

Corrections Standards Authority

Youthful Offender Block Grant: Expenditures & Outcomes

Second Annual Report to the Legislature

2010-11



Youthful Offender Block Grant

Second Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2012

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive Sacramento, CA 95811
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/index.html**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN JR, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
Matthew L. Cate, Secretary

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

Members

Matthew L. Cate, Chair

Terri McDonald

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

Vacant

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility*

Vacant

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program
Delancey Street Foundation, San Francisco*

Dean Growdon

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or less)
County of Lassen*

Michele Minor

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Leroy Baca

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or more)
County of Los Angeles*

Carol Biondi

*Public Member
County of Los Angeles*

Susan Mauriello

*County Supervisor/Administrative Officer
County of Santa Cruz*

Eleanor Andrade-Silva

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Linda Penner

*Chief Probation Officer (county over 200,000 pop.)
County of Fresno*

Jonathan Raven

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Adele Arnold

*Chief Probation Officer (county under 200,000 pop.)
County of Tuolumne*

Sandra McBrayer

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff, County of Yuba*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Agent*

Charlotte Mello

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Staff

Robert J. Takeshta, Executive Director (A)

CORRECTIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
Jean L. Scott, Deputy Director

STANDARDS AND TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONS DIVISION
Evonne Garner, Deputy Director (A)

FACILITIES STANDARDS AND OPERATIONS DIVISION
Gary Wion, Deputy Director

COUNTY FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION DIVISION
Robert J. Takeshta, Deputy Director

Acknowledgements

CSA would like to acknowledge the contribution of time and effort by Lee Britton, Ph.D., Research Manager II for the California Department of Justice. Dr. Britton's contribution made possible the collection of performance outcome data and the subsequent development of this report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	4
History of the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program	4
SBX4 13 – Bringing Accountability to YOBG	5
Executive Steering Committee	5
Key Provisions of YOBG	6
Expenditures Reported for FY 2010-11	8
Summary of Actual Expenditure Data	8
Comparison of FY 2010-11 Expenditures with FY 2009-10 Expenditures	12
Performance Outcome Process and Results	16
Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample	16
Assembling the Final Sample	16
Characteristics of Final Sample	17
Data Collection Instrument	18
Data Verification	19
Results	19
Comparison of Current Year Findings with Prior Year Findings	24
Summary	31

Appendices

- A – Total Expenditures in Each Expenditure Category (All Funding Sources)
- B – Amount of YOBG Funds Spent By Allocation Year
- C – Summary of Per Capita Costs
- D – Comparison of County YOBG Allocation Amounts & County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group
- E – YOBG Performance Outcome Report form
- F – Assessments Administered, Services Delivered and Outcomes Achieved

List of Tables

- Table 1 – Summary of 2010-11 YOBG Expenditures
- Table 2 – 2010-11 YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- Table 3 – 2010-11 Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and Other Funding Sources
- Table 4 - Fiscal Year Comparisons of Funding Sources
- Table 5 - Line Item Comparisons of YOBG Expenditures
(FY 2010-11 and FY 2009-10)
- Table 6 - YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type
- Table 7 - Breakdown of YOBG Expenditures and Youth Served by Fiscal Year
(2010-11 and 2009-10)
- Table 8 – Cases Excluded from Initial Study Sample
- Table 9 – Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample
- Table 10 – Assessments, Placements and Direct Services Rates
- Table 11 – Baseline Characteristics of Final Sample
- Table 12 – Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period (Percent Cases)
- Table 13 – Outcomes and Risk/Needs Assessment Rates
- Table 14 – Performance Outcomes Relationship with Baseline Characteristics
- Table 15 – Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services
- Table 16 - Percentage of YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth Receiving Assessments, Placements and Services by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)
- Table 17 - Baseline Characteristics YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)
- Table 18 - Outcomes for YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)

1 Executive Summary

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program was established in 2007 with enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 81 (Chapter 175, Statutes of 2007), and amended in 2009 by SB 13 of Extraordinary Session 4 (SBX4 13, Chapter 22, Statutes of 2009). The YOBG program commenced on September 1, 2007, realigning the non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender population within California's juvenile justice population from state to local control. Counties have been deemed better suited to provide services to this population based on the premise that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders in the proximity of their families and communities.

In recognition of the increased county responsibility for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through YOBG. Funding for FY 2010-11 was \$93.4 million.

Actual Expenditures

Counties reported spending a total of \$97.1 million in YOBG funds during FY 2010-11. Because counties are not required to spend YOBG funds in the year allocated, \$77.8 million of these expenditures were from the FY 2010-11 allocation, while the remaining \$19.3 million came from prior year allocations. A total of \$15.6 million in FY 2010-11 YOBG funds remain to be expended.

YOBG expenditures funded, in whole or in part, Placements, Direct Services and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities that directly or indirectly served a total of 43,061 youth, at an overall per capita cost of \$2,255. For every \$1 spent in YOBG funds, counties reported spending an additional \$.61 dollars from other funding sources. This represents approximately a 50% increase from the previous year (FY 2009-10), when every \$1 in YOBG expenditures was accompanied by an additional \$.40 dollars in expenditures from other sources.

Of the \$97.1 million in YOBG funds spent in FY 2010-11, 71% went toward Placements, 26% toward Direct Services; and 3% toward Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities.

Compared to FY 2009-2010, there was a 12.2% increase in overall YOBG expenditures and an 11.4% increase in the number of youth who were served. YOBG per capita costs remained essentially unchanged.

Performance Outcomes

Counties provided performance outcome information for a representative statewide sample of 1,159 youth with adjudicated felony offenses during FY 2009-10. Of the 1,159 sampled youth, 502 (43%) were reported as receiving one or more YOBG-funded

service during the one-year period following their date of disposition of the adjudicated felony offense.

Compared to youth who did not receive any YOBG-funded services (657), the YOBG-funded group received significantly more direct services, including assessments, and placements. For those direct services and placements counties provided, in all but one instance where there was a statistically significant difference, the percentage of youth who received the particular placement or service was higher for YOBG-funded youth than non-YOBG-funded youth.¹ The exception was Home on Probation, wherein a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth received this type of placement.

There was also a statistically significant difference in the total number of types of assessments received by YOBG-funded youth compared to non-YOBG-funded youth; and for every assessment type (risk/needs, substance abuse, etc.) a significantly greater percentage of YOBG-funded youth received the assessment.

A significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school during the one year follow-up period; however, significantly higher percentages of YOBG-funded youth also received a new felony adjudication in juvenile court or a commitment to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). There was no significant difference in the percentage of youth in each group who received a new felony conviction in adult court.

For all youth, the number of direct services was found to be positively related to school enrollment (both during and at the end of the year), receipt of a new felony adjudication, and being on probation at the end of the year. Identical results were obtained last year, suggesting that the number of services received goes hand-in-hand with continued involvement in school and in the juvenile justice system.

Conclusion

A comparison of YOBG-funded youth and non-YOBG-funded youth in this study sample suggests the infusion of additional funds resulting from enactment of the YOBG program has benefited youth in the county juvenile probation system by providing more placements and direct services, including assessments. Unfortunately, the data do not paint a clear picture of the relationship between YOBG funding and outcomes for youth – especially continued/increased involvement in the criminal justice system. For the second consecutive year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth than non-YOBG-funded youth had a new felony adjudication (juvenile court). Unlike last year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth also had a DJJ commitment. Further, whereas last year a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth had a new felony conviction (adult court); no difference was found

¹ Throughout this report the term “YOBG-funded youth” refers to youth who received one or more assessment, placement or other direct service funded in whole or in part by YOBG. The term “non-YOBG-funded youth” refers to youth who received no assessment, placement or other direct service funded in whole or in part by YOBG.

this year. And although a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth had substance abuse indicated in their file at baseline (a factor found to be significantly related to receipt of a new felony adjudication) – a significantly lower percentage of YOBG-funded youth had a mental health diagnosis/symptoms indicated in their file at baseline, a factor also found to be significantly related to a new felony adjudication.

The nature of data collected each year for the random sample of juveniles with a felony adjudication precludes the ability to draw inferences about cause and effect relationships between services and outcomes. Further, the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) has no information concerning county practices with respect to the individual youth who receive YOBG-funded services – practices which might in some way be influencing the outcomes that are being reported on. For example, there may be instances where youth with more severe risk/need profiles or with more serious felony adjudications are given preference for YOBG-funding because they are perceived to have the greatest need. However, absent the information for each individual youth, caution must be taken in drawing any conclusions regarding outcome differences for YOBG-funded and non-YOBG-funded youth.

2 Background

History of the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program was established in 2007 with enactment of SB 81, and later amended in 2009 by SBX4 13. The YOBG program commenced on September 1, 2007, realigning a segment of California's juvenile justice population from state to county control. Under this legislation, counties are no longer allowed to send certain lower level offenders to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Youth who are no longer eligible for DJJ commitment are those who commit an offense that is not listed in Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 707(b) and is not a sex offense as set forth in Penal Code Section 290.008(c). Consistent with best practices, counties have been deemed better suited to provide services to this population of juvenile offenders. YOBG supports the concept that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders in the proximity of their families and communities.

In recognition of the increased county responsibility for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through the YOBG program. The proportion of YOBG funds allocated to each county is based on a statutorily defined formula that gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population and the number of juvenile felony dispositions. In FY 2010-11, statewide YOBG funding was \$93.4 million.

Per the statute, "allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject [to the provisions of SB 81]." Based on this provision, allowable uses of YOBG funds are very broad. The proposed uses of YOBG funds vary significantly, reflecting the broad differences in California's counties and highlighting local priorities. To guide counties in appropriate use of YOBG funds, the Legislature identified several key components counties could employ to positively and effectively impact the lives of juveniles who remain under their supervision per SB 81. Those key components include:

- Adequate risk and needs assessments;
- The ability to utilize a multitude of graduated sanctions from treatment to intensive supervision and detention;
- Re-entry and aftercare programs;
- Agency capacity building; and
- The formation or expansion of regional networks.

SBX4 13 – Bringing Accountability to YOBG

In an effort to increase accountability for the program, SBX4 13 was enacted in 2009. As a result, State law governing YOBG now requires comprehensive reporting on performance outcomes and on the use of YOBG funds. The reporting requirements are as follows:

By May 1st of each year, counties must submit annual Funding Applications containing their proposed expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. These Funding Applications are also referred to as Juvenile Justice Development Plans.

By October 1st of each year, counties must submit a report of actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year. Also by October 1st of each year, counties must report on performance outcomes for the previous fiscal year.

By March 15th of each year, based on the October reports received from counties, the Corrections Standards Authority must prepare and submit to the Legislature a report summarizing county utilization of block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including a summary of performance outcomes. CSA must also post an annual summary of county reports on its website; however, the due date for this posting is not specified in law

Executive Steering Committee

Given the magnitude of change to the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program that resulted from SBX 4 13, CSA felt it was imperative to convene an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) that would guide the decision making process around implementation of YOBG amendments. Three CSA Board members served as tri-chairs and selected the other 13 members of the ESC. As a committee, the ESC members represented a wide variety of disciplines and geographical areas. Represented disciplines included probation, research, mental health, county administration, and advocacy.

The decisions made by the ESC, as well as the resulting reporting forms and processes, remained in place for the FY 2010-11 reporting year.

Significant Decisions of the ESC:

1. Because YOBG funds do not have to be used to support programs, but rather can be used to support any number of probation-related activities, the ESC determined it is infeasible to collect YOBG-related outcome data on programs. In turn, it was decided that it would be necessary to use the authority in Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1961(e) to modify the performance measures specified in the YOBG statute (WIC 1961(c)(2)).
2. In order to capture youth who would have been likely candidates for DJJ commitments prior to SB 81, the ESC decided that counties should report on a random sample of felony adjudicated youth pulled from the Juvenile Court &

Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). Given concerns about the reliability of JCPSS data, it was decided its use would be limited to drawing the random sample. No data regarding youth dispositions is obtained through JCPSS, rather this is all provided by counties.

3. The ESC identified the specific outcomes that counties must report and included only a limited number of performance measures focusing on the most frequently requested data.
4. The ESC developed a list of assessments, services and outcomes that counties must provide information on relative to each youth in the random sample.
5. The ESC determined the annual statewide random sample must include a minimum of 1,000 youth.
6. To ensure a full year of follow up data when reporting on services provided and outcomes achieved, the ESC determined the sample of youth must be taken from the previous fiscal year.

Key Provisions of YOBG

YOBG is formula-driven, not competitive: Every county is included in the YOBG program and receives an allocation. There is no competitive aspect to YOBG; each county's allocation is simply based on the formula prescribed in statute. That formula gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population as well as its juvenile felony dispositions. The Department of Finance (DOF) calculates each county's allocation amount annually using their own demographic information for the juvenile population, which is derived from national census data, and using Department of Justice data for juvenile felony dispositions. While the formula was generally constructed to give counties \$117,000 per YOBG eligible youth, there is no tangible tie to youth who previously would have gone to DJJ since that population is unidentifiable. Furthermore, each county receives a minimum annual allocation of \$117,000, regardless of what the formula yields.

Broad flexibility: As provided by statute, "allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject [to the provisions of SB 81]." There is no other provision that addresses eligible uses of YOBG funds. Consequently, counties have tremendous flexibility in how they use YOBG funds and counties have used this flexibility to tailor YOBG-funded programs to fit local needs and priorities.

No Anti-Supplantation Clause: Consistent with the intent to give counties broad flexibility to manage the realigned population as they determine to be most appropriate, the YOBG statute does not contain language prohibiting supplantation of funds. Given the timing of YOBG implementation, and the concurrent reduction of other county funding sources, some counties have chosen to use YOBG funds to offset cuts elsewhere in their budgets.

Department of Finance and State Controller's Office roles: As specified in statute, the Department of Finance is responsible for calculating the annual amount of YOBG funding to be allocated to each county. DOF performs this calculation each year following enactment of the State budget. In turn, the State Controller's Office (SCO) is responsible for remitting the quarterly allocation amounts to each county according to the calculation provided by DOF. Consequently, CSA, which is responsible for program administration and oversight for this program, is not the fiduciary agent.

CSA Oversight/Monitoring: Despite the new reporting requirements introduced by SBX4 13, CSA has never received any funding for administration of the YOBG program. As a result, no systematic monitoring has occurred, nor is any planned. Should CSA identify a need or receive an inquiry regarding county use of YOBG funds, monitoring would be scheduled in response.

Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1962(b) provides that "The Corrections Standards Authority may monitor and inspect any programs or facilities supported by block grant funds ... and may enforce violations of grant requirements with suspensions or cancellations of grant funds." While this provision seems to provide a degree of accountability, the "grant requirements" for YOBG are so broad it is possible for counties to make an argument for funding almost anything that is part of their juvenile justice programs. The lack of anti-supplantation language in the statute further supports this county flexibility.

No Requirement for EBP: Despite the current emphasis on Evidence Based Programs and Practices (EBP), there is no requirement that YOBG funds be used to support either. Nonetheless, many counties have opted to utilize YOBG funds for implementation and/or maintenance of EBP.

3 Expenditures Reported for FY 2010-11

Summary of Actual Expenditure Data

On October 1, 2012, the second annual YOBG Actual Expenditure Reports were due from counties to CSA. All 58 counties complied with this reporting requirement and the expenditure information that follows was extracted from the county reports. While the expenditure information reported below is focused on YOBG expenditures, it should be noted that counties reported total expenditures for those YOBG Expenditure Categories that had multiple funding sources. For example, if a county had an electronic monitoring program funded 50% by YOBG, 25% by the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and 25% by the county general fund; the county reported all of those funding sources to CSA in its Actual Expenditure Report. For additional information regarding total funding for all YOBG Expenditure Categories, refer to Appendix A.

The total amount of YOBG funds allocated to counties during FY 2010-11 was \$93,446,631; however, counties are able to spend funds allocated in one fiscal year during subsequent fiscal years and many opted to do so. Consequently, total YOBG expenditures during FY 2010-11 were \$97,103,010. Of those expenditures, \$77,833,469 was from the FY 2010-11 allocation, while \$9,657,936 was from the FY 2009-10 allocation, \$3,945,417 was from the FY 2008-09 allocation, and \$5,666,188 was from the FY 2007-08 allocation. Appendix B provides county-by-county detail of expenditures by YOBG allocation year.

Since there were no reporting requirements during the early years of YOBG, CSA could only report on the amounts counties spent from prior year allocations but not on how much remained unspent. Now that reporting is required, remaining amounts can be tracked and reported. For example, last year's report identified that \$18,856,762 of the FY 2009-10 allocation was not spent during that year. Based on the latest reporting, it is known that counties spent \$9,657,936 of that balance during FY 2010-11, leaving \$9,198,826 for use in future fiscal years. Similarly, of the \$93,446,631 allocated to counties for FY 2010-11, only \$77,833,469 was spent, leaving \$15,613,162 for use in future fiscal years.

CSA collected expenditure information for each of 52 Expenditure Categories. Seven of the 52 Expenditure Categories refer to types of Placements, 8 to types of Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities, and the remaining 37 to types of Direct Services.

Table 1 shows total YOBG expenditures for each Expenditure Category, the number of counties who spent YOBG funds in the category, the total number of youth served by these expenditures, and the resultant YOBG per capita cost.² Within each of the three major Expenditure Category types, individual expenditure categories are listed in descending order on the basis of total YOBG expenditures.

Within Placements, Camps accounted for the largest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$41,622,302) and had the highest YOBG per capita cost (\$15,746).

Within Direct Services, Intensive Probation Supervision accounted for the greatest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$6,568,079) and was the direct service most frequently funded by YOBG (16 counties). Next in order of total YOBG funds spent is Day/Evening Treatment Programs (\$3,331,564), followed by Other Direct Service (\$2,674,060) and then Re-Entry or Aftercare Services (\$2,590,080).

Among Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities, Staff Salaries/Benefits accounted for the greatest amount of YOBG expenditures by far (\$1,167,266). Alternatively, Staff Training/Professional Development was the activity most frequently funded by YOBG (10 counties). It is also noteworthy that very few YOBG funds were spent on Capital Improvements (\$27,700) or Other Procurements (\$65,040).

In total, of the \$97 million in YOBG funds spent during FY 2010-11, 71% went toward Placements, 26% toward Direct Services and 3% toward Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities. While a large percentage of YOBG funds were devoted to Placements, it is important to note these are among the most costly services (see YOBG per capita costs in Table 1). Also, as shown in Table 1, a total 28,844 youth received YOBG-funded Direct Services, including Assessments. This represents 67% of the total 43,061 youth who were served in some capacity by YOBG funding.

² No county reported YOBG expenditures devoted exclusively to the Expenditure Categories of Private Residential Care Facility, Job Placement, Monetary Incentives, Restitution, Restorative Justice, Substance Abuse Screening, and Transitional Living Services/Placement.

Table 1 – Summary of YOBG Expenditures

Expenditure Category	Expenditures	Number of Counties	Youth Served	Per Capita Costs
Camp	\$41,622,302	12	2,599	\$15,746
Home on Probation	\$7,686,682	4	5,975	\$1,286
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility	\$7,307,863	5	712	\$10,264
Juvenile Hall	\$6,772,688	16	2,094	\$3,063
Other Placement	\$5,652,315	3	2,290	\$2,468
Ranch	\$62,989	3	52	\$1,211
All Placements	\$69,104,839	43	13,722	\$4,959
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$6,568,079	16	2,128	\$3,087
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$3,331,564	7	982	\$3,393
Other Direct Service	\$2,674,060	12	7,211	\$371
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$2,590,080	8	1,658	\$1,562
Individual Mental Health Counseling	\$1,447,942	13	1,010	\$1,434
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,412,358	14	5,614	\$248
Family Counseling	\$1,005,196	3	326	\$3,083
Vocational Training	\$917,161	5	285	\$3,218
Job Readiness Training	\$830,624	2	197	\$4,216
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$823,008	7	1,124	\$732
Mentoring	\$683,347	6	362	\$1,888
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	\$621,128	5	516	\$1,204
Development of Case Plan	\$551,762	2	618	\$893
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$482,280	5	430	\$1,122
Detention Assessment(s)	\$427,724	3	2,183	\$196
Recreational Activities	\$193,427	3	725	\$267
Functional Family Therapy	\$144,884	3	135	\$1,073
Electronic Monitoring	\$141,927	8	672	\$211
Gang Intervention	\$134,364	1	58	\$2,317
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$122,367	3	514	\$238
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	\$93,208	4	291	\$320
Group Counseling	\$85,062	4	257	\$331
Community Service	\$75,276	1	40	\$1,882
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$57,110	3	230	\$248
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	\$56,411	2	176	\$321
After School Services	\$29,128	3	470	\$62
Special Education Services	\$26,987	1	484	\$56
Mental Health Screening	\$6,156	2	128	\$48
Tutoring	\$4,725	1	20	\$236
Parenting Education	\$245	1	N/A	N/A
All Direct Services	\$25,537,590	148	28,844	\$885
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,167,266	8	219	\$3,519
Other Capacity Building/Maintenance	\$515,637	8	5	\$1,000
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$491,849	10	118	\$57
Equipment	\$188,089	7	71	\$809
Other Procurements	\$65,040	1	N/A	N/A
Capital Improvements	\$27,700	1	82	\$338
Contract Services	\$5,000	1	N/A	N/A
All Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities	\$2,460,581	36	495	\$1,752
All Placements/Services/Capacity Bldg./Maint. Activities	\$97,103,010	227	43,061	\$2,255

For each applicable Expenditure Category, counties were also required to report YOBG expenditures for each of six budget line items. Table 2 summarizes this information and shows that Salaries and Benefits accounted for \$76,547,445, or 79%, of total YOBG expenditures. This is understandable given that both Placements and Direct Services rely heavily on staff for program delivery. Alternatively, it is interesting to note that Administrative Overhead and Fixed Assets/Equipment combined accounted for only 1% of total YOBG expenditures.³

Table 2 – YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

Line Item	Expenditures	Percent Total
Salaries & Benefits	\$76,547,445	78.83%
Services & Supplies	\$7,053,129	7.26%
Professional Services.	\$7,532,683	7.76%
Community Based Organizations	\$3,051,254	3.14%
Fixed Assets	\$74,125	0.08%
Administrative Overhead	\$851,678	0.88%
Other Costs	\$1,992,696	2.05%
Total	\$97,103,010	100.00%

As mentioned previously, for each Expenditure Category funded by YOBG, counties were required to report expenditures from funds received under the JJCPA, as well as other funding sources. Table 3 summarizes this information and shows that for all Placements, Direct Services and Capacity Building/ Maintenance Activities that received YOBG funding, this funding accounted for 62% of all spending reported by the counties for these items, with 1% of total expenditures coming from JJCPA funds (\$2,053,926) and the remaining 37% of total expenditures coming from other funding sources (\$57,526,537). As a percentage of total reported expenditures, the contribution of YOBG funds was greatest for Direct Services (80%) and smallest for Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities (49%). Overall, these results indicate that for every \$1 in YOBG funds spent by counties, an additional \$.61 was spent from other funding sources (\$.021 from JJCPA; \$.592 from other sources).⁴

Table 3 – Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and other Funding Sources

Expenditure Type	YOBG Expenditures		JJCPA Expenditures		Other Expenditures		Total Expenditures
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount
Placements	\$69,104,839	57.8%	\$56,000	0.1%	\$50,488,461	42.2%	\$119,649,300
Direct Services	\$25,537,590	79.8%	\$1,864,598	5.8%	\$4,581,885	14.3%	\$31,984,073
Cap Bldg./Maint	\$2,460,581	48.7%	\$133,328	2.6%	\$2,456,191	48.6%	\$5,050,100
Total	\$97,103,010	62.0%	\$2,053,926	1.3%	\$57,526,537	36.7%	\$156,683,473

³ Only 11 counties utilized YOBG funds for administrative overhead costs.

⁴ See Appendix C for breakdowns of per capita costs for each Expenditure Category for all funding sources and for YOBG expenditures only.

Comparison of FY 2010-11 Expenditures with FY 2009-10 Expenditures

Overall, YOBG expenditures for the current reporting year (FY 2010-11) closely mirrored those for the previous reporting year (FY 2009-10). However, there were some important distinctions. The similarities and differences are highlighted below.

Total YOBG Expenditures

There was a 12.2% increase in YOBG expenditures from \$86,570,073 in FY 2009-10 to \$97,103,010 in FY 2010-11. This increase was associated with an 11.4% increase in the number of youth who were served in some capacity from 38,659 in FY 2009-10 to 43,061) in FY 2010-11.

In FY 2010-11, a slightly lower percentage, 80.2%, of YOBG expenditures were made from the current fiscal year allocation than was the case in FY 2009-10, where 86% of expenditures were made from that fiscal year allocation.

Matching of YOBG Expenditures

As reflected in Table 4, YOBG expenditures accounted for 62.0% of total spending in FY 2010-11 compared to 71.6% of total spending in FY 2009-10. This was due to a substantial increase of expenditures from Other funds, from 26.0% to 36.7%, and a drop in JJCPA expenditures as a percentage of total expenditures from 2.4% to 1.3%. Stated differently, the values reported in Table 4 indicate that for every YOBG dollar spent in FY 2010-11 counties spent an additional 61 cents in other funds (including JJCPA funds), whereas in FY 2009-10 for every YOBG dollar spent counties spent an additional 40 cents. Thus, there was an approximate 50% increase in the leveraging of YOBG dollars in FY 2010-11.

Table 4 - Fiscal Year Comparisons of Funding Sources

Fiscal Year	YOBG		JJCPA		Other		All Funds	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
2009-10	\$86,570,073	71.6%	\$2,946,940	2.4%	\$31,409,664	26.0%	\$120,926,677	100.0%
2010-11	\$97,103,010	62.0%	\$2,053,926	1.3%	\$57,526,537	36.7%	\$156,683,473	100.0%

Breakdown of YOBG Expenditures

As shown in Table 5, YOBG expenditures by budget line item were highly similar in the two fiscal years, with expenditures on salaries and benefits increasing slightly from 75.02% to 78.83% as a percentage of total expenditures.

Table 5 - Line Item Comparisons of YOBG Expenditures (FY 2010-11 and FY 2009-10)

Line Item	YOBG Expenditures			Percent Total YOBG Expenditures		
	FY 2011-11	FY 2009-10	Change	FY 2011-11	FY 2009-10	Difference
Salaries & Benefits	\$76,547,445	\$64,946,279	\$11,601,166	78.83%	75.02%	3.81%
Services & Supplies	\$7,053,129	\$7,412,578	-\$359,449	7.26%	8.56%	-1.30%
Professional Services	\$7,532,683	\$6,685,656	\$847,027	7.76%	7.72%	0.03%
CBOs	\$3,051,254	\$2,951,852	\$99,402	3.14%	3.41%	-0.27%
Fixed Assets	\$74,125	\$711,554	-\$637,429	0.08%	0.82%	-0.75%
Admin. Overhead	\$851,678	\$1,322,726	-\$471,048	0.88%	1.53%	-0.65%
Other Costs	\$1,992,696	\$2,539,428	-\$546,732	2.05%	2.93%	-0.88%
Total	\$97,103,010	\$86,570,073	\$10,532,937			

Table 6 provides comparative information on YOBG expenditures by major expenditure category type. It shows marked similarity in the two fiscal years, with Placements accounting for 71.2% of YOBG expenditures in FY 2010-11 and 72.7% in FY 2009-10; Direct Services accounting for 26.3% of YOBG expenditures in FY 2010-11 and 24.2% in FY 2009-10, and Capacity Building accounting for 2.5% of total YOBG expenditures in FY 2010-11 and 3.1% in FY 2009-10.

Table 6 - YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type

Expenditure Category Type	Fiscal Year 2010-11		Fiscal Year 2009-10	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Placements	\$69,104,839	71.2%	\$62,944,571	72.7%
Direct Services	\$25,537,590	26.3%	\$20,918,716	24.2%
Capacity Building/Maintenance	\$2,460,581	2.5%	\$2,706,781	3.1%
Total	\$97,103,010	100.0%	\$86,570,073	100.0%

Table 7 compares YOBG expenditures and total youth served in the two fiscal years. Within Placements, a 9.8% increase in total YOBG expenditures in FY 2010-11 resulted in a 60.2% increase in the number of youth served. Much of the increase in youth served came from Home on Probation placements, which accounted for 5,975 youth in FY 2010-11 but only 3,676 youth in FY 2009-10. However, there were also increases in the number of youth served in the categories of Camp, Juvenile Hall, and Other Placement. In contrast, there was a dramatic decrease in Ranch placements that were funded by YOBG in FY 2010-11 (52 compared to 410 the previous fiscal year).

The pattern of reported expenditures within Direct Services was consistent across the two fiscal years in that Intensive Probation Supervision received the greatest amount of YOBG funding, followed in rank order, in both fiscal years, by Day or Evening Treatment Program, Other Direct Service, and Re-Entry or Aftercare Services. Considerably more

YOBG funds were spent in FY 2010-11 on Individual Mental Health Counseling, Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Job Readiness Training, Gender Specific Programming for Girls, Aggression Replacement Therapy, Case Plan Development, Mentoring, and Detention Assessments. With the exception of Detention Assessments, these Direct Services have relatively high YOBG per capita costs, which undoubtedly contributes to the fact that while total YOBG expenditures for all Direct Services rose by 22.1% during FY 2010-11, the total number of youth served rose by only 6.9%.

Expenditures within the Capacity Building/Maintenance expenditure category type were also highly similar to those in FY 2009-10. Total YOBG expenditures within Capacity Building/Maintenance decreased slightly from \$2,706,786 in FY 2009-10 to \$2,460,581. Within this category type Staff Salaries and Benefits accounted, by far, for the greatest amount of YOBG spending.

**Table 7 - Breakdown of YOBG Expenditures and Youth Served by Fiscal Year
(2010-11 and 2009-10)**

Expenditure Category	YOBG Expenditures			Total Youth Served		
	2010-11	2009-10	Change	2010-11	2009-10	Change
Camp	\$41,622,302	\$30,111,786	\$11,510,516	2,599	1,859	740
Home on Probation	\$7,686,682	\$7,896,109	-\$209,427	5,975	3,676	2,299
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility	\$7,307,863	\$6,744,542	\$563,321	712	814	-102
Juvenile Hall	\$6,772,688	\$7,251,931	-\$479,243	2,094	1,140	954
Other Placement	\$5,652,315	\$7,715,201	-\$2,062,886	2,290	664	1,626
Ranch	\$62,989	\$3,225,002	-\$3,162,013	52	410	-358
All Placements	\$69,104,839	\$62,944,571	\$6,160,268	13,722	8,563	5,159
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$6,568,079	\$6,027,161	\$540,918	2,128	2,361	-233
Day/Evening Treatment Program	\$3,331,564	\$3,036,487	\$295,077	982	816	166
Other Direct Service	\$2,674,060	\$2,764,760	-\$90,700	7,211	3,667	3,544
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$2,590,080	\$2,087,231	\$502,849	1,658	776	882
Mental Health Counseling	\$1,447,942	\$955,348	\$492,594	1,010	1,542	-532
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,412,358	\$1,514,124	-\$101,766	5,614	12,582	-6,968
Family Counseling	\$1,005,196	\$1,001,667	\$3,529	326	99	227
Vocational Training	\$917,161	\$929,657	-\$12,496	285	246	39
Job Readiness Training	\$830,624	\$318,780	\$511,844	197	32	165
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$823,008	\$266,876	\$556,132	1,124	833	291
Mentoring	\$683,347	\$398,251	\$285,096	362	201	161
Programming for Girls	\$621,128	\$192,596	\$428,532	516	279	237
Development of Case Plan	\$551,762	\$256,318	\$295,444	618	160	458
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$482,280	\$102,624	\$379,656	430	184	246
Detention Assessment(s)	\$427,724	\$241,490	\$186,234	2,183	77	2,106
Recreational Activities	\$193,427	\$165,042	\$28,385	725	524	201
Functional Family Therapy	\$144,884	\$184,739	-\$39,855	135	166	-31
Electronic Monitoring	\$141,927	\$105,176	\$36,751	672	756	-84
Gang Intervention	\$134,364	\$111,702	\$22,662	58	56	2
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$122,367	\$80,040	\$42,327	514	288	226
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng.	\$93,208	\$32,742	\$60,466	291	530	-239
Group Counseling	\$85,062	\$0	\$85,062	257	0	257
Community Service	\$75,276	\$21,354	\$53,922	40	65	-25
Anger Management Counseling	\$57,110	\$17,042	\$40,068	230	180	50
Programming for Boys	\$56,411	\$53,222	\$3,189	176	223	-47
After School Services	\$29,128	\$0	\$29,128	470	0	470
Special Education Services	\$26,987	\$29,997	-\$3,010	484	37	447
Mental Health Screening	\$6,156	\$10,200	-\$4,044	128	173	-45
Tutoring	\$4,725	\$0	\$4,725	20	0	20
Parenting Education	\$245	\$2,987	-\$2,742	N/A	83	-83
Restorative Justice	\$0	\$10,433	-\$10,433	0	30	-30
Substance Abuse Screening	\$0	\$670	-\$670	0	11	-11
All Direct Services	\$25,537,590	\$20,918,716	\$4,618,874	28,844	26,977	1,867
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,167,266	\$1,097,788	\$69,478	219	562	-343
Other Capacity Bldg./Maint.	\$515,637	\$493,485	\$22,152	5	2,001	-1,996
Staff Training./Development	\$491,849	\$315,242	\$176,607	118	15	103
Equipment	\$188,089	\$284,832	-\$96,743	71	40	31
Other Procurements	\$65,040	\$121,839	-\$56,799	N/A	250	-250
Capital Improvements	\$27,700	\$224,891	-\$197,191	82	0	82
Contract Services	\$5,000	\$168,709	-\$163,709	N/A	251	-251
All Capacity Building Activities	\$2,460,581	\$2,706,786	-\$246,205	495	3,119	-2,624
Total	\$97,103,010	86,570,073	\$10,532,937	43,061	38,659	4,402

4 Performance Outcome Process and Results

Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample

CSA staff, based on established direction from the Executive Steering Committee, worked with the Department of Justice (DOJ) to extract a random sample of juveniles with sustained felony offenses between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010 from its Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). While last year's sample from JCPSS contained 1,100 juveniles, the sample for this year was increased to 1,200. In addition, DOJ provided a random sample of alternate cases for each county based on the number of sampled cases from each county that were subsequently excluded last year. For both the main sample and the alternate sample, juveniles with sustained felonies were selected based on the presumption that these youth reasonably approximate the types of juveniles who would have been likely candidates for DJJ commitment prior to SB 81. The specific time period was selected so that services and outcomes data could be collected for the one-year period following the disposition date for the sustained felony for each juvenile. Applying this same methodology each year will permit year-to-year comparisons.

The number of cases sampled from each county was based on the percent of total YOBG funds received by each county, with a minimum of one case selected from each county. Within counties, sampling was done randomly within each gender group. Alpine, San Benito, Sierra, and Trinity counties did not have any felony adjudicated youth during FY 2009-10 and therefore did not report any youth for this reporting cycle. Del Norte County did not participate in JCPSS during the time period from which the sample was drawn so an alternative process was used in which Del Norte County informed CSA of all youth who had sustained felony adjudications during FY 2009-10 and CSA randomly selected two of these cases.

Using these procedures, the total number of cases for which data was sought was 1,266.

Assembling the Final Sample

A total of 107 cases were ultimately excluded to arrive at the final sample of 1,159 cases. The reasons for exclusion are shown in Table 4. As indicated in Table 8, the most frequent reasons for exclusion were an invalid adjudication date, i.e., the date was outside of FY 2009-10, DJJ commitment upon initial disposition of the offense, a sealed record precluding the collection of desired data, and a non-felony adjudicated offense (offense ultimately adjudicated as a misdemeanor). A listing by county showing YOBG allocation amount as well as the number of cases in the target sample and final sample is provided in Appendix D.

Table 8 – Cases Excluded from Initial Study Sample

Reason for Exclusion	Number of Cases	Percent of Total
Invalid Adjudication Date	25	23.4%
Minor Sent to DJJ	21	19.6%
Record Sealed	19	17.8%
Non-Felony Adjudicated Offense	18	16.8%
Immediately Released with No Time on Probation (general)	3	2.8%
Released to Immigration and Customs Enforcement	3	2.8%
Transferred to Another County for Disposition	3	2.8%
Lost File	3	2.8%
Invalid ID (not in County records)	2	1.9%
Released Upon Submission of DNA Sample	2	1.9%
Transferred to Another County After Adjudication	1	0.9%
Left Country Prior to Disposition	1	0.9%
Left State Immediately After Disposition	1	0.9%
5-20 Days in Juvenile Hall & Probation Terminated Upon Release	1	0.9%
Juvenile Case Terminated & Adult Case Moved to Another County	1	0.9%
Terminated & Placed on Adult Probation	1	0.9%
Absconded and Never Located	1	0.9%
Case Information Not Fully Available	1	0.9%
Total	107	100.0%

Characteristics of Final Sample

Table 9 compares the age and other demographic characteristics of the final sample with those of the study population, i.e., all juveniles in the JCPSS database with felony adjudications between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010. Inspection of the table shows that the final sample is highly similar to the study population.

Table 9 – Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample

Characteristic		Study Population (N=16,058)	Final Sample (N=1,159)
Mean Age (on Date of Adjudication)		16.5	16.5
Gender	Female	12.03%	11.65%
	Male	87.97%	88.35%
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian	0.29%	0.09%
	Asian Indian	0.07%	0.09%
	Black	24.90%	23.30%
	Cambodian	0.17%	0.17%
	Chinese	0.07%	0.09%
	Filipino	0.48%	0.35%
	Guamanian	0.04%	0.09%
	Hawaiian	0.01%	0.00%
	Hispanic	54.69%	54.79%
	Japanese	0.03%	0.09%
	Korean	0.07%	0.00%
	Laotian	0.07%	0.09%
	Other	1.42%	1.81%
	Other Asian Pacific Islander	0.82%	1.04%
	Samoan	0.27%	0.43%
	Unknown	0.16%	0.09%
	Vietnamese	0.44%	0.00%
White	0.45%	0.43%	
		15.56%	17.08%

Data Collection Instrument

Performance Outcome data were collected via electronic files formatted in Excel. In addition to collecting information on selected outcomes, data were also collected for 35 different types of Direct Services, including Assessments, and 6 types of Placements. For each such applicable item, information was collected on all source(s) of funding, (YOBG, JJCPA, and Other funds). Baseline data were also collected on each juvenile as of the date of disposition (enrolled in school, case plan in place, employed, etc.). As mentioned previously, all service and outcome data were collected with reference to the one-year period following each juvenile's adjudicated felony disposition date. A copy of the data collection instrument is provided in Appendix E.

Data Verification

All data received from the counties were subjected to a series of data checking procedures to identify missing or conflicting responses. Counties were alerted to all such items and worked with CSA staff to resolve any discrepancies. All but a small handful were resolved.

Results

YOBG-Funded Services

Counties reported providing one or more YOBG-funded assessment, other direct service or placement to 502 of the 1,159 youth sampled (43%). Alternatively, counties reported that 657 of the sample youth did not receive any YOBG-funded assessments, other direct services or placements. The average number of Assessments, other Direct Services, and Placements was significantly greater for the first group, i.e., those youth who benefited from some YOBG funding. Specifically, YOBG-funded youth received an average of 3.59 Assessments, compared to 2.68 for non-YOBG-funded youth; an average of 9.07 other Direct Services, compared to 7.11 for non-YOBG-funded youth; and an average of 2.14 Placements, compared to 1.82 for non-YOBG-funded youth.

The percentage of cases in each group who received each of five specific types of assessments during the one-year period from date of disposition is shown in Table 6. As in all subsequent tables, statistically significant differences are presented in bold.⁵ In every instance, the percentage of youth who received a given type of assessment was significantly higher for those youth who benefited from one or more services funded in whole or in part by YOBG funding.

Table 10 also shows the rates with which the two groups received various types of Placements and Direct Services. Within each category, the specific types are ordered from highest to lowest rate for the YOBG-funded group. Again, all statistically significant results are shown in bold. Additional information regarding the number and percentage of youth receiving Assessments, Placements and Direct Services can be found in Appendix F.

Results in Table 10 pertaining to Placements reveal that YOBG-funded youth more often spent time in Juvenile Hall, a Camp or a Ranch, while non-YOBG-funded youth more often spent time Home on Probation. Home on Probation was the most frequent placement type for both groups, though only marginally so for YOBG-funded youth. The results also reflect the fluid nature of the youth during the one-year period from date of disposition, with many youth in both groups spending time in more than one type of placement during this time period.

Results for Direct Services indicate that YOBG-funded youth received significantly higher rates of service for 22 of the 31 Direct Services listed, and that in no instance did

⁵ As is standard practice, a probability value of .05 or less ($p \leq .05$) was used as the criterion for statistical significance. Chi-Square was the predominant test statistic used to evaluate statistical significance.

a significantly greater percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth receive a specific service. The rates at which YOBG-funded youth received Aggression Replacement Therapy and Job Readiness Training were more than double those of non-YOBG-funded youth.

Table 10 – Assessments, Placements and Direct Services Rates

Assessment, Placement or Direct Service	YOBG-Funded Youth (502)	Non-YOBG-Funded Youth (657)
Assessments		
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	92.4%	74.4%
Substance Abuse Screening	81.9%	65.0%
Educational Assessment	74.8%	46.8%
Detention Assessment	71.1%	48.6%
Mental Health Screening	65.9%	51.9%
Placements		
Home on Probation	78.3%	83.0%
Juvenile Hall	77.7%	57.7%
Camp	28.9%	11.6%
Other Placement	12.9%	12.0%
Ranch	7.2%	4.1%
Private Residential Care Facility	4.8%	7.5%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab. Facility	4.0%	6.4%
Direct Services		
Development of Case Plan	85.9%	77.3%
Intensive Probation Supervision	64.9%	46.3%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	61.0%	48.1%
Restitution	49.6%	43.5%
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	46.8%	32.6%
Group Counseling	46.4%	43.4%
Community Service	45.6%	44.9%
Recreational Activities	44.4%	33.0%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	42.4%	32.9%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	39.8%	25.9%
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	39.6%	30.5%
Family Counseling	38.4%	32.6%
Pro-Social Skills Training	35.1%	24.5%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	28.1%	12.6%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	28.1%	21.0%
Gang Intervention	26.3%	14.0%
Electronic Monitoring	24.5%	17.0%
After School Services	24.1%	19.0%
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	19.8%	10.8%
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	18.9%	13.4%
Mentoring	17.9%	21.3%
Job Readiness Training	17.5%	8.4%
Parenting Education	14.9%	12.2%
Tutoring	14.7%	10.4%
Special Education Services	12.5%	11.0%
Vocational Training	12.2%	8.1%
Transitional Living Services and/or Placement	9.4%	12.0%
Functional Family Therapy	9.0%	5.8%
Job Placement	7.6%	4.6%
Restorative Justice	6.8%	9.6%
Monetary Incentives	5.6%	6.4%

Baseline Characteristics

Certain baseline information was collected for each youth in the final sample with reference to their status as of the date of disposition. Results for these status indicators are presented in Table 11, with YOBG-funded youth compared to non-YOBG-funded youth, and show some significant differences between the two groups. For both groups a very high percentage of youth had case plans in place on the date of disposition, and for YOBG-funded youth this percentage was significantly higher at almost 90%. A significantly greater percentage of YOBG-funded youth had substance abuse indicated in their file; however, a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth had a mental health diagnosis/symptom(s) indicated in their file. The data also show a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth with a prior finding of juvenile dependency per Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC) Section 300. Without further information, there is no way to account for any of these differences; however, it is noteworthy that the results show very high rates of substance abuse and mental health issues among the youthful felony offenders studied.

Table 11 – Baseline Characteristics of Final Sample

	YOBG-Funded Youth	Non-YOBG-Funded Youth
Enrolled in School	88.3%	87.3%
High School Grad or GED Indicated in File	5.9%	6.1%
Employed	6.6%	8.4%
Case Plan in Place	89.7%	80.0%
Substance Abuse Indicated in Case File	80.0%	70.5%
Mental Health Diagnosis in Case File	38.5%	44.3%
Taking Psychotropic Medications	14.8%	15.5%
Ever WIC 300 Indicated in File	18.4%	24.3%
Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation	4.6%	5.3%

Performance Outcomes

Information was collected on seven different outcomes related to education and further involvement in the criminal justice system. All outcomes pertain to the one-year period from date of disposition of the adjudicated felony. Results are reported in Table 12, and show that a higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school during the year. No differences were found with respect to end-of-year school enrollment or graduation. Turning to criminal justice outcomes, a higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were adjudicated in juvenile court for a new felony and received a commitment to DJJ during the year. No group differences were found with respect to end of the year probation status or rates of new felony convictions (adult court).

**Table 12 – Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period
(Percent Cases)**

Outcome	YOBG-Funded Youth	Non-YOBG-Funded Youth
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	95.8%	91.8%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	70.6%	73.7%
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	7.6%	6.6%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	17.1%	10.0%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.8%	3.7%
On Probation at End of Year	76.5%	71.5%
Committed to DJJ During Year	3.2%	1.4%

Given the increased emphasis on risk and needs assessments during the past few years, counties have almost all implemented one or more of these tools. That being the case, the data were analyzed to determine whether there were any differences in outcomes for youth who received an assessment compared with those who did not, irrespective of whether they received YOBG funding. The data in Table 13 show a statistically significant difference for two of the three outcomes for which there were YOBG-funded/non-YOBG-funded differences. Specifically, youth who received a risk/needs assessment were significantly more likely to be enrolled in school sometime during the year and to have received a new felony adjudication in juvenile court during the year. In contrast, no relationship was found between receiving a risk/needs assessment and commitment to DJJ during the year.

Table 13 – Outcomes and Risk/Needs Assessment Rates

Outcome	Received Risk/Needs Assessment During Year	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	94.4%	89.3%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	14.7%	5.8%
Committed to DJJ During Year	2.0%	2.9%

Additional analyses were conducted to examine whether performance outcome differences for the outcomes of enrollment in school during the year, new felony adjudications (juvenile court), and commitment to DJJ were associated with differences at baseline as reported in Table 11. Results of these analyses are shown in Table 14. Table entries are the percentages of cases among both YOBG and non-YOBG-funded youth who achieved each outcome within each baseline characteristic subgroup. For example, as reported in the table, among those who had a case plan in place on the date of disposition, 94.6% were enrolled in school during the year; whereas for those who did not have a case plan in place on the date of disposition, 89.5% were enrolled in school during the year. As shown in the table, having a case plan in place, having substance abuse indicated in the case file, and having a mental health

diagnosis/symptom(s) indicated in the case file were all found to be significantly related to a higher rate of having a new felony adjudication. None of the baseline characteristics were found to be associated with a new DJJ commitment, and having a WIC 300 declaration on file was not founded to be related to any of the outcomes. The only other significant finding was that having a case plan in place was found to be related to a higher rate of being in school during the year.

Table 14 – Performance Outcomes Relationship with Baseline Characteristics

Performance Outcome (One Year Follow-Up Period)	Baseline Characteristic	
	Case Plan in Place	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	94.6%	89.5%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	14.6%	5.5%
Committed to DJJ During Year	2.1%	2.2%
	Substance Abuse Indicated in Case File	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	93.7%	92.9%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	14.9%	7.8%
Committed to DJJ During Year	2.1%	2.4%
	Mental Health Diagnosis in Case File	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	93.1%	93.7%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	15.8%	11.3%
Committed to DJJ During Year	2.5%	1.9%
	WIC 300 Indicated in File	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	92.5%	94.2%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	15.4%	12.6%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.3%	2.1%

Analyses were also conducted to examine whether outcomes were associated with “dosage effects” with respect to the number of Direct Services received during the year. Results of these analyses, which include all youth irrespective of whether they received YOBS funding, are presented in Table 15. The results show that enrollment status in school, both during and at the end of the year; receiving a new felony adjudication in juvenile court; and being on probation at the end of the year were all significantly related to the number of Direct Services received. That is, the more services received, the more likely the youth maintained involvement in school and in the juvenile justice system.

Table 15 – Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services

	Number of Direct Services			
	1-5	6-10	11-15	≥16
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	90.0%	96.3%	97.4%	99.3%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	67.1%	73.8%	77.2%	84.7%
Graduated from High School/Received GED or Equivalent	7.2%	8.2%	3.7%	7.6%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	8.7%	14.2%	19.6%	18.8%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	5.6%	4.2%	2.1%	3.5%
On Probation at End of Year	65.5%	76.3%	84.7%	84.7%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.8%	2.6%	0.5%	3.5%

Comparison of Current Year Findings with Prior Year Findings

Highlighted below are the similarities and differences in the findings for the current reporting year and the prior reporting year:⁶

Age at Disposition for Felony Offense

The mean age at the time of disposition for the felony offense upon which the juveniles were randomly selected (i.e., mean age at time of disposition for the offense that occurred during the applicable fiscal year) increased from 15.8 the prior year to 16.5 in the current year.⁷

Percentage of YOBG-Funded Youth

The percentage of youth receiving one or more YOBG-funded Placements, Assessments, or other Direct Services rose dramatically from 33% (334 out of 1,011) last year to 43.3% (502 out of 1,159) this year.

Frequency of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services

In both years, YOBG-funded youth received, on average, a significantly greater number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services than non-YOBG-funded youth during the one year from date of disposition of their felony offense. Both the average number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services received, and the magnitude of the differences in these averages for YOBG-funded youth and non-YOBG-funded youth were essentially unchanged from last year to this year. A breakdown of the percentage of YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth who received each type of

⁶ Current reporting year findings refer to findings for youth who were randomly sampled based on an adjudicated felony that occurred in FY 200910; prior reporting year findings refer to findings for youth who were randomly sampled based on an adjudicated felony that occurred in FY 2008-09.

⁷ The mean ages for the populations of juveniles from which the samples were randomly selected rose similarly from 15.9 to 16.5.

Assessment, Placement and Direct Service in each of the two reporting years is presented in Table 16 (page 27).

Assessments

As shown in Table 16, a significantly greater percentage of YOBG-funded youth received each of the five types of assessments (Detention Assessments, Educational Assessments, Mental Health Screening, Risk and/or Needs Assessments and Substance Abuse Screening) in each reporting year. In addition, in both years the assessment most frequently conducted for the youth in both groups was a Risk/Needs Assessment.

Placements

Results reported for Placements in Table 16 show some noteworthy changes in the pattern of placements reported during the two years:

Home on Probation was the most frequent type of placement for both groups in both years, but unlike last year, the percentage of youth who experienced this type of placement was significantly higher for non-YOBG-funded youth (83%) than for YOBG-funded youth (73.8%) during the current year.

While significantly more YOBG-funded youth spent some time in Juvenile Hall both years, the difference between the rates was far greater this year (77.7% vs. 57.7%) than last year (74.3% vs. 65.7%), due largely to the decrease in the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth who spent some time in Juvenile Hall this year.

Whereas there was no significant difference in the percentage of youth in the two groups who experienced a Camp placement last year, there was a significant difference this year, with the percentage of YOBG-funded youth in a Camp placement increasing from 20.4% last year to 28.9% this year, and the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth decreasing from 24.1% last year to 11.6% this year.

Although a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth received a Ranch placement in each year, the percentage of YOBG-funded youth with such a placement decreased from 12.3% to 7.2% for YOBG-funded youth, but increased from 3.4% to 4.1% for non-YOBG-funded youth.

Last year significantly more YOBG-funded youth were in Other Placement, whereas there was no significant difference this year, with the rate decreasing modestly for YOBG-funded youth (from 15% to 12.9%) and increasing dramatically for non-YOBG-funded youth (from 7.2% to 12.0%)

A significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth were placed in a Private Residential Care Facility last year. This year there was no significant difference, as the percentage of YOBG-funded youth who were in a Private Residential Care Facility rose

slightly from last year (4.2%) to this year (4.8%), while the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth placed in such a facility dropped significantly from last year (11.5%) to this year (7.5%).

Direct Services

YOBG-funded youth received 22 of these services this year as compared to 18 services last year.⁸ Table 16 results for Direct Services show the following:

- In both years, YOBG-funded youth most frequently received a case plan (Development of Case Plan), Intensive Probation Supervision and Alcohol and Drug Treatment.
- There were five services - Group Counseling, Community Service, Gender Specific Programming for Girls, Parenting Education and Special Education Services – that had significant differences last year but non-significant differences this year. With the exception of Special Education Services, all of these changes were associated with an increase in the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth receiving the service this year (and in some instances, a decline in the percentage of YOBG-funded youth who received the service).
- There were nine services for which non-significant differences last year were significant this year – Recreational Activities, Individual Mental Health Counseling, Re-Entry or Aftercare Services, Pro-Social Skills Training, After School Services, Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education, Tutoring, Functional Family Therapy - and the pattern of results underlying these changes are more complex. For Individual Mental Health Counseling, Job Placement, and Pro-Social Skills Training, the changes were largely associated with a decline in the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth who received the services. The changes for After School Services and Re-Entry or Aftercare Services were associated with larger increases in the percentage of YOBG-funded youth than non-YOBG-funded youth who received the services this year. In the case of Life/Independent Skills Training/Education, the change was associated with a larger decrease in the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth than YOBG-funded youth who received the service this year. For the services of Functional Family Therapy and Recreational Activities, the changes were associated with an increase in the percentage of YOBG-funded youth who received the services and a decrease in the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth who received the services.

⁸ In neither year did a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth receive any Direct Service.

Table 16 - Percentage of YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth Receiving Assessments, Placements and Services by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)⁹

Assessment, Placement or Direct Service	2010-11		2009-10	
	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth
Assessments				
Risk/Needs Assessment	92.4%	74.4%	91.9%	80.4%
Substance Abuse Screening	81.9%	65.0%	76.3%	62.0%
Educational Assessment	74.8%	46.8%	72.2%	59.5%
Detention Assessment	71.1%	48.6%	78.4%	58.1%
Mental Health Screening	65.9%	51.9%	67.4%	48.3%
Placements				
Home on Probation	78.3%	83.0%	75.4%	77.7%
Juvenile Hall	77.7%	57.7%	74.3%	65.7%
Camp	28.9%	11.6%	20.4%	24.1%
Other Placement	12.9%	12.0%	15.0%	7.2%
Ranch	7.2%	4.1%	12.3%	3.4%
Private Residential Care Facility	4.8%	7.5%	4.2%	11.5%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab. Facility	4.0%	6.4%	5.7%	4.4%
Direct Services				
Development of Case Plan	85.9%	77.3%	88.3%	73.6%
Intensive Probation Supervision	64.9%	46.3%	60.5%	31.8%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	61.0%	48.1%	56.9%	36.0%
Restitution	49.6%	43.5%	47.0%	34.4%
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	46.8%	32.6%	44.9%	27.9%
Group Counseling	46.4%	43.4%	46.4%	35.0%
Community Service	45.6%	44.9%	45.8%	34.0%
Recreational Activities	44.4%	33.0%	39.5%	43.3%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	42.4%	32.9%	41.6%	41.4%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	39.8%	25.9%	25.1%	22.6%
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	39.6%	30.5%	47.2%	24.1%
Family Counseling	38.4%	32.6%	32.0%	23.3%
Pro-Social Skills Training	35.1%	24.5%	37.7%	36.0%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	28.1%	12.6%	24.9%	7.1%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	28.1%	21.0%	25.7%	14.9%
Gang Intervention	26.3%	14.0%	28.4%	20.8%
Electronic Monitoring	24.5%	17.0%	26.9%	20.1%
After School Services	24.1%	19.0%	15.9%	14.9%
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	19.8%	10.8%	23.2%	17.2%
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng./Educ.	18.9%	13.4%	28.7%	33.7%
Mentoring	17.9%	21.3%	21.3%	20.4%
Job Readiness Training	17.5%	8.4%	21.9%	12.6%
Parenting Education	14.9%	12.2%	17.7%	7.4%
Tutoring	14.7%	10.4%	12.3%	8.9%
Special Education Services	12.5%	11.0%	17.7%	11.7%
Vocational Training	12.2%	8.1%	17.4%	9.3%
Transitional Living Services and/or Placement	9.4%	12.0%	15.0%	13.7%
Functional Family Therapy	9.0%	5.8%	7.8%	9.0%
Job Placement	7.6%	4.6%	8.7%	8.3%
Restorative Justice	6.8%	9.6%	9.0%	7.5%
Monetary Incentives	5.6%	6.4%	3.3%	5.0%

⁹ Percentages in bold indicate statistically significant difference in the given reporting year. All significant differences indicate a higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth received the service.

Baseline Characteristics and Performance Outcomes

Table 17 shows the baseline characteristics of YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth in each of the two reporting years. As indicated in the table:

- In both years, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth had a case plan in place and had substance abuse indicated in their file at the time of disposition for their felony offense, while a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth had a mental health diagnosis/symptoms indicated in their file.
- Unlike last year, the percentage of youth in the two groups who were enrolled in school at the time of disposition was not significantly different.
- Whereas last year there was no significant difference in percentage of cases with WIC 300 declaration indicated in file, this year the percentage was significantly higher for the non-YOBG-funded youth (24.3%) than for YOBG-funded youth (18.4%).
- Unlike last year, the percentage of youth in the two groups taking psychotropic drugs as indicated in their file was not significantly different, whereas last year a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were identified as taking such medications.

Table 17 - Baseline Characteristics YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)¹⁰

Baseline Characteristic	2010-11		2009-10	
	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth
Enrolled in School	88.3%	87.3%	89.5%	82.6%
High School Grad or GED Indicated in File	5.9%	6.1%	6.0%	4.7%
Employed	6.6%	8.4%	10.2%	10.6%
Case Plan in Place	89.7%	80.0%	82.0%	69.9%
Substance Abuse Indicated in Case File	80.0%	70.5%	83.2%	73.9%
Mental Health Diagnosis in Case File	38.5%	44.3%	32.9%	42.4%
Taking Psychotropic Medications	14.8%	15.5%	16.5%	10.5%
Ever WIC 300 Indicated in File	18.4%	24.3%	9.6%	6.2%
Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation	4.6%	5.3%	6.9%	4.9%

¹⁰ Percentages in bold indicate a statistically significant difference in the given reporting year.

Performance outcomes for the two groups in each of the two reporting years are presented in Table 18. Results for outcomes pertaining to educational status and achievement indicate the following:

- In both years, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth were enrolled in school at some time during the one year following disposition of their felony offense, but there was no significant difference in the percentage of youth in the two groups who were enrolled in school at the end of this one year period.
- Last year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth graduated or received their GED or equivalent during the one year from date of disposition of their felony offense (12.0% versus 8.1%); this year the percentage of youth who achieved this milestone was lower for both groups (7.6% for YOBG-funded youth; 6.6% for non-YOBG-funded youth), and the difference was not statistically significant.

With respect to criminal justice outcomes:

- In both years, the percentage of youth on probation at the end of the one-year period from date of disposition was not statistically significant.
- In both years, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG-funded youth received a new felony adjudication during the one-year period.
- Last year, the percentage of youth in the two groups who were committed to DJJ during the one-year period was essentially the same (1.5%). This year the percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth with such a commitment was largely unchanged at 1.4%, while the percentage for YOBG-funded youth increased to 3.2%, and the difference was statistically significant.
- Last year, a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBG-funded youth received a new felony conviction in adult court during the one-year period. This year the difference was not statistically significant, although the rate was higher for YOBG-funded youth than for non-YOBG-funded youth.

Table 18 - Outcomes for YOBG-Funded Youth and Non-YOBG-Funded Youth by Reporting Year (2010-11 and 2009-10)¹¹

Outcome	2010-11		2009-10	
	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth	YOBG Funded Youth	Non-YOBG Funded Youth
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	95.8%	91.8%	95.2%	89.8%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	70.6%	73.7%	72.8%	67.1%
Graduated from High School/Received GED	7.6%	6.6%	12.0%	8.1%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	17.1%	10.0%	19.8%	12.4%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	4.8%	3.7%	1.8%	6.4%
On Probation at End of Year	76.5%	71.5%	73.1%	72.1%
Committed to DJJ During Year	3.2%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%

Relationships between Statistically Significant Outcomes and Statistically Significant Baseline Characteristics

Receiving a new commitment to DJJ was not found to be significantly related to any of the baseline characteristic differences (having a case plan in place, having a WIC 300 declaration on file, having a mental health diagnosis/symptoms indicated in the file or having substance abuse in the file).

A significantly higher percentage of cases with new felony adjudication had a case plan in place, substance abuse indicated in their case file, and a mental health diagnosis indicated in their file. Last year, only substance abuse indicated in their case file was significantly related to this outcome.

This year, having a case plan on file was found to be associated with a significantly higher rate of enrollment in school at any time during the year; last year no such relationship was found.

Outcome Relationships with Number of Direct Services

In both years the number of Direct Services was found to be significantly related to the outcomes of Enrolled in School at any time During Year, Enrolled in School at End of Year, New Felony Adjudication, and On Probation at The End of the Year. That is, those who received more Direct Services were more likely to be enrolled in school during the year and at the end of the year, and were also more likely to be on probation at the end of the year and to have received a new felony adjudication during the year.

¹¹ Percentages in bold indicate a statistically significant difference in the given reporting year.

Also in both years, no significant relationships were found between the number of Direct Services and the outcomes of Graduated from High School/GED, New Felony Conviction in Adult Court, or Commitment to DJJ During the Year.

Summary

Counties provided detailed information for a representative sample of 1,159 youth with felony adjudication during FY 2009-10. Among this group, approximately 43% were the beneficiary of YOBSG funding during the one-year period following the date of disposition of their adjudicated offense. This compares to a YOBSG funding rate of 33% for the youth who were sampled the prior reporting year (i.e., youth with a felony adjudication during FY 2008-09).

Similar to last year, YOBSG-funded youth received significantly more Assessments, Placements and other Direct Services than non-YOBSG-funded youth, and in most instances, the majority of individual Assessments, Placements and Direct Services received by this group were funded in whole or in part by YOBSG.

Again this year, for both groups, Risk/Needs Assessments were the most frequently administered type of Assessment; Home on Probation was the most frequently used type of Placement; and Development of Case Plan was the most frequently provided Direct Service. A significantly higher percentage YOBSG-funded youth received Direct Services this year compared to last year.

During the one-year period from disposition of their adjudicated felony, YOBSG-funded youth were significantly more likely to be enrolled in school, and were also significantly more likely to receive new felony adjudications. The same results were obtained for the youth sampled the prior reporting year. Unlike last year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBSG-funded youth were committed to DJJ during the one-year follow-up period, and whereas last year a significantly higher percentage of non-YOBSG-funded youth received a felony conviction in adult court, there was no significant difference in the rates for YOBSG-funded and non-YOBSG-funded youth this year.

As was the case last year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBSG-funded youth were found to have substance abuse indicated in their file at baseline, and this baseline characteristic was found to be significantly related to the occurrence of a new felony adjudication (i.e., those with substance abuse were significantly more likely to have a new felony adjudication). Having a mental health diagnosis/symptom(s) indicated in the file at baseline was also found to be significantly related to having a new felony adjudication during the year. Paradoxically, while a significantly higher percentage of YOBSG-funded youth received a new felony adjudication during the year, a significantly lower percentage of YOBSG-funded youth had a mental health diagnosis/symptom(s) indicated in their file at baseline. The same results were obtained last year. No baseline differences were found to be related to the higher DJJ commitment rate for YOBSG-funded youth.

In both years, for all youth, the number of Direct Services was found to be associated with continued involvement in school, a new sustained felony in juvenile court, and continued status as a probationer; but not with educational achievement, a new felony conviction, or commitment to DJJ.

Appendix A

Total Expenditures in Each Expenditure Category (All Funding Sources)

Expenditure Category	Total Expenditures (All Funds)	Per Capita Cost
Camp	\$51,126,248	\$19,403
Home on Probation	\$7,982,155	\$1,336
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility	\$8,546,248	\$12,003
Juvenile Hall	\$35,437,471	\$16,752
Other Placement	\$16,293,477	\$7,115
Ranch	\$263,701	\$5,071
All Placements	\$119,649,300	\$8,642
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$7,614,431	\$3,578
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$3,992,792	\$4,066
Other Direct Service	\$3,660,117	\$508
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$2,941,772	\$1,774
Individual Mental Health Counseling	\$1,583,170	\$1,567
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,931,566	\$341
Family Counseling	\$1,005,196	\$3,083
Vocational Training	\$917,161	\$3,218
Job Readiness Training	\$877,456	\$4,454
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$1,049,080	\$933
Mentoring	\$691,443	\$1,910
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	\$621,128	\$1,204
Development of Case Plan	\$1,732,149	\$2,803
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$566,714	\$1,318
Detention Assessment(s)	\$526,384	\$241
Recreational Activities	\$193,427	\$267
Functional Family Therapy	\$679,174	\$5,031
Electronic Monitoring	\$539,550	\$803
Gang Intervention	\$150,842	\$2,601
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$242,767	\$472
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	\$93,208	\$320
Group Counseling	\$101,038	\$393
Community Service	\$75,276	\$1,882
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$74,580	\$324
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	\$56,411	\$321
After School Services	\$29,128	\$62
Special Education Services	\$26,987	\$56
Mental Health Screening	\$6,156	\$48
Tutoring	\$4,725	\$236
Parenting Education	\$245	N/A
All Direct Services	\$31,984,073	\$1,108
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$3,433,939	\$13,869
Other Capacity Building/Maintenance	\$821,214	\$1,000
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$491,849	\$57
Equipment	\$205,358	\$809
Other Procurements	\$65,040	N/A
Capital Improvements	\$27,700	\$338
Contract Services	\$5,000	N/A
All Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities	\$5,050,100	\$6,332
All Placements/Services/Cap Bldg./Maint. Activities	\$156,683,473	\$3,569

Appendix B

Amount of YOBG Funds Spent By Allocation Year

County	Total YOBG Expenditures	Fiscal Year Allocation Source							
		FY 2010/2011		FY 2009/2010		FY 2008/2009		FY 2007/2008	
		Amount	% Tot	Amount	% Tot	Amount	% Tot	Amount	% Tot
Alameda	\$3,087,405	\$3,087,405	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Alpine	\$118,015	\$117,000	99.1%	\$1,015	0.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Amador	\$80,586	\$36,764	45.6%	\$43,458	53.9%	\$364	0.5%	\$0	0.0%
Butte	\$143,706	\$143,706	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Calaveras	\$117,000	\$117,000	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Colusa	\$98,215	\$98,215	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Contra Costa	\$2,055,005	\$2,055,005	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Del Norte	\$40,111	\$40,111	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
El Dorado	\$396,761	\$99,816	25.2%	\$296,945	74.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Fresno	\$3,124,490	\$2,667,213	85.4%	\$457,277	14.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Glenn	\$81,942	\$15,412	18.8%	\$66,530	81.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Humboldt	\$218,186	\$199,127	91.3%	\$19,059	8.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Imperial	\$513,736	\$334,239	65.1%	\$179,497	34.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Inyo	\$35,792	\$35,792	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Kern	\$3,220,957	\$2,834,568	88.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$386,389	12.0%	\$0	0.0%
Kings	\$193,258	\$0	0.0%	\$70,190	36.3%	\$123,068	63.7%	\$0	0.0%
Lake	\$135,505	\$135,505	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Lassen	\$117,000	\$117,000	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Los Angeles	\$29,572,410	\$21,572,410	72.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$2,541,737	8.6%	\$5,458,263	18.5%
Madera	\$300,964	\$300,964	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Marin	\$517,565	\$517,565	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Mariposa	\$110,636	\$50,249	45.4%	\$60,387	54.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Mendocino	\$141,849	\$141,849	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Merced	\$1,064,119	\$1,064,119	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Modoc	\$117,000	\$117,000	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Mono	\$49,000	\$49,000	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Monterey	\$1,058,464	\$1,058,464	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Napa	\$441,410	\$217,766	49.3%	\$223,644	50.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Nevada	\$195,111	\$10,387	5.3%	\$184,724	94.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Orange	\$7,140,422	\$7,140,422	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Placer	\$600,000	\$0	0.0%	\$290,300	48.4%	\$309,700	51.6%	\$0	0.0%
Plumas	\$90,423	\$0	0.0%	\$90,423	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Riverside	\$5,387,106	\$5,387,106	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Sacramento	\$3,782,072	\$3,775,368	99.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$6,704	0.2%	\$0	0.0%
San Benito	\$137,272	\$75,555	55.0%	\$61,717	45.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
San Bernardino	\$8,390,481	\$8,390,481	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
San Diego	\$6,071,122	\$4,007,713	66.0%	\$2,063,409	34.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
San Francisco	\$1,050,317	\$983,262	93.6%	\$51,739	4.9%	\$15,316	1.5%	\$0	0.0%
San Joaquin	\$2,154,784	\$1,071,720	49.7%	\$1,083,064	50.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
SLO	\$421,516	\$421,516	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
San Mateo	\$2,170,446	\$855,592	39.4%	\$1,314,854	60.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Santa Barbara	\$1,002,924	\$1,002,924	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Santa Clara	\$2,868,521	\$2,114,267	73.7%	\$754,254	26.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Santa Cruz	\$310,276	\$230,213	74.2%	\$80,063	25.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Shasta	\$640,191	\$315,546	49.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$175,550	27.4%	\$149,095	23.3%
Sierra	\$59,650	\$59,650	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Siskiyou	\$148,424	\$117,000	78.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$31,424	21.2%
Solano	\$1,741,118	\$1,713,712	98.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$27,406	1.6%
Sonoma	\$765,010	\$0	0.0%	\$416,829	54.5%	\$348,181	45.5%	\$0	0.0%
Stanislaus	\$98,653	\$98,653	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Sutter	\$211,208	\$101,768	48.2%	\$71,032	33.6%	\$38,408	18.2%	\$0	0.0%
Tehama	\$154,365	\$154,365	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Trinity	\$117,000	\$117,000	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Tulare	\$1,515,059	\$1,515,059	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Tuolumne	\$117,500	\$117,500	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Ventura	\$1,883,826	\$256,127	13.6%	\$1,627,699	86.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Yolo	\$507,524	\$507,524	100.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Yuba	\$219,602	\$69,775	31.8%	\$149,827	68.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
All Counties	\$97,103,010	\$77,833,469	80.2%	\$9,657,936	9.9%	\$3,945,417	4.1%	\$5,666,188	5.8%

Appendix C

Summary of Per Capita Costs

Note: Costs shown are those based on total funds (all sources) and YOYG funds only. Statewide Per Capita Costs are based on total costs divided by total youth served for those programs/activities where youth were identified as being served. Also shown are Minimum and Maximum Per Capita Costs at the County level.

Expenditure Category	Counties	All Funds			YOYG Funds		
		Statewide	Min	Max	Statewide	Min	Max
Camp	12	\$19,403	\$868	\$91,000	\$15,746	\$785	\$30,475
Home on Probation	4	\$1,336	\$700	\$14,429	\$1,286	\$700	\$12,895
Other Rehab Facility	5	\$12,003	\$2,014	\$48,442	\$10,264	\$2,014	\$48,442
Juvenile Hall	16	\$16,752	\$104	\$308,779	\$3,063	\$104	\$23,050
Other Placement	3	\$7,115	\$35	\$44,692	\$2,468	\$35	\$17,262
Ranch	3	\$5,071	\$1,761	\$18,178	\$1,211	\$508	\$18,178
All Placements	43	\$8,642	\$35	\$308,779	\$4,959	\$35	\$48,442
Intensive Probation Supervision	16	\$3,578	\$1,124	\$31,278	\$3,087	\$1,124	\$6,358
Day or Evening Treatment Program	7	\$4,066	\$720	\$9,651	\$3,393	\$304	\$9,651
Other Direct Service	12	\$508	\$4	\$4,635	\$371	\$4	\$2,662
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	8	\$1,774	\$426	\$7,068	\$1,562	\$426	\$7,068
Individual Mental Health Counseling	13	\$1,567	\$158	\$12,758	\$1,434	\$47	\$11,499
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	14	\$341	\$26	\$1,040	\$248	\$26	\$1,040
Family Counseling	3	\$3,083	\$167	\$11,043	\$3,083	\$167	\$11,043
Vocational Training	5	\$3,218	\$637	\$11,519	\$3,218	\$637	\$11,519
Job Readiness Training	2	\$4,454	\$2,846	\$4,851	\$4,216	\$2,846	\$4,555
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	7	\$933	\$62	\$10,241	\$732	\$30	\$9,643
Mentoring	6	\$1,910	\$28	\$12,030	\$1,888	\$5	\$12,030
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	5	\$1,204	\$41	\$3,060	\$1,204	\$41	\$3,060
Development of Case Plan	2	\$2,803	\$2,191	\$2,930	\$893	\$633	\$2,148
Aggression Replacement Therapy	5	\$1,318	\$15	\$2,411	\$1,122	\$15	\$2,344
Detention Assessment(s)	3	\$241	\$110	\$3,211	\$196	\$39	\$3,211
Recreational Activities	3	\$267	\$82	\$1,351	\$267	\$82	\$1,351
Functional Family Therapy	3	\$5,031	\$1,945	\$7,309	\$1,073	\$139	\$1,535
Electronic Monitoring	8	\$803	\$38	\$2,192	\$211	\$20	\$1,799
Gang Intervention	1	\$2,601	\$2,601	\$2,601	\$2,317	\$2,317	\$2,317
Pro-Social Skills Training	3	\$472	\$243	\$1,525	\$238	\$34	\$1,525
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng./Educ.	4	\$320	\$10	\$464	\$320	\$10	\$464
Group Counseling	4	\$393	\$51	\$2,845	\$331	\$51	\$2,845
Community Service	1	\$1,882	\$1,882	\$1,882	\$1,882	\$1,882	\$1,882
Anger Management Couns./Treatment	3	\$324	\$34	\$2,055	\$248	\$34	\$1,182
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	2	\$321	\$24	\$711	\$321	\$24	\$711
After School Services	3	\$62	\$58	\$74	\$62	\$58	\$74
Special Education Services	1	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56
Mental Health Screening	2	\$48	\$28	\$1,339	\$48	\$28	\$1,339
Tutoring	1	\$236	\$236	\$236	\$236	\$236	\$236
Parenting Education	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All Direct Services	148	\$1,108	\$4	\$31,278	\$885	\$4	\$12,030
Staff Salaries/Benefits	8	\$13,869	\$570	\$70,162	\$3,519	\$570	\$15,018
Other Capacity Building/Maintenance	8	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
Staff Training/Professional Development	10	\$57	\$51	\$190	\$57	\$51	\$190
Equipment	7	\$809	\$358	\$4,300	\$809	\$358	\$4,300
Other Procurements	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Capital Improvements	1	\$338	\$338	\$338	\$338	\$338	\$338
Contract Services	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All Capacity Bldg./Maint. Activities	36	\$6,332	\$51	\$70,162	\$1,752	\$51	\$15,018
All Categories	227	\$3,569	\$4	\$308,779	\$2,193	\$4	\$48,442

Appendix D

Comparison of County YOBG Allocation Amounts and County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group

County	YOBG Allocation		Performance Outcome Study Group			
	Amount	% Total	Initial	Exclusions	Final	% Total
Alameda	\$3,087,405	3.3%	40		40	3.5%
Alpine	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Amador	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Butte	\$476,058	0.5%	6	1	5	0.4%
Calaveras	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Colusa	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Contra Costa	\$2,055,006	2.2%	26	7	19	1.6%
Del Norte	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
El Dorado	\$359,596	0.4%	5	1	4	0.3%
Fresno	\$3,106,964	3.3%	40	3	37	3.2%
Glenn	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Humboldt	\$234,468	0.3%	3		3	0.3%
Imperial	\$334,239	0.4%	4		4	0.3%
Inyo	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Kern	\$2,834,568	3.0%	36	1	35	3.0%
Kings	\$471,070	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Lake	\$181,057	0.2%	2	1	1	0.1%
Lassen	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Los Angeles	\$21,572,410	23.1%	323	45	278	24.0%
Madera	\$480,562	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Marin	\$615,713	0.7%	8		8	0.7%
Mariposa	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Mendocino	\$189,102	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Merced	\$1,064,119	1.1%	13		13	1.1%
Modoc	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Mono	\$117,000	0.1%	1		1	0.1%
Monterey	\$1,058,464	1.1%	14	2	12	1.0%
Napa	\$440,392	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Nevada	\$257,372	0.3%	3		3	0.3%
Orange	\$7,010,986	7.5%	90	7	83	7.2%
Placer	\$690,415	0.7%	9	1	8	0.7%
Plumas	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Riverside	\$5,387,106	5.8%	73	8	65	5.6%
Sacramento	\$4,522,433	4.8%	58	1	57	4.9%
San Benito	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
San Bernardino	\$8,244,151	8.8%	106	3	103	8.9%
San Diego	\$7,710,853	8.3%	115	20	95	8.2%
San Francisco	\$981,461	1.1%	13		13	1.1%
San Joaquin	\$2,283,566	2.4%	29	1	28	2.4%
San Luis Obispo	\$421,516	0.5%	5		5	0.4%
San Mateo	\$2,006,829	2.1%	26		26	2.2%
Santa Barbara	\$1,002,924	1.1%	13	1	12	1.0%
Santa Clara	\$3,164,987	3.4%	41		41	3.5%
Santa Cruz	\$406,844	0.4%	5		5	0.4%
Shasta	\$315,546	0.3%	4		4	0.3%
Sierra	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Siskiyou	\$117,000	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Solano	\$1,582,335	1.7%	20		20	1.7%
Sonoma	\$904,850	1.0%	12	2	10	0.9%
Stanislaus	\$1,218,626	1.3%	16		16	1.4%
Sutter	\$241,691	0.3%	3		3	0.3%
Tehama	\$166,268	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Trinity	\$117,000	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Tulare	\$1,612,326	1.7%	21		21	1.8%
Tuolumne	\$117,000	0.1%	3	1	2	0.2%
Ventura	\$2,076,235	2.2%	27		27	2.3%
Yolo	\$507,524	0.5%	7	1	6	0.5%
Yuba	\$179,594	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Total:	\$93,446,631	100.0%	1266	107	1159	100.0%

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER BLOCK GRANT (YOBG) PERFORMANCE OUTCOME REPORT

Contact Name: William Brown
 Contact Phone: 688-688-6888
 Contact Email: wbrown@co.smyth.ga.us

Section 1 - IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

Access the JCPDS system and use the Personal Identification Number provided to identify each youth. For purposes of reviewing local records to obtain the information requested you may enter the name of each youth in the space provided. However, REMOVE ALL NAMES PRIOR TO RETURNING THE COMPLETED FORM TO CSA.

County	99	99
Personal Identification Number	666	111
Last Name		
First Name		
Adjudicated Offense (Penal Code Section)	PC 0001	PC 0002
Date of Disposition of Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/27/2009	3/31/2008
Gender (1=Male, 2=Female)	1	2
Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)	1/11/1994	3/31/1994
Race/Ethnicity (see codes below)	17	18

Section 2 - CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH AT THE TIME OF DISPOSITION OF ADJUDICATED OFFENSE

Respond to all items in this section with reference to the DATE OF DISPOSITION shown to the right. Do not leave any spaces blank.

Date of Disposition of Adjudicated Offense (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/27/2009	3/31/2008
Was the Youth Enrolled in School? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	
Had the Youth Graduated from High School or Achieved a GED or Equivalent? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2	
Was the Youth Employed? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2	
Was a Case Plan in Place for the Youth? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	
Was Substance Use/Abuse Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1	
Was a Mental Health Diagnosis or were Mental Health Symptoms Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2	
Was the Taking of Prescription Psychotropic Medication(s) Indicated in the Youth's File? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2	
Had the Youth Ever Been Declared a Dependent Under Child Welfare Services Section 3007? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	
Had the Youth Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	3	

Section 3 - PLACEMENTS/SERVICES RECEIVED DURING ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF DISPOSITION

Complete all items in this section (Section 3) even if the youth received no YOBG-funded placements/services DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF DISPOSITION. Leave no spaces blank.

Date of Disposition (mm/dd/yyyy)	2/27/2009	3/31/2008
Did the Youth Receive any YOBG-Funded Services (Direct or Indirect) During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1	
Did the Youth Receive a Detention Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	
Did the Youth Receive a Risk and/or Needs Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	
Did the Youth Receive an Educational Assessment During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2	
Did the Youth Receive a Mental Health Screening During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	2	
Did the Youth Receive a Substance Abuse Screening During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Unknown)	1	

Nature of Placement(s)

Listed to the right are placement alternatives. Use the codes below to indicate the source of State funding (YOBG and/or JJCPA funds) for each type of placement that applied to the youth DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM THE DATE OF DISPOSITION of the Adjudicated Offense.

Juvenile Hall	4
Ranch	1
Camp	1
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility	1
Private Residential Care Facility	3
Home on Probation	1
Other Placement	1

Services Received

Listed to the right are alternative interventions and services. Using the codes provided, indicate the type of State funding (YOBG and/or JJCPA funds) for each intervention/service provided to the youth DURING THE ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF DISPOSITION. Enter a single code for each intervention/service listed. Do not leave any spaces blank.

Alcohol/Drug Treatment	2
After-School Services	1
Aggression Replacement Therapy	1
Anger Management/Counseling/Treatment	1
Development of Case Plan	1
Community Service	1
Day or Evening Treatment Program	1
Detention Assessment(s)	1
Electronic Monitoring	4
Family Counseling	1
Functional Family Therapy	1
Gang Intervention	1
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	1
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	1
Group Counseling	3
Intensive Probation Supervision	1
Job Placement	1
Job Readiness Training	1
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	1
Individual Mental Health Counseling	1
Mental Health Screening	1
Mentoring	1
Monetary Incentives	1
Parenting Education	1
Pro-Social Skills Training	1
Recreational Activities	1
Restorative Justice	1
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	1
Resortation	1
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	1
Special Education Services	1
Substance Abuse Screening	1
Transitional Living Services and/or Placement	1
Tutoring	4
Vocational Training	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1
Other (enter funding code only)	1

Section 4 - PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Responses to all questions in this section should reflect the behavior of the youth DURING THE SAME ONE YEAR PERIOD FROM DATE OF DISPOSITION of the adjudicated offense that was identified for the youth. Do not leave any space blank.

Was the Youth Enrolled in School AT ANY TIME During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
Was the Youth Enrolled in School AT THE END of this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
Did the Youth Graduate from High School or Achieve a GED or Equivalent DURING this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
Did the Youth Receive a new Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court) During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
Did the Youth Receive a new Felony Conviction (Adult Court) During this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	2
Was the Youth on Probation DURING this One Year Period? (1=Yes, 2=No)	1
Was the Youth on Probation AT THE END of this One Year Period (1=Yes, 2=No, 3=N/A)	1
Was the Youth Committed to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) AT ANY TIME during this One Year Period? (1=Yes, Upon Initial Disposition; 2=Yes, Later in the Year; 3=No)	3

Assessments Administered, Services Provided and Outcomes Achieved¹

	YOBG-Funded Youth (502)		Non YOBG-Funded Youth (657)		All Youth (1159)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Assessments Administered						
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	464	92.4%	489	74.4%	953	82.2%
Substance Abuse Screening	411	81.9%	427	65.0%	838	72.3%
Educational Assessment	240	74.8%	184	46.8%	424	59.4%
Detention Assessment	357	71.1%	319	48.6%	676	58.3%
Mental Health Assessment	331	65.9%	341	51.9%	672	58.0%
Services Provided - Placements						
Home on Probation	393	78.3%	545	83.0%	938	80.9%
Juvenile Hall	390	77.7%	379	57.7%	769	66.4%
Camp	145	28.9%	76	11.6%	221	19.1%
Other Placement	65	12.9%	79	12.0%	144	12.4%
Ranch	36	7.2%	27	4.1%	63	5.4%
Private Residential Care Facility	24	4.8%	49	7.5%	73	6.3%
Other Secure/Semi-secure Facility	20	4.0%	42	6.4%	62	5.3%
Services Provided - Direct Services						
Case Plan	431	85.9%	508	77.3%	939	81.0%
Detention Assessment	357	71.1%	319	48.6%	676	58.3%
Intensive Probation Supervision	326	64.9%	304	46.3%	630	54.4%
Drug Treatment Program	306	61.0%	316	48.1%	622	53.7%
Restitution	249	49.6%	286	43.5%	535	46.2%
Anger Management Counseling	235	46.8%	214	32.6%	449	38.7%
Group Counseling	233	46.4%	285	43.4%	518	44.7%
Community Service	229	45.6%	295	44.9%	524	45.2%
Recreational Activities	223	44.4%	217	33.0%	440	38.0%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	213	42.4%	216	32.9%	429	37.0%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	200	39.8%	170	25.9%	370	31.9%
Family Counseling	193	38.4%	214	32.6%	407	35.1%
Pro-Social Skills Training	176	35.1%	161	24.5%	337	29.1%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	141	28.1%	83	12.6%	224	19.3%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	141	28.1%	138	21.0%	279	24.1%
Gang Intervention Program	132	26.3%	92	14.0%	224	19.3%
Electronic Monitoring	123	24.5%	112	17.0%	235	20.3%
After School Services	121	24.1%	125	19.0%	246	21.2%
Life/Independent Living Skills Trng.	95	18.9%	88	13.4%	183	15.8%
Mentoring	90	17.9%	140	21.3%	230	19.8%
Job Readiness Training	88	17.5%	55	8.4%	143	12.3%
Parent Education	75	14.9%	80	12.2%	155	13.4%
Tutoring	74	14.7%	68	10.4%	142	12.3%
Special Education Services	63	12.5%	72	11.0%	135	11.6%
Vocational Training	61	12.2%	53	8.1%	114	9.8%
Transitional Living Services	47	9.4%	79	12.0%	126	10.9%
Functional Family Therapy	45	9.0%	38	5.8%	83	7.2%
Job Placement	38	7.6%	30	4.6%	68	5.9%
Restorative Justice	34	6.8%	63	9.6%	97	8.4%
Monetary Incentives	28	5.6%	42	6.4%	70	6.0%
Outcomes Achieved						
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	480	95.8%	603	91.8%	1083	93.5%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	353	70.6%	483	73.7%	836	72.4%
Graduated/Received GED or Equivalent	38	7.6%	43	6.6%	81	7.0%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	86	17.1%	66	10.0%	152	13.1%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	24	4.8%	24	3.7%	48	4.1%
On Probation at End of Year	384	76.5%	470	71.5%	854	73.7%
Committed to DJJ During Year	16	3.2%	9	1.4%	25	2.2%

¹ Results exclude cases with missing data or responses of "unknown."