

**PROGRAM MONITORING AND  
EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE**



Palm Beach County Governmental Center  
12th Floor, McEaddy Conference Room

301 N. Olive Avenue

West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

<http://www.pbcgov.com/criminaljustice>

**Wednesday, July 24, 2013**

**2:30 PM to 4:30 PM**

**- FINAL MINUTES -**

**Members:**

Lee Waring, Chair

Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission

Carey Haughwout, Public Defender

Alan Johnson, State Attorney's Office

Chuck Shaw, School District (absent)

**Guests:**

Dan Alexander, Chief, Boca Raton Police Department

Penny Anderson, Palm Beach County ISS/LEX

Jeffrey Colbath, Chief Judge, 15<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit

Barbara Dawicke, Court Administration

Frank Kitzerow, Chief, Jupiter Police Department

Mary Quinlan, Court Administration

Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court

Caroline Shepherd, Judge, Adult Drug Court

Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court

Denise Vidal-Bennette, Palm Beach County ISS/LEX

**Staff:**

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director

Arlene Griffiths, Administrative Assistant

Katherine Hatos, Law Enforcement Planning Council

Danielle Kennedy, Intern

Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager

Rosalind Murray, Criminal Justice Program Development Specialist

Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Planning Coordinator

Danielle Oulette, Intern

Candee Villapando, Criminal Justice Analyst

**1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Lee Waring, Chair**

**2. Roll Call**

**3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

**4. Approval of March 19, 2013 Minutes**

The minutes from the March 19, 2013 meeting were approved without amendments.

**5. Chairman's Comments**

Chair Lee Waring welcomed and thanked everyone for attending and asked staff to conduct roll call. It was noted that Mr. Chuck Shaw was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict - standing meeting of the School Board. Mr. Waring welcomed the guests and asked them to introduce themselves. He emphasized that the purpose of the proposed measures was to enhance programming and not to "cut funding" to any one program. He thanked staff for their work in operationalizing the previously approved measures and noted that this work was done under the direction of the Program Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Sub-Committee and the Criminal Justice Commission.

**6. Executive Directors Comments**

Michael Rodriguez explained the distinction between the performance measures and the program evaluations currently underway and gave a brief status report on where the programs are right now. He emphasized the CJC's responsibility to the Board of County Commissioners in terms of what they report and said that he is pleased that staff was provided direction by the PME and the CJC. This meeting provided yet another opportunity to clarify the measures and receive feedback from the PME. Chair Waring concurred and noted that in the past evaluations relied heavily on work done mostly by CJC and program staff, while now the PME and CJC provide direction and are more involved.

**7. New Business**

No new business.

**8. Old Business**

**A. Program Performance Indicators – Proposed Revisions to Indicators**

Damir Kukec gave a presentation on the Final Draft Report which updated the Proposed Definition for Key Performance Indicators previously provided to the members and program coordinators for their review. The presentation summarized what had been discussed in the past several months. Mr. Kukec highlighted the following items contained in the report:

- 1) the background/history of performance indicators and evaluations concerning CJC programs;
- 2) the basic areas of minimal performance indicators, i.e., caseload, dispositions, and recidivism;
- 3) adoption of "intent to treat" concept;
- 4) program data and processing; and,
- 5) specific recommendations concerning the implementation of the PME minimal performance indicators.

Mr. Kukec stated that the report is not intended to evaluate the current performance standards of programs, nor change the programs' existing reporting methods. Rather, the report and today's discussion will center on the recommendations that operationalize the performance indicators adopted by the PME and CJC. Mr. Kukec also provided relevant tables and charts and examples to aid in the discussion, and specified the information and data required from the programs.

Mr. Kukec described the three minimal performance indicators found the report. He noted that "caseload" measures how many participants were served by the program during a specific timeframe. It includes data on admissions and exits, and calculations of average daily population and percent capacity. He noted that "dispositions", also called terminations or exits, refer to how participants leave programming, e.g., by successful completion, voluntary exit, removed from program due to lack of compliance, arrested, deceased, etc. He also highlighted that "recidivism" has six components including:

- 1) First Event (date of exit);
- 2) Second Event (first arrest after exit);
- 3) Program Participants or Specific Groups (individuals being followed for a specific timeframe);
- 4) Follow up Period (how long program participants are going to be followed or tracked);
- 5) Levels of Recidivism (arrest, and arrest and conviction); and
- 6) Offense Types (including degree and level, e.g., misdemeanor or felony, etc.).

Mr. Kukec concluded his presentation by describing the staff recommendations contained in the report:

- 1) Programs will include all active program participants during a fiscal year when measuring caseload;
- 2) Programs will provide data tables on specific variables representing each program participant;
- 3) Staff will compute monthly statistics on data provided;

- 4) Computations on recidivism will include all program participants applying the “intent to treat” method – it was noted that the “intent to treat” approach includes all program participants – not just those that completed all aspects of programmatic supervision and treatment (when applicable); furthermore, it was noted that this approach was vital to measuring the full impact of the program when it comes to outcomes;
- 5) Computations on recidivism will include all program participants after exiting in specific six-month periods;
- 6) Computations on recidivism will include arrests and arrest dates that result in conviction (or adjudicated delinquents);
- 7) Computations on recidivism will include three follow up periods (90 days/ three months, 1 year, and three years);
- 8) Staff will compute recidivism by matching program caseload data with Computerized Criminal History (CCH) database from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE);
- 9) Timeframe for computing the first set of performance indicators will be the county fiscal year for all available data currently maintained by Commission staff;
- 10) Programs will also provide copy of reports submitted to other funders or coordinating agencies to the PME; and,
- 11) Recommendations adopted by the PME will be include as an Appendix to Professional Services Contracts and other agreements involving CJC funding.

Mr. Kucek stated that staff will complete a report using existing data already compiled from the outcome evaluations which will be provided to program coordinators for review and their feedback by the end of August. This report will provide the baseline data to be presented to the full CJC in late September.

#### **Discussion/Questions by Committee Members and Guests:**

Following the presentation, members of the sub-committee discussed the proposed recommendations and its implications at length. There was a discussion concerning the “intent to treat” analysis; and how it might impact program funding. Some members were concerned with computing recidivism with all “participants”; especially since the calculation will include those that did not successfully complete all aspects of program supervision and treatment. Others noted that this approach would help us better understand the full impact of the program since it includes all participants, not just those who successfully completed programming.

Mr. Johnson suggested that by including all program participants in the recidivism computation, the sub-committee would affect how the adult drug court is perceived and possibly put its funding at risk. He noted that other drug courts in Florida measure recidivism based on their graduates only, not from all participants; and that the “true recidivist rate comes from graduates”. He questioned the matrix presented in the report in determining recidivism rates, and why a non-graduate would be included in the recidivist computation. He stated that this will “gut the program” if recidivism is as high as the jail population for example.

Chair Waring commented on a point made earlier about the importance of accounting for all resources used by programs; therefore, all participants and the length of time they spend in programming should be examined. He also clarified that the recommendations are proposals; and the purpose of today’s meeting was to discuss and or modify the proposed staff recommendations and to have the PME committee vote on these recommendations.

Ms. Haughwout stated that the sub-committee should not ask CJC staff to construct data to hurt or help programs. She emphasized that at this point we are “still” collecting data and the evaluation by this committee will come later. She noted that the report includes data tables that do separate recidivist rates between graduates (successful) and non-graduates (failures). Furthermore, she noted that she does not believe that including failures in the computation of recidivism will necessary gut programs; but that it may actually be beneficial in identifying areas where the programs can improve. Mr. Kucec clarified that individual rates were calculated for the different levels of dispositions identified by programs; and that there is total rate for all program participants that exited programming – for the reason described earlier (e.g., intent to treat analysis).

There was also a discussion on how to define program participants and a valid start date – when the individual signs the contract, at first appearance, during assessment, or when they actually starts to receive treatment? Judge Caroline Shepherd raised the concern of counting all drug court participants when computing recidivism as well: is someone who signs a contract and then does not show at all a participant? How can someone who does not finish programming be considered, given that they did not complete programming? There was also a question of whether the PME’s focus should be only on aspects of programming that is funded by the CJC? Therefore, only those that received treatment (accounting for treatment funds) should be tracked for outcome purposes. Some members of the sub-committee expressed a view that they would prefer to examine the full program rather than specific portions. It was noted that this would be too complicated and time consuming for staff. With respect to defining program participants, it was also noted that defining program participants should be the sole responsibility of program managers and coordinators; *which should be rooted in specific programmatic models outlined in policies and procedures and not only include program participants that successfully exit programming.*

Members voted unanimously to adopt the recommendations; with the two exceptions. Staff was directed to:

- 1) add a secondary recidivism computation that includes arrest (with conviction) and state whether the arrest that led to the conviction was for a felony or misdemeanor offense (most serious offense rule would apply in arrests that include more than one offense); and,
- 2) delete the “total row” for the recidivism computation.

Staff was directed to revise the draft report and incorporate the recommendations adopted by the sub-committee. The revised report and its recommendations will be presented to the full CJC on September 23, 2013.

#### **9. Member and Guest Comments**

No additional member and guest comments.

#### **10. Adjournment**