2018

OJJDP Title II Formula Grants Program Application

California's Comprehensive State Plan

FFY 2018-2020

Corrections Planning and Grant Programs Division
Board of State and Community Corrections
www.bscc.ca.gov

This page left intentionally blank

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – EDMUND G. BROWN, GOVERNOR

BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Board Members*

Chair, Board of State Community Corrections ..... **Linda M. Penner**
The Chair of the Board is a full-time paid position appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate Confirmation

Secretary, CA Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) ..... **Scott Kernan**

Director, Adult Parole Operations, CDCR ..... **Jerry Powers**

Lassen County Sheriff ..... **Dean Growdon**
A sheriff in charge of local detention facility with a BSCC rated capacity of 200 inmates or less appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

Ventura County Sheriff ..... **Geoff Dean**
A sheriff in charge of local detention facility with a BSCC rated capacity of more than 200 inmates appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

Kern County Supervisor ..... **Leticia Perez**
A county supervisor or administrative officer appointed by the Governor subject and to Senate confirmation

San Bernardino County Chief Probation Officer ..... **Michelle Scray Brown**
A chief probation officer from a county with a population over 200,000 appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

Nevada County Chief Probation Officer ..... **Michael Ertola**
A chief probation officer from a county with a population under 200,000 appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

Retired Judge, Solano County ..... **Ramona J. Garrett**
A judge appointed by the Judicial Council of California

Chief of Police (Ret), City Of Chula Vista ..... **David Bejarano**
A chief of police appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

Founder of the Anti-Recidivism Coalition and Film Producer ..... **Scott Budnick**
A community provider of rehabilitative treatment or services for adult offenders appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly

Director, Commonweal Juvenile Justice Program ..... **David Steinhart**
A community provider or advocate with expertise in effective programs, policies and treatment of at-risk youth and juvenile offenders appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules

Office of Public Safety Accountability – City of Sacramento ..... **Francine Tournour**
A public member appointed by the Governor and subject to Senate confirmation

BSCC Staff

Executive Director ..... **Kathleen T. Howard**
Communications Director ..... **Tracie Cone**
Deputy Director, Corrections Planning & Grant Programs (CPGP) ..... **Mary Jolls**
Juvenile Justice Specialist, Field Representative, CPGP ..... **Kimberly Bushard**
R.E.D. Coordinator, Field Representative, CPGP ..... **Timothy Polasik**
Field Representative, CPGP ..... **Nicole Woodman**
Staff Services Manager, CGPG ..... **Kally Sanders**
Associate Governmental Program Analyst ..... **Aleksandra Djurasovic**
Chief of Research ..... **Kasey Warmuth**

** Board member composition is pursuant to Penal Code 6025*

This page left intentionally blank

California's Comprehensive State Plan Program Narrative
FFY 2018-20 Three-Year Plan

Table of Contents

Program Narrative 1
1. System Description: Structure and Function of the Juvenile Justice System 1
2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs 5
   A. Youth Crime Analysis 6
   B. California's Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements 6
      State Plan 6
      1. Keeping youth out of the juvenile justice system by promoting community and family supports 7
      2. Promoting youth success by reducing recidivism 8
      3. Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information 11
         3.1: Overview of State Efforts and Plans to Promote Youth Development and Wellbeing 11
         3.2: Efforts by the designated state agency to partner with non-justice system agencies 12
         3.3: Challenges and plans to improve coordination and joint decision-making 13
         3.4: Youth crime data collection and analysis 13
      4. Problem Statements, Goals/Objectives, & Implementation and Budget Narrative 15
         4.1: Program Descriptions 15
         4.2: Formula Grants Program Areas 16
         I: Aftercare/Reentry 16
         II: Alternatives to Detention and Placement 17
         III: Community Based Programs and Services 19
         IV: Mental Health Services 20
         V: Mentoring, Counseling and Training 21
         VI: Compliance Monitoring 22
         VII: Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity (R.E.D.)/Disproportionate Minority Contact. 23
         VIII: Diversion 24
         IX: Native American Programs 25
         X: Planning and Administration 26
         XI: State Advisory Group Allocation 27
      5. Programmatic and Budget Assurances 28
      6. Subgrant Award Assurance 28
      7. State Advisory Board Membership 30
      8. Staff of the Title II Grant 32
         8.1: Staff and Organizational Structure 32
         8.2: Staffing (FFY Year 2018 Projections) 33
         8.3: List of Juvenile Programs Administered by the BSCC 37

Attachments

Attachment 1: New 2017 California Laws Relevant to Juvenile Justice 1
Attachment 2: Additional Attachments and Disclosures 5

Appendices

Appendix A: Structure of the Juvenile Justice System in California 1
Appendix F: OJJDP FY 2018 Title II Formula Grant Budget Detail Worksheet 3
Apprendix G: Compliance and DMC Plans 5
Appendix I: Compliance With the JJDP Act [42 U.S.C. 5633, Section 223(a)] 7
Appendix J: Contact Information for States and Territories 19
Appendix N: Juvenile Problem/Needs Analysis Data Elements 21
Youth Crime Analysis 21
1. Juvenile Arrests 22
2. Juvenile Referrals 26
2.1: Juvenile Referrals to Probation 26
2.2: Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Petitions Filed 28
3. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments 31
3.1: Summary of Juvenile Referrals by Other Actions Taken and Petitions 31
3.2: Summary of Other Actions Taken by Type 32
3.3: Summary of Juvenile Petitions by Court Action 51
4. Juvenile Hall Bookings & Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility 76
4.1: Juvenile Hall Bookings 76
4.2: Juvenile Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility 77
5. Mental Health Indicators 80
5.1: Select Juvenile Detention Profile Survey Data Trends 80
5.2: Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends for 2010 through 2016 80
5.3 Juvenile Suicide-Related Trends for 2010 through 2016 82
5.4 JDPS Reporting Jurisdictions as of December 2016 83
6. Other Trends/Qualitative Data 85
6.1: Literature Review 85
6.2: Title II State Plan Survey 100
6.3: Public Listening Session 116
6.4: Public comment: The Chief Probation Officers of California 124

Program Narrative

1. System Description: Structure and Function of the Juvenile Justice System

California's objective is to protect public safety and improve its juvenile justice system by preventing juvenile delinquency, providing fair treatment and wellbeing of youth involved in the juvenile justice system, reducing crime, and ensuring compliance with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) requirements. California is dedicated to successfully administering local grant programs and funding relevant and effective statewide initiatives.

California's juvenile justice system encompasses the agencies that have a role in the processing of juveniles alleged to be involved in criminal or delinquent behavior, status offenses, and minor traffic violations. California's juvenile justice system is composed of many responsible agencies that work in a coordinated fashion to address juvenile justice related issues:

1. Law Enforcement (County Sheriffs, City Police Departments, California Highway Patrol, etc.) – enforces the laws within its jurisdiction by investigating complaints, providing programs including alternatives to detention and restorative justice, and making arrests.[1]
2. District Attorney – files WIC 602 petitions, represents the community at all Juvenile court hearings and may act in the juvenile's behalf on WIC 300[2] petitions. WIC 602 petitions allege that a juvenile committed an act that would be against the law if committed by an adult. WIC 300 petitions allege that a child has suffered, or is at risk of suffering serious physical harm, sexual abuse, neglect, etc.

1 Welfare and Institutions Code section 601 provides, in part, "any person who is under 18 years of age when he or she violates any law of this state or of the United States or any ordinance of any city or county of this state defining crime other than an ordinance establishing a curfew based solely on age, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court."

2 Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 provides for a child to become a dependent child of the court when "[t]the child has suffered, or there is a substantial risk that the child will suffer, serious physical harm inflicted nonaccidentally upon the child by the child's parent or guardian."

3. Public Defender – represents juveniles in WIC 601[3] and WIC 602 proceedings and may represent parents in WIC 300 petitions. A court appointed or private attorney may also be used. WIC 601 petitions allege runaway behavior, truancy, curfew violations, and/or regular disobedience.
4. Probation – provides a screening function for the Juvenile Court; maintains intake services and detention facilities for wards adjudicated pursuant to WIC 602, provides intake, shelter care, and counseling services for juveniles in WIC 601 cases; provides the court with a study of the minor's situation; and provides supervision for the minor as ordered by the court.
5. Health and Human Services Department (dependent intake, Children's Protective Services, placement, etc.) – offers services to juveniles referred as possible dependent/neglected children, investigates and files WIC 300 petitions on behalf of juveniles and provides supervision of WIC 300 cases.
6. Juvenile Court – hears facts regarding WIC 300, 601, and 602 petitions, makes findings and adjudicates cases. The juvenile court has the final authority in all juvenile matters under its jurisdiction.
7. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) – DJJ houses for treatment, training and education youth committed by the juvenile and criminal courts. for serious and violent offenses set forth in Welfare and Institutions Code section 707(b), The DJJ population is a small percentage of the youth who are arrested in California each year, and they have needs that cannot be addressed by county programs. Most juvenile offenders today are committed to county facilities in their home community where they can be closer to their families and local social services that are vital to rehabilitation. DJJ's population represents less than one percent of the 225,000 youths arrested in California each year.[4] As part of the state's criminal justice system, the DJJ works closely with law enforcement, the courts, district attorneys, public defenders, probation and a broad spectrum of public and private agencies concerned with, and involved in, the problems of youth.

3 Welfare and Insititutions Code section 602 provides, in part, "Any person under 18 years of age who persistently or habitually refuses to obey the reasonable and proper orders or directions of his or her parents, guardian, or custodian, or who is beyond the control of that person, or who is under the age of 18 years when he or she violated any ordinance of any city or county of this state establishing a curfew based solely on age is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court which may adjudge the minor to be a ward of the court."

4 http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Juvenile_Justice/index.html. Includes referrals and arrests.

Upon making an arrest, a law enforcement agency typically refers youth to the applicable probation department in the juvenile's county of residence. Probation departments investigate all referrals received and make a determination of how to proceed with each. Disposition of cases include counsel and release, transfer to the jurisdiction where the minor resides, wardship and probation, out-of-home placement, commitment to juvenile hall or camp, and commitment to the DJJ. Please see Appendix A for more information on the structure of the juvenile justice system in California.

Juvenile offenders whose placement is funded through section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) receive the protections specified in section 471 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671), including a case plan and case plan review as defined in section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675). These protections exist in California's Welfare and Institutions Code Sections (WIC) 724.4, which requires social study reports/case plans, and WIC 366 which requires the submission of 6 month case plan reviews. County departments also have sole responsibility for the administration of child welfare/dependency issues and juvenile probation services, and each county's coordination and information sharing efforts are unique.

In addition, there are non-justice related State agencies participating in the administration of programs for at-risk California youth:

California Department of Education (CDE)

Community Day Schools – serve mandatory and other expelled students, and other high-risk youths. The instructional day includes academic programs that provide challenging curriculum, individual attention to student learning modalities and abilities and focus on the development of pro-social skills and student self-esteem and resiliency.

Juvenile Court Schools – provide mandated public education services for juvenile offenders who are under the protection or authority of the county juvenile justice system. The juvenile court school provides quality learning opportunities for students to complete a course of study leading to a high school diploma. Students must take all required public education assessments (e.g. The California High School Exit

Examination, Standardized Testing and Reporting Program). Opportunity Education Program

The Opportunity Education program provides support for students who struggle to perform in the traditional education system, as well as a supportive environment with specialized curricula, instruction, guidance and counseling, psychological services, and tutorial assistance to help students overcome barriers to learning.

Program Access & Retention Initiative – this program promotes dropout prevention, recovery, and retention services for all students at risk of not completing a high school education.

California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)

The Adolescent Treatment Program provides substance abuse treatment and early intervention services.[5] Generally, services include residential treatment for adolescents in group home settings, services for youth transitioning into the community after discharge from institutional facilities, outpatient programs in the community, and services at school sites.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Chafee Educational Vouchers Program – this provides Title IV-E eligible foster youth up to $5,000 per year for post-secondary education and training. Youth who received or were eligible to receive Independent Living Program (ILP) services between the ages of 16-19, and who do not reach their 22nd birthday by July 1 are eligible. Youth can continue to participate until they turn 23 years of age, if making satisfactory progress toward completion of a post-secondary education or training program.[6]

Transition Housing Placement Program (THPP) – THPP is a licensed placement opportunity for youth in foster care to help them emancipate successfully. THPP agency staff, county social workers, and ILP coordinators provide regular support and supervision. Support services include regular visits to participants' residences, educational guidance, employment counseling and assistance in reaching the emancipation goals outlined in participants' transitional independent living plans.

5 http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/individuals/Pages/youthSUDservices.aspx. This data is the most recent available here.

6 http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG4861.htm

Transitional Housing Placement Program for Emancipated Foster/Probation Youth (THP-Plus) – THP-Plus eligible youth are young adults who have emancipated from foster/probation care and are 18 to 24 years of age. THP-Plus provides a minimum of 24 months of affordable housing, coupled with supportive services.

Resource Family Approval (RFA) Program – the RFA program requires CDSS, in consultation with county child welfare agencies, including Juvenile Probation, foster parent associations and other interested community parties to implement a unified, family friendly and child-centered RFA process.[7]

Employment Development Department (EDD)

Youth Employment Opportunity Program (YEOP) – YEOP provides services (e.g. peer advising, referrals to supportive services, workshops, job referrals and placement assistance, referrals to training, and community outreach efforts.[8]) to assist youth in achieving their educational and vocational goals.

America's Job Center of CaliforniaSM (AJCC) – The AJCC network links all state and local workforce services and resources across the state and country. The AJCC partners in California are the EDD, the California Workforce Development Board, and 49 Workforce Development Boards that administer the more than 200 job centers statewide.

2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs

Local data on juvenile crime in California are reported by the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ) Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data are collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data are collected from county probation departments through the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS).

7 http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/res/RFA/pdf/RFA_Overview.pdf

8 http://www.edd.ca.gov/jobs_and_training/Youth_Employment_Opportunity_Program.htm

A. Youth Crime Analysis

California's youth crime analysis, presented in Appendix N, shows that youth crime continues to exist but has been declining in recent years. Further analysis shows a number of areas where improvements could be made including diversions and alternatives to incarceration, as well as continuing efforts around reducing racial and ethnic disparities. The qualitative data gathered point toward multiple options for addressing this crime and assisting youth in achieving positive outcomes.

B. California's Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) works in partnership with local corrections systems to protect public safety and assist efforts to achieve continued improvement in reducing recidivism with an emphasis on evidence-based practices (EBPs).

California counties have the responsibility to provide services to youth. The BSCC assists counties by providing federal and state grant awards that help support their youth services. The BSCC's grant awards typically require counties and community partners to develop a local strategic plan that involves local stakeholders, leaders from multiple disciplines, and prior offenders to determine the gaps in the continuum of care for their youthful offenders. These plans may include leveraging resources to support collaboration and to sustain local projects once grant funds have ended.

State Plan

The BSCC annually reviews its crime data analysis, needs, and program effectiveness and reports these in the annual GMS and DC-TAT progress report systems. The SACJJDP uses this information, along with other sources, to develop a Title II Three-Year State Plan that allows for the coordination of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in California. Both the SACJJDP and the BSCC Board are made up of a variety of state and local criminal/juvenile justice system stakeholders, community treatment providers, advocates and members of the public, which provide for active consultation with and participation of units of local government and the community in the

development of the state plan. The SACJJDP began work on its 2018-20 State Plan in June 2017. Following its regular meeting on June 21, 2017, the SACJJDP hosted a public listening session in Sacramento to hear directly from the community about issues, concerns and priorities for juvenile justice. A SACJJDP e-mail box was established and public input was accepted from interested parties beginning in August 2017. A second listening session was held on September 20, 2017 in Los Angeles. The input from both sessions was compiled and used to inform the SACJJDP's work in developing the State Plan. During the month of September, the BSCC made available a public survey that was widely distributed and used to gather valuable input directly from the public, including juveniles currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system, regarding needs and priorities amongst youth and communities. The BSCC collects juvenile detention data from counties monthly. Indicators of mental health collected from county juvenile detention data from counties was also used by the SACJJDP. Finally, the BSCC staff conducted an extensive literature review in order to provide the SACJJDP with information regarding current trends and issues in the field of juvenile justice. As a result of these efforts, the SACJJDP had the benefit of numerous data and information sources in making the important decision about how to prioritize the use of Title II funds over the next three years. All of these information sources, combined with the unique lived experiences of the SACJJDP members, pointed toward two high priority needs within California's juvenile justice system.

1. Keeping youth out of the juvenile justice system by promoting community and family supports

Ensuring the availability of diversion programs and alternatives to detention is essential to obtaining positive outcomes for youth who come in contact with law enforcement and the juvenile justice system. There is a need for increased awareness of, and resources for, non-arrest alternatives, and increased access to programs that address the issues that prompt low-level delinquent conduct which often serves as a gateway to deeper involvement in the juvenile justice system. Behavior modification programs should offer counseling and family support while focusing on building individual strengths. Overall, programs need to support youth in staying out of the system as well as not returning to the system. There is a need for increased awareness that incarcerated youth

experience trauma, that incarceration often severs family ties, and that, once incarcerated, youth start to identify with other system impacted youth and start to identify with anti-social peer mentality.

2. Promoting youth success by reducing recidivism

Promoting youth safety and well-being while in custody, as well as identifying and supporting successful and emerging reentry models, is critical to reducing recidivism. There is a need for in-custody programs to focus on rehabilitation and building individual strengths instead of punishment for past mistakes and deficits. The mental health needs of incarcerated youth must be properly addressed within the juvenile justice system. Furthermore, there is a need for consistent, evidence-based assessments and individualized case plans that are family-based, culturally responsive, locally relevant, and offer measurable outcomes. Incarcerated youth miss out on normal maturation and the development of social and emotional literacy; they get left behind and continuously struggle with stigma. These factors make it necessary to facilitate development of more robust case and reentry plans that can help youth navigate new systems upon release from custody. At this most vulnerable time, they need more options for a place to go as well as mentoring to help them understand not just what to do but how to do it.

Formula Grant Program – The Formula Grant Program Areas identified by the SACJJDP for inclusion in any requests for local assistance grant proposals to be developed under the 2018-20 State Plan are:

- Aftercare/Reentry
- Alternatives to Detention and Placement
- Community-Based Programs and Services
- Diversion
- Mental Health Services
- Mentoring, Counseling, and Training Programs

Local Assistance Grant Administration – Many of the decisions made by the BSCC directly impact the day-to-day operations of local public safety agencies and service providers. To ensure successful program design and implementation, it is essential that those impacted are included in the decision making process. The BSCC uses Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) to inform decision making related to the Board's

programs, including distributing funds and developing regulations. ESCs help the BSCC to work collaboratively in changing environments and create positive partnerships critical for success. Active consultation with, and participation by, units of local government is provided through the appointment of local government representatives on ESCs. Moreover, the BSCC Board and the SACJJDP have multiple members who represent units of local government. Consequently, local government participation in the discussion and decision making processes related to juvenile justice in California is ensured on many levels.

This collaborative approach is supported by the BSCC's statute, Penal Code section 6024 (c), which states:

The Board shall regularly seek advice from a balanced range of stakeholders and subject matter experts on issues pertaining to adult corrections, juvenile justice, and gang problems relevant to its mission. Toward this end, the Board shall seek to ensure that its efforts

1. are systematically informed by experts and stakeholders with the most specific knowledge concerning the subject matter,
2. include the participation of those who must implement a board decision and are impacted by a board decision, and
3. promote collaboration and innovative problem solving consistent with the mission of the Board.

The Board may create special committees, with the authority to establish working subgroups as necessary, in furtherance of this subdivision to carry out specified tasks and to submit its findings and recommendations from that effort to the board.

In order to provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] within the state, ESCs may develop strategies to ensure rural areas have equitable access to funding opportunities. For example, an ESC may establish funding thresholds for small, medium, and large jurisdictions. Following a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, ESC members (raters) are provided training and then rank proposals received in each jurisdiction size. Not later than 30 days after their submission to the SACJJDP for review, the SACJJDP is provided the opportunity to review the proposals and ESC proposal ratings and to develop an award recommendation to the Board.

Subgrants Awarded under the 2015-17 Three-Year Plan – The SACJJDP previously recommended, and the BSCC approved, the allocation of over $3,000,000 per year for four years (10/1/15-9/30/19)] for local subgrantee awards to provide funding for the following federal program areas:

- Aftercare/Reentry
- Alternatives to Detention*
- Delinquency Prevention*
- Diversion*
- Juvenile Justice Systems Improvement
- Native American*

**May support the priority area "Quality Education for Youth."*

The local 2015 Title II solicitation, as developed by the Title II/Tribal Youth Grant ESC with guidance and leadership from the SACJJDP included language that directed applicants to incorporate evidenced-based practices, principles, and strategies, consider racial and ethnic disparities in their system, and be prepared to delineate some outcome measures by age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Based on a competitive RFP process completed in the fall of 2015, Title II Formula Grant funds continue to support 12 local entities: seven (7) community-based organizations; four (4) juvenile probation departments; and one (1) police department. Of these subgrantees, five (5) support the Aftercare/Reentry program area; two (2) support the Alternatives to Detention program area; two (2) support the Delinquency Prevention program area; and three (3) support the Diversion program area. These Title II subgrantees are in year four in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018.

The RFP process also included the solicitation for federally recognized Tribes to apply for Title II Formula Grant funds to provide services to Tribal Youth. Based on the Native American subject matter experts, this RFP was built upon the beliefs and values associated with Native culture as defined in the Gathering of Native Americans (GONA) principles: Belonging: Creating a Culture of Inclusion; Mastery- Starting a Path to Healing; Interdependence- Fostering Personal and Community Development; and Generosity- Honoring the Tradition of Giving Back to the Community. In addition to factoring in traditional values and 'ways of knowing,' specific elements deemed pertinent

to cultural needs were also encouraged: capacity building for Tribal communities; culture is prevention; holistic approaches to community wellness including interconnectedness and community empowerment; and incorporation of traditional practices (ceremony, spiritual connection, cultural participation). This RFP produced two subgrantees supporting the Native American program area. These Tribal subgrantees are in year four in FFY 2018.

Additionally, there are four counties that were competitively awarded Title II Formula Grant dollars in 2014 to support broad system reform with the goal of eliminating racial and ethnic disparities in California's juvenile justice system. These funds support county probation departments in understanding and identifying disproportionalities and disparities in the system by analyzing their own data along the justice continuum for more informed decision-making. Title II Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity (R.E.D.) funds are meant to equip agencies and local community partners with the tools and resources needed to provide leadership in developing and/or strengthening community-based R.E.D. activities. These R.E.D. subgrantees are currently in their fourth and final year. The focus during this final year is on implementing and monitoring subgrantee R.E.D. reduction plans.

3. Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information

3.1: Overview of State Efforts and Plans to Promote Youth Development and Wellbeing

California promotes positive youth development through many of our programs and legislative efforts. California continues to focus on juvenile justice as a priority and plans to continue to collaborate within its government branches towards that end. Significant efforts are noted below and California intends to continue supporting them:

Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) – California is well into implementation of a 2015 launched statewide effort known as the CCR[9]. The BSCC has contributed by participating in workgroups and providing technical assistance and subject matter expertise. This effort draws together a series of existing and new reforms to California's child welfare services program designed out of an understanding that

9 http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/CCR/CCRInfographic.pdf?ver=2017-10-18-161318-400

children who must live apart from their biological parents do best when they are cared for in committed nurturing family homes. Statute now provides the statutory and policy framework to ensure services and supports provided to the child or youth and his or her family are tailored toward the ultimate goal of maintaining a stable permanent family. Reliance on congregate care should be limited to short-term, therapeutic interventions that are just one part of a continuum of care available for children, youth and young adults.

Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) – The MHSA is funded by a one percent tax on personal income above $1 million dollars. Counties use the funding to design services promoting recovery and reducing homelessness, hospitalization, and incarceration.

The Children's System of Care (CSOC) – The basic premise of this way of providing care is to redirect moneys and resources from institutional levels of care and put these funds into local programs of care and support, as well as improving service planning, delivery and evaluation across departments. The intent is an improvement in overall care to clients with serious emotional disturbances by providing service in the child's home or community. The implementation of the CSOC model thus far in California indicates improvements in child and family functioning as well as significant levels of cost avoidance. The goals of the CSOC initiative is that children will be safe in home, in school, and out of trouble.[10]

3.2: Efforts by the designated state agency to partner with non-justice system agencies

In addition to the ESC process already described, the BSCC routinely provides technical assistance and subject matter expertise to a wide array of stakeholders and its non-justice system agencies to aid California's legislative process. Attachment 1 lists new laws from 2017 that pertain to juvenile justice reform and are summarized as relevant to this State Plan:

10 http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/MH/Documents/IEBP_Data_Dictionary.pdf

3.3: Challenges and plans to improve coordination and joint decision-making

California is a large and diverse state with 58 different counties that maintain high levels of autonomy. Consequently, coordination and standardization of efforts is challenging. We will continue to prioritize coordination and joint decision making amongst stakeholders and partners.

RRI data is collected by CalDOJ and distributed upon request to the BSCC and annually to Chief Probation Officers. CalDOJ's Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) collects a variety of juvenile statistical data, including information regarding R.E.D. from county probation departments on a yearly basis.

When reviewing and interpreting RRI results, there are several caveats that need to be taken into account. Different jurisdictions may interpret the definitions of various data elements and decision points differently or use different sources of information to collect them based on their available data. To help combat this, both the JCPSS manual and the BSCC R.E.D. grantee Progress Report guidelines provide a set of definitions for counties to use. In addition, the data are based on an "event" within the juvenile system so counts along the continuum at each decision point cannot be interpreted as a count of the number of youth as a single youth may have multiple events during the reporting periods. Therefore, the RRI values provided cannot be directly compared to those reported by other government agencies nor can they be exclusively relied upon to shape California's R.E.D. Compliance Plan. However, because R.E.D. efforts are a local matter, and the most successful R.E.D. efforts appear to derive from local leadership rather than state prescribed efforts, the BSCC allows the RRI to inform local decision-makers, and the state responds accordingly by providing continued guidance, monitoring, and evaluation.

3.4: Youth crime data collection and analysis

California is a large, diverse state whose 58 counties address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention in ways tailored to their individual and unique local environments. This provides for maximum effectiveness of interventions but does create challenges in collecting and analyzing related data. Addressing Youth crime remains a

high priority in California and California and it continues to work towards improved coordinate, maintain quality of youth crime data collection and analysis.

The following agencies have a role in youth crime data collection and analysis:

CalDOJ – The CalDOJ collects statewide information through a variety of sources, makes data available on its website, and annually publishes data in its "Crime in California" and "Juvenile Justice in California" reports.[11]

Local data on juvenile crime in California continues to be reported by the CalDOJ Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data is collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data is collected from county probation departments through the JCPSS.

The BSCC – There are several ways that the BSCC is involved in juvenile justice data collection as follows:

In 2016, the BSCC's Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (JJDWG), after extensive work and analysis, provided recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor's Office for improving the collection of juvenile justice data in California. This information remains under review.

State law requires that counties annually submit to the BSCC data about programs, placements, services and system enhancements that were funded through specified state funds in the preceding fiscal year. These reports also include countywide figures for specified juvenile justice data elements available in existing statewide juvenile justice data systems, including a summary or analysis of how those programs have or may have contributed to or influenced the countywide data that is reported. Counties report data on their entire juvenile justice population and provide information on how the use of the specified funds has impacted the trends seen in that data.

The BSCC typically requires Local Evaluation Reports of its competitive grant funded programs that include performance and outcome data.

11 https://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/pubs#crimeCAUS

The BSCC routinely requires competitive grant funded programs to provide progress reports that provide demographic, service provision/system improvement, and outcome data.

4. Problem Statements, Goals/Objectives, & Implementation and Budget Narrative

4.1: Program Descriptions

During development of the 2018-20 California State Plan, the BSCC had numerous active subgrants. In making these awards under the 2015-2017 State Plan, the SACJJDP chose to fund three grant programs: Tribal, R.E.D. and Title II. The final subgrantee awards reviewed and approved by the SACJJDP and the BSCC represented the following geographical distribution:

- Tribal Grants: one small and one medium county
- R.E.D. Grants: one small, two medium, and one large county
- Title II Grants: two small, four medium, and six large counties

The R.E.D. grants currently funded will end on 9/30/18, while the Tribal and Title II grants will end on 9/30/19. Program updates are shared with the SACJJDP upon request and outcomes will be reported at the conclusion of each grant cycle. All mandatory performance measures required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) are included in the quarterly Title II progress reports that are provided to the BSCC directly from the project grantees. Across all grant programs, and within the various formula grant program areas, R.E.D. is a priority and to the degree possible is embedded in the planning and work of the BSCC.

The amount available in the 2018-2020 State Plan for subgrants in any Title II grant program areas identified below will be determined by an ESC created for the sole purpose of developing an RFP that contains complete specifications for the next award process. What is provided below represents the best estimates available at the time of submission. In years two and three of this three-year plan, exact amounts will be known and reported.

4.2: Formula Grants Program Areas

I: Aftercare/Reentry

Federal Program Number: 01 **State Priority Ranking: 03**

Working from the premise that any youth is capable of success if given support and assistance, aftercare/reentry services need to focus on individual strengths, personal growth, and building resiliency. During incarceration, youth miss out on the normal maturation process and struggle to overcome the stigma of serving time, necessitating help to navigate new systems once they are released. Currently, there are insufficient options and resources that youth can access to get their basic needs met, including employment and housing. Consequently, there is a need for models and examples they can follow for how to build a quality life. This includes assistance by capable mentors and availability of appropriate community-based services. The barriers faced by formerly incarcerated youth trying to access needed services and opportunities, such as mental health, employment, education, housing, and professional development, must be broken down and these support systems need to be introduced while youth are incarcerated as opposed to when they get out of detention.

In order to address the recidivism seen in California's data, there is a need for more and/or better aftercare programs and services to assist youth in successful transitions back to their communities.

Goal: Ensure that youth, upon entering a secure detention facility, are informed about and engaged in developing a robust reentry plan. This should be part of a comprehensive case planning process that addresses the most critical needs of the individual and provides a broad array of services.

Objectives:

1. Increase the number of youth in custodial settings with individual case plans in place that incorporate robust reentry models/plans;
2. Identify and support successful and emerging aftercare/reentry models;
3. Examine strategies to incentivize successful reentry programs that also address basic needs such as housing, employment and mental health care.
4. Increase the number of case plans, including reentry components, that consider the youth's environment and rely on collaboration with families and local support systems; and
5. Educate the public about the importance of affording youth a second chance.

Activities and Services: Through participation in aftercare/reentry programs, a greater number of youth exiting the justice system will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without exposing youth to unnecessary restriction. Partnerships among probation or an agency within the jurisdiction, as well as with local service providers including schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Resilience will be fostered by offering youth support to achieve successful rehabilitation and reintegration into their communities. Holistic and collaborative approaches will be employed as social, psychological and emotional care and literacy are nurtured. Support will be afforded through organizations dedicated to formerly incarcerated and vulnerable youth, especially those offering mentorship and specific guidance around not just 'what to do' but more specifically how to do it.

II: Alternatives to Detention and Placement

Federal Program Number: 03 **State Priority Ranking: 04**

In some situations, youth are detained due to a lack of alternatives or to receive services that are otherwise unavailable (e.g. housing). There is a lack of programs to address the issues that prompt low level criminal conduct, involve behavioral modification, offer counselling and family support, and foster collaboration between courts/probation and community based organizations. Detention is often used as the default approach, partially due to a lack of awareness of and resources for non-arrest alternatives. Incarcerated youth generally have a history of trauma and can be further traumatized through incarceration. Such youth are easily influenced by higher risk peers and often experience a severing of family ties. These concernshighlight the need to reduce the use of arrest, detention and out of home placements.

California's data show high numbers of sustained petitions, suggesting that additional effort toward developing and maintaining alternatives to detention and placement could prove beneficial.

Goal: Reduce the number of youth arrested and held in secure juvenile facilities.

Objectives:

1. Expand the use of and increase the options for holistic alternatives to arrest, detention and out of home placement;
2. Increase awareness regarding the detrimental effect of arrest and incarceration on youth;
3. Build strategic local partnerships that will serve to increase the awareness and use of effective alternatives to arrest, detention and placement; and
4. Create a vehicle for community-based, self-esteem-building and healing-centered alternatives to arrest, detention and placement.

Activities and Services: Through participation in alternatives to arrest, detention and placement in juvenile facilities, a greater number of youth coming into contact with the juvenile justice system will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without exposing youth to unnecessary restriction. In looking at solutions, community-based and community-run alternatives are an underutilized option for addressing the vast majority of youthful offender behaviors that lie outside the parameters of public safety and/or flight risk. Partnerships among probation or an agency within the jurisdiction, as well as with local service providers including schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Partnerships will focus on providing alternatives that are strength-based and healing-centered, that rely on youth empowerment to build on individual strengths while fostering success. Opportunities will be developed to create alternatives for victims of human trafficking, foster youth, and others who end up in detention because they have nowhere else to go. Awareness will be raised regarding the trauma caused to youth who are detained[12], the high costs of detention, the reality that a high percentage of mentally ill youth are in custody[13], including severe cases, and the data showing that

12 Abram, K. M., Dulcan, M.K., Charles, D. R., Longworth, S.L., McClelland, G.M, Teplin, L. A. (2004). Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Trauma in Youth in Juvenile Detention. Arch Gen Psychiatry, Vol 61, issue 4, pp. 403–410. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.61.4.403. Burrell, S. (2013). Trauma and the Environment of Care in Juvenile Institutions . Los Angeles, CA & Durham, NC: National Center for Child Traumatic Stress. http://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/assets/pdfs/jj_trauma_brief_environofcare_burrell_final.pdf.

13 Skowyra, K. R., & Cocozza, J. J. (2006). Blueprint for change: A comprehensive model for the identification and treatment of youth with mental health needs in contact with the juvenile justice system. Delmar, NY: National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice Policy Research Associates, Inc.

detention results in higher recidivism rates, does not address R.E.D. and leaves youth with a label that once embraced, changes their self-identity and ability to assimilate[14].

III: Community Based Programs and Services

Federal Program Number: 05 **State Priority Ranking: 06**

Programs that are locally based, culturally relevant, and collaborative in nature provide greater accessibility and can be more tailored to individual needs. In turn, such programs also present the best opportunity for youth to succeed. The need for these programs is supported by the numbers of juvenile arrests, referrals and bookings.

Goal: Increase the availability of, and access to, community-based and community-run programs and services that help youth, and their families, who are at risk of entering the juvenile justice system or have already entered the system

Objectives:

1. Increase access to community-based and community-run support programs and services for youth, parents and families;
2. Promote community-defined success through effective, culturally relevant and gender responsive evaluation strategies and policies;
3. Expand cultural and linguistic services for youth, parents and families; and
4. Foster collaboration between community-based and community-run providers and justice system agencies including law enforcement, probation, and the courts.

Activities and Services: Provide support for making community-based and community-run services convenient for those who most need them. Look for opportunities to provide wrap around services including having one-stop shops with social workers, nurses, interviewers, etc. on site. Make these services culturally and linguistically accessible to a wide clientele including individuals with limited English language skills. Provide assistance with locating, obtaining and/or maintaining housing, employment, after school programs, and mental health services.

14 Holman, B. & Ziedenberg (2007). The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities. A Justice Policy Institute Report. http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/0611_REP_DangersOfDetention_JJ.pdf

Lopez-Aguado, P. (2016). "I Would Be a Bulldog": Tracing the Spillover of Carceral Identity. Social Problems, vol. 63, issue 2, pp. 203-221, https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spw001.

Lopez-Aguado, P. (2016). The Collateral Consequences of Prisonization: Racial Sorting, Carceral Identity, and Community Criminalization. Sociology Compass, vol. 10, issue 1, pp. 12-23, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12342.

IV: Mental Health Services

Federal Program Number: 12 **State Priority Ranking: 02**

California's juvenile justice system includes many youth with mental health issues or concerns. Such youth need to be identified early and afforded proper treatment to halt escalating behavior problems and avoid further penetration into the juvenile justice system. Secure detention is not the best setting in which to treat youth with mental health issues and concerns as these facilities often lack adequate staffing and other resources which results in sub-standard care.

Data collected through the BSCC's Jail Profile Survey supports an ongoing effort toward improving mental health services for juvenile offenders.

Goal: Divert youth with mental health issues or concerns from arrest and from the juvenile justice system whenever possible. Employ a holistic approach to improving, increasing and leveraging the mental health services available to youth who are in the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

1. Increase early identification of youth with mental health concerns;
2. Enhance access to appropriate mental health services especially youth transitioning from custody back to the community;
3. Reduce the number of youth in the justice system with unmet mental health needs;
4. Encourage mental health treatment that is sensitive to cultural, social, gender, and racial/disparity issues, that employs a holistic approach, and that reduces stigma.

Activities and Services: There must be a continuous effort to raise awareness about mental health signs and symptoms for law enforcement, probation, courts, defense counsel, parents, teachers, and others working with youth so there is a deeper understanding of mental health issues, trauma and recovery processes. It is critical that those individuals working with youth learn to recognize mental health concerns and make appropriate referrals. Toward that end, training is needed on early identification, screening, assessment, and appropriate services. Those working with youth must be trained to identify mental health needs among youth and to divert them from the juvenile justice system as well as to support youth returning to their communities.

Within the juvenile justice system, mental health care needs must be met so that untreated issues do not persist and intensify. In order to achieve this, mental health services must be improved and priority should be given to partnerships with community-based organizations. Services must include screening, assessment, referral, and follow up after the assessment phase. Hiring additional trained behavioral health specialists and increasing intervention services should be considered. Providing appropriate mental health services to those who need them must be recognized as an ethical and humanitarian issue and sensitivity must be applied in working with these youths.

V: Mentoring, Counseling and Training

Federal Program Number: 13 **State Priority Ranking: 06**

Healthy youth development is supported by the presence and involvement of positive role models. Similarly, growth and development can best occur in an environment where youth are provided opportunities to connect with positive adults, obtain support and encouragement around education and employment, receive counseling and other support services as needed, and gain exposure to new experiences and opportunities.

To slow the trend of juvenile arrests, referrals and sustained petitions seen in California's data, these types of youth development programs are critically important.

Goal: Promote culturally relevant mentoring, counseling and training programs that enhance resilience and empower youth.

Objectives:

1. Increase mentor recruitment and development to foster more mentor-mentee matches;
2. Expand opportunities for youth to participate in drug and violence prevention counseling; and
3. Increase vocational and technical training opportunities.

Activities and Services: Mentorship can play a critical role in keeping youth out of the juvenile justice system and funding should be provided to support additional resources and training for new mentors. In addition, the time is right to explore the use of peer mentors to help youth navigate the juvenile justice system. Efforts in this area should include working with providers such as career/technical education programs to develop apprenticeships, engage prospective employers and facilitate job placement and

training. In addition, youth need opportunities to receive assistance with a variety of life skills. This could range from providing counseling in the areas of parenting and building healthy relationships to training youth to find housing, employment and other needed assistance.

VI: Compliance Monitoring

Federal Program Number: 19 **State Priority Ranking: n/a**

Three of the four requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) have been codified in California statute and regulations and, in many cases, exceed JJDPA requirements. The BSCC is given the authority to monitor facilities affected by the JJDPA for compliance with federal and state standards. The range of facilities in the compliance monitoring universe, along with the transitional nature of many personnel working in these facilities, necessitates provision of ongoing monitoring and technical assistance.

Goal: Maintain a high rate of compliance of state and local police, sheriff, and probation detention facilities with federal requirements to deinstitutionalize status offenders, remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups, and ensure separation between juveniles and adult inmates.

Objective 1: Improve compliance monitoring.

Activities and Services:

- Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility;
- Review detention facility policies and procedures; and
- Provide technical assistance.

Objective 2: Verify data collection efforts/systems in detention facilities that are affected by the JJDPA.

Activities and Services:

- Collect regular data from detention facilities;
- Follow up on self-report data; and
- Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility.

Objective 3: Maintain compliance with core protections.

Activities and services:

- Collect regular data from detention facilities;
- Follow up on self-report data;
- Provide technical assistance; and
- Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility.

VII: Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity (R.E.D.)/Disproportionate Minority Contact

Federal Program Number: 21 **State Priority Ranking: 07**

California's youth of color are disproportionately represented as they progress through the juvenile justice system and this overrepresentation becomes amplified at each successive decision point - from contact through commitment[15].

California's arrest, referral and booking data continue to show an overrepresentation of youth of color suggesting an ongoing need for work in this area.

Goal: Eliminate racial inequalities and inequities across all points of contact.

Objectives:

1. Support agencies and organizations that have a data driven, long-term R.E.D. initiative;
2. Provide training on R.E.D. philosophy and principles for those that work with at-risk and justice involved youth; and
3. Foster partnerships between community-based organizations (CBOs) and other youth-serving agencies and law enforcement, with a specific focus on helping law enforcement entities interact with youth in ways that are sensitive to their socio-cultural context.

Activities: To date, planned activities fall into three main areas: grants, training/education, and data. The current R.E.D. grants include incremental phases that occur over a four-year grant cycle: Assessment, R.E.D. Infrastructure and Education, Community Engagement (i.e. relationships with families and community partners), and Implementation of R.E.D. Reduction Plan. The existing grants were awarded through an RFP process to four county probation departments and will continue through September 30, 2018. At the end of that grant cycle, the SACJJDP will review current data, review

15 www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc_ta_manual.pdf

the outcomes and initiatives of the grant cycle, and assess the nationwide practices. This information will inform the future actions of the SACJJDP and determine its strategy for next three years. The BSCC will provide a plan and anticipates this plan will be developed by the end of 2018.

VIII: Diversion

Federal Program Number: 22 **State Priority Ranking: 01**

Incarcerated youth generally have a history of trauma and can be further traumatized through incarceration. Such youth are easily influenced by higher risk peers and often experience a severing of family ties. These concerns[16] make it critically important to avoid the initial incidence of arrest and/or detention. All other options should be exhausted prior to arrest and detention, and detention should never be accepted as a default response due to lack of other resources. Once a youth comes into contact with law enforcement and/or the juvenile justice system, recidivism rates go up[17] and youth protective factors start to diminish.

California's data show a high number of juvenile arrests, referrals and sustained petitions, which suggests that more opportunities for diversion could be beneficial.

Goal: Increase the number of youth diverted from the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

1. Increase the availability and use of diversion practices and programs;
2. Use evidence-based assessments that increase objectivity and reduce implicit bias in decision making; and
3. Expand awareness and resources for effective non-arrest alternatives, including restorative justice programs, that teach youth to accept responsibility for their actions.

16 Cox, A. (2011). Doing the programme or doing me? The pains of youth imprisonment. Punishment & Society, vol. 13, issue 5, pp. 592-610, https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511422173.

Hatt, B. (2011). Still I Rise: Youth Caught Between the Worlds of Schools and Prisons. Urban Rev, vol. 43, issue 476. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0185-y

Wilkinson, D. L. (2001). Violent events and social identity: Specifying the relationship between respect and masculinity in inner-city youth violence, in David A. Kinney (ed.) Sociological Studies of Children and Youth. Sociological Studies of Children and Youth, vol. 8. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.235 – 269.

17 Models of Change (2011). Innovation Brief: Using Diversion Fairly, Consistently, and Effectively. http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/311.

Holman, B. & Ziedenberg (2007). The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities. A Justice Policy Institute Report. http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/0611_REP_DangersOfDetention_JJ.pdf.

Activities and Services: Through participation in diversion programs, a greater number of at-risk youth will participate in programs designed to improve positive youth behavior and increase public safety without having them enter into the juvenile justice system. Partnerships amongst and between agencies including law enforcement, probation, medical and mental health providers, schools, community-based organizations, counseling/therapy providers, local businesses, and faith-based organizations are necessary for successful implementation. Such partnerships would focus on development of programs and services that use behavioral modification, social constraints, or restorative justice to address the issues that prompted the low-level criminal conduct first bringing a youth into contact with law enforcement. Other critical components of these partnerships include involving families, addressing R.E.D. concerns, providing for the measurement of outcomes, and being locally based, collaborative, culturally relevant, and affording a linguistic component. The focus would be on getting youth to complete programs that emphasize accountability and life skills development over arrest and/or incarceration.

IX: Native American Programs

Federal Program Number: 24 **State Priority Ranking: n/a**

According to the 2010 U.S. census data, California has the highest population of Native American and/or Alaska Native heritage than any other state in the country with a population of 723,225.[18] There are 104 federally recognized Native American Tribes in California[19] in comparison with 566 tribes in all of the United States.[20] The tribes exist throughout the state, including highly populated cities and rural areas, as well as across different topographies and state boundaries.[21]

Goal: Bolster information sharing so that we can enhance the level of guidance and feedback on tribal issues.

18 2010 Census Briefs, The American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2010, https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf

19 https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/pacific/tribal-operations

20 http://www.ncsl.org/research/state-tribal-institute/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx

21 http://www.courts.ca.gov/3066.htm

Objectives:

1. Enhance capacity building and sustainability for our tribal partners in their efforts to provide prevention services.
2. Stay abreast of emerging issues confronting the Native American communities in California and keep the SACJJDP informed of such issues.

Activities and Services: Inform the SACJJDP members regarding tribal issues and disparity issues. Continue support of the Title II focus areas that strategically correspond to the identified tribal issues.

X: Planning and Administration

Federal Program Number: 28 **State Priority Ranking: n/a**

The Planning and Administration funds are used for staff positions identified on page 49 of this application, administration expenses, and upon OJJDP approval, which is currently pending, a 10% de Minimis Indirect Cost Rate. These funds also represent "fair share" obligations within California that are mandatory for federal awards; these funds make up the State-Wide Cost Allocation Plan (SWCAP) General Fund recoveries of statewide general administrative costs (i.e., indirect costs incurred by central service agencies) from federal funding sources [Government Code (GC) Sections 13332.01 through 13332.02]. The SWCAP apportions central services costs to state departments; however, it includes only statewide central services that are allowable under federal cost reimbursement policies. The SWCAP rate is developed and provided annually to all State Administering Agencies (SAA) of federal awards, grants, and contracts by the California Department of Finance (DOF). In addition, Administrative Planning and Administration funds are used for development of the Three Year Plan and related grant development, administration and monitoring. Examples of such expenses include, but are not limited to, the following: on-site travel expenses for fiscal and program monitoring responsibilities, CJJ/OJJDP conference registration/travel costs for both the BSCC staff and applicable State Advisory Group (SAG) members; SACJJDP/ESC/R.E.D. Subcommittee work on Title II grant development (including producing an RFP for the local assistance grants and rating grant applications received). The BSCC provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of

funds received under Title II. During FFY years 2001-2016, the BSCC did not receive under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] any amount that exceeded 105 percent of the amount the state received under such section for fiscal year 2000, which was $5,100,000. If an amount in excess of $5,100,000 should be received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632], all of such excess shall be expended through or for programs that are part of a comprehensive and coordinated community system of services.

Goal: Provide effective and efficient support for the administration, monitoring, and fiduciary responsibilities of the Title II Formula Grant Program.

Objective: Support and facilitate the work of California's SAG, which includes meetings, State Plan and Title II application development, and the full range of work related to subgrantees.

Activities: Roles and responsibilities of identified staff/positions are outlined on page 49 of this application.

The source of state matching funds will be the state general fund and the match will be applied as a dollar-for-dollar correlative expenditure for any federal dollars expended (e.g., a single travel expenditure will be split 50/50: 50 percent from state general fund monies and 50 percent from federal Title II funds).

XI: State Advisory Group Allocation

Federal Program Number: 32 **State Priority Ranking: n/a**

Five percent of funds received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] are budgeted for the SACJJDP to carry out Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDPA of 2002. These funds enable the SAG/SACJJDP to carry out its duties and responsibilities, as specified by the Governor and the Act. The SACJJDP recommendations discussed at SACJJDP meetings are brought before the BSCC Board for review and final decision. The Governor appointed nine new members to the SACJJDP in 2016

Goal: Establish priorities, goals, objectives and a budget for the juvenile justice programming to be funded with the local assistance portion of California's federal Title II grant award. Monitor compliance with Title II requirements.

Objective: Designate funding and other needed support for activities and services that will help California address the SAG/SACJJDP identified priorities and goals.

Activities and Services: The SAG/SACJJDP members actively participate in meetings that include time dedicated to development of priorities for juvenile justice efforts and expenditures, State Plan development, approval and monitoring of subgrantees, and identification of California's juvenile justice needs and proposed solutions.

5. Programmatic and Budget Assurances

The BSCC is not designated high risk by another federal grant making agency.

The BSCC does not have any pending applications for federal grants or subgrants to support the same project as Title II.

The BSCC FFY 2018-20 Title II proposal does not anticipate inclusion of a formal research and/or evaluation project. As details of the work to be completed under the State Plan further develop, should the need for a formal research and/or evaluation project evolve, the BSCC will provide the required assurances.

The BSCC complies with Title II Civil Rights requirements, notifies subgrantees of their responsibility to comply, and monitors compliance on site visits. In this way, the BSCC requires that youth in the juvenile justice system are treated equitably on the basis of gender, race, family income, and disability**.** In addition, the BSCC and subgrantees are subject to federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) regulations and state law regarding the confidentiality of juvenile records. Data subgrantees are required to provide in progress reports is anonymous aggregate data.

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is the designated state department that oversees the OJJDP funded Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Initiative.

6. Subgrant Award Assurance

First and foremost, the BSCC requires grantees of Title II funds to use proven, or evidence-based models during implementation as a way to ensure substantial success in reaching program goals. At any time where the BSCC has determined that funded objectives are not being met, the BSCC will provide technical assistance to subgrantees

to assist in getting the project on course. In any instance where the BSCC determines that substantial success has not been achieved after two funded years, the BSCC has the contractual authority to withhold new funds for the program as administered by the funded grantee.

Ongoing BSCC oversight to ensure substantial success includes:

- An annual re-application process where subgrantees must demonstrate program effectiveness and measures of success as a requirement for future funding. The annual reapplication requires the submission of information and data that demonstrates that goals and objectives are being met.
- Site visits by the BSCC staff which are used in part to discuss outcomes and to provide technical assistance where needed to strengthen outcomes. The BSCC staff meet with subgrantees and staff, subcontracted service providers where applicable and sometimes with the clients served. This provides the BSCC with observation and anecdotal information to help demonstrate success A
- Quarterly Progress Reports by subgrantees are required. These reports provide the BSCC with regular information and measures of success. This allows the BSCC to recognize early the need for technical assistance and to then provide it so that substantial success can be achieved.
- At the start of a grant cycle, the BSCC convenes all newly-awarded grantees for a Grantee Orientation. Each grantee is invited to bring a team of 4-6 individuals including the Project Director, Financial Officer, day-to-day program or fiscal contacts, evaluator and community-based partners. At this orientation, the BSCC staff review grantee responsibilities including evaluation plans, progress reports, program and budget modifications, financial invoices, monitoring of sub-grantees and the BSCC site visits. Each grantee team shares with the group an overview of their project and what they hope to accomplish with the grant funding. Grantees are provided an opportunity to network, share ideas and ask questions. Each grantee leaves with a binder containing the information they will need to successfully meet the BSCC requirements.

- The BSCC convenes quarterly conference calls as a part of our technical assistance and monitoring process. The purpose of the conference calls is to allow the BSCC staff to check in with grantees on a regular basis and answer questions on a flow basis. The calls also provide an opportunity for grantees to discuss challenges, share ideas and learn from each other. The typical agenda for a quarterly project director call includes:
    1. Grantee updates on program activities and spending;
    2. Troubleshooting;
    3. Notice of upcoming events; and
    4. Discuss grant accomplishments and/or challenges.

7. State Advisory Board Membership

The BSCC is California's State Administering Agency for the Title II Formula Grants program. For the purposes of 34 U.S.C. 11133(a), Section 223(e), the BSCC serves as the supervisory board. The BSCC oversees California's SAG, which is the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The SACJJDP is made up of Governor-appointed members who are committed to enhancing the quality of life for all youth in California. The SACJJDP serves as a standing Executive Steering Committee of the BSCC. The current SACJJDP is comprised of a diverse group of 19 professionals and youth members who are subject matter experts in their respective fields. There are at least three members of the SACJJDP who have been or who are currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system.

The SACJJDP Membership Roster

	Name	Represents	Full-Time Government	Youth Member	Appointment Date
1	Rachel Rios, Chair rachelr@lafcc.org	D/H			November 2016
2	Carol Biondi, Vice Chair carol@thebiondis.net	E			November 2005
3	James Anderson janderson@antirecidivism.org	E/F		X	July 2014
4	Hon. Brian Back brian.back@ventuira.courts.ca.gov	B	X		December 2012
5	Michelle Brown Michelle.brown@prob.sbcounty.gov	B	X		May 2015
6	Dr. B J Davis bjdavis@strategies4change.org	D			November 2016
7	Dr. Carly Dierkhising cdierkh@calstatela.edu	C			May 2016
8	Miguel Garcia garciamsb15@gmail.com	E/F		X	November 2016
9	Juan Gomez jgomez@milpacollective.org	D/H			November 2016
10	Susan Harbert susanharbert@gmail.com	B/D			January 2007
11	Gordon Jackson gjackson@cde.ca.gov	G	X		January 2009
12	Sharon King gjackson@cde.ca.gov	E/H			November 2016
13	Ramon Leija Leija.r7@gmail.com	E			November 2016
14	Susan Manheimer smanheimer@cityofsanmateo.org	B	X		January 2009
15	Kent Mendoza kentmendoza@antirecidivism.org	E/F		X	November 2016
16	Nancy O'Malley nancy.omalley@acgov.org	A/B	X		October 2011
17	Winston Peters wpeters@pubdef.lacounty.gov	B/C	X		November 2005
18	Mimi Silbert No email address	D			April 2005
19	Dante Williams dwilliams@youthsolutions.org	D/H			November 2016

Letters Represent the Following Designations for Members:

A. Locally elected official representing general government
B. Law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies
C. Public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention
D. Private nonprofit organizations
E. Volunteers who work with juvenile justice
F. Youth workers involved with programs that are alternatives to confinement
G. Persons with experience in school violence and alternatives to expulsion
H. Persons with experience dealing with learning disabilities, child abuse, and neglect.

8. Staff of the Title II Grant

8.1: Staff and Organizational Structure

The BSCC's Corrections Planning and Grant Programs (CPGP) Division administers federal and state juvenile justice grant programs. Title II grant funding is used to supplement, not supplant or replace, local and state funding; does not cause the displacement of any current employee; and does not impair an existing collective bargaining relationship, contract for services, or collective bargaining agreement. Written concurrence of a labor organization will be obtained when necessary. The following is an updated BSCC organizational chart.

8.2: Staffing (FFY Year 2018 Projections)

The following staff are assigned to the Title II Grant and Compliance Monitoring activities. Projections are rounded and based on timekeeping conducted during FFY 2017 for Title II and Compliance Monitoring program activities.

Corrections Planning and Grant Programs (CPGP)

Percentages are projections that are rounded and based on actual time during state Fiscal Year 16/17 to date.

Mary Jolls	Deputy Director, CPGP	15%
Kimberly Bushard	Juvenile Justice Specialist	100%
Timothy Polasik	R.E.D. Coordinator; Field Representative, CPGP	100%
Juanita Reynaga	Senior Management Auditor	13%
Kally Sanders	Staff Services Manager I, Program	13%
Rosa Pargas	Staff Services Manager I, Fiscal	13%
Aleksandra Djurasovic	Assoc. Govt. Program Analyst, Program	100%
April Albright	Assoc.Govt. Program Analyst, Fiscal	30%
Isabel Diaz	Staff Services Analyst, CPGP	35%

Facilities Standards and Operations (FSO)

Percentages are projections based on prior experience with Compliance Monitoring activities.

Allison Ganter	Deputy Director, FSO	15%
Eloisa Tuitama	Field Representative, FSO Compliance Monitor	50%
Lisa Southwell	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Craigus Thompson	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Elizabeth Gong	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Charlene Aboytes	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Kim Moule	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Mike Bush	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Steve Keithley	Field Representative, FSO	5%
Bob Takeshta	Compliance Monitor, (Retired Annuitant)	100%
Bill Crout	Compliance Monitor, (Retired Annuitant)	100%
Ginger Wolfe	Assoc. Govt. Program Analyst, FSO	50%
Tamaka Shedwin	Staff Services Analyst, FSO	5%
Tina Peerson	Staff Services Analyst, FSO	25%

Research

Percentages are projections based on State Fiscal year activities to date.

Kasey Warmuth	Research Manager III	8%
Ashley Van De Pol	Research Analyst	20%

Note: Due to vacations, absences, special projects and other events, other BSCC staff may periodically charge hours worked on Title II related projects to this fund.

Classification Descriptions, CPGP:

Deputy Director, CPGP – oversee procedures, processes and workload for all CPGP staff performing work related to Title II, Tribal Youth and R.E.D. grants and related budget activity, and all SACJJDP related work and administrative support.

Juvenile Justice Specialist – The Juvenile Justice (JJ) Specialist provides staff support for the SACJJDP and assists with the development, implementation, and monitoring of the Title II Three-Year Plan. The JJ Specialist reports directly to the Deputy Director of the CPGP.

R.E.D. Coordinator/Field Representative, CPGP – The R.E.D. coordinator collects and analyzes R.E.D. data, assists with the development, implementation, and monitoring of the R.E.D. Three-Year Plan, and provides technical assistance to subgrantees. The Field Representative performs a variety of activities relating to grant administration and oversight for the grant. The following are general activities for this position: Assist in the preparation of federal applications submitted to the OJJDP for funding for the Title II Formula Grant Program; Prepare competitive RFPs as needed and coordinate activities associated with the application process; Prepare, review, and approve yearly re-applications; Coordinate activities to get both new and on-going grantees under contract; Collect and report data pertaining to federal program area activities; Provide on-site technical assistance to new grantees regarding data collection, preparing and submitting invoices and budget/program modifications, preparing progress reports, and discussing contract requirements; Review and approve/deny quarterly progress reports, invoices and budget/program modifications. If denied, provide technical assistance to correct problems; Conduct site visits as needed; Provide technical assistance as needed to address any problems noted during the on-site visit; Prepare site/monitoring reports and monitor to ensure deficiencies are corrected; Prepare correspondence sent to grantees, state and federal agencies, counties and cities, and the general public; Provide training as needed to professional organizations, state, city, county and non-profit organizations; Prepare and submit federal progress reports; and Review annual financial audits and resolve any questioned or disallowed cost issues.

The provision of technical assistance by Field Representatives includes review and recommendations regarding expenditures, program and budget modifications, local data collection procedures, local research designs and any proposed modifications; training local program evaluators with regard to conducting program evaluations and appropriate statistical analyses; and review and critique of final local program evaluation reports (which must be approved by the BSCC).

Senior Management Auditor – review conditions and requirements of CPGP grants, develop, maintain and implement procedures to monitor ongoing compliance, and develop and provide management reports to executive staff. Coordinate and manage all CPGP audits, develop audit responses and corrective action plans. Confer with federal and state agencies including the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the State Controller's office and the California Department of Finance.

Staff Services Manager 1, Program – oversee procedures, processes, and workload for grant program administrative support; oversee program staff responsible for tracking grant contracting and program activities, data analysis, progress reporting, desk reviews, federal application processes, the SACJJDP support activities, and compliance with all federal reporting requirements.

Staff Services Manager 1, Fiscal – oversee procedures, processes, and workload for fiscal administrative support; oversee fiscal staff responsible for invoicing, budgeting, projections, fiscal reporting systems maintenance and tracking activities, and compliance with federal fiscal reporting requirements.

Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Program – maintains grant files, works with subgrantees to collect and process subgrantee applications and progress reports, tracks grantee activity, performs grantee desk reviews, and monitors grant agreement compliance. In addition, program analyst works with Field Representatives on data collection and reporting, progress report analysis, federal application and state plan preparation and submittal, grant administrative technical assistance, and reporting in the federal Data Collection and Technical Assistance Tool (DCTAT).

Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Fiscal: develop and maintain budget projection and planning documents; analyze financial and budget status reports for

accuracy and funds availability; evaluate and project program expenditures; resolve budget-related problems, accounting and/or coding errors; Review invoices and budget modifications to ensure accurate expenditure coding; maintain multiple internal and external tracking systems to ensure grant balances and expenditures are posted correctly; prepare financial data analysis reports for management as needed

Staff Services Analyst, CPGP – processes monthly and quarterly invoices from subgrantees and vendors/contractors and track grantee activity and balances; assists with the preparation and tracking of subgrantee contracts; create grant files; work with subgrantees to collect and process invoices; track grantee expenditure activity and balances and assist with maintenance of internal and external tracking systems.

Classification Descriptions, FSO:

Deputy Director, FSO – oversee procedures, processes and workload for all FSO staff performing work related to Compliance monitoring and related budget, data collection and reporting activity.

Compliance Monitor/Field Representative, FSO – performs a variety of activities relating to compliance monitoring and oversight of the core requirements. The following are general activities for this position: Assist in the preparation of federal applications submitted to the OJJDP for funding for the Title II Formula Grant Program including the Compliance Monitoring Three Year Plan; Conduct juvenile facility site inspections; Review annual facility inspection reports from Juvenile Court Judges/Juvenile Justice Commissions; Follow up with facility administrators and/or Juvenile Court Judges as needed to address missing reports or issues identified during the inspection; Provide on-site technical assistance to juvenile facility staff and law enforcement; Prepare correspondence sent to grantees, state and federal agencies, counties and cities, and the general public; Provide training as needed to professional organizations, state, city, county and non-profit organizations; Review and evaluate county compliance with Federal and State laws; Review and evaluate county compliance with the core requirements and State law regarding minimum requirements for juvenile justice facilities (including, but not limited to Title 15 and Title 24); and Assist with the juvenile regulations revision process.

The provision of technical assistance by the Field Representative (FSO) includes training stakeholders on the core requirements and California law regarding minimum standards for juvenile facilities.

Associate Governmental Program Analyst, FSO – collects and analyzes compliance monitoring data and assists with preparation and submission of the Compliance Monitoring Three Year Plan and annual SACJJDP Report to the Governor and Legislature on Compliance Monitoring Recommendations.

Staff Services Analyst, FSO – Data entry of all annual surveys and monthly reports. Maintenance of Compliance Monitoring database and physical files. Communicates with reporting agencies to verify data as necessary.

Classification Descriptions, Research:

Research Manager III – oversee procedures, processes and workload for all research staff performing work related to grant support including RFP rating criteria, evaluation processes, data collection and reporting.

Research Analyst: provide grant support in RFP rating criteria and evaluation process as well as assistance in required federal and subgrantee data analysis and reporting.

8.3: List of Juvenile Programs Administered by the BSCC

- Federal Title II Grants including Tribal Youth and R.E.D. – California's current Title II plan emphasizes Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs), R.E.D., Quality Education for Youth, and Maintaining Compliance with the Four Core Protections. The BSCC Field Representatives conduct grantee monitoring visits and facility site inspections and coordinate/provide applicable training and technical assistance. There are currently 12 subgrantees with programs focusing on Diversion, Delinquency Prevention, and Aftercare/Reentry; two Tribal grantees with programs based around the Gathering of Native Americans (GONA) principles; and four R.E.D. grants based on data analysis and collaborative development of a R.E.D. reduction plan.
- Federal Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) – The JABG programs were zeroed out in the federal budget in 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017. The remaining balance of the 2013 federal allocation is being used to support the SACJJDP's priority focus on the use of EBPs. JABG EBP Training Grants fund training for local probation departments to assist them in implementing or expanding the use of EBP within their

local juvenile justice communities. While probation departments are the lead agency in the implementation of the training requested and the main recipient of the services, other key stakeholders within each juvenile justice community are also included in the training offered. The funding for this program expired on February 28, 2018.

- Federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) – The JAG Program [42 U.S. Code §3751(a)] is a key provider of law enforcement funding to state and local jurisdictions. The JAG Program provides critical funding necessary to support state and local initiatives, to include: technical assistance, strategic planning, research and evaluation (including forensics), data collection, training, personnel, equipment, forensic laboratories, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems. It funds both adult and youth programs. California has prioritized the following three JAG program areas:
    - Education and Prevention Programs
    - Law Enforcement Programs
    - Prosecution and Court Programs, Including Indigent Defense
- Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act – Youthful Offender Block Grant Program (JJCPA-YOBG) – The state JJCPA program provides state funds for probation departments to implement programs that have proven effective in reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and youthful offenders. The YOBG program provides state funding for counties to deliver custody and care (i.e., appropriate rehabilitative and supervisory services) to offenders who previously would have been committed to the CDCR, Division of Juvenile Justice. California statute was enacted in 2016 to combine the planning and reporting requirements of these two programs.
- Youth Center/Youth Shelter Program – The state Youth Center/Youth Shelter Program provided $55 million for the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of 98 youth centers and youth shelters throughout the state. Youth centers are located in low income, high crime neighborhoods and provide youth with after-school programming including educational and recreational services. Many of these centers are operated by well-known youth service agencies such as the Boys and Girls Club and YMCA. Youth shelters provide overnight sleeping accommodations for homeless and transitional youth. The shelters also provide case management services, referrals to community resources, and assistance

with family reunification. Although funding for this program has long been disbursed, the BSCC still has active contracts and oversight responsibilities.

- Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction (MIOCR) Juvenile Grants – MIOCR state funds support appropriate prevention, intervention, diversion, supervision, and services through promising and evidence-based strategies to reduce recidivism in managing California's mentally ill offender population, as well as improving outcomes for these offenders. Grant funds were awarded to implement locally-developed, collaborative and multidisciplinary projects that provide a cost-effective continuum of responses designed to provide youthful offenders alternatives to detention, reduce crime and juvenile justice costs as they relate to the mentally ill, and to maximize available and/or new local resources for prevention, intervention, diversion, detention, and aftercare services for juvenile offenders with mental health issues, while improving public safety. This grant program ends June 30, 2018.
- Proud Parenting – Proud Parenting state funds support community-based parenting services to young parents between the ages of 14 and 25 who are involved in the juvenile or criminal justice system to break the inter-generational cycle of violence and delinquency. Grantees provide classroom instruction, structured family events and mentoring as well as comprehensive assessments and assistance to young parents or those at risk of becoming parents. This program is subject to a state appropriation.
- California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) – CalVIP Program provides $9.215 million in grant funding to cities and CBOs to support a range of violence intervention and prevention activities. CalVIP is a state-funded grant program enacted by the 2017 State Budget Act and appropriated through the State General Fund. Cities and CBOs may apply for up to $500,000 for a two-year grant with a 100 percent match (cash or in-kind). City applicants must form a coordinating and advisory council to prioritize the use of grant funds. Cities that are awarded funding must pass-through a minimum of 50 percent of grant funds to one or more CBOs and must commit to collaborating with local agencies and jurisdictions in violence reduction efforts. The BSCC must give preference to applicants in cities and regions that have been disproportionately affected by violence and to applicants that propose to direct CalVIP funds to programs that

have been shown to be the most effective at reducing violence. This two year program can serve adults and juveniles.

- Proposition 47 – The ongoing state Proposition 47 program funds public agencies to provide mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and/or diversion programs for those in the criminal justice system. It may serve both adults and juveniles and also allows funds to be used for housing-related assistance and other community-based supportive services, including job skills training, case management or civil legal services.
- Strengthening Local Law Enforcement and Community Relationships – The state Strengthening Grant funded programs and initiatives intended to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve, including, but not limited to, providing training for front-line peace officers on issues such as implicit bias; funding for research to examine how local policing services currently are being delivered; assessing the state of law enforcement-community relations; comparing the status quo with the best practices in the policing profession; and receiving recommendations for moving forward, including the identification of policing models and operational options to improve policing; problem-oriented policing initiatives such as Operation Ceasefire; restorative justice programs that address the needs of victims, offenders, and the community; behavioral health training and any one-time costs associated with implementing, expanding, and maintaining a program designed to capture peace officer interactions with individuals in the community. This grant program ends June 30, 2018.

Attachment 1: New 2017 California Laws Relevant to Juvenile Justice

Assembly Bill (AB) 90 (Chapter 695) "Fair and Accurate Gang Database Act". AB 90 sets policies, procedures, training and oversight for the future use of shared gang databases, including, among other things, establishing the requirements for entering and reviewing gang designations, the retention period for listed gangs, and the criteria for identifying gang members. It further requires periodic audits by law enforcement agencies and department staff to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and proper use of any shared gang database, and the report of those results to the public. This is to address accuracy and fairness in the collection and accessing of gang allegations.

AB 507 (Chapter 705) Resource family training. As part of CCR, AB 507 provides that a portion of annual resource family training shall support the case plans, goals, and needs of children in the resource family home, if there are any children in the home, in accordance with departmental directives and regulations. It also permits a county to require one or more hours of specialized training for resource families in addition to the 8 hours of caregiver training otherwise required by current law.

AB 529 (Chapter 685) Sealing of juvenile offense records. AB 529 requires the juvenile court to order the sealing of arrest and related records held by law enforcement and probation agencies and the Department of Justice, in cases where a petition filed to declare the minor a ward of the court has been dismissed or has resulted in an acquittal on the charges. It also requires probation departments to seal records pertaining to a juvenile who completes a diversion program to which he or she is referred in lieu of the filing of a petition and it permits probation departments to access a record that has been sealed under Section 786 in order to determine eligibility for subsequent supervision programs under WIC Section 654.3.

AB 766 (Chapter 710) Foster care independent living to include university and college housing. *AB 766* provides that a minor aged 16 or older who is otherwise eligible for AFDC-FC (foster care) benefits may directly receive those payments if he or she is enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution, living independently in a dormitory or other designated school housing and where the education placement is made pursuant to a supervised placement agreement and transitional independent living plan as described in the bill. AB 766 further provides that foster care payments made to a minor enrolled in a postsecondary education placement at the University of California or California Community Colleges shall not be counted in considering the minor's eligibility for financial aid.

AB 878 (Chapter 660) Mechanical restraints used on minors during transportation from local juvenile justice facilities. *AB 878* permits the use of "mechanical restraints" (including handcuffs, chains, irons, straightjackets) on a juvenile during transportation to or from a local secure juvenile facility (including probation camps or ranches) "only upon a determination made by the probation department, in consultation with the transporting agency, that the mechanical restraints are necessary to prevent physical harm to the juvenile or another person or due to a substantial risk of flight." It requires that if the restraints are used, only the least restrictive form of restraint consistent with the legitimate security needs of the juvenile is to be used. It requires that a probation

department choosing to use mechanical restraints other than handcuffs shall adopt procedures documenting their use and reasons for use. It limits the use of restraints during a court proceeding to situations where the court determines that the minor's behavior in custody or in court makes the use of restraints necessary to prevent physical harm or flight, with the burden on the prosecution to demonstrate the need for restraints, and then requires that the least restrictive form of restraint be used and that the reasons for use of the restraint be documented.

AB 1008 (Chapter 789) Ban the box/ fair employment limits on employer inquiry into criminal history. AB 1008 revises and expands California fair employment law by declaring it to be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to a) ask about conviction history on a job application, b) enquire about conviction history until after the applicant has been made a conditional job offer, or c) in conducting a background check to consider or use certain types of criminal history including arrest without conviction, diversion only and information contained in sealed records. This only applies to employers having five or more employees. The safeguards against inquiry into criminal history do not apply to certain background checks otherwise required by law, including background checks required for employment with a state or local agency or with a designated criminal justice agency. AB 1008 also sets out requirements for informing applicants about reasons for denial of employment related to criminal history and provides for a five-day period in which persons denied employment can challenge the accuracy of the information on which rejection was based.

AB 1308 (Chapter 675) Eligibility for parole consideration for prisoners whose offenses were committed while age 25 or younger. AB 1308 raises the eligibility threshold for parole consideration to cover prisoners who were age 25 or younger at the time of their commitment offense (from age 23 under current law). Prisoners meeting this age criteria become eligible for release on parole after 15, 20 or 25 years of incarceration depending on the sentence originally imposed. AB 1308 requires the parole board, in making its determination, to consider maturity and development factors pertaining to juveniles and young adults and to provide "a meaningful opportunity for release". It further sets out a range of future dates by which the parole board must complete sentence reviews for those made eligible for release by the bill, depending on the type of sentence that was imposed.

SB 190 (Chapter 678) Elimination of costs imposed by counties for juvenile detention, placement, legal services and related charges. SB 190 deletes provisions in multiple sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code that now permit counties to assess minors and parents for the costs of juvenile processing, defense representation, detention, drug testing and placement. The bill is comprehensive in the sense that it strikes cost language from nearly every section of the Welfare and Institutions Code. SB 190 also provides additional relief from liability of parents or juveniles from having to pay the costs of designated juvenile court and probation services or operations.

SB 312 (Chapter 679) Sealing of juvenile offense records involving listed serious (WIC Section 707 b) offenses. SB 312 modifies the lifetime ban on sealing of a juvenile record involving a WIC Section 707 (b) offense committed at age 14 or older, with certain limitations.

SB 384 (Chapter 541) Tiered sex offender registration. SB 384, beginning January 2021, modifies Juvenile sex offender registration requirements as follows: establishes Tier 1 and Tier 2 registration periods for juveniles required to register after release from the Department of Correction's Division of Juvenile Justice. Based on the underlying offense, juvenile registrants fall either into Tier 1 (5 years) or Tier 2 (10 years of registration). Upon meeting performance criteria during the registration period, the juvenile registrant may petition the Juvenile Court in the county of residence for removal from registration. The criteria applied by the Juvenile Court to rule on removal are the same criteria that apply to adult sex offense petitioners in Superior Court.

SB 394 (Chapter 684) Parole hearings for persons sentenced to Life-Without-Parole (LWOP) for crimes committed prior to age 18. SB 394 expands the coverage of other law that provide for parole board review of long prison sentences imposed on individuals who were under the age of 23 at the time of commission of the offense. SB 394 adds and provides for parole board review of a LWOP sentence for an individual who received the LWOP sentence for a crime committed prior to age 18 and who has served at least 25 years of his or her sentence. Requires parole hearings for those whose eligibility is expanded by the bill to completed on or before July 1, 2020.

SB 395 (Chapter 681) Juvenile interrogation and counsel rights. SB 395 requires that a youth 15 years of age or younger, prior to any custodial interrogation, and prior to the waiver of any Miranda rights, shall consult with counsel either in person, by telephone or by video conference. This right to consultation with counsel may not be waived. SB 395 requires a court, in considering the admissibility of any statements by the minor, to consider the effect of any failure to comply with the counsel consultation requirement. The SB 395 consultation requirement does not apply to the admissibility of any statement obtained without consultation for situations in which the law enforcement officer reasonably believed that the information sought was necessary "to protect life or property from an imminent threat". SB 395 also states that a probation officer acting in the normal performance of referral and investigation activities as specified is not subject to the requirement of the counsel consultation

SB 462 (Chapter 462) Accessing juvenile case files for data reports and evaluations. A juvenile case file is the court's record of documents and reports pertaining to juvenile dependency or delinquency proceedings. By definition, the case file includes individual records in the custody probation agencies. Welfare and Institutions Code Section 827 generally provides that these records are confidential and may be accessed only by certain agencies or individuals for defined uses. SB 462 adds a new WIC Section 827.12 authorizing a law enforcement agency, probation department or any other state or local agency having custody of the juvenile case file to access and utilize the record for purposes of complying with grant reports or with data reports required by other laws, as long as no personally identifying information accessed under the bill is further released, disseminated or published. The bill also allows a chief probation officer to ask a court to authorize release of juvenile case file information for "data sharing" or for research and evaluation purposes with the ban on release of personally identifying information.

SB 625 (Chapter 683) Honorable Discharge from the Division of Juvenile Facilities. Prior to the realignment of state youth parole to counties in 2010, Honorable Discharge status could be awarded to wards paroled from the Department of Correction's Division of Juvenile Facilities (DJJ). After DJJ parole was realigned to counties, this practice became dormant. SB 625 now authorizes the Board of Juvenile Hearings (BJH) to award Honorable Discharge to DJJ wards who have been released to the county on local probation supervision. Individuals seeking this status must petition the BJH for an honorable discharge determination. Those eligible include all persons discharged from DJJ after the effective date of DJJ parole realignment (October 2010). The petition may not be considered by BJH until at least 18 months have passed since the ward's released. When a request for honorable discharge is made, the probation department must furnish a report to BJH on the ward's performance on local supervision. The bill lists criteria for honorable discharge to be considered by the Board including offense history since discharge and the "efforts made by the petitioner toward successful community reintegration, including employment history, educational achievements or progress toward obtaining a degree, vocational training, volunteer work, community engagement, positive peer and familial relationships, and any other relevant indicators of successful reentry and rehabilitation". If honorable discharge is granted, the individual is "thereafter be released from all penalties or disabilities resulting from the offenses for which the person was committed, including, but not limited to, penalties or disabilities that affect access to education, employment, or occupational license", with special limitations applicable to employment as a peace officer. It specifies that an individual granted honorable discharge is not relieved from any requirement to register as sex offender.

Finally, in November 2016, California voters approved Proposition 57, which, among other things, ended the ability of prosecutors to "direct file," i.e., file criminal cases against juveniles in adult court. This may increase the population of youth incarcerated in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)'s Division of Juvenile Justice.

Attachment 2: Additional Attachments and Disclosures

Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

The Board of State and Community Corrections is not currently designated high risk by the another federal grant making agency.

Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

The Board of State and Community Correctoins has the following pending applications

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name, Phone, and Email for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/OJJDP	Title II Formula Awards	Ricco Hall 202.616.3807 Rico.hall@ojb.usdoj.gov
DOJ/BJP	Sex Offender Registration and Notication Act (SORNA) Reallocation Funds	Cynthia Simons 202.305.1020 Cynthis.simons@usdoj.gov
DOJ/OJJDP	OJJDP FY 2017 Application for Guidance for Prison Rape Elimination Act Reallocation Funds: OJJDP Formula Grants Program	Elissa Rumsey 202.616.9279 Elissa.rumsey@usdoj.gov

Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) intends to pass through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Title II funds through a competitive process to eligible jurisdictions. The BSCC will ensure that the subrecipients of Title II funds maintain research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, and review of potential conflicts of interest.

Indirect Cost Rate Agreement

The BSCC is in the process of applying for an indirect cost rate and will not apply it without prior OJJDP approval. The BSCC will submit a FFY 2018 budget modification should OJJDP approve it within FFY 2018.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

OMB Number: 1121-0329
Expiration Date: 12/31/2018

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEM OF INTERNAL CONTROLS QUESTIONNAIRE

The financial management system of each non-Federal entity must provide for the following

- Retention requirements for records
- Requests for transfer of records
- Methods for collection, transmission and storage of information
- Access to records
- Restrictions on public access to records

(1) Identification, in its accounts, of all Federal awards received and expended and the Federal programs under which they were received. Federal program and Federal award identification must include, as applicable, the CFDA title and number, Federal award identification number and year, name of the Federal agency, and name of the pass-through entity, if any.

(2) Accurate, current, and complete disclosure of the financial results of each Federal award or program.

(3) Records that identify adequately the source and application of funds for federally-funded activities. These records must contain information pertaining to Federal awards, authorizations, obligations, unobligated balances, assets, expenditures, income and interest and be supported by source documentation.

(4) Effective control over, and accountability for, all funds, property, and other assets. The non-Federal entity must adequately safeguard all assets and assure that they are used solely for authorized purposes.

(5) Comparison of expenditures with budget amounts for each Federal award.

(6) Written procedures to document the receipt and disbursement of Federal funds including procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the United States Treasury or the pass-through entity and the disbursement by the non-Federal entity whether the payment is made by electronic funds transfer, or issuance or redemption of checks, warrants, or payment by other means.

(7) Written procedures for determining the allowability of costs.

APPLICANT ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

1. Name of Organization and Address:

Organization Name: Board of State and Community Corrections
Street1: 2590 Venture Oaks Way
Street2:
City: Sacramento
State: CA: California
Zip Code: 95833

2. Authorized Representative's Name and Title:

Prefix: Ms.
First Name: Kathleen
Middle Name:
Last Name: Howard
Suffix:
Title: Executive Director

3. Phone: (916) 445-5073
4. Fax: 916-327-3317

5. Email: kathleen.howard@bscc.ca.gov

6. Year Established: 2012
7. Employer Identification Number (EIN): 68-0282717
8. DUNS Number: 9490957310000

9. Type of Organization:

- [x] State
- [ ] Municipality
- [ ] Non-Profit
- [ ] Higher Education
- [ ] Tribal
- [ ] For-Profit
- [ ] Other:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

OMB Number: 1121-0329
Expiration Date: 12/31/2018

AUDIT INFORMATION

An audit is conducted using generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS) or Generally Accepted Governmental Auditing Standards (GAGAS) and results in an audit report with an opinion.

10. The organization has undergone the following types of audit(s)(Please check all that apply):

- [x] OMB A-133 Single Audit
- [ ] Financial Statement Audit
- [ ] Defense Contract Agency Audit (DCAA)
- [ ] None
- [ ] Programmatic Audit & Agency:
- [ ] Other Audit & Agency:

11. Most Recent Audit: [x] Within the past 12 months [ ] Within the past two years [ ] More than two years

Name of Audit Agency/Firm: Macias Gini & O'Connell

AUDITOR'S OPINION:

12. On the most recent audit, what was the auditor's opinion?

[x] Unqualified Opinion [ ] Qualified Opinion [ ] Disclaimer, Going Concern or Adverse Opinions

Please enter the number of findings: 0

Please enter the amount of questioned costs: $0.00

Were material weaknesses noted in either the Financial Statement or Single Audit? [ ] Yes [x] No

ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

13. Which of the following best describes your accounting system:

[ ] Manual [ ] Automated [x] Combination

14. Does the accounting system identify the receipt and expenditure of program funds separately for each grant?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure
15. Does the accounting system provide for the recording of expenditures for each grant/contract by budget cost categories shown in the approved budget?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure
16. Does your accounting system have the capability to document the recording of cost sharing or match for each grant? Can you determine if documentation is available to support recorded match or cost share?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure
17. Are time distribution records maintained for each employee that specifically identify effort charged to a particular grant or cost objective?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure
18. Does the accounting/financial system include budgetary controls to preclude incurring obligations or costs in excess of total funds available or by budget cost category (e.g. Personnel, Travel, etc.)?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure
19. Is the organization familiar with the existing Federal regulation and guidelines containing the Cost Principles and procedures for the determination and allowance of costs in connection with Federal grants?	[x] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not Sure

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

OMB Number: 1121-0329
Expiration Date: 12/31/2018

PROPERTY STANDARDS, PROCUREMENT STANDARDS, AND TRAVEL POLICIES

PROPERTY STANDARDS	
20. Does your property management system(s) provide for maintaining: (1) a description of the equipment; (2) an identification number; (3) source of the property, including the award number; (4) where title vests; (5) acquisition date; (6) federal share of property cost; (7) location and condition of the property; (8) acquisition cost; & (9) ultimate disposition information?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure
PROCUREMENT STANDARDS	
21. Does your organization maintain written procurement procedures which (1) avoid unnecessary purchases; (2) provide an analysis of lease and purchase alternatives; and (3) provide a process for soliciting goods and services?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure
22. Does your procurement system provide for the conduct to determine selection on a competitive basis and documentation of cost or price analysis for each procurement action?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure
23. Does your procurement system include provisions for checking the "Excluded Parties List" system for suspended or debarred sub-grantees and contractors, prior to award? Please visit www.sam.gov.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure
TRAVEL POLICY	
24. Does your organization:	
(a) maintain a standard travel policy?	☒ Yes ☐ No
(b) adhere to the Federal Travel Regulation? (FTR)	☒ Yes ☐ No
SUBRECIPIENT MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING	
25. (For Pass-through entities only). Does your organization have controls in place to monitor activities of subrecipients, as necessary, to determine that Federal awards are used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions off the award and that performance goals are achieved (2 CFR200)?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure ☐ N/A (Your organization does not make subawards.)

STANDARDS FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I certify that the above information is complete and correct to the best of my knowledge. This document must be certified by the organization's Authorized Representative, Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer, Chairman of the Board of Directors, or similar position.

Name: Kathleen Howard Date:

Title: ☒ Executive Director ☐ Chief Financial Officer ☐ Chairman ☐ Other

Phone:

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Approved by OMB
0346-0046

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure.)

1. Type of Federal Action:
[b] a. contract
b. grant
c. cooperative agreement
d. loan
e. loan guarantee
f. loan insurance

2. Status of Federal Action:
[a] a. bid/offer/application
b. initial award
c. post-award

3. Report Type:
[a] a. initial filing
b. material change
For Material Change Only:
year _____ quarter _____
date of last report _____

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:
[✓] Prime [ ] Subawardee
Tier _____, *if known*:
Board of State and Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento CA 95833-3200
Congressional District, *if known*: CA 1-53

5. If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is a Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:
Congressional District, *if known*:

6. Federal Department/Agency:
Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs

7. Federal Program Name/Description:
OJJDP 2018 Title II grant program
CFDA Number, *if applicable*: _____

8. Federal Action Number, *if known*:

9. Award Amount, *if known*:
$

10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant
(if individual, last name, first name, MI):

b. Individuals Performing Services (*including address if different from No. 10a*)
(last name, first name, MI):

11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Signature: _____
Print Name: Kathleen Howard
Title: Executive Director
Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____

Federal Use Only:

Authorized for Local Reproduction
Standard Form LLL (Rev. 7-97)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.

2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.

3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.

4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.

5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.

6. Enter the name of the Federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizationallevel below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.

7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.

8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitation for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Include prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."

9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.

10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

    (b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10 (a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).

11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503.

Appendix A: Structure of the Juvenile Justice System in California

[1] The arrest data are reported by law enforcement agencies; law enforcement referral data are reported by probation departments. Comparisons between arrest data and referral data should not be made because of differences in the units of count between the two sources.
[a] Includes the 492 juveniles sent directly to adult court. In November 2016, California voters approved Proposition 57, which, among other things, ended the ability of prosecutors to "direct file," i.e., file criminal cases against juveniles in adult court.
[b] In 2015, probation departments reported information on 566 transfers to the adult system. The adult disposition information being discussed here is for the 416 dispositions received in 2015.
[c] Turned Over is defined as turned over to another agency. Source: California Department of Justice report: Juvenile Justice in California 2015

This page left intentionally blank

Appendix F: OJJDP FY 2018 Title II Formula Grant Budget Detail Worksheet

Program Areas	Program Area Title	Proposed FY 2017 Budget (excludes match)		Proposed FY 2017 Match	Combined Total Budget
28	**Planning & Administration (P&A) Total:***	**$339,625**		**$339,625**	**$679,250**
	*Planning & Administration (P&A) Detail:**				
	-Personnel	$173,449		$173,449	$346,898
	-Benefits	$85,528		$85,528	$171,056
	-Travel	$13,446		$13,446	$26,892
	--Consultants & Non-Program Contracts	$30,000		$30,000	$60,000
	--Other P&A Costs: SWCAP	$22,381		$22,381	$44,763
	--Other P&A Costs: Supplies & Dues	$14,821		$14,821	$29,641
	Program Contracts & Sub Awards Total:**	**$3,056,620**		**$0**	**$3,056,620**
	*Program Contracts & Sub Awards Detail:***				
1	Aftercare/Reentry	$465,000	**P**		$465,000
2	After-School Programs				$0
3	Alternatives to Detention	$300,000	**P**		$300,000
4	Child Abuse and Neglect Programs				$0
5	Community-Based Programs and Services	$350,000	**P**		$350,000
6	Deliquency Prevention				$0
7	Gangs				$0
8	Graduated and Appriopriate Sanctions				$0
9	Hate Crimes				$0
10	Job Training				$0
11	Learning & Other Disabilities				$0
12	Mental Health Services	$400,000	**P**		$400,000
13	Mentoring, Counseling & Training Programs	$241,620	**P**		$241,620
14	Positive Youth Development				$0
15	Probation				$0
16	Protecting Juvenile Rights				$0
17	School Programs				$0
18	Substance and Alcohol Abuse				$0
19	Compliance Monitoring	$350,000			$350,000
20	Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders				$0
21	Disproportionate Minority Contact / Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity	$250,000			$250,000
22	Diversion	$580,000	**P**		$580,000
23	Gender-Specific Services				$0
24	Indian Tribe Programs	$100,000	**P**		$100,000
25	Indigent Defense				$0
26	Jail Removal				$0
27	Juvenile Justice System Improvement				$0
29	Reducing Probation Officer Caseload (if any) < 5%				$250,000
30	Rural Area Juvenile Programs				$0
31	Separation of Youth From Adult Inmates				$0
32	State Advisory Group Allocation	$20,000			$20,000
	Award Total	**$3,396,245**		**$339,625**	**$3,735,870**

This page left intentionally blank

Apprendix G: Compliance and DMC Plans

For information regarding California's compliance with the first three core protections of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and with the Disproportionate Minority Contact core requirement, please see the plans submitted by the April 2, 2018 due date.

This page left intentionally blank

Appendix I: Compliance With the JJDP Act [42 U.S.C. 5633, Section 223(a)]

The application must provide reasonable evidence that the state complies with each of the following requirements. As noted below, indicate on which application page(s) is found the documentation for each requirement, and submit this appendix as a separate attachment to the Plan Update application. Note the instructions provided in italics after each item for additional guidance.

(a) Requirements. In order to receive formula grants under this part, a state shall submit a plan for carrying out its purposes applicable to a 3-year period. Such plan shall be amended annually to include new programs, projects, and activities. The state shall submit annual performance reports to the Administrator which shall describe progress in implementing programs contained in the original plan, and shall describe the status of compliance with state plan requirements. In accordance with regulations which the Administrator shall prescribe, such plan shall—

(1) Designate the state agency as the sole agency for supervising the preparation and administration of the plan; ***[Provide a statement indicating the designated state agency in fulfillment of this item. Page(s): 6-7 and Abstract]***

(2) Contain satisfactory evidence that the state agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement such plan in conformity with this part; ***[Provide a citation for the executive order, legislation, or policy pointing to the authority of the agency. Page(s): Abstract]***

(3) Provide for an advisory group that***—[Attach the SAG list following the format of the sample roster as evidence of meeting this requirement. Page(s): 30-31]***

(A) Shall consist of not less than 15 and not more than 33 members appointed by the chief executive officer of the state—

(i) Which members have training, experience, or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency, the administration of juvenile justice, or the reduction of juvenile delinquency;

(ii) Which members include—

(I) At least one locally elected official representing general purpose local government;

(II) Representatives of law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, including juvenile and family court judges, prosecutors, counsel for children and youth, and probation workers;

(III) Representatives of public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment, such as welfare, social services, mental health, education, special education, recreation, and youth services;

(IV) Representatives of private nonprofit organizations, including persons with a special focus on preserving and strengthening families, parent groups and parent self-help groups, youth development, delinquency prevention and treatment, neglected or dependent children, the quality of juvenile justice, education, and social services for children;

(V) Volunteers who work with delinquents or potential delinquents;

(VI) Youth workers involved with programs that are alternatives to incarceration, including programs providing organized recreation activities;

(VII) Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to school violence and vandalism and alternatives to suspension and expulsion; and

(VIII) Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to learning disabilities, emotional difficulties, child abuse and neglect, and youth violence;

(iii) A majority of which members (including the chairperson) shall not be full-time employees of the federal, state, or local government;

(iv) At least one-fifth of which members shall be under the age of 24 at the time of appointment; and

(v) At least 3 members who have been or are currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system;

(B) Shall participate in the development and review of the state's juvenile justice plan prior to submission to the supervisory board for final action; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and describe the process used. Page(s): 6-7, 27-28]***

(C) Shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment, not later than 30 days after their submission to the advisory group, on all juvenile justice and delinquency prevention grant applications submitted to the state agency designated under paragraph (1); ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and describe the process used. Page(s): 9]***

(D) Shall, consistent with this title—

(i) Advise the state agency designated under paragraph (1) and its supervisory board; and ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and describe the process used. Page(s): 8-9]***

(ii) Submit to the chief executive officer and the legislature of the state at least annually recommendations regarding state compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13); and ***[Provide a statement affirming that***

this has been done or will be done. Page(s): 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]

(iii) Contact and seek regular input from juveniles currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system; and ***[Provide a statement affirming this has been done, and a description of the process. Page(s): 6-7]***

(E) May, consistent with this title—

(i) Advise on state supervisory board and local criminal justice advisory board composition; [and] ***[If applicable, provide relevant information. Page(s): 1, 30]***

(ii) Review progress and accomplishments of projects funded under the state plan. ***[If applicable, provide relevant information. Page(s): 28-30]***

(4) Provide for the active consultation with and participation of units of local government or combinations thereof in the development of a state plan which adequately takes into account the needs and requests of units of local government, except that nothing in the plan requirements, or any regulations promulgated to carry out such requirements, shall be construed to prohibit or impede the state from making grants to, or entering into contracts with, local private agencies or the advisory group; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and a description of the process. Page(s): 6-11]***

(5) Unless the provisions of this paragraph are waived at the discretion of the Administrator for any state in which the services for delinquent or other youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis, provide that at least 66 and 2/3 percent of funds received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] reduced by the percentage (if any) specified by the state under the authority of paragraph (25) and excluding funds made available to the state advisory group under section 222(d) [42 U.S.C. 5632(d)], shall be expended***—[Attach budget and narrative description of subgrants. Page(s): 9, Appendix F]***

(A) Through programs of units of local government or combinations thereof, to the extent such programs are consistent with the state plan; ***Page(s): 6-11]***

(B) Through programs of local private agencies, to the extent such programs are consistent with the state plan, except that direct funding of any local private agency by a state shall be permitted only if such agency requests such funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of local government or combination thereof; and; ***Page(s): 6-11]***

(C) To provide funds for programs of Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) and that agree to attempt to comply with the requirements specified in paragraphs (11), (12), and (13), applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles, an amount that bears the same ratio to the aggregate amount to be expended through programs referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) as the population under 18 years of age

in the geographical areas in which such tribes perform such functions bears to the state population under 18 years of age; ***Page(s): 6-11]***

(6) Provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] within the state, including in rural areas; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item, as well as an explanation of the process and logic the state uses as to how it is equitable. Page(s): 6-11]***

(7) (A) Provide for an analysis of juvenile delinquency problems in, and the juvenile delinquency control and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of, the state (including any geographical area in which an Indian tribe performs law enforcement functions), a description of the services to be provided, and a description of performance goals and priorities, including a specific statement of the manner in which programs are expected to meet the identified juvenile crime problems (including the joining of gangs that commit crimes) and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of the State; **[*Page(s): Appendix N]***

and that

(B) Contains—

(i) An analysis of gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency, including the types of such services available and the need for such services; ***[Provide description in application. Page(s): 6-11, Appendix N p. 24]***

(ii) A plan for providing needed gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency**;** ***[Provide description in application. Page(s): 6-11, Appendix N p. 24]***

(iii) A plan for providing needed services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in rural areas; and ***[Provide description in application. Page(s): 9]***

(iv) A plan for providing needed mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system, including information on how such plan is being implemented and how such services will be targeted to those juveniles in such system who are in greatest need of such services. ***[Provide description in application. Page(s): 6-11]***

(8) Provide for the coordination and maximum utilization of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in the state; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and a description of the process. Page(s): 37-40]***

(9) Provide that not less than 75 percent of the funds available to the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632], other than funds made available to the state advisory

group under section 222(d) [42 U.S.C. 5632(d)], whether expended directly by the state, by the unit of local government, or by a combination thereof, or through grants and contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies, shall be used for***—[Attach budget; it is not a requirement that every category (A through S below) be funded. Page(s): Appendix F]***

(A) Community-based alternatives (including home-based alternatives) to incarceration and institutionalization, including—

(i) For youth who need temporary placement: crisis intervention, shelter, and aftercare; and

(ii) For youth who need residential placement: a continuum of foster care or group home alternatives that provide access to a comprehensive array of services;

(B) Community-based programs and services to work with—

(i) Parents and other family members to strengthen families, including parent self- help groups, so that juveniles may be retained in their homes;

(ii) Juveniles during their incarceration, and with their families, to ensure the safe return of such juveniles to their homes and to strengthen the families; and

(iii) Parents with limited English-speaking ability, particularly in areas where there is a large population of families with limited English-speaking ability;

(C) Comprehensive juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs that meet the needs of youth through the collaboration of the many local systems before which a youth may appear, including schools, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies, and private nonprofit agencies offering youth services;

(D) Programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

(E) Educational programs or supportive services for delinquent or other juveniles—

(i) To encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations;

(ii) To provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency; and

(iii) Enhance coordination with the local schools that such juveniles would otherwise attend, to ensure that—

(I) The instruction that juveniles receive outside school is closely aligned with the instruction provided in school; and

(II) Information regarding any learning problems identified in such alternative learning situations is communicated to the schools;

(F) Expanding the use of probation officers—

(i) Particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

(ii) To ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;

(G) Counseling, training, and mentoring programs, which may be in support of academic tutoring, vocational and technical training, and drug and violence prevention counseling, that are designed to link at-risk juveniles, juvenile offenders, or juveniles who have a parent or legal guardian who is or was incarcerated in a federal, state, or local correctional facility or who is otherwise under the jurisdiction of a federal, state, or local criminal justice system, particularly juveniles residing in low-income and high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible individuals (such as law enforcement officials, Department of Defense personnel, individuals working with local businesses, and individuals working with community- based and faith-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;

(H) Programs designed to develop and implement projects relating to juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities, including on-the-job training programs to assist community services, law enforcement, and juvenile justice personnel to more effectively recognize and provide for learning disabled and other juveniles with disabilities;

(I) Projects designed both to deter involvement in illegal activities and to promote involvement in lawful activities on the part of gangs whose membership is substantially composed of youth;

(J) Programs and projects designed to provide for the treatment of youths' dependence on or abuse of alcohol or other addictive or nonaddictive drugs;

(K) Programs for positive youth development that assist delinquent and other at-risk youth in obtaining—

(i) A sense of safety and structure;

(ii) A sense of belonging and membership;

(iii) A sense of self-worth and social contribution;

(iv) A sense of independence and control over one's life; and

(v) A sense of closeness in interpersonal relationships;

(L) Programs that, in recognition of varying degrees of the seriousness of delinquent behavior and the corresponding gradations in the responses of the juvenile justice system in response to that behavior, are designed to—

(i) Encourage courts to develop and implement a continuum of postadjudication restraints that bridge the gap between traditional probation and confinement in a correctional setting (including expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, and similar programs, and secure community-based treatment facilities linked to other support services such as health, mental health, education (remedial and special), job training, and recreation); and

(ii) Assist in the provision [by the provision] by the Administrator of information and technical assistance, including technology transfer, to states in the design and utilization of risk assessment mechanisms to aid juvenile justice personnel in determining appropriate sanctions for delinquent behavior;

(M)Community-based programs and services to work with juveniles, their parents, and other family members during and after incarceration in order to strengthen families so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes;

(N) Programs (including referral to literacy programs and social service programs) to assist families with limited English-speaking ability that include delinquent juveniles to overcome language and other barriers that may prevent the complete treatment of such juveniles and the preservation of their families;

(O) Programs designed to prevent and to reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles;

(P) After-school programs that provide at-risk juveniles and juveniles in the juvenile justice system with a range of age-appropriate activities, including tutoring, mentoring, and other educational and enrichment activities;

(Q) Community-based programs that provide follow-up post-placement services to adjudicated juveniles, to promote successful reintegration into the community;

(R) Projects designed to develop and implement programs to protect the rights of juveniles affected by the juvenile justice system; and

(S) Programs designed to provide mental health services for incarcerated juveniles suspected to be in need of such services, including assessment, development of individualized treatment plans, and discharge plans.

(10) Provide for the development of an adequate research, training, and evaluation capacity within the state; ***[Provide a statement and description of the capacity the state has, or plans to develop, related to this. Page(s): 29-30]***

(11) Shall, in accordance with rules issued by the Administrator, provide that***—[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that documentation is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 22-23]***

(A) Juveniles who are charged with or who have committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

(i) Juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of Title 18, United States Code, or of a similar state law;

(ii) Juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of a valid court order; and

(iii) Juveniles who are held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the state; shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities; and

(B) Juveniles—

(i) Who are not charged with any offense; and

(ii) Who are—

(I) Aliens; or

(II) Alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused, shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities;

(12) Provide that***—[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that documentation is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 22, 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]***

(A) Juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent or juveniles within the purview of paragraph (11) will not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have contact with adult inmates; and

(B) There is in effect in the state a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adult inmates, including in collocated facilities, have been trained and certified to work with juveniles; ***[Page(s): 22, 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]***

(13) Provide that no juvenile will be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults except***—[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that documentation is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 22, 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]***

(A) Juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses and who are detained in such jail or lockup for a period not to exceed 6 hours—

(i) For processing or release;

(ii) While awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility; or

(iii) In which period such juveniles make a court appearance; and only if such juveniles do not have contact with adult inmates, and only if there is in effect in the state a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and adult inmates in collocated facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles;

(B) Juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses, who are awaiting an initial court appearance that will occur within 48 hours after being taken into custody (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) and who are detained in a jail or lockup—

(i) In which—

(I) Such juveniles do not have contact with adult inmates; and

(II) There is in effect in the state a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and adults inmates in collocated facilities have been trained and certified to work with juveniles; and

(ii) That—

(I) Is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) and has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

(II) Is located where conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation do not allow for court appearances within 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) so that a brief (not to exceed an additional 48 hours) delay is excusable; or

(III) Is located where conditions of safety exist (such as severe, adverse, life- threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel), in which case the time for an appearance may be delayed until 24 hours after the time that such conditions allow for reasonable safe travel; ***[Page(s): 24, 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]***

(14) Provide for an adequate system of monitoring jails, deten222tion facilities, correctional facilities, and nonsecure facilities to ensure that the requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) are met, and for annual reporting of the results of such monitoring to the Administrator, except that such reporting requirements shall not apply in the case of a state which is in compliance with the other requirements of this paragraph, which is in compliance with the requirements in paragraphs (11) and (12), and which has enacted legislation which conforms to such requirements

and which contains, in the opinion of the Administrator, sufficient enforcement mechanisms to ensure that such legislation will be administered effectively; ***[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that evidence is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 24, 2018 Compliance Monitoring Plan]***

(15) Provide assurance that youth in the juvenile justice system are treated equitably on the basis of gender, race, family income, and disability**;** ***[Provide a statement affirming this item. Page(s): 28]***

(16) Provide assurance that consideration will be given to and that assistance will be available for approaches designed to strengthen the families of delinquent and other youth to prevent juvenile delinquency (which approaches should include the involvement of grandparents or other extended family members when possible and appropriate, and the provision of family counseling during the incarceration of juvenile family members and coordination of family services when appropriate and feasible); ***[Provide a statement affirming this item. Page(s): 7-8]***

(17) Provide for procedures to be established for protecting the rights of recipients of services and for ensuring appropriate privacy with regard to records relating to such services provided to any individual under the state plan**;** ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and a description of the process. Page(s): 28]***

(18) Provide assurances that—
[Provide a statement of affirmation for all three parts. Page(s): 32]

(A) Any assistance provided under this Act will not cause the displacement (including a partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of nonovertime work, wages, or employment benefits) of any currently employed employee;

(B) Activities assisted under this Act will not impair an existing collective bargaining relationship, contract for services, or collective bargaining agreement; and

(C) No such activity that would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization involved;

(19) Provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title; ***[Provide a statement of concurrence, and submit the financial management and internal controls questionnaire. (All applicants—other than an individual—are to download, complete, and submit this form.) Page(s): 26-27, Fiscal Management and Internal Controls attachment]***

(20) Provide reasonable assurance that federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase (but not supplant) the level of the state, local, and other nonfederal funds that would in the absence of

such federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and will in no event replace such state, local, and other nonfederal funds; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item. Page(s): 32]***

(21) Provide that the state agency designated under paragraph (1) will—

(A) To the extent practicable give priority in funding to programs and activities that are based on rigorous, systematic, and objective research that is scientifically based; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item and a description. Page(s): 6-11, Appendix N]***

(B) From time to time, but not less than annually, review its plan and submit to the Administrator an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of state and local needs, that it considers necessary; and ***[Provide a statement that this has been addressed in the Crime Data section and will be addressed in the annual progress report and DCTAT. Page(s): 6-7]***

(C) Not expend funds to carry out a program if the recipient of funds who carried out such program during the preceding 2-year period fails to demonstrate, before the expiration of such 2-year period, that such program achieved substantial success in achieving the goals specified in the application submitted by such recipient to the state agency; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item with an explanation of the process for subgranting and assessing performance. Page(s): 29-30]***

(22) Address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system; ***[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that documentation is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 23-24, 3 Year DMC State Plan]***

(23) Provide that if a juvenile is taken into custody for violating a valid court order related to his/her status as a juvenile issued for committing a status offense**—** ***[Provide a statement affirming that the state/territory complies with this requirement, and confirmation that documentation is found in the information submitted in the compliance tool. Page(s): 17-19, Appendix N]***

(A) An appropriate public agency shall be promptly notified that such juvenile is held in custody for violating such order;

(B) Not later than 24 hours during which such juvenile is so held, an authorized representative of such agency shall interview, in person, such juvenile; and

(C) Not later than 48 hours during which such juvenile is so held—

(i) Such representative shall submit an assessment to the court that issued such order, regarding the immediate needs of such juvenile; and

(ii) Such court shall conduct a hearing to determine—

(I) Whether there is reasonable cause to believe that such juvenile violated such order; and

(II) The appropriate placement of such juvenile pending disposition of the violation alleged;

(24) Provide an assurance that if the state receives under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] for any fiscal year an amount that exceeds 105 percent of the amount the state received under such section for fiscal year 2000, all of such excess shall be expended through or for programs that are part of a comprehensive and coordinated community system of services; ***[Refer here for a chart of FY 2000 Formula Grant distribution amounts. Provide a statement affirming this, with analysis. Page(s): 26-27]***

(25) Specify a percentage (if any), not to exceed 5 percent, of funds received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] (other than funds made available to the state advisory group under section 222(d) [42 U.S.C. 5632(d)]) that the state will reserve for expenditure by the state to provide incentive grants to units of general local government that reduce the caseload of probation officers within such units; ***[Specify a percentage, from 0 to 5%. Page(s): 0%, no funds will be allocated, Appendix F]***

(26) Provide that the state, to the maximum extent practicable, will implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, public child welfare records (including child protective services records) relating to such juvenile that are on file in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such court will be made known to such court**; *[Provide a statement affirming this item, with a description of the process. Page(s): 3, Attachment 1 AB 529]***

(27) Establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing and implementing treatment plans for juvenile offenders; ***[Provide a statement affirming this item, with a description of the process of how the state/territory has or will work to establish these policies and systems; and Page(s): 2, 28]***

(28) Provide assurances that juvenile offenders whose placement is funded through section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) receive the protections specified in section 471 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671), including a case plan and case plan review as defined in section 475 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 675). ***[Provide a statement affirming this item. Page(s): 3]***

Appendix J: Contact Information for States and Territories

Juvenile Justice Specialist Name: Kimberly Bushard
Title: Field Representative
Mailing Address: 2590 Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone Number: (916) 324-0999
Email Address: Kimberly.Bushard@bscc.ca.gov

State Planning Agency Director Name: Kathleen Howard
Title: Executive Director
Mailing Address: 2590 Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone Number: (916) 341-6012
Email Address: Kathleen.Howard@bscc.ca.gov

State Advisory Group Chair Name: Rachel Rios, Chair
Title: Chair
Mailing Address: 5523 34th Street, Sacramento, CA 95820
Phone Number: (916) 452-3601
Email Address: Rachelr@lafcc.org

JABG Coordinator Name: Colleen Stoner
Title: Field Representative
Mailing Address: 2590 Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone Number: (916) 324-9385
Email Address: Colleen.Stoner@bscc.ca.gov

Compliance Monitor Name: Eloisa Tuitama
Title: Field Representative
Mailing Address: 2590 Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone Number: (916) 341-7328
Email Address: Eloisa.Tuitama@bscc.ca.gov

DMC Coordinator Name: Timothy Polasik
Title: Field Representative
Mailing Address: 2590 Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone Number: (916) 621-2853
Email Address: Timothy.Polasik@bscc.ca.gov

This page left intentionally blank

Appendix N: Juvenile Problem/Needs Analysis Data Elements

In assessing the juvenile justice problems and needs in California, the SACJJDP looked at many different sets of data – both quantitative and qualitative. What follows is a youth crime analysis which assessed quantitative data trends in four areas, mental health indicators, and qualitative data trends.

Youth Crime Analysis

The following youth crime data was gathered to assist the BSCC and the SACJJDP with the development of the 2018-2020 State Plan for the Title II Formula Grant Program and to fulfill the youth crime analysis required for the application. The subsequent sections address the following requirements of the youth crime analysis:

1. Juvenile Arrests – Juvenile arrests by offense type, gender, age, and race.
2. Juvenile Referrals – Number and characteristics (by offense type, gender, race, and age) of juveniles referred to juvenile court, a probation agency, or special intake unit for allegedly committing a delinquent or status offense.
3. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments – Number of cases handled informally (non-petitioned) and formally (petitioned) by gender, race, and type of disposition (e.g., diversion, probation, commitment, residential treatment).
4. Juvenile Hall Bookings and Secure Holds in Law Enforcement Facilities – Number of delinquent and status offenders admitted, by gender and race, to juvenile detention facilities and adult jails and lockups (if applicable).
5. Mental Health Indicators – select mental health related data elements from the BSCC's Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS).
6. Other Trends – data and other social, economic, legal, and organizational conditions considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming.

For juvenile arrests, referrals and status of juveniles post-referral to county probation departments (items 1 through 3 above), data were obtained from the California Department of Justice's published *Juvenile Justice in California* reports.[22] Within these reports, data is provided for four race and ethnicity categories: Whites, Hispanics, Blacks, and Other. As part of the 2018-2020 State Plan, data will be requested and collected to expand the future reporting of race and ethnicity to include both Asian/Pacific Islanders, including major groups within each (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Hawaiian, Guamanian, etc.), and American Indians.[23]

22 CalDOJ, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California* (2004 – 2016). Available online at https://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/pubs#juvenileJustice and https://openjustice.doj.ca.gov/resources/publications.

23 Race and ethnicity categories are limited in *Juvenile Justice in California* to White, Hispanic, Black and Other. Race and ethnicity categories of data available from CalDOJ's Open Justice are limited to White, Hispanic, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Other. Obtaining the following race and ethnicity categories will the submission of a special data request to CalDOJ: White, Hispanic, Black, American Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, other, Pacific Islander, Other Asian, Cambodian, Guamanian, Korean, Laotian, Samoan, Hawaiian, Vietnamese, and Asian Indian.

For juvenile bookings and holds (item 4 above), data were obtained from the BSCC's *Juvenile Detention Profile Survey* [24] and *Minors in Detention Survey*.[25] Within these two data sources, demographic information is not available for age, gender, or race and ethnicity. As part of the 2018-2020 State Plan, alternative data sources for juvenile bookings that include this demographic information will be explored.

1. Juvenile Arrests

Tables 1 through 6 below provide trend data for juvenile arrest from 2004 through 2016 by offense type, gender, age, and race, respectively. [26] Figure 1 (which follows Tables 1 – 6) displays the percent of arrests by race and ethnicity. Trends in juvenile arrests are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Arrests* (Tables 1 - 6) – Arrests steadily increased from 2004 through 2007 reaching a peak of 236,856. Arrests have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 62,743 arrests, representing a 73.5 percent decrease since 2007.
- *Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type* (Table 1) – For the 62,743 juvenile arrests in 2016, 31 percent were felonies, 57 percent were misdemeanors, and 12 percent were status offenses. Felony arrests increased from 26 percent in 2004 to 31 percent in 2016. Misdemeanor arrests remained steady ranging between 56 to 57 percent from 2006 through 2016. Arrests for status offenses decreased from 16 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2016.
- *Juvenile Arrests by Gender* (Table 2) – For the 62,743 juvenile arrests in 2016, 72 percent were males and 28 percent were females. Percent of arrests by gender have remained steady from 2004 through 2016.
- *Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type and Gender* (Table 3 and Table 4) – For arrests of juvenile males from 2006 through 2016, felony arrests increased from 23 percent to 26 percent, misdemeanor arrests decreased from 41 percent to 39 percent, and status offense arrests decreased from 10 percent to 7 percent. For arrests of juvenile females from 2006 through 2016, felony arrests have remained steady at 5 percent, misdemeanor arrests increased from 16 percent to 18 percent; and status arrests remained around 5 percent.
- *Juvenile Arrests by Age* (Table 5) – For the 62,743 juvenile arrests in 2016, 74 percent were for 15-17 year-olds and 25 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent of arrests by age group has remained steady from 2009 through 2016.
- *Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 6 and Figure 1) – For the 62,743 juvenile arrests in 2016, 22 percent were White, 53 percent Hispanic, 19 percent Black, and 6 percent Other. Percent of arrests have: decreased for Whites from 29 percent in 2004 to 22 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanics from 46 percent in 2004 to 53 percent in 2016; and ranged from 16 to 19 percent for Black juveniles over the years.

24 Board of State and Community Corrections, *Juvenile Detention Profile Survey* (2004 – 2016). Available online at http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_fsojuveniledetentionprofile.php.

25 Board of State and Community Corrections, *Minors in Detention Survey* (2004 – 2015).

26 Important to keep in mind the ratio of each racial/ethnic breakdown to its representative juvenile population in our State.

Table 1. Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type for 2004 through 2016

Year	Total Arrests	Felonies		Misdemeanors		Status Offenses	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2004	206,201	54,368	26%	123,754	60%	28,079	14%
2005	222,512	59,027	27%	133,606	60%	29,879	13%
2006	232,849	65,189	28%	131,164	56%	36,496	16%
2007	236,856	66,191	28%	134,629	57%	36,036	15%
2008	229,104	64,963	28%	130,142	57%	33,999	15%
2009	204,696	58,555	29%	115,951	57%	30,190	15%
2010	185,867	52,020	28%	106,253	57%	27,594	15%
2011	149,563	43,403	29%	84,333	56%	21,827	15%
2012	120,720	36,368	30%	67,960	56%	16,392	14%
2013	96,937	30,812	32%	54,315	56%	11,810	12%
2014	86,823	27,651	32%	48,291	56%	10,881	13%
2015	71,923	21,381	30%	41,848	58%	8,694	12%
2016	62,743	19,656	31%	35,756	57%	7,331	12%

Table 2. Juvenile Arrests by Gender for 2004 through 2016

Year	Total Arrests	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent of Arrests	Count	Percent of Arrests
2004	206,201	150,223	73%	55,978	27%
2005	222,512	163,663	74%	58,849	26%
2006	232,849	172,747	74%	60,102	26%
2007	236,856	175,449	74%	61,407	26%
2008	229,104	169,270	74%	59,834	26%
2009	204,696	151,274	74%	53,422	26%
2010	185,867	135,795	73%	50,072	27%
2011	149,563	107,653	72%	41,910	28%
2012	120,720	87,286	72%	33,434	28%
2013	96,937	71,008	73%	25,929	27%
2014	86,823	63,221	73%	23,602	27%
2015	71,923	51,693	72%	20,230	28%
2016	62,743	44,980	72%	17,763	28%

Table 3. Number of Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type & Gender for 2006 through 2016

		Male			Female		
Year	Total Arrests	Felonies	Misdemeanors	Status Offenses	Felonies	Misdemeanors	Status Offenses
2006	232,849	54,399	95,059	23,289	10,790	36,105	13,207
2007	236,856	54,864	97,034	23,551	11,327	37,595	12,485
2008	229,104	53,880	93,191	22,199	11,083	36,951	11,800
2009	204,696	48,693	82,537	20,044	9,862	33,414	10,146
2010	185,867	43,164	74,314	18,317	8,856	31,939	9,277
2011	149,563	35,870	57,202	14,581	7,533	27,131	7,246
2012	120,720	30,092	46,304	10,890	6,276	21,656	5,502
2013	96,937	25,757	37,546	7,887	5,237	16,769	3,923
2014	86,823	22,814	33,341	7,066	4,837	14,950	3,815
2015	71,923	17,879	28,420	5,394	3,502	13,428	3,300
2016	62,743	16,344	24,251	4,385	3,312	11,505	2,946

Table 4. Percent of Juvenile Arrests by Gender & Offense Type for 2006 through 2016

		Male			Female		
Year	Total Arrests	Felonies	Misdemeanors	Status Offenses	Felonies	Misdemeanors	Status Offenses
2006	232,849	23%	41%	10%	5%	16%	6%
2007	236,856	23%	41%	10%	5%	16%	5%
2008	229,104	24%	41%	10%	5%	16%	5%
2009	204,696	24%	40%	10%	5%	16%	5%
2010	185,867	23%	40%	10%	5%	17%	5%
2011	149,563	24%	38%	10%	5%	18%	5%
2012	120,720	25%	38%	9%	5%	18%	5%
2013	96,937	27%	39%	8%	5%	17%	4%
2014	86,823	26%	38%	8%	6%	17%	4%
2015	71,923	25%	40%	7%	5%	19%	5%
2016	62,743	26%	39%	7%	5%	18%	5%

Table 5. Juvenile Arrests by Age for 2004 through 2016

Year	Total Arrests	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2004	206,201	4,474	2%	58,125	28%	143,602	70%
2005	222,512	4,667	2%	60,409	27%	157,436	71%
2006	232,849	4,701	2%	64,122	28%	164,026	70%
2007	236,856	4,393	2%	61,647	26%	170,816	72%
2008	229,104	3,647	2%	58,767	26%	166,690	73%
2009	204,696	2,883	1%	51,146	25%	150,667	74%
2010	185,867	2,462	1%	46,222	25%	137,183	74%
2011	149,563	2,032	1%	36,632	24%	110,899	74%
2012	120,720	1,912	2%	29,687	25%	89,121	74%
2013	96,937	1,394	1%	23,715	24%	71,828	74%
2014	86,823	1,181	1%	21,145	24%	64,497	74%
2015	71,923	984	1%	17,459	24%	53,480	74%
2016	62,743	804	1%	15,716	25%	46,223	74%

Table 6. Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2004 through 2016

Year	Total Arrests	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2004	206,201	60,008	29%	95,700	46%	36,283	18%	14,210	7%
2005	222,512	61,456	28%	107,699	48%	38,395	17%	14,962	7%
2006	232,849	62,093	27%	115,520	50%	40,586	17%	14,650	6%
2007	236,856	61,357	26%	119,897	51%	40,882	17%	14,720	6%
2008	229,104	55,612	24%	121,120	53%	38,198	17%	14,174	6%
2009	204,696	48,383	24%	110,083	54%	33,676	16%	12,554	6%
2010	185,867	43,065	23%	101,811	55%	29,797	16%	11,194	6%
2011	149,563	34,349	23%	81,469	54%	24,899	17%	8,846	6%
2012	120,720	27,616	23%	65,324	54%	20,652	17%	7,128	6%
2013	96,937	21,586	22%	52,580	54%	17,050	18%	5,721	6%
2014	86,823	19,265	22%	46,862	54%	15,683	18%	5,013	6%
2015	71,923	15,929	22%	38,379	53%	13,434	19%	4,181	6%
2016	62,743	13,551	22%	33,556	53%	12,008	19%	3,628	6%

Figure 1. Percent of Arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2004 through 2016

2. Juvenile Referrals

2.1: Juvenile Referrals to Probation

Tables 7, 8, and 9 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation departments by gender, age, and race, respectively. Figure 2 displays the percent of referrals to probation by race and ethnicity. A referral is defined as a juvenile who is brought to the attention of the probation department for alleged behavior under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 601 and 602. Juveniles can be referred by a variety of sources including law enforcement, schools, parents, public agencies, private agencies, individuals, or transfers from another county or state. The largest percentage of referrals come from law enforcement. Trends in juvenile referrals to probation are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Referrals to Probation* (Tables 7 - 9) – Referrals increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 220,896 in 2008. Referrals have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 77,509 referrals, representing a 64.9 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Referrals by Gender* (Table 7) – For the 77,509 referrals in 2016, 75 percent were for males and 25 percent were for females. Percent by gender has remained consistent over the years.
- Referrals by Age (Table 8) – For the 77,509 referrals in 2016, 69 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 12 percent were 18-24 year-olds and 18 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent of referrals for 12-14 year-olds have decreased from 21 percent in 2006 to 18 percent in 2016, while percent of 18-24 year-olds have

slightly increased from 8 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2016. Percent of referrals for 15-17 year-olds have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.

- *Referrals by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 9, Figure 2) – For the 77,509 referrals in 2016, 21 percent were White, 54 percent were Hispanic, 19 percent were Black, and 6 percent Other. Percent of referrals have decreased for Whites from 27 percent in 2006 to 21 percent in 2016 and increased for Hispanics from 46 percent in 2006 to 54 percent in 2016, and remained largely unchanged for Blacks.

Table 7. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2016

		Male		Female	
Year	Total Referrals	Count	Percent of Arrests	Count	Percent of Arrests
2006	207,298	158,834	77%	48,464	23%
2007	203,526	156,390	77%	47,136	23%
2008	220,896	170,209	77%	50,687	23%
2009	207,568	159,701	77%	47,867	23%
2010	186,019	143,153	77%	42,866	23%
2011	148,250	112,550	76%	35,700	24%
2012	125,474	95,655	76%	29,819	24%
2013	111,988	85,550	76%	26,438	24%
2014	101,531	77,284	76%	24,247	24%
2015	86,539	64,942	75%	21,597	25%
2016	77,509	58,288	75%	19,221	25%

Table 8. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Age for 2006 through 2016

		Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
Year	Total Referrals	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	207,298	2,655	1%	43,955	21%	143,209	69%	17,479	8%
2007	203,526	2,295	1%	41,171	20%	141,379	69%	18,681	9%
2008	220,896	2,231	1%	43,581	20%	154,192	70%	20,892	9%
2009	207,568	1,958	1%	39,806	19%	145,734	70%	20,070	10%
2010	186,019	1,582	1%	34,820	19%	130,769	70%	18,848	10%
2011	148,250	1,307	1%	27,606	19%	104,819	71%	14,518	10%
2012	125,474	1,046	1%	22,287	18%	88,243	70%	13,898	11%
2013	111,988	931	1%	19,493	17%	78,890	70%	12,692	11%
2014	101,531	897	1%	18,117	18%	70,457	69%	12,062	12%
2015	86,539	687	1%	15,259	18%	60,238	70%	10,355	12%
2016	77,509	652	1%	13,968	18%	53,561	69%	9,328	12%

Table 9. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Referrals	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	207,298	56,868	27%	95,987	46%	39,883	19%	14,560	7%
2007	203,526	54,014	27%	98,420	48%	37,899	19%	13,193	6%
2008	220,896	56,597	26%	109,835	50%	40,589	18%	13,875	6%
2009	207,568	51,790	25%	104,120	50%	38,374	18%	13,284	6%
2010	186,019	45,193	24%	96,420	52%	33,223	18%	11,183	6%
2011	148,250	34,971	24%	79,114	53%	25,168	17%	8,997	6%
2012	125,474	29,162	23%	66,848	53%	22,127	18%	7,337	6%
2013	111,988	24,828	22%	60,238	54%	20,837	19%	6,085	5%
2014	101,531	21,675	21%	55,063	54%	19,120	19%	5,673	6%
2015	86,539	17,999	21%	47,340	55%	16,572	19%	4,628	5%
2016	77,509	16,379	21%	41,695	54%	15,094	19%	4,341	6%

Figure 2. Percent of Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

2.2: Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Petitions Filed

Tables 10, 11, and 12 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that resulted in petitions filed with the juvenile court by gender, age, and race, respectively. Figure 3

displays the percent of petitions filed by race and ethnicity. Trends in petitions filed are described below.

- *Total Petitions Filed* (Tables 10 - 12) – Petitions filed increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 112,383 in 2008. Petitions have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 40,569 petitions filed, representing a 63.9 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Petitions Filed by Gender* (Table 10) – For the 40,569 petitions filed in 2016, 80 percent were for males and 20 percent were for females. Percent by gender have remained steady over the years.
- *Petitions Filed by Age* (Table 11) – For the 40,569 petitions filed in 2016, 70 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 16 percent for 18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Petitions have decreased for juveniles under 12 from 18 percent in 2006 to 14 percent in 2016 and increased for 18-24 year-olds from 11 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2016.
- *Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 12, Figure 3) – For the 40,569 petitions filed in 2016, 21 percent were White, 54 percent were Hispanic, 20 percent were Black, and 6 percent Other. Percent of petitions have: steadily decreased for White juveniles from 25 percent in 2006 to 18 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 47 percent in 2006 to 55 percent in 2016; and remained consistent for Black and Other juveniles over the years.

Table 10. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Gender for 2006 through 2016

		Male		Female	
Year	Total Petitions	Count	Percent of Arrests	Count	Percent of Arrests
2006	104,094	84,342	81%	19,752	19%
2007	101,816	82,853	81%	18,963	19%
2008	112,383	91,858	82%	20,525	18%
2009	105,858	86,857	82%	19,001	18%
2010	95,212	78,678	83%	16,534	17%
2011	73,639	60,334	82%	13,305	18%
2012	64,863	53,043	82%	11,820	18%
2013	58,001	47,401	82%	10,600	18%
2014	51,645	42,240	82%	9,405	18%
2015	44,107	35,497	80%	8,610	20%
2016	40,569	32,652	80%	7,917	20%

Table 11. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Petitions	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	104,094	583	1%	18,374	18%	74,139	71%	10,998	11%
2007	101,816	482	<1%	17,317	17%	72,037	71%	11,980	12%
2008	112,383	444	<1%	18,354	16%	80,013	71%	13,572	12%
2009	105,858	351	<1%	16,853	16%	75,787	72%	12,867	12%
2010	95,212	246	<1%	14,122	15%	68,710	72%	12,134	13%
2011	73,639	175	<1%	10,580	14%	53,583	73%	9,301	13%
2012	64,863	182	<1%	8,970	14%	46,612	72%	9,099	14%
2013	58,001	131	<1%	7,741	13%	41,759	72%	8,370	14%
2014	51,645	134	<1%	6,903	13%	36,437	71%	8,171	16%
2015	44,107	100	<1%	5,947	13%	31,091	70%	6,969	16%
2016	40,569	85	<1%	5,587	14%	28,466	70%	6,431	16%

Table 12. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Petitions	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	104,094	26,524	25%	49,361	47%	21,718	21%	6,491	6%
2007	101,816	24,839	24%	50,831	50%	20,344	20%	5,802	6%
2008	112,383	26,607	24%	56,311	50%	23,087	21%	6,378	6%
2009	105,858	23,245	22%	54,598	52%	21,477	20%	6,538	6%
2010	95,212	20,677	22%	50,239	53%	19,147	20%	5,149	5%
2011	73,639	15,026	20%	40,303	55%	14,258	19%	4,052	6%
2012	64,863	12,981	20%	35,701	55%	12,765	20%	3,416	5%
2013	58,001	11,103	19%	31,877	55%	12,260	21%	2,761	5%
2014	51,645	9,495	18%	28,530	55%	11,062	21%	2,558	5%
2015	44,107	7,707	17%	24,729	56%	9,551	22%	2,120	5%
2016	40,569	7,294	18%	22,376	55%	8,940	22%	1,959	5%

Figure 3. Percent of Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments

3.1: Summary of Juvenile Referrals by Other Actions Taken and Petitions

Table 13 provides the total number of juveniles referred to probation departments and provides a breakdown of how the referrals were handled by two categories: petitions filed and other actions taken[27] for 2006 through 2016. Trends in juvenile probation department referrals are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Referred to Probation* – Referrals increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 220,896 in 2008. Juvenile referrals have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 77,509 referrals, representing a 64.9 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Total Juvenile Petitions Filed (Formal)* – Petitions increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 112,383 in 2008. Petitions have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 40,569 petitions filed, representing a 63.9 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Total Other Actions Taken (non-petitioned) by Probation Departments* – Other actions taken in the handling of referrals increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 108,513 in 2008. Other actions taken have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 36,940 other actions taken, representing a 66 percent decrease since 2008.

27 Other actions taken are described in section 3.2 and include the closed at intake, informal probation, diversion, transferred, traffic court, deported, and direct files.

Table 13. Total Juveniles Referred to Probation and a Breakdown of Post-Referral Action by Other Actions Taken (non-petitioned) and Petitions Filed (Formal) for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Juveniles Referred	Other Actions Taken	Total Petitions Filed
2006	207,298	103,204	104,094
2007	203,526	101,713	101,816
2008	220,896	108,513	112,383
2009	207,568	101,710	105,858
2010	186,019	90,807	95,212
2011	148,250	74,611	73,639
2012	125,474	60,611	64,863
2013	111,988	53,987	58,001
2014	101,531	49,886	51,645
2015	86,539	42,432	44,107
2016	77,509	36,940	40,569

3.2: Summary of Other Actions Taken by Type

Juvenile referrals to probation that were non-petitioned and categorized as “other actions taken” can be further broken down by seven action types: closed at intake, informal probation, diversion, transferred, traffic court, deported, and direct file to adult court. Table 14 provides a breakdown of the other actions taken by the seven action types for 2006 through 2016. Trend data for each of these action types by gender, age, and race are provided in the subsections that follow.

Table 14. Juvenile Referrals that were Non-Petitioned by Action Type for 2006 through 2016

Year	Closed at Intake	Informal Probation	Diversion	Transferred	Traffic Court	Deported	Direct File	Total
2006	72,961	6,792	10,856	2,110	9,771	60	654	103,204
2007	72,706	6,472	11,474	2,067	8,216	54	724	101,713
2008	77,759	7,167	12,576	2,132	7,929	84	866	108,513
2009	73,922	5,805	14,413	2,428	4,324	49	769	101,710
2010	67,818	4,202	11,958	2,195	3,889	29	716	90,807
2011	55,949	3,699	10,070	1,673	2,523	11	686	74,611
2012	46,441	2,456	7,352	1,390	2,327	41	604	60,611
2013	41,175	2,957	5,887	1,153	2,175	7	633	53,987
2014	36,396	2,733	7,563	857	1,851	12	474	49,886
2015	31,830	2,165	5,600	634	1,706	5	492	42,432
2016	27,001	1,471	5,723	611	1,788	6	340	36,940

The following seven sections provide further data broken out by the types of other actions that may be taken. These other action types include:

- 3.2.1. Closed at Intake
- 3.2.2. Informal Probation
- 3.2.3. Diversion
- 3.2.4 Transferred
- 3.2.5 Traffic Court
- 3.2.6 Deported
- 3.2.7 Direct Filed

3.2.1: Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake

Tables 15, 16, and 17 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that were closed at intake by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in referrals closed at intake are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Referrals that were Closed at Intake* (Tables 15 - 17) –Referrals closed at intake steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 77,759 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 27,001 referrals closed at intake, representing a 65.3 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Closed at Intake by Gender* (Table 15) – For the 27,001 referrals closed at intake in 2016, 70 percent were for males and 30 percent were for female. Percent closed at intake from 2006 through 2016 have decreased slightly for males and increased slightly for females.
- *Closed at Intake by Age* (Table 16) – For the 27,001 referrals closed at intake in 2016, 67 percent were for 15-17 year-old juveniles, 9 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 22 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent by age group have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 17, Figure 4) – For the 27,001 referrals closed at intake in 2016, 23 percent were for Whites, 53 percent were for Hispanics, 18 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of closed at intake have: steadily decreased for White juveniles from 27 percent in 2006 to 23 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 46 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2016; and have remained somewhat consistent for Black and Other juveniles over the years.

Table 15. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Closed at Intake	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	72,961	53,269	73%	19,692	27%
2007	72,706	53,231	73%	19,475	27%
2008	77,759	57,251	74%	20,508	26%
2009	73,922	53,735	73%	20,187	27%
2010	67,818	48,994	72%	18,824	28%
2011	55,949	39,794	71%	16,155	29%
2012	46,441	32,980	71%	13,461	29%
2013	41,175	29,330	71%	11,845	29%
2014	36,396	25,757	71%	10,639	29%
2015	31,830	22,274	70%	9,556	30%
2016	27,001	18,915	70%	8,086	30%

Table 16. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Closed at Intake	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	72,961	1,471	2%	17,838	24%	48,364	66%	5,288	7%
2007	72,706	1,320	2%	16,549	23%	49,376	68%	5,461	8%
2008	77,759	1,235	2%	17,568	23%	52,891	68%	6,065	8%
2009	73,922	1,192	2%	16,321	22%	50,513	68%	5,896	8%
2010	67,818	1,017	1%	15,160	22%	46,019	68%	5,622	8%
2011	55,949	859	2%	12,587	22%	38,126	68%	4,377	8%
2012	46,441	686	1%	10,205	22%	31,485	68%	4,065	9%
2013	41,175	625	2%	8,915	22%	27,937	68%	3,698	9%
2014	36,396	583	2%	8,000	22%	24,623	68%	3,190	9%
2015	31,830	476	1%	6,859	22%	21,655	68%	2,840	9%
2016	27,001	383	1%	5,951	22%	18,203	67%	5,288	7%

Table 17. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Closed at Intake	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	72,961	19,920	27%	33,350	46%	14,209	19%	5,482	8%
2007	72,706	18,981	26%	34,469	47%	14,295	20%	4,961	7%
2008	77,759	19,840	26%	38,811	50%	14,060	18%	5,048	6%
2009	73,922	19,329	26%	36,297	49%	13,258	18%	5,038	7%
2010	67,818	16,995	25%	35,071	52%	11,210	17%	4,542	7%
2011	55,949	13,953	25%	29,904	53%	8,403	15%	3,689	7%
2012	46,441	11,486	25%	24,689	53%	7,237	16%	3,029	7%
2013	41,175	9,794	24%	22,192	54%	6,672	16%	2,517	6%
2014	36,396	8,209	23%	19,930	55%	6,003	16%	2,254	6%
2015	31,830	7,239	23%	17,181	54%	5,535	17%	1,875	6%
2016	27,001	6,262	23%	14,390	53%	4,740	18%	1,609	6%

Figure 4. Percent of Juvenile Referrals that were Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.2: Other Actions Taken: Informal Probation

Tables 18, 19, and 20 below provide trend data for referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles granted informal probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in juveniles granted informal probation are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Granted Informal Probation* (Tables 18 - 20) –Informal probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 7,167 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 1,471 youth granted informal probation, representing a 79.5 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Informal Probation by Gender* (Table 18) – For the 1,471 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 65 percent were for males and 35 percent were for females. Percent of males have decreased slightly while females have increased slightly from 2006 through 2016.
- *Informal Probation by Age* (Table 19) – For the 1,471 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 69 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 4 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 26 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent by age group have remained steady for Under 12 years old & 18-24 year-olds from 2006 through 2016. Percent of 12-14 year-olds decreased from 36 percent in 2006 to 26 percent in 2016. Percent of 15-17 year-olds have increased from 59 percent in 2006 to 69 percent in 2016.
- *Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 20, Figure 5) – For the 1,471 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 24 percent were Whites, 55 percent were Hispanics, 14 percent were Blacks, and 7 percent were Other. Percent of youth on informal probation have: decreased for White juveniles from 35 percent of in 2006 to 24 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanics from 50 percent in 2006 to 55 percent in 2016; and remained steady for Black and Other juveniles over the years.

Table 18. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	6,792	4,787	70%	2,005	30%
2007	6,472	4,555	70%	1,917	30%
2008	7,167	4,962	69%	2,205	31%
2009	5,805	3,911	67%	1,894	33%
2010	4,202	2,960	70%	1,242	30%
2011	3,699	2,589	70%	1,110	30%
2012	2,456	1,702	69%	754	31%
2013	2,957	2,041	69%	916	31%
2014	2,733	1,873	69%	860	31%
2015	2,165	1,490	69%	675	31%
2016	1,471	957	65%	514	35%

Table 19. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	6,792	213	3%	2,418	36%	4,025	59%	136	2%
2007	6,472	133	2%	2,285	35%	3,925	61%	129	2%
2008	7,167	146	2%	2,405	34%	4,449	62%	167	2%
2009	5,805	96	2%	1,929	33%	3,638	63%	142	2%
2010	4,202	83	2%	1,470	35%	2,557	61%	92	2%
2011	3,699	78	2%	1,177	32%	2,367	64%	77	2%
2012	2,456	30	1%	709	29%	1,647	67%	70	3%
2013	2,957	49	2%	895	30%	1,922	65%	91	3%
2014	2,733	50	2%	800	29%	1,817	66%	66	2%
2015	2,165	28	1%	598	28%	1,467	68%	72	3%
2016	1,471	22	1%	383	26%	1,012	69%	54	4%

Table 20. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	6,792	2,372	35%	3,386	50%	602	9%	432	6%
2007	6,472	2,198	34%	3,278	51%	609	9%	387	6%
2008	7,167	2,374	33%	3,745	52%	638	9%	410	6%
2009	5,805	1,849	32%	3,020	52%	593	10%	343	6%
2010	4,202	1,242	30%	2,354	56%	352	8%	254	6%
2011	3,699	1,054	28%	2,104	57%	319	9%	222	6%
2012	2,456	804	33%	1,285	52%	229	9%	138	6%
2013	2,957	777	26%	1,617	55%	388	13%	175	6%
2014	2,733	677	25%	1,440	53%	440	16%	176	6%
2015	2,165	505	23%	1,223	56%	312	14%	125	6%
2016	1,471	346	24%	805	55%	212	14%	108	7%

Figure 5. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Granted Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.3: Other Actions Taken: Diversion

Tables 21, 22, and 23 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being granted diversion by gender, age and race, respectively. Diversion is defined as any delivery or referral, by the probation department, of a minor to a public or private agency with which the city or county has an agreement to provided diversion services. Diversion services must meet the following criteria: the probation department must have referred the minor and continued to be responsible and maintained responsibility for the minor's progress; and placement and monitoring of the minor must have a beginning and ending date. Trends in diversion are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Referrals Resulting Juveniles being Diverted* (Tables 21 - 23) – Diversion increased from 2006 through 2009 reaching a peak of 14,413 in 2009. Diversions have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2015 with 5,600 referrals resulting in the diversion of juveniles, representing a 61.1 percent decrease since 2009.
- *Diversion by Gender* (Table 21) – For the 5,723 referrals resulting in diversion in 2016, 67 percent were for males and 33 percent were for females. Percent of diversions for males and females have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Diversion by Age* (Table 22) – For the 5,723 referrals resulting in diversion in 2016, 62 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 4 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 31 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Diversions by age group have

remained steady for Under 12 year-olds, 12-14 year-olds and 18-24 year-olds from 2006 through 2016. Percent of diversions for 15-17 year-olds has steadily increased starting in 2006 with 62 percent to 69 percent in 2013 and have since begun to decrease.

- *Diversion by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 23, Figure 6) – For the 5,723 referrals resulting in diversion in 2016, 28 percent were for Whites, 50 percent were for Hispanics, 15 percent were for Blacks, and 7 percent were Other. Percent of diversions have: decreased for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 28 percent in 2016; remained steady for Hispanics; and increased for Blacks from 11 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2016.

Table 21. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	10,856	7,157	66%	3,699	34%
2007	11,474	7,444	65%	4,030	35%
2008	12,576	8,111	64%	4,465	36%
2009	14,413	9,695	67%	4,718	33%
2010	11,958	7,671	64%	4,287	36%
2011	10,070	6,366	63%	3,704	37%
2012	7,352	4,734	64%	2,618	36%
2013	5,887	3,860	66%	2,027	34%
2014	7,563	5,054	67%	2,509	33%
2015	5,600	3,582	64%	2,018	36%
2016	5,723	3,815	67%	1,908	33%

Table 22. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	10,856	306	3%	3,497	32%	6,732	62%	321	3%
2007	11,474	273	2%	3,396	30%	7,406	65%	399	3%
2008	12,576	340	3%	3,742	30%	8,104	64%	390	3%
2009	14,413	282	2%	3,800	26%	9,749	68%	582	4%
2010	11,958	197	2%	3,249	27%	8,048	67%	464	4%
2011	10,070	163	2%	2,700	27%	6,770	67%	437	4%
2012	7,352	125	2%	1,876	26%	4,985	68%	366	5%
2013	5,887	92	2%	1,475	25%	4,062	69%	258	4%
2014	7,563	116	2%	2,043	27%	5,056	67%	348	5%
2015	5,600	77	1%	1,562	28%	3,705	66%	256	5%
2016	5,723	147	3%	1,795	31%	3,567	62%	214	4%

Table 23. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	10,856	3,644	34%	5,367	49%	1,175	11%	670	6%
2007	11,474	4,007	35%	5,442	47%	1,230	11%	795	7%
2008	12,576	4,144	33%	6,213	49%	1,410	11%	809	6%
2009	14,413	4,410	31%	6,958	48%	2,252	16%	793	6%
2010	11,958	3,570	30%	5,883	49%	1,767	15%	738	6%
2011	10,070	2,997	30%	4,766	47%	1,637	16%	670	7%
2012	7,352	2,242	30%	3,331	45%	1,361	19%	418	6%
2013	5,887	1,724	29%	2,754	47%	1,057	18%	352	6%
2014	7,563	2,193	29%	3,722	49%	1,209	16%	439	6%
2015	5,600	1,677	30%	2,806	50%	832	15%	285	5%
2016	5,723	1,609	28%	2,844	50%	870	15%	400	7%

Figure 6. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Diverted by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.4: Other Actions Taken: Transferred

Tables 24, 25, and 26 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that resulted in the juveniles being transferred to another county court or probation department by gender, age, and race, respectively. A transfer is defined as a disposition that transfers the juvenile to another county juvenile court or probation department. Trends in transfers are described below.

- *Total Referrals Resulting in the Juveniles be Transferred* (Tables 24 - 26) – Transfers increased from 2006 through 2009 reaching a peak of 2,428 in 2009. They have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 611 transfers, representing a 74.8 percent decrease since 2009.
- *Transferred by Gender* (Table 24) – For the 611 transfers in 2016, 62 percent were for males and 38 percent were for females. Percentages have decreased for males from 65 percent in 2006 to 62 percent in 2016 and increased for females from 35 percent in 2006 to 38 percent in 2016.
- *Transferred by Age* (Table 25) – For the 611 transfers in 2016, 81 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 5 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percentages by age group have: remained steady for Under 12 year-olds and 18-24 year-olds, decreased for 12-14 year-olds from 21 percent in 2006 to 14 percent in 2016; and increased for 15-17 year-olds from 75 percent in 2006 to 81 percent in 2016.
- *Transferred by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 26, Figure 7) – For the 611 transfers in 2016, 30 percent were for Whites, 39 percent were for Hispanics, 22 percent

were for Blacks, and 9 percent were Other. Percentages have: decreased for Whites from 49 percent in 2006 to 30 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanics from 23 percent in 2006 to 39 percent in 2016; increased for Blacks from 15 percent in 2006 to 22 percent in 2016; and decreased for Other juveniles from 13 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2016.

Table 24. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	2,110	1,362	65%	748	35%
2007	2,067	1,316	64%	748	36%
2008	2,132	1,278	60%	854	40%
2009	2,428	1,487	61%	941	39%
2010	2,195	1,279	58%	916	42%
2011	1,673	969	58%	704	42%
2012	1,390	853	61%	537	39%
2013	1,153	712	62%	441	38%
2014	857	552	64%	305	36%
2015	634	412	65%	222	35%
2016	611	381	62%	230	38%

Table 25. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	2,110	21	1%	434	21%	1,579	75%	76	4%
2007	2,067	24	1%	410	20%	1,537	74%	93	4%
2008	2,132	13	1%	404	19%	1,603	75%	112	5%
2009	2,428	18	1%	427	18%	1,847	76%	136	6%
2010	2,195	24	1%	402	18%	1,672	76%	97	4%
2011	1,673	13	1%	305	18%	1,293	77%	62	4%
2012	1,390	13	1%	231	17%	1,083	78%	63	5%
2013	1,153	6	1%	169	15%	899	78%	79	7%
2014	857	5	1%	124	14%	676	79%	52	6%
2015	634	2	0%	81	13%	514	81%	37	6%
2016	611	5	1%	85	14%	493	81%	28	5%

Table 26. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	2,110	1,025	49%	495	23%	316	15%	274	13%
2007	2,067	1,009	49%	517	25%	289	14%	249	12%
2008	2,132	957	45%	641	30%	314	15%	220	10%
2009	2,428	1,025	42%	774	32%	406	17%	223	9%
2010	2,195	977	45%	668	30%	362	16%	188	9%
2011	1,673	707	42%	518	31%	288	17%	160	10%
2012	1,390	579	42%	417	30%	267	19%	127	9%
2013	1,153	510	44%	347	30%	181	16%	115	10%
2014	857	307	36%	318	37%	149	17%	83	10%
2015	634	198	31%	245	39%	126	20%	65	10%
2016	611	186	30%	238	39%	133	22%	54	9%

Figure 7. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.5: Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court

Tables 27, 28, and 29 below provide trend data for referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being sent to traffic court by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends for traffic court are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Sent to Traffic Court* (Tables 27 - 29) –Traffic court referrals steadily decreased from 2006 through 2015 reaching the lowest point of 1,706 in 2015, representing an 82.5 percent decrease since 2006.
- *Traffic Court by Gender* (Table 27) – For the 1,788 referrals resulting in traffic court in 2016, 70 percent were for males and 30 percent were for female. Percent sent to traffic court for males decreased slightly from 2006 through 2016. Percent sent to traffic court for females increased slightly from 26 percent in 2006 to 30 percent in 2016.
- *Traffic Court by Age* (Table 28) – For the 1,788 referrals resulting in traffic court, 84 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 6 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 9 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent sent to traffic court by age group have: remained steady for juveniles under 12 years old and 18-24 year-olds; decreased for 12-14 year-olds from 14 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2016; and increased for 15-17 year-olds from 80 percent in 2006 to 84 percent in 2016.
- *Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 29, Figure 8) – For the 1,788 referrals resulting in traffic court in 2016, 36 percent were for Whites, 47 percent were for Hispanics, 7 percent were for Blacks, and 11 percent were Other. Percent of referrals resulting in traffic court have: increased for Whites from 34 percent in 2006 to 36 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanics from 38 percent in 2006 to 47 percent in 2016; decreased for Blacks from 17 percent in 2006 to 7 percent in 2016; and remained steady for Other juveniles.

Table 27. Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	9,771	7,241	74%	2,530	26%
2007	8,216	6,250	76%	1,966	24%
2008	7,929	5,843	74%	2,086	26%
2009	4,324	3,232	75%	1,092	25%
2010	3,889	2,866	74%	1,023	26%
2011	2,523	1,838	73%	685	27%
2012	2,327	1,722	74%	605	26%
2013	2,175	1,588	73%	587	27%
2014	1,851	1,336	72%	515	28%
2015	1,706	1,215	71%	491	29%
2016	1,788	1,246	70%	542	30%

Table 28. Other Actions Taken: Court by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	9,771	61	1%	1,369	14%	7,782	80%	559	6%
2007	8,216	63	1%	1,172	14%	6,413	78%	568	7%
2008	7,929	53	1%	1,071	14%	6,256	79%	549	7%
2009	4,324	19	0%	457	11%	3,448	80%	400	9%
2010	3,889	15	0%	391	10%	3,073	79%	410	11%
2011	2,523	19	1%	244	10%	2,037	81%	223	9%
2012	2,327	10	0%	272	12%	1,852	80%	193	8%
2013	2,175	10	0%	278	13%	1,738	80%	149	7%
2014	1,851	7	0%	233	13%	1,427	77%	184	10%
2015	1,706	4	0%	196	11%	1,369	80%	137	8%
2016	1,788	10	1%	157	9%	1,508	84%	113	6%

Table 29. Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	9,771	3,319	34%	3,669	38%	1,646	17%	1,137	12%
2007	8,216	2,923	36%	3,396	41%	947	12%	950	12%
2008	7,929	2,598	33%	3,531	45%	856	11%	944	12%
2009	4,324	1,833	42%	1,992	46%	186	4%	313	7%
2010	3,889	1,679	43%	1,755	45%	182	5%	273	7%
2011	2,523	1,173	46%	1,120	44%	73	3%	157	6%
2012	2,327	1,007	43%	1,019	44%	127	5%	174	7%
2013	2,175	861	40%	1,045	48%	130	6%	139	6%
2014	1,851	745	40%	838	45%	129	7%	139	8%
2015	1,706	622	36%	853	50%	92	5%	139	8%
2016	1,788	642	36%	835	47%	122	7%	189	11%

Figure 8. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Sent to Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.6: Other Actions Taken: Deported

Tables 30, 31, and 32 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being deported by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in deportation are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Deported* (Tables 30 - 31) – Deportation increased between 2006 and 2008, reaching a peak of 84 in 2008. Deportations have since decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2015 with 5 deportations, representing a 94 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Deported by Gender* (Table 30) – For the 6 juveniles who were deported in 2016, 83 percent were male and 17 percent were female.
- *Deported by Age* (Table 31) – For the 6 juveniles who were deported in 2016, 67 percent were for 15-17 year-olds and 33 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles.
- *Deported by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 32, Figure 9) – For the 6 juveniles who were deported in 2016, 17 percent were White, and 83 percent were Hispanic.

Table 30. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	60	54	90%	6	10%
2007	54	45	83%	9	17%
2008	84	76	90%	8	10%
2009	49	43	88%	6	12%
2010	29	25	86%	4	14%
2011	11	10	91%	1	9%
2012	41	37	90%	4	10%
2013	7	7	100%	0	0%
2014	12	10	83%	2	17%
2015	5	3	60%	2	40%
2016	6	5	83%	1	17%

Table 31. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	60	0	0%	5	8%	53	88%	2	3%
2007	54	0	0%	7	13%	47	87%	0	0%
2008	84	0	0%	8	10%	76	90%	0	0%
2009	49	0	0%	3	6%	43	88%	3	6%
2010	29	0	0%	1	3%	22	76%	6	21%
2011	11	0	0%	1	9%	10	91%	0	0%
2012	41	0	0%	4	10%	34	83%	3	7%
2013	7	0	0%	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%
2014	12	0	0%	2	17%	9	75%	1	8%
2015	5	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%
2016	6	0	0%	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%

Table 32. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	60	1	2%	57	95%	0	0%	2	3%
2007	54	0	0%	54	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2008	84	3	4%	77	92%	0	0%	4	5%
2009	49	5	10%	44	90%	0	0%	0	0%
2010	29	1	3%	27	93%	1	3%	0	0%
2011	11	1	9%	9	82%	1	9%	0	0%
2012	41	1	2%	39	95%	0	0%	1	2%
2013	7	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	12	0	0%	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%
2015	5	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%
2016	6	1	17%	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%

Figure 9. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.2.7: Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed

Tables 33, 34, and 35 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being direct filed to adult court by county prosecutors[28] by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in direct files to adult court are described below.

- *Total Direct Files to Adult Court* (Tables 33 -35) – Direct files to adult court steadily increased from 2006 through 2008, when direct files reached a peak of 866 in 2008. Direct files have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 340 direct files, representing a 60.7 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Juveniles Direct Filed by Gender* (Table 33) – For the 340 direct files in 2016, 93 percent were for males and 7 percent were for females. Percent of direct files from 2006 through 2016 by gender have remained consistent over the years.
- *Juveniles Direct Filed by Age* (Table 34) – For the 340 direct files in 2016, 91 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 7 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 2 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of direct files have; remained consistent for 12-14 year-olds, increased for 15-17 year-olds from 82 percent in 2006 to 91 percent, decreased for 18-24 year-olds from 15 percent in 2006 to 7 percent in 2016.
- *Juveniles Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 35, Figure 10) – For the 340 juveniles direct filed in 2016, 11 percent were White, 59 percent were Hispanic, 23 percent were Black, and 6 percent Other. Percent of direct files have; remained steady for Whites; increased for Hispanics from 46 percent in 2006 to 59 percent in 2016; decreased for Blacks from 33 percent in 2006 to 23 percent in 2016; and decreased for Other juveniles from 11 percent in 2006 to 6 percent in 2016.

28 Proposition 57, passed by California voters in November of 2016, ended the process of juveniles being transferred to (direct filed) to adult court by county prosecutors. The law was effective immediately making 2016 the final year, and partial year, for direct files. Juveniles can still be transferred to adult court by a juvenile court judge through the process of a fitness hearing.

Table 33. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Direct Files	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	654	622	95%	32	5%
2007	724	696	96%	28	4%
2008	866	830	96%	36	4%
2009	769	741	96%	28	4%
2010	716	680	95%	36	5%
2011	686	650	95%	36	5%
2012	604	584	97%	20	3%
2013	633	611	97%	22	3%
2014	474	462	97%	12	3%
2015	492	469	95%	23	5%
2016	340	317	93%	23	7%

Table 34. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Direct Files	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	654	0	0%	20	3%	535	82%	99	15%
2007	724	0	0%	35	5%	638	88%	51	7%
2008	866	0	0%	29	3%	800	92%	37	4%
2009	769	0	0%	16	2%	709	92%	44	6%
2010	716	0	0%	25	3%	668	93%	23	3%
2011	686	0	0%	12	2%	633	92%	41	6%
2012	604	0	0%	20	3%	545	90%	39	6%
2013	633	0	0%	17	3%	569	90%	47	7%
2014	474	0	0%	12	3%	412	87%	50	11%
2015	492	0	0%	15	3%	434	88%	43	9%
2016	340	0	0%	8	2%	308	91%	24	7%

Table 35. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Direct Files	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	654	63	10%	302	46%	217	33%	72	11%
2007	724	57	8%	433	60%	185	26%	49	7%
2008	866	74	9%	506	58%	224	26%	62	7%
2009	769	94	12%	437	57%	202	26%	36	5%
2010	716	52	7%	423	59%	202	28%	39	5%
2011	686	60	9%	390	57%	189	28%	47	7%
2012	604	62	10%	367	61%	141	23%	34	6%
2013	633	59	9%	399	63%	149	24%	26	4%
2014	474	49	10%	275	58%	128	27%	23	5%
2015	492	51	10%	299	61%	127	26%	18	4%
2016	340	39	11%	202	59%	77	23%	22	6%

Figure 10. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3: Summary of Juvenile Petitions by Court Action

Juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the district attorney filing a petition with the juvenile court can be broken down into the nine court action categories of: dismissed, transferred, remanded, deported, informal probation, non-ward probation, diversion, deferred entry of judgement, and wardship probation. Table 36 provides a breakdown of the petitions by the nine court action categories for 2006 through

2016. Trend data for each of these categories by gender, age, and race are provided in the subsections that follow.

Table 36. Juvenile Petitions by Court Action for 2006 through 2016

Year	Dismissed	Transferred	Remanded to Adult Court	Deported	Informal Probation
2006	20,994	3,487	275	26	5,756
2007	19,435	3,714	399	25	6,642
2008	25,094	3,533	335	27	7,093
2009	24,766	2,798	346	30	6,815
2010	22,623	2,455	260	14	5,743
2011	10,868	1,659	226	10	4,866
2012	9,753	1,539	146	7	4,223
2013	8,612	1,447	122	2	3,887
2014	7,717	1,196	123	2	3,956
2015	7,359	1,082	74	0	2,940
2016	6,975	1,041	66	1	2,899

Table 36. Juvenile Petitions by Court Action for 2006 through 2016 (Continued)

Year	Non-Ward Probation	Diversion	Deferred Entry of Judgement	Wardship Probation	Total
2006	4,744	673	3,681	64,458	104,094
2007	4,959	444	4,556	61,642	101,816
2008	5,540	528	5,125	65,108	112,383
2009	5,296	217	4,699	60,891	105,858
2010	4,853	141	4,354	54,769	95,212
2011	4,522	149	3,684	47,655	73,639
2012	4,075	118	3,247	41,755	64,863
2013	3,482	126	2,708	37,615	58,001
2014	2,717	114	2,394	33,426	51,645
2015	2,404	151	1,650	28,447	44,107
2016	2,529	86	1,501	25,471	40,569

3.3.1: Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed

Tables 37, 38, and 39 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in court dismissal by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in dismissed petitions are described below.

Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Court Dismissal (Tables 37 - 39) – Dismissals increased from 2006 through 2009 reaching a peak of 25,094 in 2008. Dismissals have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 6,975 dismissals, representing a 72.2 percent decrease since 2008.

- *Dismissed by Gender* (Table 37) – For the 6,975 dismissals in 2016, 78 percent were for males and 22 percent were for females. Percent of dismissals for males decreased slightly from 2006 through 2016 while females increased slightly from 19 percent in 2006 to 22 percent in 2016.
- *Dismissed by Age* (Table 38) – For the 6,975 dismissals in 2016, 61 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 25 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of dismissals for 12-14 year-olds have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 18 percent to 14 percent in 2016. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 66 percent to 61 percent in 2016. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 16 percent in 2006 to 25 percent in 2016.
- *Dismissed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 39, Figure 11) – For the 6,975 dismissals in 2016, 20 percent were for Whites, 50 percent were for Hispanic, 23 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of dismissals have: decreased for White juveniles from 28 percent 2006 to 20 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 41 percent in 2006 to 50 percent in 2016; have decreased for Black juveniles from 25 percent of petitions in 2006 to 23 percent in 2016; have remained steady for Other juveniles.

Table 37. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Dismissed	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	20,994	16,924	81%	4,070	19%
2007	19,435	15,921	82%	3,514	18%
2008	25,094	20,566	82%	4,528	18%
2009	24,766	20,138	81%	4,628	19%
2010	22,623	18,623	82%	4,000	18%
2011	10,868	8,753	81%	2,115	19%
2012	9,753	7,802	80%	1,951	20%
2013	8,612	6,882	80%	1,730	20%
2014	7,717	6,119	79%	1,598	21%
2015	7,359	5,793	79%	1,566	21%
2016	6,975	5,470	78%	1,505	22%

Table 38. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Dismissed	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Count	Count	Count
2006	20,994	215	1%	3,680	18%	13,820	13,820	3,279	16%
2007	19,435	142	1%	3,198	16%	12,591	12,591	3,504	18%
2008	25,094	137	1%	3,925	16%	16,584	16,584	4,451	18%
2009	24,766	109	0%	3,905	16%	16,265	16,265	4,487	18%
2010	22,623	93	0%	3,429	15%	14,935	14,935	4,166	18%
2011	10,868	61	1%	1,526	14%	6,717	6,717	2,564	24%
2012	9,753	63	1%	1,407	14%	5,920	5,920	2,363	24%
2013	8,612	41	0%	1,188	14%	5,331	5,331	2,052	24%
2014	7,717	56	1%	1,096	14%	4,648	4,648	1,917	25%
2015	7,359	40	1%	985	13%	4,423	4,423	1,911	26%
2016	6,975	30	0%	960	14%	4,270	4,270	1,715	25%

Table 39. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Dismissed	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	20,994	5,862	28%	8,535	41%	5,153	25%	1,444	7%
2007	19,435	5,248	27%	8,103	42%	4,811	25%	1,273	7%
2008	25,094	6,677	27%	10,956	44%	5,988	24%	1,473	6%
2009	24,766	5,879	24%	11,227	45%	5,910	24%	1,750	7%
2010	22,623	5,369	24%	10,511	46%	5,417	24%	1,326	6%
2011	10,868	2,432	22%	5,421	50%	2,322	21%	693	6%
2012	9,753	2,230	23%	4,803	49%	2,118	22%	602	6%
2013	8,612	1,961	23%	4,177	49%	1,978	23%	496	6%
2014	7,717	1,687	22%	3,783	49%	1,752	23%	495	6%
2015	7,359	1,419	19%	3,873	53%	1,618	22%	449	6%
2016	6,975	1,421	20%	3,500	50%	1,631	23%	423	6%

Figure 11. Percent of Juvenile Petitions that Resulted in Dismissals by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.2: Juvenile Petitions: Transferred

Tables 40, 41, and 42 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juveniles being transferred to another county juvenile court or probation department by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends for these transfers are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Transfers* (Tables 40 - 42) – Transfers increased from 2006 through 2007 reaching a peak of 3,714 in 2007. Transfers have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 1,041 transfers, representing a 72.0 percent decrease since 2007.
- *Transferred by Gender* (Table 40) – For the 1,041 transfers in 2016, 77 percent were for males and 23 percent were for females. Percent of transfers for males and females have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Transferred by Age* (Table 41) – For the 1,041 transfers in 2016, 74 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 13 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds and 13 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of transfers for 12-14 year-olds have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 15 percent to 13 percent in 2016. Percent of transfers for 15-17 years old have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 77 percent to 74 percent in 2016. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 8 percent in 2006 to 13 percent in 2016.
- *Transferred by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 42, Figure 12) – For the 1,041 transfers in 2016, 15 percent were for Whites, 48 percent were for Hispanics, 30 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of transfers have: decreased for White juveniles from 24 percent of transfers in 2006 to 15 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 39 percent in 2006 to 48 percent in 2016; have slightly increased for Black juveniles from 29 percent of petitions in 2006 to 30 percent in 2016; have slightly decreased for Other juveniles from 7 percent of petitions in 2006 to 6 percent in 2016.

Table 40. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,487	2,672	77%	815	23%
2007	3,714	2,824	76%	890	24%
2008	3,533	2,686	76%	847	24%
2009	2,798	2,158	77%	640	23%
2010	2,455	1,939	79%	516	21%
2011	1,659	1,300	78%	359	22%
2012	1,539	1,200	78%	339	22%
2013	1,447	1,124	78%	323	22%
2014	1,196	950	79%	246	21%
2015	1,082	842	78%	240	22%
2016	1,041	803	77%	238	23%

Table 41. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,487	8	0%	522	15%	2,675	77%	282	8%
2007	3,714	13	0%	485	13%	2,878	77%	338	9%
2008	3,533	9	0%	457	13%	2,727	77%	340	10%
2009	2,798	2	0%	402	14%	2,149	77%	245	9%
2010	2,455	6	0%	307	13%	1,920	78%	222	9%
2011	1,659	0	0%	203	12%	1,299	78%	157	9%
2012	1,539	0	0%	212	14%	1,165	76%	162	11%
2013	1,447	6	0%	188	13%	1,110	77%	143	10%
2014	1,196	2	0%	132	11%	923	77%	139	12%
2015	1,082	1	0%	141	13%	819	76%	121	11%
2016	1,041	3	0%	133	13%	774	74%	131	13%

Table 42. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Transferred	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,487	843	24%	1,375	39%	1,026	29%	243	7%
2007	3,714	810	22%	1,558	42%	1,092	29%	254	7%
2008	3,533	808	23%	1,388	39%	1,107	31%	230	7%
2009	2,798	635	23%	1,132	40%	834	30%	197	7%
2010	2,455	506	21%	1,013	41%	753	31%	183	7%
2011	1,659	322	19%	730	44%	510	31%	97	6%
2012	1,539	313	20%	699	45%	430	28%	97	6%
2013	1,447	248	17%	637	44%	474	33%	88	6%
2014	1,196	212	18%	540	45%	375	31%	69	6%
2015	1,082	171	16%	526	49%	331	31%	54	5%
2016	1,041	158	15%	503	48%	313	30%	67	6%

Figure 12. Percent of Juvenile Petitions that Resulted in Juvenile Transfers by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.3: Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court

Tables 43, 44, and 45 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that were remanded to adult court by gender, age and race, respectively. A remand to adult court is defined as a disposition resulting from a fitness hearing that finds a juvenile

unfit for the juvenile system and transfers the juvenile to the adult system. Trends in petitions that were remanded to adult court are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Petitions Remanded to Adult Court* (Tables 43 - 45) – Juvenile petitions remanded to adult court reached a peak of 399 in 2007. Remands have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 66 remands, representing an 83.5 percent decrease since 2007.
- *Remanded to Adult Court by Gender* (Table 43) – For the 66 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2016, 95 percent were male and 5 percent were female. Percent of remands for males and females remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Remanded to Adult Court by Age* (Table 44) – For the 66 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2016, 59 percent were for 15-17 year-olds and 41 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds. Percent of remands for 12-14 year-olds remained steady from 2006 through 2016. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have significantly decreased starting in 2006 with 76 percent to 59 percent in 2016. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased significantly from 23 percent in 2006 to 41 percent in 2016.
- *Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 45, Figure 13) – For the 66 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2016, 18 percent were White, 39 percent were Hispanic, 32 percent were Black, and 11 percent Other. Percent of remands have: increased for White juveniles from 8 percent of petitions in 2006 to 18 percent in 2016; significantly decreased for Hispanic juveniles from 63 percent in 2006 to 39 percent in 2016; have increased for Black juveniles from 24 percent of petitions in 2006 to 32 percent in 2016; have increased for Other juveniles from 6 percent of petitions in 2006 to 11 percent in 2016.

Table 43. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Remanded	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	275	262	95%	13	5%
2007	399	387	97%	12	3%
2008	335	319	95%	16	5%
2009	346	336	97%	10	3%
2010	260	254	98%	6	2%
2011	226	215	95%	11	5%
2012	146	144	99%	2	1%
2013	122	117	96%	5	4%
2014	123	121	98%	2	2%
2015	74	74	100%	0	0%
2016	66	63	95%	3	5%

Table 44. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Remanded	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	275	0	0%	4	1%	208	76%	63	23%
2007	399	0	0%	1	0%	285	71%	113	28%
2008	335	0	0%	7	2%	247	74%	81	24%
2009	346	0	0%	5	1%	233	67%	108	31%
2010	260	0	0%	0	0%	167	64%	93	36%
2011	226	0	0%	2	1%	147	65%	77	34%
2012	146	0	0%	4	3%	96	66%	46	32%
2013	122	0	0%	1	1%	78	64%	43	35%
2014	123	0	0%	1	1%	78	63%	44	36%
2015	74	0	0%	1	1%	47	64%	26	35%
2016	66	0	0%	0	0%	39	59%	27	41%

Table 45. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Remanded	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	275	21	8%	172	63%	66	24%	16	6%
2007	399	31	8%	260	65%	98	25%	10	3%
2008	335	22	7%	209	62%	90	27%	14	4%
2009	346	20	6%	232	67%	79	23%	15	4%
2010	260	19	7%	171	66%	63	24%	7	3%
2011	226	19	8%	143	63%	60	27%	4	2%
2012	146	7	5%	84	58%	51	35%	4	3%
2013	122	9	7%	79	65%	29	24%	5	4%
2014	123	6	5%	76	62%	34	28%	7	6%
2015	74	10	14%	45	61%	17	23%	2	3%
2016	66	12	18%	26	39%	21	32%	7	11%

Figure 13. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.4: Juvenile Petitions: Deported

Tables 46, 47, and 48 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in the deportation of juveniles by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in juvenile petitions resulting in deportations are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Deportation* (Tables 46 - 48) – Deportations reached a peak of 30 in 2009 and have since steadily decreased reaching zero deportations in 2015 and one in 2016.
- *Deported by Gender* (Table 46) – In 2016, one juvenile petition resulted in the deportation of a male juvenile.
- *Deported by Age* (Table 47) – In 2016, one juvenile petition resulted in the deportation of a juvenile between 15-17 years old.
- *Deported by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 48, Figure 14) – In 2016, one juvenile petition resulted in the deportation of a Hispanic youth.
- Historically, overwhelmingly the juvenile petitions that resulted in the deportation of juveniles were for Hispanic males between 15-17 years-old. This number has decreased from 24 in 2006 to one in 2016.

Table 46. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	26	24	92%	2	8%
2007	25	22	88%	3	12%
2008	27	25	93%	2	7%
2009	30	26	87%	4	13%
2010	14	13	93%	1	7%
2011	10	7	70%	3	30%
2012	7	5	71%	2	29%
2013	2	1	50%	1	50%
2014	2	2	100%	0	0%
2015	0	0	-	0	-
2016	1	1	100%	0	0%

Table 47. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	26	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	0	0%
2007	25	0	0%	1	4%	19	76%	5	20%
2008	27	0	0%	2	7%	21	78%	4	15%
2009	30	0	0%	2	7%	26	87%	2	7%
2010	14	0	0%	0	0%	14	100%	0	0%
2011	10	0	0%	0	0%	10	100%	0	0%
2012	7	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%
2013	2	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
2014	2	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
2015	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
2016	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

Table 48. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deported	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	26	0	0%	26	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2007	25	0	0%	24	96%	0	0%	1	4%
2008	27	0	0%	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2009	30	1	3%	29	97%	0	0%	0	0%
2010	14	0	0%	9	64%	3	21%	2	14%
2011	10	0	0%	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%
2012	7	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	2	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%
2014	2	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2015	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
2016	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

Figure 14. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.5: Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation

Tables 49, 50, and 51 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juvenile receiving informal probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in informal probation are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Petitions Resulting in Informal Probation* (Tables 49 - 51) – Informal probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 7,093 in 2008. Informal probation has since steadily decreased reaching the

lowest point in 2016 with 2,899 grants, representing a 59.1 percent decrease since 2008.

- *Informal Probation by Gender* (Table 49) – For the 2,899 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 76 percent were for males and 24 percent were for females. Percent of informal probation by gender has remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Informal Probation by Age* (Table 50) – For the 2,899 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 63 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 11 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 26 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of informal probation for all age categories have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 51, Figure 15) – For the 2,899 youth granted informal probation in 2016, 27 percent were for Whites, 53 percent were for Hispanics, 13 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of youth granted of informal probation have: decreased for White juveniles from 37 percent of grants in 2006 to 27 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 43 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2016; have remained steady for Black and Other juveniles.

Table 49. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	5,756	4,309	75%	1,447	25%
2007	6,642	4,897	74%	1,745	26%
2008	7,093	5,228	74%	1,865	26%
2009	6,815	5,042	74%	1,773	26%
2010	5,743	4,196	73%	1,547	27%
2011	4,866	3,474	71%	1,392	29%
2012	4,223	3,044	72%	1,179	28%
2013	3,887	2,847	73%	1,040	27%
2014	3,956	2,906	73%	1,050	27%
2015	2,940	2,161	74%	779	26%
2016	2,899	2,204	76%	695	24%

Table 50. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	5,756	119	2%	1,518	26%	3,581	62%	538	9%
2007	6,642	105	2%	1,783	27%	4,115	62%	639	10%
2008	7,093	108	2%	1,781	25%	4,525	64%	679	10%
2009	6,815	113	2%	1,726	25%	4,316	63%	660	10%
2010	5,743	73	1%	1,402	24%	3,694	64%	574	10%
2011	4,866	49	1%	1,194	25%	3,214	66%	409	8%
2012	4,223	50	1%	1,054	25%	2,747	65%	372	9%
2013	3,887	33	1%	925	24%	2,569	66%	360	9%
2014	3,956	42	1%	884	22%	2,663	67%	367	9%
2015	2,940	22	1%	738	25%	1,892	64%	288	10%
2016	2,899	19	1%	757	26%	1,813	63%	310	11%

Table 51. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Informal Probation	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	5,756	2,105	37%	2,472	43%	747	13%	432	8%
2007	6,642	2,380	36%	3,075	46%	782	12%	405	6%
2008	7,093	2,419	34%	3,261	46%	926	13%	487	7%
2009	6,815	2,149	32%	3,285	48%	962	14%	419	6%
2010	5,743	1,808	31%	2,756	48%	779	14%	400	7%
2011	4,866	1,525	31%	2,378	49%	671	14%	292	6%
2012	4,223	1,292	31%	2,131	50%	521	12%	279	7%
2013	3,887	1,109	29%	2,017	52%	550	14%	211	5%
2014	3,956	1,062	27%	2,076	52%	525	13%	293	7%
2015	2,940	786	27%	1,604	55%	403	14%	147	5%
2016	2,899	785	27%	1,547	53%	389	13%	178	6%

Figure 15. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.6: Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation

Tables 52, 53, and 54 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in juveniles receiving non-ward probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in non-ward probation are described below.

- *Total Juveniles Petitions Resulting in Juveniles Receiving Non-Ward Probation* (Tables 52 - 54) –Non-ward probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 5,540 in 2008. Non-ward probation has since steadily decreased reaching the lowest point in 2015 with 2,404 granted, representing a 56.6 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Non-Ward Probation by Gender* (Table 52) – For the 2,529 youth granted non-ward probation in 2016, 74 percent were for males and 26 percent were for females. Percent of youth granted non-ward probation by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Non-Ward Probation by Age* (Table 53) – For the 2,529 youth granted non-ward probation, 69 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 13 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds and 18 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have increased starting in 2006 with 63 percent to 69 percent in 2016. Percent of juveniles 12-14 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 23 percent to 18 percent in 2016. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 54, Figure 16) – For the 2,529 youth granted non-ward probation in 2016, 23 percent were for Whites, 55 percent were for Hispanics, 16 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent for Other. Percent of youth granted non-ward probation have: decreased for White juveniles

from 31 percent in 2006 to 23 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 40 percent in 2006 to 55 percent in 2016; decreased for Black juveniles from 21 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2016; and have remained steady for Other juveniles.

Table 52. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Non-Ward Probation	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	4,744	3,410	72%	1,334	28%
2007	4,959	3,649	74%	1,310	26%
2008	5,540	4,066	73%	1,474	27%
2009	5,296	3,845	73%	1,451	27%
2010	4,853	3,608	74%	1,245	26%
2011	4,522	3,324	74%	1,198	26%
2012	4,075	2,879	71%	1,196	29%
2013	3,482	2,528	73%	954	27%
2014	2,717	2,064	76%	653	24%
2015	2,404	1,750	73%	654	27%
2016	2,529	1,859	74%	670	26%

Table 53. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Non-Ward Probation	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	4,744	28	1%	1,099	23%	2,997	63%	620	13%
2007	4,959	43	1%	1,064	21%	3,244	65%	608	12%
2008	5,540	37	1%	1,146	21%	3,599	65%	758	14%
2009	5,296	27	1%	1,114	21%	3,513	66%	642	12%
2010	4,853	22	0%	985	20%	3,250	67%	596	12%
2011	4,522	13	0%	891	20%	3,123	69%	495	11%
2012	4,075	23	1%	794	19%	2,776	68%	482	12%
2013	3,482	10	0%	693	20%	2,348	67%	431	12%
2014	2,717	6	0%	486	18%	1,903	70%	322	12%
2015	2,404	7	0%	440	18%	1,638	68%	319	13%
2016	2,529	7	0%	453	18%	1,738	69%	331	13%

Table 54. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Non-Ward Probation	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	4,744	1,467	31%	1,901	40%	1,017	21%	359	8%
2007	4,959	1,385	28%	2,248	45%	995	20%	331	7%
2008	5,540	1,569	28%	2,584	47%	1,054	19%	333	6%
2009	5,296	1,541	29%	2,471	47%	963	18%	321	6%
2010	4,853	1,352	28%	2,333	48%	837	17%	331	7%
2011	4,522	1,188	26%	2,242	50%	800	18%	292	6%
2012	4,075	1,049	26%	2,098	51%	667	16%	261	6%
2013	3,482	884	25%	1,755	50%	598	17%	245	7%
2014	2,717	645	24%	1,413	52%	496	18%	163	6%
2015	2,404	546	23%	1,287	54%	437	18%	134	6%
2016	2,529	586	23%	1,392	55%	407	16%	144	6%

Figure 16. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.7: Juvenile Petitions: Diversion

Tables 55, 56, and 57 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juveniles being diverted by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in juveniles who were granted diversion are described below.

- *Total Juveniles with Petitions Who Were Diverted* (Tables 55 - 57) – From 2006 through 2016, juvenile petitions resulting in diversion have steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 86 granted, representing an 87.2 percent decrease since 2006.
- *Diversion by Gender* (Table 55) – For the 86 diversions in 2016, 71 percent were for males and 29 percent were for females. Percent of diversions by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Diversion by Age* (Table 56) – For the 86 diversions in 2016, 83 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 6 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 12 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of diversions have: increased for 15-17 year-olds from 79 percent of diversions in 2006 to 83 percent in 2016, increased for 12-14 year-olds from 16 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2016, and remained steady for 18-24 year-olds.
- *Diversion by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 57, Figure 17) – For the 86 diversions in 2016, 22 percent were for Whites, 67 percent were for Hispanics, 1 percent were for Blacks, and 9 percent were Other. Percent of diversions have: decreased for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 22 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 57 percent in 2006 to 67 percent in 2016; decreased for Black juveniles from 5 percent in 2006 to 1 percent in 2016; and increased for Other juveniles from 4 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2016.

Table 55. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	673	466	69%	207	31%
2007	444	280	63%	164	37%
2008	528	334	63%	194	37%
2009	217	160	74%	57	26%
2010	141	104	74%	37	26%
2011	149	90	60%	59	40%
2012	118	81	69%	37	31%
2013	126	94	75%	32	25%
2014	114	87	76%	27	24%
2015	151	87	58%	64	42%
2016	86	61	71%	25	29%

Table 56. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	673	3	0%	110	16%	532	79%	28	4%
2007	444	0	0%	62	14%	364	82%	18	4%
2008	528	1	0%	74	14%	433	82%	20	4%
2009	217	1	0%	20	9%	179	82%	17	8%
2010	141	0	0%	15	11%	120	85%	6	4%
2011	149	1	1%	13	9%	128	86%	7	5%
2012	118	0	0%	11	9%	99	84%	8	7%
2013	126	0	0%	12	10%	111	88%	3	2%
2014	114	0	0%	13	11%	92	81%	9	8%
2015	151	0	0%	31	21%	115	76%	5	3%
2016	86	0	0%	10	12%	71	83%	5	6%

Table 57. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Diversion	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	673	227	34%	381	57%	37	5%	28	4%
2007	444	152	34%	258	58%	17	4%	17	4%
2008	528	166	31%	329	62%	20	4%	13	2%
2009	217	82	38%	117	54%	14	6%	4	2%
2010	141	46	33%	83	59%	7	5%	5	4%
2011	149	40	27%	97	65%	12	8%	0	0%
2012	118	40	34%	64	54%	7	6%	7	6%
2013	126	37	29%	82	65%	5	4%	2	2%
2014	114	31	27%	68	60%	12	11%	3	3%
2015	151	38	25%	111	74%	1	1%	1	1%
2016	86	19	22%	58	67%	1	1%	8	9%

Figure 17. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Diverted by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.8: Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgment

Tables 58, 59, and 60 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in grants of deferred entry of judgment by gender, age and race, respectively. Deferred entry of judgment is defined as a treatment program for first-time felony offenders aged 14 to 17 (pursuant to WIC section 790). Trends in grants of differed entry of judgment are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Deferred Entry of Judgement* (Tables 58 - 60) – grants of deferred entry of judgement increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 5,125 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 1,501 granted, representing a 70.7 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Gender* (Table 58) – For the 1,501 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2016, 86 percent were for males and 14 percent were for females. Percent of youth granted deferred judgement by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Age* (Table 59) – For the 1,501 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2016, 75 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 12 percent were fore18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent by age has remained steady for 12-14 and 15-17 year-olds from 2006 through 2016, while percent for 18-24 year-olds have increased from 8 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2016.
- *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 60, Figure 18) – For the 1,501 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2016, 27 percent were for Whites, 53 percent were for Hispanics, 14 percent were for Blacks, and 6 percent

for Others. Percent for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 27 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 44 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2016; and remained steady for Blacks and Other juveniles.

Table 58. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deferred Entry of Judgment	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,681	3,116	85%	565	15%
2007	4,556	3,838	84%	718	16%
2008	5,125	4,344	85%	781	15%
2009	4,699	4,017	85%	682	15%
2010	4,354	3,644	84%	710	16%
2011	3,684	3,177	86%	507	14%
2012	3,247	2,809	87%	438	13%
2013	2,708	2,354	87%	354	13%
2014	2,394	2,056	86%	338	14%
2015	1,650	1,430	87%	220	13%
2016	1,501	1,285	86%	216	14%

Table 59. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deferred Entry of Judgment	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,681	4	0%	553	15%	2,836	77%	288	8%
2007	4,556	0	0%	665	15%	3,447	76%	444	10%
2008	5,125	0	0%	771	15%	3,877	76%	477	9%
2009	4,699	6	0%	691	15%	3,540	75%	462	10%
2010	4,354	0	0%	582	13%	3,266	75%	506	12%
2011	3,684	0	0%	459	12%	2,879	78%	346	9%
2012	3,247	0	0%	462	14%	2,467	76%	318	10%
2013	2,708	1	0%	373	14%	2,048	76%	286	11%
2014	2,394	0	0%	348	15%	1,773	74%	273	11%
2015	1,650	0	0%	224	14%	1,236	75%	190	12%
2016	1,501	0	0%	204	14%	1,119	75%	178	12%

Table 60. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Deferred Entry of Judgment	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	3,681	1,269	34%	1,636	44%	429	12%	347	9%
2007	4,556	1,547	34%	2,090	46%	536	12%	383	8%
2008	5,125	1,606	31%	2,382	46%	695	14%	442	9%
2009	4,699	1,272	27%	2,404	51%	599	13%	424	9%
2010	4,354	1,269	29%	2,131	49%	604	14%	350	8%
2011	3,684	1,066	29%	1,826	50%	471	13%	321	9%
2012	3,247	877	27%	1,641	51%	431	13%	298	9%
2013	2,708	722	27%	1,480	55%	316	12%	190	7%
2014	2,394	637	27%	1,265	53%	326	14%	166	7%
2015	1,650	438	27%	878	53%	210	13%	124	8%
2016	1,501	404	27%	797	53%	209	14%	91	6%

Figure 18. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

3.3.9: Juvenile Petitions: Wardship Probation

Tables 61, 62, and 63 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in wardship probation by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in wardship probation are described below.

- *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Wardship Probation* (Tables 61 - 63) –Wardship probation increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 65,108 in 2008. Wardship probation has since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2016 with 25,471 granted, representing a 60.9 percent decrease since 2008.
- *Wardship Probation by Gender* (Table 61) – For the 25,471 youth granted wardship probation in 2016, 82 percent were male and 18 percent were female. Wardship probation by gender has remained steady from 2006 through 2016.
- *Wardship Probation by Age* (Table 62) – For the 25,471 youth granted wardship probation, 73 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 15 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds and 12 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have remained steady from 2006 through 2016. Percent of juveniles 12-14 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 17 percent to 12 percent in 2016. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 9 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2016.
- *Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 63, Figure 19) – For the 25,471 youth granted wardship probation in 2016, 15 percent were White, 57 percent were Hispanic, 23 percent were Black, and 4 percent Other. Percent of grants have: decreased for White juveniles from 23 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2016; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 51 percent in 2006 to 57 percent in 2016; and have remained steady for Black and Other juveniles.

Table 61. Wardship Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Wardship Probation	Male		Female	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	64,458	53,159	82%	11,299	18%
2007	61,642	51,035	83%	10,607	17%
2008	65,108	54,290	83%	10,818	17%
2009	60,891	51,135	84%	9,756	16%
2010	54,769	46,297	85%	8,472	15%
2011	47,655	39,994	84%	7,661	16%
2012	41,755	35,079	84%	6,676	16%
2013	37,615	31,454	84%	6,161	16%
2014	33,426	27,935	84%	5,491	16%
2015	28,447	23,360	82%	5,087	18%
2016	25,471	20,906	82%	4,565	18%

Table 62. Wardship Probation by Age for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Wardship Probation	Age Group Under 12		Age Group 12-14		Age Group 15-17		Age Group 18-24	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	64,458	206	0%	10,888	17%	47,464	74%	5,900	9%
2007	61,642	179	0%	10,058	16%	45,094	73%	6,311	10%
2008	65,108	152	0%	10,191	16%	48,003	74%	6,762	10%
2009	60,891	93	0%	8,988	15%	45,566	75%	6,244	10%
2010	54,769	52	0%	7,402	14%	41,344	75%	5,971	11%
2011	47,655	51	0%	6,292	13%	36,066	76%	5,246	11%
2012	41,755	46	0%	5,026	12%	31,335	75%	5,348	13%
2013	37,615	40	0%	4,361	12%	28,162	75%	5,052	13%
2014	33,426	28	0%	3,943	12%	24,355	73%	5,100	15%
2015	28,447	30	0%	3,387	12%	20,921	74%	4,109	14%
2016	25,471	23	0%	3,070	12%	18,641	73%	3,734	15%

Table 63. Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

Year	Total Wardship Probation	Whites		Hispanics		Blacks		Others	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2006	64,458	14,730	23%	32,863	51%	13,243	21%	3,622	6%
2007	61,642	13,286	22%	33,215	54%	12,013	19%	3,128	5%
2008	65,108	13,340	20%	35,175	54%	13,207	20%	3,386	5%
2009	60,891	11,666	19%	33,701	55%	12,116	20%	3,408	6%
2010	54,769	10,308	19%	31,232	57%	10,684	20%	2,545	5%
2011	47,655	8,434	18%	27,458	58%	9,412	20%	2,351	5%
2012	41,755	7,173	17%	24,174	58%	8,540	20%	1,868	4%
2013	37,615	6,133	16%	21,649	58%	8,310	22%	1,523	4%
2014	33,426	5,215	16%	19,307	58%	7,542	23%	1,362	4%
2015	28,447	4,299	15%	16,405	58%	6,534	23%	1,209	4%
2016	25,471	3,909	15%	14,552	57%	5,969	23%	1,041	4%

Figure 19. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2016

4. Juvenile Hall Bookings & Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility

4.1: Juvenile Hall Bookings

Table 64 and Figure 20 provide trend data for juvenile hall bookings from 2004 through 2016. [29] Juvenile hall bookings increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 114,404 in 2006-. Juvenile hall bookings have since declined reaching a low of 41,248 in 2016, representing a 63.9 percent decrease.

Table 64. Juvenile Hall Bookings for 2004 through 2016

Year	Juvenile Hall Bookings
2004	112,049
2005	112,207
2006	114,404
2007	113,006
2008	111,876
2009	85,037
2010	81,612
2011	74,365
2012	66,515
2013	58,544
2014	52,797
2015	46,723
2016	41,248

Figure 20. Juvenile Hall Bookings for 2004 through 2016

29 Board of State and Community Correction, *Juvenile Detention Profile Survey* (2004 – 2016). Available online at http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_fsojuveniledetentionprofile.php

4.2: Juvenile Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility

Juvenile secure holds are defined as post-arrest holds in law enforcement facilities and are broken down into two types: secure holds for juvenile delinquent offenders and secure holds for juvenile status offenders. The term juvenile delinquent offender refers to a juvenile who has been charged with or adjudicated for a crime that would be illegal regardless of whether the individual was a juvenile or adult. [30] Secure holds of delinquent offenders are tracked for both under 6 hours and over 6 hours. [31] The term status offender refers to a juvenile offender who has been charged with or adjudicated for conduct which would not be a crime if committed by an adult. [32] Status offenses include truancy, violations of curfews, and runaway.

Table 65 provides trend data for juvenile secure holds by type (delinquent offenders under 6 hours, delinquent offenders over 6 hours, and status offenders) for 2004 through 2015.[33] Figure 21 displays secure holds for juvenile delinquent offender holds under 6 hours. Figure 22 displays juvenile delinquent offender secure holds over 6 hours and status offender secure holds. Trends in juvenile secure holds are described below.

- *Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds U*nder 6 Hours (Table 65, Figure 21) – Secure holds increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 11,713 in 2006. They have since decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2015 with 2,804 holds.
- *Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds* Over 6 Hours (Table 65, Figure 22) – Secure holds doubled between 2004 and 2006 reaching a high of 158 in 2006. Holds decreased in 2008 with 75 holds and have since remained steady.
- *Juvenile Status Offender Secure Holds* (Table 65, Figure 22) – Secure holds increased between 2007 and 2011, reaching a high of 101 holds in 2011. Secure holds have since decreased with 46 holds in 2015.[34]

30 Welfare and Institution Code section 602.

31 The BSCC collects numbers of juveniles held in secure detention over and under 6 hours as required by the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (*WIC 207.1(d) 1&2).* The Six (6) Hour Rule follows that a minor detained for a WIC 602 violation cannot be held in secure or non-secure detention for more than six (6) hours. There may be times when a detention exceeds six (6) hours due to the investigative process or inability to locate a parent.

32 Welfare and Institution Code section 601.

33 Board of State and Community Correction, *Minors in Detention Survey* (2004 – 2015). Board of State and Community Correction, *Minors in Detention Federal and State Requirements*. Available online at: http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Minors_in_Detention_Training_Video_Companion_Workbook_2013_01.pdf.

34 Data for this category began to be collected in 2007. 2016 data is not yet available.

Table 65. Juvenile Secure Holds by Type for 2004 through 2015

Year	Delinquent Offenders Under 6 Hours	Delinquent Offenders Over 6 Hours	Status Offenders*
2004	9,981	73	-
2005	10,579	79	-
2006	11,713	158	-
2007	10,336	107	47
2008	8,655	75	19
2009	7,095	87	18
2010	6,644	81	76
2011	5,806	65	101
2012	4,254	69	67
2013	3,616	57	45
2014	3,149	71	57
2015	2,804	78	46

*Note: Data was not collected as part of the MID Survey until 2007.

Figure 21. Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds Under 6 Hours for 2004 through 2015

Figure 22. Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds for 2004 through 2016 and Juvenile Status Offender Secure Holds for 2007 through 2015

5. Mental Health Indicators

5.1: Select Juvenile Detention Profile Survey Data Trends Gathered for the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention (October 18, 2017)

The BSCC's Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) is a data collection instrument designed to gather pertinent data related to juvenile detention to provide state and local decision makers with information about the changing populations and needs of local juvenile detention facilities. This document presents juvenile detention trends for calendar years 2010 through 2016 for the JDPS's population, mental health and suicide-related data elements defined below.

- *Average Daily Population (ADP)* **–** The ADP of juvenile detention facilities is collected *each month* and is calculated by taking a count of the number of juveniles in custody each day of the month, adding these daily counts together, and dividing the sum by the number of days in each month.
- *Number of Juveniles with Open Mental Health Cases* – The total number of juveniles who have an open mental health case[35] with the mental health provider is collected *each month* and is a *snapshot* taken on the 15th day of the month. As a snapshot, the count does not necessarily represent the total number of juveniles who have an open case simply because they were not in custody during the snapshot day or did not have an open case on the snapshot day.
- *Number of Juveniles Receiving Psychotropic Medication* – The total number of juveniles who were administered psychotropic medication is collected *each month* and is a *snapshot* taken on the 15th day of the month. As a snapshot, the count does not necessarily represent the total number of juveniles receiving psychotropic medication simply because they were not in custody during the snapshot day or did not receive medication on the snapshot day.
- *Number of Suicide Attempts* – The total number of *instances* in which a juvenile made a physical attempt at suicide requiring staff intervention and placement on a suicide watch (e.g., five-minute watches or one-on-one direct visual supervision) is collected *each quarter*. This count does not include juveniles identified as suicidal because of notice on admission related to prior history. Because these are instances, the count does not necessarily represent a unique count of juveniles.
- *Number of Suicides* – The total number of instances in which a juvenile committed suicide is collected *each quarter*.

5.2: Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends for 2010 through 2016

A total of 48 jurisdictions report data to the BSCC through the JDPS (see Attachment 1 for a list of jurisdictions). From 2010 through 2016, 37 jurisdictions[36] consistently

35 The BSCC does not define open mental health cases. Each jurisdiction may have their own method for determining cases.
36 Represents 33 reporting jurisdictions and 4 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer

reported the mental health-related data elements. For this sample of jurisdictions, Table 66 provides the ADP and number and percent of ADP for both juveniles with open mental health cases each month and juveniles receiving psychotropic medications each month, aggregated for each year from 2010 through 2016. Figure 23 provides a visual of the percent of ADP for the mental health-related data elements for the same timeframe. Based on this sample of jurisdictions, trends for these mental health-related data elements are described below.

Open Mental Health Cases - There has been a consistent downward trend in the average number of juveniles each month with open mental health cases, from 2,273 in 2010 to 1,646 in 2016. This decrease has coincided with a decrease in the ADP. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population with open mental health cases, from 36.4 percent in 2010 to 52.4 percent in 2016.

Psychotropic Medications - There has also been a consistent downward trend in the average number of juveniles who receive psychotropic medications each month, from 733 in 2010 to 609 in 2016. This decrease has coincided with a decrease in the ADP. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population who receive psychotropic medications, from 11.7 percent in 2010 to 19.4 percent in 2016.

Table 66. Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends from 2010 through 2016 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions

		Juveniles with Open Mental Health Cases Each Month		Juveniles Receiving Psychotropic Medications each Month	
Year	ADP	Average	Percent of ADP	Average	Percent of ADP
2010	6,253	2,273	36.4%	733	11.7%
2011	5,353	2,084	38.9%	731	13.7%
2012	4,645	1,955	42.1%	715	15.4%
2013	4,239	1,877	44.3%	692	16.3%
2014	3,840	1,852	48.2%	657	17.1%
2015	3,459	1,820	52.6%	628	18.2%
2016	3,143	1,646	52.4%	609	19.4%

Note. Based on JDPS monthly data available on October 6, 2017 from January 2010 through December 2016. Based on data for 33 reporting jurisdictions and 4 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer have juvenile detention facilities. The 15 excluded jurisdictions were Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Kings, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Marin, Monterey, Orange, Solano, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, and Yuba/Sutter. Included an additional.

Figure 23. Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends as a Percentage of ADP for 2010 through 2016 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions

have juvenile detention facilities.

Note. Based on JDPS monthly data available on October 6, 2017 from January 2010 through December 2016. Based on data for 33 reporting jurisdictions and 4 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer have juvenile detention facilities. The 15 excluded jurisdictions were Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Kings, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Marin, Monterey, Orange, Solano, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, and Yuba/Sutter. Included an additional.

5.3 Juvenile Suicide-Related Trends for 2010 through 2016

From 2010 through 2016, 45 of the 48 reporting jurisdictions have consistently reported the suicide-related data elements. For this sample of jurisdictions, Table 67 provides yearly totals for the suicide-related data elements and the ADP, aggregated for each year from 2010 through 2016. For this sample of jurisdictions, a total of three suicides were report from 2010 through 2016. This total *does not* change when data for all 48 jurisdictions are included. Although there has been a consistent downward trend in the statewide ADP between 2010 and 2016, there has not been a corresponding decrease in the total number of instances of suicide attempts. Considering suicide attempts for 2011 through 2016 and excluding 2013 as an abnormally high year, suicide attempts have fluctuated between 114 to 139 annually.

Table 67. Juvenile Suicide-Related Trends for 2010 through 2016 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions

Year	Total Number of Instances of Suicide Attempts	Total Number of Suicides	Average Daily Population
2010	198	0	10,550
2011	133	0	9,221
2012	116	1	7,937
2013	200	1	7,517
2014	114	1	6,714
2015	139	0	6,127
2016	134	0	5,436

Note. Based on JDPS quarterly and monthly data available on October 6, 2017 from January 2010 through December 2016. Based on data for 45 jurisdictions. The 3 excluded jurisdictions were Merced, Orange, and Tuolumne.

5.4 JDPS Reporting Jurisdictions as of December 2016

As of December 2016, a total of 48 jurisdictions report data to the BSCC through the JDPS.[37] Jurisdictions generally represent counties. However, the Yuba/Sutter jurisdiction represents both counties with Yuba county reporting data for the jointly run facility. Table 68 provides a list of each reporting jurisdiction and, for each jurisdiction, identifies the type of juvenile detentions options (juvenile halls, camps/ranches, and other detention alternatives), size of the county (small, medium, or large)[38], and location of the county (Northern, Central, or Southern).

Table 68. JDPS Reporting Jurisdictions and Juvenile Detention Options

Reporting Jurisdictions	Juvenile Hall/SPJH[39]	Camp / Ranch	Other Detention	Size	Location
Alameda	X	X	--	L	Central
Butte	X	X	--	M	Northern
Contra Costa	X	X	--	L	Central
Del Norte	X	X	--	S	Northern
El Dorado	X	X	X	S	Central
Fresno	X	X	X	L	Central
Glenn	X	--	--	S	Northern
Humboldt	X	--	X	S	Northern
Imperial	X	--	--	S	Southern

37 Counties that do not currently have juvenile detention facilities and do not report to the BSCC through the JDPS include Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Lake, Modoc, Mono, Plumas, and Sierra.
38 Department of Finance county population data for 2016 was used to categorize counties by size. Small = less than 200,000, Medium = between 200,001 and 700,000, and Large = greater than 700,001.
39 Special Purpose Juvenile Halls (SPJH)

Reporting Jurisdictions	Juvenile Hall/SPJH[39]	Camp / Ranch	Other Detention	Size	Location
Inyo	X	--	--	S	Central
Kern	X	X	--	L	Southern
Kings	X	X	X	S	Central
Lassen	X	--	--	S	Northern
Los Angeles	X	X	X	L	Southern
Madera	X	X	X	S	Central
Marin	X	--	X	M	Central
Mariposa	X	--	--	S	Central
Mendocino	X	--	--	S	Northern
Merced	X	X	X	M	Central
Monterey	X	X	X	M	Central
Napa	X	--	--	S	Central
Nevada	X	--	X	S	Northern
Orange	X	X	X	L	Southern
Placer	X	--	--	M	Northern
Riverside	X	X	X	L	Southern
Sacramento	X	--	X	L	Central
San Benito	X	--	X	S	Central
San Bernardino	X	X	--	L	Southern
San Diego	X	X	X	L	Southern
San Francisco	X	X	--	L	Central
San Joaquin	X	X	--	L	Central
San Luis Obispo	X	--	--	M	Southern
San Mateo	X	X	X	L	Central
Santa Barbara	X	X	--	M	Southern
Santa Clara	X	X	X	L	Central
Santa Cruz	X	--	--	M	Central
Shasta	X	--	X	S	Northern
Siskiyou	X	--	--	S	Northern
Solano	X	X	--	M	Central
Sonoma	X	X	X	M	Central
Stanislaus	X	X	X	M	Central
Tehama	X	--	--	S	Northern
Trinity	X	X	--	S	Northern
Tulare	X	X	X	M	Central
Tuolumne	X	--	--	S	Central
Ventura	X	X	--	L	Southern
Yolo	X	--	--	M	Central
Yuba/Sutter	X	X	--	S	Northern

6. Other Trends/Qualitative Data

The following trend data and other social, economic, legal, and organizational information is considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming and was provided to SACJJDP members for consideration during the process of developing the 2018-20 Title II State Plan. The following four components are included:

1) Literature Review
   Findings from our review of current literature – "Literature review: Qualitative research organized around priority areas"

2) Title II State Plan Survey
   Results obtained from a widely distributed survey of interested parties

3) Public Listening Session
   Summary of information obtained during public listening sessions held in Northern and Southern California

4) Public comment: The Chief Probation Officers of California

6.1: Literature Review

Findings from a review of current literature containing qualitative research organized around the following priority areas:

- Mental Health Services
- Rural Areas Juvenile Programs
- Gender-Specific Services
- Aftercare Services
- Alternatives to Detention and Placement
- Graduated and Appropriate Sanctions
- Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)
- Diversion
- Juvenile Justice Improvement
- School Programs
- Afterschool Programs
- Community-Based Programs and Services
- Learning and Other Disabilities
- References

Mental Health Services

Between 60 and 70 percent of youth involved with the justice system have been diagnosed with a mental health disorder (Skowyra & Cocozza, 2006 in Calleja et al, 2016). According to the research, psychological factors throughout the developmental

stages of adolescence are correlated with antisocial behavior and criminal activity (NCJRS, 2016).

Existing needs (Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Nissen, 2006 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017)

- There is a need to overcome the blocks to service utilization
- To measure program effectiveness, there is a need for policies based on empirical research
- There is a need for policies to generate uniformity about services within juvenile facilities
- There is a need to overcome the stigmatization around mental health issues

Potential reform areas (Models for Change, 2017a; OJJDP, 2010)

- Addressing collaborative approaches to the youth's mental health needs of youth to avoid (unnecessary) JJS involvement
- Addressing general improvement of the mental health services)
- Addressing the standards for the qualifications of mental health providers

Recommendations to Treatment Providers (Lipsey et al, 2010)

- To recognize the importance of quality research (for youth, families, and communities)
- To target and serve high risk youth by using the appropriate and approved JJ risk assessment tools
- To clearly articulate (via treatment service manuals) the clinical protocols and procedures that are used by clinicians

Rural Areas Juvenile Programs

About 20 percent of the US residents live in rural areas (a quarter of the Native American and Alaska native population live in the rural areas; Hispanic population is increasingly populating rural areas) (The Justice Innovation Center, 2016). Certain facets rural juvenile recidivism correlate with the juvenile crime in rural areas (i.e., housing instability, ethnic heterogeneity, etc.), while others show little or no correlation with the juvenile crime (i.e., poverty rate, unemployment, etc.) (OJJDP, 2015).

Factors that impact Rural Youth (Family Justice, 2009; The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

- Housing
- Race and ethnicity
- Family dynamics
- Income
- Homelessness
- Re-entry issues
- Access to health and social services
- Community belonging
- Access to transportation
- Access to employment
- Access to mental health and substance-abuse programs

Challenges (The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

- Geography
- Access to funding
- Access to social service provision
- Access to personnel
- Access to communications and information-technology management
- Data-Sharing and Interoperability
- Crime-related issues
- Access to adequate infrastructure
- Legal and policy challenges

Potential goals and areas of priority (Family Justice, 2009; The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

- Decreasing youth recidivism
- Decreasing youth homelessness
- Supporting family health and well-being
- Increasing public safety
- Generating cost-effective solutions
- Supporting collaboration and partnership
- Improving inter-agency information sharing
- Assisting with the procurement and management of information-technology systems
- Assisting with grant applications

Gender-Specific Services

Girls and young women make up about 30 percent of arrested juveniles – the number that increased in the last 20 years. Most often, these are the girls of color that grew up in poverty and are victims of abuse, trauma and continuous racial bias. In addition, LGBTQI youth also experiences high systemic inequalities (OJJDP, n.d.).

Focus areas for states, tribes and local communities (OJJDP, n.d.)

- Prohibiting girl placement (girls that are status offenders) in the JJS
- Reducing arrest and detention for status offences, probation violation, prostitution-related charges, etc.
- Improving collaboration among state and national juvenile advocates, agencies and coalitions
- Implementing the PREA on state level
- Developing alternatives to detention and incarceration
- Applying a developmental approach (with communal and family support)
- Identifying the needs of the girls who have interacted with child welfare and/or the juvenile justice system
- Supporting gender- and culture-sensitive programs

Potential elements as part of the reforms (Watson & Edelman, 2012)

- Developing quality research around needs, service-availability, and gender-responsiveness of jurisdictions
- Promoting public education through campaigns

- Strategic planning
- Supporting stakeholder-inclusion
- Improving legislation
- Training staff
- Developing community-based prevention programs
- Measuring and evaluating outcomes
- Providing technical assistance
- Promoting sustainability

Federal policy recommendations in support of state and local reforms (Watson & Edelman, 2012)

- Investing in research
- Investing in assessment and data collection tools
- Encouraging state advisory groups to support girl programs and reforms
- Supporting interagency working groups on federal and state levels
- Eliminating Valid Court Order Exception for status offenders
- Banning handcuffing for pregnant girls
- Monitoring compliance with the PREA
- Encouraging the development and progress of national standards for gender-responsive programming

Aftercare Services

Challenges to re-entry (Calleja et al, 2016)

- Returning to the unstable environment (home and community) that lacks opportunities
- Lack of access to education
- Lack of access to employment
- Lack of access to housing
- Lack of access to quality mental health

Reform areas (Models for Change, 2017a; NJJN, 2016)

- Aftercare
- Post-release services, supervision and supports
- Education
- Interagency cooperation
- Community cooperation
- Family involvement
- Speedy and appropriate placement
- Improved transfer of records
- Improved school reenrollment and drop-out reengagement programs

Other recommendations (Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Grisso, 2005 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Cavendish, 2014 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017)

- Developing issue-specific and individual rehabilitation plans
- Supporting reintegration into the community
- Supporting follow-ups
- Offering transitional support

- Supporting parental support
- Supporting state investment into rehabilitation

Alternatives to Detention and Placement

According to the research, placing juveniles in community settings with supporting services has a greater impact on youth rehabilitation than detention and confinement. Confinement has a strong impact on youth's mental state, academic performance, employment, etc. (OJJDP 2014; Holman and Ziedenberg 2007 in OJJDP 2014).

The Impact of Detention (Holman, B. & Ziedenberg, 2007)

- Potentially increases recidivism
- Negatively impacts youth's behavior and increases their chance of re-offending
- Pulls youth deeper into the JJS
- Potentially interrupt the natural process of maturing out of delinquency
- Negatively impacts youth's mental health
- Negatively impacts mentally ill youth
- Negatively impacts the special needs youth's chances to return to school
- Negatively impacts youth's chances to find employment
- Detention is more expensive than alternatives to detention

The alternatives to detention/confinement (OJJDP, 2014; Owen, Wettach & Hoffman, 2015)

- Community based programs
- Community-school partnerships
- Home confinement
- Day (or evening) treatment
- Shelter care
- Group homes
- Intensive supervision programs
- Specialized foster care
- Positive behavior intervention and support
- Safe and responsive school environment
- Limiting the role of school resource officers
- Assessment
- Restorative justice
- Substance abuse interventions
- Alternative schools
- Reducing the use of suspension for discipline

Graduated and Appropriate Sanctions

Graduated responses is a "structured system of graduated incentives and sanctions to respond to youth behavior" (Center for Children's Law and Policy, 2016, p. 8). Research shows that combining sanctions and progressive incentives can help reduce racial and ethnic disparities (Njjn, n.d.). A system of graduated responses should be: certain, immediate, proportionate, fair and tailored to individual youth (Center for Children's Law and Policy, 2016).

The graduated sanctions continuum consists of (Louisiana District Attorneys Association, 2012)

- Immediate (Diversion)
- Intermediate sanctions
- Secure care
- Reentry

Community alternatives to secure care (Louisiana District Attorneys Association, 2012)

- Home detention
- Employment projects
- Evening reporting centers
- Electronic monitoring
- Intensive supervision

Steps involved in creating a graduated responses system (Njjn, n.d.)

- Defining the purpose of implementing a graduated responses practice
- Gathering data on youth under supervision/youth sanctioned for violations (of probation/other court orders)
- Interviewing to gain an understand of youth supervision in the community.
- Forming a committee to develop the graduated responses system
- Thinking of behaviors and skills to promote among youth under supervision
- Identifying reward incentives
- Identifying negative behaviors (low-, medium-, or high-severity)
- Identifying possible sanctions for specific behaviors
- Developing a system to the system effectiveness
- Training staff
- Gathering data and evaluating implementation

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)

DMC refers to prominence of contact with the JJS by minority groups in comparison to the rates of contact by white juveniles. According to data, youth of color are more likely to be arrested and later go deeper in the JJS (Puzzanchera and Hockenberry 2013 in OJJDP 2014). There exist 2 theoretical frameworks of looking at DMC:

Differential offending (OJJDP, 2014) - Youths of color commit more crimes due to the context (socio-economic disadvantages, family context, greater exposure to violence, etc.)
Differential treatment (OJJDP, 2014) - JJS treats youth of color differently than white youth (bias theory)
Contributing factors (OJJDP, 2014)

- Differential behavior
- Indirect/environmental effects (socio-economic status, quality and level of education, location, etc.)
- Geography (harsher laws)
- Legislation, policies, and legal factors

Strategies for reducing DMC (OJJDP 2014):

- Direct services that address the risks and needs
- Training and technical assistance (juvenile justice personnel and law enforcement)
- Systemic change (OJJDP, 2009)

Guidelines for developing DMC Intervention Plan (OJJDP, 2009)
- Designing a comprehensive approach
- Focusing on critical areas
- Choosing community-friendly interventions
- Using evidence-based strategies

Diversion

Diversion refers to "channeling youths away from the juvenile justice system and into an alternative program before formal court involvement" (Models of Change 2011, p. 1). Research shows that the formal system processing may lead to higher rates of re-offending (Models of Change 2011).

Diversion programs are designed to (OJJDP 2017)

- Reduce recidivism
- Reduce stigma
- Reduce coercive entry into the system
- Provide services
- Offer alternative community services
- Reduce the risk of criminal socialization
- Instill discipline
- Improve school engagement
- Reduce the cost of formal court proceedings

Six components of diversion programs (why diversion programs might vary) (OJJDP 2017)
- Points of contact
- Setting
- Structure
- Target population
- Types of intervention of delivered services
- Formal and informal processing

Juvenile Justice System Improvement

Restorative justice is an approach based on the belief that delinquency impacts victims, communities, and delinquent youth themselves. By following the approach, youth are held accountable for their actions and are guided through a process to restore and amends for the loss and damage caused (OJJDP 2017).
Recommendations (Lipsey et al, 2010)

- Legislating evidence-based programming for youth services
- Promoting pilot programs and providing limited funding, for developing evidence-based practices
- Building a far-reaching administrative model and increasing system capacity for:
  1. Improved matching of specific treatment needs with effective services

2. Targeting higher risk offenders
3. Improving prevention, court, and correctional programs.

- Improving cross-system coordination and collaboration
- Addressing excessive confinement
- Supporting evidence-based programming
- Bringing together agencies and individuals that are part of the JJS to work on the system reform
- Working with treatment providers

School Programs

The U.S. Departments of Justice and Education suggested five guiding principles for quality education programs in JDCs (Benner et al, 2016): Positive climate, community engagement, effective classroom practices, academic engagement, and coordinated transition supports

Barriers to education the JJS-involved youth (Juveniles for Justice, 2015; National Juvenile Justice Network, 2016)

- A lack of adequate work in the JJ facilities
- A lack of adequate education in the JJ facilities (resources, staff, teachers)
- Improper use of discipline in in the JJ facilities
- Difficulties around transitioning back to school and issues around alternative schools
- Difficulties around curricula alignment with state standards and transfer of the correctional educational records to the home schools after release

Recommendations

- Performing student assessments (Juveniles for Justice, 2015; Benner et al, 2016)
- Aligning curriculum with state standards
- Ensuring reenrollment
- Arranging formal hearings before placement in alternative schools
- Providing diverse educational options
- Providing access to higher education credits
- Providing classroom resources and work technology
- Recruiting qualified teachers
- Establishing rules and responses to classroom misbehavior
- Increasing data collection on discipline
- Promoting restorative practices
- Arranging transition meetings
- Promoting professional development
- Tracking recidivism

Suggested reforms (NJJN, 2016)

- Facility reforms
    - Providing a safe climate that prioritizes education in facilities
    - Providing funding to support education for youth in long-term secure care facilities
    - Recruiting qualified education staff

    - Supporting college readiness programs
    - Supporting transition from child-serving systems into communities.

- Re-entry reforms
    - Supporting inter-agency and community cooperation
    - Supporting youth and family involvement
    - Supporting speedy placement
    - Improving record transfer
    - Improving school reenrollment practices

Afterschool Programs

The afterschool programs and the programs for youth with academic challenges. These youths are more likely to struggle academically, struggle with learning disabilities and drop out of school (Calleja et al, 2016; Leone & Weinberg, 2010 in Calleja et al, 2016; Llamas & Chandler, 2017):

Effective afterschool programs (OJJDP, 2010; Durlak and Weissberg 2007 in OJJDP, 2010)

- Have an emphasis on social skills
- Target specific skills
- Are more structured
- Are smaller in size and with options for one-on-one training/tutoring
- Offer qualified staff
- Have low attrition
- Use evidence-based approaches
- Use active forms of learning

Community-Based Programs and Services

Community-based alternatives are the local alternatives to incarceration (Models for Change, 2017a).
Reform areas (NJJN, 2014; OJJDP, 2014)

- Developing more community-based alternatives
- Developing more community-focused programs

Learning and Other Disabilities

There are between 4 and 10 percent of the incarcerated population with intellectual disabilities (ID) in the US1 (Scheyett, Vaughn, Taylor, & Parish, 2008). Research shows that more than 50 percent of juvenile offenders show evidence of an ID (Katsiyannis et al, 2008). Research has also shown that the juvenile population with ID tends to be associated with more serious offenses and is at a higher risk of second- and third-time offending (Zhang et al. 2010). Certain groups of youths have higher likelihood to be diagnosed with a disability (i.e. black, Native American, and/or Latino; Low socioeconomic status (Quinn et al. 2005), etc.

There are four general types of disabilities (OJJDP, 2017)
- Intellectual
- Developmental
- Learning
- Emotional

Links to Delinquent Behavior (OJJDP, 2017)
- Low Intellectual Functioning
- Susceptibility to Delinquent Behavior
- Differential Treatment

References

Mental Health Services

Lipsey, M., Howell, J., Kelly, M., Chapman, G. & Carver, D. (2010). Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/ImprovingEffectiveness_December2010.pdf.

Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

Models for Change (2017a). Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice. http://www.modelsforchange.net/about/index.html

NCJRS (2016). Justice-Involved Young Adults Research Planning Meeting. Meeting minutes. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/250735.pdf

Nissen, L. (2006). Effective adolescent substance abuse treatment in juvenile justice settings: Practice and policy recommendations. Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal, 23(3), 298-315 in Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

OJJDP (2010). Youth's Needs and Services. Juvenile Justice Bulletin, April 2010. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/227728.pdf.

Skowyra, K. R., & Cocozza, J. J. (2006). Blueprint for change: A comprehensive model for the identification and treatment of youth with mental health needs in contact with the juvenile justice system. Delmar, NY: National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice Policy Research Associates, Inc. in Calleja, N., Dadah, A., Fisher, J. & Fernandez, M. (2016). Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Specialized Reentry Services: A Second Chance Art Project. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 1-11. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251065.pdf

Rural Area Juvenile Programs

Family Justice (2009). Enhancing Rural Reentry through Housing Partnerships: A handbook for community corrections agencies in rural areas. New York, NY: Family Justice https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/appa/pubs/ERRTHP.pdf.

Justice Innovation Center (2016). Identifying the Needs and Challenges of Criminal Justice Agencies in Small, Rural, Tribal, and Border Areas. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1479.html

OJJDP (2015). Rural Youth Crime: A Reexamination of Social Disorganization Theory's Applicability to Rural Areas. Journal of Juvenile Justice, Vol 4, issue 1, pp. 47-63, Winter 2015. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292775190_Rural_Youth_Crime_A_Reexamination_of_Social_Disorganization_Theory%27s_Applicability_to_Rural_Areas.

Gender-specific services

OJJDP (n.d.). Girls and the Juvenile Justice System. OJJDP Policy Papers. https://www.ojjdp.gov/policyguidance/girls-juvenile-justice-system/.

Watson, L. & Edelman, P. (2012). Improving the Juvenile Justice System for Girls. Georgetown Center on Poverty, Inequality and Public Policy. October, 2012.

Aftercare-Reentry

Calleja, N., Dadah, A., Fisher, J. & Fernandez, M. (2016). Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Specialized Reentry Services: A Second Chance Art Project. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 1-11. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251065.pdf

Cavendish, W. (2014). Academic attainment during commitment and post release education-related outcomes of juvenile justice-involved youth with and without disabilities. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 22(1), 41-52 in Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

Grisso, T., Vincent, G., & Seagrave, D. (2005). Mental Health Screening and Assessment in Juvenile Justice. New York: The Guilford Press in Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

Models for Change (2017a). Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice. http://www.modelsforchange.net/about/index.html

NJJN (2016). Snapshot: Improving Educational Opportunities for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. http://www.njjn.org/our-work/improving-education-for-youth-in-juvenile-justice-snapshot

Alternatives to Detention and Placement

Holman, B. & Ziedenberg (2007). The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities. A Justice Policy Institute Report. http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/06-11_REP_DangersOfDetention_JJ.pdf. in OJJDP (2014). Changing lives: Prevention and Intervention to Reduce Serious Offending. OJJDP Justice Research Series, Bulletin. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/243993.pdf

OJJDP (2014). Changing lives: Prevention and Intervention to Reduce Serious Offending. OJJDP Justice Research Series, Bulletin. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/243993.pdf

Owen, J., Wettach, J. & Hoffman, K.C. (2015). Instead of Suspension: Alternative Strategies for Effective School Discipline. Duke Center for Child and Family Policy and Duke Law School. https://law.duke.edu/childedlaw/schooldiscipline/downloads/instead_of_suspension.pdf.

Graduated and Appropriate Sanctions

Center for Children's Law and Policy. (2016). Graduated Responses Toolkit: New Resources and Insights to Help Youth Succeed on Probation. Washington, DC. http://www.cclp.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Graduated-Responses-Toolkit.pdf.

Louisiana District Attorneys Association (2012). Graduated Sanctions Paper. https://ncc.nebraska.gov/sites/ncc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/Graduated_Sanctions_Louisiana_District_Attorneys_Association.pdf.

Njjn (n.d.). Implementing an Effective Graduated Responses System. www.njjn.org

Disproportionate Minority Contact

OJJDP (2009). Disproportionate Minority Contact Technical Assistance Manual. Fourth Edition. Washington, D.C.: OJJDP. https://www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc_ta_manual.pdf in OJJDP (2014). Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). OJJDP Literature Review: A Product of the Model Programs Guide. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Disproportionate_Minority_Contact.pdf.

OJJDP (2014). Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). OJJDP Literature Review: A Product of the Model Programs Guide. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Disproportionate_Minority_Contact.pdf.

Puzzanchera, C. and Hockenberry, S. (2013). National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Juvenile Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/ in OJJDP (2014). Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). OJJDP Literature Review: A Product of the Model Programs Guide. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Disproportionate_Minority_Contact.pdf.

Diversion

Models of Change (2011). Innovation Brief: Using Diversion Fairly, Consistently, and Effectively. http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/311.

OJJDP (2017). Diversion Programs. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Diversion_Programs.pdf.

Juvenile Justice Improvement

OJJDP (2017). Policy Guidance. https://www.ojjdp.gov/policyguidance/Youth-Family-Engagement/YouthFamilyEngagement.pdf

Lipsey, M., Howell, J., Kelly, M., Chapman, G. & Carver, D. (2010). Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/ImprovingEffectiveness_December2010.pdf.

School Programs

Benner, G.J., Armstrong, A.L., Anderson, C. & Zeng, S. (2016). Strengthening Education in Short-term Juvenile Detention Centers: Final Technical Report. Sponsored by OJJDP. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/251118.pdf.

Juveniles for Justice (2015). Justice for juveniles: Youth recommendations to improve educational outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system.

http://jlc.org/resources/publications/justice-juveniles-youth-recommendations-improve-educational-outcomes-youth-ju.

National Juvenile Justice Network (2016). Snapshot: Improving educational opportunities for youth in the juvenile justice system. http://www.njjn.org/our-work/improving-education-for-youth-in-juvenile-justice-snapshot.

NJJN (2016). Snapshot: Improving Educational Opportunities for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. http://www.njjn.org/our-work/improving-education-for-youth-in-juvenile-justice-snapshot

Afterschool Programs

Calleja, N., Dadah, A., Fisher, J. & Fernandez, M. (2016). Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Specialized Reentry Services: A Second Chance Art Project. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 1-11. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251065.pdf

Durlak, j. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). The Impact of Afterschool Programs That Promote Personal and Social Skills. Chicago, Ill.: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. In OJJDP (2010). Afterschool Programs. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Afterschool_Programs.pdf Prepared

Leone & Weinberg, 2010 in Calleja et al, 2016 in Calleja, N., Dadah, A., Fisher, J. & Fernandez, M. (2016). Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Specialized Reentry Services: A Second Chance Art Project. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 1-11. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251065.pdf in Calleja, N., Dadah, A., Fisher, J. & Fernandez, M. (2016). Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Specialized Reentry Services: A Second Chance Art Project. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 1-11. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251065.pdf

Llamas, J. & Chandler, R. (2017). Practitioner's views on service needs for justice involved youth. Electronic Thesis, Projects, and Dissertations. 493. http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=etd.

OJJDP (2010). Afterschool Programs. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Afterschool_Programs.pdf Prepared

Durlak and Weissberg 2007 in OJJDP (2010). Afterschool Programs. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Afterschool_Programs.pdf Prepared

Community-Based Programs and Services

Models for Change (2017a). Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice. http://www.modelsforchange.net/about/index.html

NJJN (2014). Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Justice Systems: Promising Practices. Policy Update. http://www.njjn.org/uploads/digital-library/RED-Policy-Update-0914-FINAL.pdf

OJJDP (2014). Changing lives: Prevention and Intervention to Reduce Serious Offending. OJJDP Justice Research Series, Bulletin. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/243993.pdf

Learning and Other Disabilities

Anderson, V.R., Barnes, A., Campbell, N., Campbell, C., Onifade, E. & Davidson, W. (2016). Gender and Adolescents' Risk for Recidivism in Truancy Court. OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice vol 5, issue 1. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/249840.pdf.

Scheyett, A., Vaughn, J., Taylor, M., & Parish, S. (2008). Are we there yet? Screening processes for intellectual and developmental disabilities in jail settings. Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, Vol 47, Issue 1, pp. 13–23.

Katsiyannis, A., Ryan, J. B., Zhang, D., & Spann, A. (2008). Juvenile delinquency and recidivism: The impact of academic achievement. Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, Vol 24, Issue 2, pp. 177–196.

Zhang, D., Willson, V., Katsiyannis, A., Barrett, D., Song, J., & Wu, J. (2010). Truancy offenders in the juvenile justice system: A multicohort study. Behavioral Disorders, Vol 35, issue 3, pp. 229–242.

OJJDP (2017). Youths with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Intellectual-Developmental-Disabilities.pdf

Quinn, M., Rutherford, R., Leone, P., Osher, D. & Poirier, J. (2005). Youth with Disabilities in Juvenile Corrections: A National Survey. Exceptional Children, Vol 71, issue 3, pp. 339–45. in OJJDP (2017). Youths with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System. Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Intellectual-Developmental-Disabilities.pdf

6.2: Title II State Plan Survey

Results obtained from a widely distributed survey of interested parties

- **Total Questions:** 7
- **Total Responses:** 172
- **Date Created:** August 30, 2017
- **Date Closed:** October 2, 2017

Summary of Recurring Themes across Questions 4, 6, and 7

- Low income assistance services and programs/Social system
- Mental health services and programs/Mental health system
- Substance abuse services and programs
- School-based services and programs/Education system
- Employment-based training and programs/Employment system
- Family-based services and programs/Family support system
- Community-based services and programs/Community support system
- R.E.D programs/Culturally responsive programs/Racial and ethnic disparities
- Re-entry programs/Re-entry

Question 1: Survey Respondents by Age

Answered: 168 Skipped: 4

Question 2: Geographic Location of Respondents

Answered: 171 Skipped: 1

Question 3: What is your relationship to the issue?

Answered: 172 Skipped: 0

Question 4: What are the most important changes that need to be made in your community to improve the overall well-being of youth?

Answered: 167 Skipped: 5

Low income assistance services/program

- Access to housing
  - Transitional Age Youth (TAY) programs
  - Access to transitional housing
  - Access to emergency shelter
  - Host home coordination
  - Rental assistance
  - Provision of Section 8 housing vouchers
- Assistance to homeless youth
- Access to affordable healthcare services
- Transportation assistance
- Improvement of the low-income communities-law enforcement relationship
- Sufficient staffing for social services departments and programs

Mental health services/program

- Access to mobile mental health clinicians that accept Medi-Cal
- Access to trauma treatment for parents
- Improvement of the Mental health treatment team staffing

Substance abuse services/programs

- Opiate addiction assistance
- Drug abuse counselling
- Residential alcohol/drug rehabilitation
- Improvements around substance abuse treatment providers
- Provision of quality evidence-based substance abuse treatment
- Improvements around the outpatient youth treatment CBOs

School-based services/programs

- Increased funding for public schools
- Access to quality education for low income families
- Creating more teacher incentives
- Sufficient staffing
- Access to special education
- Access to tutoring in public schools
- Access to counselling
- Access to mentorship programs
- Education on implicit bias and de-escalation techniques for police officers
- Access to culturally relevant activities
- Education on cultural diversity
- Access to libraries

- Access to weekend and summer programs
- Access to afterschool programs:
  - Recreation
  - Art programs
  - Pro-social activities vs. over-reliance on technology
  - Boys & Girls Club
  - YMCA
- Elimination of mandatory referrals for suspension and expulsion
- Use of positive reinforcement techniques
- Education on discrimination and racism

Employment-based training/programs

- Access to job training and career counselling
- Access to vocational training
- Access to paid employment trade schools

Family-based services/programs

- Access to single-parent family services
- Access to childcare support for single/working parents
- Access to services for young/new parents
- Family events
- Access to services for youth raised in foster care
- Access to domestic violence treatment services
- Home environment safety evaluation
- Access to services for children involved in parental bullying
- Outreach to non-compliant parents

Community-based services/programs

- Access to community-based organizations and resources
  - Recreation services for youth
  - Cultural activities
  - Improvement of cultural competences for officials, educators, and service agencies
- Community outreach

Rural communities-based services/programs

- Child psychiatry in rural areas

Age appropriate services/programs

Gender appropriate services/programs

R.E.D. Program

- Tackling overrepresentation of black and Latino youth in the justice system
- Addressing racial and ethnic disparities in justice system and agencies involved with youth

Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention measures and programs

- Focus on restorative services vs. institutionalized punitive punishment
- Focus on early prevention/intervention programs
- Focus on evidence based programs
- Focus on diversion programs
  - Keeping juveniles out of court system
  - Emphasis on the county-based programs
  - Investment in non-jail alternatives
- Access to restorative justice grants
- Gang/violence prevention programs
- Addressing human trafficking
- Addressing sexual exploitation

Re-entry programs

- Access to quality rehabilitation programs
- Access to quality transitional programs
- Access to housing, services and resources after release
- Community follow-up and support after incarceration

Inter-departmental collaboration between service providers

Quality assurance, data collection and reporting

Question 5: Please indicate below what you consider to be the very highest priority program type(s) to receive this limited funding on the scale of 1 to 5 (1 - the lowest priority, 5 - the highest priority).

Answered: 170 Skipped: 2

(Each respondent could select one "5," one "4," etc. such that no individual respondent was able to identify more than 5 total priority areas)

Question 5 (*continued*): The highest priority programs with the score of 5

Question 6: Are there specific programs you've found to be highly effective in assisting youth? If so, please use the space below to name them or describe them.

Answered: 130 Skipped: 42

Low income assistance services/programs

- Agencies assisting with supportive housing
- TAY Tunnel housing assistance
- SHORE housing through Ventura Housing Authority, with transferable Section 8 Vouchers
- Homeless services housing assistance for homeless families
- Interface Safe House
- Thirtymillionwords.org
- One Step a la Vez
- Children's Auxiliary to assist foster families with expenses not covered by foster care payments
- Transportation support
- Free counselling programs for youth
- School on Wheels tutoring for homeless youth
- Street outreach

Mental health services/programs

- Trauma focused cognitive behavioral therapy (TFCBT)
- Therapeutic Behavioral Skills Program (TBS)
- Behavioral Wellness
- Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT)
- Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)
- Ventura County Behavioral Health
- Individual and group counselling
- TAY Tunnel
- Thinking for a Change
- Pacific Clinics
- Animal/pet therapy
- Art therapy
- Play therapy
- Learning disabilities treatment
- Rape Trauma Services
- Resiliency Interventions for Sexual Exploitation
- Interface Youth Programs (Domestic Violence, Human Trafficking, Runway and Homeless Youth)
- Aggression Replacement Training (A.R.T.)
- Alternatives to Violence Project

Substance abuse services/programs

- Coast Valley Substance Abuse Treatment Center
- Daniel Bryant Youth & Family Treatment Center

- Drug Prevention and Treatment
- Juvenile Drug Court
- Residential drug rehabilitation programs
- Narcotics Anonymous
- Residential alcohol treatment
- Alcoholics Anonymous

School-based services/programs

- Coalition for Engaged Education and their community partners
- Literacy Programs
- School based mentorships
- Vocational education programs
- Project-based learning method
- Project Change
- 4-H
- Future Farmers of America (FFA) Program
- Each One Reach One
- Street Law
- Fresh Lifelines for Youth
- Reality Changers
- Public library programs
- Afterschool programs
  - Homework assistance
  - Self-expression programs
  - Boys & Girls Club
  - Girl and Boy Scouts
  - Youth Interactive
  - Model United Nations
  - Youth and Government
- Summer school programs
  - Upward Bound
  - EOP
  - EOPS
- YEP
- Some program where inmates visit schools
- Start Smart Teen Safety Program
- Assistance for children who cannot afford to play sports

Employment-based training/programs

- Job training and apprenticeships
- Job placement and interview training
- Summer youth employment programs
- Internship programs
- Volunteer programs
- Regional Occupational Program (ROP)

- YEP
- Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) Program

Family-based services/programs

- Early childhood programs
- Incredible Years
- Infant/Child Enrichment Services (ICES)
- Parent-Child Interaction Therapy
- Functional Family Therapy
- Parent Project
- Positive Parenting Program
- Family Service Agency
- Family Resource Centers
- Strengthening Families Program
- In-home parenting services
- Family home visiting
- Homebuilders
- Family Counseling
- Nurse-Family Partnership
- Thirtymillionwords.org
- Staying Connected with Your Teen
- Wraparound
- First 5
- Casa Pacifica
- Foster Youth
- YMCA
- Cal-Learn

Community-based services/programs

- Restoration Outreach Programs
- Church youth groups
- Community centers with arts, sports and leadership opportunities
- Los Compadre
- Fighting back: Santa Maria Valley
- Freedom 4 Youth
- Friday Night Live
- A Different Point of View
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
- Homeboy Ministries, LA
- Explorer Program

Rural communities-based services/programs

- Afterschool programs
- Mentorship for probationary youth
- Job training

- Job finding assistance
- Cultural field trips
- Restorative Justice
- MRT
- Rural Juvenile Probation Camp settings

Gender appropriate services/ programs

- Gender dysphoria clinic at VCMC

Culturally responsive programs

- National Latino Network (Casa de Esperanza)
  - Cara y Corazon
  - MEChA Xinachtli Mission
  - Joven Noble
- Circle Keepers
- One Step a la Vez
- Santa Maria Valley Youth & Family Center

Diversion programs

- Youth Courts
  - CADA's Teen Court Diversion Program
- Gang Resistance and Education Training (G.R.E.A.T.)
- Youth Restorative Intervention
- Centinela Youth Services
- Evening Reporting Center
- Juvenile Specialty Courts
- California PAL

Probation-based programs

- Sonoma County Probation Camp

Re-entry programs

- Any program in the community that fosters follow-up from treatment from facilities
- Restorative justice

Inter-departmental collaboration between service providers

Question 7: What is the most important systemic change you feel should be made to help youth succeed?

Answered: 151 Skipped: 21

Social system

- Addressing essential needs
  - Food, shelter, safety and security
- Addressing extreme poverty
  - Preventative measures for homelessness
- Education and job opportunities
- Affordable childcare services
- Affordable maternal and paternal leave
- Reassessing fines and fees

Mental health system

- Effective therapy services for youth and their families
- Mental health placement services
- Trauma informed services

Substance abuse

Education system

- Addressing the overall need for change in the education system
  - Robust K-12 education
  - Early education programs
  - Smaller class size
  - Better support system for students
  - Investment in public education
  - Free community college for all
  - Distributing funding towards teachers' training
  - Training teachers to motivate children to be critical thinkers and purposeful actors
  - Afterschool programs
  - Greater focus on creativity
  - Involvement in school clubs
  - Strength-Based learning and Growth Mindset
  - Individualized attention to each child and focus on strengths instead of weaknesses
  - Lunch programs
  - After school tutoring for all
  - Mentoring
  - More vocational training in high schools
- School interventions
  - Mental health interventions provided through schools
  - Skills to identify warning signs before the arrest and expulsion

    - Addressing disability issues more thoroughly and offering services to the whole families
- More funding for public libraries

Employment system

- Job training
- Job-ready programs, including return of driver's education
- Financial management education

Family support system

- Family assistance programs
    - Family strengthening programs
    - Parent education programs
    - Home intervention programs

Community support system

- Community involvement
    - Involvement through mentoring and supportive services
    - Cultural diversity services
    - Cultural and linguistic competencies
    - Ethnic studies at a young age
    - Cultural competence, proficiency and equity
    - Foster youth services
    - Education for children about community resources

Juvenile Justice system restructuring

- Focusing on prevention and alternatives to incarceration and detention
    - Restitution instead of imprisonment
    - Providing funding for non-jail alternatives
    - Restorative justice
    - Stopping the gang registration base
    - Providing opportunities instead of punishment
    - Juvenile diversion programs
    - Direct referrals from law enforcement to diversion
    - Greater consideration of the underlying causes and correlates
    - More time on rehabilitation vs. punitive measures
    - More effective use of de-escalation
- Changes in the governmental departments responsible for juveniles
- Increased financial support from Counties to Probation

Re-entry

- Respite housing
- Quality re-entry programs (education, employment resources and life skills, mental health and substance abuse treatment)
- More resources for rehabilitation

A paradigm shift in general approaches to young people

- Treating youth as children rather than criminals
- Valuing youth and providing community support for their growth
- Showing juveniles care and consideration
- Listening attentively
- Changing the belief that incarceration 'assists' youth
- Instilling positive behavioral reinforcement and outlook in behavioral treatment
- Avoiding labels
- Youth Centered Approach
- Acknowledging children's autonomy and knowledge
- Teaching youth about personal responsibility and self-reliance
- Un-normalizing violence

Racial and ethnic disparities

- Addressing institutional racism and systemic inequalities

Data collection and information sharing

- Information sharing across all relevant agencies and departments
  - 'One door' model – once you enter the system, receive access to all services
  - Simplifying the system
- Integrated and/or closely coordinated services across agencies
- Networked services

In addition

- More youth driven programs
- More funding streams for non-profit organizations have direct contact with youth
- More programs to help youth cope in society
- Civic and leadership training

SACJJDP State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

6.3: Public Listening Session

Summary of information obtained during public listening sessions held in Northern and Southern California

Main themes and recommended areas of focus

NOTE: *✓- How many times the item was mentioned*

Low income assistance

- Housing ✓✓✓
- Transitional housing ✓✓
- Social work ✓
- Financial aid ✓

Mental health

- Mental health (in general) ✓✓
- Trauma informed care ✓
- Mental health diversion ✓

Education

- Education (in general) ✓
- In-custody education ✓
- Implementation of transitional programs for college readiness ✓

Employment

- Job services ✓✓✓✓✓✓
  - Jobs for land-based cultures ✓
- Job training ✓✓
- Job placement ✓
- Internships with CBOs that provide youth with juvenile justice services ✓

Family-based initiatives, services and programs

- Engaging families ✓✓
- Family wraparound services ✓

Community-based initiatives, services and programs

- Investing in community-based organizations (CBO) ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓

- Funding CBOS that are ethnically and culturally aligned with population ✓
- Helping CBOs get evidence-based programs ✓
- Juvenile facility coordination with community ✓

R.E.D. ✓✓

Culturally-responsive initiatives, services and programs

- Cultural relevance ✓
- Investing in community resources ✓
- Moral traditions ✓

Alternatives to detention and placement

- Alternatives to detention ✓✓✓
- Alternatives to incarceration ✓✓
- Alternative placements ✓
- Resourcing communities to provide services instead of focusing on detention facilities as service providers ✓
- De-institutionalization of status offenders ✓✓
- Jail removal ✓
- Rehabilitation rather than punitive responses ✓
- Decriminalization ✓
    - Ticketing ✓

Diversion

- Diversion (in general) ✓✓✓
    - Arrest ✓
    - Police contact (in general) ✓
- Community efforts when dealing with diversion (vs. Law enforcement) ✓

Evidence-based practices ✓✓✓✓

Re-entry programs ✓✓✓✓✓✓

Aftercare services and programs ✓✓✓

State Plan

- Transparency ✓
- Ongoing feedback ✓
- Gap analysis and addressing identified gaps ✓
- More outreach using social media ✓
- Asking the public session attendees to share information ✓

- Need for SACJJDP to seek community input into the State Plan ✓

Systemic reform

- Systemic reform ✓
- Clear vision ✓
- Youth development vision ✓
- Data transparency ✓
- Holistic approach ✓
- Support for public defenders ✓
- Clear, concise and feasible court orders ✓

Intervention ✓

Other youth programs

- Programs that align with adolescent development ✓
- Providing youth-oriented services ✓

Agencies – needs

- Access to resources ✓
- Staff capacity ✓

Assessment

- Assessment upon initial contact is essential ✓

Networking

- Making connections ✓
  - Dialogue circles ✓
  - Cultural connections ✓
- Fostering positive relationships ✓

Notes from the Public Listening Sessions

The State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (SACJJDP) held two public listening sessions, one in Sacramento on June 21, 2017 and another in Los Angeles on September 20, 2017. The purpose of the meetings was to gather input from the communities across California about what they believe are the most important and effective interventions to help at-risk young people succeed - what works, what does not work and where are the gaps in service. The information is intended to help the SACJJDP develop its three-year state plan, and the strategies and policies that will direct spending under the federal Title II grant program.

Sacramento Listening Session Notes

There were 13 community members that provided input on personal experience and the services they deemed most needed. There was interactive discussion

between Committee members and the members of the public. Public input is listed in blue font, and where it occurred Committee member discussion follows in black font.

Jon Morse, Owner, JM consulting

- Mr. Morse would like help from SACJJDP in finding things that work to reduce recidivism

Daniel Mendoza – Youth Advocate, Motiving Individual Leadership for Public Advancement (MILPA)

- Mr. Mendoza stressed the need for cultural relevance, trauma informed care, evidence based practices, aftercare, investing in community resources, and engaging family.

Christian Franco – Intern, MILPA

- Mr. Franco addressed reentry needs, housing, transitional-housing, and job training and experience.

Dominique Nong – Senior Policy Associate, Children's Defense Fund

- Ms. Nong discussed SACJJDP providing transparency and ongoing feedback on State Plan draft. She also talked about the need for gap analysis, addressing identified gaps, alternatives to detention, investing in community-based organizations (CBO), helping CBOs get programs deemed evidence-based, and the need to support public defenders.

Member comments following Ms. Nong:

Chief Michelle Brown inquired about the program purpose areas (PPA) that Ms. Nong is referring to. Ms. Nong responded alternatives to incarceration, community-based programs and services and systemic reform. Dr. B. J. Davis inquired about gaps in service and are there any that Ms. Nong has identified or thinks that SACJJDP should focus on. Ms. Nong replied that the current gap relates to alternative placements and alternatives to detention and resourcing communities to provide those services rather than focusing on detention facilities to do so.

Israel Villa – Program Assistant, MILPA

- Mr. Villa talked about reentry, family wrap around services, education, job training, job placement, alternatives to detention, deinstitutionalizations of status offenders, jail removal, diversion, the need to invest in CBOs, and the need to do more outreach on state plan development perhaps using social media.

Member comments following Mr. Villa:

Chair Rachel Rios asked for suggestions about how SACJJDP can do better outreach. Mr. Villa replied social media and asking those who regularly attend public sessions to share the information.

Anthony Trevino – Intern, MILPA

- Mr. Trevino talked about aftercare, reentry, deinstitutionalization of status offenders, and transitional housing.

Member comments following Mr. Trevino:

Dr. Davis inquired about Mr. Trevino's pre-release prep and what services he received, either from state or family, upon release from the detention facility. Mr. Trevino replied that resources were limited that and there was no direct referral to CBOs that could assist with reentry

Erica Webster – Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

- Ms. Webster talked about the need to invest in community/CBOs, juvenile facility coordination with community, housing, employment, reentry, Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities (R.E.D.), the need for SACJJDP continue to seek community input into State Plan, and the provision of seed money to CBOs such as ARC

Tre Vasquez – Middle School Restorative Justice Manager, Restorative Resources

- Mr. Vasquez stressed the important to not only focus on evidence-based outcomes, but understanding that simply making connections is also important, i.e., dialogue circles, cultural connections, moral traditions, and fostering positive relationships, and job creation – specifically, jobs tied to the land for land-based cultures.

Member comments following Mr. Vasquez

Chief Susan Manheimmer commented that working with middle school age youth is vital because they're looking for answers at that age and it's important that they get them from people who have relevance and understanding.

Michael Rizo – Advocate, Anti-Recidivism Coalition (ARC)

- Mr. Rizo discussed the need for education in custody, and implementing a transition program for college readiness.

Daniel Silva – Founder, Self-Awareness and Recovery (SAR)

- Mr. Silva stressed diversion, intervention, CBO programs, reentry, recovery programs, housing, and jobs.

Member comments following Mr. Silva

Chair Rios stated that Mr. Silva and Victor Malin did a presentation for Sac County Probaiton youth and invited Mr. Silva to speak to some of the needs of youth entering probation. Mr. Silva stressed the importance of housing and jobs and the need to be more help for youth coming out of juvenile hall, DJJ and prisons. Dr. Davis asked Daniel Mendoza about what worked for him during his incarceration and reentry. Mr. Mendoza said during incarceration it was the rehabilitative rather than punitive response to his offense that made the

difference and during reentry teachers and community providers/volunteers first made sure his basic needs were met and he was placed a family and then enrolled in college – that combination of services contributed to his ability to stay out of the system. Mr. Ramon Leija stated the need for a list to identify service-providing CBOs, and added that identifying as a formerly-incarcerated youth that was tried as an adult makes it hard to find gainful employment. Chair Rios mentioned an initiative that was introduced that would omit the formerly incarcerated question from job applications, but she did not know the status of the initiative. Chief Manheimmer discussed Community Corrections Partnerships (CCP) funds in San Mateo County that are mandated for reentry plans that happen in the jails and suggested that the same would be beneficial in the juvenile system. Kathleen Howard said all 58 counties have CCPs as outlined in statute, and each county is responsible for determining how to use those funds to meet local needs, and that these listening sessions will help in determining priorities for the use of Title II money.

Sue Burrell – Policy and Training Director, Pacific Juvenile Defender Center

- Ms. Burrell talked about Juvenile defense funding, mental health diversion, funding CBOs that are ethnically and culturally aligned with population, the need for programs that align with adolescent development, and the need for clear, concise and feasible court orders.

Member comments following Ms. Burrell

Chair Rios discussed mental health diagnoses and services for system-involved youth, and adolescent behavior differentiating it from criminal behavior. Chief Manheimmer asked Ms. Burrell for an example of an adolescent development type of outcome and Ms. Burrell referenced a book published by the National Academy of Sciences, Reforming Juvenile Justice – An Adolescent Development Approach that defines four core things that are important for healthy adolescent development. Chief Brown commented on Ms. Burrell's suggestion for concise and feasible court orders and stated that it is being talked about at the national level and said she had participated in and exercise recently at the CJJ conference in DC. Chief Brown found that the exercise's sample court orders would have been difficult for adolescents, and perhaps even parents, to comply with. Chief Brown stated she is not sure how this issue could be addressed with Title II funds, but stated it is an important issue. Dr. Davis commended Ms. Burrell for talking about the significance of adolescent development as it relates to criminal misconduct and how the consideration of this is an important factor in the goal of reducing juvenile recidivism.

Raymond Garcia – Intern, ARC

- Mr. Garcia talked about the need to support CBOs that provide youth with the necessary juvenile justice services.

Victor Malin - Sacramento Director, ARC

- Mr. Malin stated the need for more funding for CBOs, and employment services and opportunity such as internships with CBOs that provided youth juvenile justice services.

Member comments following Mr. Malin

Chair Rios asked Mr. Malin to provide the SACJJDP with a summary of what the ARC does. Mr. Malin described ARC as a non-profit organization based out of Los Angeles that provides a pro-social circles and services for formerly incarcerated young men and women, and advocates for fairer criminal justice policies.

Los Angeles Listening Session Notes

There were four community members that provided input in Los Angeles. The discussion was narrative in nature and less interactive than the session in Sacramento. The following community members talked about their experiences with a focus on the services that their agencies provide.

Roy Brown, Officer, Santa Monica Police Department, Youth services

- Officer Brown stated that assessment upon initial contact is essential, as well as providing youth-oriented services. Santa Monica Police Department uses YASI Youth Assessment Screening Instrument. Most young people the department encounters are the first-time offenders. Often, families want to engage. The biggest issue the department is facing is access to resources and staff capacity. They saw 45 kids since the program started.

Kim McGill, Organizer, Youth Justice System

- The Youth Justice System works with formerly incarcerated people. Ms. McGill expressed that a clear vision is lacking in California. It is the state with the largest jail system in the world, largest sheriff's departments, juvenile halls, etc. Ms. McGill urged for a youth development vision in California. Currently, most resources are going to the Law Enforcement, as opposed to community operated organizations. In addition, a youth development department does not exist in LA. Ms. McGill also calls for the programs focusing on data transparency; diversion (not just arrest but police contact), decriminalization (ticketing was vicious), de-incarceration, etc. State wide youth development and regional wide youth development departments handle diversion and housing for people, but also provide everything young people need.

Detective Kim, City of Gardena Police Department, Los Angeles County

- Dr. Kim compared the situation in Gardena to the situation in Santa Monica – the department brings in the high-risk youth and divert them to the program, where social workers assess the youth. Mr. Kim expressed that the City of Gardena needs better mental health assistance, financial aid, social work, and overall, a holistic approach. Mr. Kim asked SACJJDP about grants available to cities such as Gardena. Mr. Kim also asked if there is a statutory method to bring kids into the programs.

Jessica Ellis, Centinela Youth Services

- Ms. Ellis explained the work of the agency, specializing in diversion, and shared their success stories and impressive results in lowering the rates of recidivism. She advised SACJJDP to focus on efforts to keep the kids out of the system and minimize all contact with the system and law enforcement. Ms. Ellis also encourage community efforts when dealing with diversion vs. Law Enforcement. Ms. Ellis praised Title II, which holds the grantees accountable but also allows them to be creative.

This page left intentionally blank

6.4: Public comment: The Chief Probation Officers of California

Chief Probation Officers of California

Officers

President
Chief Mary Butler
Napa County

President Elect
Chief Jim Salio
San Luis Obispo County

Treasurer
Chief Terri McDonald
Los Angeles County

Secretary
Chief Stephanie James
San Joaquin County

Legislative Chair
Chief John Keene
San Mateo County

Past Presidents
Chief Steve Bordin
Butte County

Chief Michael Daly
Marin County

Chief Mark Varela
Ventura County

Chief Mark J. Bonini
Amador County

Bay Region Chair
Chief R. Ted Baraan
San Benito County

Central Region Chair
Chief Kelly Zuniga
Kings County

North Region Chair
Chief Jeffrey Bosworth
Sierra County

Sacramento Region Chair
Chief Marshall Hopper
Placer County

South Region Chair
Chief Steven J. Sentman
Orange County

Executive Director
Karen A. Pank

Deputy Director
Rosemary Lamb McCool

Legislative Director
Danielle Sanchez

August 25, 2017

Mary Jolls
Deputy Director
Corrections Programs and Grant Planning Division
Board of State and Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833

Subject: Title II Grant Public Comments

Dear Ms. Jolls,

The Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) wishes to submit our comments below in response to your request for comment for strategies to be included in California's Title II grant application to the federal government. CPOC is a statewide association representing California's 59 Probation Chiefs who are responsible for the supervision and rehabilitation of approximately 400,000 juvenile and adult offenders.

The purpose of Title II grants mirror probation's fundamental mission which is, in part, to divert at-risk youth from entry and further penetration into the juvenile justice system. When successful, the entire community benefits from the work of probation, not just the youth and his or her family. During the most recent funding cycle four probation departments received Title II grant awards which provided funding for activities such as aftercare and reentry as well as alternatives to detention.

For the next four-year cycle one of the core areas CPOC would like to see California's Title II grant emphasize is alternatives to detention. CPOC believes funding for these alternatives should be evidenced-based and broad allowing grantees to develop strategies within this scope which are responsive to the unique characteristics and needs of their local youth. Below we provide more specifics on our proposal.

> *Alternatives to Detention* – Programs funded in this area would focus on expanding programming and services for youth who are more appropriately served in the community. Activities and/or programs funded would include, but not be limited to: utilization of assessment tools to determine appropriate supervision/program needs; alternative to detention programs in the community such as restorative justice programs; family and youth engagement; mental health and/or substance use services; gender specific services; and combatting racial and ethnic disparities.

Chief Probation Officers of California
1415 L Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 447-2762 • Fax (916) 442-0850