

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

November 3, 2021

In attendance:

Rodney Brooks: Alameda County Public Defender's Office

Janene Grigsby: Alameda County Probation Department

Nancy French: Alameda County Probation Department

Shawn Rowland: Re-Entry Private Practitioner

Shauna Conner: Alameda County Probation Department

Veronica Rios Reddick: Alameda County District Attorney's Office

Gina Temporal: Alameda County Probation Department

Darryl Stewart: Office of Supervisor Nate Miley

Shahidah Williams: Office of County Supervisor Keith Carson

Laura Chavez: Alameda County Probation Department

The meeting started with the attendees agreeing to meet virtually in alignment with AB 361.

Laura Chavez presented a PowerPoint summarizing the current draft proposal to be submitted to the state outlining the proposed process for monitoring the County's AB 109 funding in response to the state audit released in March.

Below is a summary of the presentation:

- In addition to responding to the state audit, only a few of our programs have been evaluated locally, taking into account the issues specific to the bay area, thus making the proposed evaluation essential.
- Prior evaluations include the Results First Initiative, conducted by the California State Association of Counties; AB 109 Overview and Outcomes Report, produced by Resource Development Associates; and The Pathways Capacity Enhancement Project, led by Researchers at George Mason University.

- Results First was a cost benefit analysis, resulting in an inventory of public protection programs run and contracted by county departments. Local programs were compared to those in the Pew database which ranks the effectiveness of national programs that have been through a rigorous program evaluation. However, very few county programs are similar to those evaluated in the Pew database.
- The RDA report evaluated the impact on recidivism for clients who received probation services. It did show a slowing of recidivism for clients who received services. The report did not evaluate other outcomes, i.e., employment or program completion. The RDA report only covers clients from 2011-2018.
- The Pathways Enhancement Capacity Project is designed to identify gaps in services and will train CBO's on how to fill the identified gaps.
- The Plan has two Phases, Phase One, identifies/ confirms the programs run by Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and the programs and activities run by Alameda County Departments. This phase will also cover their spending to date, program objectives etc.
- Phase Two will look at the programs through an RDA framework: How much did we do, how well did we do it; and is anyone better off. The evaluation will also look at racial equity: are resources allocated disproportionately to people of color to ameliorate historical racism and how well are the programs tailored to address race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity and other social inequities.
- The entire evaluation will have quantitative and qualitative analysis. Probation will do the quantitative analysis of the CBO programs that are contracted by Probation; an external evaluator will do the qualitative analysis of those programs. An external evaluator will do the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the work done by county government departments.
- Probation plans to have 3-4 CBO programs evaluated each year. The expectation is the outside contractor will evaluate two county departments each year.

A summary of the questions, answers and discussion is below:

- Who pays for this? The expectation is the money will be “taken off the top” before the funding is split between CBOs and County departments.
- The scope of what is needed is still unclear.
- At the Community Advisory Board meeting, members expressed an interest in refining the actual research questions and the variables for success and failure. The data may not be available, without the data we can include these questions in the qualitative analysis.

Update on the Agenda Item Request Form

- A change from the original draft was recently implemented, if there is a request for new funding, the contractor will not respond directly, doing that would put them at a disadvantage in the procurement process. Therefore, Probation will provide an explanation of the logic model used to create the RFP. When there is a request for continued funding, the information will be provided directly by the contractor requesting the funding extension.

The question of developing a working group for the 2022 evening meeting of the Process and Evaluation Workgroup was continued to a future meeting.

The meeting Adjourned at 11:23.