

## Process and Evaluation Workgroup

### Meeting Minutes

April 5, 2023

In attendance:

- **Rodney Brooks**, Alameda County Public Defenders Office
- **Janene Grigsby**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Jean Moses**, The Interfaith Coalition for Justice in our Jails
- **Ayana Cruz**, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
- **Jasmine Quinn**, East Oakland Community Project
- **Jason Sjoberg**, Alameda County District Attorneys Office
- **Gina Temporal**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Adrienne Chambers**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Nancy French**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Shahidah Williams**, Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson's Office
- **Charles Turner**, Alameda County Workforce Development Board
- **Shawn Rowland**, Our Road Prison Project
- **Alex Garcia**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Naseem Badiey**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Charlie Eddy**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Karen Chin**, The Justice Reinvestment Coalition
- **Darryl Stewart**, Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley's Office

The minutes from the March meeting were adopted, it was noted that "Shadeequa" was misspelled.

A summary of the discussion about developing and implementing a quality-of-life survey for probation clients is below.

- While not definitive, it was highly questionable that the proposed quality of life surveys could be kept anonymous if they were housed in Enterprise, Probation's case management system.

- It was suggested to add a mental health question to the proposed survey.
- The group engaged in a discussion about the purpose of the survey, it was concluded it was important to understand how clients felt about the way they were treated by a service provider and if services received had a negative or positive impact on their lives.
- Meeting attendees talked about the challenges of having Probation staff conduct the proposed quality of life survey.
- It was suggested to add a survey question about food security.
- The challenge of probation doing the survey led to the question of how they could conduct the survey pre and post receiving services and maintain a clients' anonymity.
- It was suggested the "pre" portion of the survey should take place while clients are still incarcerated.
- Probation staff explained their employment program has been revamped and the new service provider (the contract award is not public) will do a quality-of-life assessment which most likely will include many of the proposed questions raised by the Workgroup.
- It was agreed that members of the Workgroup need to meet with the vendor who will implement the newly designed employment program to see how our questions can be integrated into their work.

In prior meetings it was suggested that the Workgroup hold some focus groups to see how effective the quality-of-life questions are for the individuals we plan to survey. A summary of the discussion about focus groups is below.

- The survey responses can be anonymous to the probation staff but known to the community-based provider who administers the survey.
- It was ultimately decided it would be ineffective for Workgroup members to conduct the focus groups, since much of the material will be covered by a new community-based organization who will provide employment services. In addition, the procurement process will only allow Workgroup members to meet with the vendor after they have been awarded the contract.
- It was agreed to make the suggested changes to the quality-of-life survey before meeting with the community-based organization who will implement the newly designed employment program.
- There was some discussion about continuing the conversation around expanding the eligibility requirements to receive AB 109 services. Meeting attendees agreed to continue the discussion when the Justice Reinvestment Coalition can present a proposal outlining their plans for implementation; and the Probation department can present updated utilization data.

The meeting adjourned at 11:54.