



Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

**Annual Report
March 2011**

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Corrections Standards Authority**

Juvenile Justice

Crime Prevention Act

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2011

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95811
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/index.html**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
Matthew L. Cate, *Secretary*

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

Members

Matthew L. Cate, *Chair*

Scott Kernan

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

John Ingrassia

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility
San Diego County Sheriff's Department*

Vacant

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program
Delancey Street Foundation, San Francisco*

Ed Prieto

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or less)
County of Yolo*

Michelle Minor

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Leroy Baca

*Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or more)
County of Los Angeles*

Carol Biondi

*Public Member
County of Los Angeles*

Patricia Bates

*County Supervisor
County of Orange*

Eleanor Andrade-Silva

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Linda Penner

*Chief Probation Officer (county over 200,000 pop.)
County of Fresno*

Collene Campbell

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Adele Arnold

*Chief Probation Officer (county under 200,000 pop.)
County of Tuolumne*

Sandra McBrayer

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff*

Kimberly Epps

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Vacant

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Officer*

Charlotte Mello

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Staff

Debbie Rives, *Executive Director (A)*

CORRECTIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
Marlon Yarber, *Deputy Director*

STANDARDS AND TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONS DIVISION
Evonne Garner, *Deputy Director (A)*

FACILITIES STANDARDS AND OPERATIONS DIVISION
Gary Wion, *Deputy Director*

COUNTY FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION DIVISION
Robert J. Takeshta, *Deputy Director*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
An Overview of the Program	2-4
■ Local Planning Process	
■ Program Evaluation	
■ Program Administration	
Statewide Evaluation	5-7
■ Program Expenditures	
■ Mandated Outcomes	
■ Local Outcomes	
County Program Highlights	8-12
Appendices	
A. Statewide Expenditure Summary	
B. Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs	
C. Change in County Arrest Rate	

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) is a state funded initiative that supports juvenile probation programs with a record of reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and young offenders. In fiscal year (FY) 2009-10 the JJCPA supported 151 programs implemented by counties to address locally identified needs throughout the continuum of responses to juvenile crime. This produced significant improvements in several measures of crime and delinquency for program participants.

The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is responsible for administering the JJCPA and submitting annual reports to the Legislature on: 1) the local planning process; 2) program expenditures; and 3) six mandated juvenile justice outcomes (Government Code Section 30061[4]). This ninth annual report addresses each of these issues.

Local Planning Process: The JJCPA requires counties to establish and maintain a multi-agency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and updating a comprehensive plan that documents the condition of the local juvenile justice system and outlines proposed efforts to fill identified service gaps. Welfare & Institutions Code Section 749.22 defines the JJCC membership.

Program Expenditures: By June 30, 2010, the 56 counties participating in the JJCPA program expended or encumbered \$79,929,574 of State funds in FY 2009-10 (see Appendix A: Statewide Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$629,655 in interest earned on State funds and \$16,855,663 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities, for a combined total of \$17,485,318. Although the JJCPA program does not have a local match requirement, the voluntary infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 108,516 minors participated in the 151 JJCPA programs in 2009-10, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State of \$736.57 (see Appendix B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs).

Juvenile Justice Outcomes: The data submitted by counties for FY 2009-10 indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have a positive impact on juvenile crime and delinquency in communities throughout California. This is evident in the results for the mandated juvenile justice outcomes as well as education outcomes tracked by a number of counties. For example:

- Youth participating in JJCPA programs were arrested for new offenses and incarcerated at significantly lower rates than youth in a comparable reference group.
- JJCPA participants also successfully completed probation at significantly higher rates than youth in the comparison group.
- JJCPA youth achieved significantly higher school attendance rates and grade point averages, and exhibited significantly lower school expulsion rates than reference group youth.

In total, these results are highly consistent with those achieved in previous years, and provide ongoing evidence that the programs are continuing to have a positive effect on the juveniles they serve.

An Overview of the Program

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) program was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Chapter 353) to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

The JJCPA involves a partnership between the state of California, 56¹ counties, and community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. It is a partnership that recognizes the need for juvenile justice resources and the value of local discretion and multi-agency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

Local Planning Process

State policies have increasingly recognized the need to strengthen the local juvenile justice system and its array of alternatives and graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders through a comprehensive local planning process that requires probation departments to coordinate their activities with other key stakeholders.

The programs funded by the JJCPA address a continuum of responses to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders—prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration—and respond to specific problems associated with these populations in each county.

To receive the initial JJCPA allocation, each county developed a comprehensive multi-agency juvenile justice plan that included an assessment of existing resources targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders and their families as well as a local action strategy for addressing identified gaps in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency. Each year counties either update or modify their plan, as needed, or reapply for continuation funding for the same programs as the prior year. The application and any plan modifications must be approved by the CSA before funds can be expended.²

In an effort to ensure coordination and collaboration among the various local agencies serving at-risk youth and young offenders, the JJCPA requires Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils (JJCCs) chaired by the county's chief probation officer and comprised of representatives of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the board of supervisors, social services, education, mental health and community-based organizations to develop and modify the plan. The JJCCs typically meet monthly or quarterly to review program progress and evaluation data.

Chief probation officers and other JJCC members continue to report high levels of satisfaction with the JJCPA planning process, noting that it maximizes their ability to implement or expand successful programs tailored to the specific populations and needs

¹Alpine and Sierra Counties chose not to participate in this program due to the small amount of their expected allocations. Allocations are based, in part, on county population.

² Prior to the July 2005 reorganization of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency, the CSA was known as the Board of Corrections.

of local jurisdictions. In addition to pointing out that juvenile justice planning has become more strategic, integrated, and outcome-oriented, JJCC members have underscored the value of sharing information regarding youth programs across the many disciplines involved in the JJCPA programs.

Program Funding

Funding for the JJCPA has changed significantly in recent years. In previous years, counties received their JJCPA allocation in October for program expenditures occurring the following fiscal year (i.e., nine months in advance). Thus, counties were able to bank and earn interest on the allocation, with the earned interest used for program expenditures in the subsequent fiscal year. In FY 2005-06, as part of its budget reduction strategy, the Legislature changed this process so that counties would receive their allocation immediately prior to the period in which the funds were to be spent. The elimination of the nine month lead time allowed the State, rather than counties, to benefit from any interest earned on the funds. In FY 2005-06 only approximately one-quarter of funding was provided to counties (\$25,825,000). Consequently, the program year budget for JJCPA (July 1 through June 30) is a combination of two fiscal year allocations. The program year budget is comprised of the fourth quarter allocation from the prior year and the first three quarters of the current year. Below is a summary of recent changes:

- Funding for JJCPA changed again in FY 2008-09. As part of the State Budget Act (Assembly Bill (AB) X3 3), the funding source for JJCPA was changed from State General Fund (SGF) to the Vehicle License Fee (VLF). The change took effect April 1, 2009;
- The allocation amount for JJCPA was reduced during the 2008-09 program year. The third quarter allocation, distributed April 17, 2009, was the last of the State General Fund dollars allocated to JJCPA and was only \$8,718,749 statewide;
- The Department of Finance and State Controller's Office allowed counties, at their discretion, to use fourth quarter funding (normally reserved to fund the first quarter of the next program year) to cover both third and fourth quarter expenditures if needed;
- JJCPA funding is currently set in statute as 21.30 percent of the Local Safety and Protection Account of the Transportation Fund, funded by the VLF.
- The amount of VLF funding available is known to fluctuate. Consequently, counties no longer receive a set allocation amount, as their allocations will vary quarter-by-quarter; and
- According to the Department of Finance, funding of the Local Safety and Protection Account is a continuous appropriation without respect to fiscal years. However, the VLF fee dedicated amount of 0.15 percent that funds the account is set to sunset on June 30, 2011.

It should be noted the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2011-12 and recently introduced legislation (AB 66 and AB X1 9) each attempt to address the sunset date related to the VLF dedicated 0.15 percent.

In addition to changes in funding cycle and source, the Department of Finance is required to annually adjust allocations to reflect changes in county populations.

Program Evaluation

The JJCPA requires funded programs to be modeled on evidence-based strategies that have proven effective in curbing juvenile delinquency. Additionally, the JJCPA requires counties to collect and report information related to annual program expenditures and juvenile justice outcomes. At the local level, these evaluation activities enable stakeholders to assess progress toward desired goals, refine their programs, and target available resources. These evaluation efforts also enable the Legislature to monitor the State's investment in the JJCPA and assess its overall impact on juvenile crime and delinquency.

The data that counties are statutorily required to report are categorized into six categories:

- Arrest rate;
- Incarceration rate;
- Probation violation rate;
- Probation completion rate;
- Restitution completion rate; and
- Community service completion rate.

Individual counties only report on outcome measures applicable to their programs. For example, a truancy prevention program serving primarily middle-school students would not be expected to have an impact on the completion of probation rate. In this example, the program would only report data for relevant categories.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, many counties track and report on local outcomes specific to their individual programs. For example, some local outcomes relate to education and track academic progress through school attendance, grade point averages, and school behavior reports.

Program Administration

The Legislature tasked the CSA with the administration of the JJCPA including annual legislative reports to address:

- the overall effectiveness of the local planning process;
- program expenditures for each county; and
- data for the six statutorily mandated outcome measures.

In administering the JJCPA, CSA staff work closely with the local JJCCs in developing and updating their comprehensive juvenile justice plan. This plan must be approved by the CSA each year before JJCPA funds may be expended. At the request of counties, CSA provides extensive technical assistance to identify and document programmatic strategies that have proven effective in reducing juvenile crime, determine appropriate evaluation designs for the proposed programs, and problem-solve on issues related to program implementation and evaluation.

Statewide Evaluation

Program Expenditures

The counties participating in the JJCPA program expended \$79,929,574 of State funds in FY 2009-10 (see Appendix A: Statewide Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$629,655 in interest earned on State funds and \$16,855,663 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities for a combined total of \$17,485,318. Although the JJCPA program does not have a local match requirement, the voluntary infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 108,516 minors participated in the 151 JJCPA programs in FY 2009-10, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State (JJCPA funds) of \$736.57 (see Appendix B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs). The current year per capita costs are far less than the first year of the initiative (\$1,201.53), and have declined during the life of the JJCPA program.

Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As required by law, the statewide evaluation of the JJCPA focuses on six legislatively mandated outcomes: arrest rate, incarceration rate, probation violation rate; and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The data collected by counties on these six variables continue to indicate that the JJCPA programs are having the intended effect of curbing juvenile crime and delinquency in California.³

Statewide results for the six legislatively mandated for FY 2009-10 are shown in Table A. All results are averages across programs for rates measured as percentages (e.g., percent of youth with one or more arrest). As has been the practice since the inception of the JJCPA Program, programs included in the computation of these averages are those that reported results for a minimum of 15 Program Juveniles and 15 Reference Group youth.⁴

As reported in Table A, average rates for Program Juveniles for the first three outcomes (arrest rate, incarceration rate, and completion of probation rate) are all statistically significantly different in the desired direction from the average rates for Reference Group youth⁵. Results for probation violation rate, while in the desired direction, are not statistically significant.⁶ Results for the last two outcomes (completion of restitution and completion of community service) indicate that on average Program Juveniles completed these obligations at essentially the same rates as Reference Group youth.

³For most outcomes, counties assess their progress by comparing the results for participating minors and a reference group (i.e., participants prior to entering the program, prior program participants, juveniles comparable to those who received program services, or some other external reference group). The length and timing of the evaluation periods vary from program to program. For example, one program might compare the arrest rate of participants for the three-month period prior to program entry with their arrest rate during the first three months of the program, whereas another program might use a longer time period and compare the arrest rate prior to program entry with the arrest rate following program exit.

⁴ This restriction is applied to protect against the calculation of statewide average rates from being inappropriately influenced by individual program rates that are based on very few cases and are thus subject to extreme fluctuations from year to year.

⁵ Per standard practice, statistically significant differences are those with a probability of .05 or less of occurring by chance ($p \leq .05$).

⁶ Probation violation rate was measured as mean number of violations in 8 programs. Across these 8 programs, the mean number of probation violations averaged .56 for Program Juveniles and .84 for Reference Group youth. The difference in these averages is statistically significant.

TABLE A

Results for Legislatively-Mandated Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate*	120	26.1%	31.0%
Incarceration Rate*	125	24.2%	27.6%
Completion of Probation*	103	25.4%	22.6%
Probation Violation Rate	93	29.6%	31.6%
Completion of Restitution	69	26.9%	26.7%
Completion of Community Service	63	42.8%	43.0%

*Statistically significant group differences

On balance, results for the six legislatively mandated outcomes are very similar to those obtained in previous years, with Program Juveniles performing significantly better than Reference Group youth with respect to arrest rate, incarceration rate and completion of probation rate, and not distinguishing themselves from Reference Group youth with respect to completion of restitution and completion of community service. Probation violation rate was significantly lower for Program Juveniles for the first time in FY 2008-09 but did not achieve statistical significance in the current report year.

The enabling legislation also requires that all counties specify a goal or expectation for change in the annual countywide arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles age 10 to 17. Each county also specifies data from a baseline year to which comparisons are made. In most cases, the baseline for this reporting period is 2008. Results for this measure are presented for the most recent reporting year (2009) in Appendix C.

A total of 45 counties (80.4 percent) achieved an actual arrest rate reduction, and there was little relationship between predicted reductions and actual reductions, as 20 of the 24 counties that expected a decline achieved a decline (83.3 percent), but seven of the eight counties that predicted an increase (87.5 percent) and 18 of the 24 counties that predicted no change (75 percent) also experienced reductions.

At the individual county level, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles can vary significantly from year to year – especially in counties having small juvenile populations. A better indicator of arrest rate trends is the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles based on the total population of juveniles in the state – or in the case of JJCPA, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles for the total population of juveniles in the 56 counties that receive JJCPA funding. As shown in Appendix C, this rate decreased from 4,973 in 2008 to 4,511 in 2009. This is the eighth year-to-year decline that has occurred in the nine years since CSA began preparing annual reports to the Legislature on JJCPA.

Education Outcomes

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes. Some of these are common to a sufficient number of programs to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. As shown in Table B, the results for these outcomes are quite impressive. Program Juveniles, on average, achieved significantly higher grade point averages, attended a significantly greater percentage of school days, and were significantly less likely to be expelled from school than Reference Group youth. Group differences in percent of youth suspended from school were in the desired direction, but did not achieve statistical significance. Again, these results are highly consistent with results obtained in previous years.

TABLE B

Results for Education Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
% School Days Attended*	17	87.3%	72.9%
% Expelled from School*	11	.8%	2.0%
Grade Point Average*	13	2.24	1.90
% Suspended from School	11	18.0%	24.0%

*Statistically significant group differences

County Program Highlights

During FY 2009-10 there were 151 programs in the 56 participating counties. The JJCPA recognizes the importance of a continuum of responses to the complex problem of juvenile crime and delinquency – from prevention, intervention, and supervision to treatment and incapacitation or commitment to a local juvenile facility. The local planning and decision-making process inherent in JJCPA resulted in the implementation, improvement and/or expansion of a variety of juvenile justice efforts, as evidenced by the following examples.

Prevention/Early Intervention/Supervision

The following programs, typically referred to as prevention/early intervention and supervision programs, focus on keeping at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system and preventing first-time offenders from further involvement in the juvenile justice system. These programs may also provide very intensive supervision for probation youth in the community and in school settings.

As early as the 1800's, the Court and school officials recognized the link between truancy and delinquency⁷. A recent report by a nonprofit anti-crime organization clearly indicated the correlation between high school graduation and criminal behavior. The report stated:

“California faces a dropout crisis that poses a significant threat to public safety....High school dropouts are three and one-half times more likely than high school graduates to be arrested, and more than eight times as likely to be in jail or prison. Across the country, 68 percent of state prison inmates do not receive a high school diploma. According to researchers, a 10 percentage point increase in graduation rates reduces murder and assault rates by about 20 percent, which would prevent 500 murders and over 20,000 aggravated assaults in California each year.”⁸

The programs below are a few examples of the many early intervention and school-based programs supported by JJCPA.

San Luis Obispo County has developed an Intensive Community Diversion (ICD) program. The ICD program uses a standardized risk/needs assessment tool (Youth Level Service Case Management Inventory) and consists of three components to meet the changing needs of minors and their families in San Luis Obispo County. Following the initial assessment, some minors are referred to the District Attorney's Office for the filing of a formal petition for probation. However, the majority of minor's are supervised on informal diversion pursuant to Welfare and Institution Code Section 654.

In FY 2009-10, the ICD program supported three Deputy Probation Officers located in the northern, central, and southern regions of San Luis Obispo County. The regional placement of these officers benefits families with limited funds and few transportation options. The number of minors who participated in the program in FY 2009-10 was 520.

⁷ FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, March 1997.

⁸ “School or the Streets, Crime and California's Dropout Crisis”, 2007. Fight Crime: Invest in Kids California.

The minors served ranged in age from 13 to 18 years old. The three ICD Deputy Probation Officers have recently broadened their duties to incorporate a larger population of minors who have been referred to probation through local law enforcement agencies.

The Deputy Probation Officers comprise the first component of the ICD program and focus on minors who register as “high needs” on the assessment instrument. The minors may score at any level of risk since the focus of the program is on minors with high needs. The ICD staff use Motivational Interviewing techniques to focus on the most critical factors relevant to the initial assessment and evaluation of the minor’s needs. These factors include: the minor’s age, the nature of the presenting charge, the minor’s prior probation or law enforcement history, any substance abuse history, an evaluation of parents or guardians, an assessment of the minor’s known peers, and the minor’s mental health history.

ICD deputies carry caseloads of approximately 40 cases each. The relatively small caseload size allows for greater supervision of these “high-needs” minors. The minors involved in the ICD program often come from dysfunctional families that have multiple county agencies involved in their lives. The ICD officers work to coordinate their services with the other agencies.

The second component of the ICD utilizes a Probation Assistant to oversee a countywide caseload of approximately 80 first time misdemeanor offenders. Eight interns from the California Polytechnic State University and local community colleges help to mentor and supervise these medium risk minors.

The third category of minor assessed by ICD deputies are those who score low on the risk/needs assessment instrument. Utilizing evidence-based criteria, these minors are admonished and their cases are closed without any further intervention from the probation department. In these cases officers have found that the parents are taking appropriate action commensurate to the nature of the charge and further involvement from probation is not warranted.

Using new assessment tools such as a standardized risk instrument, as well as other evidence-based techniques; the ICD staff have been able to continue to reduce the flow of minors into the juvenile justice system while directing minors and their parents to outside agencies for counseling and specialized programs.

Lassen County operates a Truancy Reduction Program (TRP) that places Deputy Probation Officers on fourteen school campuses in six districts. The program began in 2001 and was initially designed to assist four K – 8th grade districts by targeting an estimated 70 habitual truants at the onset of implementation. Only one Deputy Probation Officer was responsible for working with the four districts. Over the past nine years the program has evolved into one of the most successful prevention and intervention programs involving Deputy Probation Officers in Lassen County.

The TRP program now consists of four Deputy Probation Officers working with the fourteen schools. Probation Officers are utilized to ensure that all students attend school; to assist school administrators with behavioral problems; and to provide intense supervision of approximately 100 juvenile probationers. The regular presence of Deputy Probation Officers on campuses has reduced the number of negative situations during

both school hours and evening sporting events. Probation Officers are frequently contacted by school staff and parents requesting assistance with various issues including: bullying, possible substance abuse, school violence, and gang related issues.

School districts provide approximately \$56,000 annually to support the TRP program. This additional revenue allows the Probation Department to add a Deputy Probation Officer to the program.

TRP Deputy Probation Officers host and participate in Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings, truancy conferences, and behavioral discipline meetings. In some circumstances, students who have become habitually truant or defiant are placed on informal probation for the remainder of the school year. The use of informal probation allows the Deputy Probation Officers to ensure that the students remain in compliance with school rules and attendance, and allows the officers to increase the supervision of the minors by checking on their homes, lockers, vehicles, etc. Additionally, the officers may be involved in seeking the suspension of the student's drivers license, assign community services hours, and require substance abuse testing.

Under the TRP program, approximately ten cases annually are submitted to the District Attorney for the prosecution of parents under Penal Code Section 272. This code section allows for the prosecution of parents for contributing to the delinquency of a minor by failing to make certain that their children attend school.

The TRP Deputy Probation Officers work collaboratively with the school administration, the Lassen County Sheriff's Department, the Susanville Police Department, and various community agencies. The Probation Department is very proactive in referring families to other appropriate agencies for assistance in areas including: mental health issues, additional educational needs, substance abuse treatment, family counseling, Child Protective Services, and Public Health concerns. Due to the constant exposure and participation of the Probation Officers, caseloads within the juvenile division have decreased by approximately 75% over the last nine years. Although this last reporting year incarceration rates of truant students has increased slightly for delinquent behaviors by 0.21%, this remains a very small percentage when compared to the one thousand five (1,005) students involved in the truancy program. The number of arrests also increased from 4.84% to 8.85%. This may be due to the increased direct involvement that Deputy Probation Officers have with this population. Despite the slight increase in arrest rates, the overall number of truant days at school decreased and aggregate grade point averages continue to increase.

Truancy is a major problem which can have a negative impact on the future of the youth and decrease revenue to the county and its districts. In addition to Deputy Probation Officers making certain students arrive and remain in school, the Probation Department generates the Mandated Cost forms for School Intervention and Advocacy, which provides some reimbursement for truancy related activities.

San Bernardino County operates a School Probation Officer program that involves thirteen full-time and two part-time probation officers who are assigned to various school districts throughout San Bernardino County. Youth experiencing attendance or behavior problems are identified by school officials and referred to officers assigned to either a specific school campus or the school district. The program's objective is to reduce campus delinquent behavior, and provide prevention and intervention services to

students who have attendance and suspension/expulsion issues. The program also provides training to campus staff and works with students and their families to solve the problems causing the referral. Every school probation officer works to protect the community and acts as a special liaison between the minor/family and the many city, county and state agencies involved. The officers participate in educational events such as the annual School Attendance Review Board (SARB) Training sponsored by San Bernardino County Schools, and they participate in additional training as it relates to school issues, such as courses on the latest drug and gang/graffiti trends.

School Probation Officers both teach and refer students and adults to various treatment courses in the local community. These educational treatment programs may include: anger management, truancy intervention, drug and alcohol intervention, the Parent Project, individual and group counseling, tutoring, and mentoring programs. During this past year, School Probation Officers conducted the following interventions:

- 478 classes were conducted by probation staff;
- 111 parents completed the Parent Project;
- 665 minors were referred to individual counseling;
- 1,057 minors were referred to various types of treatment classes;
- 396 minors were referred to tutoring; and
- 1,287 minors were put on a behavioral contract.

Officers assist school districts by performing home visits to make contact with parents and students regarding attendance, and to serve SARB hearing notices. In FY 2009-10, School Probation Officers conducted 6,775 home visits and 6,190 direct contact visits with the parents of minors assigned to the program. The officers also regularly participated in Truancy Sweeps, SARB hearings, functioned as speakers at school Career Days, and provide added security on campuses for special events, such as football games and graduations.

Several of the School Probation Officers are trained to write “Clean Sweep” tickets for infractions committed at school, and must then testify in Juvenile Informal and Traffic Court regarding the allegations. Others officers may issue SARB citations to the parents of the minors in the program. The officers are called to testify at the hearings where parents are held accountable and ordered to pay fines for their child’s non-attendance at school.

The School Probation Officers are always looking for innovative ideas to curb discipline and truancy. One officer provides outreach to local businesses asking them to not provide goods or services to minors during school hours so that minors have less incentive to leave campus. Another officer met with all sixth graders in the district at the end of the last school year to explain the “Clean Sweep” process and to advise the students that minor infractions they may have committed as elementary school students will be considered more serious as they enter middle school, often resulting in a citation.

San Joaquin County has developed a Probation Officers on Campus program (POOC) program to provide increased supervision of probationers and to increase opportunities for behavior improvement of minors. By placing an officer directly on high school campuses, the program seeks to establish closer supervision of juvenile probationers. The daily close proximity provides greater opportunity for contact, both formal and informal, between the officer and minor. Officers are able to observe the minors

interactions with other minors and school officials, and are able to identify a minor's associates and enforce no contact orders.

The POOC program also has overall delinquency prevention goals that connect to the entire school campus. The presence of officers on campus increases campus safety and provide a safer learning environment for all students. Additionally, POOC officers can function as mentors and role models for all students. Officers can assist at-risk students who are not on probation by providing informal counseling, referrals for services, and advise minors of the severe consequences for delinquent behavior. Officers are available to work with parents and all students. Minors not involved in the program are classified as "walk-ins". These minors and their families can receive crisis intervention and assistance in obtaining program referrals to other service agencies.

In FY 2009-2010, the POOC program consisted of one Probation Unit Supervisor and seven Probation Officers. The POOC unit provided services to 18 high schools in San Joaquin County. The program served a total of 204 probation clients. Of these, 144 (70.6%) remained in the program for a full 6 months (the program's specified duration). The remaining 60 cases (29.4%) failed to complete the program. The specific reasons for not completing the program included: youth was expelled from school; the case was transferred to the gang caseload for further supervision; the youth was ordered into a residential placement; a bench warrant was issued for the youth; or the minor was sentenced to the Juvenile Probation Camp.

The Probation Officers on Campus program has noted the following successes during FY 2009-10:

- minors participating in the program have lower incidences of arrest,
- minors participating in the program have lower incidences of incarceration,
- minors participating in the program have increased success in completing probation, and
- schools participating in the program have experienced a decrease in the number of crimes committed on or near campus.

APPENDIX A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary⁹

County	State Fund Expenditures	Interest Expenditures	Non-JCPA Fund Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Alameda	\$3,063,185	\$20,000	\$18,740	\$3,101,925
Alpine	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$75,004	\$19	\$28,906	\$103,929
Butte	\$434,952	\$3,715	\$210,906	\$649,573
Calaveras	\$111,932	\$18,185	\$0	\$130,117
Colusa	\$50,566	\$1,264	\$0	\$51,830
Contra Costa	\$2,437,705	\$9,166	\$1,151,773	\$3,598,644
Del Norte	\$67,922	\$0	\$11,550	\$79,472
El Dorado	\$396,145	\$995	\$250,049	\$647,189
Fresno	\$2,185,316	\$0	\$294,764	\$2,480,080
Glenn	\$67,213	\$101	\$3,362	\$70,676
Humboldt	\$300,674	\$4,500	\$1,196,154	\$1,501,328
Imperial	\$352,196	\$0	\$24,940	\$377,136
Inyo	\$41,490	\$0	\$0	\$41,490
Kern	\$2,014,796	\$80,592	\$614,440	\$2,709,828
Kings	\$390,382	\$22,232	\$0	\$412,614
Lake	\$161,863	\$3,237	\$0	\$165,100
Lassen	\$91,350	\$0	\$57,300	\$148,650
Los Angeles	\$20,862,578	\$166,199	\$0	\$21,028,777
Madera	\$346,711	\$0	\$0	\$346,711
Marin	\$650,408	\$0	\$0	\$650,408
Mariposa	\$42,081	\$0	\$0	\$42,081
Mendocino	\$207,364	\$392	\$0	\$207,756
Merced	\$644,960	\$2,591	\$167,289	\$814,840
Modoc	\$24,515	\$0	\$0	\$24,515
Mono	\$21,834	\$305	\$0	\$22,139
Monterey	\$992,824	\$40,281	\$1,640,357	\$2,673,462
Napa	\$270,832	\$1,439	\$96,332	\$368,603
Nevada	\$214,629	\$593	\$58,139	\$273,361
Orange	\$6,180,409	\$17,962	\$784,029	\$6,982,400
Placer	\$780,612	\$13,293	\$142,935	\$936,840
Plumas	\$48,419	\$714	\$60,515	\$109,648
Riverside	\$5,273,071	\$51,791	\$91,900	\$5,416,762
Sacramento	\$2,821,567	\$9,922	\$255,597	\$3,087,086
San Benito	\$134,747	\$21	\$0	\$134,768
San Bernardino	\$4,040,752	\$14,483	\$353,999	\$4,409,234
San Diego	\$5,236,969	\$31,466	\$5,720,894	\$10,989,329
San Francisco	\$1,794,679	\$34,396	\$0	\$1,829,075
San Joaquin	\$1,732,510	\$0	\$0	\$1,732,510
San Luis Obispo	\$680,555	\$702	\$254,945	\$936,202
San Mateo	\$1,714,563	\$0	\$779,139	\$2,493,702
Santa Barbara	\$991,491	\$3,110	\$349,560	\$1,344,161
Santa Clara	\$3,653,917	\$10,079	\$961,201	\$4,625,197
Santa Cruz	\$528,708	\$1,841	\$170,799	\$701,348
Shasta	\$358,581	\$0	\$347,509	\$706,090
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Siskiyou	\$98,335	\$511	\$0	\$98,846
Solano	\$1,031,651	\$2,815	\$0	\$1,034,466
Sonoma	\$1,224,150	\$681	\$0	\$1,224,831
Stanislaus	\$1,173,309	\$0	\$0	\$1,173,309
Sutter	\$190,059	\$1,888	\$219,063	\$411,010
Tehama	\$120,266	\$0	\$0	\$120,266
Trinity	\$70,578	\$174	\$0	\$70,752
Tulare	\$1,084,763	\$9,000	\$173	\$1,093,936
Tuolumne	\$159,465	\$0	\$38,180	\$197,645
Ventura	\$1,646,242	\$49,000	\$500,224	\$2,195,466
Yolo	\$438,646	\$0	\$0	\$438,646
Yuba	\$199,133	\$0	\$0	\$199,133
TOTALS	\$79,929,574	\$629,655	\$16,855,663	\$97,414,892

⁹ Alpine and Sierra counties did not apply for JJCPA funding.

APPENDIX B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs

County	Programs	Program Participants	Average Per Capita Costs	
			JJCPA Funds	All Funds
Alameda	1	908	\$3,373.55	\$3,416.22
Amador	1	94	\$797.91	\$1,105.63
Butte	2	458	\$949.68	\$1,418.28
Calaveras	2	50	\$2,238.64	\$2,602.34
Colusa	1	67	\$754.72	\$773.58
Contra Costa	3	1082	\$2,252.96	\$3,325.92
Del Norte	1	88	\$771.84	\$903.09
El Dorado	1	453	\$874.49	\$1,428.67
Fresno	1	665	\$3,286.19	\$3,729.44
Glenn	1	53	\$1,268.17	\$1,333.51
Humboldt	2	345	\$871.52	\$4,351.68
Imperial	2	866	\$406.69	\$435.49
Inyo	2	6322	\$6.56	\$6.56
Kern	2	442	\$4,558.36	\$6,130.83
Kings	1	233	\$1,675.46	\$1,770.88
Lake	1	73	\$2,217.30	\$2,261.64
Lassen	3	1058	\$86.34	\$140.50
Los Angeles	14	39152	\$532.86	\$537.11
Madera	1	77	\$4,502.74	\$4,502.74
Marin	3	267	\$2,435.99	\$2,435.99
Mariposa	1	240	\$175.34	\$175.34
Mendocino	1	75	\$2,764.85	\$2,770.08
Merced	1	99	\$6,514.75	\$8,230.71
Modoc	1	11	\$2,228.64	\$2,228.64
Mono	1	16	\$1,364.62	\$1,383.69
Monterey	7	4905	\$202.41	\$545.05
Napa	2	201	\$1,347.42	\$1,833.85
Nevada	3	210	\$1,022.04	\$1,301.72
Orange	8	3819	\$1,618.33	\$1,828.33
Placer	3	942	\$828.68	\$994.52
Plumas	1	85	\$569.64	\$1,289.98
Riverside	2	1259	\$4,188.30	\$4,302.43
Sacramento	3	414	\$6,815.38	\$7,456.73
San Benito	1	41	\$3,286.51	\$3,287.02
San Bernardino	4	14011	\$288.40	\$314.70
San Diego	3	5565	\$941.05	\$1,974.72
San Francisco	5	1629	\$1,101.71	\$1,122.82
San Joaquin	3	1445	\$1,198.97	\$1,198.97
San Luis Obispo	2	573	\$1,187.71	\$1,633.86
San Mateo	8	2028	\$845.45	\$1,229.64
Santa Barbara	2	424	\$2,338.42	\$3,170.19
Santa Clara	4	10362	\$352.63	\$446.36
Santa Cruz	2	501	\$1,055.31	\$1,399.90
Shasta	4	487	\$736.31	\$1,449.88
Siskiyou	1	269	\$365.56	\$367.46
Solano	4	952	\$1,083.67	\$1,086.62
Sonoma	6	626	\$1,955.51	\$1,956.60
Stanislaus	2	1067	\$1,099.63	\$1,099.63
Sutter	4	170	\$1,117.99	\$2,417.71
Tehama	1	41	\$2,933.32	\$2,933.32
Trinity	1	23	\$3,068.61	\$3,076.17
Tulare	2	789	\$1,374.86	\$1,386.48
Tuolumne	2	78	\$2,044.42	\$2,533.91
Ventura	6	2119	\$776.90	\$1,036.09
Yolo	3	99	\$4,430.77	\$4,430.77
Yuba	2	188	\$1,059.22	\$1,059.22
Totals	151	108516	\$736.57	\$897.70

APPENDIX C: Change in County Arrest Rates per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17

County	Baseline Rate	Baseline Year	Expectation	Current Rate (2009)	Change	Meet/Exceed Expectations
Alameda	4,962	2000	Decrease	3,778	-1,184	Yes
Amador	3,572	2008	No Change	2,542	-1,030	Yes
Butte	6,705	2008	Increase	5,146	-1,559	Yes
Calaveras	6,355	2008	Decrease	4,625	-1,730	Yes
Colusa	3,934	2008	Increase	1,905	-2,029	Yes
Contra Costa	3,521	2008	Decrease	2,827	-694	Yes
Del Norte	5,108	2008	No Change	4,798	-310	Yes
El Dorado	3,721	2008	Decrease	3,674	-47	Yes
Fresno	6,416	2008	Decrease	5,466	-950	Yes
Glenn	9,526	2008	Decrease	5,682	-3,844	Yes
Humboldt	8,530	2008	Decrease	7,973	-557	Yes
Imperial	4,352	2008	Increase	5,307	955	Yes
Inyo	3,883	2008	No Change	2,170	-1,713	Yes
Kern	5,395	2008	No Change	4,385	-1,010	Yes
Kings	11,870	2008	No Change	7,622	-4,248	Yes
Lake	9,235	2008	No Change	7,505	-1,730	Yes
Lassen	4,714	2008	Decrease	4,611	-103	Yes
Los Angeles	4,634	2008	Decrease	3,792	-842	Yes
Madera	3,544	2008	Increase	3,482	-62	Yes
Marin	7,912	2008	Decrease	6,537	-1,375	Yes
Mariposa	4,172	2008	No Change	5,397	1,225	No
Mendocino	7,043	2008	Decrease	5,638	-1,405	Yes
Merced	8,916	2008	No Change	7,971	-945	Yes
Modoc	1,932	2008	Decrease	8,970	7,038	No
Mono	1,290	2008	No Change	1,171	-119	Yes
Monterey	6,069	2008	No Change	6,255	186	No
Napa	3,095	2008	Decrease	3,247	152	No
Nevada	5,778	2008	No Change	5,455	-323	Yes
Orange	6,646	1997	Decrease	4,014	-2,632	Yes
Placer	3,871	2008	No Change	4,013	142	No
Plumas	8,492	2008	Increase	4,772	-3,720	Yes
Riverside	3,909	2008	Decrease	3,711	-198	Yes
Sacramento	3,752	2008	No Change	3,654	-98	Yes
San Benito	5,218	2008	No Change	5,796	578	No
San Bernardino	6,311	2008	No Change	5,320	-991	Yes
San Diego	4,655	2008	Decrease	4,787	132	No
San Francisco	5,603	2008	No Change	5,300	-303	Yes
San Joaquin	6,744	2008	Decrease	5,466	-1,278	Yes
San Luis Obispo	4,384	2008	Decrease	4,041	-343	Yes
San Mateo	3,850	2008	No Change	3,983	133	No
Santa Barbara	7,226	2008	Increase	6,693	-533	Yes
Santa Clara	7,040	2008	No Change	5,731	-1,309	Yes
Santa Cruz	7,156	2008	Decrease	7,399	243	No
Shasta	6,896	2008	No Change	7,617	721	No
Siskiyou	6,710	2008	No Change	5,582	-1,128	Yes
Solano	10,094	2008	Decrease	6,351	-3,743	Yes
Sonoma	6,027	2008	Increase	5,587	-440	Yes
Stanislaus	5,533	2008	Decrease	4,152	-1,381	Yes
Sutter	5,699	2008	Increase	5,291	-408	Yes
Tehama	4,840	2008	Decrease	4,352	-488	Yes
Trinity	5,284	2008	No Change	2,682	-2,602	Yes
Tulare	6,768	2008	No Change	5,830	-938	Yes
Tuolumne	6,740	2008	No Change	6,623	-117	Yes
Ventura	7,095	2008	Decrease	7,004	-91	Yes
Yolo	5,845	2008	Decrease	5,119	-726	Yes
Yuba	4,418	2008	No Change	2,859	-1,559	Yes
All JJCPA Counties	4973	2008		4,511	-462	

Source data for Arrest Rates: Criminal Justice Center, California Department of Justice

