



**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

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*

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
PART I: BACKGROUND	1
A. The Need to Rebuild California’s Juvenile Justice Data System	1
B. Legislative Mandate	2
C. Membership	3
D. Scope of Review.....	4
1. Materials reviewed.....	4
2. Gap analysis and review of other state systems	4
3. Data elements scan.....	4
4. County Probation Survey.....	5
E. Recommendations Overview.....	5
1. General approach, feasibility	5
2. The cost of modernization	6
3. Implementation strategy	6
PART II: A CURRENT ASSESSMENT OF CALIFORNIA’S JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING CAPACITY	7
A. Description of the Current System	7
1. Local juvenile justice data systems and requirements	7
2. State level juvenile justice data systems and capacity	9
B. Gap Analysis	14
1. Inability to track important case and outcome information.....	15
2. Outdated technology.	17
3. Data collection design limits—the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey	17
4. Fracturing of data collection and reporting responsibilities among state agencies	18
5. Disparity of data capacity compared to other disciplines including child welfare and education and lack of investment in juvenile justice data.....	18
6. Lack of performance outcome measures for the juvenile justice system.....	19
7. Poor transparency and availability of statewide juvenile justice information	20

C. Comparison to Other States	20
1. <i>Integrated case management data systems or networks</i>	<i>21</i>
2. <i>Extensive tracking of case processing and outcome data.....</i>	<i>21</i>
3. <i>Recidivism routinely measured and reported</i>	<i>21</i>
4. <i>Capacity to produce specialized studies and reports</i>	<i>23</i>
5. <i>Cost-based system performance and accountability models</i>	<i>23</i>
6. <i>State websites or clearinghouses providing comprehensive information.....</i>	<i>24</i>
7. <i>Limits of other-state models.....</i>	<i>25</i>
D. Policy Choices for California	25
PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS	27
A. Overview: Approach to the Recommendations Offered in this Report.....	27
B. Recommendations	28
<i>RECOMMENDATION 1: REPLACE THE JUVENILE COURT AND PROBATION STATISTICAL SYSTEM, CURRENTLY HOUSED AT THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 1</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>RECOMMENDATION 2: CONSOLIDATE ALL STATE-LEVEL JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES INTO A SINGLE STATE AGENCY</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 2.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>RECOMMENDATION 3: EXPAND THE RANGE OF CASELOAD AND OUTCOME DATA COLLECTED AND REPORTED AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 3.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>RECOMMENDATION 4: MAKE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION PROFILE SURVEY, MANAGED BY THE BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 4.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>RECOMMENDATION 5: ESTABLISH A WEB-BASED CALIFORNIA JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA CLEARINGHOUSE</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 5.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>RECOMMENDATION 6: ESTABLISH A JUVENILE JUSTICE DATA DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE OR COMMISSION WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE RECOMMENDATIONS.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 6.....</i>	<i>48</i>
FUNDING THE IMPLEMENTATION EFFORT	50
CONCLUSION.....	51
<u>APPENDIX</u>	
ATTACHMENT A: WORKING GROUP MEMBER PROFILES	52
ATTACHMENT B: 2015 PROBATION SURVEY	55
ATTACHMENT C: MATERIALS REVIEWED BY THE WORKING GROUP	60
ATTACHMENT D: SUMMARY OF KEY DATA ELEMENTS	61

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Executive Summary of this Juvenile Justice Data Working Group Report to the Legislature is available on the Board of State and Community Corrections' website at www.bscc.ca.gov or upon request by contacting Colleen Curtin, Field Representative at colleen.curtin@bscc.ca.gov.

The Working Group wishes to thank the following BSCC staff who coordinated the meetings of the Working Group and contributed to the research and production of this Final Report:

Katie Howard - Executive Director

Mary Jolls - Deputy Director, Corrections, Planning & Programs Division (CPP)

Allison Ganter - Deputy Director, Facilities Standards & Operations Division

David Lovell, Ph.D. - Research Specialist V

Lee Britton - Research Specialist III

Kimberly Bushard - Field Representative, CPP

Colleen Curtin - Field Representative, CPP

Corey Kai - Research Program Specialist I

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

PART I: BACKGROUND

A. The Need to Rebuild California’s Juvenile Justice Data System: Growing Concerns Lead to the Creation of the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group

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. Respected national organizations—like the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Council of State Governments—have joined with leaders in philanthropy to advance technology and new outcome measures in juvenile justice. 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 and the corresponding need to identify 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, and the corresponding need to use data and evaluation to adapt programs and practices accordingly; and*
- *Recognition that the fundamental purpose of the juvenile justice system is rehabilitation and that, in order to measure rehabilitation, juvenile justice systems must have adequate capacity to monitor youth outcomes.*

Regrettably, California has allowed its juvenile 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 recidivism or other important outcomes for justice system youth. California’s state-level juvenile justice data banks are split between different agencies and are not integrated by design with county-level data systems. An overarching problem is that California has not made

a 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 state investment and upgrades to meet contemporary needs, this has not been the case for a California juvenile justice system that processes more than 100,000 children as arrest, supervision or confinement cases each year.

In 2014, the California Legislature established this Juvenile Justice Data Working Group to address these concerns. This Final Report to the Legislature provides an analysis of the pertinent issues and needs and offers recommendations to improve California's juvenile justice data capacity, and correspondingly, to improve outcomes for justice-involved youth.

B. Legislative Mandate

The California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (Working Group) was established by statute enacted in 2014 (Assembly Bill 1468). This legislation established the Working Group within the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), effective June 2014. The main purpose of the Working Group is to conduct a thorough review of state and local juvenile justice data systems, capacity and needs in California and to produce a report to the Legislature recommending "...options for improving interagency coordination, modernization and upgrading of state and local juvenile justice data and information systems." The premise underlying the creation of the Working Group is that California's current juvenile justice data systems are insufficient to meet current needs.

By statute the Working Group was mandated to do the following:

- *Analyze the capacities and limitations of data systems and networks in current use, including a review of other-state systems;*
- *Identify changes or upgrades to improve the capacity and utility of juvenile justice caseload and outcome data in California, including changes to support the gathering of juvenile justice outcome and recidivism information and changes to improve performance outcome measures for state-local grant programs;*
- *Identify changes in data collection and reporting responsibilities of agencies, departments and providers affected;*
- *Produce recommendations on the creation of a web-based statewide clearinghouse or information center making relevant juvenile justice information available in a user-friendly, query-based format for stakeholders and members of the public;*
- *Submit its report and recommendations to the Legislature, including an implementation plan, by January 1, 2016.*

This report is submitted to the Legislature in fulfillment of the statutory mandate. It reflects more than a year of meetings, research and deliberation by the Working Group. This is the second of two Working Group reports. The first report, also mandated by the enabling law, presented recommendations to “improve the current juvenile justice reporting requirements” for two major state-local grant programs—the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and the Youthful Offender Block Grant. That report (referred to as the “Grants Report”) was completed and submitted to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) in April 2015.¹ The Grants Report contained recommendations to consolidate the plans and reports and to improve the data elements collected and reported by counties under the two grant programs. 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 under the proposed changes. That inquiry and review is ongoing. While there is overlap between the Grants Report and this more comprehensive Final Report on the needs and issues addressed, this Final Report is intended to be a stand-alone report. It does not reiterate the recommendations or text of the earlier Grants Report. Those interested in the Grants Report can access it [here](#).

Table 1
California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group

1. **David Steinhart**, (Chair) - BSCC Board Member 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 Member 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, California State University, Los Angeles
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, County of San Diego *

C. Membership

Membership in the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group was governed by statute which included a list of agencies or associations to be represented. 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 Assembly Bill 1468

¹ The due date for the Grants Report (originally December 31, 2014) was extended by subsequent legislation to April 30, 2015.

(Statutes of 2014), BSCC Board Member David Steinhart was selected to Chair of the Working Group. In September 2014, the BSCC Board approved a thirteen member Working Group. Membership is displayed in Table 1, with mandated statutory positions marked with an asterisk. Additional information on the members of the Working Group can be found in Attachment A.

D. Scope of Review

The Working Group met nine times over the course of a year and a half to fulfill its legislative mandates. Two of these meetings were meetings of a Grant Reports Subcommittee, dedicated to developing recommendations for the Grants Report described above (completed April 2015).

1. Materials reviewed

In the course of its review, the Working Group consulted a multitude of studies, reports and collateral materials from California, other-state and national sources. These materials covered a wide range of national, state and local justice system data issues, needs and models. The Working Group also heard presentations from representatives of state agencies that manage juvenile justice and child welfare data systems in California. Juvenile justice websites maintained by California public and private agencies and by other-state juvenile justice departments were examined live in Working Group meetings. Additional information on state and county level data systems was gathered from California professional and stakeholder organizations. A list of key materials reviewed by the Working Group can be found in Attachment C.

2. Gap analysis and review of other state systems

The Working Group conducted a gap analysis of state and local juvenile justice data in California, in order to identify the systems and technologies in current use as well as their known limitations. This analysis involved an assessment of the goals and needs that should reasonably be met by a competent and modern juvenile justice data system. This review took into account, as well, levels of juvenile justice data development in other states and national reports or recommendations on desired benchmarks for juvenile justice data systems. The results of the gap analysis are found in Part II of this report.

3. Data elements scan

The Working Group produced an inventory of all data elements and variables considered useful or relevant for a “perfect” juvenile justice data collection system, were such a system to exist. The goal of this exercise was to identify the total universe of data points or elements having current or future utility in an upgraded data system. The data element scan was organized and moderated by Working Group member Professor Denise Herz, Director of the School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics at California State University, Los Angeles.

Major decision and processing points for juvenile justice cases—from initial referral through disposition, confinement, supervision and re-referral—were plotted on a flowchart. Data variables were identified for each decision point—covering multiple processing options or choices for every juvenile justice event in the life of each case

and including elements related to transfers of minors to adult criminal courts and jurisdiction. Additionally the Working Group considered levels of disaggregation of data considered necessary for each processing point (e.g., by age, gender and ethnicity). The Working Group acknowledged that many of the data points or elements identified in this exercise were either not collected or reported at the present time to the state data bases and might not, in fact, be considered essential for collection and reporting in a revised data system. The product of this exercise is a reference catalogue of relevant juvenile justice data elements that could be incorporated into a modernized California state data repository. The results of this scan are included in this report in a document titled, *Summary of Key Data Elements for Juvenile Justice Tracking across Processing Decision Points* (see Attachment D).

4. County Probation Survey

The Working Group concluded soon in its deliberations that that the state's primary juvenile justice data bank—the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) maintained by the state Department of Justice—was in need of replacement. In order to assess how a replacement of the state system would coordinate or be compatible with 58 different county-level data systems, the Working Group conducted a data survey of 58 county probation departments.

The survey asked counties to describe the local juvenile justice data systems in use including costs, replacement plans and linkages with other child-serving agency information systems. The survey also asked respondents to comment on their experience with the current JCPSS, including their views on how a replacement system should function in relation to their local data network. In addition the survey explored county-level compliance and utilization of the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS), maintained by BSCC to monitor populations of youth in local juvenile justice facilities. The Working Group probation survey was distributed in September 2015 with the assistance of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC). Of the 58 county probation departments, 45 completed and returned the survey to BSCC. Responding counties provided useful information that has been incorporated into this report at multiple points. A summary of survey questions and responses can be found in Attachment B.

E. Recommendations Overview

1. General approach, feasibility

This Final Report offers six major recommendations to improve and modernize California's juvenile justice data system. The Working Group spent a good deal of time evaluating the scope and feasibility of these recommendations. Concerns related to the cost of replacement technology were taken into account, as was the need for a replacement data repository 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 and information systems now utilized by counties be scrapped in favor of a new and seamlessly interfacing state-local data network. Nor does this report propose the creation of a statewide case management system to replace the juvenile justice caseload management systems now in place at the county level. While this was recognized as a worthy goal—one that has already been achieved for child

welfare case management in California—it was viewed as not presently feasible to recommend a total overhaul of the case management systems now operating in 58 different counties.

Instead, these recommendations are oriented toward rebuilding the state’s juvenile justice data repository so that it can properly document juvenile justice events, be compatible with local caseload management and data systems, support informed program and policy development and track juvenile justice outcomes for a range of uses.

2. 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 further as the system continues to age toward obsolescence or breakdown.

“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 further as the system continues to age toward obsolescence or breakdown.”

It is not that the state has failed entirely to invest in juvenile justice reform. California’s two major juvenile justice state-local grant programs (Youthful Offender Block Grant and Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act) are solid evidence of continuing state investment in local juvenile justice programs. Nevertheless, there has been a dearth of state investment in the data tools and technology needed to document outcomes for justice system youth and to serve as a basis for future program and policy development. Several options for developing the resources needed to rebuild California’s juvenile justice data system are referenced in the discussion following Recommendation 6 of this report.

3. Implementation strategy

Finally, the last recommendation of this Final Report outlines an implementation plan and strategy for all of the recommendations of this Report. 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 the State Juvenile Justice Commission expired on the date its report was issued, and no responsible entity was ever tasked with implementation responsibility. Now, seven years later and farther down the road of deferred maintenance, the Working Group concludes that a responsible body or task force must be authorized by the Legislature to take the lead on implementation. Otherwise, the most likely prospect is that California will continue to deteriorate in its capacity to document juvenile justice events and outcomes that must be monitored in order to adequately serve children and youth in the juvenile justice system in the years ahead.

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*

It is important to recognize that 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, in county-run juvenile halls and probation camps or ranches—although not every county in California has either or both of these types of facilities. Juvenile justice “realignment” reforms over the last twenty years have moved most of the youth formerly held in state correctional facilities back to counties under the management and supervision of local courts and probation departments.

To manage these local caseloads, county-level agencies—including law enforcement, probation, courts and nonprofit service providers—have developed 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, age of the system in use and the design capacity built into the system.

In September 2015, the Working Group, in coordination with the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC), compiled and distributed a survey of California probation departments asking each county to describe its juvenile justice information system now in use, its age and general capacity, replacement plans and other features. Some overall findings based on responses to the survey are:

- *These local juvenile justice data systems have been independently developed by local agencies and vary greatly with regard to design, capacity and age.*
- *All respondents report that their juvenile justice information systems are essentially case management systems.*
- *A majority of the systems were developed by outside vendors, and counties depend on contracted services with vendors to maintain these systems.*
- *The local juvenile justice data systems, by and large, are not integrated locally with data systems operated by other local youth service agencies (such as education, child welfare, health/mental health).*

- *The local juvenile justice data systems are stand-alone, intra-county data systems or networks that do not share data directly with other counties.*
- *Less than half of the respondent counties have information systems that contain a "dashboard" function or other mechanism to easily monitor key indicators.*
- *Two-thirds of respondent counties do not track or monitor recidivism events by juveniles based on a departmental definition of recidivism.*

When polled regarding the age of their juvenile justice information systems, 29 percent of responding departments report that their system is five to ten years old and an additional 38 percent operate systems that are over ten years old. Forty-two percent of responding departments have plans to replace their current information and case management system. A summary of the Working Group Probation Survey can be found in Attachment B.

Despite California's orientation toward local control of juvenile justice cases and operations, counties cannot and do not operate in local silos or vacuums of justice administration. There are important state data collection mandates that local governments and agencies must meet. In the context of juvenile justice, some examples are:

- The state requires counties to comply with data, outcome and reporting requirements for state/local juvenile justice grant programs, including the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG), Juvenile Probation Camp Fund, and other state and federal grant programs. [Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1961 and Government Code Section 30061]
- State law additionally requires counties to submit local juvenile justice caseload and outcome data to state agencies that are mandated by law to collect and report this information on a statewide basis. The main reporting requirement relates to the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) maintained by the California Department of Justice, as described below and mentioned at multiple points in this report. [Penal Code Sections 13010-13012.5]

In addition to state-mandated data collection and reporting requirements, counties can and do collect and maintain additional data for special programs or purposes or as a matter of local practice in the management of their juvenile caseloads. For example, Santa Cruz, Orange and Ventura counties as participants in the Annie Casey Foundation's national Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) compile annual "results reports" for the JDAI documenting detention activity by different variables and outcome measures. County probation departments may also gather data for special projects or studies, beyond what is required for state reports, and may even routinely collect juvenile justice data at levels that exceed state reporting requirements.

2. State level juvenile justice data systems and capacity

California's state-level juvenile justice data apparatus is perhaps aptly described as both modest and fractured. Below we summarize the state-level agencies and the data systems they use to collect and report juvenile justice data from local sources, with reference to the state laws and mandates on data collection.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The California Department of Justice (DOJ) is mandated by law to collect "data pertaining to the juvenile justice system for criminal history and statistical purposes" (Penal Code Section 13010.5). To this end, DOJ maintains two databases that support the implementation of this mandate:

- **Juvenile Justice Court and Probation Statistical System**

This is the state's primary database for the collection and reporting of local juvenile justice system data on probation and court processing of cases. The system collects and compiles data on the number of juveniles referred to a Probation Department pursuant to Welfare & Institutions Code Sections 601 and/or 602. The system also maintains data on a defined universe of data elements for each individual juvenile whose identifying information is entered into the system. Generally speaking, Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) data will track individual justice system events beginning with a referral to probation and concluding with a court disposition of the case.

Table 2
Probation Survey

<i>Which best describes the process for compliance with and completion of data requirements for JCPSS?</i>	<i>Percent of county respondents</i>
Query is written and data are extracted with the push of a button	28%
Query is written but data require clean up	21%
Some data are easily extracted by query and some data are compiled manually	23%
We compile/collect all data manually	28%

Counties submit data into the JCPSS on a monthly basis, via either a manual data entry or the web-enabled uploading process. Counties that enter data manually via the web-enabled application may enter it throughout the month. Counties that submit data via the upload process must submit the data by the tenth working day of month following the reporting period. There is wide variation in the way that counties comply with JCPSS reporting requirements, most likely dependent upon the sophistication of the local data systems. When asked in the Probation Survey to describe the process for completion of data requirements for JCPSS, county responses were distributed almost equally, as shown in Table 2.

Regardless of the process used, it is the responsibility of the counties to provide accurate, reliable and complete data to the JCPSS. To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data, comprehensive edits and conditional checks are performed by DOJ on all data. For those counties that submit data via the upload process, these checks occur when the data is processed. For those counties that enter data via the web-enabled application, these checks occur at the time of entry. In addition to ongoing quality control procedures, at the beginning of the year each county receives the following five summary reports:

- ✓ *Referrals of Juveniles to Probation Departments for Delinquent Acts;*
- ✓ *Referral (Offenses) of Juveniles to Probation Departments for Delinquent Acts;*
- ✓ *Juvenile Court Dispositions Resulting from Petitions for Delinquent Acts;*
- ✓ *Petitioned Offenses Resulting from Petitions for Delinquent Acts; and*
- ✓ *Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Report*

All counties provide written confirmation to the DOJ that summary reports have been received including identification of any discrepancies that need to be corrected.

While this DOJ array of data on individual case processing and outcomes may seem at first glance to be comprehensive, important juvenile justice events and outcome data are not presently tracked or even “trackable” through JCPSS. The system is built on outdated technology and is considered to be essentially “non-expandable” by DOJ. A critical case outcome measure, considered the “gold standard” used to evaluate juvenile justice programs, is recidivism. However, the JCPSS cannot track individual cases through the system in order to produce comprehensive recidivism reports. The limitations of the JCPSS data repository are further described in the gap analysis section of this report.

- **Monthly Arrest and Citation Register**

The Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) includes reports on arrests and law enforcement dispositions, entered into the DOJ system by law enforcement agencies. The data bank includes juvenile arrests and law enforcement dispositions. Juvenile arrest information is accessible on the DOJ website in query-based interactive formats largely replacing the report formats previously published by DOJ as “Criminal Justice Profiles” for California.

- **DOJ annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report**

To meet its juvenile justice information and reporting mandates, the Department of Justice publishes an annual report entitled *Juvenile Justice in California*. This report merges the arrest data from MACR and from the Automated Criminal History System (ACHS) with the probation and court data from JCPSS to produce an overall, annual statewide picture of juvenile justice case processing and outcomes. The report is published electronically and can be downloaded from the DOJ’s state website. It is produced at a relatively high level of graphic design with informative pie charts and tables summarizing arrest, probation and court processing events, disaggregated at key points by age, gender and race/ethnicity. Detailed data

tables are included in the Appendix of each annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report for those seeking more drill-down information on the caseloads covered in this annual report.

In 2003, the Legislature directed the DOJ to collect additional statewide data on transfers of juveniles to adult criminal courts. (Penal Code Section 13012.5). This came in the wake of a year 2000 voter initiative (Proposition 21) that created a “direct-file” process for prosecutors to initiate proceedings in adult criminal courts against juveniles charged with listed serious offenses. This mandate to collect adult court information on juveniles took several years to implement, as it involved developing linkages between separate juvenile and adult criminal justice data banks maintained at DOJ. As a result DOJ now includes in its annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report an accounting of statewide transfers of juveniles to adult criminal courts and on adult court dispositions of juvenile transfer cases.

The annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report is relied on by policymakers, legislative analysts, system professionals, reform advocates and others as a primary source of information on juvenile justice caseloads and outcomes. While it presents an abundance of information on arrest, probation and court actions, some critics have faulted this annual report for the information it does not include. For example, it does not include information about population levels in state or county juvenile justice facilities, and it lacks data relating to recidivism (repeat offenses)—because these data points are not captured by the JCPSS. It lacks additional information that researchers and others have sought to gather on court dispositions, probation violations and placements. County-level outcomes are not included in the hard copy of the report, though county level data can be accessed by special requests presented to DOJ.

BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

- **Juvenile Detention Profile Survey**

For facility-based information, one must look to the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) which is produced by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). These surveys are compiled and published by BSCC as quarterly reports on local juvenile justice facilities. In part, the JDPS serves to support BSCC’s statutory role as the regulatory oversight body for local juvenile justice facilities. By law, BSCC promulgates minimum standards and regulations for local juvenile justice facilities (juvenile halls, camps and ranches, and adult jails holding juveniles). BSCC also inspects local juvenile justice facilities for compliance with minimum standards.

For the survey BSCC collects monthly and quarterly reports from probation departments on juveniles who are admitted to county juvenile halls and county camps and ranches. These reports are either average daily population or point-in-time counts of juveniles in custody by specific characteristics (such as pre- and post-disposition status; misdemeanor or felony status; age and gender; adult court status; mental health status). Additional information is submitted on facility admissions (bookings) and length of stay. These ADP and point-in-time reports

are aggregate data reports. Because the data are not submitted as files on individuals, they cannot readily be reprocessed or reprogrammed to facilitate the production of special or analytical reports on local facility detention and commitment populations.

Other limitations of the JDPS include the fact that no information is required to be submitted by county facility operators on the race and ethnicity of detained youth. The offense information available through JDPS on population counts is limited to gross classification of felony or misdemeanor status. Admission and length of stay information are not currently available by offense, age, gender or race.

The accuracy of the data reported to BSCC for the JDPS is also a question mark. Standard definitions are lacking for many of the data points reported to BSCC for the survey. Though BSCC has issued guidelines for the reports and works with counties to assure compliance, delays and compliance troubleshooting are frequent occurrences according to BSCC staff. Historically, BSCC has long time lags between gathering data and posting survey results. This is due to late responses from the field, the time it takes staff to check the data for errors and to receive corrections. BSCC has taken steps to improve and accelerate survey reports, including additional training for local probation departments in coordination with the Chief Probation Officers of California. However, these efforts to increase reporting efficiency do not presently address the inherent structural and methodological shortcomings of the JDPS.

There is no statutory mandate in California to collect local juvenile facility data. The county obligation to collect and report JDPS data is found instead in Title 15 of the Code of California Regulations (CCR), "Minimum Standards for Juvenile Facilities." 15 CCR Section 1342 is a single-sentence regulation that requires counties to make monthly facility population reports to BSCC.

Meanwhile, county probation departments report a fairly high level of confidence in the data they are presently submitting to BSCC for the detention survey. In the Working Group Probation Survey conducted for this report, two thirds of responding probation departments said the data reported to BSCC was "highly accurate." When asked how useful they find the BSCC detention profile survey to be overall, probation respondents had a more tepid reaction, with slightly more than half respondents indicating the JDPS to be "somewhat useful" and 16 percent finding it to be "highly useful."

- **BSCC Grant Reports**

Some statewide juvenile justice data is assembled into state-level reports by BSCC on two juvenile justice grant programs. These reports are required by law for the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG). Under existing law, counties receiving these grant funds must supply reports on expenditures and selected outcomes for local programs funded by the grants. Examples of the data collected and reported by counties to BSCC are:

- For JJCPA: rearrest, reincarceration, probation violations and successful completion of probation, community service and restitution. These reports are compiled separately for program-served youth.
- For YOBG: recidivism for a statewide random sample of 1,000 youth either served or not served by YOBG program funds, and related follow up data on education status of individuals in this cohort.

Annually, BSCC publishes a report for each grant program summarizing the outcome data and expenditures reported by county grant recipients. The information is useful mainly as an attempt to evaluate outcomes and performance of the grant programs. However, the reporting requirements for these two grant programs are currently undergoing a complete overhaul, based on recent findings and conclusions about the accuracy and utility of information now reported, and related concerns about probation department workload. The Working Group considered these matters and recommended major changes in the data collected and reported by BSCC for these two juvenile justice grant programs. Those recommendations were included in the Working Group “Grants Report” submitted to the BSCC Board in April 2015.

A key recommendation made by the Working Group was to discard outdated performance measures that have proven to be of little value or utility to policymakers and probation program operators. Instead, the Working Group recommendation is to have counties report juvenile justice trend information (arrests, incarceration, other data) drawn from the JCPSS. These and other “streamlining and consolidation” recommendations in the Grants Report are currently under review by the Administration and by legislative staff and are expected to lead to code revisions that will define future reporting requirements.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION, DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE, RESEARCH BRANCH

In the wake of juvenile justice realignment reforms effective in 2007, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) has continued to maintain its own data base of statistics and reports on individuals who are confined in its remaining facilities. DJJ monitors the flow of commitments and releases to its institutions for various classes of youth under both juvenile and adult court jurisdiction. The Division also publishes monthly population reports by institution and multiple individual characteristics. Other reports are maintained on length of stay and releases to parole (now, local probation supervision).

In the past, DJJ and its predecessor (the Youth Authority) published annual reports on “recidivism,” using a standard of a return to custody within two years of release. These recidivism reports are no longer available on the CDCR website that displays other DJJ population data. In years past, DJJ’s predecessor agency, the California Youth Authority, had broader responsibility for the collection of local facility data. In 1995 these local data

collection responsibilities were shifted to the Board of Corrections which became the Corrections Standards Authority in 2004 and the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) in 2012.

Currently, the CDCR Office of Research is engaged in two projects involving the analysis of juvenile recidivism data in California. One of these is a partnership with the University of California at Irvine to gather DJJ recidivism data including program evaluations of outcomes for DJJ youth. In the other project, DJJ is the lead California agency along with the BSCC, DOJ and others working with the Pew Charitable Trust and the National Center for Juvenile Justice on a multi-state recidivism data development effort.

B. Gap Analysis

The Working Group conducted a thorough review of the capabilities and limitations of the state and local data systems and features described in the preceding section. Overall, the Working Group is persuaded that county-level justice agencies—including law enforcement, probation and courts—have built and utilized the data systems needed to manage their local juvenile justice caseloads. This conclusion is supported by the all-county survey of probation-based juvenile justice data systems conducted by the Working Group and the Chief Probation Officers of California in September of 2015. We found that even though county information systems vary in scope and capacity, using a range of vendors and technology, juvenile justice agencies at the local level appear to be meeting the basic need to process and monitor juvenile justice cases and to comply with state data reporting requirements.

Nevertheless, from a statewide perspective, the Working Group has identified critical deficiencies in the state's overall capacity to collect, analyze and utilize juvenile justice system data. As now constituted the California juvenile justice data system is a mosaic of divergent local systems reporting information to an antiquated and dispersed set of state data banks. The closest thing we have to a comprehensive statewide juvenile justice data network or repository is the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) maintained by the state Department of Justice (DOJ). While the JCPSS does collect and produce statewide data on key juvenile justice processing points and outcomes, it operates on outdated technology and has severe capacity limitations that are described additionally below.

To assist policymakers in addressing the challenge of upgrading California's juvenile justice data system, the Working Group has further identified the following gaps and deficiencies in the capacity and structure of the statewide data system that are now in place.

“...from a statewide perspective, the Working Group has identified critical deficiencies in the state's overall capacity to collect, analyze and utilize juvenile justice system data. As now constituted the California juvenile justice data system is a mosaic of divergent local systems reporting information to an antiquated and dispersed set of state data banks.”

1. Inability to track important case and outcome information on a comprehensive statewide basis. The JCPSS data repository maintained by DOJ has severe shortcomings as to the level and detail of processing data that can be tracked and reported. Some important juvenile justice processing events identified by the Working Group are not included in the set of data elements currently collected through JCPSS. The “catch-22” on this deficiency is that outdated JCPSS technology precludes being able to capture additional data simply by tweaking or adjusting the operating program that is built into JCPSS. Some desired data elements not presently captured on the JCPSS include:

- Probation violations by type and outcome
- Placement outcomes by type of facility (e.g., juvenile hall, camp/ranch) and related facility data (e.g., length of stay in placement)
- Probation supervision detail—for example, time on supervision
- Adult court dispositions of juveniles by transfer mechanism
- Recidivism data
- Other “wellness” outcomes—e.g., education, mental health or child welfare status

The absence of data on key processing points and outcomes makes it difficult or impossible to analyze program or system performance on a comprehensive, statewide basis, or to identify best practices that improve outcomes for youth.

California’s major juvenile justice realignment reform adopted in 2007 provides a good example of the state’s limited capacity to document youth outcomes or to assess the overall effectiveness of system reforms. In 2007, Senate Bill 81 restructured the state youth corrections system (Division of Juvenile Justice) by transferring custody and care of defined non-violent juveniles from state to local control. The goals of juvenile justice realignment included reducing state cost and promoting better outcomes for youth in programs and facilities located closer to home and designed to meet locally defined needs.² The state provided counties with Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) funds to support this caseload shift, averaging about \$100 million statewide over the last eight years and rising to an Fiscal Year 2014-15 level of \$114 million. However, the Senate Bill 81 reform imposed no requirement for counties to monitor and report recidivism or other outcomes for realigned youth.

In 2009, lawmakers sought to fill this information gap by adding outcome measures to be reported by counties receiving YOBG funds. A Corrections Standards Authority committee charged with defining the new outcome measures concluded that the statutory prescribed elements, including recidivism, could not be tracked given state and local data system limitations. Surrogate outcome measures using caseload samples were adopted instead, but those measures have proven to be inadequate. In

² Senate Bill 81 added Section 1960 to the Welfare and Institutions Code listing legislative findings and declarations supporting the 2007 juvenile justice realignment reform, stating that, “The Legislature finds and declares that local youthful offender justice programs, including both custodial and noncustodial corrective services, are better suited to provide rehabilitation services for certain youthful offenders than state-operated facilities. Local communities are better able than the state to provide these offenders with the programs they require, in close proximity to their families and communities...”

2012, the State Auditor issued a highly critical report on the YOBG, citing major flaws in the outcome data and reports. In its April 2015 report to the BSCC Board, the Working Group recommended abandoning these YOBG monitoring criteria based on the unavailability of adequate data to support them.

At this juncture, California remains without a comprehensive plan or capacity to monitor juvenile justice outcomes for youth who were realigned from state to county control by Senate Bill 81. This is not to say that juvenile justice realignment has failed to achieve major objectives staked out by lawmakers when it was adopted. State youth correction populations and costs and juvenile arrest rates across the state have declined dramatically in the wake of the 2007 realignment reform. In this same period, counties have developed specialized and innovative programs using YOBG funds and other resources to serve the local caseload as reconfigured by Senate Bill 81. Nevertheless, there is no comprehensive all-county requirement to track and report data on how children and youth have fared under realignment. Questions that are difficult or impossible to answer include:

- ✓ *What are their recidivism rates?*
- ✓ *How many are being committed to juvenile halls and how long are they staying?*
- ✓ *What is the impact of realignment on race and ethnic subgroups of youth returned from state facilities?*

A different approach to realignment evaluation is exemplified by the state of Texas. In 2007, Texas also downsized its state youth correctional system, moving a share of its state-incarcerated caseload to local probation supervision. Texas supplemented this reform with an evaluation plan leading to the publication of a comprehensive report in January of 2015. That report (*Closer to Home: An Analysis of the State and Local Impact of the Texas Juvenile Justice Reforms*) has gained national recognition as a model of analysis and performance monitoring for state funded juvenile justice programs. Moreover, the conclusions of that report (which includes county-to-county comparisons of recidivism outcomes) are being used by state and local Texas juvenile justice agencies to modify their programs in order to improve measured youth outcomes.

With additional statewide data capacity, California might be better positioned to document the benefits of realignment reforms and (like Texas) make data-driven adjustments to improve outcomes for youth.

The need for additional data to support outcome analysis and program evaluation was strongly advanced by the State Commission on Juvenile Justice in its 2009 report, *Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan: Blueprint for an Outcome Oriented Juvenile Justice System*. That legislatively mandated report included an exhaustive analysis of (then) current juvenile justice data system capacity and the additional capacity needed to support an “outcome oriented” system. The data recommendations of the report were based on the premise that: “Measuring outcomes and monitoring the

quality of program delivery are critical to success. The indication of success...requires quality analysis of reliable data” (*Juvenile Justice Operational Plan*, page 29). However, the Commission’s recommendations on data reform were never adopted.

The Justice Center of the Council of State Governments (CSG) has been assisting states in building data system capacity to support measurement of program outcomes. CSG is a national nonprofit organization funded by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to advise states on effective public safety programs and strategies. Some CSG Justice Center recommendations on state juvenile justice data collection are referenced at the conclusion of this section of the report

2. **Outdated technology.** The data system that serves as the state’s central repository for juvenile justice case information in California (JCPSS) operates on outdated technology. The JCPSS was installed and became operational at DOJ in 2002. By modern standards, this is an antiquated information system.

DOJ has attempted to add data elements for collection and to modify JCPSS programming so that it can capture more information. Requests to augment the current data collection capability of the JCPSS have come from different sources. Above we have described some of the concerns expressed by researchers and system critics, including the State Auditor, with regard to the general unavailability of juvenile justice recidivism data. In seeking to revise the grant report requirements for JJCPA and YOBG juvenile justice grants, the Working Group reconfirmed the limits of JCPSS, concluding that the JCPSS is ill-equipped to capture additional and useful information in key areas including probation violations, court dispositions and placements.

The JCPSS now in place is essentially “non-expandable.” In other words, the system’s internal programming cannot be modified to accommodate multiple additions to the data elements now collected. Nor was the system built to include an analytical capacity to produce routine or comprehensive reports comparing outcomes for the individuals whose data are entered into the system by county personnel. Moreover, the system does not operate with unique identifiers so that juveniles with data entries can be tracked or identified across county lines. In short, the technology supporting the main juvenile justice database in California is ready to be retired and replaced by a more modern system. This need is addressed in the recommendations that follow.

3. **Data collection design limits—the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey.** One of the areas examined by the Working Group was the state’s capacity to collect and report data on juvenile populations housed in county juvenile justice facilities. These local facilities include county juvenile halls and probation camps and ranches. How these local facilities are utilized is a matter of great interest to juvenile justice policymakers, practitioners, researchers and advocates. The only available statewide data on these county facilities is that which is collected by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and published periodically as the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) Quarter Survey Results. However, the data compiled for the JDPS are

not individualized case data, and many key measures and data elements on juveniles in local custody are not included in the BSCC data set.

County-level data for the JDPS are submitted to BSCC in monthly and quarterly reports that are point-in-time snapshots of facility populations. Some of the data are submitted via facsimile and must be hand-keyed by BSCC staff. Once the data has been submitted, BSCC conducts a visual review for each county, looking for any county-specific reporting abnormalities (for example, a juvenile hall with an average daily population of 35 suddenly jumps to 300). If abnormalities are discovered, BSCC contacts the county and waits for verification of the data. Upgrades of the BSCC detention facility data need to begin with an overhaul of the design of the survey, including standard definitions, expanded data elements and improved data collection methodology and monitoring of the reports submitted by county agencies. See Recommendation 4.

- 4. *Fracturing of data collection and reporting responsibilities among different state agencies.*** Unlike other states, California does not have a central state agency, such as a Department of Juvenile Justice, that is dedicated exclusively to the oversight or management of state-local juvenile justice functions. Some observers are confused on this point because California does have what is commonly referred to as the Division of Juvenile Justice.³ The Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) resides within the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Its main job is to operate the state's three secure correctional facilities for juveniles and young adults committed by county courts. In the wake of juvenile justice realignment in California, DJJ no longer retains its former role or responsibility for local program coordination, training on community corrections or juvenile justice policy development.

Lacking a dedicated state juvenile justice agency, California's statutory data collection mandates for juvenile justice are dispersed among different state agencies. The Department of Justice collects arrest and probation/court information. The Board of State and Community Corrections collects facility and grant compliance reports. The Division of Juvenile Justice maintains its own research division to collect data on the state custody caseload. Researchers and analysts seeking to compose a coherent juvenile justice profile or picture need to jump between websites maintained by different agencies. Even then, the information gleaned from the search may be incomplete or may be incompatible as to the data elements or methodology used. This fracturing of juvenile justice data collection at the California state level may be fiscally inefficient as well. Economies of scale might well be achieved by consolidating these scattered juvenile justice data operations into a single state agency. This need is addressed in Recommendation 2.

- 5. *Disparity of data capacity compared to other disciplines including child welfare and education and lack of investment in juvenile justice data.*** Other state youth serving departments or realms have improved the capacity and utility of the data needed to support operations and program or policy development. The California

³ In fact the official code designation of the CDCR juvenile division is the "Division of Juvenile Facilities," even though the division is commonly referred to as the Division of Juvenile Justice.

Department of Education, for example, has made major strides toward the augmentation and modernization of its California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). CALPADS is a longitudinal data system used to maintain individual-level data including student demographics, course data, discipline, assessments, staff assignments, and other data for state and federal reporting. Each student in the system is assigned a unique identifier, allowing students to be tracked within and across districts, anywhere in the state.

The California Department of Social Services tracks child welfare caseloads, including services and placements, on a Child Welfare Services/Case Management System that has been consistently modernized and upgraded by supporting state appropriations. By contrast, no significant state investment or appropriation to upgrade state-level juvenile justice data collection has been made in the last two decades, and perhaps longer. This failure of investment has led to the situation of deferred maintenance now affecting the JCPSS and related state juvenile justice data systems. It has also contributed to growing blind spots in the information needed to measure or assess juvenile justice programs and policies adopted in recent years.

6. Lack of performance outcome measures for the juvenile justice system.

California lacks standard and statewide performance outcome measures for the juvenile justice system. While the state JCPSS collects and reports case processing information, the data as reported are not linked to performance targets or outcome expectations that are centrally defined. An example referenced repeatedly in this report is the lack of any standard performance outcome measure for recidivism, as applied to state-funded juvenile justice grant programs. Some effort has been made in recent years to require state-funded juvenile justice programs to be “evidence-based.”

“While the state JCPSS collects and reports case processing information, the data as reported are not linked to performance targets or outcome expectations that are centrally defined.”

For example, the passage of Assembly Bill 526 in 2013 requires that 70 percent of defined youth program grants made by BSCC be “evidence-based” in the future. A determination that a program is evidence-based cannot be made in the absence of outcome measures and related data. On the adult side, the Legislature has required BSCC to adopt a standard definition of “recidivism” to be incorporated into tracking of outcomes for adult prisoners realigned to county jails and supervision—but not for juveniles.

The Council of State Governments, in its November 2015 report on “Improving Outcomes for Youth,” frames a key question that state policymakers and agency leaders should ask as follows: *Have specific measures been identified to evaluate the performance of the juvenile justice system and whether resources are being used efficiently?* For the California juvenile justice system as a whole, the answer to this question is either “no” or “not yet.” In its Grants Report on improved reporting requirements for the JJCPA and YOBG juvenile justice grant programs, the Working Group concluded that due to the lack of consistent and available cross-county data on

youth outcomes, it could not presently recommend the adoption and enforcement of program-specific outcome measures or evaluations for those state-local grants.

- 7. Poor transparency and availability of statewide juvenile justice information for analysts, researchers, stakeholders and members of the public.** Due in part to the fracturing of data collection among different state agencies, California has no central website or data clearinghouse for retrieval of juvenile justice program, caseload, facility or performance outcome information. Anyone searching for relevant data must hopscotch between different agency websites to cobble together the information that is scattered among different agencies. Depending on the level of inquiry, some questions asked by those searching for information can be readily answered, while others cannot be answered at all.

For juvenile arrest data, the DOJ website provides a decent level of information on arrests by offense, gender, age and ethnicity in a query-based format that can produce county-level or statewide reports. However, probation and court processing information can only be accessed by downloading the annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report and scanning the hard copy text or appendix tables. BSCC's Juvenile Detention Profile Survey Quarter Survey Results can be accessed online, though it takes practice to be able to locate the survey data on the BSCC website. If your inquiry is about recidivism rates for juvenile offenders in California, you will find nothing useful in a present search of any agency websites, because there is no state database that contains recidivism data. Researchers, in particular, may be frustrated in attempts to derive deeper information or disaggregation of data from the state information sites as presently constituted.

The legislation creating the Working Group anticipates the need for greater transparency and public accountability. Assembly Bill 1468 (Statutes of 2014) requires the Working Group to produce recommendations on "the creation of a Web-based statewide clearinghouse or information center on operations, caseloads, dispositions and outcomes available in a user-friendly, query-based format for stakeholders and members of the public." See Recommendation 5 of this report.

C. Comparison to Other States

The Working Group was required by statute to review relevant data systems, studies or models from other states and to identify "elements worthy of replication in California." BSCC staff assisted in the identification of states having more advanced data and information models and capacity than California. In one meeting, the Working Group went "online" as a group for live exploration of the data and websites maintained by juvenile justice agencies in other states. The search tapped into sites operated by the states of Virginia, Illinois, Texas, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, and Washington. The Working Group also reviewed reports on data system technology and models published by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Contact was also made with the National Center for Juvenile Justice (the research arm of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges) for insights into other-state data systems.

This review served to reconfirm the limitations and constraints that characterize California's sparse and fractured state juvenile justice data network. Summarized below are some of the features from other-state systems that may be worth of replication in California.

- 1. *Integrated case management data systems or networks.*** Some states have moved well beyond the bare-bones data repository model by designing and using statewide juvenile justice case-management systems and networks. Virginia, through its Department of Juvenile Justice, retained the National Council on Crime and Delinquency to develop a statewide case management network whereby case-level data from arrest through disposition and supervision is entered by county agencies into the statewide data network. Information on individual cases can be accessed across jurisdictional boundaries and tracked over time, with the capacity to produce statewide analytical reports on populations and trends. Pennsylvania, with assistance from the MacArthur Foundation, replaced a fractured patchwork of local data systems with a modern, statewide Juvenile Court Case Management System putting all counties on the same case management network. This system includes risk and needs assessment information and diversion and placement options that probation case workers can access for case processing purposes. Arizona is expanding its Juvenile On-Line Tracking case management programming, extensively developed first in Maricopa County, into a statewide juvenile justice case management network.
- 2. *Extensive tracking of case processing and outcome data.*** Even where a state juvenile justice data system serves mainly as a data repository rather than as an active case management system, the breadth and depth of case-level data collected on exemplary other-state systems far exceeds the capacity or design of the California system. Florida's Department of Justice collects massive data on every juvenile referral, prosecution, diversion and placement made in that state. Their system captures and annually reports extensive outcome data for each public or private youth placement or correctional facility, including recidivism and cost-per-case outcome measures for each dispositional placement. Texas provides another example of a state juvenile justice data system that collects case-level data that is far more exhaustive than the short list captured by JCPSS in California; see, for example, the data elements listed for the Texas Electronic Data Interchange on their department website at <http://www.tjtd.texas.gov/statistics/statisticsdetail.aspx>.
- 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. Recidivism is widely regarded as the gold standard of performance measures for justice system programs. Policymakers, system professionals and members of the public want to know whether the programs they support with tax dollars are working and how well the goals of public and community safety are being served. The Council of State Governments Justice Center, in 2015 survey of states, reports that 39 of 50 states routinely track juvenile recidivism at some level of detail, though California is not among them.

Analysis of recidivism reporting is complicated by the great variation in how recidivism is defined and measured. In the context of juvenile justice, a recidivism event might

be a subsequent arrest, a subsequent charge or petition filed, subsequent court adjudication or a return to custody. Recidivism reports also use different lengths of times or “periods of risk” over which repeat offense events are tracked.

Florida’s Department of Juvenile Justice may top the list for the level and detail of its juvenile recidivism data reports. The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice publishes annual “Comprehensive Accountability Reports” documenting recidivism rates (re-adjudication within 12 months) for each program and facility to which juvenile justice youth are referred. It supplements these reports with “Performance Measure Reports” on broader juvenile justice caseloads and with Monthly “Accountability Scorecards.” These reports are updated through 2014 and are posted on the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice website at www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/research-reports/car. Texas has recidivism measures embedded in the statewide database managed by their Department of Juvenile Justice. The Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice publishes annual reports on rearrest and rates for youth on probation supervision or parole. The group reviewed recidivism reports published annually by the states of Illinois and Colorado, documenting annual recidivism rates for juveniles coming out of their state commitment facilities.

“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.”

A 2011 report issued by OJJDP studied juvenile justice recidivism reports published routinely by the states of Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin. The state of Kentucky recently revised its juvenile justice code to require the “development of procedures to track juvenile recidivism, which shall include adjudication of a new public offense or conviction of a crime within three years of release from an out-of-home placement or release from commitment.” Washington State has taken recidivism monitoring to another level, combining recidivism reports for state-funded programs with economic modeling to produce a cost-benefit analysis for each program.

The list of states that routinely collect juvenile justice recidivism outcome data does not include California. The 2009 report of the California State Juvenile Commission (*California Juvenile Justice Master Plan: A Blueprint for an Outcome Oriented Juvenile Justice System*) cites recidivism data as a necessity, stating that: “The long term goal of an outcome-oriented juvenile justice system is to reduce recidivism. Consequently, all of the data required to measure recidivism must be collected” (*Master Plan*, page 33). Based on the Probation Survey conducted for this report, only one-third of California probation departments are routinely engaged in the collection of some form of juvenile recidivism data at the county level, and this practice is neither standardized nor required by state law. Some recidivism data on individual programs has been collected and reported by counties receiving state-local juvenile justice grants; however, the methods used to gather this data have been questioned by analysts and by the Working Group.

Some special projects and studies on juvenile recidivism have been conducted or are underway in California. A comprehensive report on *Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes* in March 2015 was co-authored by partners from California State University at Los Angeles, the Advancement Project and the Children's Defense Fund. California also participates in a three-state project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts in coordination with the National Center for Juvenile Justice to examine needs and best methods for the collection of juvenile recidivism data. However, on a statewide basis, California remains without a plan, approach or commitment to the collection and reporting of recidivism outcomes for juvenile offenders at all levels of justice system processing.

4. **Capacity to produce specialized studies and reports.** Other states were also distinguished from California by a state-level capacity to use data systems to generate specialized studies or reports on juvenile justice populations, practices and reforms. These include recidivism studies on defined offender populations (for example, state-incarcerated youth, crossover youth), information on risk and needs assessment tools, analyses pertaining to juveniles transferred to adult criminal courts and reports on other practice and policy issues.

In 2015, the state of Texas, with help from the Pew Charitable Trust, accessed its juvenile justice data bank to produce a widely heralded report on outcomes for juveniles moved from state institutions to local probation control, under that state's 2007 juvenile justice realignment reform. The Texas *Closer to Home* study compared recidivism outcomes for different realignment service cohorts, broken out by county and type of program to which realigned offenders were referred. This landmark report is now helping Texas counties with higher recidivism rates make adjustments in their juvenile justice programming, in order to improve performance results. By contrast, California's lack of data capacity to track juvenile offender outcomes renders it nearly impossible to produce comprehensive statewide analyses or reports on the outcomes of youth who were realigned from state correctional facilities to local control in 2007.

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, has adopted a cost-based accountability model that, by law, requires state-funded corrections programs to be evaluated based on the cost and performance of state-funded programs. The goal is to provide Washington policymakers and budget writers with research-based information that can, with a high degree of certainty, lead to better program outcomes coupled with more efficient use of taxpayer dollars. WSIPP has developed a three-step process to draw conclusions about what works and what does not to meet legislative funding criteria. First, it systematically assesses relevant studies to identify policy options that have been found to be effective. Second, it determines how much it would cost Washington taxpayers to produce the results found in Step 1. Third, WSIPP assesses the risk of estimated investments to determine the odds that a particular policy option will at least break even.

The cost-based performance and accountability approach adopted in the State of Washington has no parallel in California. In 2013, legislation to replicate the WSIPP model was introduced in California, but that measure never made it out of the Legislature (Senate Bill 466, DeSaulnier). The proposal drew support from the Little Hoover Commission and others seeking to tie state justice system investments to performance outcomes; others, however, perceived it to be inconsistent with the 2011 California prison realignment principle that counties should have wide latitude to determine which programs and public safety strategies should be supported with state funds. Among probation departments there remains some concern that state-crafted program evaluations could lead to invidious comparisons of results, failing to account for local differences in demographics, economics and crime profiles.

State and county stakeholders continue to explore issues related to justice system program evaluation in California. Currently, four California counties are partnering with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative with a focus on programs for adult offenders.⁴ Results First is a multi-state initiative that seeks to increase the capacity of states to base program and budget decisions on evidence about program cost and efficacy. The approach is summarized in a Results First Initiative report as follows:

Information on how the cost of a new opportunity compares with its short- and long-term effects is critically important in any major budget or policy decision, yet these data are often in short supply. ...Results First partners collect cost information on their programs and services to customize a benefit-cost model that estimates a return on investment for each assessed program. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy developed this model, which includes modules on criminal and juvenile justice, pre-K through 12th-grade education, child welfare, mental health, substance abuse, and public health.

6. State websites or clearinghouses providing comprehensive juvenile justice information.

Other states provide models of juvenile justice information sharing that may be worthy of replication in California. The Georgia Juvenile Justice Data Clearinghouse presents basic juvenile justice caseload and processing information in user-friendly format on a central site developed through a collaborative multi-agency group under the aegis of the Georgia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice maintains a website that is replete with information on caseloads, facilities and outcomes pertaining to its juvenile justice population, including recidivism reports for youth released from each type of juvenile justice facility in the state. Juvenile justice department or agency sites in Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Virginia, among others, offer multiple windows and options for the review and retrieval of juvenile justice system and performance information. To help fill the information gap in California, private nonprofit organizations like the Center for Juvenile and Criminal

“Other states provide models of juvenile justice information sharing that may be worthy of replication in California.”

⁴ A Results First special report on how these four California counties have applied this results-based approach can be accessed online at www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2015/09/results_first_ca_case_study_web.pdf?la=en

Justice and the W. Haywood Burns Institute have built their own websites capturing and displaying presently available juvenile justice data, in query-based formats.

- 7. Limits of other-state models.** While other states may have out-paced 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. In July 2014, the Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center, in a partnership with the Pew Charitable Trusts and the National Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, issued the results of a 50-state survey on state practices in measuring recidivism and other juvenile justice outcomes. Their report concluded that:

Almost half of all states described their capacity to collect and report recidivism and other performance data as “Strong” or “Very Strong,” but the other half rated their capacity as “Average,” “Below Average,” or “Weak.” States primarily blamed a lack of easily retrievable data, the perception that the data was not reliable, and limited resources for their struggles to track recidivism. (Policy Brief: Measuring and Using Juvenile Recidivism Data to Inform Policy, Practice and Resource Allocation, CSG Justice Center, July 2014)

The CSG Justice Center makes available a number of resources for states interested in upgrading their data systems and their capacity to track key outcome measures for justice system youth and to use those results to inform policy, budget and program decisions. This could serve as a resource for the agencies or individuals seeking to implement the recommendations of this report on rebuilding the California juvenile justice data system.

D. Policy Choices for California

In important ways, California has been a trendsetter among states for juvenile justice reform. California’s major youth corrections realignment law (Senate Bill 81) adopted in 2007 has served as a legislative and funding model for juvenile justice realignment and “deep end” reforms considered or adopted in other states. California’s Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, passed in the year 2000, may be unrivaled among states for the size of the annual state appropriation that supports local youth crime prevention programs. California has been on the forefront of states modifying pupil suspension and expulsion laws to support better education outcomes for youth. California has responded quickly to U.S. Supreme Court rulings by establishing sentence reviews for prisoners whose crimes were committed as juveniles. On their own accord, many counties have adopted modern risk and needs assessment tools and have updated their own information systems to support case management efficiency and evidence-based practices.

It therefore seems surprising the California juvenile justice system has lagged so profoundly behind other state and national benchmarks for data capacity and development. Compare, for example, this demonstration of commitment to a data-driven juvenile justice system from the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice:

Over the past several years, (Virginia's) DJJ has greatly enhanced its ability to effectively plan for and manage juveniles, programs, services, and other resources. DJJ designed functional management information systems and used the data generated and reported from these systems to better understand the offender population, activities in relation to those offenders, and methods to become more effective and efficient. ...DJJ's philosophy is that sound management of public resources and adherence to our core mission cannot be accomplished without the input provided from comprehensive data-based practices.

Virginia's commitment to a data-driven juvenile justice system is echoed in a more recent set of recommendations issued by the Justice Center of the Council of State Governments (CSG). The CSG Justice Center is a nonprofit organization that works in conjunction with the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to advise states on evidence-based approaches to crime reduction and public safety. Its November 2015 report on *Improving Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System* stresses the need for states to build the data capacity to track juvenile offender outcomes, including recidivism, in order to evaluate "whether their program and service investments are producing the expected benefits." The multi-state panel of experts and advisors urged state policymakers to ask these questions:

- ✓ *Have specific measures been identified to evaluate the performance of the juvenile justice system and whether resources are being used efficiently?*
- ✓ *Does a centralized data system exist to track assessments, supervision and services for youth across all parts of the juvenile justice system?*
- ✓ *Is data analysis readily available and routinely shared with policymakers and other stakeholders that shows what's working, what's not, and what improvement efforts are needed?*

For California, the need to upgrade current state-level capacity is compelled, not only by its outmoded technology, but also by the dynamics of change in the juvenile justice system. Juvenile justice laws, policies and programs are fast-evolving at all levels of government. Policymakers must constantly adapt to court rulings, crime trends, and fluctuations in the economy, new best-

practice models and emerging research on adolescent development. In California, major corrections realignment reforms have altered the fundamental landscape and fiscal structure of the justice system. The growing, and pervasive emphasis on evidence-based programming is built on a premise that program and spending decisions must be data-driven. The national effort to erase racial and ethnic disparities in the justice system cannot advance in the absence of data on affected populations. These evolving information needs cannot be met unless California takes action to modernize its statewide juvenile justice data and information capacity.

"The growing, and pervasive emphasis on evidence-based programming is built on a premise that program and spending decisions must be data-driven."

As noted earlier, California has invested in the modernization of data systems in other child serving realms, including welfare and education, but not for juvenile justice. We are

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?

Rebuilding will require resources. The cost of rebuilding California’s juvenile justice data systems may well be the most significant challenge or obstacle to getting it done. All of the recommendations that follow are offered on the condition that adequate resources must be allocated to support recommended changes at both the state and local levels. In the text under Recommendation 6 (implementation) the Working Group has suggested several options or opportunities for development of the resources needed for rebuilding.

In summary, the Working Group considers it timely for California policymakers—including affected state and local agencies, lawmakers and leaders in the executive branch—to make a commitment to modernizing the data capacity of the state’s juvenile justice system.

PART III: RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Overview: Approach of the Working Group to the Recommendations Offered in this Report

Members of the Working Group spent a good deal of time discussing the scope of this report. While Assembly Bill 1468 (Statutes of 2014) requires the Final Report to address specific issues, questions were raised about the breadth and extent of the report recommendations. In its review, the Working Group identified numerous gaps in the level and availability of juvenile justice information in California—especially when compared to other states. Our review also confirmed the use of outdated technology supporting the state’s central juvenile justice data bank (JCPSS), the fracturing of data collection responsibilities among different agencies and other major shortcomings described earlier in the text. A report recommending remedies for every problem encountered could conceivably run hundreds of pages while prospectively incurring massive costs for implementation. 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 outcome measurement needs of California’s 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, both by limiting the projected cost of proposed changes, by preserving system elements that do not need to be scrapped and by accessing public-private partnerships to support development.*

Using this approach, some of the changes considered by the Working Group review were taken off the table or placed on a list for deferred development. For example, the Working Group considered but did not adopt the goal of replacing the state's juvenile justice data repository with a new state-level case management system, on the model developed by some other states (described earlier) or on the model deployed for case management in the California child welfare system. Similarly, while there was strong support within the Working Group for the incorporation of "wellness" outcome measures in the juvenile justice system, our report recommends that the capacity to track youth outcomes in the allied areas of education, employment and child welfare be placed on a longer term timetable for development. With these guidelines in mind, the Working Group presents six major recommendations to the Legislature as stated below.

B. Recommendations

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

- 1. 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:***

- 1.1 The JCPSS operates on 15 year old technology that lacks expandability and is due for replacement. California should take immediate steps to plan and fund the replacement of this outdated system, with a goal of producing plans, specifications and costs for a modernized juvenile justice data system by January of 2018.*
- 1.2 The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) should have primary responsibility for developing the JCPSS replacement plan. The Legislature and the Governor should be advised of the need to identify and set aside the resources that will be needed both to plan and fund the replacement data system. In the planning and development phase, BSCC should work in concert with probation, courts, information technology experts, legislative committees, the Department of Justice and other stakeholders to produce a replacement plan and Request for Proposal (RFP) by January 1, 2018 that includes specifications and costs for the new system and other criteria (including integration local data systems) to meet data system replacement needs within a reasonable time frame.*

- 1.3 If the implementation task force or commission described in Recommendation 6 of this Report is established, primary responsibility for the development of the JCPSS replacement plan should be vested in that stakeholder and implementation body, including design of the RFP to replace the current system and review of responding proposals or applications, with the proviso that the BSCC Board is the appropriate authority to finally approve and issue the RFP and to approve final grant or contract awards for the new data repository.
- 1.4 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 and information resource and repository that collects, stores and makes available data on juvenile justice caseloads and outcomes. While the creation of an integrated juvenile justice state-local case management system is viewed as a laudable long term goal, retrofitting of the entire state-local juvenile justice data network to serve as an integrated case management system is not recommended at this time. Case management and case management methodology will continue to be local probation and court operations under local control. The new state juvenile justice data system will support but not replace local case management systems.
 - Compatible with existing county systems. The new juvenile court and probation information system should be developed so that it is compatible, to the extent feasible, with existing local systems and capacity to enter data into the newly devised state information system and to extract data back from that system for local applications. The replacement system should have utility for the counties and local agencies that are submitting data, so they can use the system to inform, guide and make appropriate program and spending decisions at the local level.
 - 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, in addition to those already embedded in the current JCPSS. This expanded data capacity should include the collection of key information in areas that are presently deficient or lacking such as: diversion, probation violations, transfers to adult court, recidivism and capturing juvenile justice outcomes in “wellness” areas that may include education, mental health, employment and other individual youth and re-entry outcomes. Any replacement system needs to have the flexibility to add and adapt to changing and expanding data collection needs over time. See Recommendation 3 for additional detail in this regard.
 - Unique identifiers. The new system should be developed with new specifications as to the identifier used for each individual whose information is captured or entered into the system. The goal is to improve identification

methodology to reduce duplicate or inaccurate entries including cross-county entries for a single youth. While biometric identification technology offers some advantages over name and number identification, the Working Group recommends against the use of biometric identifiers in the new system for reasons that include the local cost and retrofitting burden tied to such a mandate, as well as policy concerns about mandating that fingerprints, DNA samples or other biometric markers be taken from a broad population of children and youth entering the justice system for a wide range of offenses, behaviors and processing outcomes.

- *Standard definitions. The new system must be developed in concert with standardized definitions for the data elements that are entered into the system by local agencies. This need should be addressed by the implementation task force or commission established under Recommendation 6.*
- *Cost considerations. As they develop specifications and cost parameters for the replacement system, replacement planners must include not only the development costs but ongoing maintenance costs to keep the system operational over time. Changes in local systems that are need to link to or support replacement technology at the state level should also be identified in the cost analysis or projections for the revised statewide data system and network. Costing out a replacement system will require further investigation and discussion with prospective vendors prior to the design and distribution of a Request for Bid or RFP; one strategy suggested is to ask vendors to respond to Request for Information that will help to define the acceptable cost parameters for an RFP or vendor solicitation process that follows.*

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 1:

As mentioned above, the Department of Justice (DOJ) reports that the JCPSS operates on an outdated software platform that has reached maximum capacity and cannot accommodate significant changes to the organization of its data variables. It was designed in 1995 and converted to a web-based platform in 2002. The system cannot be “upgraded” or “patched” and cannot accommodate additional data fields or data variables. In fact, due to its age and limited capacity, the system is in danger of a complete breakdown, even without the overhaul and replacement recommended here.

Technology issues notwithstanding, the system is limited in its ability to track an individual’s path through the state’s juvenile and criminal justice process. The JCPSS was not designed for this purpose. Because no unique identifier is assigned to juveniles whose case data are entered into JCPSS, it is impossible to track a juvenile across county lines or to know if two entries from different counties are duplicates for the same juvenile. (In the present system, counties use their own individual identifiers which may differ from county to county). The JCPSS is useful in its capacity to produce aggregate reports, to reveal overall trends and to show some demographic information. However, there is no capacity to produce analytical reports for policymakers, budget writers or program developers, and there is no capacity to capture recidivism or other outcomes beyond those already embedded in the system.

DOJ utilizes JCPSS data, in aggregate form, to analyze process outcomes within the juvenile probation systems (e.g., numbers of arrests, petitions, adjudications, etc.). The aggregate counts derived from this analysis are published annually in DOJ's *Juvenile Justice in California* report. The limitations of that annual report have been described in Part II above. Essentially, the data and reports published out of this system answer only the question of "how many?"—disaggregated by age, race/ethnicity and gender. It is impossible to track individual juveniles as they move through the system, to assess which juveniles received which types of dispositions at which points and for which types of crimes. There is no capacity to track outcomes tied to specific dispositions in order to draw conclusions about what is or is not working.

County probation departments responding to the Working Group Probation Survey conducted in September 2015 offered insights into their experience with the JCPSS as presently configured. Many reported difficulties as users of the system, including problems with integrating locally collected data with JCPSS, confusion regarding JCPSS definitions for offenses and other data elements; and the inability to use JCPSS to generate recidivism and other analytical reports.

"Policymakers can look on the bright side of renewal cost by anticipating that the information generated by a modernized data system can be utilized, as it has been by other states and disciplines, to achieve future cost savings through a more efficient and data-driven approach to program development and resource deployment."

The overarching need to improve California's state-level juvenile justice data system and performance measurement capacity has been described previously in this report. See Part II of this report under the Gap Analysis, Comparison to Other States and Policy Choices for California.

In California, the JCPSS is the only statewide database that collects and maintains data drawn from county-level processing of juvenile justice cases. Its replacement presents a potentially costly and time-consuming challenge. The cost of replacement can only be determined based on specifications for the new technology that must come from a focused and future planning process. While this replacement cost may run into the hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars, at some point California must end the long hiatus of investment in adequate justice system technology. Further deferral of the investment can only mean that replacement costs will rise as utility and function decline in years ahead. Policymakers can look on the bright side of renewal cost by anticipating that the information generated by a modernized data system can be utilized, as it has been by other states and disciplines, to achieve future cost savings through a more efficient and data-driven approach to program development and resource deployment.

Under Recommendation 1.2, the task of designing the specifications and vendor responses to replace JCPSS with a modern system is assigned under this recommendation to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). This delegation is consistent with the following recommendation on consolidation of juvenile

justice data collection responsibilities into a single state agency. It is also compatible with the statutory community corrections data collection and policy setting roles articulated in the 2012 Penal Code revisions that replaced the Corrections Standards Authority with BSCC (see Penal Code Section 6027).

Recommendation 1.3 seeks to conform this recommendation with Recommendation 6, where the Working Group advises the establishment of a Juvenile Justice Data task force, board or commission having implementation responsibility and oversight for report recommendations. If such an implementation body is established by legislation or other means, as recommended, the Working Group strongly suggests that the design and development of the JCPSS replacement system, including the RFP and proposal review, be vested in the implementation body so created, with the proviso that final RFP approval and grant awards must necessarily be actions taken by the full BSCC Board.

Recommendation 1.4 outlines key features or issues that should be included or taken into account in the design and installation of the replacement system. The need to include these features or components has been explained at multiple points in the text of this report. The Working Group discussed the option of recommending that JCPSS be replaced with a new statewide juvenile justice case management system, modeled to some extent on the integrated state-local child welfare case management system (CWS/CMS) maintained by the California Department of Social Services. While desirable as a long-term goal for the California juvenile justice system, the group concluded that such a recommendation was not feasible at the present time due to the cost and conversion barriers faced in such a massive overhaul of current operations.

The planning group that develops the specifications for the replacement system must take into account how the new system will interface with existing county juvenile justice data systems. The Working Group has sought to adhere to a goal or principle that the state's replacement system should be compatible, to the extent feasible, with existing county information systems. However, the real-world application of this principle deserves deeper analysis. Many of the counties responding to the Working Group Probation Survey described their own, local juvenile justice data systems as antiquated, difficult to use and afflicted with many of the limitations described above for the JCPSS as a whole. Thus the question arises whether the new JCPSS should be tuned down in order to remain compatible with county systems that have presently limited capacity. The alternative, of course, is to design and implement a more global modernization plan that would incentivize or fund county-level upgrades that are needed to ensure compatibility with a revised and improved state data network.

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

2. State-level juvenile justice data collection and reporting responsibility should be consolidated 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 and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), Division of Juvenile Justice.

2.1 In the future, the Working Group recommends that state-level juvenile justice data collection should be consolidated, centralized and managed by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). This would entail moving to BSCC the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System presently managed by DOJ. It would also necessitate an appropriation of sufficient, supporting state funds to BSCC to staff and manage the consolidated data operations.

2.2 The consolidation of state juvenile justice reporting responsibility should be guided by the following factors or principles:

- In light of its statutory mission and mandates on the collection of up-to-date statewide justice system data, and given its central function as the state's primary community corrections agency dedicated to the development of effective local justice system programs and practices, BSCC is viewed as the logical agency-of-choice to manage these responsibilities.
- DOJ would continue to collect statewide law enforcement and arrest data, including juvenile arrest data, under its Monthly Arrest & Citation Register (MACR) data network. DOJ would continue for the time being to publish the annual Juvenile Justice in California report in cooperation with BSCC.
- The CDCR 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 operate the new Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) in cooperation with its traditional community corrections partners: probation, courts and law enforcement.
- BSCC would continue to collect juvenile justice facility data for a revised and improved Juvenile Detention Profile Survey as recommended further below.
- BSCC will retain responsibility for the compilation of annual reports for the JJCPA and YOBG grants, as further facilitated by having operational control

over the revised JCPSS that supplies key information for these annual legislative reports.

- 2.3 *A necessary condition for the implementation of this recommendation is that adequate provision must be made in annual state budgets to support the proposed consolidation of juvenile justice data collection and management responsibilities within BSCC.*

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 2:

The dispersal of juvenile justice data collection responsibilities among different state agencies has been described at multiple points in this report. The bottom line is that state-level juvenile justice data banks are in different locations, where data are collected and reported using different definitions and methods. This fracturing of statewide juvenile justice data compromises the ability of policymakers, budget planners and others to fund, plan and manage juvenile justice programs and facilities across the state.

We noted previously California, unlike most other states, lacks a dedicated state “Department of Juvenile Justice.” For the most part, juvenile justice in California is a locally-run operation with 58 different county iterations. State-level functions—like the promulgation of facility standards, the administration of state-local grants, the operation of state corrections facilities and the collection of data—have splintered over time into different state agencies. Meanwhile, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) has accumulated the largest share of state functions related to the oversight and support of state and local juvenile justice programs and operations.

Under legislation that reconfigured the former Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) as the BSCC in 2012, BSCC operates under an expanded mission statement that vests it with broad justice system policy, program, funding and oversight functions. Penal Code Section 6024 requires BSCC to provide “...leadership, coordination and technical assistance to promote effective state and local efforts and partnerships in California’s adult and juvenile criminal justice system” and to promote, “a justice investment strategy that fits each county and is consistent with the integrated statewide goal of improved public safety through cost-effective, promising and evidence-based strategies for managing criminal justice populations.” Some of the important juvenile justice functions carried out by BSCC include:

- BSCC promulgates state minimum standards for the operation of local juvenile justice facilities, including juvenile halls, camps and ranches and adult jails holding juveniles. BSCC inspects these local juvenile facilities for compliance with state and federal regulations.
- BSCC also houses a Juvenile Justice Standing Committee of state and local experts and practitioners who advise the BSCC Board on a range of juvenile justice policy and program matters that come before it.
- BSCC administers federal juvenile justice grant programs including federal Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Act and Title II and Juvenile Accountability Block Grants.

- BSCC also administers state-local grant programs including the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, the Youthful Offender Block Grant, the California Gang Reduction, Intervention & Prevention grants, juvenile facility construction grants and myriad smaller grant programs with juvenile justice features such as the Mentally Ill offender Crime Reduction grant program. Starting in 2016, BSCC will allocate 65 percent of Proposition 47 funds for which juvenile justice programs are eligible under recent legislation (Assembly Bill 1056, Atkins).
- BSCC sets, maintains and oversees hiring and training standards for county probation departments.
- BSCC was designated by the Legislature as the state agency base for this Juvenile Justice Data Working Group.

BSCC also operates with specific mandates related to justice system data collection. Penal Code Section 6027 (a) states that it shall:

...be the duty of the Board of State and Community Corrections to collect and maintain available information and data about state and community corrections policies, practices, capacities and needs...as they relate to both adult corrections, juvenile justice and gang problems. The board shall seek to collect and make publicly available up-to-date data and information reflecting the impact of state and community correctional, juvenile justice and gang-related policies and practices enacted in the state, as well as information and data concerning promising and evidence-based practices from other jurisdictions.

One of the questions asked within the Working Group as it approached the decision to consolidate juvenile justice data collection at BSCC was: What is the position or reaction of allied agencies, like DOJ and CDCR, to the recommended shift of juvenile justice data operations to BSCC?

DOJ presently administers the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). However, DOJ is primarily a state agency that deals with matters related to law enforcement and the adult criminal justice system, and its data collection and reporting operations are strongly oriented around those system components. DOJ is not fundamentally set up or oriented to serve as a state-level juvenile justice agency. Based on DOJ input into Working Group deliberations, DOJ is supportive of the proposed shifting juvenile justice data collection activity to BSCC. Nevertheless, the Working Group recommends that pending further definition of BSCC's juvenile justice data management role, DOJ should retain responsibility for publishing the annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report. This report combines arrest data drawn from MACR (a continuing DOJ function), from the Adult Criminal History System and from the JCPSS (proposed to move to BSCC). DOJ has a successful history of producing the report in years past. The continued publication of *Juvenile Justice in California* by DOJ would be subject to later review, if and when BSCC's overall juvenile justice data operation has been reconfigured based on all of the recommendations in this Report.

Yet to be determined is how the data and research bank on CDCR's Division of Juvenile Facilities inmate populations maintained by the research division of CDCR would be affected under this proposed realignment of juvenile justice data responsibilities. CDCR's Juvenile Justice Division (DJJ) has eliminated some of the data reports rendered irrelevant by recent realignment and parole reforms. DJJ is making other adjustments to the juvenile inmate data it routinely collects and reports. DJJ is undeniably in the best position among state agencies to collect and report data on its own inmate population. In this regard, the Working Group recommends that BSCC and DJJ work together as juvenile justice data collection tasks are consolidated at BSCC to plan how the integration, sharing and publication of information on state youth corrections are to be managed in future years.

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

3. 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.

3.1 The expanded list of additional data elements should be defined by a Board of State and Community Corrections (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 to state and local agencies to increase data collection capacity. The juvenile justice data task force or commission described in Recommendation 6, if established, may also serve as the stakeholder group responsible for defining the expanded data elements to be collected and reported under this recommendation.

3.2 The Working Group recommends that the following juvenile justice processing and outcome points be considered by the implementation group as priorities for inclusion in the data universe of the revised state data repository:

- Diversion from prosecution by probation and courts.*
- Petitions filed including subsequent petitions by offense.*
- Probation violations by type and outcome.*
- Placements by type.*
- Adult criminal court outcomes by method of transfer to adult court.*
- Recidivism monitoring and reporting based on standard definitions of juvenile recidivism.*
- Wellness outcome measures, to be developed over time, to identify post-custody or post-service status of justice system youth with regard to education, employment, health or mental health and other factors.*
- Adequate disaggregation of major data elements by gender, age, race and ethnicity.*

- 3.3 *The goal of expanding the number and diversity of data elements collected and included in the state juvenile justice data bank is integrally related to the capacity of local agencies to supply the additional data. 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:

Repeatedly in this report, the Working Group has described the current limitations of the state's main juvenile justice data repository—the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) presently maintained by the state Department of Justice. In brief summary, the important limitations include:

- JCPSS is limited to the collection and reporting of process events using data submitted by juvenile court and probation systems that make up the reporting universe. Lacking unique identifiers and new programming features, the JCPSS cannot track individuals as they progress through the juvenile justice system, nor can it be used as an analytical tool or system to produce outcome reports or useful comparisons based on analysis of individual data files.
- The system is presently capable processing a static list of probation and court events—such as referral reason, probation disposition, petitions filed by offense, court dispositions by broad categories, and so on. The JCPSS, operating on antiquated (15 year old) technology, has reached its capacity for the processing of data elements and is considered “non-expandable” by DOJ.

At the outset it is important to acknowledge that JCPSS, even with its present limitations, does serve the purpose of providing basic data covering an extensive list of probation and court processing events in California counties. As aggregated, this data bank supports publication of DOJ's annual *Juvenile Justice in California* report that documents probation dispositions, petitions filed by offense, court dispositions, transfers and direct files to adult court and adult court dispositions of juveniles. Given an existing capacity to collect and report the current body of juvenile justice information on a statewide basis one could ask: Why do we need anything more?

In part, the answer is that the current data system cannot track basic justice system outcome indicators like recidivism. In addition, the California juvenile justice system has evolved over the years into a more complex system with higher demand for information supporting the development of evidence-based practices, the measurement of realignment success, the adoption of new sentencing laws and the assessment of gender and racial equality in the justice system. More—not less—information is needed to support competent and effective budget, program and policy development in a modern juvenile justice age.

In its deliberations, the Working Group identified an “ideal” universe of data elements that could or should be collected by counties and entered into the statewide data repository. The results of this data element “scan” can be found in Attachment D. As replacement technology is planned for JPCSS, a number of questions regarding the scope of data to

be managed by the new system will need to be answered. Which of these data elements are feasible to include in a new system? What systems outside of probation would need to be accessed in order to track them? What would that access look like? Do any counties have the capacity to phase in new data elements now? This report recommends the formation of a task force or committee to move these recommendations forward; these questions would fall to this group as it continued to flesh out a new data universe. Some important areas in which data collection needs to be expanded beyond present limits are listed above in Recommendation 3.2.

Not only must the new statewide data bank have the capacity to track additional data elements, but it must also include an expanded capacity for data analysis. Under the current JCPSS, it is not possible to track individual juveniles as they move through the system, to assess which juveniles received which types of dispositions at which points and for which types of crimes. There is no capacity to track outcomes tied to specific dispositions in order to draw conclusions about what is or is not working. The system is not designed to be able to produce routine monitoring reports. Any analysis comparing specific JCPSS populations must be accomplished, if even possible, by writing new programming to extract the desired information. Given these constraints, queries from policymakers or budget writers making important juvenile justice program or funding decisions become difficult or impossible to answer.

“...the California juvenile justice system has evolved over the years into a more complex system with higher demand for information supporting the development of evidence-based practices, the measurement of realignment success, the adoption of new sentencing laws and the assessment of gender and racial equality in the justice system. More—not less—information is needed to support competent and effective budget, program and policy development in a modern juvenile justice age.”

Recidivism outcome measures

The gold standard by which nearly all justice system programs are measured is recidivism. Recidivism measurement is particularly relevant in the context of a juvenile justice system that is founded on a primary goal of rehabilitation. Measures of crime reduction are key factors that enter into decision making at all levels of the justice system—from judges who make sentencing choices to policymakers who allocate funds for programs. Yet as we have noted often in this report, California has no state-level capacity to monitor and report recidivism outcomes for children and youth under justice system control.

This omission has not gone unnoticed in California. It has been highlighted in past reports including the 2009 *Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan* issued by the former State Juvenile Justice Commission, and the 2012 State Auditor’s Report that was so critical of the methods used to measure realignment outcomes for youth served under the Youthful Offender Block Grant program. In 2013, California passed Assembly Bill 1050 (Dickinson) requiring the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) to adopt a standard, statewide definition of recidivism in order to “facilitate consistency in local data

collection, evaluation and implementation evidence-based practices.” This mandate was interpreted to apply only to the adult criminal justice system, not to juvenile justice.

Coming up with a standard definition of recidivism is a necessary first step on the path toward implementing a statewide capacity to track and report juvenile recidivism outcomes in a consistent and useful manner. This is no easy task given the multiple factors that must be considered in crafting a definition. Is a subsequent juvenile arrest a recidivism event? Should a tighter standard apply, such as the filing of a subsequent petition or a subsequent adjudication or finding on a new criminal offense? Over what period or multiple time windows will recidivism events be counted? Lacking any statewide definition, the Chief Probation Officers of California deliberated for many years before adopting their own working definition of recidivism for juvenile justice (“Adjudication for a new offense committed while under probation supervision”).

The Working Group is persuaded that the capacity to monitor and report juvenile recidivism in a consistent and useful way across the state must be a high priority for the future. Under this recommendation, a BSCC stakeholder group (or the implementation body described in Recommendation 6) would do the following:

“The Working Group is persuaded that the capacity to monitor and report juvenile recidivism in a consistent and useful way across the state must be a high priority for the future.”

- Draft a standard definition of recidivism to track and measure outcomes of youth across a wide range of justice system interventions and programs. This might include having more than one universal definition fitting all programs and purposes. It might also include tracking of recidivism events over multiple time or risk periods (for example, over one, two and three years).
- Ensure that the design of the new state juvenile justice data repository (under Recommendation 1) includes the capacity to track recidivism events that are consistent with the definition(s) adopted.

It may be most appropriate for this element of the reform plan to be implemented by a special group or subcommittee that is dedicated to defining recidivism and planning how a JCPSS replacement system will track recidivism events going forward.

Some concern was raised in the Working Group that requiring counties to report recidivism outcomes might lead to invidious comparisons of county results, making counties with higher reported rates “look bad” in relation to those reporting lower rates. The Working Group agrees all results need to be fairly interpreted in relation to each venue’s demographic, economic and crime characteristics. However, the concern about differential results is not viewed as a reason not to collect recidivism data in the first place. From a positive perspective, sites with higher reported rates can use the information to target strategies and resources in areas likely to lower those rates in the future. The *Texas Closer to Home* study of juvenile realignment outcomes has been used in this way by local probation agencies in Texas to adjust programming in order to achieve more positive outcomes.

Wellness outcome measures

The Working Group considered how and whether a rebuilt juvenile justice data system in California should be able to measure “wellness outcomes” for youth, beyond the core measure of recidivism. The inquiry builds on the principle that the juvenile justice system has some obligation and responsibility to address the multiple needs of youth under justice system control—including their needs in the areas of education, health and mental health and family stability and support. At present, neither state nor local data systems have a consistent or statewide capacity to track reentry outcomes for juveniles who complete terms of probation, placement or confinement.

Ideally, local juvenile justice systems should be able to identify how various classes of justice system youth have met outcome goals in defined areas including education, mental health and employment, to name a few. However, juvenile justice information systems at the local level are rarely linked or integrated with the information systems of other youth-serving agencies. Aside from the simple fact that these agency information systems are segregated, confidentiality laws and other regulations often stand in the way of information sharing. Multiple technology and cost barriers need to be overcome in order to achieve this integrated capacity to track youth outcomes across different agencies and disciplines.

Despite these obstacles, the Working Group believes that California should have a system-wide goal of developing some capacity to track key wellness outcomes for justice system youth. The development effort might begin by investigating how links can be forged between a rebuilt statewide juvenile justice data repository and the newly expanded CALPADS information system under the state’s Department of Education. Another area perhaps worth examining is some level of information sharing or integration between the newly designed JCPSS system and the more advanced child welfare data and information system of the California Department of Social Services.

“California should have a system-wide goal of developing some capacity to track key wellness outcomes for justice system youth.”

The value of collecting wellness outcomes on the “whole life” impact of justice system involvement was echoed by the by the Sacramento County Probation Department in its response to the Working Group Probation Survey, as follows:

The data each County submits to the JCPSS system represents unbelievable potential for reporting and integration with social service, educational, and other justice partners. JCPSS could potentially be integrated with statewide School and/or Child Welfare systems. The union of data from just those two (additional) systems would allow big picture views of things like graduation rates for offenders involved with Child Welfare and Justice systems.

Despite its worthiness as a goal, the collection and reporting of youth wellness outcomes involves significant cost and system retrofitting challenges. In light of these challenges the Working Group has placed this objective on a list for longer term development. Yet it remains important to acknowledge the need to move in this direction. We note, as well, that new findings in adolescent science are changing how juvenile justice systems respond to youth misconduct. The evolution of juvenile justice law into reforms that are

more developmentally based implies a further need to adjust the juvenile justice data system in California to take the wider, developmental needs and outcomes of youth into fuller account.

Recommendation 3.3 acknowledges that expanding the data collection capacity at the state level has an impact on the county agencies that must supply the additional data. The stakeholder or implementation body that undertakes the task of defining new data elements for the state system must also evaluate the associated workload and capacity demand on county agencies. The planning effort must include identification of the equipment, software, training and related needs of local agencies as well as an analysis of local costs and available resources. A guiding principle of the Working Group in drafting these recommendations is that, to the extent possible, state level changes and upgrades should be compatible with existing county systems and capacity. This is not an easy goal to meet. The implementation body will need to come up with plans and specifications to support the integration of county-level systems. This may include the need to identify incentives or resources to help counties upgrade data systems that are operating on older technology. These state-local compatibility, development and resource issues must be carefully considered by planners and policymakers alike.

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

4. 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 disposition placements for juvenile offenders.

- 4.1 *The Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) presently managed by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is deficient in many respects. It should be revised and upgraded based on a full review of the facility-based data presently collected and of the data that needs to be collected to adequately meet juvenile justice system monitoring and development needs in the future.*
- 4.2 *BSCC should convene an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) immediately to assume responsibility for reviewing and recommending upgrades to the JDPS.*
- 4.3 *The new survey or report must be grounded in standard definitions of the facility data elements that counties are to report to BSCC.*
- 4.4 *In revising the JDPS, the following issues and needs should be addressed by the ESC and others who are involved in the effort to improve state-level data collection and reports on utilization, occupancy and population characteristics for local juvenile justice facilities:*
 - *Capacity to collect additional detail on facility admissions by offense.*
 - *Capacity to collect additional detail on status of detainees, for example, pre-trial, awaiting placement, commitment, etc.*
 - *Include race/ethnicity and age detail in addition to gender information.*

- *Include or improve length of stay data for each type of facility.*
- *Retain average daily population (ADP), rated capacity and other basic facility population information in reports.*
- *Include mental health, education and welfare status based on standard definitions.*
- *Consider adding information to support analysis of relevant policy and practice concerns such as the use of solitary confinement.*
- *Restore annual reports summarizing annual data in addition to quarterly reports.*
- *Reduce delay between submission of data and BSCC publication of reports.*

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 4:

Part II of this report offered a general description of the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) maintained by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). This is the only statewide source of data on the populations, capacities and uses of California's substantial network of county-run juvenile justice facilities. Those facilities include detention centers (juvenile halls) and county probation camps and ranches holding pre-trial and post-disposition youth. As of mid-2014, the combined "rated capacity" of those local juvenile justice facilities (for all counties) was just under 13,000 beds. Due to lower juvenile crime rates and other factors, occupancy levels in these county juvenile facilities have fallen to under 50 percent of rated capacity (overall) at the present time.

California law vests BSCC with important responsibilities related to the oversight of county-operated juvenile justice facilities. BSCC is responsible for standards and inspections of county juvenile halls, camps and ranches and local jails holding juveniles. BSCC also allocates funds for the construction and renovation of county juvenile detention and commitment facilities. The obligation of county probation departments to collect and report facility data for the JDPS is articulated in BSCC regulations (CCR Title 15, Section 1342). The original intent of the

"Over the years the JDPS has become a critical and sole source of statewide information on how local confinement beds are used and how they fit into the overall landscape of juvenile justice policy and practice in California."

JDPS was to collect information that would assist decision makers in choices regarding capital outlay, construction, programs and operation of local juvenile facilities which BSCC oversees. Over the years the JDPS has become a critical and sole source of statewide information on how local confinement beds are used and how they fit into the overall landscape of juvenile justice policy and practice in California.

Nevertheless, the JDPS operates under severe limitations as to the scope, methodology and reliability of the data collected and reported. Unlike the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS), the data processed through the JDPS are wholly aggregate data based on monthly snapshots or average daily population (ADP) counts submitted by probation departments to BSCC. These reports are rather narrow in scope, including ADP counts by type of facility, a breakdown of pre- and post-dispositional status for juvenile halls, disaggregation by gender and age and misdemeanor/felony offense level,

and information on the mental health, psychotropic drug and adult court status. Average length of stay information is collected and reported for all housed juveniles without any further disaggregation, and no data are collected on the race and ethnicity of youth who are confined in these local justice system facilities.

According to BSCC, data consistency and reliability are chronic problems affecting the JDPS. Counties use their own definitions for many of the data points, and because only aggregate data are reported there is no ability to cross-check for duplicate or missing entries or to impose other reliability checks through the state agency. In addition, due to resource, staffing and other problems, the JDPS Quarter Survey Results are currently running about one year in arrears. In 2011, BSCC loaded the county-level reports into an online query dashboard so that county-by-county results can be accessed by any user. However, continuing delays in updating survey results means that they are of limited value in driving current policy, practice or budget decisions related to local confinement.

The need for more complete and useful information on local juvenile justice facility utilization is paramount. From the data that are available, we know that occupancy levels for juvenile halls and probation camps are running below 50 percent of rated capacity. The confined local juvenile offender population has been dropping steadily over the last ten years due to factors that include ongoing declines in juvenile arrests, petitions filed and dispositions of secure confinement. In some counties, declines in occupancy can also be attributed to increased referrals of offenders to non-custodial alternatives. At the same time, some classes of juveniles, including those who can no longer be committed to CDCR's Division of Juvenile Facilities, are serving longer local commitment sentences in the post-realignment era. Due to the limits of design and information for the JDPS, deeper analysis of these local detention and commitment trends is rendered difficult or impossible.

Other criticisms include the inability of the survey to capture adequate demographic information (on race and ethnicity), making it impossible for California to comply with the U.S. Department of Justice's mandate that all states examine practices and policies that may contribute to the disproportionate confinement of youth of color. As now constructed it does not collect information as to how local facilities are used for confinement practices that may be under scrutiny from a policy perspective, such as the use of solitary confinement. Under Recommendation 4.4, the Working Group has listed some of the key points of information that should be considered for revision or addition to the JDPS.

This recommendation proposes convening an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) of BSCC to identify the gaps in survey data and to design a new framework for the JDPS. The task is assigned to an ESC rather than to the implementation body described in Recommendation 6. This is based on the assumption that BSCC will continue to collect aggregate local juvenile facility data from county probation departments, and that the facility reports would not be integrated into the replacement JCPSS advised in Recommendation 1. In addition, the Working Group views the challenge of reworking and upgrading the JDPS to be "doable" using BSCC's internal process over a relatively short time frame.

This recommendation stops short of calling for the survey to be upgraded so that it operates using individualized data for each confined or covered juvenile, because that would require a cost and conversation effort viewed as beyond the present capacity of BSCC. Still, the Working Group suggests the following two implementation issues as questions that deserve further review by stakeholders, lawmakers and others who are considering improvements in the JDPS. These questions are:

- Should the implementation task force recommended to produce a plan for the upgrade and replacement of the JCPSS also consider a design that would incorporate or subsume the JDPS into the “new” JCPSS? If the replacement data repository is moved as recommended to BSCC and if the new system could incorporate all of the recommended and expanded facility data elements, the need to overhaul and publish a separate Detention Profile Survey on a separate track could be avoided. This could equate to a higher level of efficiency and an economy of scale for a consolidated juvenile justice data system and network in the future.
- Should the JDPS be mandated by legislation? We noted previously that the requirement for county probation departments to submit facility reports to BSCC is articulated in BSCC regulations but not by statute. The transfer of juvenile justice data collection and management to BSCC, as recommended earlier, will require statutory changes to implement the shift of responsibilities. Stakeholders and lawmakers considering that transfer of responsibilities may also wish to consolidate JDPS data collection and reporting into a revised code structure that addresses juvenile justice data collection roles and responsibilities in a comprehensive manner.

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

5. California needs to improve stakeholder and citizen access to information on the operations, costs, outcomes and effectiveness of the California juvenile justice system.

5.1 *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.*

5.2 *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 and appreciate how the juvenile justice system works;*
- *Access to caseload and outcome data drawn from the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS), the revised Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) and other sources (including DOJ juvenile arrest data);*

- *Ideally, this access would be in the form of interactive web-based technology that allows queries to be submitted and answered for specific referral, processing, outcome and confinement sections of available data;*
- *Access to published juvenile justice data reports such as “Juvenile Justice in California;” and*
- *Graphic displays on juvenile justice trends and other key data to enhance the comprehension and utility of the information provided through the clearinghouse.*

5.3 *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 located and 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.*

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 5:

Penal Code Section 6032, subdivision (c)(2)(B) (added by Assembly Bill 1468, Statutes of 2014) requires the Working Group to develop:

Recommendations for the creation of a Web-based statewide clearinghouse or information center that would make relevant juvenile justice information on operations, caseloads, dispositions, and outcomes available in a user-friendly, query-based format for stakeholders and members of the public.

This recommendation, and the statutory mandate behind it, emerge from a widely-shared recognition that the juvenile justice system should operate in a transparent manner, using modern web-based technology to provide policymakers, stakeholders and citizens with useful data and insights on the system’s operations, costs and performance.

In its review of other-states the Working Group located multiple examples of state-level juvenile justice websites and data clearinghouses that exceed anything available in California. Some of these model state websites were referenced in the “gap analysis” in the preceding text (for example, for the states of Georgia, Florida and Texas).

These states feature juvenile justice websites or clearinghouses in graphically appealing, interactive formats with many of the features listed under Recommendation 5.2 above. A good example is the website maintained by the Department of Juvenile Justice Website operated by the state of Florida. That site offers comprehensive and detailed information on every aspect of the state-local juvenile justice system, including recidivism rates for each type of facility to which youth are committed.

“In its review of other-states the Working Group located multiple examples of state-level juvenile justice websites and data clearinghouses that exceed anything available in California.”

California, by contrast, has no state-based website providing a comprehensive description of the California juvenile justice system works—including how youth populations are processed, supervised or confined, what programs are offered or how juvenile justice programs and interventions succeed in terms of recidivism or other outcome criteria. To gather a picture of how the system operates, one must access multiple websites to gather slivers of information on facility use (BSCC), arrest, probation and court processing (DOJ) and state youth corrections (CDCR-DJJ). A number of private nonprofit organizations have launched their own juvenile justice information websites in the attempt to fill the information gap. Examples include the San Francisco-based Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice and the Oakland-based W. Haywood Burns Institute, both having added interactive and query-based juvenile justice data banks on their own organizational websites.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the dispersion of online access to juvenile justice information can be attributed to some degree to the absence of a dedicated state Department of Juvenile Justice in California—one having comprehensive juvenile justice system management, oversight and information dissemination needs. In California, the state agency having the largest share of code-designed juvenile justice program development, funding and data collection mandates is the BSCC. Barring legislative or executive action creating a dedicated state juvenile justice agency in California, BSCC becomes the logical state agency in which to place a juvenile justice data clearinghouse.

One alternative included in this recommendation is that the data clearinghouse and website be outsourced to and maintained by a university-based department that has the requisite skills, staffing and expertise in juvenile justice. A model for this approach is the child welfare case management data site that is operated for the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) by the University of California at Berkeley School of Social Welfare. This site, recently reorganized as the Child Welfare Indicators Project, offers a range of dashboards, data sets and analytical tools for any site visitor seeking detailed information on county child welfare caseloads in California. It operates as a collaborative venture of the University and CDSS with supporting grants from several California foundations having a history of child welfare system engagement.

The Working Group did discuss whether DOJ, as the current operator of the JCPSS, would be a viable option for development, launch and maintenance of this comprehensive juvenile justice information center. As noted elsewhere in this report, DOJ is primarily a state law enforcement agency. It is not designed or positioned to serve as a central state juvenile justice support and oversight agency. Moreover, DOJ has so many divisions and is so strongly focused on adult criminal justice system objectives that a juvenile justice website could very well become lost in this expansive state agency.

Implicit in the effort to implement this recommendation is that adequate resources must be made available to BSCC and other development partners, both for the design and launch of the new site and for its ongoing operation and maintenance. The total cost to design and launch such a site may well be surprisingly affordable according to Working Group member Laura Ridolfi who led development of the interactive juvenile justice data dashboard at the W. Haywood Burns Institute. The Working Group recommends that the

effort to design, develop and implement the clearinghouse should include outreach to private foundations and individual or corporate sponsors who have participated in similar ventures and might be willing to share development costs and the costs of ongoing upkeep. Another suggestion aired in the Working Group was that the California Office of Information Technology might be able to provide valuable assistance in the design of a dedicated California Juvenile Justice Data Clearinghouse.

The Working Group also considered a short term option. In the short term, California could make available, for internet publication, data that is already collected in JCPSS. This data is already formatted and available on the W. Haywood Burns Institute's website, in a map-based format where the data set can be queried in a variety of ways, including by county, by trend, by percent difference from prior years, by percent difference among racial and ethnic groups. It would not be difficult to clone or copy the W. Haywood Burns format, making the data similarly available on the BSCC website. This is viewed as a short-term option only---not as a substitute for a comprehensive, analytically competent and user-friendly juvenile justice clearinghouse that meets broader statewide needs for system information and transparency.

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

6. 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 that would have the following responsibilities:

- Include representatives from probation, courts, law enforcement, counties, advocacy, research and information technology disciplines.*
- Provide for representation or linkage with allied agencies that serve the juvenile justice population including child welfare, education and mental health.*
- Have primary and ongoing responsibility, beyond the life of the Working Group, for improvements of juvenile justice data and information capacity in California.*
- Have specific responsibility for designing and costing out the Juvenile Court Probation & Court Statistical System (JCPSS) replacement system, including development of specifications and Requests for Proposal and oversight of the implementation and phase-in of the replacement state data repository.*
- Develop standard definitions for data elements for the revised JCPSS and Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (facility data) systems recommended in this report.*
- Work with the Administration, state agencies, legislative budget committees, county government, probation, courts and others to develop resources to support implementation of the recommendations in this report, and encourage and pursue*

resource sharing with federal, state and local government sources and with private and philanthropic organizations to support implementation.

- *Take into account the capacity, development and resource needs of local agencies and county-level data systems as recommendations for state-level data system upgrades are implemented.*
- *Stage or prioritize the implementation of the recommendations in this report as necessary, based on available or emerging resources for implementation.*

6.1 The implementation Task Force or Commission should be attached to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) for administrative purposes but should have statutorily defined membership, mandates, and authority to make key implementation decisions. The recommendation is that this inter-disciplinary implementation body would operate, to the extent feasible and as defined by statute, with some degree of autonomy or independent implementation authority, with the details and the structure of the relationship to be defined by the Legislature on the advice of BSCC and affected stakeholders. This is recommended in lieu of a traditional Executive Steering Committee for which all decisions and action would require formal BSCC Board approval, with the details of this structure and relationship to be defined by the Legislature on the advice of BSCC and affected stakeholders.

6.2 A top priority for the implementation Task Force or Commission is to work with state and local policymakers and stakeholders to identify and allocate the funds and other resources needed to support implementation activity and to rebuild California's juvenile justice data systems.

Rationale/Discussion for Recommendation 6:

As a state, California has made no significant investment in over two decades to maintain or improve its outmoded statewide juvenile justice data network or to address the numerous data needs described throughout this report. As a result, California's statewide juvenile justice data capacity has declined to a level that is well below the capacities of other model states. In its current condition of deferred investment, our California juvenile justice data system fails to provide a data-driven capacity to track youth caseloads and outcomes, to document evidence-based practices or to assess realignment and related system and policy reforms.

"This recommendation addresses the paramount need to have an implementation capacity and strategy."

In part, the failure to act, invest and modernize has also been a failure to delegate implementation responsibility. We noted earlier that no steps were taken to implement the recommendations of the California Juvenile Justice Commission's 2009 *Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan*—a plan that included specific recommendations to restructure state-level data collection and capacity. The Commission that developed that report was disbanded on the date the Master Plan was published, leaving no group or planned capacity to press ahead with implementation.

This recommendation addresses the paramount need to have an implementation capacity and strategy. The tasks to be addressed by the implementation body are summarized in the bullets below the lead Recommendation (6.0), including the design of the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System replacement data repository outlined in Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 6.1 addresses questions discussed in the Working Group with regard to the authority of a task force or implementation body to act on key recommendations of this report without submitting each step or action to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and waiting for Board approval. 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 can reliably be vested in an expert implementation body without being submerged in the slow or cumbersome process of full Board review. At the same time, certain decisions—like approval of a Request for Proposal 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. Additionally it is expected that the presence BSCC Board members on the implementation body will help ensure coordination of effort and decision-making.

We note that some implementation objectives for this report remain with BSCC as a whole rather than with the implementation body recommended here. In particular, the Working Group has recommended that the juvenile justice website or clearinghouse in Recommendation 5 be developed as an activity and product of the BSCC, rather than as a sub-objective included in the work plan of the proposed implementation group. The delegation of clearinghouse development to BSCC as a whole is based on an assessment that this objective is one that fits seamlessly into the website that BSCC has already developed for all of its programs and activities, and that it is within the capacity of BSCC to launch within an 18-month timeframe on its own accord. We would expect, nevertheless, that the implementation body, as authorized by the Legislature, would have input into how the BSCC juvenile justice clearinghouse developed in the shorter term would incorporate the data repository changes recommended for implementation on a longer development timeframe. Similarly, the process of upgrading the Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (Recommendation 4) is delegated to BSCC via the ESC process which is considered appropriate for this specific recommendation.

FUNDING THE IMPLEMENTATION EFFORT

No effort to implement these recommendations can succeed in the absence of sufficient resources. Recommendation 6.2 makes it clear that sufficient resources must be allocated to support staffing and other costs that will be incurred by the implementation body and the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) in the planning and implementation phase, as well as the core costs of system upgrades recommended in this report.

Throughout this report, the Working Group has described the state's long-term failure to invest in upgrades of what is now a distressed state-level juvenile justice data system. The time has come to allocate appropriate resources to the task and goal of modernizing the system so that it can adequately meet the contemporary needs of youth-serving agencies and of the tens of thousands of children who are processed through the juvenile justice system in California each year.

On this point, the Working Group encourages California policymakers, including those in the Legislature and the Administration, to identify and allocate the funds and other resources needed to make progress in this neglected area. The implementation body recommended here should make a special effort to advise and assist policymakers in resource development. Over and above direct state appropriations, The Working Group offers the following resource options for consideration in meeting that challenge:

- Tapping federal funds that may be directed to upgrades of California's juvenile justice data capacity—including 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. Large national foundations that are active in this regard include the MacArthur Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. In addition, California-based foundations like the California Endowment and the California Wellness Foundation, among others, have recently oriented grant portfolios around youth justice reform.
- Exploring partnerships with private and corporate sector companies or entrepreneurs who 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 data-driven practices or sentencing reforms that can serve as sources of justice system reinvestment in data and information system improvements.
- Devising funding strategies that are consistent with the Proposition 30 guarantee against state mandates that increase overall county costs for realignment programs.

- Exploring innovative policy or program funding strategies drawing on public-private partnerships to support justice system reforms, similar to the Pay for Success/Social Innovation Funding model approved in 2014 (Assembly Bill 1837, Atkins).

The allocation of sufficient resources is essential if forward progress is to be made.

CONCLUSION

The title of this report is “Rebuilding California’s Juvenile Justice Data System.” This presupposes that the building is broken or dysfunctional in the first place. Indeed, in its review the Working Group has confirmed critical gaps, fractures and omissions in the total foundation and framework of the state’s juvenile justice data system. It has described the chronic failure of the state to invest in system upgrades, compromising the ability to assess system and program performance and to support state and local policy and program development in the field. 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 improvements needed to ensure that children and youth moving through the system in years to come are well-served.

ATTACHMENT A

California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group Member Profiles

David Steinhart, Chair

David Steinhart is a member of the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and is the Director of the Commonwealth Juvenile Justice Program. He was the principal drafter of California laws removing children from adult jails, creating homeless youth programs and widening children's access to mental health care. In 2007, he had a lead role in the design of Senate Bill 81—the landmark reform that realigned non-violent youth from the state Division of Juvenile Justice to local control with Youthful Offender Block Grant funds. Mr. Steinhart chairs the BSCC Standing Committee on Juvenile Justice. Previously, he served two terms as a California State Juvenile Justice Commissioner. He continues to serve as a lead trainer for states participating the Annie Casey Foundation's national Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.

Jill Silva, Vice Chair

Jill Silva, Chief Probation Officer of Stanislaus County, graduated from California State University, Fresno, in 1986 with a B.A. degree in Social Work. She started her career with the Stanislaus County Probation Department in April 1989 as a Deputy Probation Officer and during her career with the department, she served as a Supervisor, Manager, Chief Deputy Probation Officer, and Assistant Chief Probation Officer with the Juvenile and Adult Field Services Divisions and the Institutional Services Division. Throughout her career, Ms. Silva has served on various committees including the Stanislaus County Children's Council, Stanislaus County Child Abuse Prevention Council and Stanislaus County Methamphetamine Task Force. In December 2011, Ms. Silva assumed the role of Acting Chief Probation Officer and on May 5, 2012, she was appointed Chief Probation Officer of the Stanislaus County Probation Department.

Wayne Babby

Wayne Babby is currently the Deputy Director for the Office of Research, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Mr. Babby has been with the State of California for 26 years, including 15 years in the Information Technology field supporting the deployment and support of large computer applications. His experience also includes working with both CDCR and the California Youth Authority to deploy computer applications and Business Intelligence software.

Julie Basco

Julie Basco serves as Chief of the California Department of Justice's (DOJ) Bureau of Criminal Information and Analysis (BCIA), where she has held various positions within the Department since 1993. The BCIA functions as California's criminal offender record information repository, maintains the Child Abuse Central Index, processes state and federal level regulatory purpose background checks, administers the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) and computes and publishes California's crime statistics. Chief Basco represents DOJ in several Federal Bureau of Investigation affiliations including chair of the National Instant Criminal Background Check

System Subcommittee and serves as the California representative to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System.

Sue Burrell

Sue Burrell is the Policy Director for the Pacific Juvenile Defender Center. During the preparation of this report and since 1987, she was a Staff Attorney at the San Francisco-based Youth Law Center. Ms. Burrell has worked in California and nationally to reduce unnecessary incarceration, assure safe, humane conditions for children in custody, and assure that youth in the system have access to the supports needed for healthy development. She has worked for system improvement through litigation and the legislative process, written widely on juvenile law issues and trained system professionals in almost every state. Ms. Burrell has received a number of awards for her work, including the American Bar Association's Livingston Hall award.

Michael Ertola

Michael Ertola was appointed Chief Probation Officer of Nevada County in September 2012. He has served in the field of probation for 26 years. The current collaboration amongst local law enforcement agencies, social services and community partners is at an all-time high under in Nevada County Chief Ertola's charge. He is dedicated to public safety and promotes evidence-based practices both internally and within community partnerships. His dedication to community programs extends to local non-profit youth organizations as well as adult programs aimed at forming pro-social connections for high risk probationers and AB109 clients alike. Chief Ertola serves on the Executive, Training, and Legislative Committees for the Chief Probation Officers of California. He holds a B.A. degree in Liberal Studies from California State University Hayward.

Honorable Donna Groman

Judge Donna Groman is the Supervising Judge of the Los Angeles County Juvenile Court, Delinquency Division. She has worked in the field of juvenile law for over 25 years, both as a lawyer and a judicial officer. Judge Groman is active in judicial education and serves as faculty to the Center for Judicial Education and Research in California, teaching juvenile delinquency law and related topics to judges statewide.

Denise Herz, Ph.D.

Denise Herz, Ph.D., is a Professor at the California State University—Los Angeles and the Director of the School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics. Her primary area of research is in juvenile justice, with particular emphasis on integrating systems to improve outcomes for youths at-risk for delinquency and for youths who have entered the juvenile justice and/or child welfare systems. She recently led the *Los Angeles Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study* and is actively involved in identifying key measures related to system effectiveness and improving data systems to produce those measures.

Sandra McBrayer

Sandra McBrayer has served as the chief executive officer of the Children's Initiative, a children's advocacy non-profit, since 1996. She was previously an adjunct professor with San Diego State University from 1990 to 2004 and a teacher with the San Diego County Office of Education from 1984 to 1996. She was named National Teacher of the Year in 1994 and serves on the boards of the San Diego Workforce Partnership Youth Council

and the California After-School Partnership as well as the BSCC Juvenile Justice Standing Committee.

Laura Ridolfi

Laura John Ridolfi is the Director of Policy for the W. Haywood Burns Institute (BI) for Juvenile Justice Fairness & Equity. Ms. Ridolfi provides technical assistance to BI sites in analyzing whether and to what extent policies and practices contribute to racial and ethnic disparities in youth justice systems. Prior to the BI, Ms. Ridolfi was a Fulbright Fellow in Kenya, where she conducted original research on the youth justice system. Ms. Ridolfi is a recent graduate of the University of California Berkeley School of Law where she coordinated the Boalt Hall Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild and the Youth and Education Law Society. Ms. Ridolfi also sits on the Disproportionate Minority Contact Subcommittee for the State of California's Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Michael Roddy

Michael M. Roddy, Executive Officer of the Superior Court of San Diego County since 2006, has more than 30 years of court administration experience, both in the trial courts and in state court administration. Mr. Roddy served as the Administrative Office of the Court's Regional Administrative Director for the Northern/Central Region (2001-2006), Executive Officer of the Sacramento Superior Court (1989-1994), Assistant Executive Officer (1988-1989) of the Superior Court of San Diego County, and in a variety of other administrative positions in the Superior Courts of San Diego and Los Angeles counties. He served on the Judicial Council from 2006 to 2011.

Jim Salio

Jim Salio is the Chief Probation Officer for San Luis Obispo County. He was appointed Chief by the Board of Supervisors on June 2, 2009. He has worked for 26 years with San Luis Obispo County Probation. In 2008, he was appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger to the State Juvenile Justice Committee to help develop the State Juvenile Justice Master Plan, as required by Senate Bill 81. In 2013 he was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown to the California Council for Interstate Adult Offender Supervision. Also in 2013, Chief Salio was appointed by Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye to the Judicial Council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. Chief Salio has served on the Executive Board of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) and is the Chair of the Juvenile Services Committee for CPOC.

Dorothy Thrush

Ms. Thrush is the Chief Operations Officer for the Public Safety Group within the Chief Administrative Office of the County of San Diego. Prior to this assignment, Ms. Thrush was the Public Safety Group Finance Director from 2004 to 2014. Ms. Thrush has worked with the County of San Diego since 1990 and has served in executive roles in the Office of the District Attorney and in financial management for the Health and Human Services Agency. Ms. Thrush was also a senior budget analyst with the State of Illinois, Executive Office of the Governor, Bureau of the Budget.

ATTACHMENT B

2015 Probation Information Systems Survey Survey Questions and Summary of Responses

(Conducted by the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group in September 2015
with the assistance of the Chief Probation Officers of California)

NOTE: This summary of the Probation Survey includes answers to closed-end questions but excludes answers submitted as individual comments by respondents to open-ended questions.

Question 1. In which county do you work?

Question 2. What juvenile justice information system and version is currently used by Probation? If more than one, please describe accordingly.

Question 3. How many youth are currently under the supervision of your probation department?

Question 4. Was your information system developed internally? (If yes, skip Question 5.)

Question 4. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	28.89%	13
No	71.1%	32
Total		45

Question 5. If your information system was not developed internally, who was the vendor? (Skip if you answered yes to Question 4.)

Question 6. Overall, how satisfied are you with your information system vendor or IT support in maintaining or managing your information system?

Question 6. Answer Choices	Responses	
Very satisfied	26.67%	12
Somewhat satisfied	42.22%	19
Indifferent	6.67%	3
Dissatisfied	13.33%	6
Very dissatisfied	11.11%	5
I don't know	0.00%	0
Total		45

Question 7. If known, what was the purchase cost of your vendor system or the development cost of your internally developed system? (Please specify which.)

Question 8. What is the annual licensing and/or maintenance cost of your current system? (Include vendor charges and internal salaries.)

Question 9. Does the current information system have a "dashboard" or other mechanism to easily monitor/track key indicators by a chosen time period (e.g., for average daily population in detention or supervision status of selected youth)? (If no, skip Question 10.)

Question 9. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	38.64%	17
No	61.36%	27
I don't know	0.00%	0
Total		44

Question 10. Who is able to access and view the dashboard? (Choose all that apply.)

Question 10. Answer Choices	Responses	
Probation management only	62.50%	15
Multiple Probation personnel	91.67%	22
Non-Probation agencies	0.00%	0
Members of the public	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 24		

Question 11. Would you characterize your information system as mainly a case management system (maintaining information about individual youth traveling through the juvenile justice system), or does it serve both as a case management system and as an analytic system that can produce aggregate reports or respond to queries on Probation populations or trends?

Question 11. Answer Choices	Responses	
Only a case management system	13.33%	6
Mostly a case management (with minimal reporting capacity)	51.11%	23
Both a case management system and analytic system (with full reporting capacity)	35.56%	16
Total		45

Question 12. Is the information system linked through database fields to any of the following information systems? (Check all that apply.)

Question 12. Answer Choices	Responses	
Schools	7.69%	2
Child Welfare	0.00%	0
Police or Sheriff	73.08%	19
District Attorney	69.23%	18
Courts	57.69%	15
I don't know	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 26		

Question 13. How long have you used the current information system?

Question 13. Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than 1 year	4.44%	2
1-3 years	17.78%	8
3-5 years	11.11%	5
5-10 years	28.89%	13
More than 10 years	37.78%	17
Total		45

Question 14. Are there plans to replace the current information system?

Question 14. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	42.22%	19
No	57.78%	26
Total		45

Question 15. What have been your greatest challenges in using your current information system? Describe briefly.

Question 16. What do you see as the main benefits of the current information system? Describe briefly.

Question 17. What do you wish your information system could do that it currently cannot do? What additional capacity would you like to have? Describe briefly.

Question 18. Which best describes the process for compliance with and completion of data requirements for JCPSS?

Question 18. Answer Choices	Responses	
Query is written and data are extracted with the push of a button	27.91%	12
Query is written but data require clean up	20.93%	9
Some data are easily extracted by query and some data are compiled manually	23.26%	10
We compile/collect all data manually	27.91%	12
Total		45

Question 19. How much personnel time does it take your staff ANNUALLY to extract data from your system and meet the submission and reporting requirements for JCPSS? (Answer with Full-Time-Equivalent [FTE] days.)

Question 19. Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than a day	46.34%	19
1-3 days	21.95%	9
4-7 days	4.88%	2
1-2 weeks	14.63%	6
More than 2 weeks	12.60%	5
Total		41

Question 20. On the scale below, rate your level of confidence in the accuracy of the following data points as compiled and submitted on JCPSS:

Question 20.	Mostly Confident	Somewhat Confident	No Confidence	N/A	Total
Referrals to Probation by Offense	62.79% 27	25.58% 11	9.30% 4	2.33% 1	43
Admissions to Juvenile Hall	65.12% 28	13.95% 6	11.63% 5	9.30% 4	43
Petitions Filed by Type (New, Subsequent)	67.44% 29	20.93% 9	9.30% 4	2.33% 1	43
Probation Dispositions by Type	69.77% 30	18.60% 8	9.30% 4	2.33% 1	43
Court Dispositions by Type	69.05% 29	19.05% 8	9.52% 4	2.38% 1	42
Probation Violations	53.49% 23	32.56% 14	9.30% 4	4.65% 2	43
Race/Ethnicity Breakout for Multiple Data Points	65.12% 28	18.60% 8	9.30% 4	6.98% 3	43

Question 21. Describe briefly what might be affecting your confidence in these areas (e.g. definition issues, limited data fields, etc.).

Question 22. When you report offense information on JCPSS, do you have a clear hierarchy or standard to determine the most serious or most accurate offense for this purpose?

Question 22. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	80.95%	34
No	19.05%	8
Total		42

Question 23. How does your county define "recidivism" in the juvenile justice system?

Question 24. Do you currently have the capacity to track recidivism events by juveniles based on the definition listed for Question 23?

Question 24. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	60.47%	26
No	30.23%	13
I don't know	9.30%	4
Total		43

Question 25. Are you maintaining or producing periodic or regular juvenile recidivism reports? Describe briefly.

Question 25. Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	33.33%	14
No	64.29%	27
I don't know	2.38%	1
Total		42

Question 26. The Juvenile Justice Data Working Group is reviewing the current capacity and utilization of the statewide JCPSS system. If you were asked how you would change current requirements for data collection or inputting data into JCPSS, what main (1-3) changes would you recommend?

Question 27. If JCPSS were to be upgraded to be able to collect and report additional data elements (for example, on recidivism), what would you cite as the main barriers or problems to implementing such a change from your county perspective?

Question 28. Please add any other comments you may have with regard to the current or potentially upgraded JCPSS system.

Question 29. Which best describes the process for compiling and completing data requirements for the BSCC Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (DPS)?

Question 29. Answer Choices	Responses	
Query is written and data are extracted with the push of a button	12.82%	5
Query is written but data require clean up	2.56%	1
Some data are easily extracted by query and some data are compiled manually	51.28%	20
We compile/collect all data manually	33.33%	13
Total		39

Question 30. How much personnel time **ANNUALLY** is required by your IT staff to compile and complete data requirements for the DPS? (Answer with FTE days.)

Question 30. Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than a day	41.03%	16
1-3 days	35.90%	14
4-7 days	10.26%	4
1-2 weeks	10.26%	4
More than 2 weeks	2.56%	1
Total		39

Question 31. What are the main (1-3) problems you currently encounter in having to compile and submit data to BSCC for the DPS?

Question 32. How clear and standardized are the definitions you are using for the data elements submitted to BSCC for the DPS?

Question 32. Answer Choices	Responses	
No standard definition (we apply our own definition)	0.00%	0
Neither clear nor standardized	7.69%	3
Standardized definitions but could be clearer	46.15%	18
They are clear and standardized	46.15%	18
Total		39

Question 33. How would you rate the accuracy of data reported to BSCC for the DPS overall?

Question 33. Answer Choices	Responses	
Not accurate	0.00%	0
Somewhat accurate	28.21%	11
Highly accurate	66.67%	26
I don't know	5.13%	2
Total		39

Question 34. Using the scale below, rank how easy or difficult it would be to add the following data elements to your DPS data collection and reports on juveniles in county facilities:

Question 34.	Easy/Report Available	Moderate/ Requires Minimal Work	Complex/ Requires Report Formatting	Not Available/ Information Systems cannot do this without additional programming or analysis	Total
Detained/Committed for probation violations	38.46% 15	35.90% 14	10.26% 4	15.38% 6	39
Race/Ethnicity of juveniles in custody	56.41% 22	25.64% 10	10.26% 4	7.69% 3	39
Special Education status of juveniles in custody	21.62% 8	10.81% 4	21.62% 8	45.95% 17	37
Child Welfare status (e.g., dual status or active W&I Sec. 300 case)	20.51% 8	12.82% 5	20.51% 8	46.15% 18	39
Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/ Transgender (LGBT) status	21.05% 8	15.79% 6	10.53% 4	52.63% 20	38

Question 35. How useful does your department find the DPS reports maintained by BSCC (online or as published) for probation facility or program management in your county?

Question 35. Answer Choices	Responses	
Not useful	5.41%	2
Somewhat useful	56.76%	21
Highly useful	16.22%	6
I don't know	21.62%	8
Total		39

Question 36. What improvements or changes (if any) would you like to see made to the DPS as managed and published by the BSCC? Describe briefly.

ATTACHMENT C

Materials Reviewed by the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (Partial list)

- *Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan: Blueprint for an Outcome Oriented Juvenile Justice System*, produced by the State Commission on Juvenile Justice, January 2009;
- California State Auditor's Report, *Juvenile Justice Realignment*, September 2012, which provided critical feedback on reporting processes tied to the YOGB program;
- Data systems, data reports, recidivism studies and related material developed in other states, as mandated by the legislation establishing the Working Group;
- Juvenile justice websites, informational clearinghouses and other web-based data banks and information centers maintained by other California youth-serving departments and by juvenile justice agencies in other states;
- National reports and studies issued by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Council of State Governments Justice Center, the National Juvenile Justice Center and by projects supported by the John and Catherine MacArthur Foundation "Models for Change" initiative, the Annie Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative, the MacArthur-Pew "Results First Initiative" and other foundation initiatives.
- The Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) administered by the California Department of Justice.
- The Juvenile Detention Profile Survey, administered by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC).
- The population data bank maintained by the California Division of Juvenile Justice within the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation;
- The Child Welfare System/Case Management System and data network that is co-managed by the California Department of Social Services and the U.C. Berkeley School of Social Welfare;
- The *Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes* report (March, 2015) authored by multiple partners including the co-authors from Cal State University at Los Angeles, the Advancement Project and the Children's Defense Fund with financial support from the Keck and California Wellness Foundations.

ATTACHMENT D

Summary of Key Data Elements for Juvenile Justice Tracking across Processing Decision Points

NOTE: (1) This table includes key data elements identified by the California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group; however, it does not operationalize them (i.e., identify how they would be measured); (2) these elements are presented as individual-level data—facility level measures mentioned are listed in “other” at the end of the table; and (3) an “X” indicates each processing stage that a data element should be measured.

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Arrest/Referral Description							
Source of Referral	X						
Type of Referral	X						
Offense Charge by Code	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Offense Type (i.e., Misd. v. Felony v. 707b)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Brought to Detention Intake		X					
Risk Level Assessed at Intake		X					
Outcome of Detention Intake		X					
Detained		X					
Returned Home w/Electronic Monitoring		X					
Returned Home w/Alternative to Detention		X					
Youth Demographic Description							
Current or Previous Case in Child Welfare	X						
Gender	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
LGBT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Race	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ethnicity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Age	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Living Situation							
Primary Parent/Caregiver							
Socioeconomic Status	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Zip code	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Citizenship Status	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Previous Contact with CJ/JJ system	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Case Processing Information							
Diversion Decisions by Referral Source			X	X			
Type of Diversion			X	X			
Diversion Outcome (i.e., Successful)			X	X			
Outcomes for Failed Diversion			X	X			
Decision to Petition to Juvenile Court					X		
Referral for a W&I 241.1 Hearing					X		
Competency Issue					X		
Sustained Petitions					X		
Original Charge v. Adjudicated Charge v. Sustained Charge					X		
Probation Recommendation v. Court Disposition and Order					X		
Timing of Probation Recommendations (i.e., Pre vs. Post Adjudication)					X		
Role of other stakeholders					X		
Type of Disposition (including Dual Jurisdiction)					X	X	
Victim Restitution					X	X	X
Juvenile to Adult Case Processing Information							
Direct Files					X		
Reverse Remands to Juvenile Court					X		
Fitness Motions					X		
Fitness Motion Outcomes					X		
Conviction in Adult Court					X		
Role of other stakeholders					X		

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Sentencing Outcome						X	
Supervision and Incarceration/Placement							
Type/Level of Supervision in Community						X	
Type of Placement—Detention Facility, Relative/Non-Relative Care, Foster Home, Group Home, Camp, DJJ						X	
Length of Supervision/Incarceration/ Placement						X	
Group Home Information						X	
Rate Classification Level (RCL)						X	
In-state / out-of-state						X	
In-county / out-of-county						X	
Type of Correctional Institution						X	
Supervision Level							
Experiences in Placement Detention						X	
Use of Pepper Spray						X	
Solitary Confinement						X	
AWOLs/Escapes						X	
Return to Child Welfare System Upon Exit						X	
Family/Youth Involvement in Other Systems							
Child Welfare Involvement	X					X	X
Open CW case	X					X	X
Placement history: Number and Type	X					X	X
Referrals to/Services Provided by the Department of Mental Health	X					X	X
Referrals to/Services Provided by the Department of Public Health	X					X	X
Family Involvement with Public Assistance (e.g., general relief, food stamps)	X					X	X

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Enrollment in Medi-Cal	X					X	X
Risk, Need, and Resiliency Factors							
Age at First Arrest	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Prior Contact with CJ/JJ System	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Family History/Involvement in the Justice System	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gang Involvement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Risk Level Overall and by Individual, Family, School, Peer and Community Domains (from Risk Tool)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Protective/Strengths Level by Domain (from tool when available)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
-Education							
School enrollment status	X	X				X	X
Name and type of school attending	X	X				X	X
School Attendance	X	X				X	X
Special Education Status	X	X				X	X
Age Appropriate Grade Level	X	X				X	X
Developmental disability/Regional centers	X	X				X	X
Current Grade Level	X	X				X	X
Academic Performance	X	X				X	X
School Credit Status	X	X				X	X
School discipline history	X	X				X	X
Length of Time in School	X	X				X	X
Earned Credits	X	X				X	X
Graduation/GED Completion	X	X				X	X
Enrollment in Higher Education							
-Behavioral Health							
Exposure to Violence	X	X				X	X

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Trauma History	X	X				X	X
Involvement in Commercial Exploitation	X	X				X	X
Substance Abuse	X	X				X	X
Mental Health Problems	X	X				X	X
Need for/Use of Psych Meds	X	X				X	X
Psychiatric hospitalizations	X	X				X	X
Programming							
Number and Type of Services Accessed			X	X		X	X
Time to Enroll in Services (includes Ed)			X	X		X	X
Duration and Status in Services			X	X		X	X
ILP eligibility and receipt							
Relationship between Need for Services and Type of Services Accessed			X	X		X	X
Change in Risk, Need, and Protective Factors over Time	X		X	X		X	X
Additional Data for Tracking							
Successful completion of probation							X
Time to Completion							X
Transition to Extended Foster Care							X
Employment							X
Probation violations							X
Type of condition(s) violated							X
Court Result for Violation							X
Bench Warrants—Number and Reason							X
Recidivism (6 months &/or 1 year)							X
New arrest							
Type of New Arrest							
New sustained petitions							X

	<i>Arrest/ Referral</i>	<i>Detention</i>	<i>Informal Diversion</i>	<i>Formal Diversion</i>	<i>Charging/ Adjudication</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Post- Disposition</i>
Return to Custody							X
Adult Charges & Outcome							X
Death							X
Other							
Average Daily Population (ADP) Capacity							
Registration – sex, gang, arson							
Sex offender 290.008							
Sealed Records–whether/when/how							
System cost							
Facility Level Data							
Occupancy							
Use of Pepper Spray, Isolation							
Availability of programming/services							