Adult Redeploy Illinois Oversight Board
Performance Measurement Committee Meeting
Friday, May 8, 2015
2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
At the following public site:
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor – Large Conference Room, Chicago

ARIOB board members present: John Maki, Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)
ARIOB by phone: Judge James Radcliffe, Kathy Starkovich (for Patricia Hayden)

Non-ARIOB present: Reshma Desai, Chris Devitt, Lindsey LaPointe, Lynne Mock, Erin Sheridan
Non-ARIOB by phone: Judge Tom Sumner

Welcome and introductions
Lindsey LaPointe opened the meeting at 2:14p.m. After a roll-call, it was determined there was not a quorum. The committee decided to review information and discuss agenda items without any votes.

Approval of previous meeting minutes – March 31, 2015
This item was tabled to the next committee meeting due to a lack of quorum.

Review of site data
Lindsey LaPointe opened this discussion, nothing that according to the data, there appears to be only one Adult redeploy Illinois (ARI) site of the 22 that is at risk for not meeting their reduction goal of sevent. Kankakee County ARI's hiring challenges are due to implementation barriers such as a January 2015 executive order to halt all state contractors and the inability to guarantee the probation officer positions after June 30, 2015. ARI staff has been in high communication with this site to determine if they can meet their goal an related mitigating circumstances. ARI staff anticipates discussing this at the next full Oversight Board meeting in the context of a possible penalty.

The committee reviewed highlights from the quarterly data report summary. Information shared included training through the National Drug Court Institute (NDCI) in the 2nd Judicial Circuit attended by 55 stakeholders, on-site technical assistance from the NDCI in the 4th Judicial Circuit, a new circuit-wide coordinator position in the 9th Judicial Circuit, and a research partnership for an outcome evaluation in the Cook County Access to Treatment Court. The ACT Court plans to continue the evaluation into the next grant period. Other highlights shared included the first graduation for LaSalle ARI and full enrollment of 108 probationers in Peoria County ARI. Peoria County has communicated the need for a third ARI probation officer since the spring of 2014 but due to the budget, has not been able to add this officer, but instead have been able to maintain the program. The program is looking at ceasing enrollments and aiming for a program capacity of about 80. ARI staff plans to visit Peoria ARI in the fall of 2015. Nate Steinfeld noted that this summary document could be reconfigured as the program grows and organized differently such as by outcomes, completion rates or a more concise summary of

highlights or key findings. Ranking the sites on key measures was mentioned, but then cautioned since programs are different and thus cannot be accurate compared. Chris Devitt noted that researchers at the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority could provide more summary statistics for this committee.

Review of data for benchmarks

Dashboard
The committee reviewed the updated dashboard. A committee member suggested an update to the annual cost per person in prison cost since the new figure from the Illinois Department of Corrections is $22,201 per person (SFY14) instead of $21,500 per person. Jordan Boulger cautioned that the cost per person for earlier diversions would not change and the calculation would only change for diversions after the annual cost per person in prison changed.

Action items: Update the cost per year in the Illinois Department of Corrections and subsequent cost-savings calculation.

LSI-R scores by site
The committee reviewed the LSI-R score by site document, noting that scores for newly enrolled participants are listed separately. The committee discussed what other information would be helpful, the usefulness of the format, and the missing scores. It is not clear if missing scores are due to a lack of LSI-R assessment or lack of entering the data. Due to differing program models, different sites conduct the LSI-R at different points in the program process. For instance, in sites with direct sentencing (some problem-solving courts), the LSI-R is not necessarily done at sentencing, but at probation intake. The appropriate time to conduct the LSI-R assessment is frequently discussed with sites at site visits. Due to site visits, frequent communication, and the clear directive to serve a truly prison-bound population that is written into many local program manuals, ARI staff does not believe that any ARI site is "creaming" or serving a low-risk population. The importance of providing the missing data will be impressed upon the sites. John Maki emphasized that the risk assessment is foundational to the programs overall and supervision and punishment specifically. It was noted that people sentenced into an ARI program and subsequently found inappropriate (e.g., low-risk, violent), can be referred out.

The committee requested that the date of program commencement be added for context. Nate Steinfeld suggested an ARI summary of LSI-R scores or by program model. Lynne Mock mentioned this will likely be in the 2014 Annual Report.

Chris Devitt noted the challenge of managing, cleaning, and analyzing the data with current staff resources. Little time is left to develop research ideas and questions for further analysis.

The committee directed ARI staff to share this LSI-R document with the full board since risk assessment is so foundational to ARI and community corrections. Additional helpful information is a note on when the LSI-R occurs in the process and obtaining the missing data.

Action items: Add date of program commencement to the LSI-R document and provide document to the full Oversight Board.

Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) revocation of unsuccessful exits
ARI staff provided an overview on this data which is another proxy measure to determine if an ARI participant is truly prison-bound, methodology borrowed from Dr. Dave Olson from Loyola. It is not a measure of program effectiveness. The committee discussed outliers and confidence in this measure. John Maki noted the measure is interesting and asked when the numbers are meaningful since some sites have small numbers of exits. If presenting data, leaving out newer sites would be helpful. Chris Devitt noted that the mechanisms for verifying that participants went to IDOC are not always checked with the sites for their awareness. John Maki noted a possible unintended consequence of discussing this data is a false impression (to sites) that they should be sending people to IDOC. The committee discussed the importance of the timing of IDOC commitments (i.e., within 90 days of unsuccessful exist or not). Some programs have to send an individual unsuccessfully exiting the program back to the original judge to determine the disposition while other programs give the judge the authority to commit to IDOC if appropriate. This is the case with Cook HOPE and the Cook Access to Community Treatment (ACT) Court, respectively, although the Cook HOPE correction action plan is attempting to change this internal process.

Chris Devitt noted the importance of capturing program flow by site which, at this point in time, is not gathered consistently and comprehensively. Program flow could include points of assessment and points of revocation. John Maki noted the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts might be interested in joint data gathering on this. ARI staff noted that most local court systems don't have these program flows documented. Jordan agreed this is the case in Cook County and he would be interested if other counties document the program or court flow. The committee discussed that, up to this point, ARI has only collected data and an outcome evaluation would have to address this program flow issue.

Overall, ARI is well-positioned as a strategic partner, technical assistance provider and funder to assist programs to make tweaks that could have big impact on outcomes. The committee agreed that sharing best practices between sites and technical assistance provision instead of simple penalties for sites can go a long way in this effort.

<mark>Action items</mark>:   Determine the most efficient way to gather program flow information
                         from sites.

Update on sites under corrective action plans
Lindsey LaPointe led this discussion. Jersey County ARI has reported on their correction action plan (CAP) for a year and have made progress to bring in people to the drug court program. Jersey ARI will no longer be on the corrective plan.

LaSalle County ARI began a CAP in October 2015 due to low enrollments and missing the SFY14 reduction goal by one. The SFY15 goal is 36 this year and they are on track to meet the goal.

The Cook County HOPE program has been working on corrective action since the fall of 2014 and the Oversight Board approved the formal CAP in early February 2015. The committee

discussed the CAP progress report, supplemental information gathered, and letter with program changes outlined provided by Chief Judge Evans. ARI staff met with Chief Judge Evans and some team members in mid-April, providing guidance on necessary program and process changes. Overall, the program appears to be making some progress and the stakeholders have provided strong written documentation that directs the enrollment of more high-risk individuals into the program. The new directive now must be tested in the court process with time to see effectiveness. ARI staff believes the team, including Chief Judge Evans, heard the need for program changes to align the program with ARI funding. The committee discussed the need for ARI staff to determine what specifically needs to be seen and by when by setting aggressive and achievable benchmarks. Jordan Boulger suggested a clear timeline will be helpful to the program and the committee agreed that a timeline with a probationary period would be helpful. Previously the committee discussed the three options of funding this program in SFY16, not funding the program in SFY16 or providing a period of probationary funding. The committee directed ARI staff to provide this clear, aggressive, and achievable timeline with benchmarks to Chief Judge Evans. ARI staff can articulate the timeline first, giving the program an opportunity to negotiate it if it is not realistic. The committee directed ARI staff to insert a directive related to the LSI-R scores into an updated CAP. ARI staff provided a review for the committee of the previous corrective action timeline and the committee and discussed a six month probationary funding period beginning July 1st, 2015 and ending December 31, 2015. This information will be passed on to the full Oversight Board for an informed decision.

Old business/new business
Lindsey LaPointe noted that the LSI-R thresholds discussed at the previous committee meeting will be presented to the Oversight Board for a vote at the May 18 meeting. The next committee meeting will occur in advance of the August board meeting. Nate Steinfeld mentioned the need for more ARI research staff since a significant amount of good data is being collected however the ability to provide feedback to sites or analyze in depth is severely limited.

Adjournment
Nate Steinfeld made the motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Jordan Boulger. All in favor, none opposed, meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.
(Approved 9/23/15)