

**PROGRAM MONITORING AND
EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE**



Palm Beach County Governmental Center
10th Floor, Criminal Justice Commission Conference Room

301 N. Olive Avenue
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

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

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM

- FINAL MINUTES -

Members:

Lee Waring, Chair
Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission
Carey Haughwout, Public Defender
Alan Johnson, State Attorney's Office (absent)
Chuck Shaw, School District

Guests:

Cristy Altaro, Delinquency Drug Court Coordinator
Ronald Alvarez, Delinquency Drug Court Judge
Barbara Dawicke, Court Administrator
Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court Coordinator
Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court Coordinator

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director
Katherine Hatos, Law Enforcement Planning Council
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Rosalind Murray, Criminal Justice Program Development Specialist
Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Planning Coordinator
Danielle Ouellette, Intern
Samantha Santiago, Intern
Craig Spatara, Reentry Coordinator
Becky Walker, Criminal Justice Manager

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 July 24, 2013 Minutes

The minutes from the July 24, 2013 meeting were approved without amendments.

5. Chairman's Comments

Chair Lee Waring welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked members of the sub-committee for taking time out of their day to be at the meeting and the program coordinators who worked with staff to develop and compose the minimal performance indicator reports. Mr. Waring stated that the purpose of today's meeting was to review the draft summary and detailed reports, focusing more on content rather than the specific findings. In addition, he noted that the PME would review and consider the proposed minimal performance indicators drafted for the Law Enforcement eXchange (LEX) and the Youth Empowerment Centers (YEC). Mr. Waring stated that today's review would be a starting point and we can work toward completing them before the November 2013 meeting of the Criminal Justice Commission.

6. Executive Directors Comments

No Comments.

7. Old Business:

- A. Review of Summary and Detailed Performance Indicators Reports and Proposed Minimal Performance Indicators by LEX and YEC.

Summary and Detailed Performance Indicators:

Mr. Waring asked Damir Kukec to provide an overview of the summary and detailed reports and to answer any questions that members and guests may have concerning the reports. Mr. Kukec presented an overview of the progress made by the sub-committee and the work that had been accomplished with program coordinators and Commission staff. He noted since the sub-committee is planning to take the summary reports to the Criminal Justice Commission in November 2013, staff is open to re-examining and further explaining the computations to program coordinators – for example, he informed the sub-committee that delinquency drug court submitted new data recently and this was updated and included in today's report. He also asked members of the sub-committee to focus more on the content and structure of the reports today rather than the specific results. Mr. Waring also emphasized that he would also like to begin the review of the proposed indicators

for LEX and YEC; however, he recognized that this will require more time; especially since the LEX representatives were not able to attend today's meeting. Mr. Barr asked if he would like to finalize these indicators in time for the November 2013 Criminal Justice Commission meeting and Mr. Waring responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Kukec indicated that he would like to use the City of Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court summary and detailed reports to provide members an overview of the structure and content of the reports given that we had limited time and if no one objected. He provided an overview noting that the summary report contains the following sections:

- 1) Program name, responsible agency, and partners
- 2) Annual Budget Allocation and Applicable Fees (Revenues)
- 3) Brief description of the Commission's historical involvement in the program.
- 4) Fiscal Year Budget Allocation (with breakdown)
- 5) Program Description
- 6) Minimal Performance Indicators:
 - a. **Caseload:** Average Daily Population reported as the MEAN over the last three years (or with available data for programs that have been in operation for less than three years – October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012);
 - b. **Disposition:** how program participants exit programming over the last three years – October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012 (focusing on participants that successfully complete programming); and,
 - c. **Recidivism:** program participant's recidivism (arrest and conviction) rate within three years after program exit – examining "successful exits" with those that did not complete programming. The three year period includes a "lag" time so that the majority of program participant's have been out of programming for at least three years – October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2010.

He also described the contents of the detailed reports which describe the caseload and disposition performance indicators on a monthly basis. Mr. Kukec noted that caseload tables provide the number of admissions, dispositions (program exits), "Graduation Rate", Average Daily Population (ADP), Peak Participants, Capacity Percentage (using ADP), and noted Capacity Levels. The detailed recidivism tables are based on groups that exit programming every six months, where program participants are tracked for 90 days, 1 year, and 3 years after program exit. The detailed tables also include information on recidivism that examines arrests, arrests with convictions, as well as a breakdown for arrests with convictions for felony and misdemeanor arrests (following the most serious offense rule in cases where arrests have multiples levels of offenses).

Public Defender Carey Haughwout recommended that in addition to the Average Daily Population and active caseload, that staff add the total number of program participants served (active participants). It was decided that staff would include the active number of participants served (as an average over three years) in the summary report – this is in addition to the Average Daily Population.

Mr. Barr noted that the recidivism rate presented in the summary reports provided a good comparison between those that completed programming and those that did not. Mr. Waring also inquired about the inclusion of a control or comparison group. Mr. Kucec noted that it was his understanding that the minimal performance indicators established by the PME represent a benchmark from which programs will be assessed and monitored – so, the comparison group is represented by the established levels. Mr. Kucec, also noted that programs will be compared to a control group within the context of an outcome evaluation, which will compare the recidivism levels between program participants and an actual control group (*control group denotes a group that is similar to program participants on observed characteristics (e.g., criminal history, sex, race, age, and other observed values); and that the only difference between the two groups is that one received treatment and the other did not*). Mr. Kucec further noted that the current levels were established after the PME reviewed the evaluation literature (examining *meta data analyses*) for similar programs and consulted with program coordinators.

There was further discussion that the goal or minimal performance indicators in the case of recidivism focused on graduates; and that the actual performance included all program participants by comparing graduates to non-graduates without reporting a total recidivism rate. Mr. Kucec added that this was done at the request of the PME following the July 24, 2013 meeting. Mr. Waring and Public Defender Haughwout further emphasized that these reports are for performance monitoring and not formal evaluations that incorporate a comparison between the treatment and control group – she emphasized that we need to make this clear that it’s a monitoring report not an evaluation.

Mr. Waring asked Mr. Kucec to quickly review the detail reports just in case members wanted to include some of the charts in the summary reports. As a result, the sub-committee requested that staff include the graphs (caseload, graduation, and the three year recidivism). Ms. Cristy Altaro noted that the desired levels for delinquency drug court recidivism should be defined as arrested and “adjudicated delinquent” (convictions) and not arrested and filed – Mr. Kucec noted that this will be changed.

Mr. Kucec provided an overview of the timeframes and that as a next step he would contact individual programs to obtain more recent data, so that all programs would be on the same timeframe. He also noted that the pre-release reentry program was changed to reflect arrested and convicted – while before it was arrested and returned to Florida Department of Corrections. There was also a question concerning updates and Mr. Kucec noted that this would be appended to the information already provided.

Mr. Chuck Shaw asked what if 27% of the graduates' recidivate with a three year period compared to 12% of the failures, what are we going to do as a group? What are we going to do as a sub-committee if the "actual results" do not line up with our desired minimal performance indicators, what are we going to do when we see a program is "totally non-effective" where does that leave us? Mr. Waring noted that this is the first step – getting consistent uniform data – and if we do see a trend that concerns us (confirming it's not a data or computation error), we can further investigate and take action to assist programming. The PME and the Criminal Justice Commission would vet the results and provide assistance.

Mr. Kukec also noted that he believes it is staff's responsibility to work with the coordinators to try to explain the trends, especially wide swings, and to ensure that it is not a data or computation error – and to offer solutions as well when reporting. Public Defender Haughwout noted that the funding committee will have an interest in these results when considering funding and perhaps in the worst case scenario would choose not to fund a program based on results given limited funding. Mr. Waring offered another possibility, the funding committee may also choose to direct staff to find additional resources, through grants and foundations, or provide technical assistance. Mr. Shaw also noted that the sooner we see a significant change in the trend the better - so that we can do something about it. As a result, the committee directed staff to complete data collection, computations, and reports every quarter – not once per year. Others agreed with reporting quarterly. Staff indicated that they would change the schedule and ensure that agreements with FDLE include this requirement to compute recidivism every quarter – Ms. Becky Walker indicated that it would be possible given that reentry currently submits data each quarter for matching.

Modifications to the summary reports:

- 1) Summary report should include active number of participants served (three year average).
- 2) Summary report should include graphs (only) that shows the historical trends (caseload, disposition, and three year recidivism – arrest and conviction). Three graphs per program.
- 3) Collection, computation and reporting should be calculated on a quarterly basis.

LEX Performance Indicators:

Mr. Rodriguez provided an overview of the LEX network and its desire to better share information in “real time”. He also noted that the Commission funded this project in the past, when it was first conceived by the Commission in the early 2000s, under the name “Visual Planning Technology (VPT)” to conduct crime mapping. Soon after, it was renamed to the LEX network and directed by local law enforcement. Regrettably, LEX representatives are unable to attend the meeting today. However, staff will be meeting with representatives shortly to discuss the proposed indicators; which are:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Develop and distribute a comprehensive LEX Training manual within 90 days of the effective date of the contract to all LEX usersB. Train 200 individual users on LEX systemsC. Evaluation of training by implementing pre and post surveysD. Establish baseline number and increase number of participants at regional and countywide LEX meetings by 20%E. Ensure 100% of all necessary LEX MOUs are executedF. Increase the number of LEX users by 50% based on baseline from October 1, 2013G. Increase number of hits from the LEX system by 20% based on baseline number established on October 1, 2013.H. Provide the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. LEX Training Manualb. Analysis of number of users and hitsc. Analysis of survey resultsd. Develop and provide a LEX regional and countywide crime report for cross-jurisdictional trend analysis by the end date of the contract |
|--|

Mr. Rodriguez noted that the 100k is for a person that will help develop the profile of LEX and to do training for LEX, and evaluate the implementation of the LEX program, and get more users online. Mr. Rodriguez asked that members review the measures and provide staff with their input as we will be meeting with LEX representatives to further develop and refine the measures. Mr. Rodriguez noted that while the measures highlight what the position will be doing, he noted that we wanted to include more information on what LEX was designed to accomplish – this would include one or two measures to see how the LEX program was working. Public Defender Haughwout commented that since the performance indicators were task oriented that could be completed in one year – it seems that they would be asking for only one year of funding. Mr. Rodriguez clarified that this funding would be for fiscal year 2014 which started October 1, 2013. Mr. Waring noted that we should let them know what we are looking for, and that telling us that they are going to prepare a manual is not a performance indicator – it’s a deliverable – “tell us what the result of it will be.” Mr. Waring and Public Defender Haughwout asked the question of what will this network accomplish; will it help us locate and apprehend offenders? What is the benefit to the community by funding this program? Mr. Barr requested that staff make recommendations concerning the LEX program. Mr. Kucec noted that it was a principled position that we should request from LEX the same standard of measures we are asking the other programs funded by the Commission.

Youth Empowerment Centers:

Mr. Rodriguez noted that although there are no representatives here today from the cities, Ms. Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Project Coordinator, is here and she is able to speak to the performance indicators (see below):

These minimal standards apply to 3 of the 5 Youth Empowerment Centers.

GOAL: 100% of youth served in the program will have at least one risk factor present in two out of the four major domains.

MEASURE: This will be measured by reviewing the youth admission information.

MINIMUM STANDARD: 70% of youth served in the program will have at least one risk factor present in two out of the four major domains.

(Temporary goal until we start using the Prevention Assessment Tool (PAT), as presented by DJJ on Sept 17. We will still be assessing risk but the scoring will be different)

GOAL: 100% of program participants shall not be arrested or rearrested for a 3 year window post-enrollment.

MEASURE: This will be measured by the annual FDLE records check.

MINIMUM STANDARD: 85% of program participants shall not be arrested or rearrested while enrolled in the program.

GOAL: 100% of youth serving on the Youth Councils (6 months or more) will demonstrate an increase in leadership development or positive youth development skills.

MEASURE: This will be measured by a pre and post test on Youth Leadership.

MINIMUM STANDARD: 90% of youth pre and post tested will show an increase.

Ms. Oakes noted that since the County is funding 3 out of the 5 existing YEC locations across the county, we will expect that only the funded YEC locations will adhere to the program model and maintain and collect demographic and programmatic data. Mr. Waring asked that we only describe the performance indicators for the three funded programs going forward – Ms Oakes agreed to change the measures to include only the three funded Youth Empowerment Centers (YEC) and not make reference to those that were not funded in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Waring asked Ms. Oakes to review the three indicators provided to the sub-committee. Ms. Oakes presented the indicators and their rationale (see above). Ms. Oakes noted that the first goal is to reach “at risk” youth by employing a risk assessment tool that the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) currently uses. The DJJ Prevention Assessment Tool (PAT) is an online instrument that staff would receive training for and implement in the field. The DJJ instrument would both capture and calculate risk scores. We hope to show that at least 70% of our participants show at least one risk factor in the four major domains. Ms. Oakes stated that implementing the tool will help the YEC to identify participants’ needs and individual issues that we need to address at the centers. However, the DJJ instrument is not yet operational so she noted that they are going to employ the first risk assessment tool – Brenda can you please clarify, what is the name of the first risk assessment tool?

Ms. Oakes noted that the second indicator is a long standing indicator used by the program – recidivism after enrolling in the program (recidivism is defined as an arrest). We do this at the end of the program year. Ms. Walker noted that FDLE will no longer provide arrest information for misdemeanor arrests, only for felony arrests. Ms. Oakes also noted that we have the option of matching names with the Department of Juvenile Justice.

Ms. Oakes described the third performance indicator: conforming to the model, each center is to have a youth council that helps identify and develop programming that the youths at the centers want to see. Youth councils also perform a leadership role, they review proposals, present before city council meetings, and while city and commission staff help prepare and write program proposals, the youth councils “drive the process.” She noted that traditionally, they hire Florida State University (FSU) or the University of Miami to measure improvement in youth leadership skills by implementing a pre and post instrument – this is something that YEC and staff will do since there is no funding to contract with the universities.

Mr. Barr suggested that the goals be changed so that they describe desired programmatic levels – referring to the desired levels of 75% or 85%, rather than the 100% goal. Public Defender Haughwout recommended that the measures identify how many unique program participants they anticipate providing services to during the course of the year – this will then be in line with the other programs which identify service levels. Ms Oakes noted that she normally does not view the number of participants as a vital factor that correlates with reducing violence or involvement with the criminal justice system. She noted that the length of time a youth participates in programming to be more important (e.g., greater involvement in programming the less likely to show involvement with violence and the criminal justice system). She also noted that she would rather say that YECs have to do outreach with the Department of Juvenile Justice, diversion programs, schools, law enforcement, so that we can target “at risk youth” at our centers.

Public Defender Haughwout noted that it is vital to identify how many people are in the program, because if you say 85% of participants will not be arrested after starting programming, and you only have 15 people in the program, this is an issue. She noted that all of the other programs have to identify how many people they will serve and this is an important standard. Public Defender Haughwout also acknowledged that this is not the only factor, but it is an important measure – as we should be able to point out that we are spending X number of dollars for N number of Youth. Mr. Rodriguez noted that they do have the number of unique participants per YEC and this is easy to compile and report. Ms. Oakes noted that historically they serve around 850 per year across the four YECs. Public Defender Haughwout noted that these figures should be reported for each YEC. Mr. Waring asked that staff work on these measures to address some of the concerns expressed by the PME. Mr. Rodriguez requested that measures also be developed for the 20k countywide community component for the law enforcement work group. Ms. Oakes noted that they provide annual data on the number of youth served, length of stay in the program, race, gender, age, by YEC. However, she didn’t consider them performance indicators – they are demographic data.

Public Defender Haughwout stated that this is where she becomes concerned with Commission staff and their involvement with programming. We need to have uniform standards and demonstrate that we are not more invested in one program over another. Mr. Rodriguez noted that we are going to be able to do at least two of the standard measures; however, the graduation rate (or successful completions) is more difficult to replicate for the YECs; because, it's not like the other programs, there is no defined period of time between start and end dates.

Ms. Oakes added that the "platform" for YEC is different than the drug court; "the client for drug court is a person, and you are looking at that client's individual needs and hopefully you are addressing that person individually". Ms Oakes continued... "when I look at Youth Empowerment Centers, I'm looking more at a service platform." She noted that are the center's providing transportation, do they have a youth council, unless we have a case management component, generally speaking they are not looking to address youth individual needs, unless that youth goes up to somebody and says I need help, and we don't even track that.

Mr. Waring stated that Public Defender's Haughwout point is well taken and we should focus on uniform standards and commonality between the programs. He asked that staff work on developing uniform standards between now and our next meeting. Public Defender Haughwout noted that ultimately we would want all programs to demonstrate that they are serving the mission of the Criminal Justice Commission which is about public safety, coordination, etc. The question is not whether the kids like the program it's about does the program contribute to the overall mission of the Commission. Mr. Rodriguez responded that if crime prevention is part of YEC goals, then yes it does contribute to the goals of the Commission and we can show that.

8. New Business

9. Member and Guest Comments

No additional member and guest comments.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned without a new meeting date.