LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Date: Monday, October 28th, 2019

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

Co-Chairs	Angelica Almeida (DPH, *alternate for Grant Colfax*), Katherine Miller (District Attorney's Office, *alternate for Suzy Loftus*), Sergio Chin (SFPD, *alternate for Chief Scott*)
Committee Members	Everett Hewlett (Public Defender's Office, *alternate for Manohar Raju*), Katherine Johnson (SFSD, *alternate for Vicki Hennessy*), Thesia Naidoo (Sentencing Commission and Drug Policy Alliance), Kyriell Noon (Glide Foundation), Robin Ortiz (Felton Institute*, alternate for Al Gilbert*), Jana Taylor (Adult Probation Department, *alternate for Karen Fletcher*), Jennifer Varano (Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership)
Attendees	Janet Ector (Glide), Sercan Ersoy (Public Defender's Office), Kenneth Kim (Glide), Kris Nyrop (LEAD NSB), Curtis Penn (Felton Institute)
LEAD SF Project Team	Robin Candler (DPH), Michael Huff (DPH) Jessica Lee-Burleigh (HTA), Michelle Magee (Harder+Company Community Research), Allison Smith (Harder+Company Community Research), Danielle Toussiant (HTA)

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
Welcome, Opening Remarks & Introductions	■ Angelica Almeida welcomed the committee and guests and reviewed the agenda. ■ Co-Chairs gave opening remarks. All attendees were given the opportunity to introduce themselves.	
Quarterly Communication Updates	■ Michael Huff provided an update on past and upcoming trainings, and noted that the LEAD team is always open to hearing about additional opportunities to develop 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 program has surpassed the social contract referral target, and continues to work towards the goal for pre-booking referrals.
	  2. The majority of referrals come from SFPD (78%), followed by 18% coming from BART Police and 4% from SFSD.
	  3. Glide and Felton have approximately the same amount of clients: 49% with Glide, 49% with Felton, and 4% through other agencies.
	  4. Of the 17 referrals in the last two months, 15 of these have been warm hand-offs.
	  5. Sixty-four percent of referrals have been made in the Tenderloin, an increase in the last quarter.
	■ The Policy Committee further discussed data regarding client contact with the jail system:
	  1. **Question:** The percentage of people who have had contact with the jail system seems low (70% for pre-booking referrals, 76% for social contact referrals). Is this just contact with the San Francisco jail system?
	    ○ **Comment:** These data only reflect contact with the San Francisco jail system. This
		■ 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

	lower number could reflect a younger population, or a population that is newer to San Francisco.
	  ◦ **Comment:** The Sherriff's Department has data on the percentage of clients booked into the San Francisco jail system that are new to the city. CSU Long Beach has applied to use this data, but it is not likely that they will be able to obtain it before January to utilize in the evaluation. The Sherriff's Department can present on this at the next Policy Committee meeting, if it would be helpful.
	
	▪ Robin Candler noted that in response to feedback from the LEAD National Support Bureau, Policy Committee meetings should focus more on important policy discussions, and less on presentations. To facilitate this, meetings going forward will be kept to a smaller group. She noted that Policy Committee members are encouraged to bring feedback from case managers and legal staff.
	▪ Policy Committee members engaged in discussion about future potential meeting topics:
	  1. **Comment**: It is important we continue to talk about the racial makeup of LEAD participants compared to the jail population. Additionally, we are still having the issue of meeting our target for pre-booking referrals.
	  2. **Comment**: We need to acknowledge that there is inequity within the system with regards to racial demographics.
	  3. **Comment**: It would be interesting to revisit the topic of eligible offenses. As we move beyond this current stage of funding and transition to a more long-term effort, we should think about what other offenses would make sense to divert.
	    ◦ **Comment:** The BSCC has been flexible with charges, so maybe this is something that could be added in before the grant is over, with further discussion.
	    ◦ **Comment:** We need to set to rest the idea that people are in jail due to a controlled substance offenses. The Sherriff's Department did an analysis of these data, and found that three people were in jail for a drug-related offense at the point in time that the analyses were conducted. This number is consistently low.
	    ◦ **Comment:** We could also examine those who were LEAD eligible and were booked.
	  4. **Comment:** (LEAD National Support Bureau) We have learned so much through the implementation of LEAD in California. I recommend that you do a dive into the data to see who is in jail and for what charges, so that the next iteration of eligibility criteria can be adapted to the real situation.
	  5. **Comment:** It would be great to take advantage of this data and have a presentation at the next Policy Committee meeting. It's also important to note that having conversations between Policy Committee meetings is also important, so that the data is not surprising when presented to the group.
	▪ Everett Hewlett presented the Public Defender's Offices analysis of LEAD SF referrals, arrests, and bookings from July to September 2019. Data highlighted during the discussion included:
	  1. There were 35 total referrals over the last quarter, which comprised of: 32 social contact	

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	referrals and 3 pre-booking referrals. 2. The number of felony pre-booking referrals has remained low throughout 2019. One felony pre-booking referral was made in the last quarter. 3. The Public Defender's office has looked into the overlap of the population receiving services from the Community Justice Court (CJC) and those referred to LEAD. The population of the CJC is comparatively older and has a higher proportion of non-white participants. o One marked difference between the CJC and LEAD is that the CJC admission guidelines are more flexible. The Public Defender's office recommends empowering officers to be comfortable using discretion in making LEAD referrals.	
Evaluation Update	▪ California State University Long Beach was unable to provide an update on the External Evaluation as originally planned in the agenda due to travel complications. They will provide an updated presentation in January 2020. ▪ Jessica Lee-Burleigh of Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates (HTA) presented the updated interim analyses on LEAD SF outcomes from November 2017 – June 2019. The analyses include examination of the following themes: fidelity to the original grant proposal; client participation; pre-booking charges and recidivism; and achievement of grant objectives. Key points made through the presentation include: Fidelity to the original grant proposal 1. The level of collaboration and coordination between program partners has been marked by a high level of engagement from all. 2. Thoughtful conversations regarding program policies occurred during program ramp-up and throughout implementation. 3. High-quality data has been collected around diversions, enrollments, and services received due to high compliance with tracking systems. 4. Program staff, law enforcement, and all other partners were trained in harm reduction and evidence-based practices through a total of 92 trainings. 5. The program was unable to maintain the Community Assessment Service Center (CASC) open 24/7 due to the available resources, which deviated from the original plan. Additionally, the program made a higher number of social contact referrals than pre-booking referrals, which was a change from the original proposal. Client participation; Pre-booking charges and recidivism 1. Sixty percent of charges with pre-booking referrals were associated with possession, and approximately 10% were for prostitution.	▪ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation (references summary of findings); **Materials to be posted to website**

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

	2. Approximately 11% of felony charges were associated with vandalism, theft, and tampering with a vehicle.
	
	Achievement of grant objectives
	1. Recidivism: The recidivism analyses found no statistically significant difference in the frequency of jail bookings or number of jail bed days 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. Housing: Although the grant objectives have not yet been met regarding Housing indicators, the percent of housed individuals has increased over the grant period.
	3. Employment: The program has met its objective to provide clients with increased stability. Overall, the number of employed clients has increased, there has been increased enrollment in food and cash benefits, and increased wages.
	4. Treatment Services: Clients are being linked to the treatment services they need, with over 80% of participants with a Substance Use Disorder (SUD) having been connected to SUD treatment, and 77% of clients with a serious mental illness having been connected to mental health services.
	
	■ Members of the Policy Committee posed questions regarding the interim analyses and interpreted the findings:
	  1. **Question:** Will the pre-booking and felony charges data be looked at by race and ethnicity?
	    ○ **Comment:** The data are presented this way in the interim report.
	  2. **Comment:** It would be interesting to look at how many LEAD clients are being assessed through the coordinated entry program of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, and whether they are being prioritized.
	    ○ **Comment**: We know that if you are not prioritized within San Francisco's system, you may not receive housing for years.
	  3. **Comment:** The LEAD National Support Bureau did not find any meaningful outcomes until the 2-year mark; looking at 1-year pre- and post- data is not likely to show us the full impacts.
	■ HTA will continue data collection through the no-cost extension and will conduct further analysis on services data. The final Local Evaluation Report will be produced following the extension period.
	■ The Policy Committee adjourned the meeting.	

NEXT POLICY COMMITEE MEETING: Monday, January 27th 1:00-2:30 pm – 850 Bryant Street, APD 2nd Floor conference room		