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Learning Objectives

By attending this webinar, participants should be able to:

- Describe how performance measurement fits into program design, operation, and sustainability
- Understand how the National Center’s performance measures were developed and how implementation of these measures works for mental health courts
- Identify factors for selecting appropriate performance measures for your program
MHC Data Collection Framework

- **WHY** collect data?
- **WHAT** data should we collect?
- **HOW** should we collect data?

Reporting, Evaluation, Performance Measurement
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MHC Data Collection Framework

WHY collect data?

WHAT data should we collect?

HOW should we collect data?

Reporting, Analysis (Evaluation, Performance Measurement)

Additional resources:

• Webinars: Data for Mental Health Court Practitioners Parts 1 & 2
• A Guide to Collecting Mental Health Court Outcome Data
• Justice Center MHC Data Collection Tool
Performance Measures:
Widely used in government as tools for management and accountability

Process Evaluations:
Is the program operating as intended in terms of population served and tracking of information?

Outcome Evaluations:
Are program goals being achieved?

Cost-Benefit Analysis:
Are the costs of properly operating the program offset by virtue of reduced costs to the criminal justice and mental health systems?
# A Quick Comparison of Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Who Does It</th>
<th>Expertise Level</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>Must be able to identify measures and collect data</td>
<td>Regularly (quarterly, semiannually, or annually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Evaluation</td>
<td>Team member and/or evaluator</td>
<td>Often helpful to have research expertise</td>
<td>After program in operation for at least 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluator or researcher rec’d</td>
<td>Research expertise very helpful for selecting appropriate control groups</td>
<td>After program in operation for at least one full term (based on max. program duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>Evaluator or researcher rec’d</td>
<td>Doing this “right” involves heavy statistics</td>
<td>At significant stage in program’s life (as anticipating new funding, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Polling Questions

1. Are you currently collecting performance measure data?

2. Approximately how many participants are currently enrolled in your program?

3. Has your program been evaluated?
1. Tools designed to better manage and effectively administer MHCs.

2. Assist with making policy decisions about how to address MH issues within the criminal justice system

3. Inclusive of the key issues that address the purpose of MHCs (both criminal justice and mental health needs) while balancing the need to be *inclusive* of all key domains.

4. *Performance measures* will be clearly distinguished from *process* and *outcome/impact evaluation measures*.
Unlike Outcome and Impact evaluations, performance measurement is not concerned with questions of “attribution”

Performance Measures
- Carefully chosen set of indicators of performance in critical areas of functioning
- “Dashboard” Analogy
- Provide performance information in a timely and ongoing basis
- Reflect program objectives
• Basic concept of performance measurement involves:

1. Plan and meet established operating goals/standards for intended outcomes
2. Detect deviations from planned levels of performance
3. Restore performance to the planned levels or achieving new levels of performance
1. Extensive review of literature

2. Convened panel of PM and MHC experts for advice and review

3. Pilot-tested measures at four sites
   - County of Orange, CA
   - York County, PA
   - Monroe County, NY
   - Washington, DC
Participant Accountability

1. **In-Program Reoffending** - % of each exit cohort who were arrested during the time they participated and were formally charged.

2. **Attendance at Scheduled Judicial Status Hearings** - % of scheduled status hearings attended by participants.

3. **Attendance at Scheduled Therapeutic Sessions** - % of scheduled therapeutic sessions attended by participants.
4. **Living Arrangement** - Change in living arrangement that occurs during participation:

- % of participants who changed from **Homeless** to **Not Homeless**
5. Retention – % of participants who successfully complete the program.

6. Time from Arrest to Referral – Length of time between a participant’s arrest and referral to mental health court.

7. Time from Referral to Admission – Length of time between the referral to mental health court and when the participant was accepted into the program.

8. Total time in program - Length of time between a participant’s admission into the mental health court and permanent exit.
9. **Team Collaboration** – % of time *information* relevant for discussion at the pre-docket meeting is available to the MHC team.

10. **Agency Collaboration** – % of time that a MHC representative was notified within 24 and 48 hours that a participant in the program was arrested.
11. Need-Based Treatment and Supervision - % of participants who receive the highest/lowest level of services and supervision and whether those are the same participants who are designated as having the highest/lowest needs.
Procedural Fairness

12. **Participant-Level of Satisfaction** – % of participants who agree that the MHC processes were fair, expressed in a 5-question survey:

a. The way my case was handled was fair.
b. The judge listened to my side of the story before he or she made a decision.
c. The judge had the information necessary to make good decisions about my case.
d. I was treated the same as everyone else.
e. I was treated respectfully during my time in MHC.
13. Participant Preparation for Transition – % of correct responses by participant identifying sources of assistance to be used after exiting the program.

*Sources:*

a. Housing  
b. Medication  
c. Mental Health Symptoms  
d. Medical Problems  
e. Substance Abuse (if applicable)

14. Post-Program Recidivism – % of participants who reoffended within 2 years of exiting the MHC.
Cohort Size = 18

Percent of exiting participants with arrest during participation
- 39%

Percent reoffending, by Type of
- Successful Completion: 14%
- Withdrew While in Compliance: 33%
- Discharged: 50%
- Transferred to Another Treatment Court: 50%
- Failed to Complete: 75%

Of those reoffending, Type of Offense:
- Felony: 43%
- Misdemeanor: 29%
- Ordinance Violation/Summary Offense: 14%
- Violation of Probation: 14%
## Data Graphics Template

### Measure 11: Need-Based Treatment and Supervision
**Individualized and Appropriate Treatment**

### Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Quadrant</th>
<th>Supervision Contacts Per Quarter</th>
<th>Units of Service Per Quarter</th>
<th>Supervision Score</th>
<th>Service Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Williams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille Miller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Anderson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micky Michaels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim James</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lawrence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Thomas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Phillips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josey Joseph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Roberts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Williams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Johns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scored as a “1” if Participant data is above the Average.
### Results

#### Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Number of Participants (N)</th>
<th>Average Units</th>
<th>% of Participants Above the Average</th>
<th>Average Units</th>
<th>% of Participants Above the Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Low CR/Low FI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Low CR/High FI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = High CR/Low FI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = High CR/High FI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supervision and Service Contacts By RNR Quadrant

- **Supervision Contacts**
- **Service Contacts**

- **1 = Low CR/Low FI**
  - Supervision: 25%
  - Service: 25%

- **2 = Low CR/High FI**
  - Supervision: 50%
  - Service: 50%

- **3 = High CR/Low FI**
  - Supervision: 75%
  - Service: 75%

- **4 = High CR/High FI**
  - Supervision: 100%
  - Service: 100%
Sampling in High Volume Courts: Post-exit surveys, depending on the volume of exiting participants, can be administered to all participants exiting the program, or by selecting a random sample of those who exit the program. The court can sample in a variety of ways to ensure randomness. One technique is to sample by selected time frames (e.g., every Tuesday for a month, followed by every Wednesday for the following month). Another technique is to select every $n^{th}$ participant. This can be done by identifying the participant number.

Agency Interaction

- Sharing Information is **vital** to the data collection process

During evaluation, health care staff obtain a waiver from participant for sharing information

- Individuals are discussed in the pre-court staffing:
  - by name / by issues / by needs

Data are collected and input immediately after Court session

- No need for future requests for data from collaborative partners
- No need to backtrack for data – information is fresh and more complete
- Data collection should be simple and take little time
Additional Questions?

Please contact:

Fred Cheesman II, Ph.D
757-259-1511
fcheesman@ncsc.org

Nicole L. Waters, Ph.D
757-259-1574
nwaters@ncsc.org

800-616-6109
National Center for State Courts

www.ncsc.org/mhcpm
What is a “mental health court”?

- Planning & Administration
- Target Population
- Timely Participant Identification and Linkage to Services
- Terms of Participation
- Informed Choice
- Treatment Supports and Services
- Confidentiality
- Court Team
- Monitoring Adherence to Court Requirements
- Sustainability

Design decisions for each element

Are there emerging standards for mental health courts in your state?
What sort of MHC “performance” to measure?

Performance Measures for Grants

MHC Performance Measures

Performance Measures for your Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health Systems

Performance Measures for Government
Resources

- *Mental Health Court Performance Measures* available online at: [www.ncsc.org/mhcpm](http://www.ncsc.org/mhcpm)


The webinar recording and PowerPoint presentation will be available on [www.consensusproject.org](http://www.consensusproject.org) within a few days.
Local Programs Database: [http://consensusproject.org/programs_start](http://consensusproject.org/programs_start)

Discussion Forum: [http://consensusproject.org/forums/1](http://consensusproject.org/forums/1)
Thank You

Questions? Comments?

Please contact:
Hallie Fader-Towe
Hfader@csg.org

www.consensusproject.org
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