

**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>
Tuesday, 12:00 pm, March 19, 2013

- FINAL MINUTES -

Members:

Lee Waring, Chair
Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission
Carey Haughwout, Public Defender

Guests:

Cristy Altaro, Court Administration
Ronald Alvarez, Judge, 15th Judicial Circuit
Jennifer Loyless, Public Defender
Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court
Tony Spaniol, Palm Beach County Youth Affairs
Twila Taylor, Palm Beach County Youth Affairs
Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Rosalind Murray, Criminal Justice Program Development Specialist
Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Planning Coordinator
Craig Spatara, RESTORE Program Manager
Becky Walker, Criminal Justice Manager

1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Lee Waring, Chair

2. Roll Call & Introduction of Guests

3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda

The approval and/or additions to the agenda were done out of order (at the end of the SOW discussion under New Business). The agenda was approved with no additions or deletions.

4. Approval of October 10, 2012 Minutes

The approval of the minutes was done out of order (at the end of the SOW discussion under New Business). The minutes from the October 10, 2012 meeting were approved without amendments.

5. **Chairman's Comments:** Mr. Waring welcomed members and guests to the meeting and asked Damir Kukec to introduce the first item on the agenda: the Scope of Work.

6. **New Business**

- A. Scope of Work of the PME Sub-Committee

Damir Kukec referred to the draft of Scope of Work of the PME sub-committee included in the packet. First, he talked about the purpose of the committee, its membership, and the authorities granted to the Criminal Justice Commission under the ordinance that in turn give weight to the PME SUB-committee. And lastly, Mr. Kukec talked about the scope of work or how the PME will operate as a committee. Michael Rodriguez added the importance of having a scope of work and knowing what to focus on, with which Mr. Waring agreed. Mr. Waring would like to get directions from the committee to bring back to the CJC. The committee then discussed the draft in detail and amended it accordingly. Specifically, the committee voted and agreed to keep the SOW narrow and seek direction from the CJC in terms of which programs to evaluate. Also, upon the recommendation of Mr. Waring, the committee voted and agreed to amend the meeting schedule to "bi-annual and as needed" basis.

- B. Highridge Evaluation

The committee discussed what to do with the Highridge report. It was presented to the CJC which sent it back to the PME to review. A question was raised whether the report should have been done in the first place since Highridge is not funded by the CJC. Tony Spaniol stated that years ago, they had wanted to have an evaluation done to determine the effectiveness of their program and reached out to CJC staff. He said the report and the data collected were helpful in showing that what they are doing is effective, and Barbara Taylor concurred. Ms. Haughwout noted that they should be careful in using the term "evaluation" and agrees that the Highridge report is educational, but it is not an evaluation. After further discussion, Mr. Waring recommended and the committee agreed that the report be returned to the subcommittee and the program that originally requested for it (Highridge) with no action taken at the PME.

7. **Old Business**

- A. Program Performance Indicators – First Report by Programs

Mr. Kukec reminded the committee that in October 2012 the PME met with the various drug court and reentry program coordinators and providers in the county to review previously compiled statistics/baseline data on recidivism in addition to programmatic data and set up performance indicators. Mr. Kukec had requested data updates from the all the programs in preparation for the annual planning meeting. He asked the program coordinators to provide a summary of the information they provided.

- B. Drug Court Outcome Evaluations

- a) Adult Drug Court

Dorrie Tyng reported data as of February 28, 2013. She stated that the Adult Drug Court met the program's three goals: 1) Caseload (per year) of 180 participants (average caseload for FY13 is 189 participants); 2) Graduation rate of 50% (57% graduation rate since November 2000); and 3) 15% or less of graduates not arrested and convicted of

serious crime within three years after graduation (10% of graduates arrested). She noted that the program has been following the state's minimum standard at 10%.

There was a discussion to clarify what is the reporting period. Mr. Kukec stated today's report is the baseline, i.e., the first report based on what the PME has asked for. He also requested the PME to define the performance indicators define the performance indicators and give direction as to how much interaction can he have with the program coordinators. Mr. Kukec added that the committee recognizes that different programs will report differently, and clarified that the minimal standards are indicators, not goals.

b) Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court

Felicia Scott reported data for the 6-month period of October 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013 based on 25 petitions filed. As Ms. Scott reported data only for the last 6 months and not from inception of the program, she expressed that the data is not really able to capture the success of the program. The committee agreed to clarify its definition of reporting period. Mr. Kukec also asked permission from the committee to work with the programs regarding this issue.

c) Delinquency Drug Court

Cristy Altaro presented data as of March 2013. She reported data from time of inception but noted that she can break down the numbers per year. She raised the issue of how to measure recidivism being that Delinquency Drug Court measures recidivism differently from Adult Drug Court. The committee agreed that it should be measured uniformly across the programs for consistency. Mr. Kukec offered to work with the programs in hammering out standardized measures based on the minimum performance guidelines.

C. Reentry Outcome Evaluation

Craig Spatara reported data from inception on the RESTORE program as of January 15, 2013. Sixty-nine percent of the clients have been active at some point since they left Sago Palm; 21% were rearrested; and rearrest rate was cut in half to 10% for clients who had at least minimal contact with the program. Mr. Rodriguez requested for non-RESTORE numbers also. At this point, Ms. Haughwout remarked that although measuring the minimum performance indicators is important, it is also important to include other information relevant to the program outside the standard measures. Brenda Oakes also commented not to focus only on measuring rearrest or reoffense, pointing out, for example the fact that almost 70% of RESTORE's released clients were active at some point was incredible.

8. Member and Guest Comments

Mr. Kukec reaffirmed with the committee his task of working with the program coordinators in finding a way to standardize measures based on minimal performance indicators. Mr. Waring added having to readjust timeframes for certain programs for which six months, for example, is too short to reflect effectiveness of the program, to make it valid.

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting: To be determined.