

**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, 12:00pm, October 10, 2012

- FINAL MINUTES -

Members Present:

Lee Waring, Chair
Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission
Carey Haughwout, Public Defender
Jennifer Loyless, Public Defender
Chuck Shaw, Palm Beach School District Board

Guests:

Cristy Altaro, Court Administration
Ronald Alvarez, Judge, 15th Judicial Circuit
Patrick Doyle, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court
Krista Marx, Judge, 15th Judicial Circuit
Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court
Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Craig Spatara, RESTORE Program Manager
Becky Walker, Criminal Justice Manager

1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Lee Waring, Chair

Mr. Waring welcomed and thanked everyone for coming.

2. Roll Call & Introduction of Guests

3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda

The agenda was approved with no additions or deletions.

4. Approval of September 19, 2012 Minutes

The minutes from the September 19, 2012 meeting were approved without amendments.

5. Chairman's Comments

Mr. Waring stated that the findings of the two reports discussed in the committee's September 19th meeting was presented at the Criminal Justice Commission meeting. As a result, the Commission recommended that the committee consult with local program providers before asking the Commission to act on the recommendation. As such, the purpose of this meeting was to review and discuss performance measures and levels from programs of the CJC such as Adult Drug Court, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court, Delinquency Drug Court, and the County's Reentry program. Mr. Waring then asked Damir Kukec to take over the discussion.

6. Old Business

Mr. Kukec first thanked and acknowledged Mr. Waring and Mr. Rodriguez for their vision and leadership on this issue. He noted how historically, they have evolved from reporting on the results from service providers to comparing them with other similar programs by looking at peer-reviewed literature. He referred to Attachment A where they looked at the local programs' recidivism rates and compared them to peer-reviewed literature which showed that local programs faring better than the results shown in the peer-reviewed literature. The results from local programs will then become the standard for which outcomes or the effectiveness of programs will be measured. Mr. Kukec then referred to Attachment B, which outlines the expected level of service and performance from the service providers. He also mentioned about the Children's Services Council news article saying that CSC was only concern as to whether or not their programs are meeting the expectations of the CSC board, which he said the committee can use in delineating whether or not they are going to consider a program for funding. They are now at a point when they are asking the service providers to give a level of service based on the funding they are given.

Mr. Kukec said that most of the local providers are already aware in the sense that they have given their data, although they have not yet seen the proposed short term outcomes they would have to report. He discussed the importance of having a clear definition of recidivism, suggesting that it should refer to re-arrest rates. Mr. Waring added that historically, they looked at activity levels of local programs, and now they would like to make comparisons with other programs around the country. Mr. Waring referred to a grid they have prepared for drug court and reentry for which he requested feedback from the committee.

However, there was first a discussion of what the appropriate definition of recidivism should be and Mr. Kukec stated that they will adopt whatever definition the committee agrees on. Ms. Haughwout suggested that the definition of recidivism does not have to be the same for all programs, but it has to be clear in terms of the goals of the program. Mr. Waring said the committee will continue working on refining the definition of recidivism. There was also a discussion on how the outcomes presented in the reports were decided and a shared concern that these outcomes did not necessarily reflect the actual experience of the local programs and their future funding implications. Mr. Waring said that was exactly the reason everybody was invited to the meeting – i.e., to validate this information. Mr. Rodriguez then suggested they go through each report and verify the numbers.

A. Defining Expected Performance Measures and Levels to Priorities (Attachment B):

- i. Adult Drug Court: minimum of 120 participants; 60% graduation rate; and 10% recidivism rate within the first 90 days. Judge Marx suggested a minimum of 180 participants; 15% recidivism rate, with recidivism defined as arrest and convicted, reported every six months; and graduation rate of 50% based on a 12-month average; tracked for three years.

- ii. Civil Drug Court: minimum of 150 court participants; 60% graduation rate; and 10% arrest rate within the first 90 days. Felicia Scott suggested a minimum of 100 participants; under Target Population, adults and adolescents; 50% graduation rate; and 10% arrest rate; reported every six months. Ms. Scott noted that their definition of recidivism will be different from the other programs being that their clients have yet to commit a crime, and therefore, would not have an arrest history, so it was agreed that an arrest and conviction would be more appropriate.
- iii. Delinquency Drug Court: 14 court participants; target population as youth on probation with Department of Juvenile Justice; 50% graduation rate; 10% recidivism after first 90 days. Ms. Altaro offered a narrower definition of their target population as youth on probation with a pending violation of probation, with no first degree felonies; filing of delinquency instead of arrest was suggested; 50% graduation rate; 25% recidivism, meaning any misdemeanor or felony arrest regardless of conviction; with six-month reporting period.

Ms. Haughwout wanted to clarify whether these are the acceptable standards being set by the committee; Mr. Waring reiterated that these are just baselines they would like to start working with the caveat that they may need to be modified after six months when they have the ability to review data received from the programs.

Mr. Rodriguez reminded the members that this exercise is a proactive way of addressing an issue that the CJC may bring up in the future in terms of measuring effectiveness of programs it funds. Mr. Waring concurred by saying that this is an opportunity to improve our programs in terms of preventing crime.

B. Interim Report: Outcome Evaluations of Select Programs (Attachment A):

- i. RESTORE: 200 adult felons returning to Palm Beach County from Florida Department of Corrections); recidivism defined as re-commitment at the Florida DOC; 15% convicted of a new crime and re-sentenced to DOC within three years after release.
- ii. Non-RESTORE: 250 adult ex-offenders (adult misdemeanants and felons) returning to Palm Beach County from Florida Department of Corrections or the county jail; recidivism defined as re-commitment at the Florida DOC; 25% recidivism rate in first three years following release.

C. Update on Evaluations

No updates.

7. New Business

No new business.

8. Member and Guest Comments

No member and guest comments.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Waring thanked everyone for their time and participation and appreciated everyone's input acknowledging it as critical. He said they will be in touch with everyone as they continue to make changes.

Next Meeting: To be determined.