**Process and Evaluation Workgroup**

**Meeting Minutes**

**February 5th, 2020**

**In attendance:**

**Rodney Brooks:** Alameda County Public Defender’s Office

**Joey Mason:** Alameda County Probation Department

**Rashad Eady:** Alameda County Behavioral Health

**Sophia Lai:** Alameda County Behavioral Health

**Bob Britton:** Faith in Action East Bay (FIAEB) Live Free

**Neola Crosby:** Alameda County Probation Department

The meeting started with brief introductions.

Rodney then provided a brief update on the Board of Supervisors’ progress in developing a streamlined process for connecting recently released Santa Rita Jail inmates with Medi-Cal, a summary of the update is below:

Essentially there are three categories of individuals:

* + - * People who are in Santa Rita for less than 30 days, their Medi-Cal is not suspended, therefore no action is required.
			* Individuals who are in for more than 30 days; the County plans to either have Social Services staff work with inmates pre-release to fill out the Medi-Cal applications or contract with a CBO to do that work.
			* For people with determinant sentences, Social Services will turn on Medi-Cal the month clients are released.

Next there was a discussion about the advocacy to get the Sheriff Office to amend their policy regarding entry into Santa Rita Jail for people with prior criminal justice involvement.

Rodney gave a brief update on the proposed presentation to the Public Protection Committee outlining the challenges formally incarcerated individuals who work for community-based organizations with county contracts have gaining entrance into Santa Rita jail to do their work.

* **Neola:** A major problem is requiring people list all their convictions.
* **Joey:** Listing prior convictions can be overwhelming.
* **Neola:** It would be helpful to have some people experiencing this problem attending the meeting.
* **Neola:** AB 2138 is a recently chaptered bill, allowing people with records to receive licenses does not require the individual to list all their prior convictions.
* **Neola:** Are we going to bring this issue to the CCP-EC?
* **Rodney:** It may be appropriate to do so after the Presentation to the Public Protection Committee, since the Committee asked for an update on the issue.

Workgroup Members then had a brief discussion on potential issues to address in the future. Three issues were raised at the January meeting: Providing Assistance to the Community Advisory Board (CAB); Developing a Process for Assessing AB 109 Contracts; Developing a Data Analysis Process to Support recommendations to the Fiscal and Procurement Working Group.

A summary of the discussion is listed below:

**Assisting the CAB:**

* + - **Neola:** They (The CAB) were supposed to have a Board retreat – County Counsel has given them a Brown Act training; they need to learn how to run a meeting. Collectively they could use some training in building an agenda and other issues.
		- **Rodney:** If someone tells them to do something, they will respond? The original idea was to allow for an independent Board yet, it is questionable if they understand how to use their position appropriately. Maybe they should be asked how they see this issue and how they want to address it?
		- **Bob:** We need to connect with Board staff.
		- **Neola:** Carson and Miley’s staff have been attending. CAB has stated they want to change their by-laws
		- **Rodney:** How about we draft a list of challenges facing the CAB as we see it and some suggestions for moving forward.
		- **Sophia:** Can we assist in shaping their agenda?
		- **Neola:** I already work with them to revise their agendas to conform with Brown Act. An additional issue they have is time management during meetings.
		- **Joey:** I like Rodney’s idea of holding them to their guidelines, helping them set professional boundaries, and educating them before coming up with an agenda item, a lot of time is spent and they often have no knowledge of what they’re talking about.
		- **Rodney**: I would like everyone review the CAB Guidelines and come to the next meeting with a list of ideas.

**Developing a process for assessing the AB 109 contracts:**

* + - **Neola:** Chief Still has hired people to address this issue. I can request that the appropriate staff come to the next meeting and give us an update on their work activities.

**Developing a data analysis process to support recommendations to the Fiscal and Procurement workgroup:**

* + - **Neola:** Chief Still has also hired people to do this.
		- **Rodney:** Would Probation be willing to have the appropriate staff come to our next meeting and make a presentation on this issue?
		- **Neola:** this might be premature. The Chief has prioritized pro-stat – look at outcomes of units, services. There are approximately 61 things to do with research

**Next Steps:**

* + Everyone reviews CAB by-laws and agendas to suggest areas of improvement.
	+ Neola will follow up with Chief to determine whether research staff can present at March meeting