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Executive Summary
Communities across the country are standing up to demand change, hold law enforcement accountable for racist practices, and calling out the failures of custody suppression and control: the very pillars of the failed punishment approach. It is time to push beyond reform to achieve transformation in all aspects of the notion of justice.

In response, members of the Youth Justice Work Group (YJWG) are building a new model of justice for young people, one based upon the foundational competencies of youth development (Health, Social, Environmental, Cognitive/Creative, Vocational, Leadership, and Equity), that, to date, has offered several action points/goals, including: 1) deep financial investment in communities diminished by mass incarceration and structural neglect—from community centers to parks and recreation, housing and job development; 2) the establishment of a County department to resource, cultivate and support a vast network of community-based organizations to carry out youth development work; 3) relying on an intervention team, rather than law enforcement, to immediately address crises by engaging the youth development network; and 4) moving away from the failures of the custody-suppression-control model by requiring investment in community support and community intervention, while also limiting out of home placement to small, home-like, therapeutic community-based options.

While some are more quickly achievable than others, these goals nonetheless lay the groundwork for a youth justice model with promise. And, as such, would have been impossible without the collaborative synergy of YJWG stakeholders, particularly the youth, whose active participation, vision and experience have been especially crucial every step of the way.
I. Introduction

Overview of Board Motion
In a historic move in August 2019, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution to study and propose a pathway for transitioning youth from Probation into a wholly different system. The motion directed the Chief Executive Officer and the Director of the Office of Diversion and Reentry to co-convene a Youth Justice Work Group (YJWG)—comprised of various County and city agency representatives, labor stakeholders, community stakeholders, and current or former justice-involved youth, with the assistance of a third-party consultancy—to begin this unprecedented work, with the goal of creating a rehabilitative, health-focused and care-first system. The Office of Diversion and Reentry’s division of Youth Diversion and Development and Chief Executive Office contracted with W. Haywood Burns Institute (BI) as lead consultant who then assembled a team to exemplify the breadth of individuals necessary to provide leadership in a culture shift of such magnitude. Each key consultant partner has a proven history of working on the very issues the Board resolution seeks to address and possesses long-standing cross-sector relationships critical to ensure short- and long-term success. This diverse team includes Patricia Soung (Children’s Defense Fund-California), Anthony Robles (Youth Justice Coalition), Kent Mendoza (Anti-Recidivism Coalition), and Danielle Dupuy and Issac Bryan (Millions Dollar Hoods, University of California, Los Angeles).

Prior Accomplishments and Other Pre-Work in Los Angeles
YJWG has built upon the recommendations and prior work of relevant County and community-led projects, many of which utilized extensive hearings and meetings of their own to address similar issues concerning how to reduce the County’s reliance on justice systems altogether to address the needs of youth and community safety; what practices uphold the core principles of youth development versus incarceration models; and accountability for systems, as well as youth and their families. Key recent and relevant recommendations for YJWG include those of the Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration project; the Los Angeles County Probation Reform and Implementation Team; and “LA Model” proposing a culture of care first implemented at Camp Kilpatrick in 2017.

BI Role, Position and Framework
For nearly 20 years, BI has created pathways nationally to support local collaboratives to: a) advance efforts focused on eliminating racial and ethnic disparities (RED); b) engage and organize community stakeholders; and c) convene system stakeholders and community advocates to work together in advancing change. With an established record of significant gains in local efforts to address disparities in detention, utilize more community-centered approaches and alternatives, and partner with communities more broadly, BI aims to build upon these harm reduction efforts toward a wellbeing frame promoting transformation, equity and inclusion as normative culture and the only way to achieve true public safety.
BI believes that the only approach to a newly defined wellbeing frame within the justice context requires naming, understanding and addressing structural racism and the myriad impacts of its historical and modern-day constructs perpetuating these inequities. This includes the human services sector, which operates independently to produce life outcomes that result in either justice or injustice. We recognize, therefore, that the administration of justice—the last stop on this path of structural and systemic racism—inevitably steers some toward freedom of opportunity and others toward incarceration.

BI convenes the variously siloed and disparate agencies that, collectively, comprise the blunt justice apparatus. We recruit impacted community members to share their stories and particular expertise—revealing often overlooked decision points crucial to stemming RED. We uphold a process whereby abstractions of professionalized consultancy do not replace lived experience.

Structure/Process of the work
The ambitious goals of the LA Board of Supervisors resolution required the creation of the approximately 110-member YJWG—itself a nexus of cross-sector of stakeholders—that includes those from both the State and City, as well as a host of CBOs spanning organizing, policy advocacy and direct service providers. YJWG has three subcommittees, each with a role to more efficiently develop the design components of LA County’s new youth justice model. Therefore, given that our principal objectives are to support YJWG’s goals (BI staff lead, manage and guide YJWG and its three subcommittees), we interface with these stakeholders utilizing our extensive expertise in convening, facilitating, and documenting such multi-sector forums.

YJWG includes representatives from the Center for Strategic Partnerships, Chief Executive Office, County Counsel, Department of Arts and Culture, Department of Children and Family Services, Department of Health Services, Department of Public Health, Department of Mental Health, Office of Education, Department of Parks and Recreation, Public Defender’s Office, Alternate Public Defender’s Office, District Attorney’s Office, Superior Court, Probation, law enforcement, and representatives from many community-based organizations that advocate for and serve youth across the County.

Emerging Challenges Related to COVID-19, National Protests and DJJ Closure
The original plan for this work relied heavily upon intentionally facilitated in-person opportunities for people to establish relationships, learn together, and negotiate through disagreement to codesign a model. In March, however, we lost the ability to convene people in person due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the important need to protect public health by complying with social distancing guidelines. In response to COVID-19, YJWG quickly pivoted to virtual meetings—adapting our facilitation strategy to make space for smaller meetings where folks were better able to engage in virtual dialogue—and building up a
comprehensive and immersive website and private social networking platform to ensure members had continued access to resources and discussion topics during and between meetings. We immediately surveyed the participating youth leaders to identify gaps in their ability to work virtually and secured philanthropic contributions to provide all YJWG youth leaders with laptops and WiFi hotspots. YJWG also transitioned all national and international learning exchanges to virtual sessions rather than in-person travel.

In late May, our work was further impacted by 1) the news of the closure of the state Department of Juvenile Justice and 2) the murder of George Floyd and the ensuing national protests and calls for reinvestment in communities most impacted by policing and the justice system. For us, these two sea changes increased and heightened the urgency and stakes of our effort. Though the general structure and timeline remain, the facilitators and members of YJWG have recognized the importance of developing a thoughtful and actionable design as soon as possible so that the next few months can focus on areas where there is still tension, disagreement, and uncertainty so that the model we present can be implemented in phases and implemented well.
II. Initial Research

Bibliography and Compiled Findings and Recommendations
To ensure a shared baseline of knowledge and familiarity with the many findings and recommendations issued in recent years about transforming the youth justice system in Los Angeles, the Consultant Team compiled a bibliography that includes descriptions and links to key, relevant studies and reports. In addition to the bibliography, the Consultant Team abbreviated findings and recommendations from seven key reports. These reports were considered particularly relevant because they resulted from collaborative initiatives involving diverse sectors and leaders, including many current YJWG participants. As it developed its proposals, YJWG was urged to become familiar or refamiliarized with these recommendations so that it could reconsider, build upon, strengthen and learn from implementation of the best ones (see Appendix).

Webinars: Probation System and Functions in LA County
In two webinars, the Consultant team conducted and presented a high-level mapping of the relevant youth-serving systems in Los Angeles County to lay critical groundwork for stakeholders to understand and then propose transformations to the youth justice system. The first (March 19) identified and described the youth-serving systems relevant to YJWG, including potentially relevant divisions and projects to build upon in transforming youth justice in the County. The second (May 28) focused on the history and evolution of probation systems, including the legal and practical attitudes about the law enforcement and social work functions of the probation officer’s job.

Data: Relevant Quantitative Data
An essential component to any accountable justice model—current or restructured—is the capacity to collect, analyze, and use data to drive decision-making regarding the youth under its care. Unfortunately, in the early months of YJWG, however, lack of access to real time data hindered the consultants’ ability to answer key questions to inform the work.

Numerous previous reports reinforce the challenges faced by consultants in YJWG and have documented the need for more and better data in Los Angeles County. According to one recent report, the Probation Department uses “46 different data systems to manage clients, staff, contracted providers, and a range of other information. There is little integration across data systems. In addition, there is limited data sharing with other County Departments.” 1 The same report documented that even after a months-long process to ensure data integrity with data from the Probation Department, there remained notable discrepancies with reports as basic as the number of young people on probation.

It should be noted that the problems associated with accessing data are less about a willingness from the Probation Department to provide relevant data and more about the

Department’s inability to easily produce relevant and timely reports regarding the status of youth under its custody and care. This good will, however, does not excuse the larger and more structural issues with the Department’s lack of accountability regarding data. After dozens of reports highlighting the same problems with data, the lack of investment in a data collection system tracking the impact justice system decisions have on the young people it serves signals a reluctance for accountability.

Beyond failing to provide important context to YJWG, the general lack of data access allows stakeholder partners (with access to data) to control the conversation around public safety. For example, early on YJWG was presented with data suggesting that a high proportion of youth involved in the justice system were accused of violent offenses. Absent the ability to access and further analyze these data, statements like this can become the prevailing narrative. More analysis is crucial to better contextualize and understand, say, what constitutes a violent offense and the justice system’s decision-making around that offense—including the initial charges, how charges change throughout the court process, and the extent to which youth of color are disparately impacted.

Without exception, these data access barriers have no place in a transformed justice system. And any model must invest in adequate information technology that allows for greater transparency. The model will draw on numerous prior recommendations for more accessible data.

Accessing Publicly Available Data
Because of data access challenges, BI relied on other publicly available data sources to inform early YJWG conversations. Consultants relied primarily on data the County of Los Angeles submitted to the California Department of Justice (DOJ) via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS)\(^2\). In addition, consultants used publicly available data published by the Probation department, data available from DOJ’s Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR), and data published by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) Detention Profile. These data were used to develop early reports submitted to the full YJWG (see Appendix) as well as analyses in presentations tailored for each subcommittee.

Data Request
As each subcommittee began meeting and reviewing the available data, they developed data-related questions to guide the reimaging of a new model. Consultants consolidated each subcommittee’s emerging questions and created a Data Tracking Guide to identify available data sources for each question. Many of these questions could be answered—in

---

\(^2\) Per Penal Code section 13010.5, the DOJ is mandated to collect data pertaining to the juvenile justice system for criminal history and statistical purposes. JCPSS is the primary statewide database of information collected from county probation departments on all juvenile probation referrals, court actions and final dispositions. Counties submit data into the JCPSS on a monthly basis, via either a manual data entry or the web enabled uploading process.
part—with the analysis of publicly available data or through qualitative methods. As subcommittees generated questions, consultants acknowledged that several questions could not be answered, which prompted additional inquiries with the Probation Department regarding available reports. Consultants have had numerous conversations with Probation staff to discuss available data.

After conversations regarding the absence of published reports to answer key questions became clear, consultants submitted a request for one year of case level data including key variables that span current justice system decision-making—from referral to probation to court disposition. Since the request scope includes youth currently under the care of the justice system, we also requested additional data on youth exiting the justice system—home on probation as a “ward” of the court; committed to camp; or committed to another suitable placement—to learn more about how long youth remain under the custody and control of the justice system. The request is outstanding.

Furthermore, consultants requested aggregate data to inform the DJJ Transition Team. Given the short timeline associated with the Motion, this request took precedent over the original request. Consultants have received a portion of these data.
III. Grounding Model in Youth Development Principles and Racial Equity

Overview
With Youth Justice Coalition’s Youth Development Competencies as a touchstone—a framework whose scope exceeds theoretical wellbeing to consider the all-important component of access—Subcommittee #1 developed and expanded the list with active participation and substantial input from youth. During one youth-led breakout session, the consensus suggested adding Environmental Competency, which the youth members thought vital to explicitly address living sustainably through fostering education and respect for the environment. At YJWG’s February meeting (the final in-person meeting due to COVID-19), the youth member, who had sparked the idea, formally proposed adding the new competency, which was promptly endorsed by YJWG. Two additional foundational elements, Equity and Justice, also emerged from this subcommittee and were adopted. These Youth Development Principles, combined with the goal of racial equity, are what YJWG agreed will shape all relevant aspects of phasing in a new, care-first youth justice model for Los Angeles County.

Youth Development Competencies

*Health Competence.* Good current health status as well as knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that will ensure future health, including access to physical and mental health services, substance use services, emotional healing, nutrition, sports and recreation.

*Social Competence.* Skills for understanding and appreciation of self, culture, language and history, as well as appreciation for others, including self-discipline and decision-making; being able to work and communicate with others; develop financial literacy; technological access and skills; parental skills; empathy for others and the ability to solve problems without domination, retribution or violence—restorative and transformative justice.

*Environmental Competence.* Skills for understanding and appreciation of environmental health, justice, and sustainability; also includes built environment and access to institutions, including housing and family settings, that are oriented towards one’s wellbeing and the policies, laws, and regulations that impact one’s healthy development.

*Cognitive/Creative Competence.* Knowledge and ability to appreciate and participate in areas of healing-centered creative expression for all of the ways people experience their worlds, including access to quality education, critical thinking, critical pedagogy, analysis and problem solving; literacy, academic support, and college preparation; and self-expression through the arts.

*Vocational Competence.* Understanding and skills of life planning and a diverse range of career choices, work options, work-life balance, life planning, and steps to act on those choices, including exploration of interests and gifts; job preparation, education, and training; seeking mentorship and support navigating career pathways; employment and career exploration; goal-setting and financial literacy.
Leadership Competence. Understanding and skills of personal values, moral and ethical decision-making, and participation in efforts that contribute to the greater good, including the right to speak out, organize and to both serve and change their schools, communities, and society.

Equity. The presence of policies, practices, and procedures that implement measures to remediate unfair and disparate differences among groups of people, whether those groups are defined socially, economically, demographically or geographically or by other means of stratification.

Justice. Reimagine. The exercise of the ability to maintain what is right, fair, equitable, and reasonable.
IV. Stakeholder Engagement
We have employed several strategies to engage stakeholders in the development of a new youth justice model and ensure a truly collaborative process. In addition to regular YJWG and subcommittee meetings, we have utilized existing coalition spaces for further input, conducted Listening Sessions and Learning Exchanges, and met one-on-one with key individuals.

Community Engagement
As previously mentioned, community has played a critical role in guiding LA County to this point of reimagining its youth justice system. It is imperative, therefore, that they be centered in the work of YJWG as well. YJWG wants to honor the expertise of CBOs and young people by not only having them as participants in the monthly meetings but by providing additional avenues for receiving their input in this process.

LA Youth Uprising
With Lead Consultant Anthony Robles as liaison, a base of youth from each organization in LA Youth Uprising (17 organizational members) have been driving YJWG’s community engagement. To date, they have hosted youth leadership development sessions on basics such as drafting email, organizing calendar, and shaping policy and demands. Furthermore, its Close and Create Workgroup, comprising system-impacted youth and youth-serving CBOs, has been a key strategizing arena in developing ways to dismantle juvenile justice probation and sharing them with YJWG.

ARC
The Anti-Recidivism Coalition (ARC), a nonprofit CBO that serves as a support and advocacy network for formerly incarcerated young men and women—identified as one of the key service providers to engage—has been actively participating in YJWG meetings, as well as providing a youth presence in YJWG subcommittees (since the March YJWG meeting, two ARC youth policy interns have been attending subcommittee meetings). Several other ARC members (not interns) participate in YJWG meetings and receive stipends. ARC also conducted a Listening Session with ARC members (see Listening Session section below). After hosting this session, many ARC members expressed interest in continuing the conversation around principles of restoration and youth development. As a result, ARC created space during their weekly scheduled Monday night policy town hall meetings on June 8 (28 attendees) and 15 (27 attendees) to discuss and brainstorm the answers to several questions relevant to the work of YJWG.

Virtual Meetings
With COVID-19, all meetings are virtual, which can be intimidating for youth as they’re facing 50+ people on a Zoom call. To account for this, we have instituted creative ways, such as implementing art, drawing and poetry, to make it less intimidating. Additionally, in some meetings youth break into groups so they can have discussions on their own, without any adults present.
Youth Justice Work Group

YJWG met for the first time in January 2020 and has met monthly since. In February and March, we established three subcommittees to provide spaces for more focused exploration of components of a reimagined model. Subcommittee #1 focuses on youth development and diversion, with an emphasis on designing what is necessary to reduce the size and scope of the reimagined justice system. Subcommittee #2 focuses on generating recommendations to support youth formally processed in the legal system. Subcommittee #3 focuses on addressing needs for alternatives to detention, placement, and incarceration.

In April and May, YJWG concentrated on absorbing existing data and recommendations from previous youth justice transformation work in Los Angeles and beyond through webinars, data briefs, and learning exchanges with experts from other jurisdictions. The subcommittees began the process of re-imagining the justice system as it pertained to each of their areas of focus.

In June, YJWG conducted Listening Sessions with youth, Probation staff, and community service providers to ensure that their input is meaningfully reflected in the reimagined model to be drafted in July, reviewed and refined in August, finalized in September, and submitted in October.

Outlined below are the goals and objectives of each subcommittee, developed at the onset of YJWG, along with the emerging elements of the new model.
Subcommittee #1 (SC1)
Youth Development and Diversion

What can we design that equitably reduces the size and scope of the youth justice system by addressing root causes and pathways?

Chairs
Tshaka Barrows, W. Haywood Burns Institute; Taylor Schooley, LA County Division of Youth Development and Diversion; and Anthony Robles, Youth Justice Coalition

Goal
SC1 will conduct research, survey existing resources, and draft recommendations related to the design of components in a youth development model that effectively and equitably reduces the size and scope of the youth justice system.

Area of Focus
SC1 will focus on identifying components of a successful youth development model that would prevent root causes of and pathways to justice system involvement for young people in Los Angeles County (see Appendix), including:

- Outlining implications of a youth development framework on considerations for a continuum of support and communicating findings to YJWG and broader community
- Assessing existing youth development and diversion resources
- Assessing the experiences, needs, and vision for improvement of young people impacted by youth-serving systems Countywide—including education, child welfare, mental health, and community-based youth development
- Exploring opportunities to expand access to youth-serving resources
- Exploring opportunities to coordinate and fund expanded youth-serving resources
- Exploring workforce needs for youth development infrastructure and expanded community-based youth-serving resources

Existing Work to Build On
- Division of Youth Diversion and Development’s Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County and subsequent implementation plans
- Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council’s Countywide Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan
- Guidelines for Implementation of Senate Bill 439
- Office of Child Protection Prevention Plans
- Office of Violence Prevention Strategic Plans
- The Ready to Rise Initiative
- The Department of Arts and Culture

Related Questions Raised by YJWG
- How can we build on and strengthen the existing infrastructure and implementation of youth development and diversion?
● How will a new model address issues that contribute to justice system involvement (i.e., economic conditions, policing, disinvestment, education, mental health, and trauma)?
● What early measures and supports can we put in place for early adolescence?
● How will a new community-based youth development model engage and interact with governmental agencies responsible for providing services to youth such as public schools, the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Health Services, the Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Department of Arts and Culture?

Opportunities to Engage the Broader Community

● Conduct Listening Sessions and focus groups with youth in the following categories:
  o Youth eligible for pre-arrest diversion
  o Youth with mental health needs
  o Youth currently or formerly put on juvenile probation and/or incarcerated in a juvenile hall or camp
  o Youth involved in the child welfare system
  o Youth enrolled in public schools across the County
  o Youth participating in community-based arts, recreation, mentoring, and leadership programs
  o Youth participating in gang intervention and violence prevention programs
  o Providers of community-based youth services in arts, recreation, mentoring, and leadership programs
● Communicate findings from youth development research; qualitative research; and data from education, child welfare, mental health, law enforcement, and diversion to YJWG and the broader community

Next Steps/Opportunities

1) Compile more information to better support community expertise, including the work the Arts Commission has done to include individuals or very small organizations in contracting opportunities even without 501(c)(3) status.
2) Organize a small group conversation/learning session with the Director of the new Department of Arts and Culture and their Director of Grants to share about successes, challenges (not quite feeling like a full department), and contracting.
3) Share information about participatory budgeting.
4) Bring in LACOE/Community Schools Initiative.
5) Bring in expertise of intervention workers.

Elements of the Model/Principles for Phased Plan

*Neighborhood-level investment in youth development*

1) A strengthened, empowered network of community-based youth development service providers is critical and should receive support through training and cross-training, community learning sessions, convenings, etc.
a) As the plan is phased in, focus on areas of the County needing the most resources and support, ending the criminalization of neighborhoods and engaging them in a new model.
b) Establish Youth Centers in every neighborhood that are coordinated regionally.
c) Establish joint-use agreements with local schools to serve as youth centers with programming through the night accessible for ALL youth, including homeless and foster youth.

2) One key priority is fully integrating youth development services in schools and parks and ensuring meaningful family engagement and support.
   a) Youth and community employment opportunities
   b) Artistic and physical outlet opportunities
   c) Environmental awareness and improvement opportunities such as gardening and neighborhood beautification such as murals
   d) Restorative Justice Hubs—places where community can resolve incidents, address tensions and heal from harm and trauma
   e) Youth outreach teams comprising local peacebuilders/street intervention workers
   f) Intentional support for homeless youth and families

3) Our recommendations should clearly state a long-term (10-year) vision and associated concrete steps in a phased “roadmap” to get there.

Equitable access to funding/support

4) Funding sources and structures should reflect values of centering youth, families, and communities.
   a) Explore participatory budgeting, innovative and effective contracting mechanisms, and reinvestment strategies.
   b) Explore DC Forum for Youth Investment’s Youth Council model; lessons learned from YDD’s first year of implementation; successes and challenges of the Department of Arts and Culture; and, as examples, the oversight and funding of JJCC and GRYD.

5) A County agency partnering with large CBOs or foundations to help move money to the CBO network, including “mom and pop” shops without 501c(3) status.

6) Opportunities for reinvestment from the justice system to community services.
   c) Legal/legislative and labor considerations
   d) Impact of budget realities brought by COVID-19
      i) Highlight as an opportunity to make a change and save money (i.e., unless you’re able to dramatically restructure and reimagine staffing, we are unable to actualize cost savings and accomplish long-term solutions).
      ii) Balance pros and cons of public private partnerships.

7) Creative structures for contracting that brings in community expertise.
   a) Providing an initial funding amount guarantee while remaining flexible to help organizations scale up if they are successful and receiving a lot of referrals.
b) Minimizing the huge administrative burden of contracts versus grants.

8) What would it look like to make flexible funding be available directly for youth and families?

**Countywide coordinating and planning structure**

9) County coordinating structure with a focus on regional/neighborhood collaboration that reduces bureaucratic barriers to access County funds, including incentive structures for partners and ongoing research/evaluation.

10) Agreement to build upon and utilize the infrastructure and capacity we’ve already built with YDD but with the caveat of a serious reevaluation (i.e., to take all this on, something would have to change, perhaps moving it into a new, broader office or department)

a) Housing something in ODR feels like youth development is a tier 3-type intervention (for youth already interacting with punitive systems) rather than aiming for youth development for all (including tier 1 and tier 2 youth) such that those competencies are available to all youth, not just those deemed vulnerable or already system-involved.

b) Balancing worries about underfunding a standalone department with an interest in ensuring the County structure has enough power and autonomy.

11) Establish a Countywide steering committee to include decision-makers from relevant County departments, commissions, and CBOs.

a) Learning from GRYD and new JJCC example, having one body meet to discuss coordination and funding

b) If OYDD acts as an intermediary, we can use the models that cities have adopted through Forum for Youth Investment’s Youth Council Model, which:
   i) Shared data system and funding tied to competencies
   ii) Engaged police force in training
   iii) Created curriculum
   iv) Organized within public housing communities and “community collaboratives” to create community-based plans and created a youth organizing corps (of youth and young adults) to continue that planning.

12) Ensuring that coordinating includes real meaningful communication, outreach, and education about options to young people.

**Youth Development Framework**

13) Establish an official network of youth service providers.

a) Creating community learning sessions and convenings for people working in youth development

14) Ensure all youth workers receive youth development training

15) Ensure youth development coordinator integration into the fabric of the school and community

16) Centering family engagement
17) Can we mandate certain diversions or counsel and release for offenses not 707(b) charges eligible for diversion/might take change in WIC code?
18) Thoughtful consent policy focusing on family consent and youth rights
19) Actively prevent net-widening
20) Centering family engagement
Subcommittee #2 (SC2)  
Youth Formally Processed in the Legal System

How can the legal system be restructured to have healing and restorative responses to arrested youth?

Chairs  
Danielle Dupuy, UCLA Bunche Center, Million Dollar Hoods; Joanna Lowry, W. Haywood Burns Institute; Raquel Mariscal, W. Haywood Burns Institute; and Kent Mendoza, Anti-recidivism Coalition

Objectives  
The objectives of SC2 are to design, enhance and/or eliminate responses, structures and policies for youth arrested by law enforcement, going through the legal court process, a declared ward of the court and/or adjudicated on probation (see Appendix). We will consider both resource allocation and the workforce related to these objectives. What should be new/transformed/gone in this regard?

Context  
The impact of involvement in the legal system is borne by young people of color. The long-term consequences of youthful misbehavior for youth of color are numerous and, oftentimes, extreme. Most young people are allowed to grow out of these behaviors without getting entangled in the legal system. However, youth of color are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted, sentenced, and incarcerated for these behaviors than are their white peers. And, according to data from the California Department of Justice (DOJ), youth of color are more likely to become system-involved in Los Angeles County. In 2018, Black youth were 14.6 times more likely than white youth to be referred to Probation, and 26 times more likely to become a ward of the court. Latino youth were more than three times as likely as white youth to be referred to Probation and nearly five times as likely to become a ward of the court. Given research on adolescent behavior, brain development and evidence about intervention strategies that promote healing, personal growth, positive development and long-term success for youth involved in the legal system, the design will look to reimagine and transform systems.

Subcommittee Focus  
● Processes, functions and workforce impacting young people arrested by law enforcement, cited, released or referred to detention.
● Processes, functions and workforce impacting youth regarding:
  ○ Filing of a formal petition
  ○ Formal wardship
  ○ Informal probation
  ○ Non-wardship probation [WIC 725]
  ○ Home on probation
Existing Work to Build On

- *A Culture of Care For All, Envisioning the LA Model*
- *Los Angeles County Probation Reform and Implementation Team*
- Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration project

Opportunities to Engage the Broader Community

Listening Sessions and focus groups with stakeholders in the following categories, including, but not limited to:

- Youth impacted by the legal system
- Probation staff
- Police officers
- Impacted unions
- Bench officers
- Prosecutors
- Defense attorneys
- Faith-based organizations
- Youth serving CBOs
- Schools
- Group Homes
- Parents/families/guardians
- Girls impacted by the legal system
- LGBTQ+ youth impacted by the legal system
- Youth-serving mental health providers
- Local academics
- Survivors
- Town Halls in each district

Related Questions Raised by YJWG

1) Who are the youth processed through the legal system?
   a) How many youths were arrested between 2014-2019?
   b) How many youths have been processed between 2014-2019?
   c) What crimes are they charged with?
   d) What are the race, ethnicity, age and sex demographics of these youth?
   e) What were the dispositions?

2) How do existing policies and practices need to change in a reimagined ecosystem?
   a) What are the current functions/decisions of the legal system? (e.g., admissions, assessments, Probation reports, court orders, supervision of probationers, etc.)?
   b) If these functions need to shift, which governmental department or agency and/or non-governmental entity will promote wellbeing?
   c) What are the non-negotiables? What functions must continue to be administered by current stakeholders?
   d) What legal roadblocks must we keep in mind as we develop a new system?
   e) What are the necessary legislative proposals to achieve the level of change
proposed in the design?
3) How can we create space to ensure people directly impacted are heard, including
the voices of survivors and arrested youth?
4) How do we reimagine the workforce for a new model?
5) What resources are necessary for this reimagined system and how much of the
current resources can be reallocated for these new purposes?
   a) What resources are currently allocated to the part of the system that
      concerns the focus of this subcommittee?
   b) Are these resources sufficient to carry out the current responsibilities of
      these entities?
   c) Which operations will no longer be needed in a reimagined system and how
      much is allocated to those functions?
   d) What projections can be made about the number of youth and the needs of
      the youth in the reimagined system?
   e) Are there functions of the reimagined system that are unaccounted for in a
      resource shift? If so, where can we go for additional resources?

Elements of the Model/Principles for Phased Plan

Introduction
SC2 has actively been working on design components for a model to achieve our charge to
create an ecosystem promoting the wellbeing of youth and families impacted by the youth
justice ecosystem: a new model for youth justice (see Appendix). To help inform the design
process, participants received a compilation of seven previous relevant reports with
findings and recommendations. SC2 has collectively developed some design components,
but primarily, as requested, participants have submitted their proffered design
components. We’ve prompted the design concepts within the following framing questions:
   • What’s Gone (e.g., function)?
   • Why’s it Gone?
   • What’s New or Transformed in its place?
   • What are the impacts on the workforce, to the particular function?
   • Who will assume the new or transformed functions?
   • Where will the function live?
   • Obstacles or challenges to having the particular policy or function Gone?

What follows are the contributions from SC2 participants and from previous relevant
findings and recommendations.

Youth Development Principles
Principles of Youth Development are the foundational principles for our charge to design a
health-focused and care-first youth justice system. These principles include:
Health Competence; Social Competence; Cognitive & Creative Competence; Vocational
Competence; Leadership Competence—all embedded in equity and justice.
Additional Principles for Consideration
The fundamental and initial change that must happen, across both systems and communities, is how justice is defined. Currently, the “justice” and “injustice” are generally contained within the dichotomy of “following the law” vs. “breaking the law.” It’s from this basic dichotomy being shaped by white supremacy values, that the current racist and punitive “justice” systems, such as law enforcement, probation, prosecution, and incarceration, parole, etc.) emerge.

What must be gone is the guiding belief that an act by anyone, in particular a young person, is “wrongful” first and foremost, because it is illegal and not, first and foremost, because it is harmful to the person responsible for that act, their community, their family and the person that they have harmed by way of that act.

The paradigm shift that we should focus on before developing new processes/policies and procedures for a reimagined youth justice system is seeing injustice—not as illegality or a legal affront on the State—but as harm to oneself and others; and justice—not as punishment for those that break laws—as healing and support in equal measure (for those that have caused harm and those that have been harmed), understanding that oftentimes, many people may coexist simultaneously in both realities.

There is a need to acknowledge the impact of structural racism on the lives of Black and Brown young people.

The creation of a new model must be based on principles of youth development and not fear of worst case scenarios. It must push back against the current culture of fear, which prohibits institutional actors from taking a “chance” on youth (see Appendix).

Referral for Harm Caused/Point of Contact
1) Process applies to all youth regardless of level of incident
2) Police Contact/Avoidance of Police Contact
   a) Other agency/entity/crisis response teams developed, rather than police, to respond to harm done by youth in the community.
   b) Community member/advocate rides along with police officers.
   c) Law enforcement increases, widens the number of youth that are simply returned home.
3) Referral Sources:
   a) Law enforcement (all sources including Probation)
   b) Schools
   c) Community
   d) Home
4) Response: MDT &/or analogous to a CFT
   a) Composition – establish lead(s) to respond 24/7
      i) Community-based youth mentors
      ii) Restorative and transformative justice/practice experts
      iii) Mental Health practitioners
iv) Community-based gang interventionists
v) Community-based substance abuse interventionists
vi) Family/chosen family members
vii) Social worker
viii) Youth chosen advocate
ix) Racial/ethnic/social justice champion

b) Role
   i) Identify and establish lead(s) to respond 24/7; responsible to assemble a team within 12-24 hours.
   ii) Reference CFT model.
   iii) Respond to referrals from law enforcement, schools, community, home.
   iv) Required not to use standardized assessment tools for youth (e.g., detention admission and/or needs assessment).
   v) Develop and oversee care plans for youth; assessment for care plan includes health/medication needs, behavioral health needs, family/loved ones in the region, custodial responsibilities, employment/school status.
   vi) Detailed written justification as to why youth not referred to diversion; report must include demographics, geography.

c) Function lives in the community hubs.

5) Trajectory through new model
   a) Dismissal or referral to diversion
      i) Youth would be taken to a diversion program, home or to a safe place which may include chosen family.
   b) Youth care plans are developed and activated by MDTs
      i) Youth would be taken home or to a safe place, which may include chosen family, while completing their care plan.
   c) Referred by MDTs for court processing
      i) Youth would be taken home or to a safe place which may include chosen family or other location while awaiting and going through the court process (design forthcoming from SC3).

Intake – For Young Person Who’s Trajectory is The Court/Legal Process as Informed by the MDT/CFT [overlap with SC#3]

1) Admissions Decision
   a) Screening instrument: discontinue use of current LAD; develop an asset-based/culturally responsive approach to this decision point.
   b) Identify and establish non-detainable incidents to include: bench warrants, technical probation violations.
   c) The community hub where the MDT/CFT lives assesses whether or not youth will be admitted to a non-carceral setting, dependent on what is developed in this new model and the phasing process.
   d) Training on the assessment process is provided to the staff making the admissions decision.
e) For those booked into detention, while the use of detention is phased out, a reentry provider, working with a rep(s) of the MDT/CFT, will immediately commence release planning.

**Referral Process: To The Court/Legal Process and/or Off-Ramps**

1) Responsible for sorting and referral decisions: a “sorting” team, subset of the MDT/CFT-Legal experts, restorative justice/practice experts, racial/ethnic social justice champion.

2) No cases that fall outside of 707(b), inclusive of misdemeanors and felonies, are referred to the prosecution for filing
   a) Those cases that fall outside of 707(b): a healing, care, and restorative plan is developed by the MDT/CFT.
   b) Monitoring of the plan is sourced to a CBO funded by the community hub.
   c) Those cases not referred to the prosecutor: where do these cases go?

3) Phasing consideration, some cases that fall outside of 707(b) will continue to be referred to the prosecution:
   a) Sorting team is responsible for the decision to refer to the prosecution.
   b) Refer to Ramsey County (St. Paul) MN Attorney Office for nuts and bolts to operationalize.

4) Actively work to eliminate mandatory filing for 707(b) charges including statutory changes.

**Filing of Petition/Charges**

1) Pilot a process that includes community representatives in the filing decision that includes the level of charges to be filed based on the facts.
   a) In collaboration with community representatives, establish the level of incidents that will be part of the pilot.
   b) Require necessary coaching for the community representatives.

2) 707(b) offenses downgraded to non-707(b) in the filing of the petition will be diverted by default.

3) Institute a blind filing system, as other phases of the new model progress, where the race/ethnic identity and zip code of the young person are unavailable to those making the filing decision.

4) Phasing consideration: D.A. pre-filing diversion JOIN will continue to be relevant and eventually phased out as diversion expands upstream SC#1.
   a) Questions: What are the criteria? Should the criteria expand to include more incident levels than currently exist?
   b) All youth (detained or not) meeting the expanded criteria are referred.

**Case Processing/Length of Stay Pre-adjudication; Dispositions**

1) Conduct a case processing assessment to inform strategies to reduce unnecessary delay through the court legal process.
   a) As part of the assessment, collect data on which judges are detaining youth and sending them to camp and/or out of home placement (overlap w/ SC#3).
   b) Move to implement reforms as informed by the assessment.
c) As part of the assessment, work with the defense attorney to understand and remove barriers to a fair adjudication process. This addresses the experience that some defense counsels have where a longer case processing time helps ensure a more just outcome for the youth.

**Court Hearings: Scheduling/Calendaring**

1) All court hearings are scheduled during times convenient for working families so as not to interfere with school attendance. Scheduling will include weekends and evenings.

2) For youth awaiting and going through the court process for serious offenses (location design forthcoming from SC3), the youth should also be accommodated and provided with the opportunity to voice when he/she is ready to have a court hearing. The scheduling of the hearing should be convenient to the emotional health of the youth. Suggestions from the youth should be considered.

**Court: Environment, Adjudication and Dispositions**

1) Eliminate use of shackling in transport and in court.

2) Eliminate use of transportation in Vans, “Doggy Vans,” that are windowless/ or in vehicles that dehumanize the youth’s character to the public while being driven. No detention/correctional letters on the transportation vehicles.

3) Eliminate use of detention/correctional clothing for young people detained while going through the court process.
   a) Contract with a community-based organization such as Clothes The Deal to provide the clothing.
   b) The [non-carceral] facility(s) being designed by SC#3 will be responsible for the youth’s clothing and care

4) The court’s physical design is changed to adhere to youth development principles and cultural responsiveness.

5) Detention Hearing and Continued Detention Reviews
   a) Docketing cases by defense attorney to present changed circumstances in support of least restrictive alternative to use of detention.
   b) The bench and prosecutor will adhere to the principle of utilizing the least restrictive alternative to detention, recognizing and acknowledging that detention includes more than just the actual four walls of a cell in a facility, but also includes other forms such as digital incarceration (e.g., electronic monitoring, and relevant forms of surveillance).

   c) Enhance, invest in, and/or build capacity for alternatives to detention on the principles of Youth Development.
      i) Assess the principles and utilization of the Community Detention Program and its continued use in the continuum of alternatives to detention modeled on the principles of Youth Development.
      ii) Enhance, invest in, and/or build capacity for alternatives to detention modeled on the principles of restoration as opposed to principles of confinement. There are two responses to a behavior: lock them up or
keep them while we help restore them. We should redefine what security looks like in this new model.

6) Investigation/Pre-plea Reports
   a) Assess the utility of these reports to determine their continued relevance and/or “necessity.”
   b) Should the reports survive, a subset team of the CFT/MDT, led by the young person, will prepare the report.
   c) Youth Development principles will guide all elements of the reports, eliminating standardized reporting templates.

7) Adjudication/Disposition
   a) The MDT/CFT, led by the young person or advocate of their choosing, will develop case and disposition plans.
      i) Develop criteria determining the role of the Judge; may include providing guidance in the development of the plan and/or arbitrate when there is disagreement amongst the MDT/CFT.
      ii) Develop criteria to determine the role of the youth going through the court process; may include providing guidance in development of his own plan. EXAMPLE: Youth going through the court process never have input on their own outcome for his/her actions. If we allow youth to help suggest what he/she needs, maybe that will be better. If a youth has a substance offense or is serious/violent, they might be able to say, “I honestly need help around this area because...” or “I’ve honestly been using a lot of... I think I really need...” This might help improve case and/or disposition plans for the youth.
   b) Develop administrative rules that establish a presumption of acceptance by the court of the case and disposition plans.
   c) The incident and/or needs of the young person tailor the conditions imposed by the court.
   d) Conditions are limited up to six months, but can be fewer than six months.
   e) Role of the Probation Court Officer has changed. Role limited to coordinating submission of the case/disposition plans and recommendations developed by the MDT/CFT.

8) Referrals to Services of Youth on Supervision
   a) The MDT/CFT or a subset makes the referral.
   b) Overlap with SC#1 re: CBO capacity building and investments.

9) Investigation/Progress Reports
   a) Reports are prepared by the young person’s MDT/CFT.
   b) This function lives in the community hub.
   c) The MDT/CFT rep works with the defense attorney to present the progress report to the court.

Community Supervision

1) Youth Development/Mentorship Dept. Establish a new office focused on youth mentoring and funding of prepared and well-equipped youth mentors to work with young people. Supervision methodology will be based on the principles of Youth
Development. This model, not founded on current Probation values, is grounded on the history and tools of racial hierarchy, responsive to and compassionate of communities of color, culturally and linguistically responsive, and rooted in social justice.

2) Workforce Implications: A new classification of staff would be created: individuals best positioned to connect with, influence and mentor youth in the justice system. Current probation officers would have the opportunity to apply for the new positions based on qualifications and qualities of Youth Development principles.

3) Replicate D.C.’s Department of Youth and Rehabilitative Services (DYRS) Credible Messenger program for youth on Community Supervision. DYRS’ Credible Messenger Initiative strengthens community relationships between youth in care and custody of DYRS and skilled mentors. Credible Messengers are members of the community previously involved in the justice system. They receive training and develop the skills necessary to mentor justice-involved youth. Components of engagement should include social media/connectivity, arts, education, job development. Family and community engagement also are promoted through peer coaches who assist families in navigating the justice system based on their own involvement and family experiences.
Subcommittee #3 (SC3)  
Addressing Needs for Alternatives to Detention, Placement and Incarceration

Chairs
Patricia Soung, Children’s Defense Fund; Laura Ridolfi, W. Haywood Burns Institute; and Isaac Bryan, UCLA Bunche Center

Objectives
SC3 conducts quantitative and qualitative research and builds on existing recommendations to reduce the number of young people exposed to detention, placement and incarceration—all guided by youth development principles (see Appendix). In the interest of the small number of youth considered unable to return to their home or community, this subcommittee seeks to identify effective, healing-centered facilities and practices to care for young people until they can return to their homes. The subcommittee was asked to consider:

- Reducing the number of young people impacted by detention, placement and incarceration
  - Identifying strategies grounded in youth development principles to further reduce use of detention, placement and incarceration

- Pre-Adjudication Detention
  - Assessing the current population of youth securely detained pre-adjudication
  - Identifying an equitable decision-making process for the use of pre-adjudication confinement, for a limited number of youth unable to remain in their home or community during pre-adjudication

- Post-Disposition Removal from Home
  - Assessing the current population of court-ordered dispositions that currently result in a young person’s removal from their home or community, including suitable placements, juvenile halls and camps
  - Identifying an equitable decision-making process for the use of out-of-home placements (non-secure and secure) for a limited number of youth unable to remain in their home or community during pre-adjudication.

- Effective, Healing-Centered and Trauma-Informed Facilities
  - Identifying effective, healing-centered and trauma-informed, out-of-home placements (non-secure and secure) for the small population of youth who are unable to return home pre-adjudication and post-disposition.

Related Questions Raised by YJWG
- Who is currently in juvenile hall pre-adjudication? How can we further reduce our reliance on pre-adjudication detention, while protecting for public safety considerations, including the child’s risk of harm to him/herself or others?
- Who is currently in a placement out of their home and community, including suitable placements, juvenile halls and camps, as the result of a court-ordered disposition? How can we further reduce our reliance on dispositions that result in a
youths removal from their home or community, while protecting for public safety considerations, including the child’s risk of harm to him/herself or others?

- How do we implement and strengthen therapeutic models (considering examples like Kilpatrick, Kirby and Short-Term Residential Treatment Programs) (STRTPs) to address the needs of youth with more serious trauma and mental health issues, and who may pose some risks of harm to him/herself or others?
- When is some level of security necessary, and what response is appropriate? What is an ideal alternative placement?
- What would a healing-centered and transformative facility look like as compared to one that is punitive? What if this model is grounded in principles of youth development?
- How do we reimagine the workforce for a reimagined model?

Elements of the Model/Principles for Phased Plan
Since March, this subcommittee has been actively working on recommendations for a system design that provides for the wellbeing of youth and families impacted by the youth justice system. To help inform the design process, participants received a compilation of seven relevant reports with findings and recommendations, quantitative data—with its current limitations—and quantitative information. During subcommittee meetings, participants were asked for real time input on design components. Following each subcommittee, participants were asked to further reflect upon the questions posed and submit their proffered design components via email. Committee chairs prompted the design concepts within the following framing questions:

- What’s Gone?
  - Who makes decisions about removing a young person from their home and community?
  - How are decisions made about removing a young person from their home and community?
  - What physical structure are youth removed from their home are exposed to?
- What is New or Transformed in its place?

In addition to best practices and promising models elsewhere, this subcommittee was asked to build on the recommendations and implementation lessons in Los Angeles County from:

- Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report
- The “LA Model” and “Culture of Care” project
- SB 439 implementation
- Department of Mental Health and YDD’s diversion motion
- The Los Angeles County Probation Reform and Implementation Team

To date, the following themes have emerged from subcommittee participation, recommendations of previous relevant findings, and recommendations affirmed by the subcommittee.
1) **Adopt and strengthen implementation of the LA Model.** This subcommittee affirmed the core principles of the LA Model as applicable to all pre- and post-adjudication settings, and also discussed missing or enhanceable design components of the LA Model.\(^3\) Participants voiced a broad critique that the implementation of and adherence to the LA Model at Camp Kilpatrick had largely failed. They also had many questions about evaluating implementation and the lessons learned, which are crucial in informing recommendations on implementing any model going forward.

   a) A key failure discussed was hiring and staffing—that to implement any therapeutic and transformative model, the County must hire staffing with belief and care skills, not law enforcement, and ensure worker wellbeing, rejuvenation, and retraining. To do this, the County needed to overhaul job descriptions, qualifications and classifications for working at these facilities.

2) **Beyond the LA Model.** Subcommittee members also proposed design components of facilities that go beyond the LA model, including:

   a) **Funding the repurposing of smaller home-like community-based detention housing alternatives**, including some that are secure and others that are staff secure

   b) **Ensuring the physical plant and location of an out-of-home setting facilitates healthy outcomes.** It is difficult or impossible to implement the small group component of the LA Model at some facilities like Challenger, where the physical plant is antithetical to many of the components of the model. Furthermore, remote facilities far from communities make it more difficult to engage community supports and families. The model should be embedded in communities.

   c) **Exploring a blended residential model.** A facility could remain open for programming during the day or evenings with a small set of those who reside there. The idea is to destigmatize residential treatment and facilitate integration and connectivity with family and community, while staying in a residential setting.

   d) **Specialization.** Current secure facilities and placements in the community should include those with specialization, say, on girls, youth under 12 (in light of SB 439) or youth with substance use challenges.

3) **Decision-making.** At every point, this subcommittee believed decisions should be multidisciplinary and inclusive of health, community and other partners, and use a strength and need-based framework. Decisions about who to detain pre- and post-adjudication are critical in designing, monitoring and accountability in the implementation of any model facility or out-of-home placement.

   At some decision-making points, multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) or Children and Family Teams (CFTs) are meant to convene and collectively consider a decision to detain. For instance, removing a youth from a community placement generally happens as the result of a 14-day notice given by the provider based on major

---

\(^3\) See LA Model report for detailed recommendations.
misbehaviors. A Child and Family Team must be convened and a Placement Preservation strategy must be developed to prevent removal of a youth. Yet, there were anecdotes among subcommittee members that these teams are often convened without all the relevant stakeholders who may, in fact, inform the placement strategies to avoid detention. One idea was to consider cross-sector partnerships, such as by a labor union and CBOs, in co-managing facilities.

4) **Accountability mechanisms.** Many subcommittee members believe that an accountability mechanism over any system is necessary in implementing a secure/locked or staff-secure model. This subcommittee recognized challenges in implementing both the LA Model at Camp Kilpatrick, as well as Short-term Residential Therapeutic Programs—though both represent framework shifts we should continue to implement and evaluate. For many subcommittee members, an accountability mechanism must involve community and diverse experts in holding all accountable—from youth to systems to CBOs.
YJWG Website

YJWG’s website, expanded and rolled out to ensure uninterrupted connectivity for YJWG participants as well as heightened visibility and transparency during the COVID-19 pandemic, is a comprehensive and immersive website and social networking platform. With a vibrant and user-friendly interface, the site includes:

- Consultant team and subcommittee structure
- YJWG’s scope and goals
- Materials for upcoming and past meetings
- Meeting Calendar
- Bibliography and library of key readings for the full work group
- Materials specific to the work of each subcommittee
- Private social networking platform facilitating posting, discussion, and interaction between members
Outreach to Gain Perspective: Qualitative Research

Listening Sessions

The Listening Sessions, which function like focus groups, are opportunities to gain greater insight from specific stakeholders. An ad hoc committee of the consultant team invited system-involved youth, community and County service providers, juvenile hall and camp Probation staff, and field Probation staff to 1.5 hour sessions comprising 10-15 attendees, two co-facilitators (one consultant and one YJWG member) and one note taker. Subcommittee co-chairs and an ad hoc committee developed the initial questions for each session. Nine sessions have been completed, including two with community-based organizations; two with field Probation staff; three with juvenile halls and camps probation staff; one with justice system-involved young women; and one with members of the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. We will next compile notes and other relevant information for incorporation into design components of the new, care-first youth justice model.

Based on the Listening Sessions to date, we have made several observations that should improve the process.

- During the two Listening Sessions with Field Probation staff (designated for intake, investigations and supervision), mostly supervisors spoke up. Several staff refrained from actively participating in the conversation, leading us to believe that a group comprising line staff and management may have made the space feel unsafe for some involved. One participant sent an email saying that most of the questions seemed directed toward line staff but the majority invited to the session by Probation were supervisors. In response, going forward, we will ensure greater engagement with Probation line staff, either through further Listening Sessions or 1:1 interactions.

- ARC held their first virtual YJWG Listening Session with a diverse group of 38 formerly incarcerated youth and adult members. Facilitated by YJWG Consultant Leader Kent Mendoza and ARC Policy Coordinator Miguel Garcia, the meeting moved from an introduction into a brief icebreaker activity where members considered key questions related to YJWG. During the meeting, 12 ARC members (young men between the ages of 18 and 24) with recent experience with California’s Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) provided answers to several survey questions. Through dialogue and surveys, they described their experience with the juvenile justice system and offered suggestions for prevention, alternatives to incarceration, and reentry. ARC will begin hosting additional Listening Sessions exclusively for formerly incarcerated juvenile hall and DJJ youth (see Appendix).

- Through outreach conducted by the Probation Chief Bureau, nine Probation officers of varying ranks participated in each of the two juvenile hall Listening Sessions (totaling 18 staff) and another four Probation officers participated in the juvenile camp Listening Session (see Appendix). The participation was active and led to several officers asking for additional information to learn about or participate in further YJWG sessions. However, during one call, a superintendent, assistant
superintendent and union representative spoke over a probation supervisor, who then privately shared with the facilitators his reticence to share further. As a follow-up, we developed a survey for juvenile halls and camp staff to further engage all levels of staff anonymously. The survey was sent July 1 for responses and further analysis.
Learning Exchanges

Introduction
The LA Board of Supervisors (BOS) Motion (Motion) calls for exploring “the transitioning of Los Angeles County’s juvenile justice system out of the Probation department into another agency, with the goal of creating a rehabilitative, health-focused and care-first system.” The Motion focuses on Probation but also notes “the benefit of centralized administrative functions no longer trumps the need for a separate and developmentally appropriate youth agency focused on youth well-being.”

Research on RED in the administration of justice reveals the involvement of multiple sectors beyond Probation: law enforcement, prosecution, defense, and the judiciary. Other sectors include health, mental health, education, and social services, among others. Though servicing the same “clients” (through various funding streams, programs or mandates) many of these sectors remain siloed, working independently. Ensuring youth wellbeing, however, requires a restructured and transformed ecosystem inclusive of all government, judicial and community sectors that provide for the administration of justice and human services. Wellbeing will never be established when reforming only one sector within an ecosystem of interrelated institutions.

Purpose
In response to the Motion’s explicit call for opportunities to hear from people across sectors instrumental in engaging shifts in their administration of justice to embrace the ethos of Positive Youth Development, we are seizing this opportunity to broaden the scope in the design of a transformed youth justice model. This promotes an exchange of ideas acquired through peoples’ lived and work experiences, successes and challenges—ideas integral to the redesign of Probation in L.A. and its interactions with relevant cross-sectors.

The consultant team planned and hosted a series of national Learning Exchanges (three occurred during this reporting period), which were open to everyone in Youth Justice Work Group (YJWG).

Learning Exchange Summaries
John Choi, Ramsey County (St. Paul) Attorney
The first exchange involved John Choi, Ramsey County (St. Paul) Attorney (see Appendix).

Approximately 50 YJWG members attended, representing a diversity of sectors: BOS deputies; other representatives of the executive branch; Probation; the Mayor’s office; representatives from universities (including Loyola Marymount and UCLA School of Law); County Department of Public Health; the Prosecutor’s office; County Department of Youth Development and Diversion; Public Defenders office; County Department of Children and Family Services; CBOs; and community activists.
Mr. Choi presented for approximately 25 minutes followed by a Q&A. Due time constraints, several questions went unanswered, so we scheduled a second exchange to answer those questions.

Values and Principals
Key to the exchange with Mr. Choi was the evolution of values and principles guiding his approach to the administration of justice:

- Acknowledging structural racism and its underpinning of the justice system; needing to “unlearn” untruths institutions have taught us; unlearning what “we” think to be true; grounding ourselves in history to understand the structurally racist institutions and its connections to current injustices; as a leader, having the will to courageously call out racism out; and getting comfortable with being uncomfortable.
- Recognizing that as a prosecutor, this role in the system is not equipped to solely handle complicated issues and cases that need responses that a court proceeding is not equipped to provide. Current approaches to prosecution and case processing does not make for safer communities. Need to rethink that having police provide a report that makes its way to the prosecutor which then processes the case in court, somehow leads to truth and public safety.
- Transforming systems is more than creating exit ramps and harm reduction strategies (e.g., tools and technologies such as diversion, alternatives to detention). While having a role, exit ramps are further iterations of tools and technologies, they tinker with and ultimately keep the existing system in place. We need to move beyond the notion that the current system will lead to justice.
- Listening to and power-sharing with the community. Need to engage, sit in circles and really listen to those most impacted by the justice system, community leaders and organizations that advocate for justice involved people. Open oneself to hearing and learning from different perspectives.
- Understanding that Transformation takes time and needs people to think radically different.

Innovations
- Harm reduction strategies via the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI): reducing the average daily population of youth in detention from more than 100 to an ADP of 20-25.
- Exit ramp diversion, generally prepetition diversion but also postpetition diversion.
- Transforming Youth Justice Initiative led to a year’s worth of listening and strategy circles with community with lived experience, community leaders and organizations that advocate for justice involved families. The circles contributed to dissecting the inefficiencies, inadequacies and inequities of the system, while radically reimagining the justice system, including the functions of the prosecutor.
- Those circles led to the development of a pilot Restorative Justice process, led by the community, to assess cases including felony charges as well as familial violence. While law enforcement has been a key stakeholder in the Restorative Justice process, the prosecutor’s office did not participate in the restorative circles. The community members developed the desired outcomes of all parties, including the
victim (in cases where they participated), to restore what was lost. The petitions were dismissed in every case. The current plan is to expand the types of cases eligible for Restorative Justice. In the meantime, the pilot serves as a touchstone to change the culture within the prosecutor’s office, despite staff feeling they have relinquished their power to the community. The community, however, never loses sight that they employ the prosecutor.

- Those circles have also led to strategizing with the community to develop a multidisciplinary community-centered team to partner with the prosecutor on charging decisions.

To access both sessions with Mr. Choi:
- **Learning Exchange** (password: 1B#&40Q#)
- **Follow-Up Q&A** (password: 2A=t@dX1)

*San Francisco Superior Court Judge Roger Chan*

The second exchange involved San Francisco Superior Court Judge Roger Chan (see Appendix).

Approximately 55 YJWG members attended, representing a diversity of sectors: BOS deputies; other representatives of the executive branch; Probation, the Mayor’s office, representatives from universities (including Loyola Marymount and UCLA School of Law); County Department of Public Health; the Prosecutor’s office; County Department of Youth Development and Diversion; Public Defenders office; County Department of Children and Family Services; community-based organizations; and community activists.

Much like John Choi, Judge Chan presented for approximately 25 minutes followed by Q&A.

**Values and Principles**

- Be mindful of procedural justice and fairness; consider how orders and decisions affect a young person’s “real” life; ensure that all in the proceeding (including families and caring adults) are heard, especially the young person; language matters so avoid dehumanizing language (instead of “the young person,” use their name, not their role); teach and explain the court processes to the young person, breaking it down so they understand what’s transpiring and and what will happen next time; and address the young person first so they know they are the center of the process.

- A judge’s decision is only as good as the information provided to the court; listen to those who know the young person, including caring adults and community.

- Recognize and apply brain science, which has established the clear and compelling developmental differences between youth and adults; apply principles of Positive Youth Development in the courtroom and in the development of interventions.

- Understand the trauma that the majority of youth and families who appear are experiencing and how it is a persistent driver in the youth justice system; apply a trauma lens in interpreting and contextualizing situations and incidents. For example, one might assume the young person’s disposition as “defiant, when, in fact, it may signal a traumatic response.
One size does not fit all; prioritize desistance over perfection. The judge and court process should consider the overall trajectory of a young person's life—recognizing accomplishments, big or small, as something to celebrate.

Innovations

- Context was provided that, for nearly two decades, San Francisco courts have collaborated with other system stakeholders on youth justice reforms, many of which had already reduced the use of detention before Judge Chan sat on the bench. He entered a system already embracing change, alternatives to detention and partnerships with the community.
- As an attorney in Alameda County, he worked collaboratively with relevant stakeholders to develop reforms for crossover youth—those in both the delinquency and dependency system. One particular strategy involved calling social workers to pick up a youth at the juvenile hall to avoid the youth being booked into detention.
- Child Family Team meetings are crucial in developing youth and family-centered case planning for young people placed in Residential Treatment Centers.
- For 20 years, San Francisco’s Community Assessment and Referral Center (CARC) has provided one-stop services for young people contacted by law enforcement but not detainable by statute. Law enforcement knows that absent a statute requiring an arrest, the young person is transported to CARC. Although assigned a Probation Officer, CARC is not a part of Probation. The agency, however, is physically located across the city from the juvenile hall. At CARC, a number of community case managers assess the young person and develop a plan prior to the youth meeting with Probation.
- Reentry Court serves young people returning from out-of-home placement. The young person leads the development of a care plan with six components: 1) housing; 2) education; 3) employment; 4) health (may include relevant mental health and substance abuse treatment); 5) prosocial activities (including identifying a caring adult); and 6) a restorative justice component. The youth presents the plan to the team who prepares it for court submission. Once the plan is accepted, the youth returns to the community. At the review hearings, the youth takes the lead in reporting plan progress. Plan progress also influences the probational end date. The youth is assigned a community case coordinator, who works closely with Probation.
- It is a long-held practice in San Francisco courts to consider both alternatives to detention release plans and disposition plans submitted by CBOs. CBOs are not part of Probation. Whether a release or disposition plan, both the CBO and Probation work in concert. The CBO manager has the most daily contact and is perceived differently than someone in law enforcement. While Probation remains “responsible” for supervision, their role is essentially limited to gathering information from the various service providers involved.

Access the session with Judge Roger Chan here (password: 1B#&40Q#).
Ramsey County Manager’s Office: Elizabeth Tolzman, Director of Policy and Planning and Zachary Hylton, Sr. Policy Analyst
Scheduled for June 30, this session will be included in the next report. Please see the flyer for this Learning Exchange (see Appendix).

Challenges
The COVID-19 pandemic impacted our line-up of potential presenters, preventing Danielle Sared, Executive Director of Common Justice (based in New York, where she also resides) from attending. Common Justice works to safely address violence without prison; build a field and movement of people committed to helping young men of color and their communities heal from trauma; and change our country’s story about violence and what is required to reduce it—a focus area especially relevant to YJWG.
One-on-Ones
In addition to Listening Sessions and Learning Exchanges, YJWG consultants have also been reaching out to stakeholders individually when further clarification or insight is needed. This is particularly true regarding County counsel and Probation union leadership, as legal considerations arise while developing the new model.

County Counsel. On April 8, 2020, consultants and County representatives met with the office of County Counsel to discuss how to identify and answer legal questions that would surface in the course of YJWG’s discussions and development of recommendations. The goals of meeting and partnering with County included:

- Short-term: Understanding any legally binding constraints of labor contracts and laws, and anticipating any state statutory and County charter provisions that could be implicated in reassigning authority and roles over justice-involved youth from Probation to another entity
- Longer-term: Developing amendments to state statutes, County charters and County agency protocols to implement a new, transformed model of youth justice

The agreement and assumption going forward among the consultant and County representatives was that the legal research would focus on enabling, versus constraining, any recommendations in the process. County Counsel represented itself as a resource to address questions as they emerged in YJWG’s process. The team agreed to meet on a monthly basis to check in as those questions emerged.

Probation Union Leadership. Probation union leadership, in addition to broader Probation engagement from high levels of management to line staff, has been acknowledged as crucial by the consultant team. Many representatives of AFSCME Local 685 attended the first YJWG meetings in January and February. At those meetings, the Consultant Team communicated its desire to meet with union leadership and members, and followed up soon after. As the COVID-19 pandemic took hold, however, meetings with union leadership have stalled as Probation prioritizes response to ensure youth and worker safety. The Consultant Team plans to reengage union leadership in the upcoming months.
V. Board Motion to Close DJJ

In his May Budget Revision, Governor Newsom proposed the closure of the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and the realignment of the care of young people, who would otherwise be subject to DJJ, to counties. In response, on May 26, 2019, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS) passed a motion, “Preparing Los Angeles County for the Closure of the State Division of Juvenile Justice.” The motion directs YJWG to create a subcommittee charged to make recommendations that include:

a) An analysis of how the new DJJ population may be incorporated into the model and plan under development by the Youth Justice Work Group for all justice-involved youth in the County, including youth committed to DJJ who are currently held in the County due to the DJJ’s COVID-19 related moratorium on new admissions
b) Strategies to prevent more youth from being tried as adults under the new system
c) Strategies to increase community-based alternatives to detention options for youth who would have previously been sent to DJJ
d) The status and capacity of the County's current juvenile facilities to adequately serve the needs of DJJ-committed youth justice populations, reserving any consideration of reopening closed facilities, only as a last resort
e) Preventing punitive practices that were previously eliminated or are being phased out from being reinstated
f) Ensuring robust oversight of the treatment of this new population, as well as the DJJ reentry population that is currently being supervised by the County
g) Any budgetary, legal or legislative implications or changes needed to create the best system possible, including the potential of raising the age of jurisdiction in the County’s juvenile justice system to align with DJJ’s age limit, and ensuring the County receives sufficient funding from the State to fund the rehabilitative programs and services needed to serve this population.

The motion creates an opportunity to continue the process of rethinking what is possible to best serve the County’s most vulnerable young people, the vast majority of whom are youth of color. A small working group comprising YJWG consultants, the Chief Executive Office and the Office of Diversion and Reentry have met to discuss the consultant's draft plan for delivering on the charge of the BOS motion. Consultants submitted a data request.
VI. Next Steps

At the July meeting, we will debrief the full YJWG on key components of the new model emerging from the three subcommittees. After compiling additional questions, concerns and feedback, along with insights from the Listening Sessions, Learning Exchanges and One-on-Ones, the consultant team will continue developing the proposed new model. At the August meeting, which will convene primarily in subcommittees, we will continue filling in missing components of the new model, gathering and reconciling legal considerations, and determining the model’s timeline and implementation phases (see Appendix). Additionally, we will continue pushing for data transparency, further defining the potential new County Department, and establishing initial budgetary requirements. The completed new model will be presented at the September YJWG meeting and feedback incorporated into the final proposal.
Select Best and Promising Practices Research

2016

Describes a model for better serving youth with complex needs, including guiding principles and core components for developing an effective continuum of care for young people impacted by the justice system.

2018

Explores the successes and challenges experienced by New Zealand’s transformation into a leading restorative youth justice system, including the need to limit arrest and charging, diverting as many youth as possible, using restorative practices for youth with more serious cases, and centering those most harmed by the system in the process.

Summarizes recent research on adolescent brain development and behavior as well as research on best practices for youth to highlight the need for a fundamental rethinking of juvenile probation practice and expanding the use of diversion and development as alternatives to justice system involvement.

Outlines six proposed strategies to transform juvenile justice systems, including decriminalization and automatic diversion, dedicated youth justice staff, elimination of violations of probation, focusing on strengths-based approaches, and using data to hold systems accountable for improved youth outcomes.
The EBP-PLUS Model: Liberating Youth, Families, and Community from the Justice System, Policy Brief #1, March 2018
A collaboration of organizations that are led by leaders of color and serving youth of color are developing a program model that can be used as an alternative for incarceration—even when youth have been charged for serious and violent crimes. The collaborative is working to shape systems and deconstruct systemic racism.

Implementation Of New York’s Close To Home Initiative: A New Model For Youth Justice, February 2018.
New York City’s efforts to reduce the use of out-of-home placement, expand its continuum of community-based alternatives, and introduce an array of residential placements that were small and near the homes of its youth.

Unlocking Opportunity: How Race, Ethnicity and Place Affect The Use of Institutional Placement in California, January 2018
The report focuses on understanding how race, ethnicity and geography all play a role in the outcomes that youth experience, and recommendations to reduce the use of out-of-home placement.

Can New Zealand Provide the U.S. With a Model for Juvenile Justice Reform?, 2018
Lawyer Melissa Goemann says implementing restorative justice practices allowed New Zealand to end the wholesale incarceration of children—and the U.S. should follow suit.

Presents metrics for assessing racial equity at each touchpoint in pre-booking diversion and documents promising practices for ensuring racial equity.

**Justice Talk: Antonio Fernandez**, October 2019
Antonio Fernandez — a credible messenger with the District of Columbia Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services and the founder and chief executive officer of Grow Up Grow Out — speaks about his experiences as a credible messenger and the value of these mentors in supporting young people.

The Alliance of National Psychological Associations for Racial and Ethnic Equity offers a broad analysis and critique of relevant issues related to context, race, and culture to understand what is needed, what is missing, and what is problematic in current mental health treatment of youth of color within the youth justice system. Powerful testimonials from youth members of the Youth Justice Coalition are included.

**What A World Without Prisons Could Look Like – Deanna Van Buren TED Talk**
Ms. Van Buren is the Co-founder and Executive Director of Designing Justice + Designing Spaces, an Oakland-based nonprofit architecture and real estate development firm with a mission to end mass incarceration and structural inequity. The organization engages communities in the design and development of new buildings, spaces, and tools to address the root causes of mass incarceration. The work seeks to counter the societal inequities evident in the dominant architectural models of courthouses and prisons, and we do so through the creation of new prototypes such as peacemaking centers, transitional housing, and mobile villages.

**Select Juvenile Justice Reports from Los Angeles County**

2015

Overview of the need for juvenile justice data as well as the current structures of data collection in Los Angeles County. Also examines the characteristics and contexts of youth
Exiting from suitable placements and juvenile camp placements during 2011 and presents recommendations to improve practice through targeted reform and improved use of data.

2016


2017


Examines “voluntary probation” that placed youth under probation supervision for mostly school performance problems like poor grades or attendance and recommends eliminating the practice.


Reflects the recommendations of a Workgroup comprised of 71 participants and provides guidance on how Los Angeles County’s Probation Department can become more efficient and effective in delivering services to youth.


Outlines a vision for probation camps as supportive and collaborative learning environments, and for a culture of healing and thriving focused on community reintegration and forged through a safe, open, and holistic partnership involving all staff, families, and communities.


Studies the Probation Department’s structure and practices, and highlights factors that influence departmental performance and outcomes. This assessment focuses on four functions: staffing, hiring and training; service delivery; juvenile facilities; and fiscal operations.

**A Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County,** by the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee Youth Diversion Subcommittee & the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office. September 2017. [http://ccjcc.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=958nu4vfXQQ%3d&portalid=11](http://ccjcc.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=958nu4vfXQQ%3d&portalid=11)

Reflects the recommendations of a collaborative subcommittee that proposes a countywide model and infrastructure for youth diversion that promotes the widespread use of community-based diversion in lieu of arrest or citation, with support from a central coordinating office.

**2018**


Makes seven primary recommendations to transform the Los Angeles County Probation Department into a high functioning, 21st Century agency and model jurisdiction.


Analyzes the history of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and advocacy to reinvest JJCPA dollars into youth development systems and organizations.

**2019**

**Recommendations to Ensure Humane Treatment and Safety of Youth and Staff and for the Phased Elimination of Oleoresin Capsicum (‘Pepper Spray’) in LA County Juvenile Facilities.** Probation Reform and Implementation Team. May 1, 2019.
http://prit.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zTu9wZLYy2Y%3d&portalid=37

Proposed Systemic Reform Plan for the Los Angeles County Probation Department. Probation Reform and Implementation Team. August 9, 2019.
http://prit.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=O9k4ducb2-o%3d&portalid=37

http://prit.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=BmWgSiQvaVQ%3d&portalid=37


Motions by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

2015

Motion to review Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study. September 15, 2015.
Instructed the Probation Department to review the Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study and establish an interagency workgroup, to support Probation in its on-going development and implementation of best practices in juvenile justice -- focusing on maximizing service integration, strengthening coordination between County departments and community based service providers, ensuring a data driven, transparent and accountable juvenile justice system, and improving information sharing within Probation and across County departments.

2016

Motion to Evaluate Probation Oversight. January 26, 2016.
Established a working group tasked with evaluating the landscape of entities overseeing the Probation Department. The working group was specifically asked to assess the feasibility of establishing a Probation Oversight Commission, make recommendations for any investigative and monitoring structure that could improve or replace the current system, and whether oversight should assess juvenile and adult collectively or separately.

Amended the January 26, 2016 motion by encouraging the workgroup to consider whether there is an existing entity that can serve a probation oversight function.

**Motion on Exploring Best Practice Models in Probation. February 9, 2016, revised February 26, 2016.**
Called for a “probation governance study” of the logistics of changing the Probation Department’s structure, including whether to divide the Department between juvenile and adult clients.

**Motion on Exploring Best Practice Models in Probation. February 16, 2016.**
Outlined a draft scope of work for a consultant to execute the probation governance study.

**Motion to coordinate and expand approach to youth diversion. January 2017.**
Established an ad hoc Youth Diversion Subcommittee to develop a roadmap for scaling up youth diversion practices throughout the County.

**Exploring Protocols/Structures to Actualize Ongoing Probation Reform and Accountability. October 3, 2017.**
Established a taskforce to make recommendations on the creation of what would become the Probation Reform and Implementation Team (PRIT) to develop probation oversight and reform plans.

**Implementing a Countywide Approach to Youth Diversion. November 7, 2017.**
Accepted the recommendations proposed in the “Roadmap for Youth Diversion Report” and created the Youth Diversion and Development division of the Office of Diversion and Reentry.

**Establishing Effective and Diverse Governance of Juvenile Justice Funds. December 19, 2017.**
Added five non-profit community-based organization members and five at-large community representatives to the JJCC, and called for developing bylaws for the governance of the JJCC.

**Developing a Path for Instituting a Probation Oversight Commission. May 1, 2018.**
Created the Probation Reform and Implementation Team, tasked with proposing a design for a permanent Probation Oversight Commission, as well as a plan for probation reform implementation.

**Letter of Support for Setting a Minimum Age for Juvenile Court Prosecution in CA. August 14, 2018.**
Supported Senate Bill 439 (SB 439), which passed and was signed into law in September 2018 to establish the minimum age of juvenile court prosecution in California at 12 years old.

**Setting a Minimum Age for Los Angeles County’s Juvenile Justice System. October 30, 2018.**
Directed Youth Diversion and Development division of Office of Diversion and Reentry to work in consultation with other stakeholders to create an implementation plan for SB 439, as well as to recommend further minimum age policies to divert younger children.

*Ensuring Safety and Humane Treatment in the County’s Juvenile Justice Facilities. December 18, 2018.*

Directed the Office of the Inspector General to investigate safety within the juvenile halls, particularly use of force including pepper spray.
2019

*Phasing Out the Use of Oleoresin Capsicum Spray In County Juvenile Facilities, February 12, 2019.*
Instructed the Probation Department to plan for the phased elimination of the use of OC spray in all Los Angeles county camps and Halls before the end of calendar year 2019.

*Meeting the Mental Health Needs of Justice-Involved Youth. June 4, 2019.*
Charged YDD and Department of Mental Health (DMH) to create a plan for increasing community-based diversion and alternative placement options for youth with mental health needs, in response to DMH’s finding that over 90% of youth in juvenile halls had an open mental health case.

Created a Youth Justice Work Group to explore transitioning the juvenile justice system out of the Probation Department into another agency with the goal of creating a rehabilitative, health-focused and care first system.

*Implementing an Enhanced Structure for Probation Oversight. October 1, 2019.*
Accepted the recommendations from PRIT and agreed to empower the POC with the following: the power to inspect facilities, the power to create a process for receiving and reviewing grievances, the power to investigate using subpoena power, the power to access data (including hiring and budget) and to establish community engagement with the POC.

---

**Los Angeles County Audits and OIG reports**

2015

*Review of juvenile camps' compliance with DOJ settlement agreement provisions between April 2014-September 2014, Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller. April 6, 2015.*

*Contracting Review, including of solicitations, proposal evaluations and reporting contract information, Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller. May 29, 2015.*


2016


2019


In recent years, Los Angeles County has issued many, many findings and recommendations related to transforming the youth justice system. The Consultant Team of the Youth Justice Workgroup has provided a separate bibliography that includes descriptions and links to those lengthy studies and reports containing the findings and recommendations. Here, we have compiled and sometimes abbreviated findings and recommendations from seven key reports. We believe these reports are particularly relevant because they resulted from collaborative initiatives involving diverse sectors and leaders, including many of you. As the Workgroup shifts to studying and developing proposals, we urge you to become familiar or refamiliarized with these recommendations so that we can reconsider, build upon, strengthen and learn from implementation of the best ones.

PRIOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDED ARE FROM THE FOLLOWING STUDIES/REPORTS:

1. Los Angeles County Report on Implementing Senate Bill 439 and Diversion of Younger Children (March 2020)
5. PRIT Reform Plan Summary (August 2019)
7. A Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County (2017)

CONSISTENT THEMES AND PRINCIPLES

- Avoid system (both dependency and justice) involvement whenever possible
- Avoid removing youth from their homes whenever possible
- Promote and expand holistic youth development supports for both youth and families across a continuum of responses, in and outside of dependency and justice systems to respond to harms
- Downsize and transform the culture of institutions – especially the Probation Department as a whole and juvenile halls – in order for all other change to be meaningful
- Improve data and information-sharing (as well as protections), evaluation, training and accountability all around
- Engage youth and families at every stage of decision-making
- Capitalize on what we have - improve coordination and collaboration across systems to better leverage existing resources and efforts

KEY QUESTIONS STILL EMERGING FROM PRIOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- What does a youth development-oriented continuum of care look like that both reduces the size and scope of the justice system and improves outcomes for youth who are justice-involved?
  - Which systems and models have been effective in serving youth who are justice-involved – in and outside of the system, and in the community and out-of-home facilities?
- Which youth:
  - Should be served outside of any justice response versus court-processed/supervised?
  - Should be in an out-of-home placement, secure and non-secure?
- What have we learned about barriers to implementation of these recommendations so far?
- What additional capacities are needed to provide interventions along the continuum?
- How can we better leverage and coordinate across systems for a youth services/youth development system?

COLOR CODE

Black – Relevant to all three subcommittees
Red – Subcommittee 1: Development and Diversion
Green – Subcommittee 2: System-Involvement
Blue – Subcommittee 3: Alternatives to Placements/Incarceration
1. **Los Angeles County Report on Implementing Senate Bill 439 and Diversion of Younger Children (March 2020)**

1.1. **Findings from Research and Stakeholder Discussions (Abbreviated):** this section draws from data, research and diverse engagement meetings to arrive at the following agreements and concerns about implementing diversion of younger children.

1.1.1. **Any contact with law enforcement can be harmful and should be avoided when possible.** Diversion from the justice system to alternative interventions can effectively deter future offending, school misconduct, school truancy and suspensions.

1.1.2. **Effective alternatives rooted in holistic youth development should be explored** – but not over-used – to address the underlying causes of justice system contacts...children’s underlying behavioral needs should be addressed through alternative child-serving systems, such as community- and family-based health and mental health, education, child welfare services, and other community-based services and programs that meaningfully engage children, their families and communities and promote healing.

1.1.2.1. There is also agreement that young children should not be removed from their homes as a default. In the most severe cases where young children present psychiatric disorders, temporary and longer-term secure holdings, in additional to mental health evaluations and treatment, are available through existing health systems. In other rare instances, the dependency system may consider removing a child from their home.

1.1.2.2. Across the board, community residents advocated for strong, holistic youth development infrastructure, with attention to improved, comprehensive assessment tools and processes to identify the right kind of intervention for youth and families across systems. However, even where some type of intervention is deemed appropriate, community and law enforcement and other system representatives alike pointed out that the diversion approaches through any system should be proportionate and focused on developing the strengths and well-being of youth and families. There was consensus that diversion can also risk being more intensive, unnecessary and harmful to youth than either the justice system or leaving them alone.

1.1.3. **Violence and harm and threats of such need to be taken seriously** - effective intervention is part of public safety. Research and feedback from the community and system representatives underscore the reality of threats and dangers and the harm inflicted on communities as a result.

1.1.4. **Los Angeles has a growing infrastructure of youth-serving initiatives, programs, and supports but should improve access and coordination.**

1.1.5. **It is important not to widen the net or bring more youth into the dependency system.** There was repeated cautioning and agreement that implementation of diversion of younger children should avoid over-relying on and involving youth in the dependency system...dependency courts should be used as a last resort for young children and families with substantial unmet needs.

1.2. **Concerns raised by stakeholders:**

1.2.1. **Lack of data about detained youth.** In considering recommendations on further detention policies for youth 12-years-old and older, further data on the numbers, demographics, the underlying alleged offenses and underlying needs of youth, is needed. Further information-gathering about youth detained and supervised by the Probation Department and Department of Mental Health are needed to better understand the appropriate type and level of intervention needed.
1.2.2. **Effectiveness of interventions.** Overall, feedback was consistent that more data and evaluation is also needed about the effectiveness of all public and private community-based systems of care for youth...There is agreement that accountability and supports for both government systems and community-based organizations are important, and youth and their communities should meaningfully inform the design, delivery and evaluation of interventions.

1.2.3. **Lack of temporary housing and secure alternatives to juvenile halls and camps for youth under 12 and few options for youth over 12.** There is a strong, widely shared belief that children under 12-years-old do not need any secure alternatives to juvenile halls at all – and those available through health systems in cases of medical crisis and through dependency systems in cases of abuse and neglect are sufficient. With regards to non-secure alternatives, there are questions about Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs)\(^1\), resource families (including those approved to provide Intensive Services Foster Care (ISFC)), relative/non-relative caregivers, and other temporary housing – including about the barriers to placement for justice-involved youth, the availability of placements prior to any child welfare system involvement, and the effectiveness of supports and services in such settings. Stakeholders interested in justice reform thus recognize that there must be greater attention and linkages to implementation of continuum of care reform happening on the dependency side. The questions of what secure alternatives do and should exist for youth age 12 and older are unanswered. For all ages, further research is needed, including about:

1.2.3.1. **The two local Community Treatment Facilities** – that serve 12- to 17-year-old youth, and whether they can be expanded to serve as alternatives to juvenile halls and camps generally, including for youth under the age of 12; and

1.2.3.2. **Children’s Crisis Residential Programs** – which is a subcategory of licensing under STRTPs and was created in 2017 through legislation “to serve children, nonminor dependents, and individuals 18 to 20 years of age, experiencing mental health crises as an alternative to psychiatric hospitalization.”\(^2\) Legislative materials that created CCRPs specifically addressed the lack of children’s mental health crisis residential services for children under 12.\(^3\) Health and Safety Code section 1562.03 provides that CCRPs shall provide “therapeutic programming” seven days a week “to maintain an appropriate treatment setting and services, based on individual children’s needs” and that the program shall be sufficient staffed “to accept children 24 hours per day, seven days a week and to admit children, at a minimum, from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m., seven days a week, 365 days per year.” As of December 2019, Los Angeles County has not developed CCRPs.

---

\(^1\) STRTPs were a concept resulting from Continuum of Care Reform, an effort authorized by Senate Bill 1013 (2012) and launched in September 2012 by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) in partnership with the County Welfare Directors Association of California to improve the rate setting system, and the services and programs serving children and families in the continuum of placement settings. In January 2015, CDSS released a report to the legislature that outlined the comprehensive approach to improving the experience and outcomes of children in foster care and made recommendations to improve the Continuum of Care through legislative action. Section 1502 of the Health and Safety Code defines STRTPs as: “a residential facility operated by a public agency or private organization and licensed by the department pursuant to Section 1562.01 that provides an integrated program of specialized and intensive care and supervision, services and supports, treatment, and short-term, 24-hour care and supervision to children.”

\(^2\) California Department of Social Services, “Short Term Residential Therapeutic Program Interim Licensing Standards: Subchapter 3” (Released January 29, 2019), Section 87098.10, page 5; see also “Assembly Bill 501: Factsheet” (2017).

\(^3\) See Assembly Bill 501: Factsheet” (2017). “With 47 out of 58 counties lacking any child/adolescent psychiatric hospital inpatient beds for children under 12 (and fewer than 70 beds statewide) the need for children’s mental health crisis residential services could not be more acute.”
1.2.4. **Unfinished definitions or dialogues to reach clarity and agreements or disagreements.** From prosecutors and police to community representatives, many beliefs and goals do converge around needing to reduce reliance on policing, prosecution and court processes to respond to youth. At the same time, there is a sense that concepts and language like “ending youth incarceration” and “transformative justice” need to be better and specifically defined. There is a call all around to continue to listen and elaborate.

1.3. **Issue discussed beyond SB 439: Other systems may also need to be transformed to be more holistic, better resourced, and more capable of partnering with community-based services.** Implementing SB 439 true to its intent of decriminalizing the behaviors of young children implicates the practices of entire justice systems, other systems and communities and the resources and readiness of all of them. For instance, to avoid the negative impacts intended, a youth under 12 should be diverted away from both prosecution in courts and expulsion from school. Community representatives discussed the need to avoid stigmatization and pathology in over-relying on traditional mental health diagnosis and treatment as well.

1.4. **Final recommendations:**

**1.4.1. Section 1: Recommendations on Service Delivery and Infrastructure**

1.4.1.1. The Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD), in collaboration with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) and Office of Child Protection (OCP), should increase access to and utilization of existing prevention and early intervention services and infrastructure for youth under 12 who are at risk of future justice involvement. These strategies to increase access and utilization to resources for youth impacted by SB 439 should include:

1.4.1.1.1. Continuing to build and update a central repository of information about resources for youth through available education, child-welfare, and health-oriented providers, prioritizing those that are holistic and community-based and designating those available for youth under 12;

1.4.1.1.2. Compiling information about resources specific to young people who are in disproportionately impacted or particularly vulnerable populations, including Black and Hispanic/Latinx youth, undocumented youth, LGBTQ youth, foster youth, and youth with serious mental or physical health needs;

1.4.1.1.3. Connecting the information and resources to justice systems and other youth-serving systems—including schools—through facilitating spaces for cross-sector communication, coordination and collaboration;

1.4.1.1.4. Making information about identified resources accessible to the community through a variety of outreach communications and technologies in collaboration with youth and community leaders;

1.4.1.2. Working with existing services to decrease eligibility restrictions and improve cultural responsivity so that justice-involved young people—especially those who are in disproportionately impacted or particularly vulnerable populations—are not excluded from accessing or meaningfully utilizing services; and

1.4.1.3. Providing support for research, evaluation, and youth/community engagement focused on holistic, community-based youth development and restorative/transformative justice approaches for partners across systems, including coordination with other county initiatives focused on positive youth development such as the Department of Parks and Recreation’s County Youth Networking Group and public-private partnerships like Ready to Rise.
1.4.1.2. **YDD should work with the Chief Executive Office to explore avenues for additional resources and staffing to support the implementation of SB 439 recommendations, including at least one full time SB 439 implementation coordinator housed in YDD. Future phases should include additional staff to support research and evaluation in addition to positions for young people and system-impacted people.**

1.4.1.3. **YDD should work with the Center for Strategic Partnerships to engage philanthropy as thought partners in addition to potential funding partners focused on components of this work for which public funding is not available.**

1.4.2. **Section 2: Recommendations on First Responder Training and Protocols**

1.4.2.1. **YDD should work with the Public Defender’s Office in collaboration with youth/community leaders and other stakeholders to continue to develop and disseminate outreach materials and trainings on the change in law; alternatives to the justice system; and developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed, racially equitable approaches to youth—focusing on first responders like police, schools, congregate care, service providers, and communities disproportionately impacted by youth arrest. These strategies to increase awareness of appropriate responses to youth impacted by SB 439 should include:**

1.4.2.1.1. Clarifying that YDD be an entity to receive diversion and development referrals, including of youth under age 12;
1.4.2.1.2. Clarifying that law enforcement agencies who have contact with youth under 12 shall report such contacts to YDD for the purposes of coordinating potential service referrals, monitoring and enforcement, and research and evaluation;
1.4.2.1.3. Clarifying that the Public Defender’s Office should be contacted immediately about improper citations and petitions by law enforcement agencies of youth under 12;
1.4.2.1.4. Addressing the need for alternatives to transportation in police cars and temporary detention at police stations to reduce the negative impact of trauma and stigmatization on youth and families; and
1.4.2.1.5. Language, visuals, and mediums for know-your-rights information that are culturally relevant and accessible.

1.4.2.2. **YDD should maintain specific protections on collection, access to, and use of information for youth under 12 over whom the court can no longer have jurisdiction through County information-sharing protocols and legislative amendments if necessary, reflecting the protocols for information generated by informal service referrals established by the YDD model. These protections for data on youth impacted by SB 439 should:**

1.4.2.2.1. Include high-quality and well-coordinated record-keeping among the network of community-based organizations providing services to youth under 12;
1.4.2.2.2. Ensure regular assessment and cross-sector review of de-identified data to avoid duplication of services and hold partners accountable to standards of quality and equity;
1.4.2.2.3. Provide data capacity-building and support as needed to improve system, program, and service delivery effectiveness;
1.4.2.2.4. Prohibit the sharing of individualized referral or service-utilization data for youth under 12 impacted by SB 439 by referring law enforcement agencies and service providers with other law enforcement and justice system agencies; and
1.4.2.2.5. Prohibit the use in any future court proceedings of statements made by youth under 12 impacted by SB 439 in the course of referral or participation in services.
1.4.2.3. YDD should monitor the implementation of SB 439 through maintaining regular collaboration and communication with law enforcement agencies, the Probation Department, Public Defender’s Office and District Attorney’s Office about youth under 12 who come into contact with law enforcement and the justice system.

1.4.3. **Section 3: Recommendations on Addressing the Need for Placements**

1.4.3.1. The SB 439 Support Team developed for the 2019 Temporary Protocol—including the Office of Diversion and Reentry’s Division of Youth Diversion and Development, the Probation Department, the Department of Children and Family Services, the Children’s Defense Fund, Public Counsel, and the Children’s Law Center—should continue to support the resolution of law enforcement contacts with youth under 12 and ensure return home as the default, always taking into account the child’s risk of harm to him/herself or others. Reflecting evidence of promising practices, it is recommended that a child under 12 does not require, and should not be placed in, a locked facility when the following strategies are available:

1.4.3.1.1. All placements recommended are non-secure, though such placements may and can adopt high security measures in order to ensure the safety of a child, other children, and staff.

1.4.3.1.2. In the rare instances children under 12 cannot return home immediately, the Support Team should work together to utilize and ensure adequate capacity and access to existing short and longer-term placements available through the education, welfare and health pathways and systems;

1.4.3.1.3. In cases where psychiatric care is required, the Support Team should connect youth and families to Children’s Hospitals;

1.4.3.1.4. Where psychiatric care is not needed, the Support Team should consult DCFS for short-term placement with resource families and relative/non-relative caregivers first; and

1.4.3.1.5. Where resource families and relatives/non-family relatives are not viable options, DCFS should use temporary housing like Short Term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs).

1.4.3.2. The County should pursue collaborative efforts—including community-based organizations serving youth and system-impacted youth and families—to evaluate and improve of placements for children under 12 as well as all youth. This research should include:

1.4.3.2.1. Exploring the need for and capacity to strengthen temporary housing options like STRTPs, including access to and payment for them;

1.4.3.2.2. Developing access to resource families, and relative/non-family caregivers and STRTPs without the involvement of the Department of Children and Family Services; and

1.4.3.2.3. Implementing Children’s Crisis Residential Programs as a subcategory of STRTPs to serve youth under 12, as well as considering CCRPs an alternative to juvenile halls and camps for youth 12 and older.

1.4.4. **Section 4: Recommendations on Additional Minimum Age Policies**

1.4.4.1. The County should adopt a protocol for presumptively prohibiting detention of 12-year-olds with a system of overrides to permit detention of a 12-year-old only in the rare instance.

1.4.4.2. The County should continue to assess the feasibility of expanding the minimum age of detention of youth older than 12-years-old as new information arises about their placement needs.
1.4.5. **Section 5: Recommendations Beyond SB 439**

1.4.5.1. YDD should continue to strengthen and expand implementation of its diversion protocol, making pre-booking or pre-arrest diversion available to all legally eligible youth under 18 through:

1.4.5.1.1. Ensuring existing sites are implementing the protocol effectively;
1.4.5.1.2. Cultivating additional law enforcement and service provider partners to divert youth at the earliest point possible; and
1.4.5.1.3. Cultivating school and community pathways to diversion without involving law enforcement or school discipline by connecting diversion to efforts promoting youth development, restorative and transformative justice, and positive school climates.

1.4.5.2. The Youth Justice Work Group should research, and/or identify opportunities for further research on, alternative models for safe and healing-centered practices, supports and placements for all youth. The research should address the needs and experiences of justice-involved youth, including their mental health needs and diagnoses; school-based arrests/discipline and promising practices to improve school climate; placement models that are community-run and available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; multi-disciplinary crisis response teams; and models for community training institutes focused on youth and community development, positive school climate, and restorative/transformational justice.

1.4.5.3. The County should continue to engage and support impacted youth and communities in the development, implementation and monitoring of all diversion and development efforts, including all of the above related to SB 439, by developing a dependable mechanism by which resources for stipends, transportation, and food can be provided to youth participating in the YDD Steering Committee and other youth advisory councils and commissions.

2. **Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) – Goals adopted by the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council and adapted from The LA County Probation Workgroup Report (March 2019)**

2.1. **Goals:**

2.1.1. **Align, coordinate, and oversee policies, practices, and services along a continuum of prevention and intervention programming focused on holistic youth development.** The youth development system should:

2.1.1.1. Whenever possible, reduce contact between youth and the juvenile justice system with diversion programs and other community-based resources.

2.1.1.2. Deliver services using a continuum of promising practices, best practices, and evidence-based programs that build on youth’s strengths and assets and support the development of youth’s skills and competencies.

2.1.1.3. Use strength-based screening and assessment tools to assess youth and family needs, build meaningful case plans and appropriately connect youth and families to appropriate services.

2.1.1.4. When the use of out of home placements—non-secure or secure—is necessary, utilize family-based settings (e.g., relative, a nonrelative extended family member, and foster care placements) whenever possible, maintain safe environments in placements, engage/deliver services within a therapeutic milieu, and provide reentry services to ensure a seamless and positive return to the community.
2.1.2. **Drive decision-making about systems coordination and integration, programming and direct services, evaluation and funding through identifying, developing and resourcing opportunities for collaborative, multidisciplinary partnerships** among county agencies, community-based organizations (CBOs), youth and parents that have been impacted by the juvenile justice system, and other interested stakeholders.

2.1.3. **Recognize and reduce the racial and ethnic and geographic disparities** related to the access to services and juvenile justice processing and the needs of special populations including (but not necessarily limited to): females, LGBTQ-2A youth, crossover/dually-involved youth, youth who become parents, undocumented, and transitional age youth without family/caretakers/support systems.

2.1.4. **Ensure transparency and accountability from all partners engaged in youth development service delivery** for fiscal management, measuring outcomes related to their work, and implementing effective practices.

2.1.4.1. Collect and report consistent and meaningful outcomes on program impact and effectiveness on an annual basis (at minimum) to assess the impact of policies, practices, and programs.

2.1.4.2. Develop and support capacity of all partners to conduct consistent and meaningful data collection and evaluation.

2.1.4.3. Ensure studies involve research methodologies that are aligned with the perceptions and experiences of communities of color.

2.2. **Continuum-Based Funding Strategies and Parameters**

2.2.1. **Primary Prevention.** Provide children and families (focusing on those at-risk and the identification of conditions (personal, social, environmental) that contribute to the occurrence of delinquency) with an array of upfront supports within their own communities to minimize their chances of entering the juvenile justice system and maximize their chances of living healthy and stable lives.

2.2.2. **Focused Prevention/Early Intervention.** Provide upfront supports and services to children and families, whose holistic needs put them at greater risk of delinquency system involvement, in order to intervene early and prevent involvement or further penetration into the delinquency system.

2.2.2.1. *Diversion Intervention to Community-Based Services*: Redirects system responses and provides children and families to avoid involvement or further involvement in delinquency with community-based supports and services to prevent a young person’s involvement or further involvement in the justice system.

2.2.3. **Intervention.** Provide children and families who are already involved in delinquency with supports and services to address the factors leading to their behavior and reduce the likelihood or reoccurring delinquency.

2.2.3.1. *During Community Supervision*: Provide children who are on community supervision (including those reentering their homes and communities after a period of placement or detention) and their families with community-based supports and services to prevent the further involvement in the justice system.

2.2.3.2. *In-Custody*: Provide in-custody children and their families with community-based supports and services prior to and while preparing to reenter their homes and communities to prevent their further involvement in the justice system.
2.2.4. **Capacity Building of Community-Based Organizations.** Support community-based organizations with capacity-building, training and cross-training, evaluation, and to regularly track and monitor outcomes and use the results to drive County policy and practice change.

2.2.5. **JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure.** Support annual evaluation and ongoing training and supports for the JJCC and CAC to provide leadership on the development and implementation of the CMJJP.

2.3. **Recommended Service Categories and Approaches**

2.3.1. **Along the continuum of youth development prevention and intervention, the CMJJP should support the following service categories and approaches.** With a few modifications, these categories and approaches were the recommendations of the JJCPA evaluation conducted by Resource Development Associates. These approaches should be built into requests and contracts for services by public and community-based service-providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Health Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide target youth populations with appropriate health, mental health, and substance abuse treatment that target their individual needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specifically, fund community-based cognitive behavioral interventions and more community-based substance abuse treatment in neighborhoods with high density of youth on probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools/Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fund educational advocacy and system navigation for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund an asset-based, family and community centered approach to truancy reduction that helps families address issues that limit regular school attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund community-based providers in schools to provide tutoring/academic support for youth, and educational advocacy and system navigation for youth and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund intervention workers to facilitate violence prevention and safe neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment/Career/Life Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase focus on job development, including career readiness and professional skill-building, vocational training, creative and alternative career training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support access to community college courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providers should be able to subsidize employment for up to 6-months to increase the likelihood that employers will hire youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase opportunities for vocational skill development, and align vocational training with career opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loosen the restrictions on the type of accepted employment opportunities to support internships, seasonal employment, and subsidized employment that support career pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leverage and align HRHN Employment with existing LA County youth employment programs, such Youth Workforce Innovations and Opportunity Act-funded YouthSource Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support financial literacy components to employment and educational programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-emotional support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contract with community-based organizations to provide programming focused on personal growth and expression, including creativity, mindfulness, and spirituality – including programs that cultivate leadership and empowerment, and conflict resolution such as restorative and transformative justice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide peer and adult mentoring services, particularly for young men of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide gender-specific, culturally-responsive services for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner with schools or CBOs to provide restorative justice models in schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Most of these are adopted entirely and/or adapted from Resource Development Associate reports evaluating probation or JJCPA.
- Provide CBOs discretionary funding that can be used for supplemental services to support youth and their families (e.g., incentives, household goods, field trips).
- Increase services that serve youth and families together, as well as those specifically for parents/caregivers.
- Support community-based programs with a focus on racial equity, historical trauma, and racism.
- Prioritize providers who work across the continuum so as to provide continuity of services for youth.

### Housing
- Support housing linkage assistance for youth and families with unstable housing.
- Support alternative housing for youth who cannot live at home.
- Partner with the LA County Homeless Initiative, particularly housing navigation and housing problem-solving for TAY.
- Establish pathways to LA County’s Coordinated Entry System (CES).

### Parent/caregiver support
- Fund wraparound services that include the family.
- Support with basic needs, homelessness.
- Fund individual and group mental health support to parents/caregivers.
- Fund family liaisons into existing services.

### Arts and Recreation
- Support arts-focused programming in the areas of employment/career and socio-emotional development.

2.4. **The following outcomes at three levels – system implementation, service provision, and youth and family impact – can guide evaluation and systems and program improvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems level</th>
<th>Service provider level</th>
<th>Youth/Family level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| See CMJJP guiding principles | **Probation Practice**  
- Successful completion rates for supervision  
- Average length of time under supervision and in specific Probation programming  
- Average length of detention in juvenile hall pending disposition or post-disposition awaiting placement or camp  
- Factors related to the increase or decrease of length of time under supervision  
- Level and type of interaction and contact between | **Improvement in Protective Factors—Individual and Family Strengths**  
- Change in protective/strength assessment scores  
- Stable living situation  
- Stable educational plan (enrollment in school, improvement in attendance, improvement in performance, improved behavior at school, access to... |

---


6 CES aligns the Single Adult, Family, and Youth Systems into a seamless, collaborative, county-wide platform for housing and service delivery to homeless households. The main objectives of the system are to:
- Reduce the length of time a family is homeless and permanently house them as quickly as possible, using Rapid Re-housing and linkages to supportive services.
- Build upon existing community-based infrastructures to serve homeless families, leverage resources, and provide more targeted and cost-effective interventions.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is the department that controls CES and has annual budget of $234 million. [https://www.lahsa.org/ces](https://www.lahsa.org/ces).

7 The outcomes for service delivery and improved youth and family well-being are adopted from the 2017 Probation Working Group’s report.
supervising probation officers and their clients
- Relationship between the use of a validated risk and needs tool, case plan goals, and referred/completed services
- Relationship between risk and needs identified by a validated tool and the services received
- Relationship between services, supervision, and achieving case plan goals
- Amount and type of service delivery for youth in placements
- Continuity of services once youth leave placements and reenter the community
- Level of coordination between agencies (e.g., Probation, DCFS, and DMHH)
- Strengths/challenges related to interagency collaboration

Program Delivery by Community-Based Agencies
- Types of programs accessed by clients
- Successful completion rates for programs
- Average length of time in programs
- Retention rates for programs
- Fidelity of service delivery across programs
- Average time between service referral & service provision
- Cultural competency of programs (including gender specific programs)

Youth & Family Engagement Experiences
- Extent to which youth and family felt they understood juvenile justice process
- Extent to which youth and family were satisfied with their experience in the juvenile justice system
- Extent to which youth and family found experiences with Probation and community-based providers helpful

an IEP, school progressions (increase in credits, graduation, GED))
- Economic stability (e.g., employment for older youth)
- Increase in positive, supportive family relationships
- Connection to positive, supportive adults
- Connection to positive, extracurricular activities
- Connection to employment

Reduction in Risk and Need Factors
- Risk/need assessment scores
- Decreased family conflict
- Decreased substance misuse/abuse
- Decreased mental health stress
- Access to basic legal documents needed for employment

Supervision Success
- Completion of probation
- Completion of community service
- Completion of restitution
- Probation violations and whether sustained (WIC 777—e.g., violations related to school, drugs)

Recidivism
- New camp/DJJ placements
- New arrests
- Sustained petitions

3. Los Angeles County Probation Workgroup Comprehensive Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan (March 2017)

3.1. Goals and Objectives

3.1.1. Goal: Establish a County-based coordinating body to align, coordinate, and oversee policies, practices, and services along a continuum of prevention and rehabilitative intervention programming for children, youth and their families prenatally through the age of 25.

3.1.1.1. Connect individual partner plans (as they relate to the prevention and/or rehabilitative intervention services for delinquency—e.g., practice models and agency specific strategic plans) with the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan.

3.1.1.2. Connect the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan to other critical documents that are related to community wellness and safety but focus on issues beyond delinquency (e.g., systemic problems, child maltreatment, educational success, etc.).
Compiled Finding and Recommendations – for Youth Justice workgroup Subcommittees

3.1.1.3. Present and gain investment in the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan across all key partners and identify leaders/champions for the implementation of the Plan.

3.1.1.4. Hold leadership across County agencies accountable for implementing and adhering to the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan on an annual basis.

3.1.1.5. Identify and address policies and/or practices across County agencies that distract or become barriers to the implementation of the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan.

3.1.1.6. Establish a method to regularly incorporate the voices of system impacted communities, families, youth, and children in the discussions and recommended reforms of County policies and practices.

3.1.1.7. Develop and support flexible funding streams that cross agency boundaries and ensure funding follows and responds to children, youth, and family needs regardless of immigration status.

3.1.1.8. When eligibility criteria cannot be established across agencies, coordinate the use of funding to meet the overall needs of children, youth, and families.

3.1.1.9. Develop, implement, and sustain a wide array of training to support the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan, including multidisciplinary and cross-training curricula and/or opportunities.

3.1.1.10. Train and incentive staff to (1) meaningfully engage children, youth, and families/caretakers; (2) treating children, youth, and families/caretakers with dignity and respect; and (3) building trust by demonstrating integrity in all their actions.

3.1.1.11. Incentivize county and city agencies to work in close partnership with the community and key stakeholders to establish consistent and positive support system for the children, youth, and family.

3.1.1.12. Provide pathways to support the self-sufficiency of children, youth, and families—teach families how to access services and address needs without the necessity of government intervention.

3.1.2. **Goal: Whenever possible, reduce contact between youth and the juvenile justice system** (i.e., law enforcement, Probation, and the delinquency court) through the use of evidence-based juvenile justice system diversion programs and other community-based resources.

3.1.2.1. Take steps to divert youth at the earliest possible points of contact with the justice system (i.e., pre-arrest).

3.1.2.2. Only divert youth who would otherwise be processed through the formal juvenile justice system and incorporate safeguards to prevent net-widening.

3.1.2.3. Focus diversion programming toward positive youth development and community engagement.

3.1.2.4. Use validated risk and needs assessment tools to inform decision-making and to develop responsive treatment plans, including services and support for all parties involved including families.

3.1.2.5. When appropriate, provide safe spaces to give all impacted parties a voice (i.e., share what they need, how they were harmed) and contribute to the development of a resolution that repairs the...
harm to the victim and community, meets youths’ underlying needs, and promotes accountability, responsibility, and community connection.

3.1.2.6. Use evidence-based practices and ongoing data collection to evaluate program impacts (e.g., program and youth characteristics associated with youth outcomes), monitor fidelity, and if applicable, track victim satisfaction.

3.1.2.7. Provide training and education to juvenile justice and community-based partners to advance evidence-based diversion practices and facilitate opportunities for networking and collaboration.

3.1.3. Goal: Drive decision-making based on: (1) engaging children, youth and their families based on their developmental stages and with respect to their respective cultures; (2) understanding and interacting with children and youth within the context of family in a trauma-informed manner; and (3) prioritizing children, youth, and family voices and experiences.

3.1.3.1. Recognize an expanded definition of family for children and youth that includes supportive non-traditional positive adult influences

3.1.3.2. Look comprehensively at family—identify supportive and consistent adult(s) for this child/youth and engage them as part of the support system. Undertake family finding efforts to locate potential family support.

3.1.3.3. Engage children, youth, and their families/caretakers as early and as often in the process as possible (i.e., see them as collaborative partners), and provide education, support, understanding, and communication throughout the process.

3.1.3.4. Interact with children, youth, and their families/caretakers as collaborators—engage with them in a developmentally appropriate way and understand their experiences from a unique and holistic perspective.

3.1.3.5. View fathers and paternal relatives as an essential part of the support system and include fathers and paternal relatives in planning and services. Undertake family finding efforts where father’s whereabouts are unknown.

3.1.3.6. Build a mindful and trauma informed connection with the children, youth, and family—take the time to really understand why something happened without attributing negative motivations to them—children, youth, and families/caretakers have more positive outcomes when someone took the time to listen, understand and come to know who they were.

3.1.3.7. Work with children, youth, and their families/caretakers with empathy and help them to find hope in their situations and to identify a pathway to realize those hopes.

3.1.3.8. Recognize and respond to the trauma and needs of parents/caretakers (e.g., previous abuse, intergenerational gang involvement, mental health and substance abuse issues, unemployment, etc.) and find ways to connect them to appropriate services, workshops and other resources to accomplish positive change and their own healing—family/caretaker participation in their own change process inspires change in their children and potentially breaks a cycle.
3.1.3.9. Address trauma in the family; families may need support to address their own trauma histories or intergenerational trauma in order to stabilize the family so that they can be part of the recovery/treatment process for their own child.

3.1.3.10. Prioritize the building and/or strengthening of positive relationships between children, youth, and their families including their system-involved siblings and their own children as well as build avenues for children and youth to connect with families out of contact.

3.1.3.11. Build on children, youth, and family strengths and celebrate their milestones, using this as a leverage point to address risks and needs directly and indirectly.

3.1.4. **Goal:** Recognize and address the racial and ethnic disparities related to the access to services and juvenile justice processing and the needs of special populations including (but not necessarily limited to): females, LGBT youth, crossover/dually-involved youth, youth who become parents, undocumented, and transitional age youth without family/caretakers/support systems.

3.1.4.1. Develop and track data that have the ability to identify the points of contact with the juvenile justice system (e.g., arrest, intake, court, etc.) and the critical decision-making points (e.g., placement decisions) that are driving Racial and Ethnic Disparity and Disproportionate Minority Contact.

3.1.4.2. Use data to strategically implement targeted programs or practices that reduce RED and DMC.

3.1.4.3. **Work with the early education system to reduce the “preschool to prison pipeline.”**

3.1.4.4. Train staff, including law enforcement, on implicit bias and best practices in reducing RED.

3.1.4.5. Develop and utilize diversion and community-based programs.

3.1.4.6. Provide training to agency/provider staff on the needs and best practices related to serving LGBT youth.

3.1.4.7. Ensure that gender responsive services are available to all youth.

3.1.4.8. Institutionalize seamless collaboration and coordination across the Department of Children and Family Services and Probation as well as other relevant agencies for youth who cross into both the dependency and delinquency systems.

3.1.4.9. Prepare youth for the transition from childhood to adulthood--connect youth age 14 or older to independent living and other services that prepare them for successful lives as adults.

3.1.4.10. Provide parenting classes and support for youth who are or become parents.

3.1.5. **Goal:** Use comprehensive, multidisciplinary and evidence-based screening and assessment tools to build meaningful case plans and appropriately connect children, youth, and families to appropriate services.

3.1.5.1. Institute a consistent and multidisciplinary screening process using validated and standardized screening tools as early as possible. These screening tools should assess for educational needs, developmental disabilities, mental health problems, suicidality, traumatic stress reactions,
substance abuse problems, sexual victimization, domestic violence issues, gang involvement, and physical health in order to identify critical issues that should be addressed in case planning.

3.1.5.2. Use validated risk/resiliency assessment tool(s) as early in the process as possible to assess criminogenic needs and areas of dynamic risk factors in need of rehabilitative intervention services.

3.1.5.3. Coordinate the tools used across agencies to avoid duplication and redundancy and to improve accuracy and maximize resources.

3.1.5.4. Institute a process/protocol for stakeholders to share screening and assessment results when appropriate in order to:

3.1.5.4.1. Connect children and youth to appropriate services by prioritizing immediate needs and risks

3.1.5.4.2. Reduce service lag times

3.1.5.4.3. Reduce duplication of assessment processes and services.

3.1.5.5. Establish a method to share important background information and history of the children and youth across agencies and providers to enhance the appropriateness of services and reduce duplication while protecting the children, youth, and families’ right to confidentiality.

3.1.5.6. Build cumulative case plans that address risk and needs based on results of the screening and assessment tools (i.e., youth should have one case plan that is updated and amended over time by all partners involved with the child, youth, and family/caretaker).

3.1.5.7. Communicate results of screening and assessments to court and request orders consistent with case plans that are developed for court-involved youth.

3.1.5.8. Build case plans that equally build on risks, needs, strengths and positive support systems; facilitate pro-social connections with the community, and work to remove barriers facing the children, youth, and family success with appropriate partners.

3.1.5.9. Re-administer the risk/resiliency tool and other relevant screening measures in regular intervals to assess progress and areas that need attention/intervention (e.g., every 6 months until case termination)—based on these results, reward progress and adjust supervision, programming, and case/treatment plans levels as necessary. Inform the court of progress, lack of progress, and any adjustments necessary.

3.1.6. **Goal: Deliver services using promising practices, best practices, and a continuum of evidence-based programs.**

3.1.6.1. Establish seamless connections with community-based providers to facilitate access to a continuum of services.

3.1.6.2. Ensure case plans match services to the needs of children, youth, and family based on the outcomes of screening and assessment and prioritize their input. Communicate to court what services are necessary/unnecessary for court-involved youth.

3.1.6.3. Connect children, youth, and families/caretakers to appropriate services and support systems within their communities.

3.1.6.4. Establish continuity in relationships between children, youth, families/caretakers, agency staff, and service providers—reduce the number of fragmented relationships in their experience.
3.1.6.5. Deliver programming that is individualized, interdisciplinary, strength-based, and trauma informed (when appropriate).

3.1.6.6. Deliver services in a timely, unified and coordinated way across different agencies—avoid duplication and redundancy and do not overload children, youth, and families with unreasonable expectations.

3.1.6.7. Engage children, youth, and families in a developmentally-appropriate way, meeting them where they are in the process of change and helping them to become a strong family unit—build positive interpersonal interactions utilizing motivational interviewing and using positive reinforcement.

3.1.6.8. Recognize and incorporate cultural competence and the availability of bilingual providers when delivering services to children, youth, and families.

3.1.6.9. Deliver services to children, youth, and families in diverse, consistent, and affordable ways and through a variety of service providers in their communities to increase the level of engagement and willingness to participate. Immediately address any gap in services in under-resourced regions of the county.

3.1.6.10. Provide an array of services and support to children, youth, and families in a convenient and effective manner through in-home family-based services (e.g., wraparound) and/or “one-stop shop” locations.

3.1.6.11. Strengthen family/caregivers’ understanding of the educational process, foster effective communication skills between family/caregivers and school, and empower them to advocate for their youth educational needs.

3.1.6.12. Use restorative pathways to facilitate a process of healing and recovery for victims and to forge foundations for strong, positive connections between the community and children, youth, and their families.


3.1.6.14. Ensure that each child or youth has at least one significant adult who will continue to support the child/youth into adulthood.

3.1.6.15. Hold service providers accountable for serving children, youth, and families and achieving effective outcomes with their clients (see Goal 8).

3.1.6.16. Maintain a database of County contracted services for youth and families to assure timely access to and prioritize necessary services.

3.1.7. **Goal:** When the use of out of home placements—non-secure or secure—is necessary, utilize family-based settings (e.g., relative, NREFM, and foster care placements) whenever possible, maintain safe environments in placements, engage/deliver services within a therapeutic milieu, and provide reentry services to ensure a seamless and positive return to the community.

3.1.7.1. Address school of origin issues prior to placement. If youth to remain in school of origin, create a transportation plan in consultation with placement and local education agency.
3.1.7.2. Ensure that services required in the youth’s Individualized Education Plan and/or Individual Program Plan through Regional Center will continue without interruption once youth is placed.

3.1.7.3. Begin transition case planning before a youth goes to the placement, continue while in placement, and drive their transition back into the community (particular emphasis on aftercare should be placed on school programming, transitional planning, immediate needs, and permanency).

3.1.7.4. Operate youth-centered and innovative facilities that build, support, and maintain relationships with family/caretakers, siblings, and their own children throughout the time spent in placement and are located in close proximity to the communities in which the youth’s family resides.

3.1.7.5. Interact with youth using a trauma-informed care approach.

3.1.7.6. Prioritize, encourage, and facilitate family/caretaker connections while in placement through in-person visitation, family engagement activities, and the use of technology (e.g., video conferencing) when appropriate.

3.1.7.7. Deliver treatment using the small-group care model and within a therapeutic milieu focused on consistency, building positive relationships, creating homelike living spaces, and sharing responsibility for daily activities.

3.1.7.8. Create supportive and innovative learning environments in which children, youth, and families can build the skills they need to be successful (e.g., utilize the performing and visual arts, provide access to extracurricular activities, and offer programs to enhance educational success; parenting skills and techniques; life skills, and employment) and provide opportunities to reinforce these skills in their communities through reentry planning.

3.1.7.9. Ensure that group homes serving youth promote the youths’ safety, well-being, educational progress, and successful completion of probation, and progress toward the new standards set by the Continuum of Care legislation regarding provision of core services; access to mental health care; accreditation, etc. Facility staff should maintain hands-on relationship with the youth’s Education Rights Holder and the youth’s school, and monitor attendance, grades, and behaviors.

3.1.7.10. Placements should provide a drug and alcohol free environment.

3.1.7.11. Integrate facility staff into program delivery and train them to be mentors for youth.

3.1.7.12. Provide structure for youth and access to opportunities to build skills for independence to prepare youth for transition to adulthood including work readiness training and exploration of transitional housing and independent living programs when available.

3.1.7.13. Provide aftercare services for youth that connect them to continued services structure/expectations, prosocial activities, and supportive relationships in the community.

3.1.7.14. Promote safety at placements through positive mechanisms (e.g., praise and reward positive behaviors) integrated into daily interactions and activities to facilitate an atmosphere for learning and recovery.

3.1.7.15. Respond to non-compliance in a proportionate, equitable and personalized way—de-escalation techniques should be used as a first response.
3.1.8. **Goal: Collect and report consistent and meaningful outcomes** on program impact and effectiveness on an annual basis (at minimum) to assess the impact of policies, practices, and programs.

3.1.8.1. Clearly define and consistently measure and report a list of clearly defined key outcomes (e.g., dashboard outcomes).

3.1.8.2. Establish a clear definition of recidivism and track recidivism whenever possible.

3.1.8.3. Regularly collect data within an agency-based information system that aligns with practice, supports case management, and is capable of real-time analysis.

3.1.8.4. Identify new technologies to facilitate an effective case management information system, real-time reports and dashboards, and interagency data-sharing.

3.1.8.5. Continuously assess effectiveness and improve practice based on a data-informed feedback loop that includes input from youth, families and community-based service providers.

3.1.8.6. Institute a comprehensive case review process of successful and challenging cases to augment the use of data dashboards and to ensure practice aligns with best practices generally.

3.1.8.7. Ensure opportunities for staff feedback in order to recognize and support effective case management strategies as well as identify areas for improvement and training.

3.1.8.8. Conduct full-scale evaluations of the various programs and services provided to Probation clients as part of the research, practice and policy feedback loop.

3.1.8.9. Collaborate with external researchers and evaluators to develop and implement a research agenda and generate a regular data reporting plan.

3.1.9. **Goal: Encourage transparency and accountability** from all partners engaged in delinquency prevention and rehabilitative intervention services for fiscal management, measuring outcomes related to their work, and implementing effective practices.

3.1.9.1. Give authority to the County based coordinating body to (see Goal 1) to monitor progress on the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan and hold County agencies (and other key partners as appropriate) accountable for implementing and adhering to the Strategic Plan.

3.1.9.2. Develop a clear, multisystem data linkage and sharing plan that would operate as a single, coordinated system—this should include agencies such as: DCFS; DPSS; DMH; DPH; DHS; Probation; LACOE; and school districts.

3.1.9.3. All community-based service providers who provide services to Probation children, youth, and families should be held accountable for the services they provide and the impact of those services on outcomes.

3.1.9.4. Annually produce a summary of all juvenile justice funds across stakeholders and how funds were expended to support the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan.

3.1.9.5. Annually produce a list of outcomes related to the Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan.
3.2. Proposed Referral Process for Accessing Services

3.2.1. The proposed referral process is intended to be interdisciplinary and strength-based, focusing on positive reporting within and across agencies serving a probation-involved youth and their families. It is not driven by compliance principles nor is it intended to be a vehicle for punishment. Importantly, it is intended to align Probation’s assessment and service provision procedures with best practices in the field; incorporate youth and family voice; create a transparent and accountable system; and most importantly, create an infrastructure to contribute positively to the well-being of youth, families, and communities.

3.2.2. Role and Responsibilities of CBO Service Providers: All service providers who receive referrals from Probation and provide services to Probation-involved youth as a result of those referrals must be an “Approved Provider,” regardless of whether the provider is paid by Probation for the services or not.

3.2.3. Approved Providers are Community Based Organizations (CBO) providers who:
- Can demonstrate experience and effectiveness in serving youth receiving prevention services (i.e., WIC 236) and Probation-involved youth at varying levels of risk;
- Can provide information on the population they are able to serve including (but not necessarily limited to): gender, race/ethnicity, age, risk level, areas/zip codes served;
- Can provide information on the specific services they provide, frequency of contact, and their competency levels related to:
  - Understanding of criminogenic risk and strengths-based programming;
  - Delivering services to (but not necessarily limited to) youth with trauma histories, developmental disabilities, deficiencies that affect learning and education, substance abuse, and mental illness, and LGBTQ identity; and, on-going training of staff.
- Engaging both the youth and family effectively by delivering culturally competent, gender appropriate, and inclusive programming with ongoing feedback from youth and families to assess and improve service delivery;
- Utilize evidence-based practices and/or programs or, if applicable, can demonstrate that programming is aligned with best practices;
- Utilize standardized or commonly used screening and assessment tools to match youth to appropriate treatments and/or develop treatment/programming plans;
- Agree to align CBO services with the Probation juvenile case plan; participate regularly in Probation trainings;
- Agree to regularly record and share core data elements (as defined by Probation) and designate staff responsible for data entry; and
- Agree to County non-discrimination policy and federal confidentiality agreement.

3.2.4. Once a provider meets the “Approved Provider” criteria and signs an agreement with the Department of Probation, they must:
- Meet with and coordinate programming for youth and their families with the DPOs and stakeholders in the community;
- Follow the case plan agreed to by the DPO, the youth and his/her family;
- Provide ongoing communication to the DPO if programming changes;
- Review background material received from probation;
- Enter data consistently and accurately (no missing data) into a designated database to determine fidelity of the program;
- Provide monthly reports to the DPO through the database; and
- Demonstrate evidence of effectiveness with the target population with outcomes by the end of the first year of services.
3.2.5. **Role and Responsibilities of Probation Administration**

- Identify and mandate the consistent use of effective screening and assessment and on an on-going basis to ensure youth are appropriately matched to services—this should be done both initially to develop appropriate case plans and monitor progress over time.
- Build tools for family assessment and identify “Approved Providers” that build on youth strengths and resiliency.
- Develop Memorandums of Agreement/Service Agreements with “Approved Providers” and create a web-based, searchable database in which they are entered.
- Require all service referrals to be generated from the inventory of “Approved Providers” — build the searchable database of “Approved Providers” in PCMS or connect the two databases so DPOs have easy access. To the extent possible, connection between relevant agency databases should occur.
- Provide technical assistance to CBOs on the provision of services to probation-involved youth, how to become an “Approved Provider” and compliance with data reporting requirements.
- Monitor provider compliance in providing data through clear and consistent quality assurance processes.
- Monitor and regularly evaluate DPO performance/compliance with responsibilities and provide ongoing training, feedback, and remedial measures. Produce a feedback loop with “Approved Providers” to support on-going improvement of services.
- Produce regular (e.g., quarterly) data reports to providers and DPOs to establish and support an on-going feedback loop to inform practice (e.g., next steps for success).
- Publicly disseminate regular data reports (i.e., annually) on the use and effectiveness of services.
- Utilize data produced on the fidelity and effectiveness of services to drive funding decisions—use funding to incentivize service providers to continuously improve their services.
- Facilitate and support service provider capacity to provide effective services over time by providing on-going training, oversight, feedback, and funding (when available).

3.2.6. **Role and Responsibilities of Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs)**

- Administer screening and assessment tools consistently and appropriately to determine the risks, needs, and strengths of a youth and his/her family initially to develop appropriate case plans and to monitor progress over time.
- Build and align youth plans based on the outcome of the screening and assessment tools and be aware of family dynamics, youth strengths, and needs.
- Make referrals based on the case plan goals and refer only to “Approved Providers.”
- Provide readily available background information as needed to providers and comply with confidentiality.
- Be an engaged partner with service providers in the delivery and monitoring of services—meet regularly with service providers and encourage local providers to become “Approved Providers.”
- Solicit feedback from youth and families to help improve and monitor service provision.
- Record updates on youth progress regularly and consistently into PCMS. (Figure 2 and 3 provides a system mockup demonstration that illustrates a case plan that tracks service referrals and progress updates).
- Reassess youth progress on regular intervals (e.g., every 6 months) to identify areas of success and continued challenges. Readjust youth case plan and services based on the reassessment.
4. **Culture of Care LA Model Recommendations (2017)**

*Note that Camp Kilpatrick was built as the LA Model and opened in July 2017, but then closed in November 2018 after being evacuated during the Woolsey Fire, and was partially reopened in January 2020.*

4.1. **ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE LA MODEL**

4.1.1. The following essential elements were defined by the stakeholders as the necessary foundation for evidence-based programming and skill-building activities. Within the therapeutic milieu:

4.1.1.1. Multi-disciplinary team planning occurs with collaboration across agencies and at all levels.

4.1.1.2. Programming is engaging and meaningful for youth and staff with a focus on skill-building, mental health, healing, and personal growth. It consistently and meaningfully includes families and community members as critical partners.

4.1.1.3. Families are engaged early and often, treated with respect, and seen as partners in the treatment and aftercare process.

4.1.1.4. Aftercare and reentry are the core drivers of case planning from the day of arrival, in order to build a continuum of care and to support stability when back in the community.

4.1.1.5. The small-group care model includes cohort consistency, a focus on relationships, homelike living spaces, and shared responsibility for daily activities, self-care and ordinary maintenance of shared spaces.

4.1.1.6. Safety, both psychological and physical, is a priority for staff and youth and is promoted through a variety of positive mechanisms integrated into daily interactions and activities.

4.1.1.7. Academic achievement and engagement are critical to each youth’s program, and input from education providers is a fundamental element of case and reentry planning.

4.1.1.8. Probation and all other staff are mentors and are consistently integrated into program delivery. Support for staff mental health and wellness is provided as an integral component of the LA Model.

4.1.1.9. Approach to programming is individualized, strength-based, and developmentally-appropriate, meeting youth where they are at in the process of change and focusing on empowerment, problem-solving, and the promotion of protective factors.

4.1.1.10. Data is continuously collected and analyzed in order to drive decision-making, guide case planning, support continuous improvement, and evaluate implementation and effectiveness of activities/programming.

4.1.2. In order for the LA Model to be successful:

4.1.2.1. The juvenile courts and stakeholders – including judges, District Attorneys, and Juvenile Defenders – must be trained on the LA Model and its goals in rehabilitating youth. These stakeholders should be invested in the model so that they can be held accountable for maintaining its mission once it has been formalized and implemented.
4.1.2.2. Prospective employees will have access to this document – as well as orientations and trainings – in order to have a baseline understanding of the LA Model and the expectations for staff.

4.1.2.3. Budgeting for programming will contemplate the long-term cost savings of effective intervention.

4.1.2.4. Community-based organizations and partnerships, which can often provide high quality services at a reduced cost, must be recognized and incorporated.

4.1.2.5. The Probation Chief, Superintendent of the Office of Education, Board of Supervisors, and other political stakeholders must endorse and advocate for the LA Model. The success of the model relies on ongoing public support.

4.1.2.6. As part of their continued involvement, experts and stakeholders from the subcommittees will provide consultation and feedback, including guidance in the selection and evaluation of providers.

4.2. Specific Recommendations to Implement and Support the Essential Elements of the LA Model: the following recommendations of the stakeholders are directed to the lead agency, the Los Angeles County Department of Probation, in coordination with all other service providers. Some recommendations are very specific and others are more general, reflecting both the time constraints of this process and the acknowledgement of the group that additional expertise in some domains is necessary. Where there was unresolved conflict, the source of disagreement is indicated.

4.2.1. Multi-disciplinary team planning occurs with collaboration across agencies and at all levels.

4.2.1.1. Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) drive case planning and are structured to facilitate collaboration across multiple agencies. In order for this to be successful, all staff across all agencies must be trained in the therapeutic model (including kitchen staff, maintenance, teachers, probation officers, etc.). This necessitates cross-training that recognizes there is no separation of staff roles in supporting program goals. All direct care providers will be trained to support the therapeutic and rehabilitative components of the model and are expected to actively participate in the program.

4.2.1.2. In order to successfully incorporate all programming elements in a holistic and integrated manner, staffing patterns and schedules will need to accommodate regular (weekly) multidisciplinary team meetings, and allow sufficient time for planning and debriefing activities.

4.2.2. Programming is engaging and meaningful for youth and staff with a focus on skill-building, mental health, healing, and personal growth. It consistently and meaningfully includes families and community members as critical partners.

4.2.2.1. Recommended programs include cognitive-behavioral therapy and evidence-based trauma-specific programs validated with justice-involved populations.

4.2.2.2. Programming builds on youth strengths and identifies opportunities and linkages in the community (i.e., program or employment opportunities at release) to support the youth’s self-identified strengths and goals while in the program and upon reentry.

4.2.2.3. Programming must include community-based organizations with direct contacts in the communities to which participating youth will return and support in aftercare.
4.2.4. Programming addresses family strengths, risks, and needs and identifies positive community supports for youth and family, including partners who will assist and support the youth and family in treatment or aftercare (i.e., friends, neighbors, extended family).

4.2.5. Providers assist with removing barriers to success: tickets and fines, normalizing immigration status, securing vital documents, etc. and have a continuous focus on reentry and aftercare.

4.2.3. Families are engaged early and often, treated with respect, and seen as partners in the treatment and aftercare process.

4.2.3.1. An expanded definition of family is necessary in order to identify and include the appropriate people who can support youth success. This group of supportive individuals may include nontraditional positive adult influences who are able to contact and visit the youth after being screened and approved.

4.2.3.2. Meaningful family engagement that provides robust support for the diverse needs of families within a trusting relationship is a key component of the LA Model. Resources and planning are necessary to facilitate this and the committee considered the possibility of a staff position dedicated to family engagement and support. Systems must be in place to protect confidentiality and to allow families to disclose information in order to seek support without negative consequences.

4.2.3.3. Research indicates that visitation is linked to youth success; therefore, visitation hours and days should be both flexible and substantial to reduce family barriers to visitation and create more meaningful opportunities for youth and family engagement.

4.2.3.4. Providing transportation for family visits and providing childcare at the facility for families with young children should be explored.

4.2.3.5. Family visits are oriented towards fostering positive connections or skill-building (for example, family visits could start with a skill-building session that relates to what the youth are learning in the program).

4.2.3.6. Visiting space is protected and private when necessary and creates a homelike and welcoming feel for families.

4.2.3.7. Families should be included in case planning and treatment and have a meaningful say in the goals and case plans; the role of families goes beyond mere visitation.

4.2.3.8. Family rights should be known and respected. Developing and circulating / posting a family bill of rights should be explored.

4.2.3.9. Family input into the LA Model should be ongoing and meaningful (for example, developing a family council to provide advisory oversight).

4.2.4. Aftercare and reentry are the core drivers of case planning from the day of arrival, in order to build a continuum of care and to support stability when back in the community.

4.2.4.1. Education and other programming should have a substantial aftercare component including formal pipelines to supportive school environments and jobs in the community.
4.2.4.2. Youth should have ample opportunities to prepare for transition, including adjustment to their living situation, enrollment in school, engagement in a job, and/or any other programs that are part of their case plan. Furloughs to prepare for that transition should be explored.

4.2.4.3. Aftercare and field probation staff must receive the same training, or training similar to that given to those working at the campus. This will allow them to deliver services designed to create consistency and shared expectations for the youth.

4.2.4.4. In order to sustain and foster positive relationships, probation officers at the campus should have a mechanism available to maintain contact with youth once they have returned to the community. Additionally, the field probation officer to be assigned to the youth once released should begin to develop a positive relationship with the youth while still at the campus, including in-reach interactions. This should be examined as an enhancement to the current protocol.

4.2.4.5. Coordinated systems for reentry and transition counselors from public agencies (Probation, Los Angeles County Office of Education, school districts, etc.) and community-based organizations should be used to assist each youth and to bring aftercare providers up to speed on the particular strengths and needs of each youth. In addition, creative opportunities for mentoring and reentry counseling should be explored.

4.2.5. A small-group model with cohort consistency, a focus on relationships, homelike living spaces, and shared responsibility for daily activities and ordinary maintenance of the space.

4.2.5.1. Youth live in a cohort of up to 12 peers and a consistent group of adults. Staffing schedules support this relationship building and consistency.

4.2.5.2. Concerns about the existing structure of the 56-hour probation staffing shift have been discussed by all committees but no resolution was reached.

4.2.5.3. Groups (composed of both youth and their direct care providers) will be kept together to the maximum extent possible in order to nurture the development of a positive group culture.

4.2.5.4. Further discussion is needed to refine the process by which young people are assigned to cohorts and the ways in which that limits or enhances their opportunities to interact in mixed groups for specific therapeutic or educational experiences.

4.2.5.5. Youth take ownership and pride over their living spaces; ordinary self-care chores (e.g., laundry) are assigned only if they encourage accountability in the shared space and support the development of life skills. Youth should never bear sole responsibility for institutional maintenance and tasks necessary to the satisfaction of basic needs such as janitorial services or routine food preparation.

4.2.5.6. Living spaces are operated (i.e., schedules, routines, clothing) to foster a homelike feel and allow youth sufficient privacy and autonomy while still achieving safety and other objectives of the LA Model. Youth should be given as much autonomy and choice as they can safely manage including a selection of bedding, clothing, and personal care products.

4.2.5.7. Youth and staff attire should be consistent with the homelike, therapeutic model.
4.2.5.7.1. The stakeholders were unable to reach consensus on specific recommendations for attire but all agreed that at a minimum, youth should have clothing that is “theirs” for the duration of their term and, if they choose, ample quantities of appropriate underwear may be provided to individual youth by their families.

4.2.5.7.2. The majority of stakeholders also agreed that staff clothing ought to communicate their participation in a culture of care (for example, sneakers in place of boots and school-branded sweatshirts in place of badged uniform shirts). In addition, most believed that school uniforms or a similar ‘professional’ dress option for youth should be explored, including options for clothing incentives linked to program engagement.

4.2.6. Safety, both psychological and physical, is a priority for staff and youth and is promoted through positive mechanisms during daily interactions and activities.

4.2.6.1. A behavior management protocol is used and supported by all staff. Positive incentives are clearly linked to youth desires for both immediate and long-term rewards (e.g., activities offered during free time, specialty food, clothing that indicates achievement or rank, early release, etc.) in order to facilitate participation; these incentives may change over time as youth desires evolve. Treatment engagement should also be included in youth’s movement through the program trajectory.

4.2.6.2. Promotion through the ranks of the program trajectory should be celebrated and positively reinforced. Movement through the stages may be contingent on an application and interview processes in which a youth must request promotion and support their application. This process should be designed to build choice, accountability, and agency.

4.2.6.3. The program trajectory may include youth recognition of their peers and staff in order to encourage shared accountability and allow youth to take ownership of the positive reinforcement system.

4.2.6.4. Sanctions should be proportionate, equitable, and personalized. They may include the loss of something the youth desires so it is essential that youth are provided with pleasurable activities and goods that can be revoked without impacting participation in essential elements of the program (for example, loss of the opportunity to join a movie night is permissible but loss of an opportunity to call home is not). However, sanctions alone are insufficient. Each incident must also be a learning opportunity for staff and trigger an informal behavior analysis: What is the insight in the behavior? What is the purpose of the behavior that is being sanctioned? When the purpose of the behavior is understood, youth can be supported to replace the destructive behavior with an alternative prosocial behavior that achieves the same purpose.

4.2.6.5. Safety should be achieved primarily through positive and trusting relationships where youth have a genuine belief that the adults on campus care for their safety and wellbeing. Additionally, youth should help hold each other accountable to create a safe environment.

4.2.6.6. A restorative justice approach should guide the management of conflict that occurs on campus.

4.2.6.7. De-escalation techniques must be graduated and start with the least restrictive technique (e.g., talking or allowing the youth to calm down on their own). The focus of every intervention is to manage the behavior and to understand the root cause rather than enforce compliance.

4.2.6.8. A special note on isolation: Given the mental, emotional and physical harm that isolation has been shown to cause on young people, a solitary or isolated holding unit may never be used to punish or
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discipline behavior. However, there should be safe and quiet spaces (e.g., a therapy room/office) where youth can calm down for a brief period of time (i.e., 15 minutes) when all other de-escalation techniques have been exhausted. Although youth may access this space voluntarily, use that is imposed should only be for the avoidance of imminent physical harm. Additionally, other practices like holding positions or use of force should be last resort interventions and ought to be followed by a debrief of staff involved to provide an opportunity for staff self-care and discussion of whether alternatives should have been attempted (or, if they were attempted, why they were unsuccessful). If use of a holding position is necessary, all efforts should be made to keep youth on their feet, to protect the physical safety of all involved. Pepper spray should never be used.

4.2.6.9. While questions still remain as to what practices should be followed for de-escalation of incidents, it is clear that there will be no measure that resembles punitive isolation. While situations may arise where kids need to be removed from their group, more discussion is needed to determine what to do in this situation. It was suggested that decisions around transfers or separation may only be made by an officer holding the title of at least Bureau Chief. It is important to note that the practice of isolation will not only be removed from this campus, but it will not be a practice used within the LA Model. Therefore a youth may not be sent to different facility to be placed in a Special Housing Unit or similar secured space.

4.2.7. Academic achievement and engagement are critical to each youth’s program and input from education providers is a fundamental element of case and reentry planning.

4.2.7.1. Los Angeles County Office of Education will provide education services for youth at the campus.

4.2.7.2. A rigorous and relevant education program is viewed as the locus of personal development for every young person on campus and is understood to be at the core of the rehabilitative program. Improved student outcomes at the Malibu Campus will be characterized by:

4.2.7.2.1. Measureable and significant academic progress (indicated by student growth measured by standardized and authentic assessment tools).

4.2.7.2.2. Transformation in student perceptions of self, with the confidence and desire to change their life trajectory through education and discovery of a passion and purpose.

4.2.7.2.3. Each student successfully i) enrolls in and attends an appropriate secondary education environment, ii) enters a post-secondary education program, or iii) begins or continues a career pathway upon release.

4.2.7.3. Intensive support for students as they transition back to the community by providing comprehensive and facilitated hand-offs to schools and service providers.

4.2.7.4. Community-based measures of success such as post-secondary enrollment and completion, job satisfaction, healthy personal relationships, and a reduction of encounters with the legal system.

4.2.7.5. Establishing a restorative and inclusive family relationship that actively participates in a nurturing academic community for themselves and the child.

4.2.7.6. The education program is rooted in social-emotional connections to content. Those specific and explicit connections permeate the campus through the LA County Office of Education’s Road to Success Academy (RTSA) themes that originate at the school but are shared with all staff and incorporated into all aspects of programming and interaction (for example, “courage” or “identity”).
4.2.7. The RTSA Model includes five key elements:

4.2.7.1. Core Education Program. This includes the core subjects required by the state, tiered intervention to allow students to make major educational improvements, and credit recovery courses. RTSA employs a positive behavior intervention system to encourage positive behavior that allows students to improve their educational scores. Teachers are able to come together to develop their curriculum in a professional learning community.

4.2.7.2. Thematic, Interdisciplinary, Project-Based Framework. The current themes being used are self-esteem/beauty, empowerment, hope, transformation, and new beginnings, which work together to support the social and emotional needs of students. At the end of each thematic unit, an exhibition will be held where students present to other students, staff, and the community, providing them the opportunity to gain leadership skills and have ownership over their learning. Every student will leave with a portfolio of their credits, workshops, and certificates.

4.2.7.3. Embedded Instructional Community Partnerships. There will be opportunity for community partners to serve as experts in order to enhance the curriculum.

4.2.7.4. Pathways to Higher Education. Curriculum is developed with the goal of college preparation in mind. Eligible students who are either enrolled in high school or have already graduated from high school are offered online college courses and career technical education. The goal is for each student to be ready for a job or higher education once they are back in their own community.

4.2.7.5. Instructional and Leadership Coaching. Administrators must be seen as leaders that guide the vision of the school. They will provide instructional guidance, classroom support, coaching, and professional development to teachers. The key to effectiveness of the RTSA model is strong leadership that fosters strong teachers.

4.2.7.8. Visual and performing arts of all kinds are integrated into academic learning time as well as out-of-class time via partnerships with artists and arts educators.

4.2.7.9. The five guiding principles released by the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education will inform the education program:

4.2.7.9.1. Safe, healthy, facility-wide climate that prioritizes education, provides conditions for learning, and encourages the necessary behavioral and social support services that address the individual needs of all youths, including those with disabilities and English learners.

4.2.7.9.2. Funding available to support educational opportunities for all youth, including those with disabilities and English learners, comparable to opportunities for peers who are not system-involved.

4.2.7.9.3. Recruitment, employment, and retention of qualified education staff with skills relevant in juvenile justice settings who can positively impact long-term student outcomes through demonstrated abilities to create and sustain effective teaching and learning environments.

4.2.7.9.4. Rigorous and relevant curricula aligned with state academic and career and technical education standards that utilize instructional methods, tools, materials, and practices that promote college and career readiness.

4.2.7.9.5. Formal processes and procedures – through statutes, memoranda of understanding, and practices – that ensure successful navigation across child-serving systems and smooth reentry into communities. In order for this to be successful in the new campus there must be extensive re-entry planning, engaging school districts, wrap-around support, collaboration, family involvement, and a soft handoff into the community.
4.2.7.10. Instructional time must be protected as a key component of the rehabilitative program; except in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., medical emergencies, court appearances, etc.) youth should not be removed from the classroom.

4.2.7.11. School staff will manage school discipline. School-based discipline matters should involve Probation intervention only when necessary to prevent immediate physical harm. When appropriate, parents and other family members or caregivers should be contacted and their involvement should be requested. Holders of education rights must be notified and given an opportunity to participate in accordance with state and federal law.

4.2.8. Probation and all other staff are mentors and are consistently integrated throughout programming. Support for staff mental health and wellness is seen as critical to the success of the LA Model.

4.2.8.1. Priority in recruiting and hiring should be given to staff members who embrace best practice and evidence-based approaches to working with youth and who consider themselves to be mentors and role models. Individual department leaders offered either explicit staffing plans or support for committee recommendations.

4.2.8.2. The committees recommend a probation supervision staff-youth ratio of 1:6 and a student-teacher ratio of 1:12. Leaders from the Departments have expressed support for this recommendation.

4.2.8.3. It was proposed that a portion of the staff demand be filled by “youth development workers” – a category of employee that does not currently exist in any department. No agreement was reached on this suggestion.

4.2.8.4. Education staffing requirements offered by the Los Angeles County Office of Education include one principal, one academic counselor, one transition counselor to follow the students for up to 90 days after reentry into community, ten teachers, two psychologists, one part-time speech and language pathologist, and one part-time school nurse.

4.2.8.5. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) offered a staffing expectation of one mental health clinical supervisor, five psychiatric social workers, and one intermediate typist clerk, and a program manager (shared with other facilities as appropriate). An on-call psychiatrist is available 24/7/365. DMH will also have access to telepsychiatry.

4.2.8.6. Health Services will require a nurse seven days a week for eight hours per day and a doctor once a week. The campus will have access to telemedicine, which will make it possible for youth to be seen 24/7 by a physician assisted by probation staff and technology. An on-call nurse and doctor will be available to the camp 24/7/365.

4.2.8.7. A selection trajectory for site-based leadership and associated materials are currently in draft format awaiting revision and final approval by the Departments. Probation and LACOE have committed to onboarding site leaders six to 12 months before the campus opens in order to allow those leaders the opportunity to engage in the planning process (see Appendix C for a summary of the proposed process).

4.2.8.8. The selection of leaders should include representatives from County agencies and stakeholder groups. The subcommittees propose a six-person panel composed of two representatives from
the hiring agency, two representatives from other County agencies, and two representatives of stakeholder groups. These individuals have not yet been identified.

4.2.8.9. All staff (probation, administration, education, janitorial, etc.) must be trained in and committed to adopting a trauma-informed, positive, youth-centered approach. Staff should use collaborative learning, problem-solving, and supportive relationship building approaches. These practices ought to extend to staff’s work with each other and with youth. The ultimate goal is a staff that leads by example with acceptance, patience, integrity, and professionalism.

4.2.8.10. An effective and holistic plan for initial and ongoing training must be in place. No decision was reached about specific trainings or programs but potential ongoing, collaborative, cross-staff trainings include secondary trauma, positive behavior intervention, transformative justice, and trauma-informed care.

4.2.8.11. Other potential trainings explored include:

- Integrative Behavioral Therapy
- Mental Health
- Small Group Treatment Model
- Positive Youth Development
- Aggression Replacement Training
- Adapted-Dialectal Behavior Therapy
- Cognitive Behavior Therapy
- NCTSN (National Child Traumatic Stress Network) Think Trauma
- TARGET by Advanced Trauma Solutions
- Sanctuary Model
- Seeking Safety
- Missouri Approach

4.2.8.12. Trainings for all site staff should be collaborative and coordinated. An initial framework for integrated trainings was developed by a workgroup of members of the subcommittees from County agencies (attached as Appendix D).

4.2.8.13. Staffing schedules need to prioritize an individual direct care provider’s ability to work closely with a small group of youth in implementing the therapeutic program so they can build relationships and promote the program goals.

4.2.8.14. Staff mental health and wellness must be prioritized in policy and practice for the program to be effectively implemented, including addressing staff vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress. These issues should be addressed in team meetings and staff should be given time to debrief following incidents with (or disclosures from) youth. Staff must have sufficient backup and support to allow for de-escalation and processing of issues (for themselves and with youth).

4.2.8.15. Probation officers must be equipped with the skills to be mentors and build rapport with youth. These skills include recognizing that change is a process, relapse occurs, how to meet youth where they are, and how to ground oneself in the face of youth aggression. Supervisors and staff of each cohort/cottage are expected to model and encourage grooming skills, life skills, and interpersonal skills.
4.2.9. **Approach to programming is individualized, strength-based, and developmentally-appropriate, meeting youth where they are at** in the process of change and focusing on empowerment, problem-solving, and the promotion of protective factors.

4.2.9.1. Individualized support for youth is fostered by creating an individual plan for each youth’s success and reentry, and identifying and problem-solving potential challenges (i.e., relapse prevention and safety planning). This will include multi-disciplinary team planning that continuously addresses youth education, skill-building, mental health, and health needs with input from the youth.

4.2.9.2. An individualized approach maximizes autonomy and choice. It also means that the case plan must meet the youth where they are at in terms of development, risk level, and readiness to change.

4.2.9.3. Being strength-based means that staff do not give up on youth in the face of challenges. An individual cannot “fail” the program. If youth are struggling in the program it is the responsibility of the Multidisciplinary team (MDT) to create a revision/response that meets the needs of the individual youth.

4.2.10. **Data is continuously collected and analyzed** in order to drive decision-making, guide case planning, support continuous improvement and evaluate implementation and effectiveness of activities/programming.

4.2.10.1. Standardized, evidence-based screening and assessments should be used. Outcomes of screening and assessment should be clearly linked to the youth’s case plan. Existing tools (e.g., Los Angeles Risk & Resiliency Check-up, or LARRC) should be evaluated and, if appropriate, replaced with tools that better meet the goal of providing meaningful information to support case planning.

4.2.10.2. Achieving case plan goals or making positive movement towards these goals are markers of success and must be measured and recorded appropriately in youth case files.

4.2.10.3. Consistent challenges and setbacks in moving through case plan goals indicate a need for a re-assessment and potentially a revision of the case plan.

4.2.10.4. Data is used to identify trends in implementation and outcomes. Data should be aggregated to understand trends in implementing the LA Model so course corrections can be made. Data should be collected on a broad range of potential outcomes including family engagement, academic success, safety, and more.

4.2.10.5. A core set of “dashboard” measures, based on available data collected by participating agencies and agreed upon by all partners, should be in place to guide cross-departmental and public-private planning for the new facility and for the LA Model. Dashboard measures and other outcome measures should be made publicly available to ensure accountability and community engagement.

4.2.10.6. A data collecting system, through which all departments and service providers may access youth data, should be explored. This system needs to be open enough for all those working with the youth to access information necessary to providing services, but must also maintain confidentiality.
5. PRIT Reform Plan Summary (August 2019) – Select Excerpts

5.1. Challenges identified as most pressing:

5.1.1. Juvenile Facilities: One of the most egregious problems facing Probation is its juvenile facilities. This includes poor physical conditions, inadequacy of staffing and training, and lack of sufficient structured time and meaningful activities for youth. Excessive use of force has ranged from room confinement and chemical spraying of youth, to sexual and physical abuse of minors resulting in criminal charges. The unavailability of meaningful grievance processes, the need for greater partnerships with community-based service providers to serve youth while in halls and camps, and the absence of validated assessment tools and inadequate data collection reflect the breadth of obstacles to rehabilitation in the juvenile justice system.

5.1.2. Community-based Services: Despite the fact that Probation has numerous contracts with community-based service providers, there is a lack of a robust continuum of community services for both youth and adults on probation, and no structured system for Probation officers to access services for their clients.

5.1.3. Bureaucratic and Administrative Inefficiencies: While any large agency will face its fair share of bureaucratic challenges, the sheer size of Probation as well as its specific bureaucratic malaise, significantly impede its ability to function at an optimal level. Probation suffers from a slow and cumbersome procurement process, extremely long and arduous hiring process, and existing labor agreements which do not allow for the effective use of staff.

5.1.4. Lack of Strategic Uses of Data and Information Technologies: Probation also faces significant challenges related to its data, research and evaluation systems; an important quality of any efficiently managed agency to hold it accountable to its mission and goals.

5.1.5. Organizational Culture: By far, the greatest challenge of Probation is its negative organizational culture, including the pervasive “us versus them” mentality and a deficit and punitive based approach that emphasizes corrections rather than rehabilitation and trauma informed strategies.

5.2. The Recommended Solutions

5.2.1. Culture Change: The Probation Department must engage in a major, intentional, organization-wide culture change initiative that includes the following actions:

- Adopt a new mission and vision statement that is widely distributed and posted throughout the organization. The statement should communicate the fact that Probation is moving away from a punitive, deficit-based system into one that is a positive, supportive, and developmental in its approach.
- Train all staff on positive client development, trauma-informed care, and the ineffectiveness of punitive approaches.
- Engage in consistent open and transparent communication regarding what policies, practices, and procedures are being changed and why the changes are being implemented.
- Establish a performance evaluation and accountability structure that holds staff accountable for adhering to the new positive and developmental approach.
- Acknowledge, reward, recognize, and promote staff who exemplifies the new positive and developmental approach.
5.2.2. Reduce and Eliminate Juvenile Facilities
(i) Remove the Juvenile Services Division from the jurisdiction of the Probation Department, thereby separating youth and adult probation services in L.A. County
(ii) Fund or build smaller home-like community-based detention housing alternatives to end youth incarceration in Los Angeles County by 2025:

We recommend that the Board:
a. Direct Probation to immediately stop housing youth with different levels of risk and needs together and to produce the assessment of detained youth described in Section B (Solutions) and sub-section 5 (Data-Driven Decision-Making) of this report within 30 days, and;
b. Authorize the Work Group described in recommendation (iii) below to assess whether the Community Detention Program is useful anymore, as too many bench officers undermine this program by using it as a form of threat, rather than for increased and meaningful supervision and;
c. Authorize the Work Group in recommendation (iii) below to draft a strategy by December 2019, for L.A. County to develop and/or build smaller home-like, community-based housing alternatives in communities where high percentages of probation youth and their families reside;
d. Shut down Central Juvenile Hall by July 2020. The County should redirect all justice-involved youth to more humane temporary facilities, and rather than spending millions to “improve juvenile hall,” should use public resources to fund alternative community-based, home-like facilities as described above;
e. Authorize that as many youth as possible coming into contact with the justice system, between July 2020 and Jan. 1, 2025, be directed to diversion programs, alternative to detention programs, and to newly developed community-based housing alternatives, including secure, non-institutional settings, in cases where they are a harm to others or themselves. This would follow the outcomes demonstrated in national research, to keep youth closest to their families, where family engagement works best, and where youth have a more successful outcome in reentry, and;
f. Finally, as alternatives to detention are fully in place across L.A. County, we recommend shutting down all juvenile camps by January 1, 2025.

5.2.3. Expand and Improve Community Services
(i) Expand the initiative to disburse grants to community-based organizations via the public/private partnerships with foundations that support both capacity building and services. The current investment, an important initial effort, still only represents 1% of Probation’s budget
(ii) Using a variety of Probation funds, including: JJCPA, YOBG, Title IV-E Waiver, AB 109, SB 678, and General Fund dollars saved through Probation downsizing, prioritize the expansion and improvement of services in: Education, Employment, Mentoring/Life Coaching, Housing, Drug Treatment, and Mental Health.
(iii) Redefine the job of both juvenile and adult probation officers in the field so that their main duties and responsibilities are to work with the youth or adults on their case load and their families to identify their greatest needs and strengths, and to develop life plans to connect clients to services, supports, and opportunities; and
(iv) Identify neighborhoods where large numbers of Probation clients live, and in partnership with those communities, establish offices and other operations in these areas. This may include renovating existing field offices to create community-oriented offices that are welcoming and supportive environments and co-location with other government agencies and community-based organizations. The recently opened “DOORS” Re-entry Opportunity Center, by the Probation Department’s Adult Services Division in the Exposition Park area of South Los Angeles is a major step forward that should be replicated across the County.
(v) Leadership and staff should create community stakeholder groups or advisory panels to inform community members of Probation’s work and learn from neighbors what challenges and
opportunities exist in their home communities. In the example above involving the new re-entry opportunity center in Exposition Park, an important next step would be to establish a meaningful advisory board for that office that allows the co-located County and non-profit providers to collaborate with community members on further innovations and system changes.

5.2.4. **Accountability Mechanisms**  
(i) The main three accountability measures that should be prioritized are as follows:  
   a. Implement the external, civilian Probation Oversight Commission (POC) and a Probation Division within the Office of Inspector General detailed in a complementary report by the PRIT;  
   b. Establish a performance evaluation system as outlined in the Culture Change section above; and  
   c. Establish a new data-driven performance management process, detailed below.

---


6.1. **Goal:** Provide children and families with the upfront supports and services they need to prevent them from entering the child welfare system and/or limit their involvement with the system once they are known to it.

   6.1.1. **Ensure that families are provided with an array of upfront supports** within their own communities to minimize their chances of entering the child welfare system and maximize their chances of living healthy and stable lives.  
   6.1.1.1. Work with First 5 LA, County departments, community partners, stakeholders, and others to develop and implement the first phase of a prevention plan that expands the infrastructure created by the Prevention and Aftercare Networks, builds on existing services and resources for families, documents gaps in community resources, and works with community partners to increase support for children and families where needed.  
   6.1.1.2. Work with DPSS, County departments, First 5 LA, community partners, and other entities to identify at-risk families and provide them with the supports they need to prevent them from entering the child welfare system.

6.1.2. **Create a structure that promotes good communication and coordination** of services across entities assisting children and families once they become known to the child protection system.

6.2. **Goal:** Minimize, if not eliminate, the risk that a child known to one or more entities in our system will be harmed.

   6.2.1. **Early Action**—Ensure that immediate attention is given to the most vulnerable children once they come into contact with the County.  
   6.2.1.1. Assist County Counsel with reviewing the last five years of reports prepared by DCFS for County Counsel related to critical incidents/fatalities and recommendations to improve the County’s child welfare system.  
   6.2.1.2. Work with DCFS, the Sheriff, stakeholders, and others to ensure that effective risk assessment tools/processes are in place.  
   6.2.1.3. Work with County departments and others to determine how best to connect highly vulnerable families to comprehensive services and mitigate their risk of harm.  
   6.2.1.4. Evaluate the current use of public health nurses (PHNs) in child welfare and explore an expanded role to make the best use of their expertise.

6.2.2. **Electronic Information-Sharing**—Ensure that legally permissible information that is relevant to child safety is shared electronically by those who need it.
6.3. Goal: No child leaves the system without a permanent family or a responsible caring adult in his or her life.

6.3.1. **Reunification, Recruitment, and Retention**—Enhance the current efforts of DCFS, Probation, community partners, philanthropy, and others to provide services for parents seeking reunification, work with partners to increase the number of relative placements and other resource families, and expand supports for all caregivers (e.g., assistance with visitation, access to child care).

6.3.2. **Connections to Caring Adults**—Make sure that every DCFS and Probation youth has the opportunity to be connected with a responsible caring adult.

6.3.2.1. Work with County departments, community partners, and others to establish a network of caring adults by expanding existing programs and/or creating new ones, and supporting healthy, organic relationships.

6.4. Goal: Ensure that system-involved youth achieve the physical, emotional, and social health needed to be successful.

6.4.1. **Youth Empowerment**—Youth have an active voice in making key decisions about their own lives.

6.4.1.1. Support DCFS, Probation, DMH, and CSS in implementing the shared Core Practice Model Countywide that will allow youth to play a central role in their case-planning process, and ensure that supports are based on their needs, not their placement.

6.4.1.2. Work with California Youth Connection and other entities representing and working with youth to ensure that their voices are heard throughout all stages of their system involvement.

6.4.2. **Education, Employment, and Housing**—Champion collaboration among major stakeholders to raise the educational achievement of system-involved youth, expand their job opportunities, and ensure that youth who transition out of care have a stable place to live.

6.4.2.1. Implement the Education Coordinating Council’s (ECC’s) recently updated strategic plan that focuses on improving the educational achievement of DCFS and Probation youth.

6.4.2.2. Work with CSS, DHR, Parks & Recreation, DCFS, Probation, community partners, philanthropy, and others to develop a Countywide plan to increase job readiness and employment opportunities in viable career paths for eligible system-involved youth.

6.4.2.3. Work with DCFS, Probation, DMH, DPH, LAHSA, community partners, philanthropy, and others to ensure that transition-age youth are connected to stable housing.

6.4.3. **Health Care**—Provide system-involved youth with good health and mental health care that targets their individual needs.

6.4.3.1. Work with the Health Agency and others to coordinate health care for DCFS and Probation youth that includes regular physical, dental, and eye exams; developmental screenings; needed mental health evaluations; substance abuse services; pregnancy prevention; services related to expectant and parenting youth; recommended treatment; and follow-up care.

6.4.3.2. Work with County departments, First 5 LA, stakeholders, philanthropy, and other partners to create a trauma-informed system that effectively assesses and treats trauma for system-involved youth.

6.4.3.3. Work with partners, the Juvenile Court, and providers of care to develop and implement an improved plan for regulating psychotropic medication practices which ensures that system-involved children are properly assessed by qualified prescribers, that alternative treatments are considered as a first option, and, when children do receive these medications, that they are not
inappropriately medicated, that they are properly monitored, and that medications are administered in conjunction with other therapeutic interventions.

6.4.3.4. Work with the CIO, CEO, ISD, DCFS, DMH, DPH, Probation, the Juvenile Court, and others as needed to develop a web-based system for electronically processing Psychotropic Medication Authorizations (ePMA), and generating reports to facilitate the monitoring and quality management of psychotropic medication usage by system-involved youth.

6.4.3.5. Work with the various agencies to ensure that accurate, timely, and complete information is maintained in the Health and Education Passport, and that youth can access this information once they exit care.

6.5. Goal: Rethink the structures, programs, and processes that affect multiple entities to continually take advantage of new thinking and learning that meaningfully improve our child protection system.

6.5.1. Broad Partnerships—Address priority issues facing children and families by establishing partnerships across multiple sectors that offer fresh perspectives and solutions.

6.5.1.1. Establish a structure for bringing together the key partners in child protection to communicate and brainstorm solutions to difficult problems through the creation of one or more collaborative bodies.

6.5.1.2. Partner with the philanthropic community through the Center for Strategic Public-Private Partnerships to develop a Shared Agenda for joint public-private initiatives that benefit children and families, and leverage public-private resources that support these initiatives.

6.5.2. Eliminating Barriers—Break down barriers that affect line staff’s ability to deliver optimal services.

6.5.3. Innovation—Research cutting-edge, proven practices in child welfare, both nationally/internationally, and determine which could be successfully implemented in or adapted for Los Angeles County.

6.5.4. Resource Acquisition—Secure the needed resources to successfully implement this plan.

6.5.5. Cross-Training—Promote cross-training efforts across organizations, disciplines, and sectors that affect the welfare of children.

6.5.6. Continuous Evaluation—Regularly track and monitor child protection outcomes and use the results to drive County policy and practice change.

7. A Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County (2017)

*Note that the first cohort of law enforcement and service provider partners was launched at 9 sites in 2019.

7.1. CCJCC Youth Diversion Subcommittee Recommendations

7.1.1. Los Angeles County should establish a central office responsible for providing countywide coordination and contracting for community-based youth diversion services.

7.1.2. The central office should implement the County’s youth diversion initiative in a phased approach that builds on existing capacity, addresses infrastructure needs, and allows for continued growth.
7.1.3. The central office should facilitate and support local partnerships between law enforcement agencies and community-based providers to implement diversion programs aligned with the County’s standards.

7.1.3.1. Law enforcement agencies should be the primary source of referrals to community-based diversion providers and should work closely with partnering organizations and the central office to develop program protocols and requirements.

7.1.3.2. In collaboration with partnering organizations and the central office, law enforcement agencies should develop eligibility guidelines that can help determine when a youth may be counseled and released or referred to diversion in lieu of further justice system involvement.

7.1.3.3. Community-based diversion partners should conduct a strengths-based assessment of the youth’s risks, needs, and interests during intake to inform the level of intervention and requirements for successful completion, consistent with established program guidelines.

7.1.3.4. Community-based diversion providers should develop program plans that offer a variety of activities and services that promote youth development and utilize effective interventions for youth who come into contact with the justice system.

7.1.3.5. Diversion partners should communicate regularly to inform program improvement and share information – guided by established agreements – regarding diversion referrals, participation status, and program completion, consistent with all applicable confidentiality protections and the best interests of participating youth, families, and public safety.

7.1.4. The central office should assess key indicators on an ongoing basis at both the program and County levels to monitor progress and inform adjustments.

7.1.4.1. Program evaluation efforts should incorporate formative, process, and outcome assessment efforts to make sure programs are effective.

7.1.4.2. Countywide progress in building capacity; advancing equity; and reducing the number of youth arrests, referrals to probation, and petitions filed should be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure the County is reaching its goals.

7.2. CEO Recommendations

7.2.1. The County should establish an Office of Youth Diversion and Development (OYDD) within the Office of Diversion and Reentry to oversee and manage the implementation of youth diversion countywide.

7.2.1.1. OYDD should implement a phased adoption of the recommended core components of effective diversion programs.

7.2.1.2. OYDD should develop and maintain a web-based diversion referral system.

7.2.1.3. OYDD should provide training and technical assistance to diversion partners.

7.2.1.4. OYDD should coordinate the evaluation of countywide progress.

7.2.2. OYDD should leverage County and external funding opportunities.

7.2.3. OYDD should provide annual reports of progress and future work.

7.2.4. OYDD should create a permanent Youth Diversion and Development Steering Committee, including representation by youth and families impacted by the system.
Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Los Angeles County Youth Justice System (2018)

According to Department of Justice (DOJ) data, in 2018, youth of color bore the brunt of justice system involvement at every decision-making point in the justice system in Los Angeles County\(^1\). In other words, the relative likelihood of justice system involvement for youth of color increases at each stage of the youth justice system, accumulating most at the point of institutional placement/EM (Post Disposition Electronic Monitoring)\(^2\).

**Cumulative Disparities for Black Youth (2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Times More Likely than White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to probation</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition filed</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securely detained</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardship</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional placement/EM</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative Disparities for Latino Youth (2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Times More Likely than White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to probation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition filed</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securely detained</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardship</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional placement/EM</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to White youth in the Los Angeles County youth population (ages 10-17), Black youth are:
- \(6.5\) times more likely to be arrested;
- \(14.6\) times more likely to be referred to probation;
- \(19.8\) times more likely to have a petition filed in juvenile court;
- \(22\) times more likely to be securely detained pre-adjudication;
- \(22.2\) times more likely to be declared a “ward” of the court;
- \(26.5\) times more likely to be placed in an institutional placement/EM.

Compared to White youth in the Los Angeles County youth population (ages 10-17), Latino youth are:
- \(1.8\) times more likely to be arrested;
- \(3.4\) times more likely to be referred to probation;
- \(4.3\) times more likely to have a petition filed in juvenile court;
- \(3.7\) times more likely to be securely detained pre-adjudication;
- \(4.6\) times more likely to be declared a “ward” of the court;
- \(4.9\) times more likely to be placed in an institutional placement/EM.

---

\(^1\) Data in this factsheet were retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). The JCPSS database is designed to collect, compile and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCPSS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOJ by County Probation agencies. See https://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/databases.

\(^2\) The California Department of Justice (DOJ) does not have a way to extract youth placed on EM from youth committed to county facilities in their data system. Therefore, this category can refer to youth who are made wards of the court and are on ankle monitors or placed in institutions.
Trends in Youth Justice Decision Making

Youth Justice Trends (2003-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>Referrals to Probation</th>
<th>Secure Detention</th>
<th>Petitions Filed</th>
<th>Formal &quot;Wardship&quot; Probation</th>
<th>Home on Probation</th>
<th>Institutional Placement/EM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>53,830</td>
<td>27,719</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>15,223</td>
<td>13,142</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>6,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>54,047</td>
<td>27,464</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>16,322</td>
<td>14,191</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>6,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56,286</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>9,356</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>16,182</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>8,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>60,699</td>
<td>32,437</td>
<td>8,627</td>
<td>17,947</td>
<td>15,407</td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>7,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>61,592</td>
<td>33,345</td>
<td>8,474</td>
<td>18,356</td>
<td>15,549</td>
<td>8,298</td>
<td>7,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56,615</td>
<td>32,461</td>
<td>8,693</td>
<td>18,012</td>
<td>15,218</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>49,182</td>
<td>25,040</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>16,364</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>7,318</td>
<td>6,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>43,599</td>
<td>23,490</td>
<td>5,939</td>
<td>14,518</td>
<td>12,676</td>
<td>6,553</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33,538</td>
<td>22,869</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>14,098</td>
<td>12,236</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25,581</td>
<td>20,783</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>13,904</td>
<td>12,168</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>5,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20,076</td>
<td>18,777</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>12,684</td>
<td>11,303</td>
<td>5,781</td>
<td>5,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17,279</td>
<td>15,793</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>10,354</td>
<td>9,474</td>
<td>4,876</td>
<td>4,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13,217</td>
<td>12,721</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>3,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11,399</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>6,917</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9,788</td>
<td>10,569</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>9,188</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>5,542</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% reduction from peak (2007) to 2018

-87%  -72%  -61%  -66%  -64%  -65%  -64%
Trends in Racial and Ethnic Disparities:
As Justice System Involvement Decreases, Disparities Increase

The rate at which youth are referred to probation has decreased across demographics from its peak in 2007.

- For White youth, the rate of referral decreased by 79% (from 12.7 per 1000 in 2007 to 2.7 per 1000 in 2018).
- For Black youth, the rate of referral decreased by 47% (from 72.8 per 1000 in 2008 to 38.9 per 1000 in 2018).
- For Latino youth, the rate of referral decreased by 69% (from 29.5 per 1000 in 2007 to 9.0 per 1000 in 2018).

Probation referrals for White youth decreased more significantly than referrals for Black youth resulting in an increase in the disparity gap or relative likelihood of probation referral for Black youth compared to White youth.

- For every 1 white youth referred to probation in 2007, there were 6.1 Black youth referred;
- For every 1 white youth referred to probation in 2018, there were 14.6 Black youth referred;

Probation referrals for White youth decreased more significantly than referrals for Latino youth resulting in an increase in the disparity gap or relative likelihood of probation referral for Latino youth compared to White youth.

- For every 1 white youth referred to probation in 2008, there were 2.4 Black youth referred;
- For every 1 white youth referred to probation in 2018, there were 3.4 Latino youth referred;

---

**Rate of Referral to Probation**
(Per 1,000 youth in population)

---

**Disparity in Referral to Probation:**
Black Youth

---

**Disparity in Referral to Probation:**
Latino Youth
Most Serious Offenses Referred to Probation and Sustained in Court (2018)

6209 cases (68% of cases referred) are petitioned in Court.
- 72% of cases petitioned were for alleged status; misdemeanor or non-violent felony offense.
- 28% of cases petitioned were for alleged “violent felony” offenses.

5,542 cases (89% of cases petitioned) result in a youth declared a “ward” of the Court.
- 75% of cases resulting in wardship were sustained as status; misdemeanor and non-violent felony offenses.
- 25% of cases were sustained as “violent felony” offenses.

2,612 cases (47% of cases with a sustained petition) result in a youth sent to an institutional placement/EM.
- 74% of cases resulting in institutional placement/EM had a sustained status; misdemeanor or non-violent felony offense
- 26% had a sustained

9188 Cases Referred to Probation.
- 75% of referrals were for alleged sustained status; misdemeanor or non-violent felony offenses.
- 25% of referrals were alleged “violent” felony offenses.

2979 cases (32% of cases referred) are closed at intake or Informal Probation (WIC 654).
- 80% of cases closed at intake were alleged sustained status; misdemeanor or non-violent felony offenses.
- 20% of cases were alleged “violent felony” offenses.

2,930 cases (53% of cases with a sustained petition) result in a young person being sent home on probation.
- 75% of cases resulting in being sent home on probation had a sustained status; misdemeanor and non-violent felony offense.
- 25% had a sustained “violent” felony offense.
“Violent Felony” Offenses ➔ A Focus on Assault

As noted above, 25% of cases referred to probation in 2018 were for “violent” felony offenses. The Department of Justice designates six (6) offenses as “Serious Violent” felony offenses. These offenses include assault, homicide, forcible rape, kidnapping, non-vehicular manslaughter, and robbery. Within each of these offenses there are numerous penal code sections—within the DOJ database, we cannot break down offenses into specific penal code sections. Below, we’ve included a schematic of one offense designated as a violent felony, assault.

**Referrals to Probation for Assault**
- **687 youth**
  - Closed at Intake: 223 youth (33%)
  - Sustained as Assault: 287 youth (42%)
  - Sustained as other offense: 186 youth (27%)
  - Detained Pre-Adjudication: 365 youth (39%)

For youth referred and sustained for a felony assault, what were the court ordered dispositions?
- Home on Wardship Probation (126)
- Private Placement (77)
- Secure County Facility / EM (33)
- Non-wardship Probation (20)

For cases not closed at intake or sustained as assault, what was the most serious offense sustained in court?
- Assault and Battery (M) (135 youth)
- Vandalism (F) (12 youth)
- Weapons (F) (12 youth)
- Disturbing the Peace (M) (8 youth)
- All other (19 youth)

**What Offenses are included in “Assaults”**

Penal Code (PC) Sections: 69*, 71, 76(a)*, 95.1, 139(a), 140(a)*, 146(b), 148(b)*, 148(c), 148(d)*, 148(d)(1), 148.1(a), 148.1(b), 148.3(c), 148.1(d), 148.3(b), 148.4(b)(1), 148.4(b)(2), 148.10(a)*, 149*, 151(a)(2), 186.26(a), 186.26(c), 203, 205, 206, 217.1(a), 217.1(b), 218, 218.1*, 219, 219.1, 219.2*, 220, 222, 224.1, 241.4, 241.7, 242*, 243(c)(1)*, 243(c)(2)*, 243(d), 243.1, 243.3*, 243.6*, 243.7, 243.9(a)*, 244, 244.5(b)*, 244.5(c)*, 245(a)(1)*, 245(a)(2)*, 245(a)(3), 245(a)(4)*, 245(b), 245(c), 245(d)(1), 245(d)(2), 245(d)(3), 245.2, 245.3, 245.5(a), 245.5(b), 245.5(c), 246*, 246.3(a)*, 247(a), 247(b), 247.5*, 273(a)*, 273ab(b), 273d(a), 273.5(a)*, 273.5b(1)*, 273.5f(2)*, 273.5g(2)*, 273.5h(2)*, 273.5i(2)*, 347(a)(1), 347(b), 347(b)(1)*, 375(a)*, 375(d), 401, 405a, 417(b)*, 417(c)*, 417.3, 417.6(a), 417.8, 422(a)*, 422.7(a), 588a*, 601(a)(1), 601(a)(2), 625c, 664/187(a), 664/192(a), 176.8(b) WI, 1768.85(a) WI*, 1808.4(d) VC, 4131.5, 4500, 4501.1(a), 4501.5, 4502, 11413(a), 11418(a)(1), 11418(a)(2), 11418(b)(1), 11418(b)(2), 11418(b)(3), 11418(b)(4), 11418(c), 11418(d)(1), 11418(d)(2), 11418.1*, 11418.5(a)*, 11419(a)*, 12308, 12309, 15656(a) WI, 18715(a)(1), 18715(a)(2), 18715(a)(3), 18715(a)(5), 18725(a), 18725(b), 18725(c), 18740, 18755(b), 20110(a), 20110(b), 21464(c) VC, 23110(b) VC, 38318(b) VC, 38318.5(b) VC

*Can be charged as misdemeanor or felony.
OUR COMMITMENT to make LA COUNTY BETTER for YOUNG PEOPLE

STAY PASSIONATE . . . . . . . . . . NEVER STOP

Subcommittee #1:
Youth Development and Diversion
April 23, 2020
Subcommittee #1 Agenda for April 23, 2020

• Introductions
• Share-out from small team meetings
• Review data and resources to inform recommendations
• Example of ATI continuum of care model
• Open Discussion on what should be gone in a new model? What should be transformed / expanded? What should be new?
• Review areas for teams to dive deeper and generate recommendations
• Closing and next steps
“I see green spaces. We are living in homes that are big enough. Our fridges are full enough. I see elders sitting on their porches, and they're making sure our children are getting to school safe. They are making sure we are holding ourselves with dignity and power. They are protecting us. I’m seeing people speechless because they have hurt someone and they have to answer the call to justice and recognize that not knowing better is a knowing best left behind. We learn so we do better. I hear communities of artists congregating in an elder’s home and playing beautifully, more in harmony today than the day before. We are growing. We know better so we do better. I see lovers holding hands, fathers napping with their babies, and hip hop blasting underneath an arc of water as grown folk and youth walk in and between the crescent coming from the hose perched on a tree branch. Of course it’s summer.”

Huge thanks to Alejandro for sharing his beautiful vision from our creative planning activity. Please share the rest of your “day in the life of a young person in our new model” visions with us so we can collect them and continue to be inspired and guided by them as we move forward!
Youth Justice Flow: Los Angeles County (2018)

980,640 young people (ages 10-17) in Los Angeles County in 2018
8,133 youth arrests reported in 2018*
9,188 youth referrals to probation reported in 2018
6,209 petitions filed in juvenile court 2018
5,542 youth declared a “ward of the court” in 2018
3,321 pre-adjudication detentions in 2018
2,612 institutional placements/EM***
2,930 home on probation

688 (6.9% of arrests) handled in house**
2,979 (32% of probation referrals) closed at intake / placed on informal probation (WIC 654)
667 (11% of cases petitioned) placed on informal probation (WIC 654.2) or non-wardship probation (WIC 725a)

* The number of referrals to Probation is greater than the number of arrests in 2018. Youth can be referred to probation by law enforcement agencies within the county as well as schools, individual, other county agencies, and law enforcement from other counties.

** According to California DOI, youth who are “handled in house” are either (1) arrested by the arresting agency and the youth is released to his or her parent, guardian or the street with no warning, or (2) placed on a local diversion program. In Los Angeles County, the number of youth diverted or handled informally at a house is increasingly higher than what is reported by DOI.

*** The California Department of Justice (DOI) does not have a way to extract youth placed on EM from youth committed to county facilities in their data system. Therefore, this category can refer to youth who are made wards of the court and are on ankle monitors or placed in institutions.

Source: Data was retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOI). DOI collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPS). The JCPS database is designed to collect, compile, and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCPS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOI by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://oag.ca.gov/justice/.
# Available Data on Arrests and Diversions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Data Sources</th>
<th>Examples of What we Can Learn</th>
<th>Examples of What we Cannot Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CA DOJ Data: Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR)** | • Trends in arrests 2006-2018  
  • For 2017 (through special request), arrests by:  
    • Reason for Arrest (primary alleged offense)  
    • Arresting Agency  
    • “Arrest Disposition” (referred to probation vs. handled in house/turned over)  
    • Demographics: Race/Ethnicity; Gender; Age at Arrest | • Location of Stop  
  • Numbers for LAPD divisions or LASD stations  
  • Residence zip code of youth arrested  
  • Details about diversion or counsel and release |
| **Youth Development and Diversion Database** | • Trends in referrals made to pre-arrest diversion programs funded by YDD between April 2019 and April 2020  
  • Reason for Referral (alleged offense)  
  • Referring Agency  
  • Type of referral (pre- or post-booking)  
  • Location of Stop  
  • Residence type and zip code of youth referred  
  • Protective factors before and after participation  
  • Youth Goals and categories of activities/services  
  • Locations where YDD programs are available | • Youth development resources outside of the YDD network  
  • Clinical and social services available outside of the YDD network  
  • Qualitative experiences of youth participating in diversion |
Youth Arrest Data 2006-2018
Number of Youth Arrests in Los Angeles County Over Time

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

- **White**
- **Black**
- **Latino**
- **All Other**
- **Total**

Arrest Type

- **Felony**
- **Misdemeanor**
- **Status**
- **Total**

Source: California Department of Justice, OpenJustice, openjustice.doj.ca.gov, accessed April 1, 2020
**Arrest Rates and Disparity**

**Rate of Arrest**

(per 1,000 youth in population)

**Disparity in Arrests:**

- **Black Youth**
  - 2006: 3.1
  - 2007: 3.4
  - 2008: 3.5
  - 2009: 3.5
  - 2010: 3.7
  - 2011: 4.5
  - 2012: 5.0
  - 2013: 5.1
  - 2014: 5.6
  - 2015: 5.4
  - 2016: 6.4
  - 2017: 7.8

- **Latino Youth**
  - 2006: 1.5
  - 2007: 1.8
  - 2008: 1.8
  - 2009: 1.8
  - 2010: 2.0
  - 2011: 2.0
  - 2012: 1.8
  - 2013: 1.9
  - 2014: 1.9
  - 2015: 2.1

**Source:** California Department of Justice, OpenJustice, openjustice.doj.ca.gov, accessed April 1, 2020
2017 Youth Arrest Data
General Profile of Youth Arrested (2017)

Race/Ethnicity:
- 936 White youth
- 2616 Black youth
- 5839 Latino youth
- 114 API youth
- 283 Other Youth

Gender:
- 7455 Boys
- 2333 Girls

Age at Referral:
- 93 youth ages 7-11 years
- 872 youth ages 12-13
- 3370 youth ages 14-15 years
- 2585 youth age 16
- 2868 youth age 17
Source: CA DOJ 2017 Data, Public Records Act Request submitted by YDD each year.

Note: when a youth was arrested for more than one alleged offense, only the most serious or “primary offense” was counted.
Proportion of Alleged Offenses Referred vs. Other Handling (2017)

Source: CA DOJ 2017 Data, Public Records Act Request submitted by YDD each year.
Top Arresting Agencies (2017)

Source: CA DOJ 2017 Data, Public Records Act Request submitted by YDD each year.
According to DOJ data, in 2017:

- Black youth arrested were more likely than arrested White youth to have their case referred to Probation. This is true across all agencies in the County.
- Example Agency A’s rate of referral to probation is higher across all demographics than Agency B.

Source: CA DOJ 2017 Data, Public Records Act Request submitted by YDD each year.
Other Resources to Inform Our Recommendations
What can we build off of from the Roadmap to Advancing Youth Diversion?

• Infrastructure for pre- and post-booking arrest diversion led by local community-based organizations but funded by the County.

• Model centers holistic, individualized care coordination and case management including connecting to health and mental health services, mentorship and peer support, arts education and creative activities, educational and vocational services, leadership development, family and community engagement.

• All youth eligible for referral in lieu of arrest or citation except youth 14 or older who is taken into custody for the personal use of a firearm in the commission or attempted commission of a felony or any offense listed in WIC 707(b).

• What have we learned from the first year of OYDD implementation? How does this inform our recommendations for a new model?
What can we learn from the Alternatives to Incarceration Continuum of Care Model?

- Strategy 1, Recommendation 1 proposes creating and expanding a holistic and decentralized community-based system of care
  - Restorative behavioral health and primary care villages
  - Families and support network
  - Restorative justice and trauma prevention
  - Mental health, substance use, and co-occurring disorder
  - Housing and services
  - Training and employment
  - Reentry and legal services

- What can we learn from the way the ATI model was designed and recommended? What would we change in our reimagined model for youth development and youth justice?
What Other Questions do you have about Youth Development and Diversion?

1. What does our ideal continuum of support look like under a youth development framework? What is gone, transformed, and new?
   • How will a new model address issues that contribute to justice system involvement (economic conditions, policing, disinvestment, education, mental health, trauma)?
   • What do young people need and want in a youth development and diversion model?

2. How do young people currently experience youth development and diversion?
   • How many youth arrests occur in Los Angeles County each year and for what?
   • What happens to young people who are arrested? What should happen?
   • Where do young people currently have access to youth development resources that support their growth, healing, and wellbeing?

3. Where do we need to expand access to existing resources to effectively and equitably reduce the size and scope of the justice system?

4. How should we coordinate and fund expanded resources?
   • How will a new model engage and interact with governmental agencies responsible for providing services to youth such as public schools, child welfare, mental health, public health, health services, parks and recreation, and arts and culture?

5. How do we need to address workforce needs, including workforce needs for young people?

6. How can this model address racial justice?
What Other Questions do you have about Youth Development and Diversion?
Subcommittee #2:
Youth Formally Justice System Involved
April 23, 2020
Youth Formally Processed in the Legal System

How can the legal system be re-structured to have healing and restorative responses to arrested youth?
Subcommittee #2 Agenda

• Introductions & Agenda Overview
• Review the focus for this subcommittee
• Review last month’s radical imagination exercise
• Radical Imagination Activity-What’s Gone?
• Data Review
• Assignments and Closing
Existing Legal System Decision Points

Subcommittee #1 is responsible for reimagining decision points in Yellow Boxes.

Subcommittee #2 is responsible for reimagining decision points in Green Boxes.
Subcommittee #2 is responsible for reimagining decision points in **Green Boxes**.

Subcommittee #3 is responsible for reimagining decision points in **Blue Boxes**.
Existing Legal System Decision Points Cont’d...

Subcommittee #2 is responsible for reimagining decision points in **Green Boxes**.

Subcommittee #3 is responsible for reimagining decision points in **Blue Boxes**.
Radical Imagination Ideas (Point of Arrest)

Avoid Law Enforcement Contact

Can LE contact be eliminated?
Community is fully resourced to provide full range of youth development programs. Mentor/Community member/Other agency are first point of contact.

Law Enforcement Contact

Connect youth to resources.
Advocate/Community member accompanies LE on patrol.
Support youth to find a space place and connect to CBO.
Youth taken to non-carceral setting and either returned home or to diversion program.
Workforce support to undergo “culture change”.

After Law Enforcement Contact

Any record of interaction with LE is expunged/sealed.
Advocate/Community member accompanies youth throughout justice process.
Instead of probation terms, plan created for type of supports youth’s community can provide.

Restorative Justice
Who are the Mentors/Youth Advocates?

- Experienced social service professional
- Trusted person in youth’s life
- Adult with similar life experience
- Community Member
- Youth Peacebuilders
Radical Imagination

What should be NEW?
What should be TRANSFORMED?
What should be GONE?
Radical Imagining Exercise

Of the current processes/topics/recommendations:

• What’s Gone

• Why is it Gone?

• What does it mean to be Gone?

• Is there something New or Transformed in its place?

• What are the ripple effects: to the workforce, to the particular function

• Obstacles or challenges to having the particular policy or function Gone?
Youth Justice Flow: Los Angeles County (2018)

980,640 young people (ages 10-17) in Los Angeles County in 2018
8,133 youth arrests reported in 2018*
9,188 youth referrals to probation reported in 2018
6,209 petitions filed in juvenile court 2018
5,542 youth declared a “ward of the court” in 2018
3,321 pre-adjudication detentions in 2018
2,612 Institutional Placements/EM***
2,930 home on probation

** According to California DOI, youth who are “handed in house” are either (1) settled by the arresting agency and the youth is released to his or her parent, guardian or a friend, with no warning, or (2) placed on a local diversion program. In Los Angeles County, the number of youth diverted or handled informally at juvenile court is significantly higher than what is reported by DOI.

*** The California Department of Justice (DOI) does not have a way to extract youth placed on EM from youth committed to county facilities in their data system. Therefore, this category can refer to youth who are made wards of the court and are on ankle monitors or placed in institutions.

Source: data were retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOI). DOI collects data via the juvenile court and probation statistical system (JCMS). The JCMS database is designed to collect, compile, and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCMS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOI by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://oag.ca.gov/jcmsdatabase.
### Available Data on Youth Referrals; Petitions; “Wardship”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Data Sources</th>
<th>Examples of What we Can Learn</th>
<th>Examples of What we Cannot Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CA DOJ Data (JCPSS)    | • Trends in numbers, rates and disparity in referrals; petitions filed; youth home on wardship probation (2006-2018) by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Reasons for referral; petition filed; wardship by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Final outcome of cases (sustained charge and disposition) Comparison of LA County referrals; petitions and home on wardship probation compared to other Counties | • Details about reasons for referral; petition; home on wardship probation *(ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of charges and it appears that violations of court order are undercounted)*  
• Residence Zip Code of youth involved in justice system  
• Length of case processing.  
• Number of court hearings to reach a disposition  
• Details about final disposition *(ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of disposition and does not include any information about youths’ probation services)*.  
• Length of time youth spend on probation.  
• Number of court reviews for youth on probation.  
• Details about youths’ educational, health, social or emotional needs  
• Details about youths’ strengths |
Youth Justice Trends (2006-2018)

In 2006:
- 55% of cases referred to probation were filed
- 86% of cases filed resulted in wardship probation.

In 2018:
- 68% of cases referred to probation were filed
- 89% of cases filed resulted in wardship probation.

Refer to Probation
- 2006: 32437
- 2018: 9188
- Percent Change: -72%

Petition Filed
- 2006: 17947
- 2018: 6209
- Percent Change: -65%

Wardship
- 2006: 15407
- 2018: 5542
- Percent Change: -64%

Source: Data were retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). The JCPSS database is designed to collect, compile and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCPSS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOJ by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://oag.ca.gov/cjs/databases.

Hereinafter source referred to as: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Referrals to Probation
Number of Referrals to Probation

Referrals by Race/Ethnicity

Referrals by Gender

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Referrals to Probation

Rate of Referral to Probation
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Referral to Probation:
Black Youth

Disparity in Referral to Probation:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top 10 Primary Charges Referred to Probation (2018)

Top 10 Charges account for 84% of referrals to probation (7737 of 9188 referrals)

- Assault and battery (M): 1,117
- Robbery (F): 624
- Weapons (F): 626
- Burglary (F): 402
- Assault (F): 404
- Motor vehicle theft (F): 381
- Vandalism (M): 400
- Theft (F): 234
- Other felonies (F): 155
- Other misdemeanor (M): 188

Note: when a youth was referred for more than one charge, only the most serious or “primary offense” was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
## Top 10 Primary Charges Referred to Probation for Girls (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault and Battery</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misdemeanor</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart Notes:
- The chart shows the top 10 primary charges referred to probation for girls in 2018.
- Each bar represents the number of referrals for girls.
- The percentage figures indicate the proportion of referrals compared to the total referrals for each charge.
- The bars are color-coded to distinguish between girls and boys.
Rate of Referral to Probation in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Petitions Filed
Number of Petitions Filed

Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>API</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PetitionsFiled by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Petitions Filed (Per Capita)

Rate of Petition Filed
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Petitions Filed
Black Youth

Disparity in Petitions Filed:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Takeaway: Disparities continue to grow as youth go deeper into the justice system. Black and Latino youth referred to probation were more likely than referred White youth to have a petition filed.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top 10 Primary Offenses with Petitions Filed (2018)

Top 10 Offenses account for 87% of petitions filed (5371 of 6209 petitions)

Note: when a youth was petitioned for more than one charge, only the most serious or "primary offense" for which youth was referred was counted. Changes in charges petitioned are not captured by JCPSS.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top Ten Primary Charges Petitioned for Girls (2018)

Note: when a youth was petitioned for more than one charge, only the most serious charge or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted. Changes in charges that are petitioned are not captured by JCPSS.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rate of Petitions Filed in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Wardship Probation
Number of Youth on Wardship Probation

Youth on Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity

- White
- Black
- Latino
- API
- Native American
- Total

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)

Youth On Wardship Probation by Gender

- Girls
- Boys
- Total
Rates and Disparity in Wardship Probation (Per Capita)

Rate of Wardship Probation
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Wardship Probation
Black Youth

Disparity in Wardship Probation:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Wardship Probation (Per Petitions Filed)

**Takeaway:** Disparities continue to grow as youth go deeper into the justice system. Black and Latino youth with a petition filed were more likely than White youth with a petition filed to have their case end in wardship probation.

Source: CA DOJ Data
Top Charges Sustained - Wardship Probation

Top 10 Offenses account for 89% of sustained charges resulting in wardship probation.

Note: when a youth had more than one sustained charge, only the most serious charge or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)

Note: when a youth had more than one sustained offense, only the most serious or "primary offense" for which youth was referred was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rate of Wardship Probation in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Tracking Charges (2018)

- Robbery (F)
- Assault (f)
Understanding “Violent” Referrals ➔ A Focus on Robbery

Key Takeaways
• Of the 1430 youth referred to Probation for robbery in 2018, 838 (58%) were detained pre-adjudication.
• Of the 1430 youth referred to Probation for robbery in 2018, 733 (51%) had their case sustained as a robbery.
• Of the 733 youth with a sustained robbery, 357 (49%) ended up home on “wardship” probation.

For cases not closed/dismissed or sustained as robbery, what was the most serious charge sustained in court?
- Petty Theft (M) (161 youth)
- Assault (F) (79 youth)
- Assault and Batter (M) (68 youth)
- Theft (F) (45 youth)

For youth referred and sustained for a felony robbery, what were the court ordered dispositions?
- Home on Wardship Probation (357)
- Private Placement (177)
- Secure County Facility / EM (163)
- DJJ (34)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Understanding “Violent” Referrals → A Focus on Assaults

Referrals to Probation for Assault
687 youth

- Closed / Dismissed
  223 youth (33%)
- Transferred Out of County
  9 youth (1%)
- Sustained as Other Charge
  177 youth (26%)
- Sustained as Assault
  278 youth (41%)

Detained Pre-Adjudication
266 youth (39%)

For cases not closed/dismissed or sustained as assault, what was the most serious offense sustained in court?
- Assault and Battery (M) (135 youth)
- Vandalism (F) (12 youth)
- Weapons (F) (12 youth)
- Disturbing the Peace (M) (8 youth)
- All other (19 youth)

For youth referred and sustained for a felony assault, what were the court ordered dispositions?
- Home on Wardship Probation (126)
- Private Placement (77)
- Secure County Facility / EM (33)
- Non-wardship Probation (20)
- DJJ (11)

Key Takeaway
- Of the 687 youth referred to Probation for felony assault in 2018, only 266 (39%) were detained pre-adjudication.
- Of the 687 youth referred to Probation for felony assault in 2018, only 287 (41%) had their case sustained as a felony assault.
- Of the 287 youth with a sustained felony assault, 146 (51%) either ended up home on “wardship” probation or on “non-wardship” probation.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
What Other Questions do you have about Youth Formally Involved in the Justice System?
Reference: Robbery and Assault Charges in DOJ Database

**Robbery** – PC 211, 212.5(a), 212.5(b), 212.5(c), 213(a)(1)(a), 213(a)(2), 214, 215(a)

**Assault** – PC 69*, 71, 76(a)*, 95.1, 139(a), 140(a)*, 146(b), 148(b)*, 148(c), 148(d)*, 148(d)(1), 148.1(a), 148.1(b), 148.1(c), 148.1(d), 148.3(b), 148.4(b)(1), 148.4(b)(2), 148.10(a)*, 149*, 151(a)(2), 186.26(a), 186.26(c), 203, 205, 206, 217.1(a), 217.1(b), 218, 218.1*, 219, 219.1, 219.2*, 220, 222, 241.1, 241.4, 241.7, 242*, 243(c)(1)*, 243(c)(2)*, 243(d), 243.1, 243.3*, 243.6*, 243.7, 243.9(a)*, 244, 244.5(b)*, 244.5(c)*, 245(a)(1)*, 245(a)(2)*, 245(a)(3), 245(a)(4)*, 245(b), 245(c), 245(d)(1), 245(d)(2), 245(d)(3), 245.2, 245.3, 245.5(a), 245.5(b), 245.5(c), 246*, 246.3(a)*, 247(a), 247(b), 247.5*, 273(a)*, 273ab(b), 273d(a), 273.5(a)*, 273.5(f)(1)*, 273.5(f)(2)*, 347(a)(1), 347(b), 368(b)(1)*, 375(a)*, 375(d), 401, 405a, 417(b)*, 417(c)*, 417.3, 417.6(a), 417.8, 422(a)*, 422.7(a), 588a*, 601(a)(1), 601(a)(2), 625c, 664/187(a), 664/192(a), 1768.8(b) WI, 1768.85(a) WI*, 1808.4(d) VC, 4131.5, 4500, 4501, 4501.1(a), 4501.5, 11412, 11413(a), 11418(a)(1), 11418(a)(2), 11418(b)(1), 11418(b)(2), 11418(b)(3), 11418(b)(4), 11418(c), 11418(d)(1), 11418(d)(2), 11418.1*, 11418.5(a)*, 11419(a)*, 12308, 12309, 15656(a) WI, 18715(a)(1), 18715(a)(2), 18715(a)(3), 18715(a)(5), 18725(a), 18725(b), 18725(c), 18740, 18755(b), 20110(a), 20110(b), 21464(c) VC, 23110(b) VC, 38318(b) VC, 38318.5(b) VC

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Contact Information

Please send all Radical Imagination brainstorming ideas to Joanna Lowry.

• Joanna Lowry, W. Haywood Burns Institute
  jlowry@burnsinstitute.org  415.321.4100 X117

• Raquel Mariscal, W. Haywood Burns Institute
  rmariscal@burnsinstitute.org  831.728.4192

• Danielle Dupuy, University of California Los Angeles, Million Dollar Hood Project
  danidupuy@ucla.edu

• Kent Mendoza, Anti-recidivism Coalition
  kmendoza@antirecidivism.org
**Outstanding Questions:**

1. Do the MDTs make the decision about next steps after initial point of contact?
2. Where will youth go with no home or safe place to go?
3. If youth do not go home, where will they go while waiting for next steps? - for example in place of juvenile halls (SC2 and SC3)

---

**Outstanding Questions:**

1. Will the juvenile courts continue to be the place where decisions are made (referencing the issue around physical space that was raised)
2. Will the DA and juvenile court judges continue to have their current power? If not, how should those decision making powers be modified (referencing blind filing)
3. What will the role of MDTs be in decision making?
4. How can we address the issue of length of time for adjudication being a tool PDs can use to promote fairness?
Subcommittee Team A & B:
Youth Formally Processed in the Legal System
Team A: May 11, 2020 2:00-4:00
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Youth Formally Processed in the Legal System

*How can the legal system be re-structured to have healing and restorative responses to arrested youth?*
Youth Justice Flow: Los Angeles County (2018)

980,640 young people (ages 10-17) in Los Angeles County in 2018
8,133 youth arrests reported in 2018*
9,188 youth referrals to probation reported in 2018
6,209 petitions filed in juvenile court 2018
5,542 youth declared a "ward of the court" in 2018
3,321 pre-adjudication detentions in 2018
2,612 Institutional Placements/EM***
2,930 home on probation

EVENT/TRIGGER for justice system involvement

688 (8.5% of arrests) handled in house**
2,979 (32% of probation referrals) placed at intake/placed on informal probation (WIC 654)
667 (13% of cases petitioned) placed on informal probation (WIC 654.2) or non-wardship probation (WIC 725a)

** The number of referrals to Probation is greater than the number of arrests in 2018. Youth can be referred to probation by law enforcement agencies within the county as well as schools, individuals, other county agencies, and law enforcement from other counties.

*** According to California DOI, youth who are "handled in house" are either (1) served by the arresting agency and the youth is released to his or her parent, guardian or the street with no warning, or (2) placed on a local diversion program. In Los Angeles County, the number of youths diverted or handled informally at a house is increasingly higher than what is reported by DOI.

*** The California Department of Justice (DOI) does not have a way to extract youth placed on EM from youth committed to county facilities in their data system. Therefore, this category can refer to youth who are made wards of the court and are on ankle monitors or placed in institutions.

Source: Data was retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOI). DOI collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCSS). The JCSS database is designed to collect, compile and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile's process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCSS electronic file dates from 2003 to the present and are submitted to DOI by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://www.ca.gov/judicial/reporting/jcss.
Subcommittee #2 Team Agenda

• Introductions & Agenda Overview
• Reviewing Relevant Committee Data
• Radical Imagination: Court Process
• Workplan Timeline
Data: Referrals to Probation; Petitions Filed; Wardship
Source of the data is the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC)

Referrals to probation have declined substantially but those declines were not experienced by all groups equally. For example, the decline was less for black youth and female youth.

Racial inequity is apparent at every level of the decision making process. Despite overall declines in the arrested and incarcerated youth population in LA, racial disparities have increased. Let's keep in mind how we reimagine a model that fights racial inequities rather than perpetuates them.

80% of youth formally processed through the court have been accused of 10 charges. At the same time, final dispositions are not equal for all charges. For example, some youth charged with robbery go to home wardship while others get remanded to juvenile camps. These 10 charges should be a focus when we think about decision making on how to imagine a new model.
## Available Data on Youth Referrals; Petitions; “Wardship”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Data Sources</th>
<th>Examples of What we Can Learn</th>
<th>Examples of What we Cannot Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CA DOJ Data (JCPSS)    | • Trends in numbers, rates and disparity in referrals; petitions filed; youth home on wardship probation (2006-2018) by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Reasons for referral; petition filed; wardship by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Final outcome of cases (sustained charge and disposition) Comparison of LA County referrals; petitions and home on wardship probation compared to other Counties | • Details about reasons for referral; petition; home on wardship probation *(ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of charges and it appears that violations of court order are undercounted)*  
• Residence Zip Code of youth involved in justice system  
• Length of case processing.  
• Number of court hearings to reach a disposition  
• Details about final disposition *(ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of disposition and does not include any information about youths’ probation services).*  
• Length of time youth spend on probation.  
• Number of court reviews for youth on probation.  
• Details about youths’ educational, health, social or emotional needs  
• Details about youths’ strengths |
Youth Justice Trends (2006-2018)

In 2006:
- 55% of cases referred to probation were filed
- 86% of cases filed resulted in wardship probation.

In 2018:
- 68% of cases referred to probation were filed
- 89% of cases filed resulted in wardship probation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer to Probation</td>
<td>32437</td>
<td>9188</td>
<td>-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Filed</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td>-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardship</td>
<td>15407</td>
<td>5542</td>
<td>-64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data were retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). The JCPSS database is designed to collect, compile and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCPSS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOJ by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/databases.

Hereinafter source referred to as: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Referrals to Probation
Number of Referrals to Probation

Referrals by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>API</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>32437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>33345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25040</td>
<td>23490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22869</td>
<td>20783</td>
<td>18777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15793</td>
<td>12721</td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12721</td>
<td></td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>10569</td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>10330</td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>9188</td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referrals by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>32437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>33345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>32461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25040</td>
<td>23490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22869</td>
<td>20783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18777</td>
<td>15793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12721</td>
<td>10569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Referrals to Probation

Rate of Referral to Probation
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Referral to Probation:
Black Youth

Disparity in Referral to Probation:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top 10 Primary Charges Referred to Probation (2018)

Top 10 Charges account for 84% of referrals to probation (7737 of 9188 referrals)

- Assault and battery (M): 1,117
- Robbery (F): 624
- Weapons (F): 626
- Burglary (F): 402
- Assault (F): 404
- Motor vehicle theft (F): 381
- Vandalism (M): 400
- Theft (F): 234
- Other felonies (F): 155
- Other misdemeanor (M): 188

Note: when a youth was referred for more than one charge, only the most serious or “primary offense” was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top 10 Primary Charges Referred to Probation for Girls (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault and Battery</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misdemeanor</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: when a youth was referred for more than one charge, only the most serious or “primary offense” was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rate of Referral to Probation in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Rate of Referral to Probation (2018)  
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Petitions Filed
Number of Petitions Filed

Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>API</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>16364</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>14094</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petitions Filed by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>12684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Petitions Filed (Per Capita)

Rate of Petition Filed
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Petitions Filed: Black Youth

Disparity in Petitions Filed: Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
**Takeaway:** Disparities continue to grow as youth go deeper into the justice system. Black and Latino youth referred to probation were more likely than referred White youth to have a petition filed.

*Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)*
Top 10 Primary Offenses with Petitions Filed (2018)

Top 10 Offenses account for 87% of petitions filed (5371 of 6209 petitions)

Note: when a youth was petitioned for more than one charge, only the most serious or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted. Changes in charges petitioned are not captured by JCPSS.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top Ten Primary Charges Petitioned for Girls (2018)

Note: when a youth was petitioned for more than one charge, only the most serious charge or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted. Changes in charges that are petitioned are not captured by JCPSS.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rate of Petitions Filed in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Rate of Petitions Filed (2018)
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Number of Youth on Wardship Probation

Youth on Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity

Youth On Wardship Probation by Gender

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Wardship Probation (Per Capita)

Rate of Wardship Probation
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Wardship Probation
Black Youth

Disparity in Wardship Probation:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
**Takeaway:** Disparities continue to grow as youth go deeper into the justice system. Black and Latino youth with a petition filed were more likely than White youth with a petition filed to have their case end in wardship probation.
Top Charges Sustained- Wardship Probation

Top 10 Offenses account for 89% of sustained charges resulting in wardship probation.

Youth Population  Total "Wardship"  Assault and battery (M)  Robbery (F)  Assault (F)  Burglary (F)  Weapons (F)  Vandalism (M)  Motor vehicle theft (F)  Petty theft (M)  Theft (F)  Other misdemeanor (M)

White  Black  Latino  API  Native American

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)

Note: when a youth had more than one sustained charge, only the most serious charge or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted.

Note: when a youth had more than one sustained offense, only the most serious or “primary offense” for which youth was referred was counted.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rate of Wardship Probation in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Rate of Wardship Probation (2018)
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Tracking Charges (2018)

- Robbery (F)
- Assault (f)
Understanding “Violent” Referrals ➔ A Focus on Robbery

Referrals to Probation for Robbery
1430 youth

- Closed / Dismissed
  248 youth (17%)

- Transferred Out of County
  24 youth (2%)

- Sustained as Other Charge
  424 =youth (30%)

- Sustained as Robbery
  733 youth (51%)

Detained Pre-Adjudication
828 youth (58%)

Key Takeaways
- Of the 1430 youth referred to Probation for robbery in 2018, 838 (58%) were detained pre-adjudication.
- Of the 1430 youth referred to Probation for robbery in 2018, 733 (51%) had their case sustained as a robbery.
- Of the 733 youth with a sustained robbery, 357 (49%) ended up home on “wardship” probation.

For cases not closed/dismissed or sustained as robbery, what was the most serious charge sustained in court?
- Petty Theft (M) (161 youth)
- Assault (F) (79 youth)
- Assault and Batter (M) (68 youth)
- Theft (F) (45 youth)

For youth referred and sustained for a felony robbery, what were the court ordered dispositions?
- Home on Wardship Probation (357)
- Private Placement (177)
- Secure County Facility / EM (163)
- DJJ (34)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Understanding “Violent” Referrals ➔ A Focus on Assaults

Referrals to Probation for Assault 687 youth

- Closed / Dismissed 223 youth (33%)
- Transferred Out of County 9 youth (1%)
- Sustained as Other Charge 177 youth (26%)
- Sustained as Assault 278 youth (41%)
- Detained Pre-Adjudication 266 youth (39%)

For cases not closed/dismissed or sustained as assault, what was the most serious offense sustained in court?

- Assault and Battery (M) (135 youth)
- Vandalism (F) (12 youth)
- Weapons (F) (12 youth)
- Disturbing the Peace (M) (8 youth)
- All other (19 youth)

For youth referred and sustained for a felony assault, what were the court ordered dispositions?

- Home on Wardship Probation (126)
- Private Placement (77)
- Secure County Facility / EM (33)
- Non-wardship Probation (20)
- DJJ (11)

Key Takeaway

- Of the 687 youth referred to Probation for felony assault in 2018, only 266 (39%) were detained pre-adjudication.
- Of the 687 youth referred to Probation for felony assault in 2018, only 287 (41%) had their case sustained as a felony assault.
- Of the 287 youth with a sustained felony assault, 146 (51%) either ended up home on “wardship” probation or on “non-wardship” probation.

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Average Length of Stay in Juvenile Hall Trends

What Other Questions do you have about Youth Formally Involved in the Justice System?
Reference: Robbery and Assault Charges in DOJ Database

Robbery – PC 211, 212.5(a), 212.5(b), 212.5(c), 213(a)(1)(a), 213(a)(2), 214, 215(a)

Assault – PC 69*, 71, 76(a)*, 95.1, 139(a), 140(a)*, 146(e)(b), 148(b)*, 148(c), 148(d)*, 148(d)(1), 148.1(a), 148.1(b), 148.1(c), 148.1(d), 148.3(b), 148.4(b)(1), 148.4(b)(2), 148.10(a)*, 149*, 151(a)(2), 186.26(a), 186.26(c), 203, 205, 206, 217.1(a), 217.1(b), 218, 218.1*, 219, 219.1, 219.2*, 220, 222, 241.1, 241.4, 241.7, 242*, 243(c)(1)*, 243(c)(2)*, 243(d), 243.1, 243.3*, 243.6*, 243.7, 243.9(a)*, 244, 244.5(b)*, 244.5(c)*, 245(a)(1)*, 245(a)(2)*, 245(a)(3), 245(a)(4)*, 245(b), 245(c), 245(d)(1), 245(d)(2), 245(d)(3), 245.2, 245.3, 245.5(a), 245.5(b), 245.5(c), 246*, 246.3(a)*, 247(a), 247(b), 247.5*, 273(a)*, 273ab(b), 273d(a), 273.5(a)*, 273.5(f)(1)*, 273.5(f)(2)*, 347(a)(1), 347(b), 368(b)(1)*, 375(a)*, 375(d), 401, 405a, 417(b)*, 417(c)*, 417.3, 417.6(a), 417.8, 422(a)*, 422.7(a), 588a*, 601(a)(1), 601(a)(2), 625c, 664/187(a), 664/192(a), 1768.8(b) WI, 1768.85(a) WI*, 1808.4(d) VC, 1431.5, 4500, 4501, 4501.1(a), 4501.5, 11412, 11413(a), 11418(a)(1), 11418(a)(2), 11418(b)(1), 11418(b)(2), 11418(b)(3), 11418(b)(4), 11418(c), 11418(d)(1), 11418(d)(2), 11418.1*, 11418.5(a)*, 11419(a)*, 12308, 12309, 15656(a) WI, 18715(a)(1), 18715(a)(2), 18715(a)(3), 18715(a)(5), 18725(a), 18725(b), 18725(c), 18740, 18755(b), 20110(a), 20110(b), 21464(c) VC, 23110(b) VC, 38318(b) VC, 38318.5(b) VC

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Revisit Youth Development Framework and Prior Findings and Recommendations
1. **Health and Physical Competence** – Including youth access to health and mental health, emotional healing, nutrition, sports and recreation.

2. **Social Competence** – Building youth knowledge and appreciation of themselves, their culture, language and history, as well as appreciation for others; having self-discipline and decision-making skills; being able to work and communicate with others; and ability to have empathy for others and solve problems without domination or violence, including transformative justice skills.

3. **Cognitive and Creative Competence** – Including critical thinking, analysis and problem solving; literacy, academic support and college preparation; and self-expression through visual and performing arts.

4. **Vocational Competence** – Including job preparation, youth employment and career exploration.

5. **Leadership Competence** – Including the right to speak out, and being a leader in transforming their schools and communities.
Court Process Elements: Key Prior Findings and Recommendations*

1. The juvenile courts and stakeholders – including judges, District Attorneys, and Juvenile Defenders – must be trained on the LA Model and its goals in rehabilitating youth. These stakeholders should be invested in the model so that they can be held accountable for maintaining its mission once it has been formalized and implemented. (LA Model 2017, p. 22 compiled report)

2. Assess whether the Community Detention Program is useful anymore, as too many bench officers undermine this program by using it as a form of threat, rather than for increased and meaningful supervision. (PRIT 2019, p. 32 compiled report)

3. Improve and expand return-to-court support services to reduce failures to appear (ATI 2020, p. 54)

4. Create a front-end system with behavioral health professionals that solicits information about unmet behavioral health needs so prosecutors can offer diversion instead of filing charges, or can file reduced charges, for individuals whose justice system involvement is driven by those needs. (ATI 2020, p. 54)

5. At the earliest point possible, connect individuals to a personal advocate or community member to assist them in navigating the justice system process and assist in advocating for diversion opportunities. These advocates, whenever possible, should include and be trained to provide tailored help/referrals to people who identify as LGBQ+, TGI and/or cisgender women. (ATI 2020, p. 55)

* Editors Note: The Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report (ATI) is not part of the compiled report. While the focus of the report is the adult system, recommendations are relevant and nuanced to the Youth Justice system.
Court Process Elements: Key Prior Findings and Recommendations*

6. Improve equal access to all treatment resources for justice-involved individuals, wherever they may be (in or out of custody) (ATI 2020, p. 56)

7. Increase ‘staffing on the ground’ across departments, including Public Defender/Alternate Public Defender, District Attorney/City Attorney, Department of Health Services/Office of Diversion and Reentry, Department of Mental Health/ Mental Health Court Linkage Program, County Counsel, Department of Public Health, and community-based organizations that work with departments to expand and integrate court-based services for as many individuals as possible. (ATI 2020, p. 56)

8. Increase collaborative, non-adversarial processes in all courtrooms where diversion/alternate sentencing occurs, to enable better outcomes that are trauma-informed and respect individual care and rights. (ATI 2020, p. 57)

9. Create a simple and real-time map of diversion options and eligibility criteria to share with the public and all system actors so that people and their support networks can help identify eligibility for diversion. The map should note available options tailored to cisgender women, LGBQ+ people, and TGI people. (ATI 2020, p. 57)

* Editors Note: The Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report (ATI) is not part of the compiled report. While the focus of the report is the adult system, recommendations are relevant and nuanced to the Youth Justice system.
10. Begin release planning for everyone as soon as possible after being booked into jail, using a reentry provider. Pre-release planning should include an assessment of health/medication needs, family/loved ones in the region, custodial responsibilities, employment status, and individuals’ reentry goals. Ensure all people who identify as cisgender women, LGBQ+ and/or TGI have a plan tailored to the unique barriers they may face upon release, especially with respect to housing.

* Editors Note: The Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report (ATI) is not part of the compiled report. While the focus of the report is the adult system, recommendations are relevant and nuanced to the Youth Justice system.
Avoid system involvement (both dependency and justice) whenever possible

Avoid removing youth from their homes whenever possible

Promote and expand holistic youth development supports for both youth and families across a continuum of responses, in and outside of dependency and justice systems to respond to harms

Downsize and transform the culture of institutions – especially the Probation Department as a whole and juvenile halls – in order for all other change to be meaningful

Improve data collection/sharing (as well as protections), evaluation, training and accountability all around

Engage youth and families at every stage of decision-making

Recognize and address the racial and ethnic disparities related to the access to services and juvenile justice processing and the needs of special populations including (but not necessarily limited to): females, LGBTQ+ youth, crossover/dually-involved youth, youth who become parents, undocumented, and transitional age youth without family/caretakers/support systems.

Capitalize on what we have - improve coordination and collaboration across systems to better leverage existing resources and efforts
Radical Imagination

What should be NEW?

What should be TRANSFORMED?

What should be GONE?
Radical Imagining Exercise – Court Process

Of the Court Process:

• What’s Gone
• Why is it Gone?
• What is New or Transformed in its place?
• What are the impacts on the workforce, to the particular function?
  • Who will assume the new or transformed functions?
  • Where will the function live?
• Obstacles or challenges to having the particular policy or function Gone?
May 11 & May 13: Courts
• The two subcommittee teams will discuss and vision what should be Gone – and therefore different and changed (New and Transformed) about 1) referrals to the court legal process; 2) filing of petitions; and 3) the court legal process, including case processing. We will keep grounding the committee in and build off of key, existing recommendations, identify remaining questions that need to be answered, and identify what is necessary for implementation.

May 21: Courts and Probation
• The subcommittee will review the results of the teams Court process visioning and recommendations.
• The subcommittee will discuss and vision what should be Gone, and therefore different and changed (New and Transformed) about 1) Probation roles and functions in the Legal process; and 2) Probation field supervision. We will build off of key, existing recommendations and identify what is necessary for implementation.
• We will further identify remaining questions that need to be answered, and identify and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions to help answer its questions and solicit feedback on any initial recommendations from the subcommittee.

June Dates TBD: Probation
• The two subcommittee teams will continue and complete discussions and visioning what should be Gone, and therefore different and changed (New and Transformed) about 1) Probation roles and functions in the Legal process; and 2) Probation field supervision. We will build off of key, existing recommendations and identify what is necessary for implementation.

June 18: Synthesize and Revise All Subcommittee Recommendations
July 16 or 23: Finalize and Submit Subcommittee Recommendations to the full Workgroup
Contact Information

Please send all Radical Imagination brainstorming ideas to Joanna Lowry.

- Joanna Lowry, W. Haywood Burns Institute  
  jlowry@burnsinstitute.org  415.321.4100 X117

- Raquel Mariscal, W. Haywood Burns Institute  
  rmariscal@burnsinstitute.org  831.728.4192

- Danielle Dupuy, University of California Los Angeles, Million Dollar Hood Project  
  danidupuy@ucla.edu

- Kent Mendoza, Anti-recidivism Coalition  
  kmendoza@antirecidivism.org
1. Introductions

2. Subcommittee Work Plan

3. Overview of Data and Policy Mapping

4. Revisit and Affirm LA Model principles and Youth Development Framework

5. Exercise Related to a New Vision for Juvenile Hall: What should be New/Transformed/Gone?

6. Meeting between meeting \textit{suggested date: May 7; 2:00-3:30]

7. Closing and Assignment
Subcommittee Work Plan
April 23: Juvenile Hall

• The subcommittee will discuss and vision what should be gone – and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) – about 1) decision-making about who is detained; and 2) detention facilities and practices. We will keep grounding the committee in and build off of key, existing recommendations, and identify remaining questions that need to be answered.

• We will also identify and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions to help answer its questions and solicit feedback on any initial recommendations from the subcommittee.

May 7: Camps - "LA Model"/Kilpatrick principles

• The subcommittee will discuss and vision what should be gone, and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) about 1) decision-making about who is placed in camps; and 2) residential treatment facilities and practices. We will build off of key, existing recommendations – in particular related to the LA Model and Camp Kilpatrick -- and identify what is necessary for implementation.

• We will further identify remaining questions that need to be answered, and identify and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions to help answer its questions and solicit feedback on any initial recommendations from the subcommittee.

• The subcommittee will also consider and assess the effectiveness of other locked facilities, including Dorothy Kirby and Community Treatment Facilities like Starview and Vista del Mar.

May 21: Placements and STRTPS and Continuum of Care Reform

• The subcommittee will discussion and vision what should be gone, and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) about 1) decision-making about who is placed in suitable placements like Short-term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs); and 2) placement facilities and practices. The discussion should take into account progress and lessons learned about efforts through Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) to overhaul the framework, culture and practices of groups homes that serve both foster and probation youth.

June 18: Synthesize and Revise All Subcommittee Recommendations

July 16 or 23: Finalize and Submit Subcommittee Recommendations to the full Workgroup
Understanding Policy Decisions/Flow to Juvenile Hall

Identifying Pathways for Juvenile Hall
1. Youth arrested for new law violation
2. Youth violates probation
3. Youth arrested with outstanding bench warrant
4. Youth at detention hearing
5. Youth receives a placement order as part of court ordered disposition
6. Youth “fails” placement
7. What else?
What is a Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI)? A RAI is a tool used at juvenile hall intake to help intake officers make an objective decision about whether a young person is a “high risk” and should therefore be detained pre-adjudication.

How are they Developed? The tools use an algorithmic assessment; they use historical patterns of data and statistics to predict which youth are “high risk” to (1) fail to appear to court pre-adjudication; or (2) have a new petition (that is eventually sustained) pre-adjudication.

Concerns about RAIs and Racial and Ethnic Disparities.

- **Structural Racism.** Even a “race neutral” tool administered in a system in which systemic and structural racism persist, will likely not mitigate disparity but simply reproduce inequity. The veneer of “race neutrality” that can be viewed as a “silver bullet” in detention reform and can therefore slow efforts to address institutional and structural racism.

- **Alternatives to Detention.** Accepting “high risk” tacitly accepts that the best response for these young people is pre-adjudication incarceration. BI suggests exploring a different response to “risk,” one with deeper resource investment in helping young people succeed in their communities.

- **Conflating Risk and Needs.** Some tools assess youth’s needs, and this can increase their overall score, making it more likely they are detained. While it is important to meet youths’ needs, this should not be a reason a young person is detained.
## Available Data on Use of Juvenile Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Data Sources</th>
<th>Examples of What we Can Learn</th>
<th>Examples of What we Cannot Learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **One Day Count from Probation (April 17, 2020)** | • Snapshot of Detention at each juvenile hall on April 17, 2020 by gender and status | • How long youth detained on day of snapshot  
• Reason youth detained for (ie. Offense youth referred to juvenile hall for)  
• Racial / ethnic breakdown of snapshot |
| **CA DOJ Data (JCPSS)** | • Trends in numbers, rates and disparity in secure detention admissions (2006-2018) by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Reasons for youth admissions to secure detention (2006-2018) by race/ethnicity, age and gender.  
• Final outcome of cases (sustained offense and disposition) where youth was securely detained.  
• Comparison of LA County Detention Use compared to other Counties | • Details about reasons for admissions (ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of offenses; appears that court order violations are undercounted)  
• Conditions youth are released under (ie: released outright)  
• How the detention risk tool (LADS) informs detention decisions  
• How many youth are released at their detention hearing.  
• Use of Specific Juvenile Halls.  
• Residence Zip Code of detained youth.  
• Length of time youth are detained.  
• Details about final disposition of youth detained (ie: DOJ Data includes broad categories of disposition and categorizes electronic monitoring “EM” with commitment to county facility/Camps).  
• Average Time in Juvenile for specific offenses. |
| **BSCC Detention Profile** | • Trends in snapshot of youth detained in each juvenile hall  
• Trends in use of juvenile hall by misdemeanor vs. felony.*  
• Average length of stay in juvenile hall.  
• Bookings for WIC 601 and 777 (note: I am suggesting we NOT use this- doesn’t appear accurate) | • Data by Race/ethnicity (Detention Profile data does not require submission of data disaggregated by race/ethnicity)  
• Trends in use of juvenile hall for probation violations (eg. Instructions for data collection includes “If the juvenile is being held on a violation of probation only, refer back to the offense on which the probation is based (e.g., a juvenile on probation for a felony who is in custody for a probation violation is counted in the felony category).”)  
• Average Time in Juvenile for specific offenses. |
Snapshot: April 17, 2020
Status of Youth in Juvenile Hall (4/17/20)

- Case Pending Disposition (241 youth)
- Camp Placement - New (34 youth)
- DKC Placement (27 youth)
- Suitable Placement - New (19 youth)
- DJJ New Juvenile (18 youth)
- Suitable Placement Detention Pend Replacement (7 youth)
- Return To Camp (6 youth)
- Suitable Placement Detained Pending Court (6 youth)
- All Other (16 youth)

All Other includes: Camp Case Return (5); DKC Case Returns (3); Adult Court Unfit(2); Camp Case Return Medical (2); 777 Violation (1); Awaiting Release (1); DJJ New Adult; OOC Transfer (1)
Data from CA DOJ
Number of Secure Detention Admissions

Secure Detention by Race/Ethnicity

Source: Data were retrieved via public record request to the California Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ collects data via the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). The JCPSS database is designed to collect, compile and report statistical data on the administration of juvenile justice in California. It provides information on a juvenile’s process through from probation intake to final case disposition. The JCPSS electronic files date from 2002 to the present and are submitted to DOJ by County Probation agencies. For more information see: https://oag.ca.gov/cjs/c/databases.
Hereinafter source referred to as: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Rates and Disparity in Secure Detention Admissions

Rate of Secure Detention
(per 1,000 youth in population)

Disparity in Secure Detention:
Black Youth

Disparity in Secure Detention:
Latino Youth

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Top Charges Contributing to Secure Detention (2018)

Top 10 charges account for 90% of detention admissions (3019 of 3321 admissions)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)

Note: when a youth was referred to probation for more than one offenses, only the most serious or "primary offense" is counted.
Top Charges Contributing to Secure Detention for Girls (2018)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)

Note: when a youth was referred to probation for more than one offenses, only the most serious or “primary offense” is counted.
Exploring Assault and Battery and Robbery

• Are youth of color more likely to be detained for Assault and Battery (m)? For Robbery (f)?
• What ultimately happens when youth are referred to probation for Assault and Battery (m)? For Robbery (f)?
Disparity in Detention for Assault and Battery (m) and Robbery (f)

Detention for Assault and Battery

- White (n=117): 58% Securely Detained, 42% Not Detained
- Black (n=555): 50% Securely Detained, 50% Not Detained
- Latino (n=1062): 57% Securely Detained, 43% Not Detained
- API (n=48): 63% Securely Detained, 38% Not Detained

Black youth referred to probation for Assault and Battery (m) are more likely than White youth to be detained. Whereas 50% of Black youth referred for Assault and Battery were detained pre-adjudication, only 42% of White youth were.

Detention for Robbery

- White (n=31): 61% Securely Detained, 39% Not Detained
- Black (n=713): 35% Securely Detained, 65% Not Detained
- Latino (n=1062): 40% Securely Detained, 60% Not Detained
- API (n=48): 50% Securely Detained, 50% Not Detained

Youth of Color referred to probation for Robbery (f) are more likely than White youth to be detained. Whereas 65% of Black youth and 60% of Latino youth referred for Robbery were detained pre-adjudication, only 39% of White youth were.
Referred for Robbery: Sustained Offenses and Dispositions In vs. Out of Custody

**Securely Detained Pre-Adjudication**
- Closed / Dismissed: (116; 14%)
- Out of County Transfer: (11; 2%)
- Sustained as Other Offense: (270; 33%)
- Sustained as Robbery: (431, 52%)

**Unknown**
- Closed / Dismissed: (91; 6%)

**Case Handled Out of Custody**
- Closed / Dismissed: (130; 25)
- Out of County Transfer: (7; 1%)
- Sustained as Other Offense: (152, 30%)
- Sustained As Robbery: (222; 43%)

**Sustained Offenses of Charges Initiated as Robbery**
- Petty Theft (M) (103, 13%)
- Assault (F) (57, 7%)
- Assault and Battery (M) (38; 5%)
- Theft (F) (29; 4%)

**Disposition of Cases Sustained as Robbery**
- Wardship Probation Supervised at Home: (203 cases 47%)
- Secure County or EM (102 cases; 24%)
- Private Facility (102 cases; 24%)
- DJJ (20 cases; 5%)

**Sustained Offenses of Charges Initiated as Robbery**
- Petty Theft (M) (58, 11%)
- Assault and Battery (M) (30; 6%)
- Assault (F) (22, 4%)
- Theft (F) (14; 3%)

**Disposition of Cases Sustained as Robbery**
- Wardship Probation Supervised at Home (116 cases 51%)
- Private Facility (55 cases; 24%)
- Secure County or EM (41 cases; 18%)
- DJJ (8 cases; 3%)

Source: California Department of Justice (2006-2018, JCPSS)
Secure Detention in Los Angeles County Compared to Other Counties (2018)

Rate of Detention (2018)
(per 1,000 youth in population)
Data from BSCC Detention Profile
### ADP in Juvenile Hall Trends

*(December of each year)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall</th>
<th>L. A. Central Juvenile Hall</th>
<th>Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% change 2010-2018:**
- Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall: -43%
- L. A. Central Juvenile Hall: -55%
- Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall: -52%
- Total: -50%

**% change 2010-2019:**
- Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall: -9%
- L. A. Central Juvenile Hall: -24%
- Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall: -100%
- Total: -47%

## Offense Types in Juvenile Hall Trends

*(Fourth Quarter of each year)*

### Offense Types in Juvenile Hall Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Misdemeanor</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Felony</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Instructions for data collection include if the juvenile is being held on a violation of probation only, refer back to the offense on which the probation is based (e.g., a juvenile on probation for a felony who is in custody for a probation violation is counted in the felony category).
Average Length of Stay in Juvenile Hall Trends

What Other Questions do you have about Juvenile Hall?
Revisit and Affirm LA Model Principles and Youth Development Framework
Avoid system involvement (both dependency and justice) whenever possible

Avoid removing youth from their homes whenever possible

Promote and expand holistic youth development supports for both youth and families across a continuum of responses, in and outside of dependency and justice systems to respond to harms

Downsize and transform the culture of institutions – especially the Probation Department as a whole and juvenile halls – in order for all other change to be meaningful

Improve data collection/sharing (as well as protections), evaluation, training and accountability all around

Engage youth and families at every stage of decision-making

Capitalize on what we have - improve coordination and collaboration across systems to better leverage existing resources and efforts
What is New / Transformed / Gone?
ARC Survey Questions and General Responses

1) **When and where was your experience in the justice system?**
   
   10 youth reported that they had prior involvement with DJJ; two with juvenile hall; and one with juvenile hall, DJJ and adult county jail.

2) **Whatever it was that brought you into the justice system, what else would you have needed?**
   
   Youth generally became involved with the justice system due to a sense of belonging. Many explained that not having the right role models in their lives, coupled with a challenging environment, made things difficult to navigate. One youth mentioned that his family’s struggle to pay rent and put food on the table made him feel like he wasn’t part of a community, and that when you don’t feel part of a community, then gangs, drugs and other negative influences become persuasive and lead to incarceration.

3) **What would you like to see happen for youth who commit some kind of offense in the future?**
   
   The young men were creative and bold in answering this. They proposed ideas such as having the young adult select the disposition in court. For example, the judge can propose three sentencing options and the youth receives counseling and guidance to make a decision for themselves. Others said that those in charge should prioritize meaningful tools for rehabilitation such as education, therapy, and a support system—both inside and out. Also, having a continuum of care is key for kids who commit the most serious harms. All agreed that a young individual should have more than a second chance outside of an institutional setting and the emphasis should be on prevention and diversion with a focus on job training.

4) **What do you think youth in the legal system need to thrive and to achieve the goals they make for themselves?**
   
   Most said understanding the meanings of court disposition terms and conditions is essential for them to thrive once they return home. Many explained the challenges of understanding the court process, as well as little to no time to talk with their attorney to ask for clarity. Having an attorney/law expert’s explanation or having it written out in simpler language can be helpful in remembering, understanding and following it during supervision.

5) **What helps you grow?**
   
   All agreed that guidance from a support group or mentor would allow them to build the confidence to grow and take advantage of opportunities that they may have not tried in the past. One youth mentioned that having people around who didn’t judge him motivated and helped him grow. Also, by networking with people with similar experience, you learn and grow from their guidance.

6) **What keeps you safe?**
   
   All mention that having a clear mind and awareness—that each choice has consequences whether good or bad—to prevent impulsiveness or radical behavior keeps them safe. Exercising the ability to remove themselves from situations that will cause harm to them or others also makes them feel safe. Giving youth tools helps them recognize bad situations and their own behavior.
Listening Sessions with Juvenile Hall and Camp Staff

Questions
1. What would you do to improve outcomes, without any limitations and all needed resources?
2. What has contributed to your best successes?
3. What have been your biggest barriers to being successful?
4. What support would you need to do your job best?
5. What are your biggest hopes for this youth justice restructuring project? What are your biggest anxieties?

Themes and Quotes
Because answers to the aforementioned questions often addressed multiple questions simultaneously, we have organized them by theme.

1) Improving outcomes and ingredients of success

   Youth Needs
     - Programs and Services Inside and Outside in Partnership with Community-Based Organizations
       • “We’re really trying to teach and train youth on how to function and cope with the situation they’ll live in.”
       • “We’ve spent so much time focusing on teaching youth how to function within dysfunction.”
       • “It once snowed at Challenger and the kids ran outside and were so excited because they had never seen snow. We take them to the movies as a reward. Youth need these experiences.”
       • “Youth need to get help from the community and parents at home; we need more support emotionally and financially for youth.”
       • “It could be music, art, reading, culinary programs - we need more of those.”
       • “We have to work within the communities that our young people go into...we create an artificial, unrealistic environment [in camps] in which they are encouraged, supported.”
       • “There’s a lack of continuity between what we do and when they go home; some of the programs we do in-house need to have a better transitioning component.”
       • “A lot of youth are behind in education. They need tutoring inside and outside.”
       • “One successful program is our college program—LA probation has the largest postgraduate programming in the state; we worked with Youth Law Center and the legislature to make that possible. CPOC was initially against it. It was something new and historically when people think about education, they don’t think about probation. In our case, education is probation led.”
- “Exposing youth to cultural experiences that on their own they wouldn’t go to is important. We work with Museum of Tolerance, UCLA, USC…”
- “We need to have better relationships with our CBOs. And really establish stalwart partnerships.”
- “I have only been with the department 7 years and was with CBOs for 21 years...now that I’m in Probation, many of the advocacy groups and CBOs that I used to work with somehow see me as an enemy instead of an ally. We need to truly understand that camp and community collaboration are important.”
- “We would have more extracurricular activities. Now we have 1-2 hours of rec outside a day, but we need more; things to keep youth learning.”
- “When I worked outside of the department, I had opportunities to train with probation, not by probation. And it might be a good idea to do collaborative training. It would be a good idea to partner more closely.”
- “Having a person be in charge of programming like me at every facility is needed.”
- “Working with CBOs is awesome. To better serve and better relate with youth. Finding CBOS with pure motives...we do run into a lot of CBOs who have an agenda. It’s very disheartening.”

**Family supports**
- “There is a disconnect with family - we need to support a whole family...with things like more adaptive parenting skills.”
- “Understanding the behavior of youth requires understanding the culture of their families and communities.”
- “Counseling needs to be provided for parents as well as youth because there is a lot of trauma.”

**Relationships and Communication**
- “I believe that we are providing encouragement and supports.”
- “Meeting youth needs has to be based on what they ask for, and challenging them to think outside of the box...Listen to all of what they say, before you respond—it plays a huge difference in working with youth. You understand them a better, it gives you more patience, it gives them space to be who they are.”
- “Start with basics first—communication, before getting to prepping for an interview.”
- “We should give youth more information about the process, and have MDTs right from the beginning... Help them not feel hopeless; having hope makes a different kid.”
- “When I worked in JH, even with limited staffing, we still figured out communication with youth…and had better results. We need to communicate with the minors, build rapport. Engage them with goal-setting. Even hard core gang members have a soft size.”
“Well before hall detention, youth probably had many interactions with police; they’re not in the mindset of receiving programs. In halls, we have to break through that mentality and gang mentality; it can feel like throwing things at a wall that’s not listening or sticking; breaking down psychology is the best thing that’s worked for me.”

- **Sense of discipline and structure**
  - “When they get here, they need discipline and the structure—they actually crave that and if it’s implemented by the right staff, we are successful.”
  - “It’s all over the place when they’re running around in streets.”
  - “When they come here, I don’t know when the last time they ate was, or if they ate.”

- **Sense of security**
  - “When probationers feel safe, they become teenagers again.”
  - “When youth act up, and they tend to when they feel unsafe.”
  - “Most youth have never had real structure, consistent food, safety.”

- **Safety and Accountability: specific approaches**
  - “The youth coming in haven’t changed since 2000 and 1990s; my parents used to work in probation...But being held accountable has changed. For instance, it used to be that your points were taken away...or an assault would be charged...Now we want to be a therapeutic department, while no one outside in the community is going to be therapeutic. Taking away pepper spray isn’t a big deal—if you have a strong board, then you don’t need it. We need to teach life lessons.”
  - “Taking away the SHU wasn’t good. We need more education for youth—need more, like financial literacy, life skills.”
  - “When you take away consequences, we don’t have authority to impose discipline or accountability.”
  - “Some practices like special housing units and pepper spray are considered “child abuse”—but they aren’t.”
  - “Things fell off in the last 3 years. There was a different approach—and young people were not held accountable, and there was $10-50K worth of damage to property. The highest levels of staff assault.”
  - “Too many times probation is trying to ignore behavior. Negative behavior was not being addressed. This shuts down the programs. Back in the day, behaviors would not have shut down the program.”
  - “The SHU is better for youth who are going to be a resource drain.”
  - “Accountability gets overshadowed by the protections...so they can’t say that, can’t do this. We all know as adults that you need accountability to be able to make change.”
Closer to home, small group models

- “Something that’s happening right now—the realignment to move Youth Authority out. And I really see that as a positive. I know how challenging it is for our families to visit youth even within the county. God forbid you have a kid in Ventura. Having youth closer to communities and working with caring organizations who share the common goals of supporting youth...all these things are key.
- “The environment we’re creating with the small group model is fortunate.”

Community and System-Level Needs

- **Improve whole communities and social disparities**
  - “We have to deal with the community, and social disparities.”
  - “Youth get pulled back into negative influences when they go home. We also need to understand all the disparities in society that help explain behavior too.”

- **Collaboration with and improvement of other systems**
  - “We have to go beyond this institution and involve families and schools.”
  - “We need better collaboration between probation, schools and mental health. We’re not on the same page, sometimes we’re battling each other, and telling each other that’s not your job.”
  - “We need to work with community-based orgs, schools, and mental health—need to go outside of institutions, and all work together.”
  - “MDTs are harder to do in juvenile hall. We’re starting to do that and mirror what takes place in camps.”
  - “Sometimes DCFS needs to do more. Sometimes the problem is the courts.”

Staff Effectiveness

- **Job satisfaction**
  - “We do a better job when we feel good about our job. When we feel cohesive...all of a sudden all our levels go up.”
  - “Staff has to really want to do the job.”

- **Staff cohesion and consistency**
  - “When you have a cohesive unit, and everyone is on the same page, those units function well.”
  - “One thing I would love our Department to get back to is building a family among the units.”
  - “Having team consistency has helped us to do a better job with the kids. They start to understand our expectations. We build rapport with them. They’re in the same building, have the same schedules.”
  - “It alleviates stress to have consistent staff.”
  - “Consistency brings about trust, which brings about change...”
• “One of the biggest challenges is inconsistency in staffing—so staff is unfamiliar with kids, and vice versa.”

○ Sufficient staffing and security and effectiveness
  • “Staff are not coming in.”
  • “Why they aren’t coming in, it’s because they’re not feeling safe, without things like pepper spray; youth not being held accountable.”
  • More staff, which allows for more time to build rapport with kids
  • “Being straightforward but open and honest [with staff] is important.”
  • “[What has contributed to the best successes is] being fair and supportive with youth and staff.”

○ Staff qualifications
  • “I’m big on education but I don’t think you always need that to do work with this youth. You need experience.”
  • “We hire staff with a squeaky background—many of the staff can’t relate to this youth population.”
  • “Currently, hiring staff who are 20-21 year olds working with a very challenging population; they’re not experienced.”
  • “Youth pick up on officers being new; we need some veteran officers who have experience in juvenile halls.”
  • “A probation officer should know his strengths and weaknesses—like I’m not a great board counselor, but I know I’m a good writer and resource finder...we need to put staff in the right positions, match them to their niche.”

○ Staff supervision and training
  • “It’s important to have a good supervisor who can balance youth and staff perspective and create common ground—separate group versus individual dynamics. Once you have the group feeling successful, then an individual can be successful.”
  • “I agree with needing training — we need support as staff.”
  • “Our job is really tough; there is so much burnt out. The majority of staff go in with good intentions.”
  • “Support seems to be the biggest issue I’ve seen.”
  • “We have a younger staff at BJH. We have an opportunity to shape and mold new staff.”
  • “I think there is good support for supervisors already.”

○ Staff agency/control and youth accountability
  • “There’s been chaos, lack of structure because of our inability to enforce structure.”
  • “There should be one way mirrors so probation officers can see out, and youth can’t see in.” (So as to create less distraction for probation officers).
  • “The biggest barrier outside of staffing is the SHU unit, which wasn’t really solitary confinement, when it was taken away; tools are being
taken away like pepper spray. But we haven’t replaced them with anything.”

• “Staff become disgruntled and then become part of the problem.”

- **Staff inclusion in policy and strategy planning and implementation**
  - “Many people in the department aren’t included enough during strategic planning and implementation sessions.”
  - “We should allow line deputies to sit at the table to be in these conversations. Because we do the jobs. To give the public as well as our managers a realistic look at what’s going on, what the needs of youth are and how to address some of those needs.”

### 2) Challenges Not Mentioned in Solutions and Successes

**A PO is “expected to be all the things”**

- “We are expected to be all things—we are counselors, we are surrogate parents, we are the authority if we are allowed to use that authority, even mental health staff…although [mental health staff] are useful, they are there when youth are tranquil and want to talk; we are always there.”
- “It becomes a lot for one person.”
- “A lot of times we’re looked to be the end all; a lot of times there weren’t interventions by those who criticize us…Like when the Reagan administration got rid of mental health hospitals, they were never replaced.”
- “We become the de facto everything.”

**Child advocacy and other outsiders**

- “One problem is—and it’s not very popular to say this—the child advocacy.”
- “Too many people setting parameters on the job who have never done the job.”
- “Sometimes there are people pushing agendas who don’t have the full picture.”
- “With some of these supposedly evidence-based programs, like the developmental disabled unit, we only see escalation and recidivism on that unit.”
- “At Barry J., it’s a challenge when we have people who don’t do the job who dictate how we should function.”
- “It’s utter chaos having people dictate how programming should look.”

**Working with some nonprofits**

- “Working with some nonprofits was a challenge…they didn’t have enough capacity…these particular nonprofits had a lack of connection with the young people.”
- “A lot of nonprofits are doing amazing work out there—but we have to really take a close look at different CBOS to figure out which are there to do good work versus grow and enrich themselves.”
Youth not participating

- “One program where we experienced a lot of challenges was the County Youth Regis Program, which originally started as the Youth Opportunity Program that I and others started with Public Works...Getting youth set up and they had opportunities, it was difficult to explain why youth failed. They had things handed them on a silver platter—as soon as they left us, they would go back to their own habits.”

Capacity of probation

- “Another struggle is sometimes as probation we shoot ourselves in the foot. We start a little too thin...we’re pulled in a different directions. So when we build a program we need to really make sure it gets the attention it deserves and ensure it is successful.”
- “The challenge can be that we’re limited in mindset sometimes. When you’re not able to hear or absorb those keys that they give us...”

Measuring success

- “Short time frame is not going actually accomplish all these. We’re planting a lot of seeds. But we’re looking for immediate results, or something that’s not trackable.”

3) Biggest Hopes for the Youth Justice Workgroup

- “That it is for better outcomes. We can do a better job. That the changes are positive and really improve outcomes for youth in LA County. Change is a good thing.”
- “That this is inclusive.”
- “Smaller caseloads, and the person at top can pull it all together cross-referencing and collaborating with other agencies.”
- “Need structure and accountability in any restructuring; otherwise ultimately seems like we’re making a prison population rather than rehabilitation.”
- “That we are able to plant seeds and help [youth] along the way. We genuinely want to see the kids succeed.”
- “We look within this system to reach into community before the youth become justice involved.”

4) Anxieties

- “It gets lost in translation, because of politics and depending on who is involved. That we throw out the baby with the bath water.”
- “One of things I keep hearing that systems like probation shouldn’t exist. I think we’ve missed the boat. Sometimes youth are in better care with us than at home. They may not have food in refrigerator or escaping violence in home or gang violence.”
- “When I hear juvenile justice reform, it is throw out probation, detention. I don’t think that personally that that’s realistic.”
- “My biggest anxiety is the loss of accountability. If we don’t do these carefully, our youth will continue to lose accountability for their action. For a lot of youth, we really are the safe haven for them.”
• “My biggest anxieties are [about] the tools that have been taken away, and are in the process of being taken away—they’re not being replaced at all, but also there are misperceptions about the tools like solitary confinement...Youth are being allowed to walk without their hands behind their backs; this makes the youth unsafe and the workplace unsafe.”

• “Not developing the program correctly, and making the environment unsafe for youth and staff.”

• “That bureaucracy will make things worse.”

• “The constant criticizing of us.”

• “Not putting together a cohesive program.”

• “We had little say or weren’t heard around Kilpatrick; and that wasn’t a success...we said certain components needed to be added—and it was ignored. Under the former chief, youth could act with impunity. You can’t formulate a design without accountability.”

• “Anxiety as an administrator is that the hard work of our staff is being overlooked. Someone else thinks they can do better. We’re doing an amazing job.”
Youth Justice Work Group Learning Exchange – John Choi
Ramsey County, MN County Attorney

Please tune in and join us in a Youth Justice Work Group Learning Exchange with John Choi, Ramsey County (St. Paul), MN County Attorney. This opportunity for a learning and peer exchange is scheduled for May 18, 2020, 1:00-2:00 PST. Please see below for Zoom access information.

A little background on John and his office. John Choi was sworn in as the first Korean-American chief prosecutor in the country in 2011. Since taking office, John has become a state and national leader in progressive justice reform, working with public officials and impacted communities to reimagine justice and the role of prosecutors. John has transformed the way government intervenes in domestic violence and sex trafficking in Minnesota; and, successfully advocated to reform state drug laws and reinvest savings in community-based solutions. Some of the initiatives John and his office are actively taking part are Reshaping Prosecution and the Ramsey County Learning Community.

The Ramsey County prosecutor’s office is one of three jurisdictions in the country participating Vera Institute’s Reshaping Prosecution program which partners with reform-minded prosecutors across the country to redefine their roles within the system. Each component of the work is part of an effort to end mass incarceration, address racial disparities, and help prosecutors be more transparent and accountable to the communities they serve.

Ramsey County is one of the two Learning Communities working with the W. Haywood Burns Institute to deconstruct institutionalized racism in the administration of justice. John Choi and members of his team have been welcome and active leaders in the work to engage structural racism in the administration of justice and the provision of human services.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/95427908024?pwd=TDIzMcnNLVmt0TlZyc0V6L1ljUkxkUT09
Meeting ID: 954 2790 8024

One tap mobile
+16699006833, 95427908024# US (San Jose)
Youth Justice Work Group Learning Exchange - Judge Roger Chan
San Francisco, CA Superior Court

Please tune in and join us in a Youth Justice Work Group Learning Exchange with the Honorable Judge Roger C. Chan, San Francisco Superior Court. This opportunity for a learning and peer exchange is scheduled for May 26, 2020, 10:00-11:00 PST. Please see below for Zoom access information.

A little background on Judge Chan. He was appointed to the San Francisco Superior Court by Governor Jerry Brown in 2016. He has been assigned to the Unified Family Court since August 2017 where he presides over family, dependency, and juvenile justice cases, including the juvenile justice collaborative courts. Judge Chan is a member of the court’s Executive Committee; of the California Judges Association, CJA’s Juvenile Court Judges of California Executive Committee; the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges; and, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to the Judicial Council.

Prior to his appointment, Judge Chan represented children and youth in San Francisco and Alameda counties for 18 years, including co-founding and serving as the Executive Director of East Bay Children’s Law Offices in Oakland. Judge Chan has co-sponsored several bills into law that improve how the juvenile court serves youth. Judge Chan is honored to be the first openly LGBT Asian-American appointed to the San Francisco Superior Court.

One might say that Judge Chan has “inherited” years of sustained youth justice reforms in San Francisco, institutionalized changed policies and practices aimed to better the outcomes for justice involved youth. Of greater significance, Judge Chan brings to bear the values of holding systems responsible and accountable to youth; of embracing community in the development of supervision plans to help youth succeed; and, acknowledging the importance of language and the humanity of all people.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/95228509523

Meeting ID: 952 2850 9523
One tap mobile
+16699006833, 95228509523# US (San Jose)
Please tune in and join us in a Youth Justice Work Group Learning Exchange with Elizabeth Tolzmann and Zachary Hylton with the Ramsey County (St. Paul), MN County Managers Office. This opportunity for a learning exchange is scheduled for June 30, 2020, 10:30-11:45 PST. Please see below for Zoom access information.

A little background on Elizabeth and Zachary. Elizabeth currently serves as the Director of Policy & Planning in Ramsey County, where she leads planning and policy analysis across the organization to inform the county's strategic priorities and supports its vision, mission and goals. She reports directly to the County Manager and serves on the County's executive team. Prior to joining Ramsey County, she served as the Assistant City Manager for the City of Bloomington, where she led overall organizational management, strategic planning, employee engagement, workforce development; and community engagement in the city.

Zachary currently serves as a Senior Policy Analyst for the Ramsey County Manager’s Office, where he works with leadership and the community on policy and strategic initiatives including homelessness and housing, countywide performance measurement, and criminal justice system transformation. All with an emphasis on addressing racial equity and engaging community at decision making tables. He has worked with Juvenile Probation where he completed an evaluation of the out-of-home placement process that led to significant reform to probation strategy and placement processes.

Ramsey County has established “well-being” as the metric for all county agencies. Thus, the expectation is that county departments execute their objectives through the well-being lens. This ethos forms the foundation for how their county departments are constructed and managed. As documented by the county government organizational chart that follows, departments have been consolidated and organized to promote collective outcomes and cross department priority-based budget development.

The County Managers Office led the development of an initiative known as Transforming Systems Together (TST). This initiative has been funded to mandate that systems work across sectors to get county dollars to services based on priority and need, not bureaucracy. The concept which envisions participatory budget development will be designed and managed by a group of 9
systems stakeholders and 9 community members. Moving from community engagement to power-sharing.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/93373807873?pwd=bWFXbEZODRJejdcVY5Y1F4dE1hdz09
Meeting ID: 933 7380 7873

One tap mobile
+16699006833,,93373807873# US (San Jose) 13462487799,,93373807873# US
+(Houston)
Vision
A vibrant community where all are valued and thrive.

Mission
A county of excellence working with you to enhance our quality of life.

Goals

**WELL-BEING**
Strengthen individual, family and community health, safety and well-being through effective safety-net services, innovative programming, prevention and early intervention, and environmental stewardship.

**PROSPERITY**
Cultivate economic prosperity and invest in neighborhoods with concentrated financial poverty through proactive leadership and inclusive initiatives that engage all communities in decisions about our future.

**OPPORTUNITY**
Enhance access to opportunity and mobility for all residents and businesses through connections to education, employment and economic development throughout our region.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**
Model fiscal accountability, transparency and strategic investments through professional operations and financial management.
Strategic Team

Health and Wellness
- Community Corrections
- Financial Assistance Services
- Health and Wellness Administration
- Healthcare Services (LOR & RCCC)
- Public Health
- Social Services
- Veterans Services

Information and Public Records
- Communications
- County Assessor
- Government Relations
- Information and Public Records Administration
- Information Services
- Project Management Office
- Property Tax, Records & Election Services

Economic Growth and Community Investment
- Community & Economic Development (HRA)
- Library
- Parks & Recreation
- Property Management
- Public Works
- Workforce Solutions

Residents

Safety and Justice
- County Attorney’s Office
- County Sheriff’s Office
- Emergency Communications
- Emergency Management & Homeland Security
- Medical Examiner

County Manager | Finance | Human Resources | Policy and Planning

RAMSEY COUNTY
## Revised Timeline and Workgroup for Los Angeles County Youth Justice Workgroup

### 2020 Overview: April to October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **April** | - Absorb existing findings and recommendations;  
- Develop initial set of subcommittee recs based on youth development and wellness framework. |
| **May** | - Absorb initial learning  
- Refine initial and make further recs based on youth development and wellness framework. |
| **June** | - Absorb additional learning from learning sessions;  
- Refine and make further recommendations based on youth development and wellness framework. |
| **July** | - Make final subcommittee recommendations |
| **August** | - View, give feedback on and refine overall model based on synthesis of |
| **September** | - Finalize model. |
| **October** | - Submit model to BOS. |
## 2. OVERALL TIMELINE - BY SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goals</th>
<th>Tasks for the Full Workgroup</th>
<th>Tasks for Each Subcommittee</th>
<th>Listening Sessions</th>
<th>Learning Exchanges</th>
<th>Legal Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
<td>- Absorb existing findings and recommendations; - Develop initial set of subcommittee recs based on youth development and wellness framework.</td>
<td>Develop initial recommendations within subcommittees.</td>
<td>A) Discuss reports / research B) Identify recs to build on and any gaps / remaining questions; C) Identify and prioritize key 2-3 listening sessions to conduct in May and June.</td>
<td>Prioritize and prepare for listening sessions.</td>
<td>To answer questions about laws/contracts impacted by proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td>- Absorb initial learning - Refine initial and make further recs based on youth development and wellness framework.</td>
<td>Present draft subcommittee proposal(s) and challenges.</td>
<td>A) Refine initial and identify additional recs to build on and any gaps / remaining questions.</td>
<td>Conduct listening sessions.</td>
<td>1) Webinar on probation system; 2) Role of Prosecutors in Transforming Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td>- Absorb additional learning from listening sessions; - Refine and make further recommendations based on youth development and wellness framework.</td>
<td>Share out learnings from listening sessions / exchanges and revised proposals from each subcommittee.</td>
<td>A) Share and absorb additional learning from listening sessions; B) Revise proposed recommendations.</td>
<td>Conduct listening sessions.</td>
<td>(Fill in schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
<td>- Make final subcommittee recommendations</td>
<td>Present subcommittee proposals and challenges for Consultant Team to synthesize and develop cohesive draft model(s).</td>
<td>A) Finalize draft of revised proposed recs; B) Discuss remaining questions / challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fill in schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUG</strong></td>
<td>- View, give feedback on and refine overall model based on synthesis of subcommittee recs.</td>
<td>Discuss initial round of issues raised by synthesis/modeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPT</strong></td>
<td>- Finalize model.</td>
<td>All-day retreat to dive into pieces of the model(s) and work through remaining challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCT</strong></td>
<td>- Submit model to BOS.</td>
<td>Final opportunity for feedback before report-back to BOS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. REVISED TIMELINE - SEQUENTIALLY: YELLOW = Work Group meetings; ORANGE = Subcommittee meetings; BLUE = time between meetings for subcommittee research / work; GREEN = draft recommendations and proposals due; RED = final deliverables due.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>APRIL Move to Design Phase</th>
<th>MAY Outline Initial Proposals</th>
<th>JUNE Listening and Learning</th>
<th>JULY Revise Proposals</th>
<th>AUGUST Synthesizing / Modeling</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER Final Feedback</th>
<th>OCTOBER Submit Report to the Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees review existing reports / research and identify what to take / what to learn more about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittee Meetings #2:</strong> A) Discuss reports / research, B) Identify recs to build on + any gaps / remaining questions, C) Identify key listening sessions to conduct in May.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #4:</strong> A) Visual syllabus for collective work; B) Share-out across subcommittees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 2.0:</strong> Progress report on initial research, engagement, justice system analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees begin to conduct any research needed to draft pieces of recommended model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar: Conduct and disseminate recording of webinar on probation system and functions in LA County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposals from each subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #5:</strong> Present initial subcommittee proposal(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees meet to revise proposals, informed by listening sessions / exchanges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening Sessions:</strong> Focused outreach to get feedback on concrete proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Exchanges:</strong> Focused learning for groups to address key challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #6:</strong> Share out learnings from listening sessions / exchanges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise proposals within each subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #7:</strong> Subcommittees to share and further revise proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees discuss remaining questions / challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Team synthesizes proposals and develops cohesive draft model(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #8:</strong> Review full model and discuss initial issues raised by synthesis / modeling so far.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Team edits and prepares for retreat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #9:</strong> All-day retreat to dive into pieces of the model(s) and work through remaining challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Team finalizes draft report and begins subcommittee mission process with BOS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YJWG Meeting #10:</strong> Final feedback before report to BOS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 3.0:</strong> Report on proposed model and implementation submitted to BOS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SUBCOMMITTEE SYLLABI AND WORKPLANS

SUBCOMMITTEE #1: Youth Development and Diversion

**April 23:** Youth Development Components

- Subcommittee #1 will first reflect on existing work and recommendations, readings, and promising practices in other jurisdictions to discuss what should be gone and what should be different and changed (new and transformed) in a youth development model that equitably reduces the size and scope of the youth justice system.
- We will identify areas where more research and learning is needed and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions

**April 23- May 7:** Smaller Team Meetings

**May 7:** Youth Development Infrastructure

- Next, Subcommittee #1 will discuss the relationship between youth development infrastructure and expanded access to youth diversion for all legally eligible youth, again identifying what should be gone and what should be different and changed (new and transformed) related to youth diversion based on existing work and recommendations, readings, and promising practices in other jurisdictions.
- As learning exchanges and listening sessions begin, we will also reflect on how each will inform our proposed recommendations.

**May 7-May 21:** Small Team Meetings

**May 21:** Relationship Between Youth Development and Youth Diversion

- Subcommittee #1 will then begin to explore the infrastructure needed to support an ideal youth development model that effectively and equitably reduces justice system involvement for youth in Los Angeles County.
- We will also identify concrete next steps to finalize proposed recommendations at this time based on learning from exchanges and listening sessions.

**May 21-June 18:** Small Team Meetings

**June 18:** Subcommittee to synthesize and revise its model and recommendations so far

**July 16 or 23:** Subcommittee to finalize and submit its recommendations to consultants to synthesize all subcommittee recommendations for the full Workgroup

**August:** Full Workgroup convenes to refine full model

**September:** Full Workgroup convenes to finalize full model
SUBCOMMITTEE #2: Youth Formally Processed in the Legal System

April 23: A Review of Existing Recommendations, Structures and Data

This meeting will begin the process of developing recommendations related to youth formally processed through the legal system by discussing what elements of the current system/structures should be gone/changed.

Reference Materials: a) compilation report of existing recommendations to change LA County youth legal system, b) flow diagram of current process for youth who come in contact with law enforcement c) data presentation power point

During this meeting we will do the following:
- Review syllabus and timeline
- Ground the subcommittee in the lived experiences of people who have been formally processed in the legal system as youth
- Discuss the homework that was sent out on 4/13/20 about what should be gone from the existing process and structures that youth face who are formally processed in the legal system.
- Provide a data overview to the subcommittee and request feedback. This presentation will cover what data we have and what data we need.
- Propose and establish smaller subcommittee work groups

April 23- May 7: Smaller Work Group Meetings

May 7: First Report Back from Small Work Groups

This meeting will continue the process of developing recommendations related to youth formally processed through the legal system by discussing report backs from small work groups about what is gone/transformed and new for youth at first point of contact with law enforcement, for youth in the court process and youth sentenced to probation.

Reference Materials: First draft of subcommittee 2 recommendations, tbd

During this meeting we will do the following:
- Discuss any syllabus updates
- Present 1st draft of subcommittee 2 recommendations
- Present on or provide data and listening session updates
- Report back from small work groups about what is gone, transformed, new and discuss

May 7-May 21: Small Work Group Meetings

May 21: Second Report Back from Small Work Groups

This meeting will continue the process of developing recommendations related to youth formally processed through the legal system by discussing report backs from small work groups about what is gone/transformed and new for youth at first point of contact with law enforcement, for youth in the court process and youth sentenced to probation.
During this meeting we will do the following:

- Discuss any syllabus updates
- Present 2nd draft of subcommittee 2 recommendations
- Present on or provide data and listening session updates
- Report back from small work groups about what is gone, transformed, new and discuss

**May 21-June 18: Small Work Group Meetings**

**June 18:** Subcommittee to synthesize and revise its model and recommendations so far

**July 16 or 23:** Subcommittee to finalize and submit its recommendations to consultants to synthesize all subcommittee recommendations for the full Workgroup

**August:** Full Workgroup convenes to refine full model

**September:** Full Workgroup convenes to finalize full model
SUBCOMMITTEE #3: Alternatives to Detention, Incarceration, and Placement

April 23: Detention

- The subcommittee will discuss and vision what should be gone – and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) – about 1) decision-making about who is detained; and 2) detention facilities and practices. We will keep grounding the committee in and build off of key, existing recommendations, and identify remaining questions that need to be answered.
- We will also identify and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions to help answer its questions and solicit feedback on any initial recommendations from the subcommittee.

May 7: Camps - "LA Model"/Kilpatrick principles

- The subcommittee will discuss and vision what should be gone, and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) about 1) decision-making about who is placed in camps; and 2) residential treatment facilities and practices. We will build off of key, existing recommendations – in particular related to the LA Model and Camp Kilpatrick – and identify what is necessary for implementation.
- We will further identify remaining questions that need to be answered, and identify and prioritize 2-3 key listening sessions to help answer its questions and solicit feedback on any initial recommendations from the subcommittee.
- The subcommittee will also consider and assess the effectiveness of other locked facilities, including Dorothy Kirby and Community Treatment Facilities like Starview and Vista del Mar.

May 21: Placements and STRTPS and Continuum of Care Reform

- The subcommittee will discussion and vision what should be gone, and therefore different and changed (new and transformed) about 1) decision-making about who is placed in suitable placements like Short-term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs); and 2) placement facilities and practices. The discussion should take into account progress and lessons learned about efforts through Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) to overhaul the framework, culture and practices of groups homes that serve both foster and probation youth.

June 18: Subcommittee to synthesize and revise its model and recommendations so far

July 16 or 23: Subcommittee to finalize and submit its recommendations to consultants to synthesize all subcommittee recommendations for the full Workgroup

August: Full Workgroup convenes to refine full model

September: Full Workgroup convenes to finalize full model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong>: 1) Strengthen and increase development and diversion alternatives; 2) further reduce numbers of court-involved youth; 3) transform justice system decision-making through MDTs across continuum; 4) launch pilot alternative to incarceration in response to DJJ closure, 5) establish oversight mechanism over new agency and remaining probation department (including JJCC and Youth Commission); and 6) continue transition planning for next phases.</td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong>: 1) Institutionalize diversion in law and policy; 2) expand development; 3) transfer supervision function to new Dept.’s multi-disciplinary restorative model; 4) expand alternatives to incarceration; and 5) continue transition planning for next phase.</td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong>: 1) Continue to strengthen development, diversion and restorative practices; 2) transfer two locked facilities to new depart and close remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition JJCC and PPP to new Department of Youth Services / Youth Development and move YDD over to expand countywide while ending probation citation diversion and school-based programs. Launch Youth Development Learning Institute (YDI) to build youth development workforce and capacity in the county’s existing youth services.</td>
<td>Establish pre-arrest diversion as default for all youth under expanded age recommended by SB 439 assessment in addition to non-707(b)s via local policy and/or leg. Expand YDI to coordinate youth development workers / peacebuilders trained in RCC/TJ at schools, parks, group homes.</td>
<td>Pass policy expanding amending 707(b) category and continue to strengthen youth development by increasing peacebuilders and county-funded services. Schools terminate contracts with local law enforcement agencies as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish five 24hr Youth Centers (1 in each district), launching pre-trial MDTs at each center and building capacity for restorative community conferencing (RCC) / transformative justice (TJ) pods. All non 707(b) become automatic diversion referrals either pre-arrest or pre-filing through new agreement w/ DA.</td>
<td>Select functions of field supervision transition to new model up to age 24 as 24hr centers expand and court-involved population shrinks. Fully fund restorative alternatives to supervision and integrate MDTs at all key decision points.</td>
<td>Expand 24hr Youth Centers in communities countywide. Continue to strengthen MDTs along the continuum. Fully integrate restorative practices in schools, parks, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Alternative Rehabilitative Community model to support DJJ transition by providing an alternative to halls and camps. Oversee universal assessment for release/transfer to LA model. Coordinate comprehensive approach to youth reentry.</td>
<td>Expand alternative rehabilitative community model and relationship with juvenile court to grow alternatives to halls and camps, including for youth impacted by DJJ closure. Strengthen youth reentry services.</td>
<td>Dorothy Kirby and Kilpatrick transition to new Dept. as remaining halls and camps close. Fund / coordinate housing and reentry services for all court-involved youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design new classification / training program for staff, improved contracting / grants mechanisms, data system to inform ongoing planning, and oversight structure. Initial ~$75M Probation funds and first wave of staff (citation diversion and school-based) reallocated to new Dept. for positions and contracts/grants. Launch participatory budgeting in partnership w/ Youth Commission.</td>
<td>Expand staff training program as youth services workforce expands and establish sustainable structure to support youth employment. ~$200M Probation funds reallocated to new Dept. Launch public education / communications campaign.</td>
<td>~$400M probation funds reallocated to new Dept, as probation staff leave by attrition or transition. Continue to generate data to inform improvements and policy change, publish findings!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alternatives continue to reduce school-based arrests.

Visual for Phase 1: January 2021 – June 2022

**New Department of Youth Services / Youth Development**

*Goal:* oversee the implementation of Los Angeles County's new model for youth justice by coordinating existing resources, funding community-based youth alternatives to the traditional justice system and building capacity for youth development and RJ/TJ countywide.
Visual for Coordination with Other Departments and Projects

New Department of Youth Services / Youth Development

Goal: oversee the implementation of Los Angeles County's new model for youth justice by coordinating existing resources, funding community-based youth alternatives to the traditional justice system and building capacity for youth development and RJ/TJ countywide.