

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

July 5, 2023

In attendance:

- **Rodney Brooks**, Alameda County Public Defenders Office
- **Janene Grigsby**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Gina Temporal**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Jenica Wilson**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Jason Sjoberg**, Alameda County District Attorneys Office
- **Nancy French**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Shawn Rowland**, Our Road Prison Project
- **Karen Chin**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Alexa Young**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Charlie Eddy**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Shadeequa Smith**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Elena Wang**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Jean Moses**, Interfaith Coalition for Justice in our Jails
- **Adrienne Chambers**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Alex Garcia**, Alameda County Probation Department

The June minutes were reviewed and approved with one revision, “require” will be changed to “request” in reference to new service providers meeting with the Process and Evaluation Workgroup.

The July meeting attendees introduced themselves.

The June meeting ended with meeting attendees outlining the data points, (questions & answers) they would like Probation staff to present regularly. Probation staff determined which data points could and could not be provided based on the data currently collected. A summary of the discussion is below.

Does the data show how many eligible probation clients are participating in programming and how many are not participating in programming?

- Yes, but we should caution against coming to conclusions about why people are not participating in programming. For example, clients may feel the current array of programs doesn't meet their needs. The department has little information on people who are not accessing probation services.

Can the data provide more detail about clients engaged in programs, i.e., race, or level of probation supervision?

In addition, meeting participants also asked if data is collected about:

Level of education; popularity about individual programs; the age of the clients and other demographic information; what data do we already have; how far are clients traveling to receive services; and client work history.

- Probation staff agreed that the level of education should be tracked, data shows education is linked to successful reentry.
- Employment providers are required to assess educational attainment; it is not standardized so currently probation staff would need to extract the education level of each client from the assessment performed by the appropriate service provider.
- As it relates to travel, Probation contracts with organizations that are accessible by public transportation; some people choose programming that is not close to their residence.

The group reviewed a copy of Probation's most recent data report to identify what information they would like to receive regularly. A summary is below.

Additional Data to be received regularly:

- How we are serving people under different levels of supervision, for example are people on Mandatory Supervision more or less likely to utilize probation services than a client under general supervision.
- People who are in the collaborative courts and are receiving AB 109 services.

Data to be eliminated:

- No data was identified to be eliminated.

How many probation clients start programs and are retained in programs?

- Probation can provide this information in aggregate or at the individual vendor level and will provide both moving forward.

Can the data show how many people are involved in one program?

- Probation will do this and will assess the possibility of providing more specificity. For example, how many people under Mandatory Supervision are enrolled in at least one program compared to how many individuals under general supervision are enrolled in at least one program.

In the June Meeting the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee Workgroup Outlines, which lists the activities and objectives for the Process and Evaluation Workgroup were discussed. The Workgroup took time to assess how the Process and Evaluation Workgroup accomplishments are aligned with the initial activities and objectives and provided initial thoughts about how to move forward. The summary of the discussion is below.

- The Process and Evaluation Workgroup should receive regular status reports on Medi-Cal enrollment for Santa Rita inmates.
- There should be a meeting with the Programs and Services Workgroup to decide how to address the overlay of their assigned responsibilities.
- Can we assess which processes are working, which are not working and provide proposed changes. (How to define what is working and what is not working will be difficult.)
- How can the Workgroup measure success of the realignment programs?
- Can we assess barriers faced by clients.
- Can the Workgroup define success for clients?
- As realignment has evolved, the population is broader and the current goals don't reflect that, nor do they account for the current goals of the Community Corrections Partners Executive Committee (CCP-EC).
- The Workgroup should provide recommendations to the CCP-EC (instead of being guided by the CCP-EC) since the Workgroup may identify issues that have not been recognized by the Executive Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:58.