

**M I N U T E S**

**MONDAY, April 14,, 2014 – 8:00 a.m.**

**PALM BEACH COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

McEaddy Conference Room  
12<sup>th</sup> Floor, 301 N. Olive Avenue  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

***Members Present:***

Dave Aronberg  
Rosalyn Baker  
James Barr  
Jeffrey Colbath  
George Elmore  
Carey Haughwout  
William Kramer  
Barry Krischer  
Gerald Richman  
Lee Waring

Douglas Duncan  
Ex-Officio Executive Committee  
(Immediate past chair)

***CJC Members Present:***

Chuck Shaw  
Greg Starling

***Guests Attending:***

Angela Bess, PBC School District  
Mike Edmondson, State Attorney's Office  
Latrona Hayes, Pretrial/PBC Justice Services  
Jennifer Loyless, Public Defender's Office  
Julio Quinones, Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Louis Tomeo, Clerk & Comptroller's Office

***Staff Present:***

Michael L. Rodriguez, Executive Director  
Arlene Griffiths, Administrative Secretary  
Shahzia Jackson, Senior Criminal Justice Analyst  
Katherine Hatos, Senior Criminal Justice Analyst  
Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager  
Brenda Oakes, Youth Violence Prevention Planning Coordinator  
Craig Spatara, RESTORE Initiative Program Manager

***Members Absent:***

Barbara Cheives  
Randy Johnson, Sr.

E. Wayne Gent  
Ex-Officio Executive Committee

Candee Villapando, Criminal Justice Analyst  
Elizabeth Williams, Financial Analyst II

***Temporary Staff:***

Pamela Williams

***Student Intern:***

Anne-Marie Brown, Florida Atlantic University

- I. Chairman William Kramer called the meeting to order.
- II. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.
- III. Chairman Kramer welcomed members and invited guests to introduce themselves.
- IV. The agenda was unanimously approved after motion by Chief Judge Jeffrey Colbath and second by Mr. George Elmore.
- V. The minutes of the August 12, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved after motion by Mr. Gerald Richman and second by Mr. James Barr.
- VI. Under Chairman's Comments, Chairman Kramer remarked about his meeting with Executive Director Michael Rodriguez and his thoughts on what the executive committee meetings should consist of. His feelings he said, is that the executive committee should be the front runners for the commission, looking primarily at policy issues. He further noted that the role of research should be proportional to the responsibilities and obligations of the Criminal Justice Commission, and proportional to research funds available. To this end, Mr. Kramer advised that members input and direction for staff is sought, specifically as it relates to research.
- VII. Under Executive Director's comments, Mr. Rodriguez provided an overview of the work done by staff and why. He further expressed staff interest in what the CJC has to say about the evaluation component.
- VIII. Business Consent Item  
There were no business consent items.
- IX. Old Business  
There were no old business items for discussion.
- X. Under New Business, Mr. Rodriguez commented on the performance measures and standards developed for programs funded by the CJC, and highlighted examples of evaluations completed, as well as those currently undertaken. He spoke of the levels of satisfaction received with the results of the evaluations completed internally and externally. Mr. Rodriguez expressed his wish to have an open discussion, and sought guidance on how to proceed with these issues given the pros and cons to the different kinds of evaluations, and doing them internally or

externally. He further reminded members of the CJC's objective, specifically as it relates to its authority.

XI.

Mr. Rodriguez cited the Batterers' Intervention Programs (BIP) as an example of the kind of program that has never been evaluated by the CJC, and said that it was brought to the CJC by Mr. Krischer. He noted that preliminary research was done into the programs but said it appears that they have not been evaluated in quite some time, if at all.

Chief Judge Jeffrey Colbath commented on the BIP saying that it is a good idea that allows the CJC to be proactive on issues. It is also timely, he said as the legislators are backing away from the requirement that these programs be certified or monitored, and will no longer be watched by the State.

Mr. Barry Krischer remarked about the distinction between analyzing the results of the programs funded by the CJC and doing the research, to be efficient, cost effective and reduce crime. For example, he said that the Children Services Council brings in an outside evaluator to assist in determining their performance. He further noted that the BIPs operate under the auspices of the court, though not necessarily statutorily. He feels however, that there should be a CJC committee working with staff to interview the program leaders to determine how they operate and make present a recommendation to the full CJC.

Chairman Kramer questioned what happens after the study and who would the CJC reports to for action after a decision is made about the programs. Mr. Krischer said that the results of the BIP study should go to the Chief Judge, and also to the legislators.

Public Defender Carey Haughwout commented on the role of the CJC staff in conducting evaluations in general, saying she feels that staff has not been very successful in that regard. She further mentioned the high cost associated with staff devoted to doing evaluations and also said that the credibility of evaluation of programs funded by the CJC would be better with outsiders, and would also be better and timelier. She noted the distinction between evaluations and performance monitoring, saying that the CJC should always require the appropriate performance measures for programs so that they are outcome related. She indicated however, that while the programs should be monitored, she feels that the limited resources are not appropriately used for the overall evaluation of programs. She remarked that the funding for outside evaluations should be included in the grant at the time of writing same.

The BIP programs, Public Defender said has lots of issues, and noted that research has shown that none of the programs are effective.

Chairman Kramer commented on the matrix, and further pointed out that the CJC has also had unsuccessful ventures dealing with universities and outside studies. Public Defender Haughwout agreed that research is an important role of the CJC and noted that the CJC should also set the matrix.

Mr. Richman questioned why the CJC would evaluate a program that it knows

doesn't work, saying it would be a waste of money. He also commented on the available funds to do research and evaluation.

State Attorney Dave Aronberg inquired as to what the CJC was looking for from the legislators. Mr. Rodriguez said that there was insufficient information at this time to determine what is needed from the legislators, but noted that staff could pull together the previous studies mentioned by the Public Defender and Mr. Krischer and present the findings to the CJC. State Attorney Aronberg highlighted two factors for consideration; the political reality of undoing a BIP as well as the stakeholders that are vested in the current system who will try to prove its effectiveness. He thinks the way forward is to build coalition with local advocacy groups and present it as an improvement to what exist.

Ms. Rosalyn Baker advised that the Department of Corrections (DOC) used the BIP program with inmates that are mandated by the courts to be in the program. She said that the Department goes further by contracting with the providers and said that certain things are requested of the programs. Ms Baker said that what the programs do with offenders must be in writing, and a report submitted to DOC each month. These programs she noted are evaluated and renewed each year.

Mr. Chuck Shaw expressed concerns about going outside on some of the assessments for the research needed, for fear of regurgitating information already collected to present the finding that is already known. He thinks that the CJC should go outside only if staff is not able to get the kind of information needed, and said that once staff is able to provide the information, the assessment should be on the effectiveness of those deliverables. He further noted that where the deliverables are not met those programs should not be funded.

Public Defender argued that the first step with the research should be to look at the national studies. She said that since the research indicating the ineffectiveness of the BIP program is at least 10 years, this research might identify other places doing things differently as well as alternative programs that may be more effective. She said that staff could also find out what information the programs now collect, in order to determine if an evaluation can or should be done.

Mr. Waring questioned the level of authority of the CJC to approach these programs for information, at which point Chief Judge Colbath said that the courts could help in that regard, and agreed that it is a worthy venture for staff to explore.

Mr. Douglas Duncan agreed that while this is an important issue, there are other issues such as the DUI program that goes on for years where anyone that gets arrested has to attend a DUI school. He noted that in evaluating the program, there is always an internal conflict of interest in the evaluators because if they don't recommend that one needs additional treatment beyond attending the regular DUI school they would have no business. He advised about the excellent overview of the reentry program presented by Craig Spatara at a recent Corrections meeting, and highlighted the sex offender residency restrictions that is also an issue to be addressed. To this end, Mr. Douglas suggested that the CJC prioritize the programs that staff should be looking at, or committing dollars to.

Mr. Rodriguez suggested that the BIP program be used as a case study, but stressed the need for members support.

After further discussion, a decision was made to inquire into the effectiveness of the BIP programs and report back to the executive committee and the full commission as appropriate, with recommendations for actions

- XII. Under member comments, Mr. Krischer remarked about the potential increase in tourist taxes, and suggested it might be a good time to approach the BCC for funding given the cuts experienced over the years.
- XIII. With no further items for discussion, the meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00a.m