

**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, August 26, 2014

2:30 PM to 3:30 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 (absent)
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
Felicia Scott, Riviera Beach Civil Drug Court Coordinator
Dorrie Tyng, Adult Drug Court Coordinator

Staff:

Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager
Shahzia Jackson, Juvenile Reentry
Rosalind Murray, Criminal Justice Program Development Specialist
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 June 2, 2014 Minutes

The minutes from the June 2, 2014 meeting were approved without amendments.

5. Chairman's Comments

Chair Nellie King reported that Damir Kukec had made the changes to the program and recidivism report from the June meeting. She would like to focus on finalizing the definitions and formats on the report and get an agreement moving forward. According to Mr. Kukec, staff had received all the data as of the third quarter (which ended on June 30th) as of August 1st and was processed and sent to FDLE for approval. Chair King also mentioned that Delinquency Drug Court had provided that data allowing demonstrating the new reporting format. She also hopes to finalize the minimal performance indicators for the Reentry programs and LEX.

6. Old Business

A. Review and Approval of New Reporting Definitions and Format

Mr. Kukec referred to the definitions of the variables (columns) included in the report. Using data provided by Cristy Altaro for Delinquency Drug Court, Mr. Kukec explained the table containing the quarterly programmatic data and answered questions during his presentation. Ms. Altaro proposed to move the Average Daily Population column after the Not Completed column for a better flow to which the committee agreed. Mr. Kukec noted that he did not include Targets on this page due to space limitations, but they are included in the actual summary report. Ms. Haughwout asked if admissions indicate how many people have received services; Ms. Tyng responded that cumulative participants served would be a better indicator. Alan Johnson asked how long the programs last that they may be serving people for three years. Ms. Tyng said by statute, a minimum of one year, up to two years. Ms. Tyng added that, although rare, it could look like someone had been in the program for more than two years, but in reality this person might have been out on a warrant and returned a few years later after this person had been picked up. Mr. Johnson suggested that there should be a discussion of what constitutes an admission because as they were, the numbers are skewed because they do not reflect those individuals who may have signed up for the program, appeared for one visit, but did not come back again, and his concern was about recidivism and meaningful treatment. The committee had a lengthy discussion about the issue. Ms. King noted that the numbers are actually reflected on the next table on recidivism, which Mr. Kukec then discussed.

Mr. Kukec explained that they are tracking a group of individuals that have exited for a period of three years. They are calculating a rolling number for recidivism rates for periods of 6 months, one year, and three years, which is what they are most interested about. He explained the recidivism rates for those who completed and did not complete the program. The group agreed to add “cumulative” to the categories of 1 Year Recidivism and 3 Year Recidivism, because there may be individuals that were counted in both categories. There was again the concern and discussion about individuals possibly being counted. Ms. King reminded the committee that this was exactly what they agreed and asked Mr. Kukec to do at the last meeting, with input from the programs, so she suggested if they can focus more on the format of the report this time and come to an agreement. Ms. Haughwout moved to accept the report to be accepted as it is, subject to the following changes: add the word “cumulative” above the one year and three year categories; spelling change and column suggestion on page one. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion; the committee voted and unanimously agreed.

B. Review and Approval of Minimal Performance Indicators

- a) Reentry – DOC (SAGO) Post Release
- b) Reentry – DOC (COMMUNITY) Post Release
- c) Reentry – COUNTY JAIL

Mr. Kukec said that the first row, the pre release program (SAGO) was already approved by the PME. The other groups are the population that goes through SAGO, released to the community and receive services; the individuals that from DOC that are released who do not go through SAGO but goes to other providers; and the group that are leaving the county jail. Craig Spatara provided the proposed measures that were primarily based on historical data. Ms. Haughwout suggested targeting a higher completion rate. Mr. Johnson agreed but thinks it cannot go over 50%. Mr. Kukec shared his briefing prior to the meeting with Mr. Waring (who could not be at the meeting due to previous commitments) who suggested also looking at what the literature says. Mr. Kukec therefore recommended accepting the target and revise it later based on what the literature says. Ms. King agreed with the suggestions, but said she did not know what gauge to use. Ms. King asked Ms. Haughwout if she would like to change the number to 40%. Ms. Haughwout made the motion; Mr. Johnson seconded; and the motion carried.

Mr. Johnson clarified whether the recidivism rate was for those that completed, which Mr. Kukec concurred. The committee discussed whether they also want to track and include recidivism rates for those that did not complete. Mr. Kukec said that this is already part of the formatting and he had canned report of the total numbers, so he can easily include the information for those that did not complete and have it as part of the summary report.

d) Law Enforcement Exchange

Ted Gonzales referred to the handout/slide presentation included in the packet. He said that as directed by the CJC, they looked at model users, or increase in users as performance measure for their project. He discussed the table that showed the increasing use of LEX only from January of this year, primarily as a result of their increased agency contact and training throughout the county, and he anticipates this number doubling for next year. Mr. Gonzales also discussed a table showing increasing distinct finder queries/requests completions from October of last year, to July of this year. Ms. Haughwout asked what "distinct" queries meant; Mr. Gonzales explained that these are queries by investigators who are doing research related to improve their investigation, and they are linked to sources outside of Palm Beach County (as opposed for queries that are mainly informational). Mr. Gonzales also talked about what is going on at LEX regional meetings and said that they will track participation at these meetings. He also showed a sample of how the LEX screen would look like and explained how it would work. He explained that information on LEX are privatized based on necessity, i.e. agencies will block highly sensitive information for individuals that do not need access to this information.

Ms. King commented that it looked like Mr. Gonzales had done a lot, just judging from what he presented from the last meeting. She asked if there are agencies that opted out from the project. Mr. Gonzales said Greenacres, due to not having enough users, and that they can use the funds somewhere else. But Mr. Gonzales said that he had spoken again with the Greenacres chief since then, and he indicated that he will have their staff evaluate the program. Ms. Haughwout commented that since Mr. Gonzales just started his position, she anticipated that their numbers will be changing as they go along so that it may be difficult to come up with an initial performance measures. Mr. Gonzales suggested that it would be best for him to show that there is a continued increase in users and identify the success stories in Palm Beach County where there has not been a lot. Lastly, Mr. Gonzales also talked about the LEX Recognition program using lapel pins to recognize law enforcement officers who used the program and helped them successfully solve the crime.

As far as the PME reporting goes, Ms. King asked Damir if this is something that will fit in the current reporting format for the other programs, or will they want to keep LEX reporting in its current format. Mr. Kukec responded it is up to what the PME wants to do. Ms. King suggested that Mr. Gonzales continue to report to us until the committee can identify what they are interested in. Mr. Johnson agreed but suggested that it should be a six month report, instead of monthly, and that LEX just continue to do what they are doing. Ms. King also asked Mr. Gonzales if he could just send the committee the numbers, so it does not have to be an agenda item. Ms. Haughwout, however, asked that Mr. Gonzales come up with a performance measure similar to the other programs which can be used when the time comes to request for a contract extension. Everybody agreed but that this will be some time in the future, and not immediately.

Ms. King asked Mr. Kukec if there should be a deadline when he needs to have the data from the programs so he can do the reports in a timely manner. She proposed 30 days after the end of the quarter. Mr. Kukec said he will work with the programs to make sure they meet that deadline.

7. New Business

A. Summary Reporting (dashboard) and Data Dissemination

Mr. Kukec just wanted to inform everyone that they are working towards having a dashboard which highlights in summary format the actual versus the target numbers, and below that all the details that are available, like a one snapshot of each program at a time.

8. Member and Guest Comments

Ms. King asked when the committee would like the next meeting to be; Mr. Kukec said that he will have someone call everyone to find out their availability for the next meeting date. Ms. King also thanked Mr. Kukec for all the work that he has done and said that she did not want to get that go unrecognized, and the members concurred.

9. Attachments

- A. June 2, 2014 Draft Minutes
- B. Report Definitions and Formats
- C. Proposed Minimal Performance Levels

10. Adjournment

Next PME meeting: September 2014.