CSAC INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN COUNTY GOVENMENT
Evidence-Based Practices
Conversation Notes
November 17, 2016 ◆ Sacramento, California

OBSERVATIONS OF ISSUE FROM COUNTIES
Small Group Discussion Charts

✳ Departments are open to sharing data but are unsure what to capture/ what questions to ask.
✳ Funding availability to conduct studies at the department level
✳ "Flavor of the Month" programs
✳ Coordinating data locally can be difficult, but it's ultimately what people want to see

---

✳ Single data system needed for all agencies involved in forensics programs
✳ HIPPA
✳ Communication barriers between agencies
✳ Evidenced programs provided by probation lack resources for co-occurring population
✳ Housing
✳ Re-entry Team

✳ Buy-in from all partners
✳ More programs: share ideas
✳ EBP gaining momentum: grants required
✳ Relationships
✳ Performance- Results
✳ Collect & Standardize data: multiple partners
✳ Sharing research
✳ EBP- fidelity to model vs. one size fits all
✳ Juvenile DRC- participation

✳ Post realignment
✳ Data driven outcomes & funding
✳ Need for updated methods for case management & data collection
✳ Inability of Government to modernize, adapt and grow

PARTICIPANTS

Facilitators
Supervisor Virginia Bass, Humboldt County
Supervisor Kevin Goss, Plumas County

Presenters
Emlyn Struthers – Pew-MacArthur Foundation
Benjamin Fulton - Pew-MacArthur Foundation
Patrick Murphy – Public Policy Institute of California

Participants
Debbie Angulo, Imperial County
Catherine Apalategui, Imperial County
Christopher Artim, Placer County
Baljit Atwal, Stanislaus County
Marianne Biangone, Merced County
Jill Blake, Nevada County
Donte Blue, Contra Costa County
Stanicia Boatner, CSAC
Michaele Brown, Tehama County
Leslie Burgett, Sacramento County
Joseph Canciamilla, Contra Costa County
Brandy Dunkel, Placer County
Mali Dyck, Nevada County
Betsy Gowan, Tehama County
Elaine Grossman, Shasta County
Michael Gunter, Plumas County
Michael Heinlein, Plumas County
Julie Hope, Shasta County
Connie Juarez-Diroll, San Mateo County
Marc Kinon, San Bernardino County
Robin Lipetzky, Contra Costa County
Valerie Lucero, Tehama County
Lorraine Martinez, Imperial County
Robbie Matheson, Solano County
Amalia Mejia, CSAC
Michael Morse, Sacramento County
Nate Palmer, Yolo County
Joe Picazo, Imperial County
Dahisy Ramirez, Tehama County
Ed Randle, Contra Costa County
Donna Robinson, Solano County
Maria Russell, Tehama County
Melvin Russell, Contra Costa County
Elizabeth Sais, Imperial County
Kathleen Schwartz, Plumas County
Amanda Sharp, Tehama County
Sharon Wardale-Trejo, Merced County
Russell Watts, Contra Costa County
Trina West, San Bernardino County

OBSERVATIONS OF ISSUE FROM COUNTIES
Small Group Discussion Charts

* CBO's lack the resources to develop evidence based practices
* Accounting for community differences

---

* Lack of providers' participant buy-in
* Affordable funding
* Data collection
* Assessments
* Quality of the data: data expectations
* Same language among partners-services
* Is something better than nothing in the program world?
* Fidelity of programs: tracking recidivism? What is success?

---

* Evidence Based Techniques
  * Lack of education and understanding
  * Buzz word - not enough doing it
* Systems Impact
  * Antiquated data systems or no systems
  * SILO'D- no sharing
  * Confidentiality issues
  * No sharing or communication between department serving customers
  * Quantitative #'s vs. Qualitative #'s
* Costs: Training staff; ensuring application; buy-in

---

* Buy in
* What questions to Ask
* Antiquated data system
* Barriers to share data across departments
* Quality of data
* Interaction of data systems
* Availability of providers

WHAT'S WORKING
Small Group Discussion Charts

What Worked	What Didn't Work
Warm hand-Off	Relationship Based/
Multi-discipline	People Promote
Workgroup	Negative Perception
Assess Needs	
Data Match/Partnering	

IBIS Training (Integrated Behavioral Intervention Strategies)
* Parenting Inside Out
  * Reevaluation of program
* Inside/Out Program
  * "Inside" students being released before class is complete

---

DRC
* Offers several programs including work programs mental health rehabilitation
* Effective Drug Court
* Helps to have a cooperative judge
* Concerns regarding buy-in from other departments (such as the DA)
* Obstacles - does the offender really want to participate?
* What works:
  * Higher participation from court-ordered clients
  * Use of reward sanctions
  * More success from supported clients
  * Positive reinforcement
* Obstacle - Staff Turnover
  * Have to rebuild trust/relationships
  * Ensure of new "players" and their agendas

WHAT'S WORKING
Small Group Discussion Charts

* CBT Programs
* Matrix-evidence based SAP
* Pre-Trail or assessment with supervisor
* Challenge to determining effectiveness to excluding certain populations
* Following the curriculum/guides vs. adapting to for personal experience

What Worked	What Didn't Work
Behavioral Health	Provider Shared
Alternative Sentencing	Funding
FSP	Connects Probates to
Quality Data Collection	MH & AOD
	Relapse, homelessness, recidivism

DRC- Worked
* Collaboration internal & externa;
* Buy-in
* Local prison buying DRC SVCS: 2 assessment tools; state, local, charter schools
* Inside Out
* Inmates & Community College together- college credits
* Juvenile: pool therapy & lifeguard training

DRC-Worked
* WRAP: family therapy
* STEP-UP: alternate custody go to community college & inmate welfare fund pays Multi-Sensory
* De-escalation Room- juveniles in room with lots of activities
* Therapy Dog - court
* Justice League - team sports
* GED in jail

MOST PRESSING:
WHAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED NEXT
Small Group Discussion Charts

* Identify How we get needed data
* Once we obtain a baseline knowing how to use that data to make informed decisions
* Collaborate partners to make sure data works together
* Make collaborative program decisions based on data
* Hold each other accountable to fidelity.
* Institutionalize changes

* Advocate for consistent definitions and data collection; overcoming isolation and size
* Three elements of problem:
  * ⇨ Conduct regional collaborations to pool resources
  * ⇨ Interdepartmental agreement on data definition
  * ⇨ Prioritizing data infrastructure development
  * ⇨ Present issues to CCP

* Lack of a Shared Vision/Goal
  * ⇨ Between local & state as well as internally among departments.
  * ⇨ Need stable funding, enabling and cleanup statutes
  * ⇨ Leadership to establish the vision

* Identify the best Evidence Based Practices within each county
  * ⇨ Apply those to a county's agreed upon vision
  * ⇨ Agree on a common vision (leadership)

MOST PRESSING:
WHAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED NEXT
Small Group Discussion Charts

Problem Identification
* Challenges
    * Data exchange
    * Marijuana Impacts
    * A.C.A. revocation
    * Measuring recidivism
* Focus on CD Effort in next 24 months
    * Marijuana
    * Cross department impacts
    * Health/child safety
    * Justice
    * Food safety
    * Vehicle
    * Probation
* Strategy: Task Force - multidiscipline & multi-agency

Prop. 57
* Legalization of marijuana
* Possible medical disqualification
* Reach out to officials to express these concerns and speak for them
* More education and communication with the public so they understand the impacts
* Build the culture you want to continue to account for leadership changes
* Tie database together and integrate for better information
* Roll tool model to use across departments and counties
* Formalized policy to utilize consistently across departments including a strategic plan to guide process, and decisions

WEBSITE RESOURCES

Pew Charitable Trusts
Results First Clearinghouse Database

http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/multimedia/data-visualizations/2015/results-first-clearinghouse-database