

Risks, Assets, and Needs (RANA) Assessment Task Force July 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Members in attendance (Chicago):

- Stephen Baker, Gino DiVito, Patricia Hayden, Jorge Montes, Mark Myrent, Michael Pelletier, Michael Randle, Jesse Reyes, Brian Sexton, Michael Tardy

Members in attendance (Springfield):

- Grace Hong Duffin

Members absent:

- Richard Schwind, Al Lolie, Mike Torchia

Non-members in attendance (Chicago) Tranece Artis, Pete Baroni, Lindsay Bostwick, Brianna Baker-Carvell, Mike Beary, Mary Ann Dyar, Cory Foster, Felicia Griffin (for Corrine Rivers), Steve Jackson, Steve Karr, Mark Kaufman, Simeon Kim, Patricia O'Brien, David Olson, Herb Quinde, Jennifer Rozhon, Nicole Saulsberry, Laurie Scott, Alison Shames, Lisa Stephens, Eileen Subak, Sara Sullivan, Gladys Taylor, Paula Wolff; (Springfield) Mark Pradun.

Welcome, Introductions and Roll Call

Chair Grace Hong Duffin called the fourth meeting of the RANA Task Force meeting to order at 1:15 pm. She welcomed meeting participants, making special note of the presence of RANA Task Force Advisory Group members. A round of introductions followed after which Laurie Scott took roll call. Ms. Hong Duffin reviewed the objectives for the meeting as follows:

- To hear an update about the RANA Advisory Group, which RANA members agreed to create at the last meeting
- To learn about the automation process and implementation costs of several of the assessment tools that were presented at the last meeting
- To continue a discussion of the selection criteria for the RANA assessment system in Illinois
- To discuss next steps, including the procurement process in Illinois

Approval of Minutes from June 1, 2010 Meeting

Director Randle's motion to approve the minutes from the June 1, 2010 meeting was seconded by Jorge Montes and passed unanimously.

Update on the RANA Advisory Group

Cory Foster provided an overview of the first meeting of the RANA Advisory Group held on June 28, 2010. The organizational meeting was attended by nineteen individuals from community-based organizations, government agencies and others. Participants included Grace Hong Duffin and Mark Myrent who represented the RANA Task Force. Foster reported that the presentations and discussion at the meeting included review of the Crime Reduction Act and RANA Task Force's charge and timeline, the role of the advisory group, a status update of RANA's work, and an abbreviated discussion of next steps for the Advisory Group. Mr. Foster stated that those present were very passionate and interested and should be a great asset. Foster distributed a list of the meeting attendees and notes and concluded by stating that Sara Sullivan will serve as the Task Force liaison to the Advisory Group. In that capacity she will convene the group prior to the next RANA meeting in order to select a chair. She will also

work with the chair to facilitate a discussion to determine how the group will achieve its mandate. The group will also establish a meeting schedule and determine who else needs to be at the table—including mental health and victims' groups representatives.

Presentation: Information on Costs and Automation of Offender Assessments (Memo)

Alison Shames introduced the Vera memo by stating that it was created to assist the RANA Task Force in developing its selection criteria. She added that it was not meant to be an exhaustive memo, but rather to facilitate discussion. She noted that the information contained in the memo resulted both from conversations with and review of materials from each of the providers. Ms. Shames highlighted three take-aways from the research: a) tools continue to evolve, b) tools are now being integrated into case management systems, and c) although the tool is important, more important is how the tool is used. She also noted that all of the tools have or are moving to a web-based system. She added that, although the Ohio tool (which the group learned about from Dr. Ed Latessa at the March 19, 2010 meeting) was developed on paper, it could be automated. If so, the cost for that development would be paid up front.

Ms. Shames then led a review of the memo's appendix which provided cost comparisons of the tools vis a vis software, automation and delivery, training, norming and validation costs. Discussion, comments and questions that followed and are highlighted below, provided an entrée into a facilitated discussion regarding the selection criteria for the assessment tool.

Software, Automation and delivery

- An estimate of number of persons who will receive the assessment at each decision point will be needed in order to calculate COMPAS' cost on a per use basis so that it can be equated with LSR-I which already structures its billing in this manner.
- The ability to integrate information throughout the courts systems for case management is/will be a function of resources. Currently there are 14 vendors who provide case management tools—some paper and some automated—that are used 64/102 counties in the state.
- It is important to assess any instrument based on its compatibility with other instruments now being used and needed for special programs.

Training

- All three providers included one-on-one and train the trainer training and all encourage states to build internal capacity by developing their own cadre of trainers.
- ORAS train the trainer cost is an estimate
- Training should be viewed as an investment in officers, not just a cost. For example, learning how to use the tool introduces a whole new way to interview and interact with the offender

Norming and Validation

Clarification of terminology:

- *Validation*: Does the instrument really determine the likelihood of an offender to re-offend to a statistically significant level?

- *Reliability*: Addresses how consistently an instrument measures a particular outcome/variable. If repeated measuring of a particular variable gives the same results, the measure is reliable.
- *Inter-rater Reliability*: Is the same outcome produced by separate raters?
- *Norming*: Refers to the statistical method used as a basis for how the score will be used and what levels of risk will be assigned to each score.
- *Point of information*: AOIC has contracted for an independent re-validation, norming and inter-rater reliability study of the LSI-R on Illinois' adult probation population. Among its many objectives, the re-validation study will examine age and gender issues.

Director Randle then introduced Herbert Quinde, Acting CIO for IDOC, who provided an overview of IDOC's initiative to update the technology of its information system and how that will impact the work of the Task Force. Mr. Quinde explained that to date the sharing of information and ability of systems to "talk to each other" have been greatly hindered by disparate systems (many paper based) as well as disparate data. IDOC is now developing a new IT system using Customer Relationship Management tools that will provide a foundation for a new system that can assemble variable data. Using the LEADS and Statement of Fact Sheets as examples, he noted that they are now building an "Offender Scorecard" that includes risks and assets (now only collected on paper) that will result in a more accurate total score. He emphasized that tools developed by IDOC will be compatible with any tool adopted by RANA.

Discussion: Selection Criteria for Assessment System (continued from May 24, 2010 Meeting)

Alison Shames began this segment of the meeting with an overview of the process that will be used to finalize the criteria. She then facilitated discussion and editing of the criteria. Each Task Force member was also asked to rank both the individual criteria and the categories in order of priority. In closing, Shames stated that she will compile the input gathered today, create a revised document and re-circulate via e-mail to the Task Force for additional comment. The Advisory Group will also be asked to comment on the criteria as part of the process to finalize them.

Discussion: RANA Task Force Next Steps

Chair Hong Duffin briefly described the procurement process in Illinois. She stated that this process is based upon the current law in effect and will change when amendments will go into effect in January 1, 2011. Given the complexity of the procurement process and December 31, 2010 deadline for RANA to complete its charge, Chair Hong Duffin recommended that a smaller working group be formed to develop an RFP or RFQ. Director Randle concurred. Patricia Hayden, Jesus Reyes, Mark Myrent, Justice DiVito, Jorge Montes, Gladys Taylor volunteered to serve on the working group of which Ms. Hong Duffin and Ms. Taylor will serve as co-chairs. It was agreed that in lieu of a full Task Force meeting, the Working Group will utilize the scheduled August 4, 2010 meeting as an opportunity to meet and move the RFP/RFQ process forward.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm with a motion by Jorge Montes, seconded by Director Randle and approved by all.

Approved at the September 1, 2010 Task Force meeting