

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

January 8, 2025

In attendance:

- **Rodney Brooks**, Alameda County Public Defenders
- **Gina Temporal**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Denise Moody**, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
- **Jason Sjoberg**, Office of the Alameda County District Attorney
- **Joey Mason**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Esther Lemus**, Alameda County District Attorney
- **Bobby Evans Jr.**, Student, San Francisco State University
- **Jade Carter**, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
- **Karen Chin**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Keisha Willard**, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
- **Mas Morimoto**, Office of the Alameda County District Attorney
- **Rezsine Gonzalez**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Charlie Eddy**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Annette Briscoe**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Dr. Maisha Scott**, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
- **Janica Wilson**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Alex Garcia**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Janene Grigsby**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Jane Kimmins-Freeman**, Office of County Supervisor David Haubert
- **Tunisia Owens**, The Urban Strategies Council
- **Jerry Law**, From the Cage to the Stage

The meeting started with the participants introducing themselves and stating their level of understanding about Participatory Action Research (PAR). Explanations were provided about the purpose of the workgroup and how PAR works.

The group reviewed the December meeting minutes which included a presentation about a Participatory Action Research project in preparation for the meeting discussion.

The minutes were voted on and approved.

It was explained that if the Probation department were to engage in a participatory action research project, they would contract with a qualified research organization.

An initial presentation was made by Probation staff outlining the procurement process. The goal was to clarify the parameters of what could be discussed without disqualifying meeting participants from engaging in a competitive bidding process due to an unfair advantage gained by being a part of this discussion.

A summary of the discussion is below:

- The current discussion about a Participatory Action Research project would be considered part of the “Research and Planning Stage”
- Moving forward would require the execution of a fair competitive bidding process.
- If they are to move forward, Probation would conduct a series of focus groups, with stakeholders, probation staff etc.
- Next, the issue would go before the Programs and Services Workgroup to allow for community input, the meetings are monitored to ensure that too much information is not discussed, thus disqualifying the meeting participants.
- The next step would be the creation of a logic model, which shows what Probation is trying to achieve with the PAR project without disclosing too much procurement information. The logic model is shared with the Community Advisory Board, the Fiscal and Procurement Committee and finally, the Executive Committee where a decision would be made to allocate the funding for the contract.
- Then the Scope of Work creation begins. The Scope of Work development can’t happen at this meeting without disqualifying the organizations who have representatives in attendance.
- Concepts can be discussed, but elements of the actual Scope of Work cannot.
- More detailed discussions about the Scope of Work take place with the appropriate probation staff. The Program Design team develops specifications, and the Scope of Work is drafted and given to Probation’s contract team. Individuals who participate in the internal Scope of Work discussions are not allowed to sit on the selection committee which evaluates the applications.
- After receiving the Scope of Work and the Program Design, the Procurement Team develops the actual request for proposals, fields questions from the perspective applicants, holds bidders conferences, evaluates the applications and then seeks Board of Supervisors approval to award the contract.
- The kickoff meeting with the successful bidder is next to discuss expectations and metrics for monitoring the contract.
- Probation conducts a research phase, which includes the types of discussion we are having today. If the conversation moves into the scope of work realm, people who are in the discussion are disqualified from participation. For similar reasons, the “concept mapping” can’t happen in this meeting either.

- The General Services Agency who handles many county procurements doesn't like what is discussed in any of the Workgroups; County Counsel has confirmed that the meeting process does not violate the procurement process. As a result of the differences of opinion, Probation does their procurement internally. Thus, Probation was able to enlist someone with lived experience as a member of a recent contract selection committee.
- If I attend the Process and Evaluation Workgroup as a member of a coalition, does my member organization become at risk? **Answer:** Yes.
- The logic model is important, because it looks at the question, what is the goal, without discussing the Scope of Work.
- So, are we to assume based on the discussion that we want to do this kind of project? **Answer:** The discussion today is to decide if within the parameters laid out by Probation, can we identify, what is the "question" to be answered, which pathway to go with the PAR.
- If that is agreed upon, the next step would be to go to the Programs and Services Workgroup.
- The group could recommend how the results of the research will be used – but there is no guarantee that the recommendation will be implemented.
- Since Participatory Action Research allows the researchers to develop the question, the Workgroup should not develop the overall question.
- The assumption is if the process moves forward, the County will execute a contract with a third party, probation will own the results of the research.
- The results could be used as the basis of an evaluation process if the Chief of Probation agrees to do so.
- For example, could we say we would like to focus on engagement, why clients choose to engage in a probation sponsored program – that would work.
- The next step would be to have a logic model discussion at the Programs and Services meeting. It is best to have the discussion there, since that is the established process, if we deviate from the process, someone could file a protest questioning that irregularity.
- The presentation about Participatory Action Research in December talked about how people feel empowered after the project.

The discussion moved to exploring issues which could be part of a proposed PAR project:

- Engagement in the Probation Programs
- Do people feel self-sufficient after completing a probation program?
- What is your plan for sustaining yourself 10-15 years after the program is completed?
- What additional job training do you need after completing the probation or parole program?
- Clients have different levels of understanding; how can a program effectively assist individuals with different levels of competency?
- People who have a more advanced level of competence still need assistance, i.e. job support. What was labeled as "sufficient" does not sustain you in the world today.
- When trying to bridge the gap between the resources you acquire after completing a re-entry plan and the resources needed to truly sustain yourself is where a mentor can assist.

- The majority of housing resources are targeted toward people with mental health or drug addiction issues.
- While incarcerated, your life is “programed”, everything is structured, once you are released, you are required to make your own decisions.
- There is the need to create a business that hires people with lived experience and provides the structure for people who have been incarcerated for a long time.
- It is important to make connections and develop a support network.
- Getting into transitional housing when you exit a probation program provides a slow transition and the support you need when you return to communities.
- Work on developing a career, not a job.
- People returning to communities have challenges obtaining essential documents – and the material needed to obtain the essential documents. Therefore, it can be helpful to have people stand in line with you at the DMV and other places.

The next presentation was about the updated configuration of the Community Corrections Partnership Workgroup. A summary of the discussion is below:

- The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) supports re-entry in a broader sense, the universe is larger than AB 109 service recipients. For example, the CCP supports family members of people who are returning home, or people who are no longer under supervision etc.
- The initial configuration of the CCP subcommittees was large; the county and community infrastructure were insufficient to support the work so probation engaged in a process to streamline the subcommittees.
- The CCP was created to develop a plan for individuals who went in and out of incarceration.
- Alameda County developed a Community Advisory Board, two of their members sit on the CCP. The CCP is required to develop a plan to make re-entry work better in Alameda County. The plan goes to the CCP Executive Committee, which decides how to fund the plan.
- The original CCP Subcommittees were:
 - Community and Civic Engagement
 - Education
 - Family Reunification
 - Housing
 - Mental Health
 - Primary Care/Physical Care
 - Substance Abuse
 - Workforce Development

- Many of the Workgroups had integrated issues. Attending all the meetings would have taken 26 hours a month, making it hard for community members to attend and get the information about the county programs and practices.
- In addition, the Community Corrections Partnership had four Workgroups:
 - Fiscal and Procurement
 - Process and Evaluation
 - Data and Information
 - Programs and Services
- The Programs and Services; and Fiscal and Procurement Workgroups now meet on alternating months, and the Process and Evaluation Workgroup will continue to meet monthly.
- Probation has hired a research organization to assess the department's needs related to Data and Information.
- The eight CCP Subcommittees are now collapsed into two, the Generational Health Subcommittee and the Generational Wealth Subcommittee.
- To be successful we need to look at what we are doing as a community to prevent people from coming into the system. The two Subcommittees will have three operating principals: Prevention, Intervention and Innovation.
- In addition, Probation is developing an Ad Hoc Committee to review and potentially revise the mission and vision of the CCP which was developed over a decade ago.
- The two Subcommittees align with the County's Vision 2026 goals of Healthcare for All and Eliminate Poverty and Hunger.
- The Generational Health and Generational Wealth Subcommittees will meet on alternate months.
- So, there will be one CCP Subcommittee meeting per month and two CCP EC Workgroup meetings per month.
- How does the implementation of the original County Re-Entry Strategic plan fit into the reorganization? **Answer:** The plans had objectives, but they did not list who is responsible or time frames for completion. In addition, the state requires that the County submit a new CCP plan every year which requires counties to state what progress has been made on objectives outlined in previous years. So, the question now being posed to the heads of the Subcommittees is: What do you want to accomplish in the next year and the next few years?
- Will the revamped plan go to the Board of Supervisors? **Answer:** We had not planned on it, the revamp is in the yearly plan which the Board signed off on.
- With the revamp, what is the purpose of the joint meetings between the CCP and the CCP EC? **Answer:** To bridge the disconnect between the people doing the work in the Subcommittees and the decision makers.

- Will the joint meetings be a place to look at the progress of the revised structure. **Answer:** Yes.

The next steps in the development of a Participatory Action Research Project will be a conversation with Probation about how to move forward.

New commers were invited to come to the February 5th Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02