



AB109 Funded Programs and Services in Alameda County

In 2015, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors approved the annual allocation of AB109 funding in alignment with the California Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011. The allocation included a directive that 50% of the funds were to be designated for government services and 50% were to be allocated to community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide programs and services to justice involved clients in Alameda County. Programs and services are administered by Alameda County government agencies and CBOs. To establish the effectiveness of all AB109 funded activities, the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee will ensure that programs and services funded by AB109 to serve the realigned population will have a plan and a process for the periodic evaluation of those programs and services. An inventory of AB109 funded programs and services is included in Appendix A¹.

Evaluation Plan

The scope of this evaluation plan will include all programs and services funded through AB109 that provide direct services to the “realigned population” of justice-involved clients in Alameda County, including those administered by government agencies and CBOs. The evaluation will be conducted in two phases:

Phase I – Baseline Inventory and Preliminary Data Collection

Since the implementation of AB109 in Alameda County, three significant initiatives have provided some baseline inventory of AB109 funded programs and preliminary data collection and program evaluation work: Results First, an initiative of the California State Association of Counties (CSAC); AB109 Overview and Outcomes Report, conducted by Resource Development Associates (RDA); and the Pathways Capacity Enhancement (PaCE) Project led by researchers at George Mason University. Together, these three initiatives have laid a groundwork for the prioritization of local evaluations of each of Alameda County’s AB109 funded programs.

Building on this groundwork, Phase 1 of the Evaluation Plan will involve 1) finalizing the County’s inventory of AB109 funded activities, 2) collecting standardized data across organizations and agencies regarding each program and agency’s implementation of AB109 funded activities, and 3) assessing the evaluation-readiness of each CBO and County agency in order to determine the final cost and timeline for Phase II.

From January 2019 through January 2020 Alameda County agencies, led by ACPD, created an inventory and assessment of programs designed to serve justice-involved clients across the entire criminal justice spectrum as part of the Alameda County Results First initiative. This inventory included 61 programs including 22 that were funded in whole or part by AB109. Detailed information for each program was included in the inventory for FY2018/2019 which contained a description of the program, target population and number of clients served, program expenditures, criminogenic needs addressed, and the program’s rating per the research studies available in the Results First Clearinghouse Database (the Clearinghouse)². Alameda County Probation was tasked by the Board of Supervisors with maintaining the inventory on behalf of the County going forward.

¹ This list may not be exhaustive at present, pending the proposed Phase 1 inventory and data collection activities.

² <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2015/results-first-clearinghouse-database>



The Clearinghouse compiles information derived from research studies nationwide to determine an overall program rating (highest rated, second-highest rated, mixed effects, no effects, or negative effects) based on the studies' methodological rigor and findings. A review of whether existing AB109 funded programs are included in the Clearinghouse is displayed in Appendix A, but many are not included, as numerous programs are too new or innovative to have a robust evidence base yet. In addition, only a local evaluation can determine whether the Alameda County programs are administered with fidelity to those evidence-based programs found in the Clearinghouse.

ACPD also enlisted Resource Development Associates (RDA) to assess the impact of AB109 funded initiatives and Behavioral Health Care programs and services on the County's AB109 clients, covering the period of October 1, 2011 through December 31, 2018. The RDA evaluation included an assessment of the percentage of clients who recidivated; clients' probation violations; a comparison of the time between convictions for people who received AB109 funded services and those who did not; and the impact on recidivism for clients who received mental health and substance use services. A short executive summary of the RDA evaluation is included in Appendix E. However, this evaluation did not assess the impact or effectiveness of individual AB109 funded programs on clients' outcomes.

Finally, ACPD initiated a partnership with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence (GMU ACE!) titled the Pathways Capacity Enhancement (PaCE) Project to assess services provided by AB109 funded providers using a Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Simulation Tool which examines the level and dosage of services, adoption of evidence-based practices, implementation issues, and provides a rating of each program regarding quality and fidelity. The RNR Simulation Tool analysis identifies critical gaps between program availability and population needs. Once these gaps have been identified, GMU will lead a Justice Leadership Academy for CBOs that provides training over a six-month period on evidence-based practices and program quality improvement. This training will bolster CBOs evaluation-readiness by focusing on areas including using and interpreting research for continuous program improvement.

The Results First Clearinghouse, RDA evaluation, and Pathways Capacity Enhancement (PaCE) Project will be used to guide the prioritization and timing of the rollout of the AB109 local evaluation plan. It is important to note that very few of Alameda County's AB109 programs and services have been evaluated locally, but local evaluations are imperative given the unique characteristics of the Bay Area, in order to account for the Bay Area's ethnic diversity, cost of living, specific program fidelity, and other unique characteristics.

Confirming the list of programs administered by the County's government agencies and CBOs and updating the inventory of AB109 programs will be completed in Phase I of this plan, along with current preliminary data collection for all CBO and government programs. The preliminary data collection will determine each agency and CBO's evaluation-readiness and will include identifying for each program:

- ❖ Theories of change;
- ❖ Implementation timelines;
- ❖ Total spending to date;
- ❖ Applicable performance measures (e.g., anticipated number of clients to be served);
- ❖ Service frequency/duration/dosage, associated evidence-based practices), and;
- ❖ An assessment of data availability and quality.

The Phase I baseline inventory and preliminary data collection will begin January 2022 and be completed by June 2022, at which point the Phase II evaluation implementation will begin. A draft of the Phase II



evaluation timelines are included in Appendix B and C, and a glossary of terms is included in Appendix D.

Phase II – Evaluation Implementation

Robust data collection will be conducted for each program category to establish a baseline for ongoing program evaluation and monitoring. The evaluation and monitoring will utilize a Results Based Accountability (RBA) approach, which examines three basic questions:

- A. The quantity of services provided (“How much did we do?”)
- B. The quality of services provided (“How well did we do it?”)
- C. The impact on the target population (“Is anyone better off?”)

In addition, the evaluation will have a focus on racial equity, examining if AB109 resources have been allocated disproportionately to people of color to ameliorate the historically racist practices in the criminal justice system. Finally, the evaluation will determine if the services are tailored to address specific issues of race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and other social inequalities.

The evaluations will include the following components:

What Did We Do?

- Program/Service description including a list of all service providers; a theory of change depicting how the program/service is intended to improve client outcomes; a logic model describing the resources and methods employed, objectives, and intended outputs; a description of the intended client population; and a description of services provided

How Well Did We Do It?

- Historic implementation summary including a timeline of implementation and challenges and successes that may have impacted implementation
- Descriptive statistics quantifying the numbers of services provided and clients served as well as adherence to applicable performance parameters and fidelity to evidence-based practice standards

Is Anyone Better Off?

- Descriptive statistics and quantitative data analysis, where appropriate, to examine the impact of program participation on client outcomes (e.g., successful/unsuccessful program completion, successful/unsuccessful completion of probation, new convictions, and probation revocations).
- Qualitative data analysis examining the experiences of clients, service providers, and justice professionals impacted by the program or service

Approach

1. **CBO Services** - the majority of CBO services are provided through contracts managed by Probation, which collects monthly data on performance measures, utilization, etc. Therefore, to evaluate these CBO services, staff from ACPD’s Research and Evaluation Unit will use the data being captured to develop reports that include quantitative analysis with the support of partnering County agencies and CBOs. To ensure an impartial analysis is done, external evaluation consultants will be secured to conduct the qualitative data collection and analysis, the results of which will be included in the final evaluation.
2. **County Agency Services** - an external evaluation consultant will be contracted to conduct the evaluation of Alameda County government agencies’ programs.



A cost amounting to up to 2% of the overall yearly Realignment Allocation can be allocated for the proposed evaluations. After the three-year implementation of Phase II is completed, the evaluation cost can be revisited in order to establish an ongoing evaluation fund. The Probation Department expects to conduct approximately four quantitative evaluations per year coupled with four qualitative evaluations by an external research firm, and an external research firm will complete two mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) evaluations of county agency AB109 programs each year. Reports conducted each year would be packaged into a final deliverable report to be submitted for CCPEC approval in June 2023 (Group A), June 2024 (Group B), and June 2025 (Group C).

Reporting and Deliverables

Reporting and deliverables will include a timeline, detailed evaluation plan individualized for each program area, and comprehensive final evaluation report with a presentation of findings to the Realignment Workgroups and CCPEC.

Following the proposed 3-year evaluation cycle, the process will begin again in order to evaluate new programs that come online during this evaluation timeframe and to establish a process wherein AB109 funded programs are evaluated every 3 years.



APPENDIX A

Draft Program Inventory of Alameda County AB109 Funded Programs and Services

Program	Lead Agency	In Results First Clearinghouse Database	Program Model Rating	Local Evaluation
211 Reentry Services	Probation	No	No	No
Adult Education	Probation	No	No	No
Career Technical Education	Probation	What Works for Health	Highest Rated	No
Case Management (MH/SUD/Dual Diagnosis)	ACBH	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Center of Reentry Excellence (CORE)	Probation	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Clean Slate Project	Public Defender	No	No	No
Community Capacity Fund	Probation	No	No	Yes ³
District Attorney's Office Staffing	DA	No	No	No
Early Intervention Court	DA	No	No	No

³ The Community Capacity Fund evaluation is currently in progress by Impact Justice. Final report due June 2022.



Program	Lead Agency	In Results First Clearinghouse Database	Program Model Rating	Local Evaluation
Electronic Monitoring	Probation	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Embedded Clinicians	ACBH	No	No	No
Employment	Probation	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Family Reunification	Probation	No	No	No
FUBU (Peer Support)	Probation	No	No	No
Higher Education	Probation	No	No	No
Homeless and Caring Court	Public Defender	No	No	No
Housing	Probation	What Works for Health	Second/Highest Rated	No
In Custody Career Training	Sheriff	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Innovations in Reentry	ACBH	No	No	Yes ⁴
Justice Restoration Project	DA	No	No	Yes ⁵
Mental Health and Substance Abuse and Mild to Moderate Mental Health	ACBH	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Mentor Diversion Court	DA	No	No	No
Misdemeanor Pretrial Diversion	DA	No	No	No

⁴ The Innovations in Reentry Evaluation Summary Report was published May 2021 by the Bridging Group.

⁵ The Justice Restoration Project evaluation is in progress by WestEd. Final report due March 31, 2022.



Program	Lead Agency	In Results First Clearinghouse Database	Program Model Rating	Local Evaluation
Operation My Home Town (OMHT)	Sheriff	No	No	Yes ⁶
Parenting and Learning for Success, Responsible Fatherhood, and MOMS (to be included with Family Reunification)	Probation	National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices	Highest Rated	No
Partners for Justice	Public Defender	No	No	No
Probation Supervision for Realigned Clients	Probation	No	No	No
Propositions 47 and 64 Resentencing Programs	DA/Public Defender	No	No	No
Public Defender's Office Staffing	Public Defender	No	No	No
Recovery Residence/Transitional Housing Facility	ACBH	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Sex Offender Treatment	Probation	Crimesolutions.gov	Second Highest Rated	No
Sheriff's Department Staffing and Jail Operations	Sheriff	No	No	No
Social Work Program	Public Defender	No	Yes	No
Transportation for Reentry Services	Probation	No	No	No
Veteran's Treatment Court and Military Diversion	DA	No	No	No

⁶ The OMHT Evaluation (2011-2015) was published by Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates (n.d.) online at <https://www.alamedacountysheriff.org/home/showpublisheddocument/36/637527093276300000>



APPENDIX B

Draft Evaluation Timeline Overview for CBOs

	Phase II Begin Date	Phase II Deliverable
GROUP A	July 2022	June 2023
Adult Education		
Family Reunification		
FUBU (Peer Mentoring)		
Transportation for Reentry Services		
GROUP B	July 2023	June 2024
211		
CORE		
Employment		
Higher Education		
GROUP C	July 2024	June 2025
CTE		
Housing		
Sex Offender Treatment		



APPENDIX C

Draft Evaluation Timeline Overview for County Agencies

	Phase II Begin Date	Phase II Deliverable
GROUP A	July 2022	June 2023
Probation		
Sheriff's Department		
GROUP B	July 2023	June 2024
Public Defender's Office		
District Attorney's Office		
GROUP C	July 2024	June 2025
Community Development Agency		
Behavioral Health		



APPENDIX D

Glossary of Terms

AB109

Assembly Bill 109 (AB109), known as realignment, is a measure passed by California voters in 2011 that diverts defendants convicted of less serious felonies to serve their time in local county jail rather than state prison. Realignment does not apply to more serious felonies, violent felonies, or major sex crimes.

Clearinghouse

A criminal justice research clearinghouse compiles studies of programs and interventions and rates them according to the evidence and research regarding the effectiveness for use by practitioners.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics summarize information from a sample or population.

Fidelity

The degree of exactness with which something is copied or reproduced. A program has a high degree of fidelity if it is implemented very closely to what was originally intended by its designers.

Logic Model

Logic models are hypothesized descriptions of the chain of causes and effects leading to an outcome of interest. While they can be in a narrative form, logic models usually take form in a graphical depiction of the relationships between the various program elements leading to the outcome.

Recidivism

Recidivism refers to a person's relapse into criminal behavior (measured as either a new arrest or conviction within a specific timeframe), often after the person receives sanctions or undergoes intervention for a previous crime.

Results Based Accountability

Results-Based Accountability (RBA) is a framework that was developed by Mark Friedman of the Fiscal Policies Studies Institute. It is a disciplined way of thinking and taking action that can be used to improve quality of life in communities, cities, counties, states, and nations, as well as to improve the performance of programs.

Theory of Change

A theory of change is essentially a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The tools of qualitative research include interviewing, participant observation, and focus groups. Data analysis in qualitative research includes systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, observation notes, or other non-textual materials that the researcher accumulates to increase the understanding of the phenomenon. The process of analyzing qualitative data then involves coding or categorizing the data, identifying themes, and exploring contextual meaning. This method is used for cases with a small sample size or in which nuanced and contextual understanding is needed.



Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis is a technique that uses mathematical and statistical modeling, measurement, and research to understand behavior. Quantitative analysts represent a given reality in terms of a numerical value. Quantitative researchers typically use complex software to analyze large datasets.

DRAFT

Appendix E

AB109 Evaluation Executive Summary

Overview: Resource Development Associates (RDA) conducted an evaluation of Alameda County's implementation of AB109, focusing on receipt of AB109-funded services and recidivism for individuals under probation for a felony offense. In Alameda County, the realigned population consists of individuals under Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS), individuals charged and/or resolved with an 1170(h)-eligible offense, and individuals who violate state parole.

Methodology: Recidivism was examined in 2 Probation Cohorts, defined as the conviction of a new felony or misdemeanor committed within three years of release from custody or within three years of placement on supervision for a previous criminal conviction. Cohort 1 includes new probation case starts between October 1, 2011 and December 31, 2014. Cohort 2 includes all individuals with new probation case starts between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2018. Analyses of AB109-funded services focus on Cohort 2 since prior to 2015 there were fewer AB109-funded services available.

Probation and Jail Population Trends: Since Realignment, the number of individuals under probation supervision has decreased from 9,818 individuals in the last quarter of 2011 to 8,236 in the last quarter of 2018. AB109-funded services tend to target higher risk groups such as PRCS clients. The average daily jail population and average length of stay for felony offenses have decreased since the start of Realignment. A greater proportion of jail bookings are for misdemeanor offenses rather than felonies.

Revocation and Recidivism Outcomes for Individuals on Probation: A revocation occurs when the court finds that an individual has violated the conditions of probation, MS, or PRCS. At that point, the probation term is paused or stopped, and the individual can be issued a sanction. Probation is typically reinstated following a revocation, sometimes with additional supervision time or new conditions, although it can also be terminated. Probation revocation rates have increased over time; 28% of Probation Cohort 1 were revoked compared to 41% of Cohort 2. For Cohort 1, a greater proportion of PRCS clients were revoked, while for Cohort 2 revocation rates across caseload types were similar. Since Realignment, jail bookings for probation violations have increased over time although the average lengths of stay for these violations have declined. Probation Cohort 2 had slightly lower recidivism rates (38%) than Cohort 1 (40%). From 2015 to 2018, one-year recidivism rates dropped from 21% for individuals who started probation in 2015 to 14% for individuals who started in 2018. Individuals with SMI, SUD, and co-occurring disorders recidivated at higher rates, as did individuals under PRCS, those with more extensive and serious criminal histories, and younger individuals. Men and women had similar recidivism rates.

Impact of AB109-Funded and Behavioral Health Services on Recidivism: Overall, individuals who received AB109-funded services were less likely to recidivate and recidivated at a slower rate than individuals who did not receive these services. Individuals diagnosed with SMI or SUD who received ACBH services were less likely to recidivate and recidivated at a slower rate than individuals who did not receive those services. For Cohort 2, 27% of probation clients had a diagnosis of SMI, SUD, or co-occurring diagnoses. 19% of these clients received AB-109 funded services. Those who received AB109-funded services were 33% less likely to recidivate with a new criminal offense within 3 years than individuals who did not receive these services. Engaging in mental health services reduced the predicted probability of being convicted of a new offense within three years from 61% to 37% for clients with SMI. Similarly, engaging in SUD services reduced the predicted probability of a new criminal conviction from 56% to 39% for individuals with a SUD diagnosis.