



San Francisco Youth Commission
Immigration, Justice & Employment Committee
Draft ~ Minutes
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
4:30~6:30 PM
City Hall, Room 278
1. Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

There will be public comment on each item.

Members: Mary Claire Amable (Chair), Martin Krause (Vice Chair), Cecilia Galeano, Tsia Blacksher, Jonathan Mesler, Madeleine Matz, William Juarez

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:40pm. Commissioners present: Amable, Krause, Galeano, Mesler, Juarez. Commissioners absent: Blacksher. Commissioner Matz noted present at 4:51pm. Staff present: Adele Failes-Carpenter. There was quorum.

2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)

Commissioner Krause, seconded by Commissioner Mesler, moved to approve the agenda. There was no public comment. The motion was approved by acclamation.

3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)

- A. February 28, 2017
[\(Document A\)](#)

Commissioner Mesler, seconded by Commissioner Juarez, moved to approve the minutes. There was no public comment. The motion was approved by acclamation.

4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (Discussion Only)

Staff and members from Project WHAT introduced themselves: Maticce, DeAngela, Deroya, Alisia, Arvaugh. Diego, a SF State Journalism student, introduced himself as well. There was no further public comment.

5. Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

- A. Discussion with Matt Haney and Project WHAT on visiting supports for students with incarcerated parents and loved ones

Chair Amable and Arvaugh Williams led the group in an icebreaker. Arvaughn gave the group background on the SF county jail minor visitation policy. The group shared the following insights with commissioner Haney, who helped to pass the school district's supports for students with incarcerated parents.



- We are glad this policy was passed, but there are some barriers to young people really making use of it that we want to improve by making changes to the policy and connecting conversations between the school district, family and children services, and the sheriff's department
- Introduce asks for the school district:
 - **Providing identification:** The policy requires that a young person bring in identification. We'd like to know if the school district can help with providing identification for students, especially identification that substantiates the relationship between the young person and their parent
 - **Providing Verification:** We'd like to know if the school district is capable of verifying the relationship between a young person and their parent, grandparent, or sibling. Does the district have access to that information? (The grandparent allowance is a new ask for Sheriff)
 - **Providing Permission:** The policy requires that the other parent or guardian sign a permission slip, and even come in to help the young person sign up for visiting. We'd like to ask the sheriff to accept a permission form signed by a school counselor. Does that seem like something the school district could provide?
 - **Confidentiality:** If the school district was involved in providing verification, identification, permission, we'd like to make sure there's a confidentiality form so that counselors and teachers don't reveal information about a student's parent or loved one being incarcerated.
 - **Starting a Working Group:** We'd like to ask the school district, the sheriff, and family and children services, to designate staff to meet a couple of times in a working group to review the policy, talk about how to streamline efforts to help students sign up for visiting, and to suggest possible changes to the policy. Is that something the school district could help with?
 - **Outreach:** After we have crafted a policy and application process that works for everyone, we'd like to have a launch event and outreach effort, and we'd really like to work with you on that when the time comes.

Commissioner Haney discussed a few of the possible roles for the school district, noting that confidentiality could be a barrier to releasing student documents, but that the Sheriff would accept a verification form from the district simply saying that the records substantiate the relationship between a parent and a student, that might be another option to explore. He noted that the information about students status of children of incarcerated parents is self-reported and is unknown to the school district.

Commissioner Haney agreed to follow up with the school districts' legal department and student services to discuss. He noted that not all children of adults incarcerated in San Francisco county jails are SFUSD students, and because of this, it would be appropriate to take multiple approaches to streamlining the visitation requirements.

Some ideas for potential follow up that were discussed include:

- Asking the sheriff to accept verification form from the school district, without requiring a release of student records.
- Asking the public defender or adult probation to assist with process of identifying/verifying parent.
- Policy that allows ID and declaration of relationship from school district.



- Look at ways to streamline on parents' end at sentencing to note who their dependent children are, so that there is no burden of proof on young people signing up to visit.
- Let incarcerated parent sign authorization for visits or to allow access to birth records so that school ID and date of birth suffice?
- Accepting an affidavit signed by guardian or parent verifying relationship?

Commissioner Haney noted that it would be good to follow up with him, Kevin Truitt, Thomas Graven and Allison Martinez for future discussion.

There was no further public comment.

6. Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

- A. Review upcoming meeting dates for immigration, justice, and employment priorities and prepare for meetings with Chief Nance, Chief Scott, and Sheriff Hennessy

Youth commissioners prepared with Project WHAT for a meeting with Sheriff Hennessy. They reviewed meeting dates for their other upcoming meetings:

- March 29: Chief Nance
- March 30: Sheriff Hennessy
- April 4: Chief Scott
- April 18: Aumijo Gomes (staff will confirm)
- Prishni Murillo: Madeleine will confirm

- B. Check in about next steps and timeline for submission of committee's budget and policy priorities and work on writing resolutions and motions

The committee Reviewed due dates for BPP's:
April 17th: First Reading and May 1st: Second reading

Committee members determined that employment resolutions will go for first reading April 17th and a motion for a hearing on alternatives to incarceration for 18-24 year olds will go up April 3rd.

There was no public comment.

7. Committee Report to Full Commission (Discussion and Possible Action)

Members discussed item to convey to full commission. There was no public comment.

8. Executive Committee Report (Discussion Only)

Executive committee members shared updates with members regarding Mondays' rally.

9. Staff Report (Discussion Only)

Staff shared roles to sign up for for Monday's rally.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50pm.