SF CJHWG

Expanding Community Alternatives Sub-Committee - January 13, 2021

Quorum Reached at 3:40PM

Homework to the Sub-Committee: Review the Legislation to understand the task at hand.

Link to legislation: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/14q_FuVUKPVPIa9hFk-jYp7_oac_SXw6_/view?usp=sharing>

1. **Expand community alternatives (sub-committee) where judicial approval is not required.**
	1. Shrinking the footprint of the legal processes that does not require judicial approval
	2. Founded on principles of youth development (community centered)
	3. Youth Development Infrastructure
		1. Use DM’s document as a guide for this sub-committee
2. **Timeline and Benchmarks**
	1. System Mapping of Enhancements and Off-Ramps (January)
		1. See basic map done for BRP
		2. Analysis of Off-Ramps can be done by February 17th based on Meredith’s PPT
		3. Youth Law Center Map <https://ylc.org/navigate-juvenile-justice-law/>
		4. List of Best Practices revealed from listening sessions needs to also be put forward in order to inform the Off-Ramps There are some programs that DON’T exist and we need to start defining sooner rather than later. Will have something by February 1 to present.
		5. Clarification of the Off-Ramps – Informal or Formal?  Maria McKee and LR will be able to connect to understand and clarify the distinction of the two.
		6. Recommendations needs to have a plan – clarification from CG
		7. Is a Utilization Report going to be made available?  Discussion deferred to criteria section of the agenda.
	2. Diversion Program Infrastructure (March)
		1. Conversation regarding community alternatives – do we have the appropriate infrastructure to handle this?  Central Location to control and track.  Should a small group think about this or is the way things now are good enough to focus only on expand the programming?
			1. AC said quality is high but efficacy is not.  A move would be to reduce a number of providers to be able to track a young person from beginning to end.  The way programs are funded through is an RFP process and dictates from a CBO’s perspective on how youth should be served and this is not the best modality.
			2. KM emphasized to elaborate a bit of the base line of off ramps and also wanted to clarify if the discussion was surrounding all ATD? Yes.
			3. DC was asking about improvements on programming that is working really well and to understand qualitatively surrounding the reason of the lower numbers of youth in the system.
			4. LH referred to BRP info that currently exists and also info that is coming out of listening sessions as a baseline of informing this process.
			5. DE felt June timeline is too late as noted below.  Perhaps the two can be combined.
			6. Weighted response/score to community voice heard loud and clear.
	3. Criteria
		1. Criteria is going to come from listening sessions, best practices but more specifically based on the population what is the primary essential criteria?
			1. Student Driven, Designed and Operated
			2. Universal Assessment Tool to keep continuity
			3. Trauma Informed
			4. Gender Responsive
			5. Commitment to develop long last relationships
			6. Life Experiences
			7. Culturally Relevant and Holistic
			8. Programs that Correlate to Offense
			9. Mentors to work with youth not attached to a program but rather a budget to help young folks succeed
			10. Community Awareness
		2. This criteria needs to be resolved by April or May at the latest as a benchmark
	4. What is the Population that this group should focus on?
		1. The Data has actually been focusing on youth in the hall
		2. In hall it is 707b, bench warrants, out of home placement
		3. Data Adhoc will be responsible to develop the profile of the youth and their needs of this population that do not need to be in detention or system involved – categories of young folks and alternatives
	5. BRP List of CBO’s and programming to be discussed
	6. Youth up to the age of 25 need to be considered as a result of the new laws, there are two 20 year olds in the hall currently
	7. Funding for Expanding Infrastructure (June)
	8. Learning Exchanges (Completed by February)
		1. Available when the person is available…
	9. Diversion (Taylor Schooley)
	10. Community Based Diversion (DM and Meredith/Oakland PD
	11. Adoption of the minutes at will be at submission of any modifications to be forthcoming – done at 5:03PM.
	12. Public Testimony Closed at 5:04PM
	13. Adjourned at 5:05PM
3. **Expand community alternatives (subcommittee)**-judicial approval not required

 Shrinking the footprint of the legal processes that does not require judicial approval.

Founded on principles of youth development (community centered)

Youth Development Infrastructure

David document as a guide for this subcommittee

**TIMELINE AND BENCHMARKS**

 System mapping of enhancements and off-ramps (January) –

 ***See basic map done for Blue Ribbon: confirm with James***

Diversion program infrastructure (March)

Comment 1: Quality of programming is high but efficacy is not performing well. Reduce the number of available providers so there is a very clear ability to track from beginning to end. Both agencies of judges needs to establish long term relationships so young people don’t have to change relationships during the process. One of our areas – it is how programs are funded. They propose programs, but we need to propose the programs and they fill the gaps.

Comment 2:

Would it be helpful if we have a baseline description of what is out there now. Is it working in the current way? In some way manage to get it done by March.

Are you talking about diversion before kids get in the system or police contact further along? All alternatives.

Comment 3: We have some excellent programs, a lot of programs. ID programs, come up with mechanism, same assessment screeners, taskforce that holds whatever programs to task, we are seeing fewer kids than we’ve seen in decades – what does that mean for all of us.

Create a vehicle, feel like programs are pretty strong but there is to be some vehicle for accountability.

If we come up with community alternatives and make recommendations to the board – can we strengthen the central hub? How do we track it? Centralized tracking and accountability.

Combine the infrastructure/Funding for expanding infrastructure (June)

Thinks June is too late, budget is already here – looking at the city process. Should have it ready to go beforehand.

Learning Exchanges (Completed by February)

* Diversion (Taylor Schooley)
* Community Based Diversion (David & Meredith/Oakland PD)

**INFRASTRUCTURE VOLUNTEERS** – Meredith, Tumani Drew (not part of subcommittees), Lonnie Holmes, Dinky Enty, Denise

**CRITERIA**

(1)Constance – Student or Youth driven, they are a big part of how the program is designed and operates.

(2) Denise – all programs have a universal assessment tool. Continuinty 0- all plugged into same information and shared info makes it easier to work together.

(3,4,5) Trauma informed, gender responsive, age appropriate (create mutual definitions) Dr. Castro has terms.

Krea – 3 & 4 of Gena’s.

(6) Dawn – programs committeed to building deep longlasting relationships with young people. Even if they are there for 24 hours. Those relationships last longer in community.

(7) Program staff representative of community served, including lived experience. (Can be combined with 8 &11)

(8) Culturally relevant and holistic – important to see your reflection, culturally, linguistically, not always prescriptive. Effective programs driven by wants of youth and driven by cultural and spiritual needs.

(9) Criteria to have access to a bank of mentors, not associated with programs around the city. With a budget attached to the mentorship program – building community capacity of those mentors, and they aren’t attached to a program. Community members who can help them.

(10) All programs should have a mental health component or immediate access to mental health services. Even if in for 24 hours.

(11) Community based awareness – create criteria. Similar to Dinky and Krea (7 & 8)

**POPULATION REVIEW**

Laura discussed the excellent report and AIR info we will receive will be our baseline data.

Identify alternatives for as many of these populations as possible. Needs Assessment and Data, come up with those populations that we need identify and create criteria. ***Done by the end of February.***

***For Judges - What populations they want alternatives for now, or that we do have alternatives and they need to be utilized. NEED TO ASK JUDGES during our Planning Committee meeting.***

Law sets up who are eligible.

Have data from referrals to CARC from 2017-2019. The 2020 data will be very helpful. We definitely want.

Have recommendations by the February 17 meeting.

Krea and Valentina – reviewed list to identify programs v. events. **Follow up with Krea**

Make sure we assess landscape of services for 18 and over. As we inventory young people we need to make sure 18-24 is within the framework.

Santiago Lerma – will be joining this group and support Tracy Gallardo.

**FINAL SUGGESTIONS:**

**Margaret Brodkin - I am interested in the landscape of services - if that is being done.**

**Connect this to the work of the Juvenile Probation Commission that will be developing ways to connect data on the relationship between JPD and CBO's and criteria for evaluation.**