**ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

March 18, 2019 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor, Rooms 226-228, Oakland

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Present:**

Wendy Still

Colleen Chawla

Nancy O’Malley

Jeff Tudor

Martin Neideffer (for Rich Lucia)

Rodney Brooks (for Brendon Woods)

Gavin O’Neill (for Judge Wynne Carvill)

**Guests**:

Ardavan Davaran

Bede Anunne

Charlie Eddy

Christy Henzi

Darryl Stewart

David Onek

Donald Frazier

Douglas Butler

Eric Von Geldern

Gina Temporal

Jeannette Rodriguez

Jon Fajardo

Lisa Abernathy

Neola Crosby

Nicole Gardner

Scott Blake

Shahidah Lacy

Sophia Lai

Tamia Brown

Tim Smith

Youseef Elias

LaLisha Norton (Recorder)

**Call to Order and Introductions:** Chief Still called the meeting to order.

**Public Comment** **on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only”**: No public comment.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Meeting minutes from February 4, 2019, were reviewed and approved as written.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Community Advisory Board (CAB) Update**

Douglas Butler provided an update regarding the CAB. New member Donald “DC” Barlow has joined the CAB and represents District 1. The CAB currently has five vacancies. The CAB is still discussing the terminology used to reference “formerly incarcerated”. Mr. Butler spoke with a few individuals at San Quentin who were ambivalent regarding the title.

**Resource Development Associate Presentations (RDA)**

1. **Final AB 109 Process Evaluation Report (action)**

***Action Item*** *- Colleen Chawla made the motion to accept the RDA* [*AB 109 Process Evaluation Report*](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567)*. The motion was second by Jeff Tudor and unanimously approved.*

1. **AB 109 Client Overview and Outcomes Analysis Plan Presentation - Ardavan Davaran & David Onek**

Ardavan provided a brief overview of the next component of their evaluation, which is an update to the 2017 report that was completed regarding an overview of the population. In 2017, RDA was unable to obtain the outcome data needed for the recidivism component of the analysis. For the 2019 report, the data is being evaluated and will be included.

Ardavan advised that the analysis outlined in the Plan is contingent upon data availability, quality, and sample size. RDA will continue to work with CCPEC partners to identify alternative or proxy measures for analysis and to refine the measures as necessary. Populations included are PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, and formal probation with and without a conviction for an 1170(h) offense. The reporting period encompasses October 2011 – December 2018. The report has three components:

1. Sentencing and Population Summary
2. Service Delivery and Outcomes
3. Recidivism Outcomes

Chief Still asked for more clarification regarding the sentencing and population summary. Ardavan noted that, to the extent possible, RDA will analyze all cases involving an 1170 offense since the beginning of realignment to determine the sentencing outcomes, the probation population over time, the average daily population, and the Sheriff’s Office population over time. For the Sheriff’s Office, RDA will analyze data for individuals on parole, PRCS, probation revocations, bookings, and bed-nights in jail, if the data is available. As it pertains to supervision, RDA will analyze the probation population over time using a hierarchy to determine the shifting population, since the beginning of the County’s realignment efforts. They will examine how the case types changed over time and what percentage of the population are realigned to obtain a descriptive overview of the County’s realignment and formal probation population, along with demographic data. They will also analyze crime trends for Alameda County. Chief Still inquired if RDA will analyze commitments before and after realignment. Ardavan confirmed that they will, if the data is available.

Chief Still emphasized that, as it pertains to local and state prison sentences, it is very important to look at our performance as a County in terms of not only the total numbers in local jails and prisons but also the types of cases. It was suggested that Neola assist with the information gathering efforts from Santa Rita Jail (SRJ), because some of the data was previously provided for the County’s Annual Realignment Report.

The second portion of the report will focus on service delivery, outcomes and recidivism. RDA will be gathering and analyzing data pertaining to programmatic outcomes from all partners. The focus will be on programs that receive AB 109 funding; however, the analysis can be expanded to include non-contracted service providers that have a high number of realignment individuals accessing their programs. Chief Still stated that it is important to look at any services being accessed by our clients. Ardavan stated that it would be nearly impossible to track all the programs that everyone is participating in and that the criteria must be confined in some way and the easiest way is to track programs that are funded specifically with AB 109 dollars. If there are additional services that are critical to the analysis, those programs can be added. Colleen noted that BHCS data should be included, which was confirmed by Ardavan. Tara asked if data from the Five Keys contract with the Sherriff’s Office should be included. Ardavan indicated that this data can be further discussed, since it may be non-AB 109 clients. Ardavan explained the three analytic techniques that would be utilized (Descriptive Statistics, Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis) and how they complement each other.

Charlie Eddy asked if Ardavan wasaware of any state-mandated evaluations and if any evaluations are being done in other counties using common techniques that can be used to compare and contrast with the work that is being done in Alameda County. Ardavan stated that RDA has completed realignment evaluations in Contra Costa, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz counties. To his knowledge, there is not a state- mandated reporting requirement regarding outcomes.

To access the complete power point presentation, click on: [AB 109 Client Overview and Outcome Analysis](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567)

**Workgroup Updates**

1. **Programs and Services – Neola Crosby**

The Programs and Services Workgroup meeting is a monthly meeting that occurs the fourth Thursday of every month. At the last meeting in February, a great deal of time was spent on a presentation from the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS), which is an area that greatly impacts our clients. DCSS did an amazing job providing information regarding their services. The next meeting will take place on March 28, 2019. The entire meeting will be devoted to determining the gaps in our reentry service system. Outreach will be conducted to ensure that clients are present and included in the discussion, along with service providers. Chief Still requested that Neola schedule some listening sessions, as it has been about three years since the last round.

1. **Fiscal and Procurement – Wendy Still/Nancy O’Malley**
2. **Employment Contract Increase of $1,681,000**

Chief Still noted that the scope of services for the new employment contract is currently being developed. The goal is to have the new employment contract finalized by the end of the year. In the interim, the current contract will need to be extended until June 30, 2020, to ensure continuity of services between the current and new provider. These funds will allow services to continue without any gaps for the client and to allow clients to reach their benchmarks with the current provider, BOSS, until the new contract is in place.It was noted that the CAB had reviewed the request and signed the [Agenda Item Request](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567) form.

***Action Item*** *- Rodney Brooks made the motion to increase the employment contract in the amount of* $1,681,000,*in order to extend services through June 30, 2020. The motion was second by Eric Von Geldern and passed unanimously.*

Chief Still noted that the Kinship Reentry Workforce item listed on the [Allocation Revision 3-15-19](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567) spreadsheet was not being overlooked and that it would be discussed at the next meeting. Charlie Eddy and Valerie Edwards will present the scope of the project and, once the presentation is made, the CCPEC will evaluate the funding amount. Currently, $250,000 is a place holder. Charlie mentioned that the next CCPEC meeting is two months away and was concerned that the remaining approximately $8 million of the FY 18/19 CBO portion of funding has not been allocated. Chief Still indicated that she plans to have all the funds allocated by the end of the fiscal year, and if necessary, the CCPEC would hold a special meeting.

1. **Process and Evaluation – Brendon Woods**

Rodney Brooks noted that the Workgroup has been discussing the challenges that individuals face with having their medi-cal activated as they leave SRJ. This has been a long-standing issue and the Workgroup is looking at substantive steps that can be taken, along with recommendations. Chief Still inquired if this is something that we consider funding through a third-party service provider or develop a scope of service so that we have benefit eligibility workers to assist with the process. Rodney noted that there have been challenges with the County providing this service and hiring a third party may be the way to proceed, but more discussion is required. It was noted that California law only allows County eligibility workers employed by Social Services Agency (SSA) to activate medi-cal benefits. Non-SSA staff can handle other parts in the process, such as gathering information, but they will not be able to activate someone’s benefits. Chief Still indicated that perhaps Rodney and Neola’s Workgroups could work together to put forth some recommendations.

Rodney indicated that the Workgroup has met with the Sheriff’s Office to discuss their policies regarding clearances for formerly incarcerated people entering SRJ. They are looking at two major categories: 1) formerly incarcerated that want to enter and; 2) formerly incarcerated that are working under a County-awarded contract that stipulates that they enter SRJ. The Workgroup has had ongoing meetings with the Sheriff’s Office over the last four months and hopefully by April, will receive thoughts, responses, recommendations, and adjustments to the policy from the Sherriff’s Office.

1. **Data and Information Management – Nancy O’Malley**

Eric Von Geldern noted that the successful collaboration with County ITD to identify the 1170(h) population continues. Statewide data sharing between counties is still an obstacle and Eric is looking for suggestions. The District Attorney’s office is working with Behavioral Health to determine which data can be shared that will help them with their goals, understanding that there may not be reciprocity because of limitations. Eric emphasized that the data conversations focusing on AB 109 has had a positive impact on all partners, resulting in increased collaboration, cooperation and problem-solving. Chief Still suggested that the CCPEC invite the Silicon Valley Data Consortium to present on their efforts relating to data sharing. Colleen suggested that the Social Health Information Data Exchange be invited to present, as well.

**Adult Reentry Strategic Plan – Recidivism Sub-Committee**

Neola referred to the [Vision Statement & Guiding Principles](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/VisionStatement&GuidingPrinciples.pdf) , an excerpt from the[*Adult Re-Entry Strategic Plan*](http://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/ReEntryStrategicPlan-BoardApproved3-11-14.pdf). The Vision Statement defines the population for reentry, as follows: “All people who have had contact with the criminal justice system living in Alameda County will live a healthy, safe and productive life with positive support systems.” In 2013, there was national data that stated 1 in 4 individuals have had contact with the criminal justice system. Current research states that 1 in 3 have had contact with the criminal justice system. The reentry population is therefore, not limited to realignment; it addresses the broader population of reentry. There are four major goals in the Plan:

1. Recidivism Reduction;
2. Providing High Quality, Comprehensive, Wrap-Around Services. There are several sub-committees meeting to update the performance measures and strategies in the various categories. Neola invited everyone to attend the sub-committees and provided the following upcoming meeting schedule [CCP SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567);
3. Developing a network of well-coordinated systems of services; and
4. Accountability, Transparency, Fiscal and Performance Outcomes.

Regarding recidivism reduction, Neola referred to the [Strategic Plan At-A-Glance](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567) spreadsheet which details the performance measures and strategies that are in the current Plan. Recidivism in the Plan focuses on those who did not re-offend. At the time the Plan was developed, the state had not yet issued a statewide definition of recidivism. The state’s definition wasn’t disseminated until November 2014, after the Reentry Plan had already been approved by the Board. Neola provided the [BSCC Recidivism Definition](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=8&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.567) which helps the state standardize the conversation and definition of recidivism. Since FY 16/17, the County has been using the BSCC definition of recidivism, in addition to other benchmarks, that include: violations of probation filed by Probation or the District Attorney (DA); convictions; the percent of people who recidivate while on probation; and those who terminate probation and recidivate within a year of that termination.

In regard to Performance Measure (PM) 1, Chief Still asked why the time intervals for the percent of target population on probation without new convictions is being tracked at 1-year, 18-months, and 3-years. Why 18-months? If the county used the standard benchmarks of 1-year, 2-years, and 3-years, we would be able to make similar comparisons with other jurisdictions. Neola noted that the Plan is a living, breathing document and we can modify the benchmarks.

Questions and Responses

* ***Question***: The definition of recidivism in this document differs from the BSCC. Is there any thought of updating the definition? ***Response:*** The CCPEC can take action to define recidivism in accordance with the BSCC definition.
* ***Question:*** Could we not just change the definition and then anything within the performance measure would use that definition. ***Response (Rodney)***: Just to provide greater clarity as to why folks wanted to track recidivism at 18 months and to use other definitions that may not be in alignment with the BSCC definition: a) there wasn’t a BSCC definition at the time; and b) there was an opportunity to see the various subsets of recidivism and to determine what may trigger people into services. The prevailing thought was that if a blanket recidivism definition was used, we would not be able to effectively peel away the layers of what’s happening to our population and what kind of assessments could be made. Chief Still stated that she would support being consistent with the BSCC definition, but she would also be supportive of all the other categories and suggested that we add two years to the one year and three years already included to be comparable with benchmarks used by others.

In regard to PM3, Neola expressed concern regarding capturing crime rates “in communities with high concentrations of formerly incarcerated residents”. Chief Still noted that there is no data source that she is aware of that provides recidivism rates for formerly incarcerated individuals. After a robust discussion, it was decided to delete “(minimally 40%) of formerly incarcerated residents”.

PM4 - Chief Still asked for clarification on the wording “percent of target population.” Neola advised that this term is used in a broad context to represent multiple populations that can later be drilled down to a specific/targeted group.

PM5 - It was noted that only the Probation Department can arrest for a technical violation. It was recommended that a separate performance measure be created specific to new violations filed by the District Attorney.

PM6 – Chief Still stated that Probation would be the data source for early terminations and PRCS, and that the clean slate program would be the data source for the petitions filed by clients, which should be added to PM6.

Neola noted that there are eight strategies to accomplish the aforementioned performance measures. For Strategy 1, Chief Still asked that PRCS’s be included as a bulleted item under target population. Strategy 4 should include skyping into CDCR. Neola noted that the Pathway Home Project is a collaboration between Probation and CDCR that begins pre-release programming at least 18-months prior to release and includes conducting assessments and determining needed services. Neola suggested that a presentation regarding the Pathway Home Project may be helpful.

Strategy 5 - Develop in-custody transitional plans for target population. Some individuals in SRJ have transitional plans but more is needed to ensure the number of clients with transitional plans increases. Chief Still mentioned that there are other nuances associated with this strategy that will need to be reviewed and defined.

Strategy 7 - Provide gender responsive services and supports to the female target population. Chief Still noted that $1 million has been allocated for female services.

Neola will provide a revised spreadsheet for approval at the next meeting. She noted that the upcoming CCP meeting is July 24, 2019, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**Next Meeting - May 20, 2019 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM**

Probation Department, 1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor (Rooms 226-228), Oakland CA. 94607

**Public comment on any item not listed on the Agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Committee**

None