

**PROGRAM MONITORING AND
EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE**



Palm Beach County Governmental Center
10th Floor, CJC Conference Room
301 N. Olive Avenue
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
<http://www.pbcgov.com/criminaljustice>
Wednesday, September 19, 2012

- FINAL MINUTES -

Members Present:

Lee Waring, Chair
Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission
Carey Haughwout, Public Defender (Absent)
Chuck Shaw, Palm Beach School District Board (Absent)
Kirk Volker, for Paul Zacks, State Attorney's Office

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Becky Walker, Criminal Justice Manager
Teshika Lee, Temporary Professional

1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Lee Waring, Chair

Mr. Waring welcomed everyone and asked if everyone was signed in that will be attending today.

2. Roll Call & Introduction of Guests

Mr. Kukec confirmed that Ms. Haughwout and Mr. Shaw sent their regrets and will not be able to attend.

3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda

The agenda was approved as is, with no additions or deletions.

4. Approval of February 15, 2012 Minutes

The minutes from the February 15, 2012 meeting was approved with the exception that Chairman Waring asked for clarifications on two items:

Page 3 of 5; paragraph 3,

5. Chairman's Comments

Recording did not begin at the beginning of the meeting.

6. Old Business (Recording did not begin at the beginning of the meeting.)

The meeting started with the review of Attachment A, the interim report on fiscal year 2012 program outcomes and comparison groups identified in the peer review literature. There was a brief presentation by the Chairman followed by discussion and questions. Most of the discussion concerned the use of recidivism as an outcome measure. Mr. Rodriguez noted that, as an example, in Adult Drug Court, he would really like to know if they (the participants) ever start using drugs again. However, once they are no longer clients of the drug courts, they are not required to submit to testing or self reporting. As a result, we are forced to examine recidivism and the type of arrest (e.g., drug offenses or other offenses). He noted that recidivism is by far one of the most important thing that we're looking at, because the whole point of the re-entry program is save costs related to incarceration for jail or prison.

It was noted that while other outcomes are important, recidivism is by far the most important and effective way of examining how the program is working. If we start to look at other variables such as relapse, like other studies have done, these types of variables are associated with long term studies and tracking individuals outside of the court ordered timeframe. Such an approach has its challenges that include "attrition"; where drug court clients move away or cannot be located for study follow-up.

Chairman Waring stated that he would like the report to clarify that although there are no comparative studies in the peer review literature for Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court, we should clarify that we are doing an outcome study that we will include a control group for comparison – this will also include a review of arrest history with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE). Mr. Kucec noted that the director of Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court was also unable to locate a similar program across the Country.

There was a request that the report include a definition of "meta data" analyses/studies. Mr. Rodriguez noted that there was also a need to clarify that the definition of recidivism is not uniform across studies. For example, the recidivism rate for the county's "RESTORE" reentry program is reported as .8%, which represents a return to a state Florida Department of Corrections (DOC) facility. On the other hand, if we include "re-arrest" as recidivism, the percentage would be 7%. The DOC statewide recidivism rate is approximately 33% - returning to a DOC facility within three years after release. It was recommended that the report include specific numbers used to calculate the percent of those that recidivate.

Chairman Waring asked Mr. Kukec to go over the tables on pages 8, 12, & 13. This shows various programs and their outcomes. Mr. Kukec explained what Civil Drug Court is, that it is a *Marchman Act* proceeding and explains its process. Chairman Waring stated to Mr. Kukec that for the purpose of our discussion to present to the Commission, to include how many drug courts that are listed in the “meta analysis”. Mr. Kukec explained the report on Delinquency Drug Court. Mr. Kukec explained the data collection that was performed at Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court and the case management system that was developed for the court. He also explained how the detailed study will determine the recidivism rate for the Riviera Beach population and the non Riviera Beach population. Chairman Waring confirmed with Mr. Kukec that this study is in process in conjunction with FDLE. Mr. Kukec stated that the University of South Florida is looking at the county’s re-entry program and will have a report ready for publication in March 2013.

Chairman Waring asked that the report be updated to clarify that the “local programs” included in the report reflect the priority areas identified during the March 2012 annual planning meeting. Furthermore, the Mr. Waring asked that for the our presentation on Monday, September 24, 2012 before the Criminal Justice Commission emphasize this point and that this report then leads to the second report: Attachment B. Following a brief presentation concerning Attachment B, Chairman Waring stated that Attachment B represents a natural progression; where the comparative outcome results and the historical outcome data of local programs help us establish acceptable “performance levels”. He noted that we can then recommend to the Criminal Justice Commission desired performance outcome levels that service providers are expected to achieve.

The meeting was adjourned following this discussion as there was no other business to discuss.