

MINUTES
Community Justice Council
Executive Committee

Meeting of:

Wednesday, November 20, 2013

12:15pm-1:45pm

Location: Milwaukee County Courthouse, Room 609

PRESENT: Paul Bargren, Joel Plant, Jeff Kremers, Kit McNally, Mike Hafemann, Tom Reed, John Chisholm, Mallory O'Brien, Edith Hudson, Kevin Nyklewicz, Amber Moreen, Héctor Colón, Terry Perry, Rob Henken, Tom Barrett, Nate Holton

DISCUSSED ITEMS:

I. Convene and Updates (*John Chisholm*)

- Mallory O'Brien provided an update on the CJC Data Scorecard, a document that will be populated with data from various criminal justice agencies on a regular basis and will be presented to the Executive Committee at these monthly meetings. The scorecard is still in the developmental stage and it would be useful for the various agencies to provide feedback on their part of the scorecard to ensure that the data included is available and useful. The Committee discussed how their agencies generally have monthly data reports that already exist and that the scorecard could simply populate that agency's section with data from these reports.
- Tom Reed provided a review of the November 25th Public Health event that featured Joe McCannon. There was a good showing and a lot of ideas were raised as how to create a more coordinated response to public health and criminal justice issues that link different existing activities together in a strategic way. The event represents the beginning of a larger effort to generate effective collaboration.
- Milwaukee County Corporation Counsel Paul Bargren attended the meeting, introduced himself, and shared with the Committee his interest in collaborating with other system actors on the civil commitment issue. The Committee voted unanimously to add Paul Bargren to the Executive Committee.

II. Approval of the Minutes (*John Chisholm*)

- The Committee voted to approve the minutes.

III. Outcome-Based Budgeting, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Tracking Recidivism (*Rob Henken*)

- Rob Henken led a discussion on outcome-based budgeting, an alternative method of budgeting that links strategic objectives to budgets and constructs budgets based on objectives rather than based on functions. Milwaukee County has taken some steps to transition to outcome-based budgeting and the Public Policy Forum is willing to assist in furthering this initiative. The criminal justice system is fairly unique in the extent to which data and outcomes are captured. Outcomes-based budgeting presents an opportunity to marry the gains made under the evidence-based decisionmaking initiative with an ongoing focus on data-informed decisionmaking.

- The next step is to develop a method of measuring the criminal justice system's effectiveness. One important element is the ability to measure recidivism for individuals who go through the criminal justice system. The Committee engaged in a discussion on the complexity that comes with measuring recidivism. The goal is to develop several measurements for recidivism that are appropriate for different circumstances and present all of them on a regular basis in order to provide proper context. It is also important to take a longitudinal view of recidivism by examining how the various measures of it are changing over time.

IV. Coordinator Updates (*Nate Holton*)

- The CJC Executive Committee strategic planning will take place on Friday, February 21st from 1:00pm to 5:00pm. All Executive Committee members are asked to reserve the day for this important meeting.
- With the expansion of health insurance that will be coming when the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented, many individuals who go through the criminal justice system will be newly eligible for health insurance that will cover AODA and mental health treatment. Some of the system's smaller nonprofit providers of these sorts of services are concerned with their ability to bill Medicaid for covered services due to the administrative cost involved with Medicaid billing. The CJC is working with BHD and others to assist providers in navigating the new insurance landscape to help ensure that important services can be rightly covered by insurance.
- The CJC has a new intern, Carmella DeLucia, who will be working on community outreach and subcommittee staffing.
- Justice Point received a \$25,000 grant from the Greater Milwaukee Foundation to study municipal court case outcomes. They are currently working on obtaining data.

V. Adjourn



BEST PRACTICE

Budgeting for Results and Outcomes (2007) (BUDGET)

Background. The National Advisory Council on State and Local Budgeting (NACSLB) has identified four essential principles of effective budgeting. The specific principles include: (1) set broad goals to guide decisions, (2) develop strategies and financial policies, (3) design a budget supportive of strategies and goals and (4) focus on the necessity of continually evaluating a government's success at achieving the goals that it has set for itself (i.e., performance). The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) has officially adopted the recommendations of the NACSLB. GFOA also has issued separate recommended practices on strategic planning and performance measurement. All of these documents underscore GFOA's longstanding support of strategic planning and performance measurement as part of the budget process.

Consistent with the NACSLB principles, a growing number of governments use the budgeting for results and outcomes approach. Rather than starting with the prior period's budgeted programs and activities, they begin with available revenues, continue with a consideration of desired results and strategies, and then conclude by deciding what activities and programs can best achieve desired results.

This approach is a marked departure from the incrementalism often characteristic of budgeting. Budgeting for results and outcomes links strategic planning, long-range financial planning, performance measures, budgeting, and evaluation. It also links resources to objectives at the beginning of the budgetary process, so that the primary focus is on outcomes rather than organizational structure.

Recommendation. The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends that governments consider budgeting for results and outcomes as a practical way to achieve the NACSLB objective of integrating performance into the budgetary process. GFOA believes that the following steps should help a government in making this successful transition:

- (1) *Determine how much money is available.* The budget should be built on expected revenues. This would include base revenues, any new revenue sources, and the potential use of fund balance.
- (2) *Prioritize results.* The results or outcomes that matter most to citizens should be defined. Elected leaders should determine what programs are most important to their constituents.
- (3) *Allocate resources among high priority results.* The allocations should be made in a fair and objective manner.
- (4) *Conduct analysis to determine what strategies, programs, and activities will best achieve desired results.*
- (5) *Budget available dollars to the most significant programs and activities.* The objective is to maximize the benefit of the available resources.
- (6) *Set measures of annual progress, monitor, and close the feedback loop.* These measures should spell out the expected results and outcomes and how they will be measured.

(7) *Check what actually happened.* This involves using performance measures to compare actual versus budgeted results.

(8) *Communicate performance results.* Internal and external stakeholders should be informed of the results in an understandable format.

Budget professionals may play a number of roles in budgeting for results and outcomes, including the following:

- Facilitating government-wide results and analytic support.
- Providing "reality checks" on budget allocations and expected revenues in the light of adopted financial policies.
- Advising on allocations for administrative support functions, which provide necessary organizational infrastructure for achieving community goals, but do not typically emerge as high priorities on their own.
- Analyzing work product to evaluate the process of budgeting for results and outcome.
- Serving as an advocate for outcomes and the process in general rather than for any particular department.

Budgeting for results and outcomes is not just a one-year exercise, but also a multi-year effort that should improve the budget process.

References

- GFOA Best Practice, "Performance Management: Using Performance Measurement for Decision Making (2002) - Updated Performance Measures," 1994.
- GFOA Best Practice, "Recommended Budget Practices of the National Advisory Council on State and Local Budgeting (NACSLB)," 1998.
- GFOA Best Practice, "Adoption of Financial Policies," 2001.
- GFOA Best Practice, "Establishment of Strategic Plans," 2005.
- GFOA Best Practice, "Managed Competition as a Service Delivery Option," 2006.

Approved by the GFOA's Executive Board, March 2, 2007.

PRETRIAL SERVICES (2900) BUDGET

DEPT: Pretrial Services

UNIT NO. 2900
FUND: General - 0001

Budget Summary

Category	2012 Budget	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2014/2013 Variance
Expenditures					
Personnel Costs	\$113,802	\$122,116	\$120,104	\$124,918	\$4,814
Operation Costs	\$4,507,568	\$4,474,054	\$4,765,911	\$3,779,498	(\$986,413)
Debt & Depreciation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Interdept. Charges	\$366,036	\$181,775	\$185,649	\$373,866	\$188,217
Total Expenditures	\$4,987,406	\$4,777,945	\$5,071,664	\$4,278,282	(\$793,382)
Revenues					
Direct Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Intergov Revenue	\$653,462	\$762,377	\$598,101	\$542,378	(\$55,723)
Indirect Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues	\$653,462	\$762,377	\$598,101	\$542,378	(\$55,723)
Tax Levy	\$4,333,944	\$4,015,568	\$4,473,563	\$3,735,904	(\$737,659)
Personnel					
Full-Time Pos. (FTE)	1	1	1	1	0
Seas/Hourly/Pool Pos.	0	0	0	0	0
Overtime \$	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Department Mission: The mission of Milwaukee County Pretrial Services is to reduce pretrial failure to appear and re-arrest rates, enhance public safety, reduce overcrowding at the Milwaukee County Jail, and enhance the processing and adjudication of criminal cases.

Department Description: The Chief Judge and the Judicial Review Coordinator are responsible for operation, fiscal management and monitoring of all pretrial contracts, programs and program outcomes. In addition, the Pretrial Services Advisory Board will continue to meet to review program activity, outcomes and recommendations regarding program development and annual budgets.

PRETRIAL SERVICES (2900) BUDGET

DEPT: Pretrial Services

UNIT NO. 2900
FUND: General - 0001

Strategic Program Area 1: Pretrial Services

Service Provision: Discretionary

Strategic Outcome: Self-Sufficiency

What We Do: Activity Data			
Activity	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Budget
Activity Data is in the Process of Being Tracked			

How We Do It: Program Budget Summary					
Category	2012 Budget	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2014/2013 Var
Expenditures	\$4,987,406	\$4,777,945	\$5,071,664	\$4,278,282	(\$793,382)
Revenues	\$653,462	\$762,377	\$598,101	\$542,378	(\$55,723)
Tax Levy	\$4,333,944	\$4,015,568	\$4,473,563	\$3,735,904	(\$737,659)
FTE Positions		1	1	1	0

How Well We Do It: Performance Measures			
Performance Measure	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Budget
Performance Measures Have Been Created. Data is in the Process of Being Collected			

Strategic Implementation:

This Division is responsible for Pretrial services and universal screening which are funded in order to reduce unnecessary and costly jail bed utilization, reduce pretrial misconduct, and enhance the efficient operation of the Court System. The goals of the Department are to develop and implement dashboard reporting to demonstrate pretrial services program outcomes and impact of Universal Screening on the jail population and expand pretrial services and drug treatment court capacity by actively seeking state and federal grants, and cooperation with neighboring jurisdictions for program expansion.

Tax levy for 2014 is reduced by \$737,659 to \$3,735,904 from the \$4,473,563 in 2013. Personal Services expenditures are largely unchanged from the 2013 Adopted Budget with an increase of \$4,814 related to cost of living increase for the Judicial Review Coordinator position. Operating costs are reduced by \$986,413 due to the shifting of the Day Reporting Center administration and management to the House of Correction. All expenses and contracts correlated with the Day Reporting Center will now be in under the House of Correction. Total revenue is reduced by \$55,723 primarily due to the expiration of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Drug Grant in the amount of \$60,000 for 2014. Cross charges for various County Departments are increased by \$191,668, which includes a \$52,000 charge for the 2014 maintenance of the new Milwaukee County Pretrial Services Case Management System by IMSD, and an increase of \$93,290 for IMSD charges related to mainframe maintenance. The development process for the new Case Management System began in 2013 with surplus funds. This software system will allow for the Department to track activity and Performance Measure data, which they hope to provide in the 2015 budget.

PRETRIAL SERVICES (2900) BUDGET

DEPT: Pretrial Services

UNIT NO. 2900
FUND: General - 0001

The following contracts are included in the 2014 Budget in lieu of separate review and approval from the County Board during the fiscal year.

Contracts		
Description	Vendor	Amount
Universal Screening	JusticePoint	\$1,024,432
TAD Grant Operation	JusticePoint	\$371,200
Drug Treatment Court Coordinator	JusticePoint	\$91,820
OW/Scram Program	Wisconsin Community Services	\$427,574
Pre-Trial Drug Testing	Wisconsin Community Services	\$170,491
GPS Monitoring/Release Preparation	JusticePoint	\$1,692,256

Pretrial Services Budgeted Positions				
Title Code	2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2014/2013 Variance	Explanation
Judicial Rev Coord (Courts)	1	1	0	
TOTAL	1	1	0	

Legacy Health Care and Pension Expenditures				
2012 Budget	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2014/2013 Variance
\$0	\$14,497	\$7,417	\$17,805	\$10,388