

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2022

In attendance:

Rodney Brooks: Alameda County Public Defender's Office

Jean Moses: Interfaith Coalition for Justice in our Jails

Shahidah Williams: Office of County Supervisor Keith Carson

Janene Grigsby: Alameda County Probation Department

Nancy French: Alameda County Probation Department

Jenica Wilson: Alameda County Probation Department

Shawn Rowland: Our Road Prison Project

Veronica Rios-Reddick: Alameda County District Attorney's Office

Dr. Laura Chavez: Alameda County Probation Department

Joey Mason: Alameda County Probation Department

Charlie Eddy: Urban Strategies Council

Yvonne Jones: Alameda County Behavioral Health

A summary of the meeting activities is listed below:

The attendees agreed to meet virtually in accordance with AB 361.

The group reviewed and approved the minutes.

Dr. Chavez gave an update about the developing evaluation of Alameda County's AB 109 programs and services; below is a summary of her report and the discussion:

- Dr. Chavez is starting by collecting an inventory of the programs and activities that county departments provide for AB 109 clients, focusing on the services, capacity, budget, and AB 109 funds used to support the program or activity.

- The next step is the development of an RFP for Probation to hire a contractor to perform the evaluation.
- The question was raised if the RFP can be prioritized.
- It was noted that additional procurement staff has been added to Probation so it is expected that the RFP would be issued in a timely manner.

The group then engaged in a discussion about the possibility of expanding the eligibility and/or utilization of AB 109 services, which started with a report from a small sub-set of this Workgroup that examined the issue. A summary of the discussion and questions is listed below:

- The small group meeting started with Probation staff presenting an overview and candidly outlining some of their challenges, including working with their new Tyler data management system, keeping Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) updated on the current contracts to serve clients.
- The following questions were developed to guide the decision-making process about expansion or increased utilization of AB 109 services:
 - How many referrals are made by DPOs to community-based organizations?
 - How many referred clients end up enrolling in services?
 - How long do clients remain active?
 - What is our capacity to serve additional clients?
 - What is the utilization rate across the different services?
 - How many clients stay in the “referred” status for over 30 days? (Referred but not enrolled in services.)
 - What are the number of 290 clients referred to services?
- Responses to the questions are expected in May.
- In response to a question raised in the March meeting about budget related to the expansion of AB 109 eligible clients in Contra Costa, it was reported that Contra Costa spent \$28.2 Million in FY 20/21.
- The question was raised about the next steps and further consideration of expanding the definition of who is AB 109 eligible. The response was the answers to the questions listed above will support the decision. It was added the current level of funding only supports the current low utilization rates. In addition, many of the programs have wait lists, expanding eligibility would make those list longer; it is questionable that providers have the capacity to expand.
- It was suggested to add the question of how many people successfully complete the programs, and to collect information via focus groups, not just surveys. Probation staff accepted both suggestions.

The group engaged in a discussion about the potential involvement in the RFP process for selecting a contractor to perform the evaluation. A summary of the discussion is below:

- At the last meeting it was agreed to consult County Counsel about potential participation of the Process and Evaluation Workgroup in the RFP process.
- Counsel noted:
 - People on the Workgroup may eventually apply for the contract to evaluate the AB 109 services, which would create a conflict.
 - Anyone can be involved in the high-level discussion about objectives of the contracts, when discussion moves to the specifics of scope of work etc. then the potential for conflict arises.
 - County Counsel agreed to review the groups proposed participation in the RFP process and provide guidance.
- Suggested ways the group may participate are:
 - Recommending what we would like to see, not dictate outcomes.
 - We may want to suggest information to be gathered and then request report outs while the vendor is under contract.
 - Asking the evaluation to look at engagement, retention, and how the contractors address this issue.
 - Many service providers may not want to collect data but can provide useful input in developing the RFP.
 - Let Counsel know who we want to consult with, and have that entity agree not to apply for the proposed contract.
 - Consider the data we are already asking people to collect.

There was a brief status update on the implementation of the updated Agenda Item Request Form (AIR) which was initially developed by the Process and Evaluation Workgroup.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 AM.