

Meeting of the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and its Executive Committee (CCPEC)

AGENDA

Tuesday,
February 16, 2016
10 am-12 noon
San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Note: *Each member of the public may be allotted no more than 3 minutes to speak on each item.*

1. Call to Order and Introductions.
2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only.”
3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of September 9, 2015 (discussion and action).
4. Staff Report (discussion only).
5. Multi-County Evaluation of Realignment: Public Policy Institute of California (discussion only)
- ~~6. AB109 Report (discussion and possible action)~~
7. Roundtable Updates on the Implementation of Public Safety Realignment (AB109) and other comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items (discussion only).
8. Public comment on any item listed above, as well as items not listed on the Agenda.
9. Adjournment.

SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the Community Corrections Partnership, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record, and brought to the attention of the Community Corrections Partnership. Written comments should be submitted to: Karen Shain, Adult Probation Department, 880 Bryant Street, Room 200, San Francisco, CA 94102, or via email: karen.shain@sfgov.org

MEETING MATERIALS

Copies of agendas, minutes, and explanatory documents are available through the Community Corrections Partnership's website at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation> or by calling Karen Shain at (415) 553-1047 during normal business hours. The material can be FAXed or mailed to you upon request.

ACCOMMODATIONS

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Karen Shain at karen.shain@sfgov.org or (415) 553-1047 at least two business days before the meeting.

TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available on request. Sign language interpreters are also available on request. For either accommodation, please contact Karen Shain at karen.shain@sfgov.org or (415) 553-1047 at least two business days before the meeting.

CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: www.sfgov.org/sunshine.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE:

Administrator
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683.
Telephone: (415) 554-7724
E-Mail: sotf@sfgov.org

CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/>

Meeting of the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and its Executive Committee (CCPEC)

DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015
10 am-12 noon
San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Members Present: Chief Adult Probation Officer Karen Fletcher (Chair), Tara Anderson for District Attorney George Gascón, Steve Good, Paul Henderson for Mayor Ed Lee, Robert Moser for Chief Greg Suhr, Craig Murdock for Public Health Director Barbara Garcia, Ali Riker for Sheriff Ross Mirkarimi, Simin Shamji for Public Defender Jeff Adachi, and Beverly Upton

Members Absent: Greg Asay and Noelle Simmons

1. Call to Order and Introductions.

Chief Fletcher called the meeting to order at 10:04am. She introduced herself and asked other members to introduce themselves as well.

2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only.”

Chief Fletcher asked for public comment and there was none.

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2015 (discussion and possible action).

After members reviewed the minutes, Craig Murdock moved they be accepted . Motion was seconded by Simin Shamji . There was not public comment and the motion passed.

4. Staff Report (discussion only).

Karen Shain reported to the members that the Reentry Division of Adult Probation has been involved in the Racial and Ethnic Disparities discussion through the Reentry Council which stems from the report by the Burns Institute. She also reported that the Reentry Division continues to work on the RFP related to the Risk-Needs-Responsivity study.

5. Evaluation of COMPAS—Jim Austin, JFA Associates (JFA).

Leah Rothstein introduced Jim Austin who presented on the COMPAS validation study. Jim Austin reported that his organization, JFA Associates, has been working on the COMPAS validation study. This report compared San Francisco, the state of California, and the national data of adult corrections. He stated that, as of 2013, San Francisco’s rate per 100,000 adults was significantly lower than California’s and the national rate and that risk assessment has been a major component which has made San Francisco a national leader.

Dr. Austin explained that key concepts in Risk Assessment are reliability and validity. A validation study examines the link between risk and actual outcomes. A client’s risk level is linked to a client’s needs and interventions. A risk instrument is only one component of a behavioral study. Other

factors include societal and environmental factors, static and dynamic factors, personal attributes, development and historical factors, contextual factors, relationships and interactions.

San Francisco Adult Probation uses a Comprehensive Assessment System (COMPAS). Regardless of the instrument used, departments will get the same results of risk no matter if the tool is lengthy or short. Strong predictors of recidivism are used in both systems. JFA used a cohort of 1,708 people placed on probation between 2011 and 2013 who had a COMPAS assessment completed. San Francisco based arrest data was collected both prior and after probation placement.

JFA determined that probationers had some difficulties and challenges answering and understanding some of the questions. Interview subjects had limited education levels, which may have limited the utility of the instrument. The COMPAS validation study determined 51 percent of respondents were re-arrested. The majority of re-arrests occurred during the first 4 months and leveled off between months 5 and 12. Most individuals who are not re-arrested in the first twelve months have a relatively small risk of re-arrest.

The study determined that Adult Probation's COMPAS instrument is producing valid assessments of risk. The most predictive factors tend to be items that measure prior criminal record that is typically found in other risk assessment systems. There are also a number of scales and items that measure a probationer's "needs" but are not strongly associated with risk. Dr. Austin suggested that it would be advisable to establish a process where an abbreviated COMPAS risk instrument is first applied to identify low risk probationers. Probationers who are not low-risk would then be assessed using the full COMPAS instrument.

Steve Good asked if there were more recent studies to compare risk since JFA used studies which were extremely old. Ali Riker asked if the sub-scales were static which Jim Austin responded "yes." Frank Williams asked if the assessment should be used upon release from custody or supervision. Jim Austin commented that in other jurisdictions risk is adjusted over time based on the probationer's progress, conduct, and compliance. Risk can be adjusted both up and down based on progress of the probationer overtime. Chief Fletcher commented that probationers are re-assessed at points throughout their supervision for early termination. Jim Austin stated SFAPD's COMPAS instrument is valid but suggested Adult Probation refrain from using risk instruments after the initial assessment, and instead evaluate a probationer's conduct.

6. Implementation of Proposition 47:

A. Hilary Blout, Californians for Safety and Justice:

Hilary Blout, Californians for Safety and Justice, updated the CCP on the progress her organization has made during the first year since the implementation of Prop 47. During the first year of Prop. 47 their work has been focused on educating Californians on Prop 47. During their initial campaign they trained numerous individuals and community-based organizations throughout the state to ensure community members were well informed about Prop 47. Additionally, they launched a website—www.myprop47.org—which is a clearinghouse of information and contains forms for each county in California.

Ms. Blout explained that individuals who have convictions in multiple counties are required to complete a Prop 47 form for each jurisdiction where a conviction occurred. She said the goal of the website was to streamline the information on filing petitions. Challenges occur due to the different stipulations to filing petitions as each county has its own requirements and restrictions.

Californians for Safety and Justice also launched an advertisement campaign to educate the public. They are now measuring the cost/benefit of their advertisement campaign. They have used billboards, radio, and other means of advertising to advance their cause. Their organizing work over the past 12 months has focused on locating expungement/reduction clinics, and the one million Californians who will benefit from Prop 47. They realized that the urban areas such as San Francisco have numerous clinics but rural areas are still challenged. Currently they are working to increase the number of clinics and capacity to serve individuals. Another barrier to getting an individual's record changed is the cost associated to getting a comprehensive RAP sheet. The Department of Justice has been able to provide some waivers in which individuals are able to get a free RAP sheet. She also stated that an old conviction which may have occurred in a different geographic area of California inhibits an individual from utilizing Prop. 47 due to travel costs and time.

She said that, at the expungement/reduction clinics, individuals who are not Prop 47 eligible will be provided the tools necessary to remedy any marks on their record. There are additional challenges which stem from the three year time limit to expunge/reduce old cases via Prop 47. The reason the deadline was implemented was to ensure the state would not be burdened fiscally. Although there is a deadline, it might be possible to get it extended. Approximately 130,000 petitions have been filed statewide.

Californians for Safety and Justice has trained 50 organizations around the state on Prop 47, gave them all the materials they need to help individuals, and equipped CBOs to connect with community members. They also connect individuals with pro bono lawyers and clinics to help them with the legal work.

Hilary said that approximately 4,000 Californians have been resentenced from prison, 10,000 from jails, and \$73 million will not be spent in the prion budget due to prop 47. The initial state savings projections were set at approximately \$100 million. By mid-2016, the savings will be available for distribution. 65% of the funds will be used for mental health and recidivism reduction programs. Californians for Safety and Justice is advocating that the funding formula be made available before mid-2016.

For the future, Californians for Safety and Justice is focused on targeted outreach and hopes to educate the public and remove any negativity associated with it. The outreach will come from community-based organizations. Additionally, Californians for Safety and Justice is hosting larger public education events to broaden their efforts to mobilize individuals who will benefit from Prop. 47. The events will include other wrap around services. They hope to include a pro bono network of attorneys.

B. Report from Mayor's Interns from the Bayview: Crime Reduction and Community Relations Strategies

Paul Henderson introduced Cheryl Davis and Alexis Hubbard from Mo' Magic, which is focused on the results of Prop. 47, and the efforts to educate the community. Over the summer there were seven cohorts of students who focused on local criminal justice issues ranging from the Fair Chance Ordinance to Prop 47. The Community Safety Internship 2015, in response to President Obama's "My Brother's Keeper", is made up of young people experiencing persistent and disproportionate contact with violence. It is public-private collaboration between SFPD, The San Francisco Police Commission, Hope SF, the Mayor's Office and Mo' Magic.

Through their Prop. 47, educational social media campaign, the students were able to reach over 1000 people in the Bay Area. Furthermore, they created buttons, stickers, and wrist bands for Prop. 47 awareness. A video was created and was shared on the National Night Out, and through social media.

The group recommends the video educational piece be used at neighborhood forums to raise awareness of Prop. 47.

7. **Roundtable Updates on the Implementation of Public Safety Realignment (AB109) and other comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items (discussion only).**

Chief Fletcher asked CCP members for updates, comments, or questions. There were none so Chief Fletcher moved to Item 8.

8. **Public comment on any item listed above, as well as items not listed on the Agenda.**

Chief Fletcher asked for public comment on any item listed above, or on any other topic not listed on the agenda. There was no public comment so Chief Fletcher moved to Item 9.

9. **Adjournment.**

Chief Fletcher thanked the members of the Community Corrections Partnership and the public for their participation in today's meeting. Paul Henderson moved that the meeting be adjourned. Beverly Upton seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:57am.

Community Corrections Partnership and its Executive Committee City and County of San Francisco

Roster of Members

1. **Karen L. Fletcher*** (Chair)
Chief Adult Probation Officer
Adult Probation Department
City & County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street, 3rd floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
karen.fletcher@sfgov.org
Executive Assistant: La Shaun Williams
lashaun.r.williams@sfgov.org
(415) 553-1687
2. **Jeff Adachi***
Public Defender
Office of the Public Defender
City & County of San Francisco
555 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
jeff.adachi@sfgov.org
(415) 553-1677
Executive Assistant: Angela Auyong
angela.auyong@sfgov.org
(415) 553-1677
Alternate: Simin Shamji
simin.shamji@sfgov.org
(415) 553-9316
3. **Barbara Garcia***
Director
Department of Public Health
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
barbara.garcia@sfdph.org
(415)255-3525
Alternate: Jo Robinson
jo.robinson@sfdph.org
(415)255-3440
Craig Murdock
craig.murdock@sfdph.org
(415)503-4732
4. **George Gascón***
District Attorney
Office of the District Attorney
City & County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street, 3rd floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
districtattorney@sfgov.org
Alternate: Cristine DeBerry
cristine.deberry@sfgov.org
(415) 553-1110
5. **Steve Good**
Executive Director
Five Keys Charter School
70 Oak Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
steveg@fivekeyscharter.org
(415) 734-3310
6. **Paul Henderson**
Deputy Chief of Staff for Public Safety
Mayor's Office
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102
paul.henderson@sfgov.org
(415) 554-6656
7. **Vicki Hennessy***
Sheriff
Sheriff's Department
City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 456
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Alternates: Kathy Gorwood, Chief Deputy, Administration & Programs Division Manager, kathy.gorwood@sfgov.org; Ali Riker, Director of Programs alissa.riker@sfgov.org, (415) 575-6417

Community Corrections Partnership and its Executive Committee City and County of San Francisco

8. Jeffrey Mori

Special Assistant, Workforce Division
Office of Economic & Workforce Development
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
jeffrey.mori@sfgov.org
(415)701-4824

9. Noelle Simmons

Deputy Director, Economic Support & Self Sufficiency
Human Services Agency
170 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
noelle.simmons@sfgov.org
(415)557-6348
Alternates: James Whelly,
james.whelly@sfgov.org
or Joyce Crum, joyce.crum@sfgov.org

10. Gregory Suhr*

Chief
Police Department
City & County of San Francisco
850 Bryant St., #525
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415)553-1551
Alternate: Michael Redmond, Commander,
Operations Bureau – Metro Division
Michael.redmond@sfgov.org
(415)553-1527

11. Frank Williams

Director
Senior Ex-Offender Program
1706 Yosemite Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94124
franktwilliams@aol.com
(415) 593-8235
OR

Mimi Silbert

President
Delancey Street Foundation
600 Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415) 512-5104

12. Beverly Upton

Executive Director
San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium
383 Rhode Island Street
Suite 304
San Francisco, CA 94103
beverly@dvcpartners.org
(415) 626-8709

13. Superior Court Judge*

Vacant

CCP Staff

Karen Shain
Reentry Policy Planner
Reentry Division
Adult Probation Department
City & County of San Francisco
880 Bryant Street Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94103
karen.shain@sfgov.org
(415) 553-1047

Alternates or other designees of department heads may represent the department.

Community Corrections Partnership and its Executive Committee City and County of San Francisco

**Denotes member of the Community Correction Partnership Executive Committee*

¹ This member meets the CCP membership requirements of California Penal Code §1230(2)(H) and (J)



Corrections: Multi-County Study

The purpose of the multi-county study is to help policymakers identify successful, cost-effective corrections and supervision policies.

The California Policy Context

California is pursuing historic changes to its adult corrections system. In October 2011, the state shifted significant corrections responsibilities to its counties—including authority over most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders. Motivated in part by rulings from a federal three-judge panel, this unprecedented policy shift—known as “realignment”—has been described as “revolutionary” and “the biggest penal experiment in modern history.” It has generated enormous interest and concern at the state, county, and community level, and contributed to an ongoing national conversation about the appropriate level of government at which to focus corrections and rehabilitation efforts.

The Multi-County Study

Shortly after the state and counties began to implement realignment, PPIC identified a critical implementation gap. Though the state had devolved considerable decision-making power to the local level, many counties were ill prepared to make data-driven decisions about their corrections and supervision policies. The missing piece was the collection and standardization of key data elements that could be used to assess performance and identify cost-effective practices. PPIC researchers also found that many counties lacked the capacity, due to resource and staffing constraints, to conduct these kinds of analyses. We saw an opportunity to help fill these gaps by first working with the counties to collect and standardize key criminal justice data elements and then taking the lead in using these data to produce the kinds of analyses that would best inform policy and practice.

The research team approached 12 counties selected as a group representative of the state – Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, Shasta, and Stanislaus and all accepted. With the support of these counties, PPIC approached the state to secure cooperation in the effort. While improving and linking data from county justice systems was a crucial first step, integrating these data with state-level sources would greatly enhance the scope to include, for example, key statewide recidivism outcomes. In July 2013, the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) voted to approve a Memorandum of Understanding with PPIC to launch what we call our multi-county study (MCS).

Progress-to-date

Since that time, PPIC researchers have worked closely with the 12 counties and the state to collect and standardize the following data for offenders: (1) individual demographic characteristics; (2) criminal histories; (3) risk and needs assessments; (4) programs, services, or sanctions received; and (5) recidivism outcomes (i.e., rearrest, reconviction, return to custody).

Our first objective is to address questions about the impact of realignment on recidivism outcomes for the full realignment population. Prior to the MCS, this work could only be undertaken for a subset of those offenders. After completing a full assessment of the effects of realignment on recidivism, we will then turn our focus to the key interventions employed by counties, including



programs, services, and sanctions. The goal of this work is to identify effective strategies for reducing recidivism in the wake of realignment. The interventions under study include some of realignment's hallmark initiatives, such as split sentencing, flash incarceration, and alternative custody programs. They also include more traditional service provision along with new initiatives drawing national attention, such as pretrial services and health insurance enrollment programs.

We anticipate findings from our research will inform policymaking and practice within our 12 participating counties, as well as in other counties across the state. We also see a national audience for this work, as other states and localities grappling with persistently high rates of recidivism are seeking a stronger evidence base to inform their efforts. The methodological approaches we use will prioritize the reduction of selection bias and other confounding factors to isolate the effects of counties' strategies and enhance the generalizability of the findings in order to contribute both to the improvement in practices in other parts of the state and to the national literature on effective interventions.

Project Team

The team includes principal investigators Mia Bird, Ryken Grattet, Sonya Tafoya, and Viet Nguyen.

Mia Bird is a research fellow in the areas of corrections and health and human services at the Public Policy Institute of California. She currently leads projects focused on how two major changes in California policy—Public Safety Realignment and the Affordable Care Act—may affect recidivism outcomes for the criminal justice population. Her past work has covered topics such as the allocation of realignment funding, the enrollment of correctional populations in health insurance, and the use of data to improve policymaking. She also serves on the faculty of the Goldman School of Public Policy. She holds a PhD in public policy, an MA in demography, and an MPP from the University of California, Berkeley.

Ryken Grattet is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, where his research addresses corrections and crime control policy. His current work analyzes strategies for reducing recidivism among offenders affected by California's historic policy change, Public Safety Realignment. He is also professor of sociology at the University of California, Davis. He previously served as Assistant Secretary for Research at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. He is the author of *Parole Violations and Revocations in California* (with Joan Petersilia and Jeffrey Lin) and *Making Hate a Crime: From Social Movement to Law Enforcement* (with Valerie Jenness). He holds a PhD in sociology from the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Sonya Tafoya is a research associate at the Public Policy Institute of California. Her work focuses on California's criminal justice system. In addition to her contributions to the MCS, her recent publications have focused on bail policies and pretrial justice issues. Before joining PPIC, she served as research staff to the California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care. She also worked as a research associate at the Pew Hispanic Center in Washington, DC, where she focused on Latino demographic trends.

Viet Nguyen is a research associate at PPIC. He received his BA in political science with a minor in public policy from the University of California, Los Angeles. His research experience has focused on corrections, policing, and survey methodology. Prior to PPIC, he worked as a survey operations analyst and survey specialist at NORC at the University of Chicago.