

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Case Processing and Sentencing		
<p>Maintain momentum that favors the use of split sentencing for 1170(h) sentences, consistent with best practices. Sonoma County has a very high percentage of 1170(h) split sentences relative to the statewide average. However, the momentum towards split sentencing encountered barriers from a number of justice partners. Continuing to communicate evidence-based research¹ on sentencing and individual outcomes can inform judicial decision making related to the AB 109 population. In particular, identification of case studies and statistics illustrating local success in rehabilitative case planning can encourage continued use of split sentencing over jail only sentencing. Furthermore, the CCP should encourage key stakeholders including the District Attorney, Probation Department, and the Court to meet to explore conflicting perspectives and facilitate a shared approach to sentencing the AB 109 population.</p>	CCP justice partners	
<p>Throughout the charging and sentencing phases of a case, the Public Defender and Judge should clearly communicate with AB 109 eligible individuals about the meaning of an 1170(h) sentence and its associated programs and services. In addition to verbal communication, RDA recommends the development of an 1170(h) "fact sheet" or similar documentation for defendants. This official documentation can ensure that consistent and comprehensive information about the meaning of an 1170(h) sentence and the programs and services available to them through status as an AB 109 individual.</p>	Court, Public Defender	

¹ Couzens, J. R. (2012). Realignment and evidence-based practice: A new era in sentencing California felonies. *Fed. Sent'g Rep.*, 25, 217.

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Impacts to Jail Capacity and Facilities		
<p>Examine use of the SPRAT in informing Probation Officer recommendations and judicial decision making for pretrial detention and level of supervision. Sonoma County selected an empirically-developed assessment tool, the SPRAT, to inform detention decisions based on individual risk level. However, both probation officer recommendations and judicial decisions for level of supervision often deviate from SPRAT assessment scores, with almost one-third resulting in supervision levels higher than recommended by the SPRAT. Further, almost 40% of individuals released pretrial do not receive a SPRAT assessment, missing a key opportunity to identify needs and refer individuals to services. Increasing the impact of the SPRAT assessment tool for achieving the objective of decreasing the jail population would benefit from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of protocols for administering the SPRAT to ensure that the tool is used prior to making pretrial decisions. • Review of reasons for deviation from the SPRAT recommendations, such as prior criminal history, impact to victim, offense severity, as identified in Appendix 3 of the Pretrial Services Program Draft 2016 Annual Report to ensure that these deviations do not result in unintended bias in pretrial decisions. • Provision of up-to-date research on the value of assessment tools as an EBP, including the SPRAT, to probation officers and judges. 	<p>Sheriff, Probation</p>	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Impacts to Jail Capacity and Facilities, continued		
<p>Consider the extent to which custody alternative programs can be expanded to contribute to AB 109 goals. Sonoma County has a variety of evidence-based programs that offer alternatives to custody in addition to services and treatment for AB 109 individuals meeting certain criteria. Sonoma County should consider the extent to which these programs can be expanded to attain their objectives of reducing jail bed use. In addition, Sonoma County may consider extending the services offered through these programs to a larger proportion of the AB 109 population. Expanding the use of custody alternative programs, which can contribute significantly to both capacity and cost savings, provides an opportunity to utilize funds for programs and services.</p>	Sheriff, Probation	
<p>Work with custody alternative program staff to ensure individual enrollment, participation, and outcomes are tracked for analysis and evaluation. This information is valuable for monitoring program implementation and outcomes, and can be used to facilitate changes that need to be made to better meet program goals. Data collection should include a common identifier that matches individuals with their case, name and date of birth, date of program enrollment, level of program participation, services provided, and date of successful program completion or date and reason of termination. It is also important to identify if referrals were obtained as part of or independent of the individual's AB 109 status. Establishment of requisite data systems may require additional funding to provide necessary technology, staffing, and training.</p>	Sheriff, Probation	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
In-Custody Health and Behavioral Health Services		
<p>Increase funding and resources available to address the more advanced health needs of the 1170(h) in-custody population. As a result of longer jail stays, 1170(h) sentenced individuals show more advanced, chronic, and longer-term medical and dental health needs, and the evaluation identified several barriers to addressing these health needs. Key challenges included limited funding and resources to address long-term health issues in a timely and effective manner. The CCP should work with the Sheriff's Office to ensure that adequate medical and dental staff and resources are available.</p>	CCP	
<p>Address barriers to providing comprehensive substance abuse and cognitive behavioral services to the in-custody AB 109 population. Facility and staffing constraints limit the ability to provide adequate substance abuse and cognitive behavioral services to the in-custody AB 109 population. The County should consider expansion of services offered by Starting Point and the women's program unit to additional individuals in the AB 109 population with behavioral health needs. Further, the County should explore means to increase the capacity of the behavioral health unit to ensure adequate space is available for individuals with behavioral health needs.</p>	Sheriff, CFMG, Behavioral Health	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
In-Custody Programs		
<p>Consider ways to maximize the utility of existing in-custody programs by increasing awareness of and accessibility to these programs for AB 109 individuals. The Sheriff's Office has made considerable improvement in the number and types of in-custody programs offered, but access remains limited for much of the AB 109 population due to limited awareness of programs, lack of access due to classification and unit assignment, and building structure. To address these limitations, the Sheriff's Office may consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying a means to allow AB 109 individuals who would otherwise be unable to attend due to classification status or facility access to request admission to programming. • Using a validated assessment tool to connect in-custody individuals with applicable programming. • Identifying additional space to accommodate classes within the facility. 	Sheriff	
<p>Improve data collection processes to ensure that individual enrollment, participation, completion, Award Program Credits received, and outcomes for all programs are tracked. These data are essential in evaluating and improving program attendance and outcomes. The data collection process could be facilitated by development of an electronic mechanism to allow AB 109 individuals to enroll and sign in at course activities to track program completion, outcomes, and Award Program Credits, where applicable.</p>	Sheriff	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Pre-Release Planning		
<p>Develop an implementation plan for systematic pre-release planning with clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the Sheriff's Office, Probation Department, and Health Services.</p> <p>Probation Department staff reported challenges related to inadequate staff capacity, access to meeting areas in jails for individuals' assessments, inconsistent information about release dates, and role confusion in the referral process that inhibit effective pre-release planning. Roles and responsibilities for this process should be clearly defined and tracked to ensure AB 109 individuals receive their assessment and case planning in a timely manner to allow for successful connection with community resources upon release. The CCP should consider revisions to budget allocations to ensure that adequate staff and facilities are available for assessment and pre-release planning.</p>	<p>Plan: Sheriff, Probation, Behavioral Health, CFMG</p> <p>Funding: CCP</p>	
Probation Supervision		
<p>Examine policy for the duration of flash incarcerations, and provide guidance and training for probation officers to limit use of flash incarcerations and make length of stay for flash incarcerations consistent with probation leadership recommendations of three to six days. The Probation Department limits the use of flash incarcerations to a great extent, but findings suggest that some POs consistently utilize the maximum 10 day incarceration length. Policy should continue to promote limited use of flash incarceration, establish consistent criteria for application across probation officers, and discourage use of maximum flash incarceration length of stay. Limiting the use and duration of flash incarceration minimizes impact on jail facilities and encourages alternatives that can be more effective in addressing individuals' risks and needs.</p>	<p>Probation</p>	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Probation Supervision, continued		
<p>Continue to utilize tools such as the case management report and EPICS rating tool in addition to ongoing training for probation officers to address specific challenges in implementation of EPICS to ensure the model is implemented with fidelity. The Probation Department currently utilizes tools to identify and assess challenges encountered by probation officers in implementation of EPICS to determine modifications or additional resources that may be needed to address concerns. These tools monitor fidelity in implementation, but data in this report suggest that there are remaining challenges. Previously identified concerns include inflexibility and extensive time requirements for use, and a strong focus on negative behaviors that can be discouraging or demeaning. Probation officers may benefit from the opportunity to offer input and troubleshoot these challenges and receive additional training on means to implement the model with fidelity. A collaborative troubleshooting approach that includes both line staff and leadership can highlight unanticipated obstacles to implementation and encourage buy in among parties at all levels of the agency.</p>	Probation	
<p>Consider adopting a dynamic risk assessment tool or utilizing the needs assessment tool to determine appropriate supervision level for AB 109 individuals. AB 109 individuals are supervised at a high-risk level regardless of their risk or needs assessment scores. Probation officers suggested that not all AB 109 individuals need to be supervised as high-risk, though that is the current policy. Aligning supervision level to individual risk level allows probation officers to focus more attention on high-risk individuals. Further, using lower levels of supervision for lower-risk individuals facilitates rapport building and cooperation between the probation officer and supervised individual. Probation may consider altering the individual's supervision level after the first six months based on changing assessed needs. Further, Probation may consider adopting a dynamic risk assessment tool to measure changing risk factors and adapting supervision levels over time.</p>	Probation	

AB 109 System Porcess Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Community Based Programs		
<p>Increase resources for housing assistance and/or partnerships with community based organizations that can provide these services. There is a significant unmet need for housing support for the AB 109 population in Sonoma County related to a lack of affordable housing, cost of long-term shelters, and long waitlists at shelters. As housing is an important component of successfully transitioning back into the community, Sonoma County should explore means to increasing accessibility to housing services for AB 109 individuals.</p>	<p>Probation, Community Development Commission, CBOs</p>	
<p>Address barriers to program and DRC participation related to transportation challenges. Lack of transportation was identified as a significant challenge for individuals whose conditions for probation require program attendance at specific locations. Probation officers should work with supervised individuals to ensure that they are placed in programs that are reasonably accessible to their work and/or home and establish meeting times that do not conflict with other terms of probation, such as the individual's job or treatment requirements. Further, the Probation Department should consider means to improve access to public transportation including connecting supervised individuals with resources for free or reduced fares/monthly passes for local transit systems.</p>	<p>Probation</p>	
<p>Increase resources for inpatient psychiatric and residential substance abuse programs for supervised AB 109 individuals. The County does not currently have enough beds in psychiatric and residential substance abuse treatment to meet the needs of the AB 109 population. Additional resources are needed to provide services for this population including inpatient psychiatric treatment. More diversity in treatment services or programs is necessary to provide alternatives for individuals who are unsuccessful in a specific program and to separate individuals from others in their communities that pose a risk to other's rehabilitation (e.g., gang members).</p>	<p>Behavioral Health</p>	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Community Based Programs, continued		
<p>Identify potential underserved individuals or groups that may not receive adequate services and expand resources to accommodate these populations. Non-English speakers and residents of rural parts of the County may have limited access to programs and services. The CCP should work with AB 109 partners to identify individuals and groups impacted by such barriers and develop capacity to ensure programs and services are accessible to underserved AB 109 populations.</p>	<p>AB 109 partners – a cross-system work group?</p>	
Cross-System Recommendations		
<p>Promote fidelity in the implementation of EBPs and best practices by AB 109 partners through the development of shared goals and responsibilities and additional training. This evaluation identified that, while some Sonoma County's AB 109 partners have been very successful in implementing EBPs, line staff in particular often encounter barriers to successful use of these tools and practices. In particular, challenges were identified in the use of the SPRAT, implementation of the EPICS model, and data collection. Sonoma County should explore barriers to EBP implementation and identify solutions to ensure EBPs are implemented with the greatest probability of success.</p>	<p>AB 109 partners – a cross-system work group?</p>	
<p>Implement specialized training for individuals that work with the AB 109 population. Formal training should be developed for AB 109 partners such as mental health, substance abuse, and human services staff to address unique needs and challenges of the AB 109 population. Trainings should incorporate language, terminology, and conditions for the AB 109 population to facilitate effective communication with other AB 109 partners and improve case management and referrals. In addition, "fact sheets" and resource libraries could provide important information to facilitate cross-system cooperation and communication across diverse AB 109 partners.</p>	<p>AB 109 partners – a cross-system work group?</p>	

AB 109 System Process Evaluation - Recommendations	Organizations Involved	Decision/Plan
Cross-System Recommendations, continued		
<p>Improve capacity of County data systems for tracking of measures for assessing fidelity of implementation. Many of the data systems used by the County to track AB 109 individuals' statuses and program participation are inefficient, obsolete, and/or do not interface effectively with other data systems. The CCP's Data Management and Evaluation Subcommittee should work with AB 109 partners to identify and address challenges to effective data collection and sharing to ensure data are available for evaluation and continuous improvement efforts. The Data Management and Evaluation Subcommittee should work with AB 109 partners to identify appropriate measures and reporting recommendations.</p>	<p>AB 109 Data & Evaluation Subcommittee, AB 109 partners</p>	
<p>Continue to develop collaboration and governance agreements and accountability structures among leadership and staff across AB 109 partner agencies. The CCP should work with AB 109 partners to ensure effective collaboration across organizations and agencies. Each AB 109 partner should work within their organization to ensure that both leadership and line staff have a shared vision for AB 109 implementation activities and effectively communicate challenges and successes encountered. Both the CCP and each partner organization should develop accountability structures that clearly identify roles, responsibilities, and expectations for AB 109 implementation to ensure that cross-systems components are conducted in accordance with the implementation plan.</p>	<p>AB 109 partners – a cross-system work group?</p>	
<p>Develop a Consumer Advisory Board of AB 109 individuals to provide feedback for continuous improvement of programs and services. Consumer advisory boards are a best practice for AB 109 operations that have been successfully implemented in other counties. These advisory boards consist of individuals who are currently or have previously been under supervision for an AB 109 sentence. These committees are valuable in providing insight into what works in program or service delivery, identifying barriers and gaps, and informing continued improvements in AB 109 implementation.</p>	<p>AB 109 partners – a cross-system work group?</p>	