

# STANISLAUS COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

## Meeting Minutes

Thursday – April 20, 2017

Stanislaus County Probation Department – Training Room

### MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT

MIKE HAMASAKI, Chief Probation Officer, Probation Department, Chair  
EVELYN STARMAN for Kristin Olsen, Board of Supervisors  
VITO CHIESA, Board of Supervisors  
CINDY DUENAS, Center for Human Services  
SHERIFF ADAM CHRISTIANSON, Sheriff's Department  
THE HONORABLE ANN AMERAL, Superior Court  
THE HONORABLE RUBEN VILLALOBOS, Superior Court  
JODY HAYES for Stan Risen, Chief Executive Officer  
ANGELICA RAMOS, Chief Executive Officer  
DR. CHAU-PU CHIANG, Community-at-Large Member  
KATHY HARWELL Community Services Agency  
DAVE CHAPMAN, Juvenile Field Services Division Director, Probation Department

### MEMBERS ABSENT

SONNY SANDHU, Public Defender	CHIEF BRENT SMITH, Ceres Police Department
JEFF ANDERSON, Sierra Vista Child and Family Services	BIRGIT FLADAGER, District Attorney
CHIEF GALEN CARROLL, Modesto Police Department	PAM ABLE, Modesto City Schools
RICHARD DEGETTE, Director, BHRS	THOMAS CHANGNON, Stanislaus County Office of Education

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**  
The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. by Chief Probation Officer Mike Hamasaki. Members of the group introduced themselves.
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**  
No members of the public were present.
- III. **APPROVE OCTOBER 2016 MEETING MINUTES: JJCC**  
Approval of the minutes of the October 2016 meeting was deferred because members who attended the October 2016 meeting were not present.
- IV. **APPROVE JJCPA/YOBG PROGRAMS FOR FY2017-18 GRANT APPLICATIONS: DIVISION DIRECTOR DAVE CHAPMAN**  
Division Director Dave Chapman reviewed information about the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) Grant noting that the master plan was established in 2001 and the most recent update to the Local Action Plan occurred in 2013 (Local Action Plan 2013 attached to original copy of minutes). He advised that AB1998, effective January 1, 2017, will change the planning and reporting requirements for JJCPA and consolidate this grant with the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG). An AB1998 Frequently Asked Questions packet (attached to original copy of minutes) was distributed outlining this Assembly Bill.

Mr. Chapman outlined the options available for consolidating these two grants and advised the Probation Department will submit program description information (narrative template attached to original copy of minutes) on both the JJCPA and YOBG funded programs to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) by May 1, 2017, pending approval by the JJCC.

Mr. Chapman presented background information on the 2001 Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan which is outlined on the Stanislaus County Graduated Responses to Youth Crime & Delinquency Prevention (plan continuum attached to original copy of minutes). This continuum originated back in the 1990's and has been continuously updated to include the programs, services and different partnerships existing in the county related to youth crime and delinquency. Partnerships and prevention programs are also highlighted on this continuum. This continuum is used as a guide to determine where to focus funding, programs that need to be enhanced or expanded, and options that could be created. YOBG and JJCPA identifiers have been added to the continuum and programs offered at the Juvenile Commitment Facility (JCF) are included.

Mr. Chapman advised that the JJCPA funded programs have not changed since last year. The programs include: Juvenile High-Risk Offender (JHRO), Home Supervision, Juvenile Drug Court, and Gender Responsive Alternatives to Detention (GRAD). The YOBG programs/services to be consolidated with JJCPA include: Home on Probation, Camp – Juvenile Commitment Facility, Crime Analyst salary/benefit costs, and Juvenile Hall.

The Local Action Plan will be updated in 2018 for the report to the State next year. A comprehensive update will be completed in collaboration with the partners. Supervision strategies from the JAIS assessment tool will be utilized to enable probation officers to assess the needs of the youth on their caseload and refer them to the appropriate services.

CPO Hamasaki discussed BSCC inspections of the Juvenile Institutions and the changes expected in the methodology used to conduct their inspections in the future. A BSCC inspection is scheduled for May or June 2017.

**MOTION:** Sheriff Adam Christianson. **SECOND:** The Honorable Ann Ameal. The JJCPA/YOBG programs for the Fiscal Year 2017-18 grant application were approved unanimously.

**VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA**

Division Director Chapman suggested having the GRAD DPO and CHS Coordinator present an update on the Girls Advisory Council and programs available in the community for girls.

Jody Hayes suggested presenting trending data on juvenile crimes over time with outcomes.

**VI. SET DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 13, 2017 at Noon at the Probation Department.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

**Stanislaus County  
Probation Department  
Local Action Plan  
2013**



**Stanislaus County  
Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council  
2012-2013**

**Jill Silva**, Stanislaus County Chief Probation Officer, Chair

**Bill O'Brien**, Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors (Chair 2012)

**Jeff Anderson**, Director, Sierra Vista Child and Family Services

**Timothy P. Bazar**, Stanislaus County Public Defender

**Birgit Fladager**, Stanislaus County District Attorney

**Adam Christianson**, Stanislaus County Sheriff

**Art de Werk**, Chief of Police, Ceres Police Department

**Galen Carroll**, Chief of Police, Modesto Police Department

**Cindy Duenas**, Executive Director, Center for Human Services

**Kathryn Harwell**, Director Community Services Agency

**Thomas Changnon**, Superintendent, Stanislaus County Office of Education

**Nan Cohan-Jacobs**, Presiding Juvenile Court Judge, Stanislaus County Superior Court

**Pam Able**, Superintendent, Modesto City Schools District

**Monica Nino**, Stanislaus County Chief Executive Officer

**Madelyn Schlaepfer**, Director, Behavioral Health & Recovery Services

**Chau-Pu Chiang**, Professor, Criminal Justice, CSU Stanislaus and Public Member

**William W. Dyer**, Public Member

## Historical Summary of Juvenile Justice Planning in Stanislaus County

Passage of Senate Bill 1760 (SB 1760) in 1996 resulted in the addition of Welfare and Institutions Code Section 749.22, the genesis for Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils in the State. However, in Stanislaus County, work on collaborative and integrated juvenile justice planning predated passage of this legislation. Stanislaus County began comprehensive interagency planning relative to its youth population in the early 1990s. In 1990, the County formed a Children's Service Coordinating Council to facilitate program information sharing and interagency cooperation. Then in 1992, the County established a county-wide Interagency Children's Services Coordinating Council to develop, implement, oversee, link and advocate for services provided to children and families in the County. In 1994, Stanislaus County applied for and received a major five-year Family Preservation and Support Program Grant from the California Department of Social Services and established a multi-agency planning group to oversee this effort. Thirty-eight focus groups were conducted throughout the County to build the plan with the goals of strengthening families, preventing delinquency, reducing placements and building neighborhood empowerment and self-help support systems. Also in 1994, the Probation Department, Mental Health Department, and Department of Social Services joined forces to develop and implement a Children's System of Care to provide assessment, crisis evaluation, brief treatment, and wrap around services delivered from a specialty team at the Juvenile Justice Complex.

Stanislaus County formed its original Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) as a result of the passage of SB 1760 in 1996. It developed its first Local Action Plan (LAP) in 1997, in preparation for the submission of a Challenge Grant proposal. Consultant Susan B. Cohen helped guide the development of the LAP, which was a requirement of the grant. The County relied on a Community Based Punishment Plan (June 1996) and the Report on the Stanislaus County Juvenile Justice System, also known as the Juvenile Justice Master Plan (December 1996), to begin work on the LAP. This enabled the County to submit the first Challenge Grant application to the California Board of Corrections. With this grant application, the County proposed to pilot an intensive probation supervision and case management program called the Intensive Diversion and /Early Action (IDEA) demonstration project.

Prior to development of the LAP, consultants Susan B. Cohen and Mark Morris assisted the county in developing the Community Based Punishment Plan, which created a comprehensive proposal for enhancing public safety by augmenting prevention and available punishment options. This plan sought to emphasize prevention and early intervention, to fill existing gaps in the correctional services available to the court for adult and juvenile offenders, and to describe the number and kinds of local punishment options that would help the county reduce its commitment to the California Department of Corrections and the Department of the Youth Authority. The Community Based Punishment Plan envisioned a

continuum of interventions, sanctions and punishments, beginning with early identification of juveniles who appear to be at risk for involvement in crime or delinquency and continuing through post release supervision of those who have committed crimes, been incarcerated and are later returned to the community. The figure on Attachment 1 graphically depicts the continuum of punishment options that was created as a result of the plan.

The 1996 Juvenile Justice Master Plan was initiated to assess the juvenile justice needs in Stanislaus County. The consulting firm of Mark Morris Associates, with Jay Farbstein & Associates, worked with an Advisory Committee appointed by the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors. The Advisory Committee and several subcommittees met over a six-month period to discuss issues and to review information developed by the committees and the consultants. The consultants reviewed existing programs and services, completed detailed case by case studies of youth in the juvenile justice system, projected future trends, and assessed the juvenile facilities existing at the time. The assessment report outlined a vision for a balanced response to juvenile problems, containing elements ranging from prevention and early intervention to suppression and enforcement. Expanding upon the continuum model previously created with the Community Based Punishment Plan, the Juvenile Justice Master Plan created a new model that took into account the risk and need levels of minors. This new concept of the continuum assumed graduated sanctions, such that each youth could be assigned to a level of supervision or consequence suited to the severity of his/her behavior and/or to the level of risk to the general community. A schematic display of this continuum is shown in the figure on Attachment 2. The 1996 Juvenile Justice Master Plan made a number of recommendations for enhancements to the juvenile justice system; including:

#### Prevention/Early Intervention

- Youth Centers for after-school hours
- Begin planning for intake/assessment centers
- Expand Youth Courts
- Create Victim Offender Reconciliation Program
- Expand Mentoring

#### Intermediate Sanctions

- Create juvenile electronic monitoring
- Supplement Probation with “trackers” for moderate risk community supervision
- Review and revise Probation intake risk and offender needs assessment system
- Create non-secure detention for youth detained while pending placement
- Create day reporting center
- Residential substance abuse treatment

#### Facilities/Facility Programs

- Create a Camp/Ranch or Commitment Facility Program
- Mental health and substance abuse treatment unit(s) in Juvenile Hall
- Expand Juvenile Hall to 150+ beds

#### Implementation

- Expand role of Interagency Children's Services Coordinating Council and create staff position to support
- Ongoing assessment of juvenile justice system, review Master Plan, and evaluation of new programs
- Coordinating Council begin planning for integrated information system and "Children's Budget"

Building upon the 1996 Community Based Punishment Plan and the Juvenile Justice Master Plan, the initial 1997 LAP modeled a continuum of support and sanctions to prevent crime and delinquency and to provide swift, sure, graduated consequences for antisocial behavior when it occurred. It encompassed prevention, early intervention, intermediate sanctions, incarceration and aftercare. It also sought to hold offenders accountable for their actions, encourage and support positive behavioral change, use punishment options that fostered both short and long term public safety, instill a sense of self-discipline and responsibility, and engender reparation to individual victims and community. The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council expressed four major goals for the LAP, in keeping with their other youth and family-based planning efforts:

- Develop system-wide vision, program capacity and long-term service sustainability
- Develop a children and youth continuum of care that provides targeted interventions and services for low risk, at risk, high risk and in-crisis youth and families
- Expand currently effective programs and create new juvenile services, community located and risk focused, to address the needs of minors already in the probation and juvenile court system
- Create a juvenile justice database and management information system that will permit program planning, outcome monitoring, appropriate client information sharing and short and long-term case tracking

Attachment 3 displays the graphic depiction of the updated Stanislaus County Graduated Responses to Youth Crime completed in 1997.

Since the Master Plan and first LAP were developed in 1996 and 1997 respectively, many of the identified gaps in the system have been filled by both public and private agencies that serve at-risk youth and juvenile offenders. The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council has periodically conducted extensive reviews of available services and programs targeting at-risk juveniles, juvenile offenders and their families in an effort to update the continuum and LAP. The

LAP has served as the County's guiding strategic plan and has been a valuable tool in pursuing new funding resources to fill critical service gaps.

The County was awarded Challenge Grant funding in 1997 to operate its IDEA demonstration project in partnership with the Center for Human Services, a local non-profit organization. The program specifically targeted low-risk juvenile offenders referred to the Probation Department from high-risk neighborhoods.

Additional Challenge Grant monies became available in 1998 and the County responded by preparing a new Local Action Plan and submitting a proposal to serve families of adult probationers with minor children. The Family Oriented Community Utilization System (FOCUS) was proposed and funded by the Board of Corrections. The array of programs and services described in the Local Action Plan were indicative of the County's commitment to providing a comprehensive continuum of interventions from prevention and early intervention through supervision, treatment, placement and incarceration of juvenile offenders. Family based supervision was a priority of the Council highlighted in its 1999 Local Action Plan. Attachment 4 graphically depicts the updated continuum of services while demonstrating the changes in responses between 1996 and 1999. The JJCC served as the oversight board for both Challenge Grants and met quarterly to hear progress reports and to receive information on the status and needs of the juvenile justice system.

In September 2000, Governor Davis signed the Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (CPA 2000). This provided Stanislaus County the opportunity to revisit the continuum of responses to juvenile crime, to reassess the current resources and statistical data, to determine the progress the County had made since the completion of the last Local Action Plan and to identify remaining gaps in service for at risk youth, families and juvenile offenders. Stanislaus County called upon the Renaissance Consulting Group to assist in preparing the required Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP). The JJCC became the planning body for the development of the CMJJP. The Renaissance Group worked with members of the JJCC to develop the CMJJP. Through this process, the LAP and continuum were once again updated. Identified goals of the LAP included:

- Increase Community/School Based Programs
- Increase Mental Health and Substance Abuse Capacity
- Increase Intensive Supervision to Wards
- Improve or Create Data Collection Systems

Programs proposed through the CMJJP filled critical gaps in the County's LAP and continuum of responses. Four programs were recommended in the CMJJP and funded through CPA 2000 including a Day Reporting Center, High Risk Offender Supervision and Juvenile Court Warrant Enforcement, Neighborhood Accountability Boards, and Home Supervision Program Expansion. As required



by CPA 2000, the JJCC continues to monitor the progress of the programs implemented through the CMJJP.

In 2005, the JJCC once again conducted a thorough assessment of existing resources available to the County to address crime and delinquency in order to assess service gaps and develop goals for the overall juvenile justice system. These goals included:

- Create a camp/ranch or commitment facility program
- Expand Juvenile Drug Court treatment programs to include a third level of care for those offenders that are resistive to or refuse treatment services
- Expand School Contracted Probation Officers to provide school-based prevention and intervention services throughout the county
- Link Probation Officers to newly formed Family Resource Centers to provide for early assessment of problems and service needs of youth referred by law enforcement
- Work in collaboration with law enforcement, schools, community-based organizations and community members to promote Youth Centers for after school hours

Since the last extensive assessment of services conducted in 2005, the JJCC has periodically updated the continuum to reflect changes in available programs and options needing to be created. Attachment 5 reflects the continuum changes between 2000 and 2008.

### **2013 Update of the Local Action Plan**

The JJCC initiated an extensive assessment of juvenile services and an update to the county's Local Action Plan on October 25, 2011, in response to the successful grant application for funding through the Evidence Based Practices Project, which is funded as part of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program. As noted previously, an extensive assessment of services had not been conducted since 2005 and the LAP had not been updated since 2008. Since the last update in 2008, there has been continued advancement and refined knowledge regarding what works best for youthful offenders. Gender responsiveness is a critical factor which historically had not been considered by the JJCC when creating or evaluating juvenile justice programs. As a group, girls' reasons for involvement in the juvenile justice system are different than those for justice-involved boys. Research indicates treating justice-involved girls like boys is ineffective. The LAP was in need of analysis and planning for providing needed gender-responsive services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Therefore, the process for updating the LAP incorporated the fundamentals of Evidence Based Practices (EBP) and gender-responsiveness. The JJCC meets on a quarterly basis, so the process took a significant period of time to complete. Some activities related to the plan began to occur before the final update had been completed. These activities will be

more fully discussed later in the report. The JJCC primary task was to assess the available community services and programs, evaluate the use level and understanding of evidence-based practices and gender-responsiveness, and identify gaps in services. The council was not charged with evaluating crime data and/or trends in their evaluation of services.

### Information Gathering About Programs and Services

In October 2011, the Probation Department assigned a probation officer to complete the first step of the LAP update. This involved gathering information about the existing services and programs targeting at-risk juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families. The probation officer contacted every known service provider/agency, public and private, in an effort to determine what services were available, the type of population being served, if the services were evidence based, and if they were gender responsive. This process took several months and resulted in the elimination of 41 programs that were no longer available to the community, and the addition of 141 programs that had been added since the previous update in 2008.

At least 60 agencies are providing services to youth in our community. Of the programs identified, 31 agencies reported that they provided gender based services; however, the council all agreed that most were pregnancy related services rather than programs based on gender-responsive services. Only four programs were identified as employing evidence based practices. It was discovered that many of the county's service providers were not aware of what evidence based practices are, and those who were aware, did not know if their program qualified. Once the program information was obtained, the Coordinating Council then moved into the next phase, which was to evaluate and analyze the programs.

### Evaluation of Available Programs

Evaluation of the programs required several meetings and took place over many months. Similar to previous Local Action Plans, the county utilized a continuum approach for assessing services available to youth in the community. The programs were divided into three primary service levels:

**Prevention** – Services for minors at-risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system or minors minimally involved in the juvenile justice system.

**Intervention** – Services geared toward minors who are involved in the juvenile justice system.

**Incapacitation** – Services offered to youth in custodial settings.

A matrix of available programs by service level was created. Services were then further divided by discipline areas within each service level to assist in identifying service gaps. The JJCC initially categorized the services into eight disciplines: drug and alcohol, education, health, law enforcement, mental health, probation, social services and youth services. As further discussion occurred, the group determined that the matrix could serve as a good resource guide for the community if the discipline categories were narrowed. Over the next several months a sub-committee worked on further analysis of the programs and returned to the JJCC with a recommendation for use of 12 disciplines; including, drug and alcohol, education, employment, family focus, health, law enforcement, mental health, mentoring, parenting and pregnancy, support services, youth services and probation. See Appendix A for the full Matrix of Services available in the community.

### Analysis of Gaps in Services

The next step was for the JJCC to identify gaps in the services available to youth. The probation officer that was tasked with contacting all the service providers in the community at the onset of the LAP update also took the initiative to ask service providers about their needs and/or what they saw as gaps in services. This information was shared with the JJCC prior to identification of the gaps.

The following gaps in services were identified:

- Lack of drug and alcohol treatment programs, especially residential treatment
- Lack of juvenile residential mental health treatment
- Lack of familiarity with Evidence Based Practices and Gender Responsiveness among the service providers
- Lack of gender responsive services
- Need to increase the use of evidence based programs
- Alternatives to detention are underutilized
- More emphasis is needed on providing services to youth with a strength based focus and/or asset based case planning
- Need more mentoring programs
- Lack of both prevention and intervention services for “cross-over” youth (youth who transition from dependency to delinquency)
- Limited options for youth encountered by law enforcement for misdemeanors or school violations
- Assessment areas are lacking for lower level mental health needs
- Academic assistance and job readiness options are lacking in our area

### Goals

Two separate meetings focused on goal setting. During goal setting discussions, the JJCC agreed that time should be spent during each quarterly meeting to

review progress on the goals. During the January 2013 meeting, the JJCC approved the following two-year goals:

1. Increase the use of Evidence Based Practices (EBP) models for prevention, intervention and in-custody services and programs.
2. Create a gender-responsive, culturally competent continuum of services to meet the needs of young women at-risk of being involved, currently involved, and previously involved in the juvenile justice system.
3. Expand juvenile alcohol and other drug services, including residential programming.
4. Create a juvenile residential mental health treatment facility/program.
5. Increase the use of alternatives to incarceration for technical violations of probation.
6. Develop prevention and intervention programs for cross-over youth.
7. Expand mentoring programs.
8. Increase emphasis on providing services to youth that have a strength-based focus and/or asset based case planning.
9. Create Youth Assessment and Reception Centers that will provide behavioral screenings, criminal risk/needs assessment, linkage to community based services, and diversion from the delinquency system.
10. Create Youth Centers to address employment and educational needs. These Centers would focus on truancy, academic counseling, vocational programming, and job assistance.
11. Enhance continuity of care for youth transitioning from custodial settings to the community.

A new continuum model was also adopted. Attachment 6 depicts the new model. More emphasis was placed on expanding prevention and intervention services, while building upon the existing successful community partnerships.

## Progress

While the JJCC has recently approved the goals for the next two years, progress towards achievement was occurring throughout the time that the LAP was being updated. Evidence Based Practices have been expanded within the Probation Department through use of funding from the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) during Fiscal Year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The department added evidence based drug and alcohol treatment through the addition of an EMPACT program. This program allowed for EMPACT to be provided to both in-custody and out-of-custody minors. Aggression Replacement Training (ART), also an evidence-based intervention, has expanded from the juvenile facilities and is being offered to out-of-custody minors participating in the Gender Responsive Alternatives to Detention (GRAD) program.

Probation has also taken significant steps toward providing gender responsive and culturally competent services to girls. In December 2009, the Stanislaus County Probation Department began collaborating with the Prison Law Office, the National Center for Crime and Delinquency and the Youth Justice Institute to implement what would come to be known as the Girls Juvenile Justice Initiative (GJJI). In February of 2011, the Probation Department applied for and was awarded the Probation and Court Based Alternative (PCBA) Project grant, which was aimed at reducing the number of violations of probation, bench warrants and failures to appear by probation youth. Stanislaus County pursued the funds to address those problems as they specifically relate to justice involved girls. The grant enabled the department to implement the GRAD program, which introduced a specialized caseload, gender responsiveness training and assessment tool, and enhanced services for the under-served population of justice involved girls. In September of 2011, Stanislaus County was awarded the Evidence Based Practices (EBP) grant, allowing Probation to continue and enhance the GRAD project through September of 2013.

As noted above, a new gender-responsive risk assessment tool was implemented for all minors in Stanislaus County in 2011. The Juvenile Assessment and Inventory System (JAIS), is a validated risk assessment which also takes into consideration the gender of the person being assessed. While it was implemented as a result of grant funding, it will continue beyond the conclusion of the grant period.

Gender-responsiveness education was also provided as a part of the GJJI. Girl Matters is training on gender-responsiveness provided over the course of two days by the National Center on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) Center for Girls and Young Women and was offered at no cost to participants. Stanislaus County Probation hosted three separate Girl Matters training sessions for probation staff and invited local service providers, as well as agencies from other counties in

2011 and 2012. As of the writing of this report, Girl Matters training has been provided to 216 people from 30 different agencies and 8 different counties.

A new pilot mentoring program was initiated in 2012 as the result of the county's increased efforts to increase gender-responsive and evidence-based programming. The Mentoring Youth (MY) program is a partnership program between the Probation Department and the Parent Resource Center (PRC). The PRC, in conjunction with the Probation Department, match mentors with girls in custody. The mentors work with the minors for a minimum of one year, with the relationship continuing regardless of the minor's custodial status. Mentors have received gender-responsive training and are also provided with information gleaned from the JAIS gender-responsive assessment tool so that they can be more effective in working with the girls.

Planning efforts are also under way to bring training to the GJJJ task force on the subject of culturally competent programming for girls. This training will be provided by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Finally, in an effort to increase the use of evidence-based practices, the Probation Department in the process of working with the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) to host a Supervisors Leadership Academy (SLA) during the next year. The SLA is designed to prepare first line Probation Department supervisors for their role as change leaders within agencies undergoing the implementation of evidence-based practices.

# AB 1998 – Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's)

March 7, 2017

Technical Edits made on April 4, 2017

## 1. What is Assembly Bill (AB) 1998?

A. AB 1998 (Ch. 880, Statutes of 2016) is legislation that was enacted on September 30, 2016 and went into effect on January 1, 2017. This legislation makes important change to the planning and reporting requirements under the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) programs. Most significantly, many of the requirements are now combined for the two programs.

## 2. What are the county responsibilities under AB 1998?

A. County responsibilities under AB 1998 remain much the same as they were previously but some things are simplified and much of the reporting will be consolidated. The most significant changes resulting from AB 1998 are:

- Beginning in 2018, annual plans due by May 1<sup>st</sup> for JJCPA and YOBG may be combined when submitted to the BSCC. These plans will describe all programs, placements, strategies, services, and system enhancements that will be supported with JJCPA and/or YOBG funds in the upcoming fiscal year. Counties are asked to provide their most up-to-date plans to the BSCC, and may use a template that the BSCC will provide for the separate or combined plans.
- Counties are no longer required to include a proposed budget in their annual plans.
- Annual plans no longer require Board of Supervisors approval.
- Annual plans will be posted to the BSCC website. The BSCC is no longer required to approve plans.
- Following a transition year in 2017, annual year-end reports for JJCPA and YOBG will be combined and will be due to the BSCC by October 1st of each year.
- Beginning October 1, 2017, annual year-end reports will describe programs, placements, services and system enhancements that were funded through either program during the preceding fiscal year, including identification of any programs that were co-funded by JJCPA and YOBG.
- In addition to expenditure information, annual year-end reports will include countywide figures for specified juvenile justice data elements available in existing statewide juvenile justice data systems. Reports will also include a summary or analysis of how grant funded programs have or may have contributed to or influenced the countywide data that is reported. These new reporting requirements will have counties report data on their entire juvenile justice population and provide information on how the use of JJCPA and YOBG funds has impacted the trends seen in that data.
- The current outcome reporting requirements for both JJCPA and YOBG will be replaced with the above described countywide data reporting.

## 3. What is the program called now that AB 1998 has been enacted?

A. The consolidated program will be referred to as the JJCPA-YOBG Program. Although the statutes keep JJCPA and YOBG largely separate, the BSCC is directed to “consolidate the form of submission” of the annual JJCPA and YOBG plans. Similarly, the BSCC is directed to specify an

*annual year-end report format that “consolidates the report to be submitted pursuant to [JJCPA] with the annual report to be submitted to the board for the Youthful Offender Block Grant program.” Since most of the individual program elements remain intact, these programs will retain their individual names.*

**4. AB 1998 calls for a consolidated form of submission for the JJCPA and YOBG plans. Are counties required to submit one consolidated plan by May 1, 2017?**

- A. *In this transition year, counties are asked to submit their current plans, updated to reflect any changes since they were developed and to prepare for the submission of a consolidated plan in 2018. However, counties may submit a consolidated plan in 2017 if they are able to do so. More specifically, for 2017, recognizing impacts to county capacity to undertake new planning activities and fully merge their JJCPA and YOBG plans, the BSCC is providing necessary flexibility as we move toward full implementation. For 2017, counties can comply with the new requirements by submitting (1) the latest version of their Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan which is required under JJCPA, (2) the latest version of their Juvenile Justice Development Plan which is required under YOBG, and/or (3) a combined plan template describing programs, services, etc. that is not included in the Plans referenced in #s 1 or 2 but that will now be supported with JJCPA and/or YOBG funding.*

*Counties that choose to satisfy the planning requirement for 2017 by submitting a previous plan should modify the plan to remove any program-related information that is no longer relevant. For example, if the most recent version of a county’s JJCPA plan indicates that Anger Management and Substance Abuse Prevention training will be provided but that is not going to be the case for the upcoming fiscal year (2017-18), then the information related to Anger Management and Substance Abuse Prevention training should be removed from the plan prior to submission.*

**5. If counties want to submit only one plan, is that allowed? If so, has the BSCC developed a template for that?**

- A. *Although 2017 has been designated as a transition year, counties are encouraged to move forward with consolidation and submission of only one plan if they are in a position to do so. The BSCC is developing a template to help guide county development of a single, consolidated plan and that will be made available to all counties as soon as possible. Counties that want to begin working in that direction should keep in mind that AB 1998 combines the reporting requirements but does not fully combine the JJCPA and YOBG programs. The consolidated plan should include all of the components under each of the two programs. For JJCPA, refer to Government Code Section 30061(b)(4)(A) and for YOBG, refer to Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1961(a).*

**6. If counties submit the latest version of their Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan (the JJCPA plan), the latest version of their Juvenile Justice Development Plan (the YOBG plan), and the combined template describing new activities to be funded by JJCPA and YOBG, will all three of these documents be posted on the BSCC website?**

- A. *Yes, following the May 1<sup>st</sup> due date, and a reasonable review period the BSCC will post all plans that are submitted by counties. In some cases, that will include more than one document per county. The website will clearly identify individual or consolidated.*



**7. If our Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) has not been updated for many years, what should we submit? Similarly, if we are no longer doing any of the programs included in our most recent CMJJP or Juvenile Justice Development Plan (JJDP), what should we submit?**

- A. *During 2017, a county that has not updated its CMJJP for many years may still submit its most recent version of the CMJJP; however, that CMJJP should be modified to remove program-related information that is no longer relevant. In this instance, the county could submit a combined plan template that describes all programs and services that will be funded through JJCPA in the upcoming fiscal year. Such a county would also submit the most recent version of its JJDP in order to have a complete plan submission.*

*For counties that are no longer doing one or more of the programs or activities described in the most recent version of their CMJJP and/or JJDP, those plans can be modified to remove program-related information that is no longer relevant. Information on new programs or activities to be funded during the upcoming fiscal year, can either be added to the existing prior year plans or submit in a combined plan template.*

*Beginning in 2018, each county is encouraged to complete one, consolidated plan that contains a complete accounting of all JJCPA and YOBG activities planned for the upcoming fiscal year.*

**8. The combined plan template states that a plan needs to be submitted but does not specify what the plan must include. Part B on the template asks about new programs, strategies and system enhancements. Is this in addition to the plan or is it part of the plan?**

- A. *In prior years, counties submitted annual Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plans for the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act program, which are required to be reviewed annually and approved by each county's Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council. Every participating county created a Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan in 2000 when JJCPA began. Since 2000, counties have been asked to submit an annual funding application that notes a county is either applying for continuation funding or substantive modification.*

*Under the Youthful Offender Block Grant program, there are also annual plans to be submitted to the BSCC. In this case, they are called Juvenile Justice Development Plans and they have been submitted in their entirety each year since 2008.*

*Given the above, each participating county has previously completed both a Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan and a Juvenile Justice Development Plan. During 2017 only, counties can satisfy the bulk of the requirements of AB 1998, by simply sending in the most recent version of each of these Plans. To satisfy the remaining requirements of AB 1998, counties would just complete the template for anything that is not already included in one of the existing Plans.*

*For a county that is doing something different with its JJCPA funding than is reflected in its most recent Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan, Part I of the template can be used to describe only those new activities. For a county that is doing something different with its YOBG funding than is reflected in its most recent Juvenile Justice Development Plan, Part II of the template can be used to describe only those new activities. Counties that are planning to continue funding the same programs, services, etc. as are reflected in the most recent versions of its Plans, do not need to submit either Part I or Part II of the template. For those counties that are making changes, some may complete only Part I, some may complete only Part II, and others may complete both Part I and Part II.*

*In summary, for any given county a complete plan during the transition year could include either of the following:*

- *The most recent Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan + the most recent Juvenile Justice Development Plan; or,*
- *The most recent Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan + the most recent Juvenile Justice Development Plan + a completed template (Part I and/or II).*

**9. What if our county no longer has a copy of the full Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP)?**

- A. *Government Code Section 30061(b)(4) requires that counties have a CMJJP developed by the local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council. If you do not have a CMJJP, please review Government Code Sections 30061(b)(4)(A) & (B) which describe what is required to be included in these plans.*

*Given that one consolidated JJCPA-YOBG plan will be submitted beginning in May 2018, any county that must develop a new CMJJP is encouraged to do so with an eye toward the consolidated plan that will be due next year. This suggestion is intended to help counties avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort next year.*

**10. Where can I find the form(s) to be completed for the JJCPA-YOBG Plan?**

- A. *All forms can be found on the BSCC website by going to [http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s\\_cppgrantfundedprograms.php](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_cppgrantfundedprograms.php) and selecting "Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act-Youthful Offender Block Grant" from the list of programs and then scrolling down to the bulleted list and selecting the document linked to the bullet "JJCPA-YOBG Plan template." The forms indicate where information is to be entered. On Parts I and II, the text boxes will expand to allow you to enter as much information as you need.*

*To download the forms, open the document as described above and then select "Save As" to save a copy to your computer. Please use the naming convention "County name fiscal year JJCPA-YOBG."*

*Naming convention example: **Sacramento 2017-18 JJCPA-YOBG***

**11. Who must develop and approve county JJCPA-YOBG Plans?**

- A. *Government Code Section 30061(b)(4) specifies that each county's Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) shall review and update the JJCPA component of the plan. The JJCC is the entity legally mandated to develop these JJCPA components. The YOBG component of the plan is not required to be developed by the JJCC.*

*Beginning in 2018, the JJCPA-YOBG Plans will be fully consolidated; however, based on the unique attributes of each program, it will continue to be the case that JJCC involvement is only required on the JJCPA component of the plans.*

*Counties are not required to obtain Board of Supervisor approval on any part of the JJCPA-YOBG Plans. In addition, the BSCC no longer approves these plans.*

**12. When are the completed JJCPA-YOBG Plans, including the Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plans (CMJJPs), and the Juvenile Justice Development Plans (JJDPs) due to the BSCC?**

- A. *Plans are due to the BSCC by May 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. For example, the plans for fiscal year 2017-18 are due by May 1, 2017.*

*Given that 2017 is a transition year, the plan requirements are different this year than they will be in future years. For 2017, a complete plan package could include either of the following:*

- *The most recent Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan and the most recent Juvenile Justice Development Plan; or,*
- *The most recent Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan, the most recent Juvenile Justice Development Plan, and a completed template (Part I and/or II).*

**13. What can JJCPA funds be used for?**

- A. *JJCPA expenditures are to be based on a local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk youth and juvenile offenders. Therefore, JJCPA funds can be used for programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation. These specifications can be found in Government Code sections 30061(b)(4)(A) & (B).*

**14. What can YOBG funds be used for?**

- A. *The purpose of YOBG funding is to enhance the capacity of local communities to implement an effective continuum of response to juvenile crime and delinquency. As such, these funds can be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders who are no longer eligible for commitment to the Division of Juvenile Justice and now must be supervised locally. These specifications can be found in Welfare & Institutions Code sections 1950 & 1951(b).*

**15. Do JJCPA funds still need to be used on programs and practices that are supported by demonstrated effectiveness data?**

- A. *Yes. Although the BSCC's role in reviewing and approving the demonstrated effectiveness data has been eliminated, counties are still responsible for ensuring that these funds are used to support "programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime..." This requirement can be found in Government Code section 30061(b)(4)(B)(i).*

**16. When will counties know their allocation amounts?**

- A. *County allocation amounts are determined as part of the annual state budget process. Each year, a new state budget is enacted on or about July 1<sup>st</sup>. Based on the enacted budget, the Department of Finance prepares an allocation schedule that specifies a county-by-county distribution percentage that will be applied to all available funding for JJCPA and YOBG.*

Typically, the allocation schedule is completed in August or September and is then sent to the State Controller's Office (SCO). Once SCO receives the allocation schedule, they begin their process to disburse funds directly to the counties, which generally begins in September.

The SCO website hosts a wealth of information regarding JJCPA and YOBG. For questions regarding the allocation schedule, payment amounts or release dates, program growth funds, and much more, counties are encouraged to visit the SCO website at:

[http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard\\_local\\_apportionments.html](http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_local_apportionments.html)

**17. Does a modification need to be submitted if a county wants to fund something that was not included in the JJCPA-YOBG Plan submitted to the BSCC?**

- A. No, modifications are not required for JJCPA or YOBG. When the year-end expenditure report is submitted in October that should be a complete and accurate reflection of what was actually implemented during the preceding fiscal year. Thus, the BSCC would effectively receive notification at the time such report is received. Similarly, a county should also include the new program or activity in the next year's plan to the extent that it will be continued into the following fiscal year.

**18. What should be included within the annual year-end reports for JJCPA & YOBG?**

- A. Annual year-end reports for JJCPA-YOBG will describe programs, placements, services, strategies, and system enhancements that were funded through either program during the preceding fiscal year, including identification of any programs that are co-funded by JJCPA and YOBG. Reports will include line item budget detail for all program, placements, services, strategies, and system enhancements that were funded.

In addition, annual year-end reports will include countywide figures for specified juvenile justice data elements available in existing statewide juvenile justice data systems. Reports will also include a summary description or analysis of how grant funded programs have or may have contributed to the countywide data that is reported.

The BSCC will be developing a data and expense reporting format for counties to use. That format will be released to counties as soon as it is complete.

**19. When are the annual year-end reports due back to the BSCC?**

- A. The completed year-end reports are due back to the BSCC by October 1<sup>st</sup> of every year. For example, the reports for fiscal year 2016-17 are due by October 1, 2017.

The BSCC will be developing a data and expense reporting format for counties to use. That format will be released to counties as soon as it is complete.

**20. What are the BSCC's responsibilities under AB 1998?**

- A. The BSCC receives all county plans submitted pursuant to AB 1998. The BSCC also receives all county year-end reports submitted pursuant to AB 1998. In the case of the year-end reports, the BSCC is directed to make all report information available on its website. For JJCPA, this web posting must occur within 45 days of report submittal.

*By March 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, the BSCC must prepare and submit an annual report to the Governor and the Legislature that includes details as to how the counties spent their JJCPA and YOBG funds. This report must also summarize countywide trend data and any other pertinent information submitted by counties indicating how the programs, strategies, or system enhancements have or may have contributed to, or influenced, the trends identified.*

*AB 1998 gives the BSCC authority to monitor YOBG-related forms, documents and information submitted by counties and provide technical assistance on YOBG implementation.*

**21. Where do I send all the forms once they are completed?**

- A. All documentation for the JJCPA-YOBG Program should be sent to:

[JJCPA-YOBG@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:JJCPA-YOBG@bscc.ca.gov).

**22. Where can I obtain more information about AB 1998?**

- A. You can use the link below to access the full text of AB 1998.

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB1998](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB1998)

**23. Who should I contact if I have questions?**

- A. You may contact Field Representative Kimberly Bushard by phone at 916-324-0999 or by e-mail at [kimberly.bushard@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:kimberly.bushard@bscc.ca.gov).

## JJCPA Funded Program, Strategy and/or System Enhancement

*This template should be copied as many times as needed to capture every program, strategy and system enhancement you plan to fund next year.*

### **Program Name:**

High Risk Offender

### **Evidence Upon Which It Is Based:**

This program has demonstrated effectiveness in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime as it has shown a decrease in the number of adjudicated offenses including, drug related and violent offenses. There were also fewer violations of probation than in previous years.

### **Description:**

The High Risk Offender Program expands intensive, community based supervision of high-risk juvenile court wards and the enforcement, or clearance, of juvenile court warrants. The objective is to reduce juvenile crime and gang involvement in the target population and increase offender accountability by actively enforcing outstanding juvenile court warrants. The program also strengthens existing law enforcement and probation partnerships by increasing the number of police/probation teams available to focus on this high-risk population. The program provides more coverage for high crime areas in the county, particularly in the West and South Modesto areas, where both the Sheriff and Modesto Police Department have jurisdiction.

### **Program Name:**

Home Supervision

### **Evidence Upon Which It Is Based:**

The program has consistently met or exceeded expectations in effectively ensuring minors attended all scheduled court hearings. The number of violations of probation for these minors has consistently been at a lower rate than those participating in the program. Victim restitution collection has been consistent as the youth are out of custody rather than incarcerated.

### **Description:**

Home Supervision, an intervention and incapacitation program, is designed to provide protection to the community and offender accountability while allowing offenders to remain in their homes in lieu of incarceration. The program consists of Electronic Monitoring and House Arrest of wards and alleged wards pending adjudication and/or disposition hearings in Juvenile Court. By restricting appropriately selected minors to their homes rather than detaining them in Juvenile Hall, secure detention beds can be reserved for those youth posing the greatest danger to the community and taxpayer costs for juvenile facility placements can be avoided. The minors are supervised through frequent face-to-face visits by program staff who verify school attendance and participation in structured, community based counseling programs and compliance with imposed restrictions.

Program enhancement: Purchase of two replacement vehicles for our Home Supervision Program staff who are conducting field supervision on the participating youth.

**Program Name:**

Juvenile Drug Court

**Evidence Upon Which It Is Based:**

Juvenile Drug Courts provide for more intensive supervision over juvenile offenders and it has been demonstrated that increased monitoring of participants, random drug screening and the treatment and rehabilitation requirements of juvenile drug court programs promote a greater likelihood of success in reducing drug use and delinquent activity than can be achieved through most existing juvenile court processes. Stanislaus County's existing Juvenile Drug Court has demonstrated significant positive outcomes proving its effectiveness since its inception in 1998.

**Description:**

The Probation Department and Juvenile Justice Behavioral Health (JJBH) have a long standing history of partnering to provide services to youth in the criminal justice system. JJBH staff are currently co-located with the Probation Department. The Behavioral Health Screening Process is utilized to make the initial referral for assessment. Upon completion of the assessment process, the Juvenile Drug Court team, to include two Behavioral Health Specialists/Certified Substance abuse counselors, one Mental Health Clinician and a Deputy Probation Officer meet to share information and determine appropriateness for the program. Once accepted into the program, staff from both agencies interact on a daily basis, exchanging information as necessary. Juvenile probationers will receive intensive drug and alcohol treatment services and random drug testing based on the Juvenile Drug Court model. JDC provides both individual and group mental health and substance abuse counseling for juveniles diagnosed with co-occurring disorders. Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT), an evidence-based program, is integrated in group treatment along with substance abuse education and recovery concepts. Information regarding the youth's progress is shared with the Juvenile Court Judge during review hearings or as the need arises to address relapse issues.

Program enhancement: Purchase of a modular building for Juvenile Drug Court counseling and training (previous building was torn down and removed as it no longer met the existing building codes).

**Program Name:**

Gender Responsive Alternatives to Detention (GRAD)

**Evidence Upon Which It Is Based:**

Treating justice involved girls and boys in a generic manner do not appropriately meet girls' needs. Girls tend to have elevated rates of trauma, which can lead to serious mental health conditions. The reasons for girls' system involvement are complex and often rooted in challenging family dynamics. Without gender-responsive assessments, programs, and services, an opportunity to address the issues that lead to girls' justice involvement is missed.

In December 2009, the Probation Department began collaborating with the Prison Law Office, the National Center for Crime and Delinquency and the Youth Justice Institute to implement what would come to be known as the Girls Juvenile Justice Initiative. The purpose of the initiative was

to create and implement a strategic plan and task force to address the dearth of services available to justice involved girls. A strategic plan was developed in December 2010 with the mission: "To promote public safety by creating a gender-responsive, culturally competent continuum of services that provides opportunities for girls and young women to lead safe, healthy and productive lives."

The Probation Department evaluated our own data and determined secure detention was the primary resource used for violations of probation, bench warrants and failures to appear. The data showed girls were over-represented in terms of bookings into the juvenile hall and out-of-home placement. It was also determined almost half of all girls entering the juvenile hall were booked for violations of probation, bench warrants and failures to appear. In July of 2011, the Stanislaus County Probation Department implement the Gender Responsive Alternatives to Detention (GRAD) program, which introduced a specialized caseload, gender-responsive training and assessment tool and enhanced services for the under-served population of justice involved girls.

**Description:**

A Center for Human Services case manager is currently co-located with the Probation Department. The probation department implemented the gender-responsive Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS) tool. The JAIS is an evidence-based tool that generates an assessment in order to identify a supervision strategy and create an intervention plan. Upon the completion of the assessment process, the GRAD team, to include the DPO I/II and the case manager meet to share information and determine appropriateness for the program for the under-served population of justice involved girls. Once accepted into the program, staff from both agencies interact on a daily basis, conducting weekly case reviews, attending court appearances and exchanging information as necessary.

The GRAD program employs numerous alternative interventions in the event of a violation of probation. When a girl receives traditional probation services, if she is in violation of probation, she is sent to Court and a recommendation for time in juvenile hall is typically made. With GRAD, the deputy probation officer and case manager engage in a "case conference," during which they meet to discuss the particular circumstances of the girl, their various options and to make recommendations for appropriate steps to take to address the behavior. Among the alternatives to the traditional approach are: referral to appropriate treatment services (i.e. substance abuse, mental health); community service; Hutton House (a shelter and respite for youth); and other non-custody options like electronic monitoring and home commitment.

Female probationers receive various services such as an evidence-based Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) treatment program, Steps to Freedom. Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT) is the premier cognitive-behavior program for substance abuse treatment which combines education, group and individual counseling, and structured exercises designed to foster moral development in treatment-resistant probationers. GRAD probationers may also be referred to Aggression Replacement Training (ART). ART is a cognitive behavioral intervention program to help children and adolescents improve social skill competence and moral reasoning, better manage anger, and reduce aggressive behavior.



## **YOBG Funded Program, Placement, Service, Strategy and/or System Enhancement**

*This template should be copied as many times as needed to capture every program, placement, service, strategy, and system enhancement you plan to fund next year.*

### **Program Name:**

Home on Probation

### **Nature of Coordination with JJCPA:**

Wards assigned to the caseloads supported by YOBG and JJCPA funds will be assessed with an evidence based risk assessment tool, the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS). This program works in collaboration with the JJCPA High Risk Offender program in that it identifies minors who may be in need of a higher level of supervision and also provides a targeted intervention for those minors who are low to medium risk. The JAIS supervision strategies determine the level of intervention.

### **Description:**

In an ongoing effort to promote public safety by preventing lower risk minors from escalating into delinquency, from being sent to out-of-home placement or from otherwise being detained, Stanislaus County will use the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS), an evidence based risk assessment tool, to develop case plans for minors supervised on probation. The JAIS identifies strategies that emphasize public safety, rehabilitation and accountability, and focuses efforts on criminogenic needs. Juvenile Supervision Officers will use this evidence based and gender responsive assessment tool in developing a plan to provide treatment options aligned with the assessed needs of minors before they are re-committed to juvenile hall, sent to placement or sentenced to DJJ. The JAIS complements the professional judgement of the supervising officer and emphasizes the reduction in recidivism through the use of evidence based supervision strategies.

Program Enhancement: Purchase of two replacement vehicles for Probation Officers conducting field supervision and compliance checks on the targeted youth.

### **Program Name:**

Camp – Juvenile Commitment Facility

### **Nature of Coordination with JJCPA:**

A number of Probation Corrections Officers have been trained in the evidence-based Aggression Replacement Training (ART). Additionally, the department has one train-the-trainer staff. Several of the officers working in the Juvenile Commitment Facility facilitate ART groups. Additionally, evidence-based drug and alcohol counseling, including Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT), is being offered within the new facility by Juvenile Justice Mental Health staff funded by YOBG.

### **Description:**

Stanislaus County completed the construction of a 47,207 square foot Commitment Facility. The 60-bed treatment facility is comprised of three living units; a 30-bed living unit and two 15-bed living units. The facility is separated from, but directly adjacent to the existing Juvenile Hall and

Juvenile Justice Center located at 2215 Blue Gum Ave in Modesto. The Commitment Facility is providing residential programming for post-adjudicated wards, thereby preserving secure beds at the Juvenile Hall for pre-adjudicated juvenile offenders. The facility is designed to house longer term Juvenile Court commitments and provides academic and vocational education programs, mental health and substance abuse services, and other programs which promote a sense of self-discipline and responsibility.

**Program Name:**

Staff Salaries/Benefits – Crime Analyst

**Nature of Coordination with JJCPA:**

The Crime Analyst will evaluate the effectiveness of existing juvenile services/programs and will assist in researching best practices for future programming. This individual collaborates with and presents findings and recommendations to a variety of program stakeholders both internal and external to the department to help achieve organizational goals related to program outcomes.

**Description:**

The Crime Analyst (Program Evaluation Researcher) plans and conducts program evaluation research to determine if department programs are achieving intended outcomes. Work includes designing research methods and statistical analysis to assess program needs, theory, processes, efficiency, outcomes, and impacts. This individual measures and interprets empirical data, draws evidence-based conclusions, and makes informed recommendations aimed at maintaining or improving program design and/or administration. In addition, this individual is responsible to prepare and disseminate research proposals and reports, grant compliance reports, and other related memoranda as necessary to administer and manage effective program evaluation pursuits.

**Program Name:**

Juvenile Hall

**Nature of Coordination with JJCPA:**

A number of Probation Corrections Officers have been trained in the evidence-based Aggression Replacement Training (ART) and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT). With the additional officers trained in ART/CBT, not only will the PREA mandate be consistent with standards, but they will also provide the needed supervision and evidence-based programming through leading ART/CBT groups.

**Description:**

The Juvenile Hall is a 158-bed facility at the Juvenile Justice Center located at 2215 Blue Gum Ave in Modesto. The Juvenile Hall provides temporary and extended detention for those minors awaiting detention, jurisdictional or dispositional hearings. Programming for both pre-and post-adjudicated wards is also provided. The facility provides academic and vocational education programs, mental health and substance abuse services and other programs which promote a sense of self-discipline and responsibility. The county will continue operating Juvenile Hall and house minors including those non-707b youth that would have previously been committed to DJJ or some youth who have violated a placement order could be returned to benefit from services at the Juvenile Hall.

Consistent with Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) standards, YOBG funds will pay for salary and benefit costs for additional staff positions to staff the facility while providing supervision

services to minors detained in the Juvenile Hall. Equipment, training and travel costs for each new staff as well as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) workbook materials and incentives will be included.



# Stanislaus County Graduated Responses To Youth Crime & Delinquency Prevention



- = Existing Option
- = Existing Option To Be Expanded
- = Option Being Implemented
- = Option To Be Created

2012                      2013 - 2016



Vocational Programming  
 General Education Program  
 Mental Health and AOD Services  
 ART  
 Culinary Arts Program

Expanded to include  
 Continuum of Care Reform (CCR)  
 Wraparound added April 2016

## PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Mental Health and Substance Abuse Programs	Family, Youth and Child Programs	Law Enforcement Sponsored Programs	Family Resource Centers and Wraparound Services	Education Services and Programs	Mentoring Programs	Parenting and Pregnancy Programs	County and City Youth and Family Programs
		Truancy Centers	Youth Leadership	ART in schools	After School Programs	Prevention and Early Intervention	

## PARTNERSHIPS

Behavioral Health and Recovery Services	Community Services Agency	Local Law Enforcement	Community Based Organizations	SCOE and local School Districts	Faith-Based Organizations	Health Services Agency	County / City Sponsored
---	---------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------