**Process and Evaluation Workgroup**

**Meeting Minutes**

**June 3, 2020**

**In attendance:**

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

**Shauna Conner:** Alameda County Probation Department

**Neola Crosby:** Alameda County Probation Department

**Joey Mason:** Alameda County Probation Department

**Timothy Smith:** Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency

**Donald Frazier:** Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency

**Kathryn McGrath:** Alameda County Probation Department

**Darryl Stewart:** Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley’s Office

**Shahidah Lacy:** Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson’s Office

**Sophia Lai:** Alameda County Behavioral Health

**Jean Moses:** Faith in Action

**Charlie Eddy:** Urban Strategies & Faith in Action

The meeting started with a review of the issue the group has been addressing, updating the Sheriff’s clearance policy and aiding the Community Advisory Board (CAB), a summary of what was said is listed below.

**Updates on Sheriff’s Clearance Policy:**

* + - The Sheriff has now posted the policy the clearance on their website.
		- The Sheriff has new appeal process and has posted also it on the website.
	+ Sheriff staff communicated to the Chris Miley of Supervisor Valle’s that they will commit to reviewing all applications within 2 weeks and asked if that would be sufficie­­­­­­nt? This proposal is not sufficient since it still does not ­­identify organizations that have contracts with County Departments. In response, the Sheriff is considering adding a box that allows the applicant to state they have a contract with a County agency that requires them to enter the jail.

**A summary of the group discussion about the proposed changes to the Sheriff’s policy is listed below:**

* + - Questions were raised as to why the Sheriff is still requesting applicants to list all their convictions.
		- The Sheriff states this is an honesty test.
		- Group members stated asking for all convictions is more of a memory test. A memory test would make it really challenging and easy to fail.
		- Chris Miley agreed to update the Workgroup on his continued discussion with the Sheriff.

**Update on Assisting the CAB**

A summary of what some community members have said about the CAB’s shortcomings are listed below:

* + - CAB Members ar­­­­e too close to government systems and are disconnected from formerly incarcerated people.
		- Perhaps formerly incarcerated people active in the community should sit down and meet with CAB members to inform them on what’s happening.
		- CAB is not relevant.
		- CAB members don’t reflect the formerly incarcerated segment of the community they represent. Often CAB members have served longer sentences compared to AB 109 who tend to serve shorter terms.
		- CAB members don’t understand how government works and are confused by the process; often they don’t know processes; and don’t understand the issues related to funding.
		- Implement refresher trainings in addition to the initial orientation; CAB members aren’t really reading the orientation documents.

Group Members discussed other challenges related to the CAB and suggestions to assist the body.

* County Counsel will start attending every month. The CAB members defer to them a bit, and so their addition to the meeting will be helpful.
* Perhaps we can borrow material from the curriculum in the Alameda County Citizens Academy that introduces the residents to the structure and operations of the County.
* It would be helpful if the appropriate County Departments provide information about their activities and funding.
* The Probation Strategic Plan addresses some of these issues.
* Department presentations have been done however, breaking it out each month may make it less overwhelming.
* Every department could present on their AB 109, contracts, a little background and have them build on it each meeting?
* Each Board of Supervisors member could engage their CAB members.
* There should be more connection to BOS member since many wants that.
* Do they have access to Fiscal & Procurement?
* Should we consultant another organization in addition to what county is doing?
* This has been discussed earlier the question becomes who will provide this? Who will pay for this?

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 PM