

**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>

Wednesday, February 17, 2011

- FINAL MINUTES -

Members Present:

Lee Waring, Chair

Jim Barr, Criminal Justice Commission

Carey Haughwout, Public Defender

Chuck Shaw, Palm Beach School District Board (Absent)

Paul Zacks, State Attorney's Office (Absent)

Staff:

Michael Rodriguez, Executive Director

Damir Kukec, Research & Planning Manager

Becky Walker, Criminal Justice Manager

1. Welcome / Opening Comments, Lee Waring, Chair

Mr. Waring welcomed everyone and asked if everyone was signed in that will be attending today.

2. Roll Call & Introduction of Guests

Mr. Kukec confirmed that Mr. Zacks and Mr. Shaw sent their regrets and will not be able to attend.

3. Approval and/or Additions to the Agenda

The agenda was approved as is, with no additions or deletions.

4. Approval of November 10, 2011 Minutes

The minutes from the November 10, 2011 meeting was approved.

5. Chairman's Comments

Chairman Waring noted that the purpose of the meeting was to develop a format for the annual reporting of Criminal Justice Commission funded programs and activities. Instead of following the agenda items, Chairman Waring asked Mr. Kukec to summarize where we have been and where are we going with the format and structure of the annual report.

6. Old Business

A. Review and Discussion of Proposed Reporting Format: Chairman Lee Waring

Mr. Kukec was asked to provide the committee with a status report on the annual reports. Mr. Kukec noted that this started back in late 2009 when the finance committee requested that information be collected on the implementation and impact of funded programs and activities. As a result, the Research and Planning Unit created a reporting framework and completed training for all programs funded in FY 2009/10 on developing logic models and measurement frameworks. The majority of FY 09/10 programs and agencies receiving funds did attend training and did submit a logic model and measurement framework. The results of FY 09/10 efforts were contained in the draft report distributed to the full commission in September 22, 2011.¹ In addition the full draft report, the Research and Planning Unit was directed by the committee to design a rating scale or matrix which would allow for objective scoring and comparison of programs funded across a variety of program/activity areas. Mr. Kukec explained that this rating scale could be part of the annual report which contains a more in-depth analysis of how the program was implemented and whether it achieved its goals. Furthermore, Mr. Kukec referred to the Financially Assisted Agencies (FAA) report which uses a table format to report on program achievements. Ideally, the format was suppose to address what the Criminal Justice Commission approved to fund, what was actually implemented, what was achieved and was the program effective. Chairman Waring stated that he was concerned that the format is clear and simple to understand and that it was something the Board of County Commissioners recognized.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that he would like to see both the rating scale and the broader report which includes the details about how the program was implemented and what did the programs accomplish. This view was also echoed by Chairman Waring. Mr. Kukec also noted that going forward, that funding should be contingent on agencies providing basic information prior to receiving funding: is the program evidence based, how many people will receive services, what outcomes are going to be achieved, and how will these outcomes be measured. Mr. Rodriguez noted that this was a first good step in getting to reporting on the program was implemented; however, more importantly, we also want to know what benefit or good did the program achieve.

¹ Kukec, Damir., Programs Funded by the Criminal Justice Commission: Fiscal Year 2010 (October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010). Research and Planning Unit., Criminal Justice Commission. September 22, 2011.

Ms. Haughwout, Public Defender, was concerned that we are not better able to report on effectiveness. This was something that the Criminal Justice Commission expected almost three years ago. She also noted that if she saw what some of the logic models identified as outcomes, she would never have supported funding the programs. Public Defender Haughwout stated that this is something we should see up front, not necessarily for evaluations.

She noted that we should now be in a place to complete evaluations rather than calling this a first step toward that end. The other issue that she raised was that the current reports focus more on “contract compliance” rather than effectiveness. The report does not say how the mission of the Criminal Justice Commission relates to the program funding; “how has this program further that mission of crime prevention”. The rating scale is something that she be on-going, as a contract compliance function by staff.

The difference being about evaluation and effectiveness and whether the outcomes; the outcome has to be a measurement tied to the Criminal Justice Commission... what is the relationship between grade levels and delinquency. Is there? And then you track how they did And as an evaluation... has it been effective based on the research, etc. It is having a positive impact on delinquency. Only 15 of the 56 improved grades and is this worthwhile and hopefully overtime, does grade have impact on delinquency. And what levels should be incorporated. Using the program... while their rating may be good, they shouldn't have a rating, where only 15 of the 56... however, Chairman Waring noted that this could have been a great score. However, we don't know at this point.

Pre-trial services is also a good example, did they really implementing however, they ended with an excellent scale. The outcomes have to be part of the funding decisions. The outcome models should be presented before funding and not after. Mr. Rodriguez also noted that we need to complete and implement “real evaluations” with in-house staff which also calls for funding and how we define effectiveness, etc.

Public Defender Haughwout noted that we did set aside funding to complete research in FY 2010. How were those funds used? Mr. Kukec noted that the funds were used to commission research on evidence based programming; literature reviews on youth violence prevention and weed and seed programs; methodological advice; purchase data and software; complete a community survey in Weed & Seed communities. All of these were useful and will be reported as part of the work completed by the Research and Planning Unit. Chairman Waring noted that literature reviews are helpful ways to identify baseline data and accomplishment.

Public Defender Haughwout recommended that from this point forward that staff complete evaluations on the programs that we are currently funding and that we anticipate are going to be coming back to the Criminal Justice Commission to request future funding. She stated that the Criminal Justice Commission and the finance committee are interested in questions of effectiveness and whether programs are achieving their goals or outcomes in an effective manner. It was also acknowledge that in some cases, the Criminal Justice Commission was going to have to identify levels of effectiveness.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that he can see at least four areas needing funding. These include:

- Re-Entry Programs
- Drug Court Programs
- Civil Drug Court Programs
- Law Enforcement Community

Public Defender Haughwout stated that base on these priorities the next step would be to have individuals programs develop program logic models and measurement frameworks which identifies what the programs are trying to achieve. In addition, program proposals should include information on whether programs are evidence based and supporting research that documents anticipated outcomes. These should all be considered prior to the Criminal Justice Commission making a funding decision. Once made, the program will be required to report to the Commission staff for purpose of contract compliance and the need to evaluate the effectiveness of the funded program. Mr. Rodriguez noted that in FY 2013 he would recommend the funding of Re-Entry programs and Drug Courts. He noted that there was a pending evaluation by University of South Florida and that additional evaluations of criminal and civil drug court could be done during the FY 2013.

Chairman Waring asked for clarification when he asked in everyone funded for FY 2012 will be evaluated for FY 2012 for some level or degree, prior to FY 2013? Mr. Kukec will prepare a brief that will the 27th as a next step. It was recommended that the rating scale would be dropped from the program review. If they didn't comply with the grid, we should not give them the funds. We can have a mid course direction.

(50:36) Recommendation: Mr. Kukec noted that for the 27th will prepare a summary as to what we agreed to do today and it will be in a format with the CJC that will be in a format for their approval going forward. The Committee agreed that staff would prioritize the evaluation of 2012 programs and programs that the CJC will be considering for funding in fiscal year 2013. Chairman Waring further stated that he would recommend that staff longer spend time on programs and gathering data on services the CJC no longer funds. Public Defender Haughwout also noted that if programs do come back to the CJC seeking funds that they should supply the necessary data if they want to be considered in the future.

7. New Business

A. Access to Information Issues: Damir Kukec.

Mr. Kukec noted that as a future issue this Committee will likely help craft a strategy to getting access for research and evaluation purposes different datasets in the county. For example, Mr. Kukec described the current process for accessing court data maintained by the Clerk and Comptroller's Office. He noted that currently data are

accessed via “shopping cart” and that each request costs the CJC \$60.00 per hour. Mr. Rodriguez noted that this is just one example that similar challenges exist when attempting to compile data from other sources (e.g., law enforcement). Mr. Barr asked what steps the Committee should take to address these challenges. Staff noted that at this time, we wanted to simply make the Committee aware of the challenges. Public Defender Haughwout noted that while she understands why access is important, she believes that programs that we fund should be able to provide and show data that demonstrates their effectiveness (e.g., reducing number of days in jail) as part of their contracting.

8. Member and Guest Comments

Adjournment

Chairman Lee Waring suggested that once the Matrix System is established that the Commission would meet twice a year or as needed and as soon as a sample of the Matrix is ready then a meeting would be scheduled to examine it. No further business the meeting was adjourned.