

**Minutes of the Waukesha County Criminal Justice Collaborating Council
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 14, 2008**

The meeting was called to order at 11:11 a.m.

Present: Judge Mac Davis, Chair, Dan Vrakas, Carolyn Evenson, Peter Schuler, Brad Schimel, Jim Dwyer.

Also present: Sara Carpenter, Joanne Eiring, Windy Jicha, Matt Hiller, Clara Daniels, Allison Bussler.

Presentation of the Alcohol Treatment Court Implementation Evaluation by Matt Hiller

Hiller is an independent evaluator helping Waukesha County fulfill grant requirements for the Alcohol Treatment Court by conducting a process and program evaluation of the first 16 months of the program. Hiller gave a PowerPoint presentation of the draft report. He said he would email a copy of the presentation to all members today. A process evaluation is required for grant accountability. The primary purpose of the process evaluation is to document the implementation of the Alcohol Treatment Court and to compare this against two sets of benchmarks; the grant application submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the ten key components of drug courts. Hiller gave an overview of Adult Drug Courts including ten key components and ten guiding principles, program background and history, review of drug court effectiveness, overview of DUI courts, national, state and county statistics, etc.

Hiller said the grant requires an outline of how the program will address ten key components. The components have been modified over the last few years to better fit alcohol treatment courts versus drug courts. The DUI model has different needs to fulfill versus drug courts. There is consensus that drug courts do affect behavior and reduce recidivism. Many times there are concurring disorders. The participants are not just alcoholics but they also tend to use other substances. It is recommended that the DUI court team consider developing additional specialized tracks within the program with additional services to address those with more complex problems more effectively.

The program fell short of the number of individuals it was set to serve due to the very high retention rate of 90%. The program remains full with 50 participants throughout the year. Goal capacity was projected to be 75 participants. People are not dropping out at the expected rate. Low turn-over rates suggest the efficient program operations but this also may lead to the maintenance of a waiting list for the program and many of these individuals finish their jail term before a slot becomes available. More extensive analyses are needed to determine the real extent to which potential participant's service needs are not met. This needs analysis could provide a clear and logical rationale for expanding the capacity of the current program. The program holds people accountable for their behaviors, which is what the program is supposed to do.

According to key component two, the prosecution and defense work together for the best interest of the participants in treatment courts. The public defender's office is integrally involved in the program while there is limited participation in the program by the district attorney's office. The lack of participation is attributable in large part to a perception that there is not a clear role for it within the current structure of the court. It may be important for the drug court team to find ways to incorporate the district attorney's office in non-traditional ways.

Component three indicates that identification and placement in drug court occur soon after the person is arrested/convicted because this event places the person in a state of crises as they realize their drug/alcohol use has resulted in serious legal consequences. Because the Waukesha Alcohol Treatment

Court is a post-conviction model, it is only possible for the program to identify and enroll participants after they are convicted or plead guilty to their third DUI. There is not enough capacity to address all the people who were convicted/pleaded guilty so many people fell off the waiting list. The only recommendation he had to solve this issue was to expand the program.

Component ten describes how programs need to establish themselves within the community in order to sustain the program once federal funding runs out. Because of its unique focus on bringing all stakeholders in the community together to address a common problem, the court provides a clear opportunity for criminal justice, community and private agencies to work together collaboratively to share resources and ideas about how to solve the problem. It also represents a means whereby these groups can heighten the general community awareness and understanding of the problem. For the program to continue beyond the funding provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, it is likely numerous other partnerships will need to be solidified.

Hiller said the first 16 months of the program show it has been implemented well and going according to plan. The program emphasizes supervision more than treatment and fills a niche. There is no marked departure from the grant application versus what actually happened. Treatment is done mostly through AA, which is not a formal type of treatment. This may not be a bad thing because of the structure of the OWI program. The majority of participants get formal treatment usually before being enrolled in the program. The 12-step services are for after care or continuum of care. The program starts with intensive treatment and moves into continuing services with a positive support group, which is favorable with good long-term outcomes for drug addiction.

It is troubling there is such a high number of participants in the supervision program with mental illness and other substance use/abuse issues. The team applied for a grant in January to address these issues. They are waiting to hear from the Bureau of Justice Assistance if they will provide funding to add another mental health care worker for those who are able to pay or have insurance. The retention rate average of 90% is above the national average and fantastic. The program is working and people are staying in the program. The number of OARs after the program started was 13% including some anonymous tips. It warrants additional study to find out why participants are driving without a license. Maybe the program can help address OARs and link participants with community services that provide a van service.

Hiller said the next steps include updating the process evaluation and conducting an effectiveness evaluation. The program needs to be tracked to understand what is happening and how changes affect the program especially the change of personnel. An effectiveness evaluation would measure if the program reduces the DUI offense rate.

Evenson asked what is the timeframe for the evaluation to be effective? Hiller said he needs to have the data collected by the end of August. Evenson asked because of the different types of monitoring besides alcohol treatment court, how do you determine who will be excluded from the data? Hiller said you could sort people eligible for the program versus those unable to get into it. A variable could be those not able to get into the program and put in the electronic bracelet or day reporting programs but that would not be a good comparison. It would be like comparing a mackintosh apple with a golden delicious. Look at the background of people who went through the program. If women have higher dropout rates than men, it would suggest something is wrong because the program is not meeting the needs of women. You can relate characteristics to long-term outcomes such as another OWI or arrest. You can make other suggestions for change to better identify people and then provide specialized services for that group.

Vrakas thanked Hiller for making a presentation to the committee. Vrakas highlighted the point that an influx of people working their way through the program needs a coordinated effort by all parties. We have

heard from the private bar that the program is difficult and it is easier to do jail time. We want to make sure we properly identify people and put them on the right path. This counsel should identify programs and move forward to attack problems. Hiller said the evaluation cannot address who should be assigned to Scram, alcohol treatment court or electronic monitoring. Assigning offenders to treatment would require a broader study.

Dwyer said program funding should last through the first quarter of 2009. When do you make the decision whether or not the program is working or when will it work especially since the information will not be ready in June or July of this year when the budget is developed? We need another year or two of statistics before a decision can be made. Dwyer asked Hiller what does he predict will happen? This is not a short-term program cranking people out. We will not have definite answers soon regarding the long-term effects of the program. Some statistical numbers are suggestive but they are not the critical evidence.

Dwyer said the other grant applied for deals with mental health as a secondary issue. If you are not dealing with the primary issue in an alcohol treatment court, you cannot deal with the secondary. Hiller said if you no longer have an alcohol treatment court, the mental health program could live on in another capacity. If the mental health treatment grant provides another case worker at WCS for mental health needs, the full program could go away. Eventually the mental health grant will also go away.

Dwyer said Waukesha County does not have public transportation throughout. Not everyone lives in the City of Waukesha with bus services. We need public outreach to build relationships to help with transportation. How do you connect with resources? Hiller said the Alcoholics Anonymous board will work to identify different meeting times and locations and work with people who can provide transportation.

Discussion of Hiring Process and Recruitment of New CJCC Coordinator

Regarding the recruitment of a new CJCC coordinator, Vrakas explained that he and Schuler were working with Norm Cummings and human resources. There is nothing new to report since the last CJCC Executive Committee meeting on April 8, 2008 but they will continue to move forward.

Davis asked Vrakas if he has developed a timeline? Vrakas said no.

Dwyer said this position is set to sunset at the end of this year so it will be virtually impossible to recruit someone at this point for a five-month position. Is the group willing to direct human resources to move forward to make this position permanent? We need to decide where we are going with this. It is up to Vrakas to consider all the options. Vrakas said he would do that.

Evenson asked how are we going to fill the gap? Schuler said Cyrulik sent out a memo before she left outlining who would take care of what tasks until we get back on track. Schuler plans to attend all subcommittee meeting to get up to speed and become better informed. Evenson explained that access to Cyrulik's electronic files and emails have been granted to other staff to help keep things running.

Discussion of 2008 Request for Proposals for CJCC Programming

Schuler said there is nothing new to report regarding the RFP for CJCC Programming. At the last meeting the group discussed options for writing the RFP including integrating programs. It will be hard to do. We could integrate the programs but we need a person who is thoroughly familiar with the programs to write the RFP.

Update on CJCC Report Development by Stratagem and Contracting for Services with Bob Gibson

Davis said Gibson is currently between contracts. If he is not hired this week, it will be too late to hire him. Schuler said he would call Gibson again when he returned to his office. Cyrulik and Gibson had discussed the prospect of Gibson working with Waukesha County.

Evenson said Stratagem met with IT staff last week to discuss reporting needs and available generic reports. The first batch of reports focuses on the jail and basic inmate information such as types of charges, legal status, length of stay, etc. Lyndsay Johnson gave input regarding types of data she needs. Michael Jon Murphy will research the data discrepancy between the data warehouse and Spillman before the data goes to the consultant.

Evenson said the consultants arrived earlier than expected to help Waukesha County develop Crystal Reports. The goal is to develop and distribute a packet of report descriptions to all players to insure that the data pulled fits all needs and to evaluate whether or not the system does what we need it to do. She is expecting another update from IT this week. Evenson recommended Gibson talking to Donn Hoffmann, the key staff person with the CCAP-Spillman interface.

Future Executive Committee Agenda Items

Davis said at the next meeting, the committee should address the following issues again:

- Discussion of Hiring Process and Recruitment of New CJCC Coordinator
- Discussion of 2008 Request for Proposals for CJCC Programming
- Update on CJCC Report Development by Stratagem and Contracting for Services with Bob Gibson

Dwyer suggested the next meeting be held after Vrakas secures more information on hiring the CJCC coordinator. Vrakas said he will notify Davis when he has made progress. Jicha will work with the group to schedule the next meeting. Davis suggested scheduling a meeting to coincide with the release date of the next draft of the Alcohol Treatment Court Implementation Evaluation.

Future CJCC Agenda Items

- Alcohol Treatment Court Implementation Evaluation
- Report on Progress of the Pretrial Screening Workgroup by Schimel.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Windy Jicha
County Board Office