



**CALIFORNIA
JUVENILE JUSTICE
DATA WORKING GROUP**

REBUILDING CALIFORNIA'S JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SYSTEM:

**Recommendations to Improve Data Collection,
Performance Measures and Outcomes for
California Youth**

**REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
January 2016**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This page intentionally left blank.

Juvenile Justice Data Working Group

REBUILDING CALIFORNIA'S JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA SYSTEM: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PART I: BACKGROUND

The Need to Rebuild California's Juvenile Justice Data System

Increasingly across the nation, state and local juvenile justice systems are expanding data collection capacity to support effective and evidence-based practices and to promote positive outcomes for justice-involved youth. Several factors help to explain this growth of interest in data-driven approaches to juvenile justice, including:

- *The need for evidence to guide the adoption of practices that are safe, effective and unbiased.*
- *The need to control justice system costs by deploying cost-effective alternatives to incarceration.*
- *An expanding national body of research on adolescent development that is changing federal and state juvenile justice laws and practices.*
- *Recognition that the juvenile justice system must have adequate capacity to document youth outcomes if its rehabilitative goals are to be met.*

Regrettably, California has allowed its state-level juvenile justice data systems to fall into a pattern of long-term decline. The technology supporting the state's main juvenile justice data bank is antiquated and cannot be upgraded. There is no state-level capacity to track many important youth outcomes including recidivism. California's state juvenile justice data banks are split between different agencies and are not integrated with county-level data systems. An overarching problem is that California has failed to make any significant state investment in modernizing its juvenile justice data capacity for more than two decades. While state data systems in other child-serving realms—like education and child welfare—have benefitted from major upgrades to meet contemporary needs, this has not been the case for a California juvenile justice system that processes more than 100,000 children each year.

Legislative Mandate

The California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (Working Group) was established by statute enacted in 2014 (Assembly Bill 1468) and was attached to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). The main purpose of the Working Group is to recommend "...options for improving interagency coordination, modernization and upgrading of state and local juvenile justice data and information systems." By statute the Working Group was mandated to do the following:

- *Analyze the capacities and limitations of data systems in current use, including a review of other-state systems having elements worthy of replication in California;*
- *Identify changes to improve the capacity and utility of juvenile justice caseload and outcome data in California, and identify changes in data collection and reporting responsibilities of agencies, departments and providers affected;*
- *Produce recommendations for a web-based statewide juvenile justice clearinghouse;*
- *Produce a report to the BSCC Board by April 2015 on recommendations for improving reporting requirements for the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) and Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) grant programs; and*
- *Produce a Final Report to the Legislature by January 2016 with its analysis and recommendations for comprehensive juvenile justice data system improvement.*

Relation to the “Grants Report”. This Final Report reflects more than a year of meetings, research and deliberation by the Working Group. This is the Working Group’s second mandated report. In April 2015, the Working Group submitted a separate report to the BSCC Board on recommendations to improve reporting requirements for the YOBG and JJCPA grant programs (the “Grants Report”). In a June 2015 meeting, the BSCC Board deferred action on those recommendations pending further inquiry into questions about cost and workload impact on counties, and that inquiry is ongoing. While there is overlap with the issues covered in the Grants Report, this Final Report is meant to be a stand-alone document. It does not reiterate the recommendations of the Grants Report.

Membership

Membership in the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group is governed by statute. Assembly Bill (AB) 1468 (Statutes of 2014) includes a list of agencies or associations to be represented on the Working Group. Beyond the prescriptive list of members, BSCC retained discretion under the enabling law to add representatives deemed appropriate by the Board. Soon after the adoption of AB1468, BSCC Board Member David Steinhart was selected as Chair of the Working Group, and Stanislaus Chief Probation Officer Jill Silva was named as Vice Chair. In September 2014, the BSCC Board approved a thirteen member Working Group as shown in Table 1.

Scope of Review

Over nine meetings the Working Group conducted an extensive review of the issues, topics and needs referenced in its enabling legislation. Review tasks included:

- **Materials review.** The Working Group consulted a multitude of studies, reports and collateral materials from California, other-state and national sources. It heard presentations from state agencies that manage juvenile justice and child welfare data systems in California and from other professional and stakeholder organizations.
- **Gap analysis and review of other-state systems.** A gap analysis was conducted to identify systems and technologies in current use in California and known limitations. Also examined were data systems and models from other states, as well as data models advanced by national organizations. The results and findings from these reviews are laid out in the full report.
- **Data elements scan.** The Working Group produced an inventory of all data elements and variables considered useful for a “perfect” juvenile justice data system. The goal was to identify the total universe of data points having current or future utility in an upgraded system. The data scan is summarized in the report Appendix.

- **County Probation Survey.** In order to assess how upgrades to state data capacity would impact 58 different county-level data systems, the Working Group conducted a survey of county probation departments. The survey asked counties to describe their local juvenile justice data systems including costs, replacement plans and linkages with other agencies. The survey also asked for comments on county experience in meeting state data reporting requirements. The survey was conducted in September 2015 in cooperation with the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC). Forty-five probation departments submitted responses. Survey results are summarized in the report Appendix.

Table 1

Juvenile Justice Data Working Group

1. David Steinhart, (Chair) - BSCC Board and Director, Commonweal Juvenile Justice Program
2. Jill Silva (Vice Chair) - Chief Probation Officer, Stanislaus County
3. Wayne Babby - Deputy Director, Office of Research, California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation
4. Julie Basco - Chief, Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis, California Department of Justice
5. Sue Burrell - Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center
6. Mike Ertola - BSCC Board and Chief Probation Officer, Nevada County
7. The Honorable Donna Groman - Los Angeles County Superior Court, Juvenile Division
8. Denise Herz, Ph.D. - Director, School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics, Cal State University LA
9. Sandra McBrayer - Chair, State Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention
10. Laura Ridolfi - Director of Policy, W. Haywood Burns Institute
11. Mike Roddy - Executive Officer, San Diego County Superior Court
12. Jim Salio - Chief Probation Officer, San Luis Obispo County
13. Dorothy Thrush - Chief Operations Officer, Public Safety Group, Chief Administrative Office. San Diego County

PART II: A CURRENT ASSESSMENT OF CALIFORNIA’S JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING CAPACITY

A. Description of the Current System

1. Local juvenile justice data systems and requirements

The California juvenile justice system is largely a locally based system. Probation departments and courts in 58 counties have primary responsibility for juvenile justice case processing—from initial referral (arrest) to petition filing, detention, adjudication and dispositions including placement, confinement and probation supervision. Most of California’s juvenile justice confinement capacity is at the local level. To manage local caseloads and facilities, local agencies—including law enforcement, probation, courts and nonprofit service providers—utilize their own information systems. These information systems have been developed and paid for by counties using different vendors and diverse technology. The specifications and capacities of these local juvenile justice information systems vary based on factors including size of the caseload served and the age and design of the system in use. Below are listed additional insights into these local systems as provided by the Probation Survey conducted for this report:

- *Most local data systems were developed by outside vendors, and counties depend on contracted services with vendors to maintain these systems.*
- *Local juvenile justice data systems, by and large, are not integrated with data systems of other local youth service agencies (e.g., education) or with other-county data systems.*
- *Two-thirds of respondent counties do not track or monitor recidivism events by juveniles based on a departmental definition of recidivism.*
- *Twenty-nine (29) percent of respondents have systems that are 5 to 10 years old and another 38 percent operate systems more than 10 years old. Forty-two (42) percent have plans to replace current data systems.*

Counties are mandated by state law to meet specific state data collection and reporting requirements. Under Penal Code Sections 13010-12012.5, counties must submit juvenile justice processing and outcome data to the California Department of Justice. Under other state requirements, probation departments must also submit reports on uses of YOBG and JJCPA grant funds and on local juvenile facility populations to BSCC.

2. State level juvenile justice data systems

California Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ operates the state’s primary juvenile justice data bank. This data bank is known as the Juvenile Justice Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). The JCPSS collects individual case data entered by county probation departments. Data elements captured by JCPSS include major processing events such as diversion, petitions filed by offense, probation dispositions, court dispositions and dispositions, direct files and dispositions of minors in adult criminal courts. JCPSS has major limitations described at multiple points in this report. DOJ also collects and publishes juvenile arrest data reported by local law enforcement agencies.

Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). BSCC has a broad statutory mandate to collect relevant data on criminal and juvenile justice systems in California. BSCC collects aggregate monthly data on populations in county-operated juvenile justice facilities (juvenile halls, probation camps and ranches) for its Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS). The JDPS offers a limited range of information on the movements and characteristics of these locally detained or committed youth. BSCC also collects county-level data on juvenile justice populations served under the YOBG and JJCPA grant programs.

California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR), Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). CDCR’s Research Division collects and publishes data on inmates in state youth correctional facilities. Under legislative realignment reforms, the inmate population at DJJ has declined considerably over the years, dropping to a 2015 level of about 700 juveniles and young adults. Historically, DJJ (as the California Youth Authority) collected and reported local juvenile facility data but that responsibility was shifted in 1995 to the state Board of Corrections (now, BSCC).

B. Gap analysis

The Working Group identified critical deficiencies in the state's overall capacity to collect, analyze and report juvenile justice system data. In brief summary the gap analysis found:

- 1. Inability to track important case and outcome information on a comprehensive statewide basis.** The JCPSS data repository maintained by the DOJ has severe shortcomings. Some important juvenile justice processing events are not collected through JCPSS, and the system cannot be upgraded to capture additional data. There is no statewide capacity to track important outcomes like recidivism. As presently configured, JCPSS does not support program evaluation or the comprehensive assessment of key policy reforms, such juvenile justice realignment.
- 2. Outdated technology.** The JCPSS became operational at DOJ in 2002. By modern standards, this is an antiquated information system. It is essentially “non-expandable.” Recommendation 1 addresses the need to replace this outdated technology.
- 3. Limits of the facility data reported to BSCC; the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey.** BSCC collects data from county probation departments on youth confined in local juvenile halls and probation camps or ranches. The results are posted online in quarterly Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) reports. This is the state's only central source of information on children confined in local juvenile justice facilities. JDPS reports are based on aggregate (not individual) data, and many important measures and data elements (such as race/ethnicity and detailed offense information) are not presently included.
- 4. Fracturing of data collection and reporting responsibilities among different state agencies.** Lacking a dedicated state juvenile justice agency, California's juvenile justice data banks are dispersed among different state agencies. Researchers and analysts seeking to compose a coherent juvenile justice profile or picture need to jump between websites of different agencies. The information gleaned from this multi-site search may be incomplete or incompatible across systems. Economies of scale might well be achieved by consolidating these scattered juvenile justice data operations.
- 5. Disparity of data capacity compared to other disciplines, lack of investment in juvenile justice.** Other state youth serving departments or realms in California have improved the capacity and utility of the data needed to support their operations. Statewide data and case management systems at both the Department of Education and the Department of Social Services have been modernized and upgraded by supporting state appropriations. By contrast, no significant state investment or appropriation to upgrade juvenile justice data capacity has been made in recent history.
- 6. Lack of performance outcome measures for the juvenile justice system.** California lacks standard and statewide outcome performance outcome measures for the juvenile justice system. An example referenced repeatedly in this report is the lack of any standard or statewide performance outcome measure for recidivism.
- 7. Transparency and availability of statewide juvenile justice information** California has no central website or data clearinghouse for retrieval of juvenile justice program, caseload, facility or performance outcome information. Recommendation 5 addresses this need as required by the enabling legislation for the Working Group.

C. Comparison to other states

The Working Group’s enabling law requires it to examine juvenile justice data systems in other states “having elements worthy of replication in California.” The full report offers an extensive review of data capacities, technologies and design found in other states. Positive features or elements of other state systems include:

- 1. *Integrated case management data systems.*** Some states (for example—Virginia, Pennsylvania and Arizona) have moved well beyond California by designing and using statewide juvenile justice case-management systems and networks.
- 2. *Extensive tracking of case processing and outcome data.*** Florida’s Department of Justice collects extensive data on every juvenile referral, prosecution, diversion and placement made in that state. Their system captures and reports outcome data for each public or private placement including recidivism and cost-per-case outcome measures for each placement. Texas provides another example of a state juvenile justice data system that collects more extensive case-level data than California.
- 3. *Recidivism routinely measured and reported.*** In state after state examined by the Working Group, we found routine collection and reporting of recidivism outcomes for children at multiple stages of supervision and placement. The Council of State Governments Justice Center found in a 2015 survey that 39 of 50 states routinely track juvenile recidivism at some level of detail, though California is not among them.
- 4. *Capacity to produce specialized studies and reports.*** Other states were also distinguished from California by a state-level capacity to generate specialized studies or reports on juvenile justice populations, practices and reforms. An example cited in the full report is the 2015 Texas *Closer to Home* study analyzing performance outcomes (including recidivism) by county under that state’s juvenile justice realignment reform. County probation departments in Texas have been using that performance outcome data to adjust programs in order to improve local results.
- 5. *Cost-based system performance and accountability models.*** Washington State is notable for its approach to the evaluation and funding of juvenile justice programs. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), an independent, non-partisan research arm of the state legislature, applies a cost-based accountability model that, by law, requires state-funded corrections programs to be evaluated based on their cost and performance. In a parallel effort, over 20 states are receiving technical assistance through the Pew-McArthur Results First Initiative that seeks to replicate WSIPP justice system cost accountability model more widely.
- 6. *State websites or clearinghouses providing comprehensive juvenile justice information.*** Georgia and Florida exemplify states having central state websites providing a wealth of juvenile justice processing and outcome information in user friendly formats.
- 7. *Limits of other-state models.*** While other states may have outpaced California with regard to the data system elements and examples described above, it is also true that many states are still lagging in their capacity to track outcomes for justice system youth.

D. Policy choices for California

As noted earlier, California has invested in the modernization of data systems in other child serving realms, including welfare and education, but not juvenile justice. We are at a crossroad where policymakers and system stakeholders need to make important decisions about how we support the effectiveness of what we collectively call the California juvenile justice system. Will we continue to support a minimal state-level data capacity that relies on ancient technology and lacks the flexibility and capacity to track standard performance indicators such as recidivism? Will we continue to develop state-funded programs and substantive law in the absence of comprehensive statewide data on the affected populations? Or should we take steps to upgrade our state level data capacity, with the requisite investment in modern technology? To respond to these questions and challenges, the Working Group offers six major recommendations in the following pages of this report.

PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS

Scope of the recommendations. A report recommending remedies for every problem encountered could conceivably run hundreds of pages while prospectively incurring massive implementation costs. The Working Group thus determined to narrow its approach and to come up with recommendations or changes that meet the following general criteria:

- *Changes that are considered essential to support the basic data collection, monitoring and performance measurement needs of the total state-local juvenile justice system.*
- *Changes that can be accomplished within a reasonable short to medium time frame, considered to be one to five years.*
- *Changes that make efficient use of resources.*

Overall feasibility. Concerns related to the cost of upgrades were taken into account as was the need for replacement technology to remain compatible (as feasible) with existing county data systems. In sum, the recommendations in this report fall well short of suggesting that local data systems now in use be scrapped in favor of a new and seamlessly interfacing state-local data network. Nor does this report propose creating a statewide case management system to replace the management systems now in place at the county level. Instead, the recommendations are oriented toward rebuilding the state's juvenile justice data capacity so that it can properly document juvenile justice events and outcomes while supporting informed program and policy development.

The cost of modernization. There is no escaping the conclusion that replacing the state's outmoded juvenile justice data repository (Recommendation 1) will require an investment of state funds. Other recommendations offered in this report are also cost-dependent. Modernization costs have grown over the 20-plus years that the state has failed to invest in updating California's juvenile justice data capacity. If investment continues to be deferred, those costs will predictably rise as the system continues to age toward obsolescence or breakdown. Some options for the resources needed to rebuild California's juvenile justice data system are described at the end of the report.

Implementation strategy. The last recommendation outlines an implementation plan and strategy. The Working Group considered the history of the last major state report that recommended an overhaul of the state's juvenile justice data system. That was the 2009 *Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan* issued by the California State Juvenile Justice Commission. None of the recommendations of that report were ever implemented, in large part

because no responsible entity was ever tasked with implementation responsibility. The Working Group now concludes that a responsible body or task force must be authorized to take the lead on implementation.

NOTE: THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FINAL REPORT HAVE BEEN ABRIDGED AND CONDENSED FOR THIS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY. Please consult the full report for the text of each recommendation and for important collateral points in the “rationale and discussion” statements that follow each recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 1: REPLACE THE JUVENILE COURT AND PROBATION STATISTICAL SYSTEM, CURRENTLY HOUSED AT THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

California’s Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS)—the state’s primary information system for juvenile justice case processing and outcomes—is based on old technology and lacks sufficient capacity and flexibility to capture the range of data needed for effective analysis and management of the juvenile justice system in California today. The following changes are recommended to upgrade and modernize California’s juvenile justice data capacity:

- California should take immediate steps to plan and fund the replacement of this outdated system, with a goal of producing plans, specifications and costs and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a modernized data system by January of 2018.
- The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) should have primary responsibility for developing the JCPSS replacement plan, in concert with the BSCC-linked implementation body described in Recommendation 6.
- The Legislature and the Governor should identify and set aside the resources that will be needed both to plan and fund the replacement data system.
- The JCPSS upgrade and replacement plan for California should be guided by the following factors or principles:
 - *Data collection, not case management.* The state data system will serve the same essential purpose as the retired system as a juvenile justice data repository that collects, stores and makes available data on juvenile justice caseloads and outcomes. While an integrated juvenile justice state-local case management system is viewed as a laudable long term goal, it is not recommended at this time.
 - *Compatible with existing county systems.* The new juvenile court and probation information system should be compatible, to the extent feasible, with existing local systems and capacity.
 - *Expanded data elements.* The new juvenile court and probation information system should be developed with the capacity to collect, track and report an expanded set of data elements. Priority consideration should be given to a capacity to collect information in areas that are presently deficient such as: diversion, probation violations, transfers to adult court and recidivism.
 - *Unique identifiers.* The new system should be developed with new specifications as to the identifier used for each individual whose information is entered. The substitution of biometric identifiers requiring fingerprinting, DNA samples or other bio-markers taken

from a broad child and youth referral population is not recommended for reasons described in the full report.

- *Standard definitions.* The new system must be developed with standardized definitions for the data elements that are entered into the system.
- *Cost considerations.* Planners must include not only the development costs of the replacement state system but also ongoing maintenance costs to keep the system operational over time. Changes in local systems that are needed to link to a replacement state repository should also be identified in the cost analysis.

Rationale/ Discussion for Recommendation 1 (excerpted from the full report):

- JCPSS is ready to be retired in favor of a more modern, expandable and useful technology supporting a wider range of data and outcome monitoring needs.
- BSCC is the appropriate state agency to take charge of the development effort, as explained fully in the rationale statement for this recommendation in the full report.
- The planning group that develops the specifications for the replacement system must take into account how the new system will interface with existing county data systems. Some counties (as confirmed by the Probation Survey) may need assistance or incentives to upgrade older or lower-capacity data systems.
- A date of January 1, 2018 is referenced as a target date for issuance of an RFP that would include plans, specifications and costs for the replacement system. This is intended to allow for adequate planning and development time.

RECOMMENDATION 2: CONSOLIDATE ALL STATE-LEVEL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES INTO A SINGLE STATE AGENCY.

At present, state-level juvenile justice data is dispersed between different state agencies including the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR), Division of Juvenile Justice. State-level juvenile justice data collection should be consolidated, centralized and managed by BSCC.

- In light of its statutory mission and mandates on the collection justice system data, and given its already extensive portfolio of juvenile justice grants, programs and facility regulations, BSCC is viewed as the logical agency-of-choice for the consolidation of these data and information responsibilities.
- DOJ would continue to collect statewide law enforcement data, including juvenile arrest data, and would continue for the time being to publish the annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report in cooperation with BSCC.
- CDCR's Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) would continue to collect and report data on its inmate population, with a goal of sharing and incorporating DJJ data into a BSCC-managed website or clearinghouse of statewide juvenile justice information.

- BSCC would continue to collect juvenile justice facility data for a revised and improved Juvenile Detention Profile Survey as recommended further below, and will retain responsibility for annual JJCPA and YOYG reports.
- The shift of these responsibilities to BSCC will require an adequate appropriation of state funds to support the staffing and management of consolidated data operations.

Rationale/discussion for Recommendation 2 (excerpted from the full report):

- Unlike many other states, California does not have a dedicated state Department of Juvenile Justice with statewide program and policy oversight. The state agency having the biggest portfolio of juvenile justice functions is BSCC. Those functions include standards and inspections of local juvenile facilities, administration of state-local juvenile justice grants, the federally mandated State Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice and training standards for probation officers. BSCC also operates under a broad mission statement to collect juvenile and criminal justice data. Given these existing functions and responsibilities, BSCC emerges as the most appropriate agency to serve as the state headquarters for juvenile justice data.
- Stakeholders represented in the Working Group, including DOJ, concluded that BSCC is the appropriate state agency to assume global responsibility for managing the replacement Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) and for related juvenile justice data collection and reporting functions. Exceptions are that DOJ would continue to produce annual *Juvenile Justice in California* reports and DJJ would continue to collect and report data on its youth inmate population.
- The recommendation is made on the assumption and condition that adequate state resources be made available to BSCC to support the data development and other responsibilities recommended for consolidation at BSCC.

RECOMMENDATION 3: EXPAND THE RANGE OF CASELOAD AND OUTCOME DATA COLLECTED AND REPORTED AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS.

California should expand the type and detail of juvenile justice caseload and performance outcome data that are collected and reported to the central state database to include key elements now omitted from the state database.

- The expanded list of additional data elements should be further defined by a BSCC stakeholder and expert group that takes into account the goals and needs to be served by the additional data as well as the workload or cost for state/local agencies.
- Specific juvenile justice processing and outcome data points for priority consideration are listed under this recommendation in the full text of the report.
- Any plan to expand the universe of juvenile justice data to be collected and reported to the state must take into account and provide sufficient resources or incentives to support county-level compliance and compatibility with the new requirements.

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 3 (excerpted from the full report):

- The California juvenile justice system has evolved over years into a more complex system with higher demand for information supporting the development of evidence-based

practices, the impact of new sentencing laws and the assessment of gender and racial equality in the justice system. More—not less—information is needed to support program and policy development in a modern juvenile justice age.

- The new state data system must have the capacity—not only to track additionally desired data elements—but also to be able to support analytical reports on juvenile justice issues, trends and outcomes for policy and budget decision-makers.
- Recidivism is the gold standard by which justice programs are normally measured or evaluated. California presently lacks a statewide capacity to collect or report standard juvenile justice recidivism data. The new, replacement system should include the capacity to monitor and report recidivism based on standard definitions.
- Wellness outcome measures are important adjunctive indicators of juvenile justice program and intervention success. The Working Group expressed a high degree of interest in developing a capacity to track outcomes for justice system youth in the areas of education, employment, health and child welfare among others. Conceivably some effort could be made to integrate the replacement JCPSS data system with newly designed state education and child welfare data banks.

RECOMMENDATION 4: MAKE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION PROFILE SURVEY, MANAGED BY THE BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS.

California needs to improve the level and quality of data collected on county-level juvenile justice facilities including juvenile halls, probation camps and ranches and other alternative dispositions for juvenile offenders. The Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) now managed by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) should be revised and upgraded.

- BSCC should convene an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) to assume responsibility for reviewing and recommending upgrades to the JDPS.
- The new survey or report must be grounded in standard definitions of the facility data elements that counties are to report to BSCC.
- In revising the JDPS, the following issues and needs should be addressed:
 - Capacity to collect additional detail on facility admissions by offense and other status information on detained and committed youth;
 - Include race/ethnicity and age detail;
 - Include mental health, education and welfare status using standard definitions;
 - Consider adding information to support analysis of relevant policy and practice concerns such as the use of solitary confinement; and
 - Reduce delays between county submission of data and issuance of JDPS reports.

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 4 (excerpted from the full report):

- The deficiencies of the JDPS as now produced are summarized at multiple points in the report.

- This task is scheduled for immediate implementation via a BSCC ESC. It is considered “doable” internally at BSCC within a shorter time frame than other recommendations assigned to an implementation task force.
- The Working Group poses two questions for further consideration by policymakers and stakeholders seeking to improve the JDPS including:
 - Should the JDPS be merged into a revised JCPSS data system that is now recommended for development and management by BSCC?
 - Should the JDPS (at present authorized by BSCC regulations) be mandated in legislation or statutory changes that may be adopted in order to implement the other recommendations of this report?

RECOMMENDATION 5: ESTABLISH A WEB-BASED CALIFORNIA JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA CLEARINGHOUSE.

California needs to improve stakeholder and citizen access to information on the operations, costs, outcomes and effectiveness of the California juvenile justice system. In response to the Assembly Bill 1468 (Statutes of 2014) mandate to address this need, California should establish a web-based California Juvenile Justice Data Clearinghouse.

- The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) should have the responsibility for design and development of the Juvenile Justice Data Clearinghouse. The upgraded website should be maintained by BSCC or outsourced to be hosted and managed by a qualified university department under contract with BSCC. Based on resources made available, the new state juvenile justice clearinghouse should be up and running, at least in a starter format, by July 1, 2017.
- The Clearinghouse should include the following minimum features:
 - General information on the setup and functions of the California juvenile justice system so that laypersons can understand how it works.
 - Access to caseload and outcome data drawn from JCPSS, the revised Juvenile Detention Profile Survey and other sources (including DOJ juvenile arrest data).
 - Access to information in the form of interactive web-based technology that allows queries to be submitted and answered for specific processing and outcome points.
 - Graphic displays on juvenile justice trends and other key data to enhance the comprehension and utility of the information provided through the clearinghouse.
- The Clearinghouse will serve the informational needs of a wide audience including policymakers, system professionals, researchers, parents, youth and others.

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 5 (excerpted from the full report):

- This recommendation derives from the Assembly Bill 1468 (Statutes of 2014) requirement to offer recommendations for a central state juvenile justice website or clearinghouse.
- The suggestion to consider outsourcing management of the state juvenile justice website or clearinghouse is based in part on comparison with the Child Welfare Services/Case Management information site operated by the University of California (Berkeley) School of Social Welfare for the California Department of Social Services.

RECOMMENDATION 6: ESTABLISH A JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE OR COMMISSION WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE RECOMMENDATIONS.

In order to implement these recommendations, the Working Group recommends the establishment of a multi-agency and multi-departmental Juvenile Justice Data Development Task Force or Commission having the following responsibilities:

- Include representatives from probation, courts, law enforcement, counties, advocacy, research and information technology disciplines, and provide for representation or linkage with allied youth service agencies (child welfare, education, mental health).
- Have primary and ongoing responsibility, beyond the life of the Working Group, for implementation of report recommendations including:
 - Design and costing out the JCPSS replacement system, including development of specifications and RFPs.
 - Develop standard definitions for data elements for the revised JCPSS.
 - Work with the Administration, state agencies, legislative budget committees, county government, probation and courts and others to develop implementation resources.
 - Pursue resource sharing from federal, state and local government sources and from private or philanthropic organizations to support implementation.
 - Take into account the capacity, development and resource needs of local agencies and county-level data systems in all implementation phases.
 - Stage or prioritize the implementation of the recommendations in this report as necessary, based on available or emerging resources for implementation.
- The implementation Task Force or Commission would be attached to the BSCC for administrative purposes but would have statutorily defined membership, mandates, and authority to make key implementation decisions. The recommendation is that this interdisciplinary implementation body would operate with some degree of autonomy with the details and the structure of the relationship to be defined by the Legislature on the advice of BSCC and affected stakeholders.

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 6 (excerpted from the final report):

- This recommendation addresses the paramount need to have an implementation capacity and strategy.
- The Working Group has determined that as a practical matter, the new implementation body must have some degree of autonomy and independent authority to act, even though the body is administratively linked to the BSCC. Traditionally, BSCC does planning and grant making through Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) made up of selected stakeholders and chaired by one or more members of the BSCC Board. Under this process, all recommendations of each ESC must be moved through a Board review and approval process, often involving delays spanning months at a time because the Board meets only five or six times per year. The implementation tasks outlined in this report require staged activity including cost estimates, technology reviews, definitions and other complex steps that need to be vested in an expert implementation body without being submerged in the slow process of full Board review. At the same time, certain decisions—like RFP approval and contract awards—must necessarily be reserved for Board action. The Working Group

suggests that definition of the working relationship between the implementation body and the BSCC Board be addressed and spelled out in relevant legislation after sufficient review and discussion among all affected stakeholders.

FUNDING THE IMPLEMENTATION EFFORT

No effort to implement these recommendations can succeed in the absence of sufficient resources. Resources are needed to support staffing and other costs that will be incurred by the implementation body and the Board of State and Community Corrections in the planning and implementation phase, as well as the core costs of system upgrades recommended in this report. Over and above direct appropriations of state funds, the Working Group suggests the following resource development options for consideration by policymakers and others addressing the implementation challenge:

- Tapping federal funds that may be directed to upgrading California's juvenile justice data capacity—such as funds available under the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program and other federal grants.
- Partnering with state or national private foundations that have launched initiatives supporting research and data-driven juvenile justice reforms.
- Exploring partnerships with private and corporate sector companies or entrepreneurs that may combine expertise in technology with an interest in modernization of child-serving information networks in California.
- Identifying state and local cost savings that result from program innovations or sentencing reforms that can serve as a source of justice system reinvestment directed toward the support of data and information system improvements.
- Devising funding and resource strategies that are consistent with the Proposition 30 guarantee against state mandates that increase county costs for realignment programs.
- Exploring innovative funding strategies drawing on the Pay for Success/Social Innovation Funding model implemented by 2015 legislation (Assembly Bill 1837).

CONCLUSION

The Working Group thanks the Legislature, the Governor of California and the Board of State and Community Corrections for this opportunity to assess these critical juvenile justice system issues and needs. We submit this report and recommendations to the Legislature in the sincere hope that some measure of renewed investment and forward progress can be made to build a modern, data-driven juvenile justice system in California— with the ultimate goal of supporting positive outcomes for justice system youth in the years to come. □