LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Date: Monday, August 12, 2019

In attendance:
(Listed in alphabetical order by last name)

Co-Chairs	Grant Colfax (Director, Department of Public Health), Bill Scott (Chief of Police), Sharon Woo (District Attorney's office, *alternate for George Gascón*)
Committee Members	Al Cabebe (SFSD, *alternate for Vicki Hennessy*), Angela Coleman (Reentry Council), Karen Fletcher (Adult Probation Department), Al Gilbert (Felton Institute), Everett Hewlett (Public Defender's Office, *alternate for Manohar Raju*), Kyriell Noon (Glide Foundation), Jennifer Varano (Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership)
Attendees	Tara Anderson (SFDA), Danny Balzer (Glide Foundation), Naveena Bobba (Department of Public Health), Nicole Brooks (DPH), Alejandra Cuspinera (Felton Institute), Kenneth Kim (Glide Foundation), Janet Ector (Glide Foundation), Sercan Ersoy (Public Defender's Office), Jeanie Gonzales (SFDA), Daryle McDaniel (CBCP, BSCC), Taylor Moss (LEAD NSB) Najja Morris (LEAD NSB), Jason Norelli (Glide Foundation), Kris Nyrop (LEAD NSB), Sara O'Malley (SFSD), Nikesh Patel (SFDA), Curtis Penn (Felton Institute), Daniel Perea (Commander, SFPD), Maia Rodriguez-Choi (Glide Foundation), Rani Singh (SFDA), Tiffany Sutton (SFPD), Mike Thompson (Glide Foundation)
LEAD SF Project Team	Angelica Almeida (DPH), Jessica Lee-Burleigh, Danielle Toussiant (HTA), Robin Candler (DPH), Michelle Magee (Harder+Company Community Research), Aili Malm (CSU Long Beach), Allison Smith (Harder+Company Community Research)

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
Welcome, Opening Remarks & Introductions	▪ Michelle Magee welcomed the committee and guests, and provided an overview of the agenda. Co-Chairs gave opening remarks. All attendees were given the opportunity to introduce themselves.	
Quarterly Communication Updates	▪ Robin Candler provided an update on past and upcoming trainings. She noted that the LEAD team is always open to hearing from case managers about opportunities to develop additional trainings.	▪ Refer to LEAD SF website for the presentation (references specific trainings); **Materials to be posted to website**

Program Implementation	▪ Robin Candler presented an overview on program progress, including a review of the data on pre-booking/social contact referrals, referrals by agency, service connections, and client demographics. The following points were highlighted:
	  1. The LEAD SF team has met the social contact referral target and is working towards achieving the target of 200 pre-booking referrals. The high percentage of social contact referrals with prior history of contact with the SF jail system (versus pre-booking referrals) reflects officers' careful consideration when making referrals.
	  2. The majority of referrals come from SFPD (78%), followed by 19% coming from BART Police and 4% from SFSD.
	  3. Glide and Felton have approximately the same amount of clients: 48% with Glide, 49% with Felton, and 3% with Other agencies.
	▪ Angelica Almeida presented further data on the ethnic composition of all referrals compared to the
		▪ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation (references recent demographics and ethnic composition of jail population and LEAD referrals); **Materials to be posted to website**

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items

	ethnic composition of the SF jail population. She also presented data on the breakdown of felony and pre-booking referrals throughout the program's lifespan. The following trends in the data were highlighted:
	1. The ethnic composition of *felony referrals* is most similar to the ethnic composition of the SF jail population.
	2. Overall, the number of pre-booking referrals has decreased over time.
	■ Angelica noted that these data are important to help drive how SF LEAD can best support officers. There is an opportunity here to reinvigorate excitement around the program and help officers understand which cases are best potential referrals. She shared gratitude for the Chief and the Police Department's strong partnership.
	■ Committee members and attendees raised additional questions and comments, and engaged in discussion.
	   1. **Question**: Does this data compare LEAD numbers to the overall jail population, regardless of court status?
	      o **Comment:** Yes, the jail population data is representative of all sentencing types; it comes from the Jail Health Information database.
	   2. **Question**: Do we have a monthly goal for felony referrals? A monthly goal could serve as a motivator to help increase felony referrals.
	      o **Comment**: The SF LEAD team will look into whether it would be feasible to generate these goals. The legal team could potentially analyze average monthly felony cases.
	      o **Comment**: The DA's office has had a conversation around valuing the quality versus the quantity of referrals over the last six months. Setting a monthly number seems premature in light of these conversations. We have also been examining the demographics at the Community Justice Center (CJC) to understand barriers individuals may have faced to becoming involved in LEAD.
	      o **Comment:** We are fortunate to have many different problem-solving avenues in San Francisco, like Healthy Streets Operation Center (HSOC) and its operations. Law enforcement should feel empowered to use their expertise in the moment to figure out the best path forward. Intentional referrals are the most successful.
	   3. **Question:** How are self-referrals being captured?
	      o **Comment:** Self referrals cannot be made directly to LEAD due to the provisions of the grant. When an individual requests a referral to LEAD, individual police officers are contacted to see if the police officer approves the referral being made. LEAD staff suggested we add the referral process to next meeting's agenda to discuss further.
	■ Nikesh Patel and Everett Hewlett presented the District Attorney and Public Defender's Offices analysis of LEAD SF referrals, arrests, and bookings from April 22nd 2019 through July 19th. Data highlighted during the discussion included:	

LEAD SF
Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items

	1. This quarter (April 23rd – July 19th) there were a total of 53 LEAD referrals. The number of referrals has decreased 34% from the previous quarter (January 28th – April 22nd) where there were 80 referrals.
	2. The 53 referrals were comprised of: 20 misdemeanor, 32 social contract, and 1 felony pre-booking referrals.
	3. The Legal team has been discussing strategies to increase pre-booking referrals. They noted that with every potential client, the individual officer uses their discretion about whether a person is an appropriate referral. The Legal team has begun to analyze CJC data to put together a more accurate picture of how those decisions are made.
	4. The number of social contact referrals in this quarter (34) fell by half from the previous quarter (68). It was noted, however, that the high number of referrals in the previous quarter came from an increase in police operations in the Tenderloin, which may have been more focused on getting numbers. The lower numbers this quarter may reflect lower quantity but higher quality referrals.
	5. The percent of African Americans referred to LEAD increased during this quarter. Overall, the demographics of LEAD clients are coming closer to representing the demographics of the jail population.
	6. The Legal team highlighted several examples of successes that clients experienced working in collaboration with LEAD case managers.
	■ The Policy Committee engaged in a discussion of the data following the presentation.
	  1. **Question**: Why are we seeing low numbers of certain felonies, such as theft and vandalism?
	   ○ **Comment:** We know that some of these referrals come into the CJC based on citizen complaints, and that officers need to factor in community and neighborhood dynamics when weighing the most appropriate response. This might be one explanation.
	  2. **Comment**: The racial disparity conversation has been ongoing throughout our work as this Policy Committee. It might be helpful to look later at racial demographic trends throughout the entire program.	

Evaluation Update	■ Aili Malm of California State University Long Beach provided an overview of the external evaluation of LEAD.
	  1. CSU-Long Beach was contracted by BSCC to provide an external evaluation of LEAD in Los Angeles and San Francisco. The report to the California Legislature will be made in January 2020. The report will consist of three parts:
	   ○ A process evaluation, which tells the story of each site;
	   ○ An outcome evaluation, which analyzes criminal justice outcomes, health outcomes, and recidivism data of participants;
	   ○ And a cost-benefit analysis, which draws on the outcome evaluation to analyze similar data from a comparison group who did not participate in LEAD.
	  2. The external evaluation team will present the near completed report at the next Policy
		■ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation (references recent demographics and ethnic composition of jail population and LEAD referrals); **Materials to be posted to website**
		■ Interim Local Evaluation Report will be produced by September 15th, 2019 by Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates.

LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items

	Committee Meeting in October.
	■ The Policy Committee posed additional questions to Aili Malm about the report:
	  1. **Question**: Were individuals in the comparison group offered to participate in LEAD?
	    Comment: Comparison group individuals were not offered to participate in LEAD. However, we are also looking at the results from a comparison group comprised of those who *were offered* to participate in LEAD and did not accept.
	  2. **Question**: What other criteria do comparison group individuals need to meet?
	    Comment: We have no data on physical or mental health; comparison group individuals are only compared with LEAD participants on demographics and criminal history.
	■ Jessica Lee-Burleigh of Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates (HTA) presented the interim analysis on LEAD SF outcomes from November 2017 – June 2019. She noted the following key points from the analysis on referral, enrollment & service data up to this quarter:
	  1. Social contact referrals have been made at five times the rate expected, and pre-booking referrals have occurred at a rate lower than expected. Overall, the number of referrals made has exceeded the target twofold.
	  2. An average of 33.5 total hours was spent per client, including assessment, legal services, case management, and outreach services.
	  3. In the previous quarter, 33% of partners' time was spent on case management and outreach compared to 47% this quarter. Partners' time with LEAD clients is divided equally between case management/outreach services and legal services.
	■ Jessica then shared results of analyses conducted on preliminary recidivism data from November 2017 to December 2018, highlighting the following from the data:
	  1. The analyses found no statistically significant difference in the occurrence or frequency of jail bookings for clients' pre-LEAD and post-LEAD enrollment. The analyses looked at bookings within three different time periods: three months before and after being enrolled in LEAD, six months before and after being enrolled in LEAD, and twelve months before and after being enrolled in LEAD.
	  2. There are also no statistically significant booking differences between pre-booking and social contact referrals, which could be interpreted as helping to confirm that the appropriate population is being targeted through social contact referrals.
	  3. HTA plans to conduct future analyses on the number of jail bed days to analyze any potential differences in time spent in jail pre- and post- LEAD enrollment. They will also analyze differences in types of charges to determine changes in the severity of offense.
		■ CSU Long Beach external evaluation outcome report will be available in October.

Seattle LEAD Feedback	■ Angelica Almeida shared reflections from the visits from the Seattle LEAD team over the last quarter. She noted that one of the most significant ongoing conversations of these visits was the importance of strengthening the warm hand-off between providers and law enforcement. The model has always involved a warm handoff, but the LEAD SF team recognizes that there is a need to refocus and	■ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation (references recent demographics and ethnic composition of jail population

LEAD SF Policy Committee Meeting – August 12, 2019

Page 4 of 6

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	strengthen this area.	and LEAD referrals); **Materials to be posted to website**

Full cell content:

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items

	• strengthen this area.
	• Angelica noted that given this subject is *operational* in nature, and that there are key conversations already planned around this issue over the next days, the LEAD SF team would request a vote from Policy Committee members to approve the discussion be moved to the Operational Workgroup and the recommendation brought back to the Committee Meeting in October.
	• Policy Committee members engaged in discussion about the context of the issue and the purpose of a vote.
	  1. **Comment**: It feels like this kind of discussion is already happening in practice at the Operational Workgroup. What is the purpose of voting on this now?
	  Comment: We recognize that these conversations are already happening, and we want to be intentional about any changes or discussion that could come out of them. We also want to make sure the procedure between Workgroup and Policy Committee is clear. It's been a while since we've made any significant changes to *procedures* based on conversations in the Operational Workgroup. Similarly, the Policy Committee has not voted on any changes in nearly a year. The vote would authorize the LEAD team to place this on the Operational Workgroup agenda for further review and bring back the procedure recommendation to Policy Committee in October.
	  2. **Comment**: There are concerns from CBOs about fidelity to the model. It is important that conversations about what ways we are shifting from the original model are had with law enforcement at the table so that everyone's opinion is heard.
	  3. **Comment/Question**: It is also important for programs to evolve and respond to local needs. Will the evaluation be able to account for adaptations that have been made?
	  Comment: Yes, the process evaluations will account for evolution of the program.
	  Comment: We've been having discussions about how to maintain the integrity of the data around this question so that we can measure the effectiveness of LEAD in SF, including any modifications that were needed to make it work for SF community.
	• The members agreed to move to a vote. All members approved to move these conversations to the Operational Workgroup and reconvene this discussion in October.
	• Policy Committee members engaged in a follow up discussion around related topics.
	  1. **Question**: Can you provide a budget update?
	  Comment: We have a no cost extension to 2020. We anticipate we will have enough funds to go through June 2020, pending a few missing invoices that must be accounted for.
	  2. **Question**: When HSIP began, we ended up getting a lot of LEAD referrals from drop offs to the CASC. Can we also discuss this at the Operational Workgroup?
	  Comment: LEAD referrals need to be intentional referrals. This discussion is appropriate for the Operational Workgroup. It is important for us to think about HSIP and other services as separate entities and programs working together with LEAD.
	  Comment: There is a need to build relationships and rapport between case managers and officers on the streets. When we truncate that process we are doing a disservice to the	

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	community on the whole. ■ **Comment:** The Committee adjourned the meeting.	

NEXT POLICY COMMITEE MEETING: Monday, October 28th 1:00-2:30 pm – 850 Bryant Street, APD 2nd Floor conference room