

Funding Distribution

To adequately explain how allotted funding was distributed and how the Community Corrections Division arrived at its recommendations to be presented to JRAC and IDOC Commissioner, Bruce Lemmon.

Factors Contributing to Funding Recommendations

- Total amount available
- Collaboration Plan – prioritization on a score from 2 - 0
- Readiness to start
- The existing ability to increase capacity
- Funding Formula
- Grant score – address target population; meeting the program targets; and development, implementation, and/or use of EBP.
- The exclusion of disqualifiers
- Prioritization of needs

Funding Formula

The primary goal of the funding formula is to objectively disburse the additional \$5 million to assist county agencies as they experience an increase in felony level 6 offenders. The main variable indicator is the Community Corrections Grant Application Score, which allows the State to incentivize positive evidence-based practices/programs. In a nut shell, if the county scores favorably, they will be rewarded as such; if the county did not score very well, they will still receive additional funding; it just won't be as much. This method allows the counties to influence their funding amount through their performance, and is expected to foster continuous improvement.

Key Aspects of the Formula:

- Incentivizes positive performance
- Sensitive to size differential between counties
- Can account for changes in State funding levels
- Can account for adjustments to county agency populations served
- All money is distributed

Automatic Disqualifiers

- Supplanting of funds for existing staff
- Request for "luxury" items, i.e. vehicles, vehicle supplies, office supplies, furniture, etc.
- Over time compensation
- Staff raises

HEA1006 Funding Analysis

60 Total Applications

\$17,428,587.00 in requests

- \$13,463,744.03 total Community Corrections requests
- \$3,401,530.84 total Probation Requests
- \$28,000 total Prosecutor's Diversion Requests
- \$535,312.35 total Court Recidivism Reduction Program Requests

County Totals

Total Available Funds: \$5,000,000

68% or 41 Counties that requested funding were granted

32% or 19 Counties were not funded

Community Corrections

98% (59) Community Corrections agencies requested funding (Figure includes unified counties) totaling \$13,778,257.03 in requests.

60% (35) of the Applications that requested Community Corrections Funding were recommended to be funded.

Recommendation total: \$3,741,001.00 or 28% of total Community Corrections requests.

Probation

58% (35) of the submitted applications requested Probation Funding (Figure includes unified counties). Total Request: \$3,477,233.34

40% (14) of the applications that requested Probation Funding were recommended to be funded.

Recommendation total: \$846,313.00 or 24% of total Probation requests.

Court Recidivism Reduction Programs (CRRP)

10% (6) of the submitted Applications requested Court Recidivism Reduction Programs Funding totaling \$535,312.35 in requests

33% (2) of the Applications that requested Court Recidivism Reduction Programs

Recommendation total: \$386,434.00 or 72% of total CRRP requests.

Prosecutor's Diversion

1.5% (1) of the submitted applications requested Prosecutor's Diversion Funding totaling \$28,000 in requests.

0% (0) of the applications that requested Prosecutor's Diversion Funding was recommended to be funded.

Services

- Was there a detailed identification of duplications in service or a detailed description of complementary/coordinated services rendered
- Was there an action plan that was measurable and time bound
- Was there a detailed description of goals and objectives
- Eligibility Criteria
 - Was the criteria listed (Description of target population served)
 - Are IRAS risk scores considered when determining eligibility for appropriate placement

Program Targets

- Eligibility Criteria (See above)
- Was there a clear and defined description of the promotion of services and materials available to the target population regardless of referral source
- Examples: Drug Testing Supplies; Program Resources

Supervision

- Was the Intervention section detailed and understandable
- Was it clear there is or will be transparency between two agencies
 - Can the case manager get the PSI
 - Access to case plans, progress reports, offender financials, drug screening results

Graduated Sanctions & Incentives

- Were there graduated sanction details listed for each department
- Was there a detailed plan to include time bound measurable goals and objectives
- Was there accompanying information
- Was there a detailed description of incentive programs for offenders

Internal Operations

- Is there a detailed description of shared resources
 - Both internal resources and resources available to the offender
 - Examples: Training, Incentives, Staff, etc.
- If resources are not currently being shared, is there a detailed plan implementing resource sharing
- Is there a detailed description of how each agency will be part of the intake process
 - Example: Completion of assessments, approval process

Quality Assurance

- Were there measurable items stating how it will be determined if and when collaboration goals are met
- Was a Quality Assurance Policy and/or Continuous Improvement Plan Included
 - If not, was there a detailed plan to develop a CQI Plan
 - Was the plan time bound and measurable
- Is there a plan to have regular collaboration meetings

Other Considerations

- Did the plan conform to the expected definition of Collaboration
 - *"To work jointly as a unit to achieve a common goal"*
- Was the Program Sheet Included
- Was the contact information for the Collaboration Heads in each agency listed
- Were key stakeholders listed
- Did the plan show accountability
- Was the plan easy to read/understand (spelling and grammar)
- Was there any other supporting documentation

Grant Scoring Matrix FY 16 Amendment

Agency: _____

Application Date Received: _____

Total Score

Summary Sheet

Advisory Board Approval Letter	
County Executive(s) Approval Letter	
Grant Application	
Detailed Budget	
Collaboration Plan	
Collaboration Plan Program Spreadsheet	

Completed Section for Grant Assistance

Amount

Community Corrections	
Probation	
Prosecutor's Diversion	
Court Recidivism Reduction	

Section I: Community Corrections

Does the section focus on meeting the needs of the Target Population ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Unknown <input type="checkbox"/>	Point <input type="text"/>	1
How many individuals within the Target Population will be served with this funding?	<input type="text"/>				
Will these funds be used to expand or begin new Program Targets ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>			1
List the programs to be supported by these funds:	<input type="text"/>				
	<input type="text"/>				
	<input type="text"/>				
Based on the written information, is the agency currently adhering to and utilizing Evidence Based Practices ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>			
If not currently utilizing Evidence Based Practices , does the agency have a written plan to implement Evidence Based Practices ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Are the items below addressed in the grant?	Yes	No	Comments:		
Assess Risk/Need	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Enhance Intrinsic Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Case Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Skill Train with Directed Practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Rewards and Positive Reinforcements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Engage On-Going Support in Natural Communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Quality Assurance Measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Quality Assurance Feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Does the agency conduct field visits/employment checks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Does the agency adhere to a policy of graduated sanctions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Does the agency supervise offenders based on risk?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Were all appropriate sections completed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	1
				Total Section Score	<input type="text"/>

Assessments/Monitoring

Does the agency utilize the IRAS risk/needs assessment?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the agency conduct a follow-up and/or discharge IRAS assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the agency conduct specialized assessments or refer clients for specialized assessments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Treatment/Services/Programs

Do the resources address the specific criminogenic risk/needs as identified on the IRAS?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Did the applicant clearly identify the specific programs offered by the provider?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Scoring Key	
2 Points	Agency currently utilizes, detailed information
1 Point	Agency provided plan to utilize or minimal information
0 Points	Agency did not address