

**Minutes from the ARIOB Site Selection & Monitoring Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, October 31, 2014, 10:00 AM-12:00 PM**  
**ICJIA small conference room, 300 W. Adams, Suite 200, Chicago, IL**

ARIOB in attendance: Lisa Castillo (for Jack Cutrone), Patricia Hayden, Angelique Orr (chair), Sarah Kooperman (for Tom Mahoney), Adam Montreal

ARIOB by phone: Judge Radcliffe, Mike Torchia

Non-ARIOB members: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe, Cindy Puent

**Welcome and introductions**

Committee chair Angelique Orr opened the meeting at 10:05am. Mary Ann Dyar called roll, and it was determined there was quorum.

**Approval of previous meeting minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from July 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Patricia Hayden made the motion to approve, seconded by Sarah Kooperman. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

**Update on SFY15 funding**

Mary Ann gave the update on SFY15 funding, noting the significant increase that was anticipated for ARI based on conversations with leadership in Springfield did not happen. ARI did not suffer budget cuts but received flat funding. With an expanded network over last year, flat funding will result in across-the-board cuts to site grant amounts and the inability to bring on new sites. ICJIA and ARI staff will prepare a case for supplemental funding in the fall veto session, if that is an option, to restore cuts and possibly bring on new sites. Approximately 15 counties have expressed interest in learning more about ARI and potentially joining the network. Restoring cuts to the administrative budget is also important.

**Review of Cook County HOPE planning grant final report**

Mary Ann reported on the Cook HOPE planning grant process, which did not occur at the beginning of the program as usual, but 2 ½ years in. The process included a stakeholder retreat and data analysis to look at how well the existing program is operating. The data analysis conducted by Dr. Olson of Loyola University examined the risk level and prison-bound nature of the program's clients. Due to the planning grant process, the program is looking at ideas to increase the inclusion of a high-risk prison-bound population in the program, and Sarah Kooperman provided some avenues under exploration. Mary Ann added that the Cook HOPE planning grant report shows success in terms of numbers served and through client testimony. There are few failures and revocations made to IDOC from the program so on key measures the program shows success. The continued work of the planning grant process seeks to ensure ARI funds are utilized for a high-risk prison-bound population.

Adam Montreal, Chairman of the Prisoner Review Board, inquired about the ability of ARI programs to serve parolees, noting that 40% of parolees violate the terms of their supervision. Adam Montreal noted that placing parole violators back into their home jurisdictions (if ARI were present) would allow for programming that is not available in IDOC; a connectivity of programs for better success. Mary Ann stated that the Crime Reduction Act legislation is explicit that ARI funds cannot be used for parolees because the idea is to keep individuals out of state

custody (parole is state custody), thus serving parolees would require a change in legislation. Mary Ann noted that some counties have specifically inquired about serving parolees.

Mary Ann noted that the Joint Criminal Justice Reform Committee is looking at community corrections as a whole and several recommendations have been made to the committee to examine what works in ARI and juvenile Redeploy Illinois and apply lessons learned across the spectrum from street-level policing to parole. It may be worth asking ARI sites to provide a case for why a parole population should be served with ARI funds and provide a similar formula to show cost savings. If ARI funds cannot be used for parolees, perhaps a non-ARI pilot could be started with an infrastructure similar to ARI. Perhaps a small percentage of clients or funds at a local ARI site could be used to serve parolees. This discussion needs to occur at the Oversight Board level. ARI staff suggested working with ICJIA researchers to determine which counties see the most parole revocations, perform data analysis and cost efficiency comparisons, and issue a mini-survey to sites to ask if they are faced with parole issues.

### **Discussion of site monitoring activities**

#### ***Site visit reports and corrective action plans review***

Lindsey LaPointe provided information on site monitoring activities and a recent site visit to LaSalle County in mid-October. The LaSalle County ARI program is an intensive probation supervision with services program in its second grant year. The program is beginning a corrective action plan as a result of falling short of its SFY14 reduction goal by one person. The site visit consisted of a meeting with probation, a talk with two current clients, a visit to a treatment provider, and a facilitated discussion with the entire ARI team facilitated by the Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice. The group discussion focused on how to increase referrals, which is the bulk of the corrective action plan in development to be reviewed at the November ARIOB meeting. Jersey County is also working on a corrective action plan, a copy of which is included in the meeting materials.

#### ***Data reports***

Lindsey LaPointe provided a few highlights from the quarterly data reports based on the summary included in the meeting materials.

### **Review and development of funding recommendations-SFY15 implementation RFP**

Angelique Orr opened up the discussion on RFP respondents and reminded the committee that these proposals are contingent upon additional SFY15 funding becoming available. Lindsey walked the committee through the proposals, focusing on the summary chart provided.

#### ***Will County***

Funds were requested to enhance and expand the current problem-solving courts and create a new ARI docket for individuals with identified risk and needs but without acute substance abuse or mental health needs that would place them in a problem-solving court. It was noted that Will County State's Attorney Glasgow is very supportive of the need for ARI in Will County. The proposed program has an extensive list of partners, including law enforcement. Based on earlier staff and committee feedback, some minor edits had been incorporated by Will County stakeholders. The group discussed the lack of clear probation involvement in the program.

Adam Montreal made a motion to approve Will County for funding up to \$151,522 for six months, which was seconded by Patricia Hayden. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed. **Funding recommendation: The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee recommends a 6-month grant of up to \$151,522.**

### ***Kankakee County***

Funds were requested for an intensive supervision probation with enhancements program. The committee reviewed the proposed elements, noting that the target population needs a new calculation with updated IDOC commitment data (2011-2013). It was noted that the community involvement piece via the steering committee could be further developed.

Sarah Kooperman made a motion to approve Kankakee County for funding up to \$89,273 for six months contingent upon clarification and recalculation of the target population and reduction goal based on the latest data and showing cost effectiveness. The motion was seconded by Adam Montreal. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

**Funding recommendation: The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee recommends a 6-month grant of up to \$89,273 contingent on a recalculation and clarification of the target population and reduction goal using the most recently available IDOC data and showing cost-effectiveness.**

### ***Grundy County***

Funds were requested to implement a mental health court. The proposed funded staff would fill identified service gaps and decrease wait time for mental health service recipients. Issues raised by the committee included the target population calculation utilizing older data, lack of reference to the LSI-R, and inclusion of a training event that occurs in SFY16. The proposal does not clearly state that this is a prison-bound population which should be explicitly stated in order to ensure proper use of ARI funds.

Sarah Kooperman made a motion to approve Grundy County for funding up to \$51,380 for six months contingent upon a recalculation of the target population with updated IDOC data and a clarification that the target population is IDOC-bound through use of a risk assessment tool (e.g., LSI-R). The motion was seconded by Patricia Hayden. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

**Funding recommendation: The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee recommends a 6-month grant of up to \$51,380 contingent on a recalculation and clarification of the target population, reduction goal, and service goal using the most recently available IDOC data with assurance that the target population is prison-bound with use of a risk assessment tool.**

### ***20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit (Monroe and Randolph)***

Funds were requested for two distinct programs to cover two of five counties in the 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit (Monroe and Randolph). The committee went over prior feedback provided to the applicant about calculation of the service goal given the limited pool of IDOC commitments and concerns over net-widening, as well as contracting with vendors at appropriate levels given the small programs. In response, the service goals were reduced and the contracted hours at the local vendor were reduced to 25 hours per week. The committee discussed concerns about including cannabis offenders in the target population and noted that the respondent must provide data to show evidence that these (cannabis) cases are prison-bound. If not provided, these cases should

be removed from service population. It was noted that the jurisdiction might not have large enough numbers to support the creation of a drug court.

Sarah Kooperman made a motion to approve the 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit for funding up to \$67,031 for six months contingent upon providing specific steps that show that the target population is IDOC-bound and in line with ARI funding. The motion was seconded by Adam Montreal. All in favor, none opposed, motion passed.

**Funding recommendation: The Site Selection & Monitoring Committee recommends a 6-month grant of up to \$67,031 contingent on showing specific steps to assure that the target population is prison-bound and in line with ARI legislation.**

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

There was no proposed date for the next meeting. If additional funding is received, over and above the amount approved for the four new sites, the committee will reconvene in December or early-January 2015 to discuss fund disbursement, including as supplemental funding to current sites to restore previous cuts.

Mary Ann acknowledged and welcomed Lisa Castillo as new ARI legal counsel. She will take the place of Simeon Kim.

Sarah Kooperman motioned to adjourn at 12:12p.m., seconded by Patricia Hayden. All in favor, none opposed, meeting adjourned.

**(Approved 1/16/15)**