sites often encounter problems scheduling trainers within a specific time period. Ideas may include manager training, utilizing technology, data analysis, sanctions and incentives, effective casework. Patricia Hayden also offered positive feedback on the all-sites meeting and the possibility of combining a robust training with the all-sites meeting.

The next committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 10th from 1:30-3pm.

Sean O'Brien asked for a motion to adjourn at 11:40a.m. Approved upon a motion seconded by Angelique Orr (none opposed, all in favor).

(Approved 9/16/13)