

Budgeting for Result Commission

Friday, May 4, 2018

1:30PM-3:30PM

Meeting Location

Chicago – James R. Thompson Center, 100 W Randolph, Governor's Office 16th Floor

Springfield – Stratton Building 500 1/2

Dial-In: 888-806-4788 Access Code: 895-685-1121#

Attendance

Chicago: Chairman Jim Lewis, Representative William Davis, Jesse Elam, Ruth Coffman, Nathaniel Inglis Steinfeld, John Specker, Adam Groner

Springfield: Kathy Saltmarsh, Curt Clemons-Mosby, Jennifer Butler, Nana Mkheidze, John O'Connor, Nicole Saulsberry

Phone: Various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance in Springfield, Chicago and by phone.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Introductions by the Commission and state agencies were made.

2. Status of BFR Bills

Curt Clemons-Mosby stated that SB1936 (which contains the mandates recommended for repeal or modification by the BFR Commission in its November 1, 2017 annual report) has passed the Senate and is on third reading in the House of Representatives. Indications are that this bill will pass and move on to the Governor's desk before the end of spring session.

SB3186 (which contains the mandates recommended for repeal or modification by the BFR Commission in its November 1, 2016 annual report) is currently in the Senate waiting concurrence on a House amendment. The amendment contains modifications to remove a mandate from the Illinois Department of Labor. There was opposition from several labor organizations. The amendment also made changes to technical language for the Illinois State Police fund cleanup.

3. Updates on Results First and SPART

Adam Groner updated the Commission on a visit to Springfield by representatives of Results First. Representatives from the Sentencing Policy Advisory Council (SPAC) came from Chicago for the site visit and representatives from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) also contributed over the phone. The two-day visit included meetings with the Department of Corrections (IDOC) on the completion of their program evaluations and the Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) on the beginning of their program evaluations. The visit ended with a discussion on the upcoming program evaluations in the Substance Use Disorder (SUD) policy domain. Adam finished by saying that the in-person meetings with Results First, SPAC, IDOC and IDJJ had been very productive and will be valuable in continuing with IDJJ and SUD program evaluations. Nathaniel Inglis Steinfeld of SPAC added that IDOC made many useful suggestions that can improve the use of Results First by Illinois.

Adam then discussed the final two IDOC program evaluations, Electronic Monitoring and GPS Monitoring. Adam said that the two program evaluations show a discrepancy between the programs positive potential return on investment according to the Results First benefit-cost model and the programs marginal performance assessment according to the SPART. Adam explained the discrepancy within Electronic Monitoring and GPS Monitoring had two causes. First, there is a lack of data, and the burden it would be on the agencies to obtain the data hindered proper program evaluation. Second, there is a problem resulting from the lack of ownership of the programs by either overseeing state agency, IDOC or the Prisoner Review Board (PRB). The confusion over program ownership has harmed data sharing and goal setting for both programs.

The results of the Electronic Monitoring and GPS Monitoring benefit-cost analyses and program assessments have been given to IDOC and PRB. The BFR Unite has received feedback that both departments recognize the issues and are working to address them.

Jim Lewis commented that the recidivism graph on page 3 of each benefit-cost report showed only a small reduction in recidivism from use of the programs. Adam said that according to the studies compiled by the Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) and the Results First Clearinghouse, GPS and Electronic monitoring do not create a large decrease in recidivism. GPS and Electronic monitoring are able supervise parolees' schedules and curfews, they are used in best practices as an increased level of supervision that allows diversion from prison, saving state resources. GPS monitoring is in statute mandatory for sex offenders, but otherwise both monitoring programs are used as a step down of supervision permitting people to leave prison, or a step up allowing them not to return. The benefit-cost analyses show that as a diversion from prison the programs produce a significant return on investment. Jim followed up asking why the recidivism graphs only covered three years while the program benefits graphs covered five years. Adam answered that the graphs covered the years where there was a change in value, but that future graphs will be consistent.

Ruth Coffman asked about the calculation of program net costs in the benefit-cost reports. Adam said net program costs included both fixed costs like guards and electricity and variable costs like program administration, to best determine the full actual costs of the program to IDOC. Nate added that the costs are comparative to the normal cost of time in prison.

Nate said that Megan Alderden, Associate Director at ICJIA provided suggestions on how to improve the implementation and roll out of the benefit-cost analysis as well as the use of the term evidence based. Kathy Saltmarsh said that among the things discussed was the need to have more clarity about definitions, and how to analyze and message the results of our program assessments. Kathy continued that BFR has made significant progress, producing reports that are useful and user friendly.

Jim said that the SPART evaluations could produce poor ratings because very few of the programs in Illinois will have had independent performance evaluations. Curt responded that IDOC was the pilot agency for BFR, and there will be fine tuning and modifications made in the SPART. Curt said the BFR unit is already working on updating the SPART questions to be more oriented towards evidence based best practice, as well as program implementation and program design. Kathy suggested that

sometime in the future an SPART system could automatically trigger an external program evaluation when a program receives a substandard rating.

Jim said we should think about the best way to message with the BFR report. Ruth said that she understands the reports as explaining that these programs do not, in the way that they are run, earn the full return on investment, but that they could get there. Curt added that one of the productive parts of the Results First meetings with IDOC and IDJJ was learning how to recraft the presentation of the information to reflect Ruth's understanding more clearly.

Jesse Elam asked if SPART rating could be used to pro-rate a program benefit-cost analysis. Adam responded that the data necessary is not available, but as the data improves the BFR unit can work with Results First and SPAC to find a solution. Jennifer Butler said that the SPART is an assessment not a complete evaluation, marginal or lower rankings can put BFR in a position to recommend an independent evaluation be considered.

Adam asked for any additional questions or comments and then moved on to discuss the progress made with in the Juvenile Justice policy domain. The BFR unit and IDJJ are working on completing a program inventory and determining which programs will be evaluated first. The BFR unit is also working with GOMB and IDJJ to match budget line items to specific programs in order to determine program costs.

4. Review and Approval of Minutes – Jim Lewis (Item delayed to allow for a quorum)

The May 4th, 2018, Budgeting For Results (BFR) meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

5. Planning for summer BFR Hearings

Panel participants in Springfield

Kathy Saltmarsh, Adam Groner, and a representative from Results First

Chicago:

Commissioner Ruth Coffman, tentatively Commissioner Jose Sanchez, and tentatively Professor....

Ask CURT

Jennifer said that Results First advertises grant opportunities for evidence based programing. BFR should promote these grants as another way of validating and encouraging the use of evidence based programing. The BFR process can give Illinois agencies and program providers an advantage in qualifying for funding opportunities. Jennifer said that promoting greater grant opportunities can be a positive message from BFR. Representative Davis wanted more information on the grant opportunities. Jennifer said that we want to ensure that we take advantage any funding available, and that BFR provides opportunities through Results First to identify grant opportunities.

Representative Davis was also interested to know how much human decision making is involved in determining when and to whom grants are distributed, for example in the case of disaster relief grants. Curt responded that as it relates to disaster relief funding, there is a per capita threshold above which the total estimated impact has to cross in order to be eligible to receive federal disaster

aid. Once a disaster occurs representatives from FEMA and IEMA go into the field and do a direct survey of the disaster site and work up an estimate for the total amount of loss not covered by insurance. Curt stated that before the representatives leave the field, FEMA tells state officials the likelihood of receiving federal aid. In most cases the chances are extremely low. It is based on this guidance from FEMA that the state decides to apply for federal disaster aid. Curt continued that federal disaster funding is mostly objective, if there is any subjectivity then it would be the FEMA regional director as they are the entity that make decision on what is and isn't eligible.

6. IPRS Discussion

Curt recapped the previous meetings discussion on IPRS program benchmarks, whether the benchmarks should be aspirational goals or measurements of current programs with revisions based on funding and other concerns. Curt offered a compromise for agencies to report current program measurements and make changes to the benchmarks only when there is a significant (5%-10%) deviation from their estimate. Jim said we have to decide whether the purpose of the benchmark is to hold agencies accountable for targets or to be a reflection of the program's use.

Representative Davis said that budgeting can be a reflection of the ideology of the political party in charge, and that defining benchmarks should be non-partisan. John Webber, CRO of Central Management Services (CMS) agreed that it can be hard to agree on definitions and we should be looking to determine an acceptable level of service from these programs. Representative Davis suggested teaching agency staff how to appropriately understand and productively use the BFR reports.

John O'Connor, CRO of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, said that there may be a more appropriate time and place to do scenario analysis for creating aspirational benchmarks. John said IPRS is useful to his agency in the current setup. Jim said to proceed Curt's compromise.

Curt concluded by giving an overview of the current technical limitations of IPRS interface with GOMB's internal Budget Book system related to tracking performance over time.

7. New Business

No new business.

8. Adjournment

BFR Public meeting adjourned 3:26pm