Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

April 1, 2026

In attendance:

- Rodney Brooks, Alameda County Public Defenders
- Shawn Rowland, Our Road Prison Project
- Aundrea Brown, Alameda County Public Defenders
- Rezsin Gonzalez, Alameda County Probation Department
- Janene Grigsby, The Alameda County Probation Department
- Gina Temporal, The Alameda County Probation Department
- Annette Briscoe, Alameda County Probation Department

The meeting opened with an outline of the purpose of the Workgroup and an explanation of the primary meeting topic: Defining the work of the Process and Evaluation Workgroup. Next, the meeting participants introduced themselves.

Summary of the Discussion About Defining the Purpose of the Workgroup

The group started by walking through a prior draft of the Process and Evaluation Workgroup activities (which has not been approved of by the Executive Committee).

- The first draft activity was articulating the goals of realignment in Alameda County. One meeting participant noted, this is the responsibility of the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee.
- It was stated that other entities are responsible for creating these goals, there was some discussion about the Process and Evaluation Workgroup evaluating and assessing whether the County is meeting the goals. The question was raised, would the Workgroup's input have any significant impact, since it has no decision-making power?
- It was noted that there is a gap in examining the charging practices which are a requirement for AB 109 compliance.
- The question was raised how to get information from the end users of the AB 109 services; and how their experiences are being integrated into the decision-making process.
- Probation staff summarized how the department is soliciting and utilizing information from clients; for example, many of the current Probation contracts require the service providers to implement feedback received from clients.
- Probation staff (not sworn officers) collect feedback from clients at the Center of Re-Entry Excellence (CORE) on a regular basis, in real time.

- The question was asked, once the information is received, how does it get to the program decision makers? If it is a contract violation, it is discussed in the service provider check-in meetings. Non-contract violations go to the Programs and Services Workgroup.
- An additional question was raised, if the Process and Evaluation Workgroup were to solicit client feedback, what is the potential retaliation against clients for voicing their critiques in a public meeting?
- It was agreed that Probation staff would come to the next Process and Evaluation Workgroup Meeting with a presentation about how they solicit feedback and utilize the information.
- The next question raised, how to make the connection between the Community Corrections Partnership identified goals and Probation's feedback loop.
- There was agreement among the participants that the Workgroup needs to find ways to identify challenging issues related to the County's realignment process that won't be brought up in the feedback loop.
- It was agreed that the next meeting agenda would include an update on the staff with lived experience and their success rate of being cleared to enter Santa Rita Jail. Attendees also expressed interest in hearing about the challenges people face in leaving the Jail with their medication.

The meeting adjourned at 11:43