

Minutes from the ARIOB Performance Measurement Committee
Performance Measurement Committee
Friday, July 29, 2016, 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor – Large Conference Room, Chicago

ARIOB members present: Jordan Boulger (for Lavone Haywood), Christine Devitt Westley (for John Maki), Nate Steinfeld (for Kathy Saltmarsh)

ARIOB members by phone: Judge James Radcliffe (Ret).

Non-ARIOB present: Naeem Chowdhury, Mary Ann Dyar, Yasmine El-Gohary, Lindsey LaPointe

Non-ARIOB by phone: Judge Thomas Sumner (Ret.)

Welcome and introductions

Mary Ann Dyar brought the meeting to order at 9:39a.m., facilitated introductions, and determined there was quorum. She noted that a new Committee Chair is not yet identified; the ideal Chair would be a statutorily defined board member who is able to facilitate the reporting out at ARIOB meetings. ARI staff noted that continual discussion is needed for the addition of new committee members, as well as SFY17 performance measurement plans.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Mary Ann called for a review of the minutes from May 10, 2016. All in favor of passing meeting minutes. None opposed. Minutes approved.

Update on status of ARI and discussion of impact of SFY16 budget impasse

Mary Ann opened the discussion on the SFY16 budget impasse, noting that ARI was included in the stop-gap budget which passed June 30th. Since none of the stop-gap budget funds are General Revenue (GR) funds, a portion of the funds for ARI *can* cover the time period through June 30, 2017. ARI staff is determining the total of what sites spent in SFY16 via the fiscal reports. Barring any atypical final reports, the \$12.5 million in the stop-gap budget would be sufficient to reimburse all sites for SFY16, and also cover SFY17 at the maintenance level budgeted for. ARI owes sites about \$5M for costs incurred in SFY16, about \$6.4M is budgeted for SFY17 grants and about \$1.2M is needed for administrative costs. ARI has lost three sites through the budget impasse. Kane County dismantled their program on Dec. 31st and Kankakee County and McLean County decided not to move forward as of July 1st.

It was acknowledged that ramping sites back up will take time and effort. As of SFY17, ARI has 19 sites in 38 counties and Cook HOPE and ACT are under one grant as of July 1st. Some sites will not begin enrollments again until SFY17 funds are in hand and thus will remain behind in performance-based measurements until funds are received. The performance measurement data document provided indicates that enrollment dropped precipitously in programs in SFY16. Those enrolled in programs have exited (successfully or unsuccessfully) and are not being replaced. Lindsey noted that ARI had a “peak” of 21 sites and 24 programs.

For a more qualitative update, Lindsey noted there were not in-depth conversations with programs in July such as occurred in May, however quarterly and final data reports were submitted and budget proposals for SFY17 were looked at. Lindsey walked the committee through the impact of the budget impasse document, highlighting the discrepancies between the program plans and implementation. Committee members raised questions about the ability of sites to implement evidence-based practices. The ability of programs to ramp back up will vary by county, some staff will have to be rehired, and some providers will be unable to come back to ARI programs, such as the Wells Center in the 2nd Judicial Circuit.

Based on preliminary numbers, three sites will not meet their SFY16 25% reduction goal: Kankakee, McLean, and 4th Judicial Circuit (Christian and Effingham counties). Full verification will happen after August board meeting. McLean County had a severely restricted program this year and has decided to exit the network. ARI staff will be speaking with the sites that are not meeting their goals. Additionally, some sites lost data staff and were unable to keep up with the ARI data requirements in recent months.

Committee members asked questions about specific target populations and reduction goals, including some sites who appear to have high target populations and lower goals. ARI staff offered that, due to program lifecycle, some programs are just now seeing turnover due to graduation within a grant period. Additionally, several sites should be recalculating their target populations that have not changed since the program's inception. Several sites have asked for assistance on this matter, but there was not the capacity to provide this assistance by ARI or Authority staff. This assistance is most needed during the narrow window of time when grant documents are being compiled.

In response to committee member questions on site capacity due to budget impasse, ARI staff provided information. It was noted that the 4th Judicial Circuit does not have a dedicated mental health provider that is part of the mental health court team; however, services are still available. Peoria County (intensive supervision with services) has consistently communicated over the past few years that they do not have enough officers to keep low caseloads. There are 135 people in the program with two probation officers. Peoria is a site visit priority for ARI staff.

Cook County is maintaining two separate programs under one grant umbrella, however they are sharing some resources. The program management from the Chicago Appleseed Fund for Justice is now over both programs which has created a steering committee structure for Cook HOPE.

Brief review of quarterly data

Mary Ann went over the documents of quarterly data, including a more in depth "feedback loop" type of document for Sangamon County, noting that the number of people staying out of IDOC after program exit exceeds the number of people going back to IDOC by 2 to 1. ARI staff would like to replicate these documents for each site, as an initial feedback loop to reveal participation trends, enrollment, etc.

Discussion of ARI process evaluations

Mary Ann opened this discussion noting that the Research and Analysis department is turning out some process evaluations related to ARI and asked the committee to think about what ARI could do with these reports. This committee should review these reports with a little more rigor than other committees. However the Outreach, Technical Assistance and Communications Committee may weigh in on use of the reports.

Jordan Boulger offered that it is valuable for this committee to review these reports, ideally before they are published or finalized, so concerns and questions can be addressed when appropriate. It was noted that this committee has expertise and can be a tool in this process. The "client feedback" process evaluation report is currently with the sites for final review and ARI staff will attempt to insert this committee into the review process.

A committee member asked about how ARI ensures programs utilize evidence-based practices (EBP) in a more timely way (vs. process evaluations). This occurs through regular reporting and sites visits. Self-correction has occurred; however, ARI staff noted it would be useful to have pre and post-impasse EBP implementation information. Mini-process evaluations going consistently would provide continuous feedback but is a huge undertaking. Elements should be incorporated into site feedback loops to help sites understand what to improve upon (actionable elements for the sites). Lindsey noted that since losing a dedicated researcher, ARI staff had sites prioritize data collection on numbers served; exits; commitments to IDOC; and access to substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment and cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT). These would be the elements to focus on for a near-term feedback loop, perhaps a few sites per quarter. Nate noted that it would be easy to overwhelm sites with charts and trends so we have to think about what is the purpose of the program and what is the outcome we are trying to get. Lindsey

reminded the committee that site visits and site visit reports are another performance measurement touchpoint staff will get back to.

Plans for performance measurement in SFY17

Mary Ann opened this discussion noting the awareness of capacity issues. Mary Ann has received feedback on the Public Service Administrator Research Director position, and there were minor tweaks and the recommendation for a minimal master's degree education requirement. Approval at Central Management Services (CMS) could take a couple of weeks, and staff will bring this issue to the August board meeting in a larger discussion on administrative costs that will go over the 10% cap. A committee member noted that important research questions can be answered with good research design; and, if the research aspect is not there, ARI is missing a critical point.

Starting an outcome evaluation is critical in SFY17 and ideally a research director could help to guide that process which will involve an RFP for an outside evaluator. This committee will assist in this process. There was discussion about whether an outcome evaluation had to wait for the new research director, and it was noted that ARI should not wait. There is much data sitting in files that has yet to be sifted through but quality assurance resources are lacking. Feasibility and mechanics of an outcome evaluation will be discussed at the next meeting.

Update on Cook HOPE ARI Corrective Action Plan

Lindsey opened this discussion, noting the corrective action plan (CAP) was updated in January-February 2016. This could be the last CAP progress report submitted if the committee votes to release Cook HOPE from the CAP. Lindsey went over the details of the report.

The committee was asked what they would like verified, e.g., cumulative LSIR scores vs. the benchmarks identified. The committee expressed comfort in voting on the CAP before the additional information was obtained. It was noted that ARI cannot lose sight that prison-bound target populations are mandatory parts of the program. ARI staff will institutionalize the process on this (verification of prison-bound target populations). The annual report will have a reference to this process.

Old Business/New Business

The alignment of ARI data collection with the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts problem-solving court standards was mentioned. Mary Ann suggested a "data summit" to discuss this with the AOIC.

Adjournment

Nate Steinfeld made a motion for adjournment. Christine Devitt seconded. All in favor. None opposed. Meeting adjourned 11:41a.m.

(Approved 10/14/16)