

**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>

Monday, June 2, 2014

12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

- M I N U T E S -

Members:

Nellie King, Chair
Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission
Carey Haughwout, Public Defender
Alan Johnson, State Attorney's Office
Chuck Shaw, School District
Lee Waring, Seaside National Bank & Trust (absent)

Guests:

Cristy Altaro, Delinquency Drug Court Coordinator
Penny Anderson, LEX Project
Ted Gonzales, LEX Project Director of Operations
Jennifer Loyless, Public Defender's Office
Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court Coordinator
Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court Coordinator
Denise Vidal-Bennette, ISS

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director
Shahzia Jackson, Juvenile Reentry
Katherine Hatos, Law Enforcement Planning Council
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Planning Coordinator
Craig Spatara, Criminal Justice Program Manager

1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Nellie King, Chair

2. Roll Call & Introduction of Guests

3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda

The agenda was approved without changes.

4. Approval of October 8, 2013 Minutes

The minutes from the October 8, 2013 meeting were approved without amendments.

5. Chairman's Comments

Chair Nellie King thanked the program providers for providing complete data on a timely basis and staff for preparing the preliminary results.

6. Old Business

A. Brief Review of First Quarter Results

Damir Kukec gave a PowerPoint presentation and an overview of the preliminary report on the minimal performance indicators for the first quarter. Carey Haughwout asked if it was the same report presented at the last CJC meeting, and Mr. Kukec confirmed it was but he wanted to clarify issues on the concept of recidivism and address any additional questions. The full report included a brief funding and history of the programs, program descriptions, and the three basic performance measures namely, caseload, dispositions, and recidivism rate. The committee had previously defined recidivism as people who are arrested and convicted upon leaving the program and report on recidivism of only those that have successfully completed the program. Mr. Kukec initially proposed to report on recidivism as cohorts – people moving out of the program in specific groups and tracking them over time. Mr. Kukec discussed in greater detail tables on the three performance measures for the first quarter which was October 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013.

The Caseload Performance Measures table included for each program the minimal level of participants to be served, total participants served, and average daily population. Mr. Kukec noted that post-release reentry program participants are also now included in the report. The Disposition Performance Measures table included the PME agreed upon minimal level of participants graduating, and the actual number of participants successfully completing. There was some confusion regarding the numbers presented in the two tables, so Mr. Kukec said he will combine the two tables together for a better flow, and include both the raw numbers and percentage of the total participants served, active participants, participants who exited the program, those who graduated and those that did not complete successfully, etc. Chair King commented that this is a difficult task as each program is administered differently but that this is a good start as long as we have the raw data; it's just a matter of how it is packaged. Mr. Kukec remarked that the

basic question he wants to answer is how people do when they leave. Ms. Haughwout suggested that the committee should decide what they want to be reported. The problem will be the extent that this reporting will aid in financing decisions. Michael Rodriguez suggested looking at the numbers globally instead of per quarter. Ms. Haughwout recommended continuing collecting and reporting data quarterly in addition to the yearly report. Chair King added that the quarterly and yearly reporting is also good in terms of trends, e.g., explaining why some programs are not effective, and may also follow trends over the years. The committee agreed to continue collecting data quarterly and report the numbers to the committee internally, and to the CJC yearly. Also, the report will include the total number of people served, who are still active at the last day of the report, how people exited, and how many successfully and unsuccessfully exited programming. The report will cover the last two fiscal years and the current fiscal year.

B. Revisit Recidivism Cohort and Follow-up Post Arrest Timeframe

Mr. Kukec gave a summary of how the committee agreed to measure recidivism rates, which will be about people who exited the program successfully, and who were later arrested and convicted. They will track quarterly exits of cohorts for three years, meaning people that left programming between October 1, 2010 and December 31, 2010. He mentioned the option of tracking people globally for a specific period of time, i.e., a total in one group, as opposed to the finite micro groups. Chair King asked how they can tell whether a program is instrumental in the success or failure of a participant's program completion. Mr. Kukec responded that this is the nuance differentiating between performance indicator measures and outcome evaluation study. Mr. Kukec stated that the report will include people that exited in over a three year period corresponding to the current quarter that is being reported, and how many were arrested in six months, one year, and three years. To recap, the first report will track a group of three years of exits between October 1, 2010 and September 30, 2013, after six months, one year, and three years.

Cristy Altaro asked how they can be sure that someone is not counted twice. Mr. Kukec replied that he will make sure that the statistical program computes it correctly. Ms. Haughwout brought up the acceptable PME levels for reentry. Craig Spataro stated that the federal funding requirements indicate the total number that they will serve. However, he expressed a similar concern about the difficulty of comparing different programs. For example, in their programs, participants are divided by geographical area, assigned by DOC, so it will not be fair to compare Riviera Beach, for example if they were assigned fewer participants. Mr. Barr remarked that their target number, however, is agreed upon in the beginning.

Mr. Rodriguez wanted to address the issue about Adult Drug Court as having 3 different tracks – drug court, co-occurring disorders, and prescription drug court. He wants to know if it is fair to lump the three different tracks together into one category. Mr. Kukec said it will not be hard to separate them, but it is up to what the committee wants. Chair King recommended the members think about it, and

Mr. Rodriguez said he will talk with drug court staff and get numbers and report back at the next meeting.

C. Minimal Performance Levels for Law Enforcement Exchange (LEX), Youth Violence Prevention Project, and Post Release RESTORE and COMMUNITY Reentry.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that LEX has preliminary performance measures that were adopted by the LEX committee. Penny Anderson talked about it in greater detail and introduced Mr. Ted Gonzales, the new Director of Operations for LEX, and Denise Vidal-Bennett from ISS who is responsible for the technical implementation of LEX. In addition to the preliminary performance measures listed, Ms. Anderson mentioned a regional and countywide crime report for cross-jurisdictional trend analysis that they have not done, but will be added. Mr. Gonzales commented that although this was officially his first day on the job, he has worked within the law enforcement community for a long time and is familiar with the law enforcement people that he is confident he will be able to direct the program in the right direction. He remarked that he will be reaching out to everybody to get ideas as to funding and program operations as it is the model for the U.S. Mr. Barr asked about target dates; Mr. Gonzales replied that their focus as of this moment is to establish a list of priorities, and will come back to the next meeting with a GAN chart showing their target dates, programs, and projects, etc., if needed. Mr. Rodriguez asked if there is a way to show the finance committee and CJC how well LEX is doing beyond anecdotal success stories. Ms. Haughwout likewise asked what would be a measurement that would tell the committee that LEX had contributed to public safety, law enforcement coordination, etc., which is a number. Ms. Anderson chimed in that an example that is increasing the number of participants at regional and countywide LEX meetings which is an indicator of interest in LEX and increased use of the system. Mr. Gonzales said another example may be cases solved by joint agencies. Ms. Anderson at this point clarified that they selected the goals for this committee is because it is funded for this position, not the program.

Mr. Kukec spoke on behalf of Brenda Oakes who had stepped out regarding the Youth Empowerment Centers performance measures. They will be doing caseload/total served, average daily population, and recidivism rates.

Ms. Haughwout asked if they will see second quarter numbers at the next meeting. Mr. Kukec replied that the second quarter report is already being developed; they have requested data from the providers and today is the deadline. Preliminary results will be shared with the committee prior to presenting it at CJC. He added that he had invited providers to discuss their numbers with him individually.

7. New Business

No new business.

8. Member and Guest Comments

Chair King thanked Mr. Kukec for doing a fantastic job. Alan Johnson suggested sending the revised report for comments directly to the Chair, instead of asking all the individual committee members for input to avoid Sunshine Law issues. Mr. Rodriguez assured that the members can communicate directly with Mr. Kukec. Chair King recommended sending out the discussion in draft minutes form just as far as take away from today's meeting, and then they can communicate. Mr. Johnson suggested that if Mr. Kukec was getting counter indication from the members, then they will have to call for a meeting to clarify the issues to which the members agreed.

Mr. Kukec asked the members after this year, if they would reconsider the quarterly checks with FDLE, instead of the regular quarterly checks. He has been in discussion with Katherine Hatos, staff contact with FDLE, who noted it's a minor change, and Mr. Kukec thinks it will not affect their results that much.

9. Adjournment

Chair King asked about the committee's preference as to meeting frequency. Mr. Rodriguez suggested doing it quarterly at first just to make sure that everyone is on the same page, and then meeting on an ad hoc basis afterwards. The meeting was adjourned without a new meeting date.