

**SONOMA  
COUNTY**

**COMPREHENSIVE  
MULTIAGENCY  
JUVENILE JUSTICE PLAN**

**Prepared for the Juvenile Justice Coordinating  
Council**

**Cora M. Guy, Chief Probation Officer**

## SONOMA COUNTY

### JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

NAME	TITLE	ORGANIZATION
Bruce Alfano	Executive Director	West County Community Services
Cecilia Belle	Executive Director	Sonoma County Associates for Youth and Development
Mary Jo Burns	Manager, Juvenile Services	Sonoma County Mental Health Department
Sergeant Tom Combs	Supervisor, School Resource Officers	Santa Rosa Police Department
Joan Demitz	Secretary	Sonoma County Juvenile Justice Commission
Suzanne Flint	Representative	Sonoma Valley Youth and Family Services
Dyan Foster	Executive Director	Teen Court/Routes for Youth
John Gurney	Chief of Police	Sonoma Police Department
Cora M. Guy	Chief Probation Officer	Sonoma County Probation Department
Richard Haines	Case Manager	Petaluma People's Services Center
Jill Hale	Analyst	Sonoma County Sheriff's Department
Norm Howard	Juvenile Deputy Public Defender	Sonoma County Public Defender
Robert Kambak	Representative	Sonoma County Architect's Office
Mike Kerns	Member	Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
Mark Kostielney	Department Head	Sonoma County Health

		Department
Richard Lawrence	Director	RECOURSE
Eric Lofchie	Representative	Windsor Youth and Family Services
Mike Mullins	District Attorney	Sonoma County District Attorney
Ed Patterson	Executive Director	Social Advocates for Youth
Andy Pickett	Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office
Arnold Rosenfield	Juvenile Court Judge	Sonoma County Superior Court, Juvenile Division
Tim Schraeder	Representative	Redwood Children's Services
Michael Spielman	Executive Director	Drug Abuse Alternative Center
Mary Ann Swanson	Supervisor, Children's Services	Sonoma County Human Services Department
Robert Tavanotti	Principal, Community Schools	Sonoma County Office of Education
Kathy Vander Vennet	Youth Services Supervisor	Rohnert Park Youth and Family Services

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Background and Summary of Sonoma County's Juvenile Justice System (1)**
  - A. Background (1)
  - B. Existing Continuum of Responses to Juvenile Crime (4)
  - C. Roles of Current Collaborations (10)
  - D. Strengths and Challenges of the Current System (11)
  
- II. Identification and Prioritization of Neighborhoods, Schools and Other Areas Facing a Significant Risk from Juvenile Crime (14)**
  - A. School Data (14)
  - B. Neighborhood Data (20)
  
- III. Local Juvenile Justice Action Strategies (21)**
  - A. Enhance Continuum of Care (21)
  - B. Continue to Leverage Community Resources (21)
  - C. Improve Data Collection Capabilities (22)
  - D. Objectives and Outcome Measures to Determine Effectiveness of Strategies (23)
  
- IV. Proposed Programs (24)**
  - A. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Adoption of Functional Family Therapy Model (24)
  - B. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Initiation of Family Group Conferencing (28)
  - C. Placement of Probation Officers on Selected High School Campuses (32)
  - D. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Creation of a Day Reporting Center (36)
  - E. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Establish Mentoring Program (40)
  - F. Development of Coordinated Information Sharing Systems (43)

# I. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF SONOMA COUNTY'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

## A. BACKGROUND

### Sonoma County Demographics

Located in the winegrowing region of Northern California north and east of the San Francisco Bay Area, Sonoma County is California's sixteenth largest county. More rural than urban, Sonoma County has a population of approximately 437,025 residents,<sup>1</sup> which is a 31,771 person, or 7%, increase over the County's population in 1993. A majority of the County's residents - 65% - live in the County's nine cities, with the City of Santa Rosa leading in population growth by adding 17,700 residents - 15% - since 1993 to attain its current population of 136,100.

The growth in Sonoma County's population is bringing an influx of new families to the County and this in turn results in the demand for additional youth services of all types, including those within the juvenile justice system. Although estimates for future population expansion indicate an increasingly older population, the number of youth is also expected to continue to rise.

At present, the 'at risk' youth population, defined as those young people aged 10 to 17 years old, is 51,822.<sup>2</sup> This figure is 11.2% of the County's total population and means that one in ten residents of Sonoma County is a juvenile, age 10 to 17. The at risk juvenile population has grown by over 33% in the decade from 1990 to 2000 and, while the Department of Finance (DOF) is projecting that this population group will continue to increase, its projections are for a slower rate of growth through the year 2020. DOF suggests that the at risk youth population will increase 16.3% over the next 20 years, to stand at 60,270 by 2020.

The DOF data indicates that Sonoma County's at risk population is nearly equally divided between male and female juveniles, with 51% being comprised of boys and 49% girls. Twenty-one percent of the at risk youth population was described as 'minority' in 1990, reflecting the ethnicity of the County as a whole; that designation is anticipated to apply to 39% of at risk youth by the year 2020.

The most current United States Census reports that 9.4% of Sonoma County's total population lived below the poverty level in 1996. Overall, the median household effective buying income for Sonoma County residents has, over the last 10 years, continued to outperform California and the United States and in fact, according again to DOF, per capita income in Sonoma County in 1996 was \$27,353, 7.8% higher than California's average per capita income in that year. In 1996, Sonoma County's per capita income ranked eleventh among California's 58 counties.

With regard to housing costs, Sonoma County can be considered a 'high-cost' county. According to the California Association of Realtors, in December 2000, the median home price in the

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance, 1998.

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit.

Northern Wine Country (which includes Sonoma County) was \$330,800. In comparison, the statewide median home price in that same period was \$249,370.

**Juvenile Justice Demographics:** Paralleling population growth and increases in the cost of living, Sonoma County has also experienced shifts in arrest practices and the numbers and kinds of juvenile arrests. In the 15- year period from 1985 through 1999, juvenile arrests peaked at 4,072 in 1996 and have declined each year since, to stand at a total of 3,453 in 1999. Approximately 808 of these arrests were for felony offenses and 2,645 involved misdemeanors. Thus roughly one out of every four juvenile arrests in Sonoma County involves a felony offense. Historically, felony arrests have increased 29.3%, while misdemeanor arrests increased 21.4%, between 1985 and 1999.

Of the total juvenile arrests in 1999, 830 - 24% - were of females. This is in keeping with the County's experience over the last five years; arrests involving female offenders have averaged about 23.3% each year. However, it is noteworthy that, while the majority of arrests of females continue to be for misdemeanor charges, more young females are now being arrested for felony crimes than was previously the case. In the period between 1985 and 1999, juvenile female felony arrests increased 42.6%, as compared to a 27% increase in felonies for male juvenile offenders.

Whereas, in 1985, only 17% of juveniles arrested in Sonoma County were minority youth, in 1999, nearly 32% of arrested juveniles were members of minority groups.

In spite of the overall decline in juvenile arrests, nearly one out of every five felony and misdemeanor arrests processed through the Sonoma County Probation Department involves crimes of violence and/or weapons charges. Analysis of juvenile offense patterns for the period 1985 through 1999 shows that juvenile arrests involving violent crimes and weapons have increased 95.4% while all other juvenile arrests have increased only 11.6%. Not to be left behind, juvenile arrests for drug offenses have similarly increased; in fact Sonoma County experienced a nearly 111% increase in drug crime arrests of juveniles since 1985. Analysis of changes in the number of juvenile arrests shows that drug arrests have experienced the greatest growth over the past 15 years.

In total, juveniles were responsible for 17.4% of all arrests in Sonoma County in 1999; nearly 33.3% of all major property crime arrests involved juveniles, as did 10% of violent crime arrests. Between 26 and 47% of all persons arrested in 1999 for robbery, burglary, receiving stolen property, motor vehicle theft and/or simple assault were under 18 years of age. In that year, more than 82% of the juvenile crime incidents local police responded to resulted in booking the youthful offender into Juvenile Hall or citing the youth to the Probation Department for further processing.

**Juvenile Hall:** The California Youth Authority purchased Sonoma County's Juvenile Hall in 1942 and by 1948, 115 girls resided in the facility. The Hall currently has a Board of Corrections rated capacity of 118. During calendar 2000, an average of 139 youth were admitted each month, in keeping with the lowest quadrant of the average number of admissions per month in the preceding 15 years. In that period, admissions had ranged from a low of 126 to a high of

168 youth. The number of bookings coupled with shifts in average length of stay have resulted in Sonoma County's Juvenile Hall experiencing an average daily population (ADP) of 95 during 2000; 80.5% of the facility's Board of Corrections rated capacity. The number and percentage of young women in the population has increased such that female ADP has escalated 88.9% since 1995. Currently the Hall is averaging 17 girls in custody at any one time.

As is true with juvenile custody throughout California, Sonoma County is experiencing an increase in average length of stay (ALS) for youth in its institution. The ALS in the year 2000 stood at 20.2 days, more than 18% higher than it had been in 1995, and peaked at a new high of 22.8 days during the year. Again female offenders were important; the most significant change in detention time was the increase in length of stay for girls. In 1995, girls were detained an average of 11.6 days; in 2000, the female length of stay was 16.8 days, an increase of 44.8%.

In 2000, an average of 41 (43.2%) juveniles were detained in a pre-dispositional status pending court adjudication. Another 54 youth (56.8%) were post-disposition detainees, including youth awaiting placement at the Sierra Youth Center or Probation Camp. Overall, the composition of pre- and post-disposition detainees in the facility has not changed significantly since 1995. In 1998, 38.4% of the average daily population (38.9 of 102 total) of the Juvenile Hall was held pending detention or other court hearings. The average length of stay for youth pending detention hearings was 2.5 days; and for other court hearings was 20.4 days. A larger percentage (40.8%) of the female population was awaiting hearings than that of the male population (37.7%).

As is true in most juvenile halls in California today, more than half the minors in the Sonoma County Juvenile Hall – 56.8% -- are post adjudicated. In part this is due to legislative and policy changes at the state level, among which the sliding scale fee structure introduced by the California Department of the Youth Authority (CYA) in the 1990s is a significant factor. Disadvantaged financially for sending what CYA considers 'less serious' offenders, counties – Sonoma among them – have opted to develop and/or enhance local commitment programs. Moreover, in Sonoma County, the Court places predominant emphasis on keeping local youth who must be in custody as close to home as possible, preferring not to commit them to CYA except as a very last resort. Sonoma County had committed only 15 youth to CYA in 1997, reduced that number to 12 in 1998, sent 22 in 1999 and 10 in 2000.

A second important factor driving the proportion of adjudicated offenders in Juvenile Hall is that length of stay (ALS) is significantly longer for adjudicated as compared to pre adjudicated minors, thus these minors account for a greater percentage of the Hall's total bed usage. Among the longest ALS is that for youth ordered into and awaiting placement. These young people spend an average of 54 days in Juvenile Hall and longer if they are among those considered 'difficult to place' such as mentally ill youth, arsonists, sexual predators and prior placement failures. Locating appropriate placements for special needs young people is not only difficult and time consuming, it is also expensive and uncertain, as placement operators are increasingly able to hand pick the youth they will accept and Community Care Licensing (CCL) allows for high rates to be charged for specialized services. Sonoma County cannot control the length of time it takes to locate an appropriate placement and must keep its young offenders in safe and secure custody until such a placement can be found and the youngster delivered to it.

## **B. EXISTING CONTINUUM OF RESPONSES TO JUVENILE CRIME**

In close concert with other local governmental and community based organizations, the Sonoma County Probation Department provides comprehensive juvenile justice services, including community based prevention, counseling and diversion, detention programs, formal probation supervision, residential placement and camp programs, among others. The County's rich array of options is particularly noteworthy given the relatively small size of the system. In fact, several of the interventions in use today have been instituted to reduce and/or stabilize the number of juvenile cases being referred to the Probation Department and thereby to keep the system small while also keeping the community safe and sound.

From the late 1980s through 1996, the annual number of juvenile cases referred to the Sonoma County Probation Department increased from 3,569 in 1986 to 5,613 by 1996 – a 57.3% jump, while the at risk age group increased only 32.4%, from 35,985 in 1986 to 47,647 in 1996. This startling escalation in referrals caused the rate of juvenile referrals to expand from 99.18 per thousand to 117.80 per thousand by 1996.

This dramatic increase, among other issues at the time, caused Sonoma County to contract for an in-depth Needs Assessment of its juvenile justice system. The project entailed an intense examination of the (then) current operations and future needs of the system and particularly its juvenile detention and corrections facilities. A total of 15 recommendations came out of that study and, to Sonoma County's credit, the majority have been acted upon. The major recommendations included:

- Assessing at risk youth to enable targeted early intervention with a view toward reducing the number of referrals to the juvenile justice system;
- Providing alternatives to reduce the number of pre adjudicated youth being placed in community detention (electronic monitoring; house arrest; etc.) and those subject to the Probation Department's discretionary release policies;
- Expanding post-dispositional options and aftercare programs, thereby enhancing the continuum of care and seeking to reduce recidivism and returns to custody;
- Re-evaluating procedures for early release reviews;
- Developing, streamlining and/or enhancing data collection capabilities and reporting procedures; and
- Coordinating service priorities and sharing funding among agencies.

The Sonoma County Probation Department and its partner agencies took these recommendations very seriously. To date, the County has implemented nearly all of them and, as a result at least in part of its improved practices and policies, has experienced a decrease in the number of youth referred to the Probation Department and admitted to Juvenile Hall. The County expects that the results of its heightened attention to prevention, diversion and early intervention will be realized over the long-term, as will the benefits of its ongoing implementation of assessment, data gathering and reporting and interagency coordination. All of these efforts necessitate continued commitment by partner agencies, which commitment is demonstrated by these approaches being central to Sonoma County's Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP).



Several of the efforts begun in response to the 1996 Needs Assessment constitute building blocks for the CMJJP and have been identified for further expansion.

**Prevention, Early Intervention and Diversion:** At the time of the increases in referrals to probation and the resulting Needs Assessment, there were some diversion and prevention efforts available in the County, but resources for such programs were scarce. Given the Needs Assessment's recommendation for expansion of diversion, prevention and early intervention as a more cost effective approach than constructing beds to address juvenile delinquency issues, Sonoma County undertook an aggressive effort to increase the availability of such programs. By 1997, the number of at risk juvenile case referrals to the Probation Department decreased from 5,613 (117.80 referrals per thousand) to 5,129 (at 104.75 referrals per thousand).

The approaches taken by the County not only reduced the number of referrals, but also reinforced collaborative relationships with other local agencies and community based organizations. The County's response involved community groups in both the planning and delivery of services and was solidified even further when, in mid-1998, the Probation Department opted to direct a significant portion of its funding from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant to community organizations for the operation of a new program, called KIDS --Kids Into Diversion Services. The goal of the KIDS effort was for community based organizations (CBOs) to create and operate programs that "promote family strengthening and pro-social competencies, reduce the level of penetration into the juvenile justice system and successfully prevent delinquent offenders from becoming chronic offenders or committing more progressively serious violent crimes."<sup>3</sup>

In all, six regionally based first and second offender KIDS diversion programs were funded using TANF monies to effectively meet the service needs of at risk youth and their families. These TANF funded collaborations cover all the major areas of Sonoma County with each focusing particular attention to the specific needs and populations of its region.

- **In Petaluma/South County**, the Petaluma People Services Center provides alcohol and drug counseling; group, individual and family counseling;
- **In Sonoma/East County**, Social Advocates for Youth (SAY) and the Sonoma Police Department provide alcohol and drug abuse counseling services;
- **In Cloverdale, Healdsburg and Windsor/North County**, Social Advocates for Youth (SAY), Boys/Girls Clubs and Circuit Riders, using a multi-disciplinary team structure typically consisting of police, schools, Health Services, Human Services, CBOs and community participation, provide individual and family counseling, twelve-week values education groups, academic support and recreational activities;
- **In Sebastopol/West County**, Community Services provides individual and family counseling, drug and alcohol counseling, community service work and mentoring;
- **In Santa Rosa /Central County**, The Santa Rosa Consortium comprised of the Drug Abuse Alternative Center, Teen Court and RECOURSE provide

---

<sup>3</sup> Sonoma County Probation Department criteria for Kids Into Diversion Services funding applications, 1998

alcohol and drug services, Teen Court referrals, mediation and conflict resolution services; and

- **In Rohnert Park, Cotati (Mid-County)**, Sonoma County Associates for Youth and Development (SCAYD) and Rohnert Park Youth Services provide drug and alcohol counseling.

In addition to the TANF funded, regional diversion programs, Sonoma County also has developed and is sustaining partnerships to provide prevention and early intervention services, including the following:

- **Circuit Riders**, which provides individual and group counseling and community work projects for youth in the northwestern area of the County;
- **Teen Court**, a school based program whereby young people are 'tried' by a jury of their peers and sanctions such as restitution and community service are imposed upon 'conviction.' Teens must also serve on three Teen Court jury panels as a form of community service;
- **Pacific Seminars**, a private, non-profit diversion service provider, offers three different all-day-Saturday educational classes in anger management, alcohol and drug abuse and theft awareness; and
- **RECOURSE**, a non-profit CBO with a long track record of restorative justice related services, provides mediation and conflict resolution interventions for offenders and at risk youth.

In addition to exemplifying Sonoma County's interest in and attention to the earliest part of the juvenile justice continuum – the prevention and early intervention domains – these programs and the County's approach to creating and sustaining them are indicative of the importance of multi-agency collaboration among public and private entities in the jurisdiction. These programs demonstrate the integral role community based organizations play in service delivery in Sonoma County.

**Screening and Assessment:** Among its other notable accomplishments, Sonoma County has been actively and positively engaged in screening and assessing at risk youth and youth coming to the attention of law enforcement and probation. In March 1999, the County instituted enhanced screening procedures and the use of a screening instrument to help identify risk and need factors early in young people's offending 'careers.' Based on the key elements of the Orange County CA "8% Study," the enhanced assessment tool is administered to every juvenile at booking. The tool seeks to identify

- Family issues;
- Problems at school;
- Substance abuse;
- Gang affiliation; and
- Delinquency history

at the point at which behavioral dysfunction is initially exhibited. It is intended to help the Probation Department begin identifying needs so appropriate resources can be directed to youth, and where appropriate, their families, at the earliest possible point. The assessment tool provides

the basis for individual juvenile case histories and case plans and, because it is used early in the young person's contacts with the system, is important to successful early intervention and treatment as well as diversion.

**Programs and Services for Pre Adjudicated Youth:** The Sonoma County Probation Department both operates its own and partners with other governmental and community based organizations to provide services to at risk and pre adjudicated young people. Pre-adjudication programs operated by the Sonoma County Probation Department include:

- diversion,
- electronic monitoring/community detention,
- informal supervision and
- Juvenile Hall detention.

As previously noted, Sonoma County places a priority on offering a rich array of prevention and diversion services as a means of keeping youth out of the system and avoiding the need for detention.

**Suppression Activities:** Again, the Probation Department works in conjunction with a number of partners for some or all of the services it provides to youth who have been through the Court process. Since 1997, it has had the benefit of the *Sonoma County Youth and Family Services Partnership*, described more fully in the next section of the CMJJP, to help facilitate the delivery of substance abuse, mental health, health and other family services to youth in custody as well as to probationers in the community. Among its suppression programs, Sonoma County offers:

- field supervision, which may take the form of regular supervision, intensive supervision and/or the Home Treatment Program where intensive supervision and comprehensive mental health and educational services are provided to seriously delinquent youth who are at risk of home removal and placement or commitment to a local or out of state program;
- specialized caseloads such as the Teen Drug Court, and the Home Treatment Program described above;
- out of home placement;
- Action Corps where youth ages 16 and 17 participate in vocational training four days a week and attend school one day a week and
- weekend work crews for youth under sanction.

**Incapacitation Services:**

Finally, Sonoma County's incapacitation services include:

- commitment to the Juvenile Hall; (Note that, on average, over half of the minors in Sonoma County's Juvenile Hall are post adjudicated offenders, either serving commitments or awaiting transfer to a placement, Camp, the Sierra Youth Center or the California Youth Authority.)
- commitment to Probation Camp;
- commitment to the Sierra Youth Center (SYC) and
- commitment to the California Department of the Youth Authority.

A number of programs are run in the Juvenile Hall for the young people housed there. Drug and alcohol counseling and groups, mental health groups, family reunification and medical care are all part of the Hall's array of services, in addition to comprehensive academic programming/school. Additionally, youth participate in a Diagnostic Program designed to provide observation and recommendation to the Probation Officer and Juvenile Court.

The Sonoma County Probation Camp was established in 1955 and presents itself as "the oldest and most successful Camp/Ranch Youth Program in the State."<sup>4</sup> During its long and colorful history, the Camp has maintained its primary mission, which was and is to "provide an alternative residence for high-risk youth while teaching work skills and to have a constructive impact on the community through completing government projects."<sup>5</sup> Not only does the Camp, which accommodates 24 male youth in its six month program, provide academic, life skills and vocational training, it also produces wood and metal products for State and Local parks, has contracts with the County Public Works Department and Schools and is home to an innovative and very successful program in which wards train seeing eye dogs for the blind. The Camp program also encompasses counseling groups, alcohol and drug interventions, independent living skills development and restitution efforts, both direct financial restitution to victims and restitution to the community through community service work projects. Youth progress in steps toward transition home and termination of Court wardship.

Sonoma County's Sierra Youth Center (SYC) provides transitional programming and services for 22 male and females. A three to eight month residential program, SYC serves youth between the ages of twelve and eighteen committed by the Juvenile Court. SYC places an emphasis on building self-esteem, improving family relationships, school advancement and accountability. Like the Probation Camp, SYC includes a combination of education, counseling and skill building programming to support young offenders' transition back to their homes and communities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Sonoma County Probation Camp brochure entitled, "Sonoma County Probation Camp; 35 Years of Positive Change."

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

SYC offers many unique and model programs, including:

- **The Dog Assistance Program** where residents train dogs that will be used by the disabled;
- **The Garden Project**, an environmental science project designed to teach ecology and other skills such as gardening, math, landscaping, irrigation and marketing;
- **Work Crews** where residents have the opportunity to earn money toward their restitution by working at county parks; and
- **The Culinary Program** where youth participate in all aspects of managing a full-scale restaurant, including meal planning, budgeting and meal preparation.

As previously noted, the Juvenile Court and the Sonoma County Probation Department actively seek other custody, placement and program options in lieu of using the California Department of the Youth Authority (CYA) to sanction juvenile criminals offenders.

## C. ROLES OF CURRENT COLLABORATIONS

As evidenced in the previous discussion, Sonoma County is fully and deeply committed to partnering and collaborating and, as a result, has built strong relationships among the public and between public and private sector agencies. The Sonoma County Probation Department views the full array of human service providing entities as essential partners in its mission to serve youth and their families. In fact, leveraging existing community resources is a key part of the Probation Department's and the County's overall philosophy.

As noted previously, the 1996 Juvenile Justice Needs Assessment contained a recommendation suggesting developing additional service integration capacity in the juvenile justice system, including strengthening substance abuse, mental health and family services at the County's juvenile facilities and developing a system of care (or aftercare) for youth leaving those facilities. In response, the *Sonoma County Youth and Family Services Partnership* was established in early 1997 to facilitate participation in the development of a countywide, comprehensive, coordinated, multi-disciplinary, interagency system for children and adolescents and their families. The Partnership is comprised of representatives of the departments of Human Services, Probation, Health Services, the Superior Court, the County Office of Education, the largest school district, SELPA, the North Bay Regional Center, a community based organization, an advocacy group and parents.

Further, the Health Services and Probation Departments currently provide coordinated and comprehensive physical health, mental health and substance abuse services at Juvenile Hall. These services are currently being expanded to the Probation Camp and Sierra Youth Center.

Finally, schools, police, the Probation Department and community based organizations are developing regional multi-disciplinary teams to share information and resources regarding youth identified as being at risk in Sonoma, Rohnert Park, Petaluma, Sebastopol/West County, Central Santa Rosa and the North County. These teams seek to coordinate governmental services, leverage funds, obtain grants and provide pro bono services to assist at risk youth and juveniles under probation supervision.

The above examples represent just a snapshot of the many partnering efforts underway in Sonoma County. The County's Crime Prevention Act 2000 program proposals continue this emphasis and rely strongly on community resources for planning and service delivery as well as for input and evaluation purposes. This strong collaborative spirit provides a cost-efficient and effective means for Sonoma County and its local, non-profit groups to consistently and expeditiously provide coordinated and comprehensive services to youth and their families.

---

## D. STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM

Among the significant strengths of the juvenile justice system in Sonoma County is its extraordinarily active and involved Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC). Sonoma's Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council has been hard at work identifying and seeking to develop programs to fill the ongoing needs of youth in Sonoma County. Through regular monthly meetings, the JJCC provides coordination for the direction of juvenile justice resources and services and it serves as the primary planning body for all juvenile justice grants and initiatives. As the attached roster of the JJCC clearly indicates, its membership reflects a wide range of interests and disciplines. The Chief Probation Officer and the Juvenile Division Director of the Probation Department provide leadership to the JJCC.

The JJCC has been instrumental in developing Sonoma County's Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan for Crime Prevention Act 2000 funding. It began this effort by identifying existing services, describing gaps in the continuum and proposing programs to fill important needs. The JJCC held numerous meetings to consider and define potential programs to best serve the County and subsequently established a subcommittee to evaluate and develop the proposals in the detail necessary for the CMJJP and application. The interest, commitment and dedication of the JJCC give the County a strong base from which to embark on its CPA 2000 program implementation activities.

The collaborative attitude prevalent in Sonoma County is another strength of the system. No one agency has to 'do it all' and most agencies are willing to contribute their strengths and expertise to both problem solving and program operation over the long run. The new Chief Probation Officer, Cora Guy, is seeking innovative and effective methods to expand the Probation Department's effectiveness and its impact on the County children, youth and families and is finding interest in working toward that goal among staff of the Probation Department as well as from agencies and organizations outside Probation.

Among the challenges facing the County is the fact that the Juvenile Justice System does not have a well developed, computerized data collection or records tracking system. Most records are maintained manually, on paper. The necessary technological infrastructure is available but has not been developed for managing case files, extracting tracking information and/or producing key studies or reports. This lack of computerized information also hampers evaluative efforts for programs and services and will be a problem relative to the data collection required by the Crime Prevention Act 2000 legislation.

The need for improved technology is complicated by the fact that the County Information Systems Department does not have adequate staff resources to meet the needs of the adult and juvenile justice systems. This was further complicated with the conversion in 2000 of the adult criminal justice system and Y2K issues that only delayed requested program enhancements. As a result, the County is unable to offer the Probation Department access to information technology equipment, software, staff support or other resources to assist in the development of a comprehensive computer system for the department.

To enhance its data collection capacity and respond to the need to accurately track information, the County plans to include funding to hire or contract for an analyst whose position will be dedicated to maintaining and tracking statistics and data for the Juvenile Division of the Probation Department and specifically for the CPA 2000 programs. This individual will work closely with the service providing CBOs and other agencies to ensure that data collection tools are developed, maintained and used correctly and that necessary information is generated, interpreted and reported accurately, consistently and appropriately. Additionally, the County is searching to address short and long-term data needs, including requirements for CPA 2000.

As previously mentioned, Sonoma County is a 'high-cost county,' particularly when it comes to housing costs. According to the California Association of Realtors, in December 2000 the median home price in the Northern Wine Country was \$330,800. In comparison, the statewide median home price during that same period was \$249,370. These high housing costs, coupled with other cost of living concerns in the tourist mecca which Sonoma County has become, make it very difficult for the Probation Department in terms of recruiting, hiring and retaining staff. While safety retirement is available in Sonoma County, salaries for Probation Department personnel are not high. Therefore, the Probation Department loses many of the prospective young employees who would like to live, work and purchase a home in the area. While many of Sonoma's smaller neighboring counties do not pay appreciably more than Sonoma County Probation does, housing prices are more affordable in some of those jurisdictions. Sonoma's larger neighbors, like the Bay Area Counties, pay higher salaries and have more extensive benefits packages, as do state and federal agencies. As a result, even when funding is provided for a position, recruiting a qualified candidate can be quite difficult and retaining a person once hired is similarly difficult.

The issue of staffing is complicated by the fact that Sonoma County is facing a large number of retirements. Many of the probation staff who have worked for the department for a number of years are preparing for retirement or have already retired. Also, the severe budget crisis felt by the County beginning in the early 1990s limited its hiring ability, meaning there are fewer staff to fill those gaps caused by retirement.

While these issues are not necessarily unique to Sonoma County, they do pose challenges, particularly when the County attempts to create new programs that require additional staffing. For those elements of its CPA 2000 programs which will utilize Probation Department personnel – those not contracted to the private sector and/or CBOs, -- the Department will try to create a mix of seasoned and new staff to create both 'wisdom' and energy so as to ensure that the programs begin and are maintained efficiently and effectively.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health issues continue to be a concern in Sonoma County. Not only did the 1996 Juvenile Justice Needs Assessment describe the need for detoxification and treatment services, particularly related to juvenile crime prevention and early intervention, but more recently a survey of active health records for 87 juveniles at Juvenile Hall was conducted to identify the number of residents who reported use, abuse or early stages of dependency or



addiction to alcohol and/or other drugs. Representatives of the Probation Department and Sonoma County Health Services expressed concern that the presence of substance abuse and mental health issues among juvenile offenders is under-reported and is of a significant concern – both within and outside of Juvenile Hall.

The findings of this 1999 survey represent a single snapshot of the prevalence of substance abuse. Even though only Juvenile Hall residents for whom active health records existed were surveyed, the preliminary findings indicated that 72 of the 87 youth -- 82.8% -- used, abused or were involved in delinquency based on alcohol and other drugs. Only 15 of the 87 (17.2%) revealed no alcohol or drug use and, of the 15 non-users, one-third reported that a family member had an alcohol and/or other drug addiction problem.

Mental health issues are also identified as a contributing factor in juvenile delinquency in Sonoma County. In 1998, 340 youth were identified as having acute or chronic mental health problems or requested mental health assistance. This represents 19.4% of the youth admitted to Juvenile Hall in 1998. This number, as noted above, is likely to be significantly underreported in as much as youth in custody would much rather be considered 'bad' than 'crazy.'

The notable presence of substance abuse and mental health issues among the Juvenile Hall population suggests the need for targeted services. While detention must be available as a consequence of criminal actions, the cause of the delinquency must be treated to provide real 'corrections' and to stem returns to the juvenile, or entrance into the adult, justice systems.

---

## **II. IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF NEIGHBORHOODS, SCHOOLS AND OTHER AREAS FACING A SIGNIFICANT RISK FROM JUVENILE CRIME**

### **A. SCHOOL DATA**

Following is a one-day snapshot of the number of youth on probation in Sonoma County, broken down by school enrollment. This information was gathered by the Sonoma County Probation Department on February 15, 2001.

This data is particularly relevant because Sonoma County decided to target a portion of its CPA 2000 funding toward placement of two Probation Officers on selected high school campuses. These Probation Officers will provide intensive supervision to youth already on probation as well as support for youth at risk of penetrating the juvenile justice system.

In selecting site locations for the Probation Officer on campus program, the County looked at both the school and neighborhood data, which is described in more detail in the next section. Specifically, the County identified which schools experience the highest levels of criminal activity in and around the campus.

Elise Allen High School, which is situated in southwest Santa Rosa, exhibited the highest level of criminal incidents and for that reason was selected as one site. The school also has a large number of gang members among its student population as well as other high visibility issues. Finally, it also has one of the largest number of youth on probation.

Further, due to the zero tolerance policy on campus, students are removed from school when any criminal activity is discovered and referred to continuation high school or a local community school. In checking the enrollment of the countywide schools, the Probation Department learned the Ridgeway Continuation High School has the highest enrollment of probation cases in the County. As a result, the County decided to split the assignment of one of the Probation Officers between Elise Allen High School and the Ridgeway continuation campus.

Additionally, Sonoma County plans to partner with the Rohnert Park School Resource Officer and place a second probation officer on the Rancho Cotati High School campus. Rancho Cotati High School is the largest high school in the County with close to 2,200 students. The school has recently seen a rise in gang activity as well as an increase in racial difficulties. Rohnert Park is proactive in dealing with members of their community and has made a conscious effort to provide local service to those residing in the area. Rohnert Park was the first community to offer a diversion program and prides themselves on their ability to be forward thinking.

## SANTA ROSA

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Ridgeway High	20	Continuation High School
Santa Rosa High	14	High School
McBride Community	14	High School
Elsie Allen High	13	High School
Los Guillicos Community	12	High School
Maria Carillo High	11	High School
Youth Build	10	Vocational School
Montgomery High	9	High School
Stuart School	8	Private Christian School
Piner High	5	High School
Mesa High	3	Alternative School
Clean and Sober	3	High School through the Sonoma County Office of Education
Rincon Valley Middle	2	Junior High School
Airway Community	2	Junior High Community School
College Oak	1	Pregnant Teens
Cook Junior High	1	Junior High
Cardinal Newman High	1	Private High School
Midrose High	1	High School
New Horizons	1	Mental Health High
North Valley	1	Mental Health High
RIDE	1	Private High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Santa Rosa Schools</b>	<b>133</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>45.09%</b>	

**PETALUMA**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Youth on Probation</b>	<b>Type of School</b>
San Antonio High	17	Continuation High School
Petaluma High	7	High School
Casa Grande High	6	High School
Petaluma Community	5	High School
Carpe Diem High School	1	Alternative High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Petaluma Schools</b>	<b>36</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	

**SEBASTOPOL**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Youth on Probation</b>	<b>Type of School</b>
Laguna	10	Continuation High School
Sebastopol Community	8	High School
Analy High	6	High School
Analy Community School	3	High School
Brookhaven	2	Elementary
Journey High	1	Private High School
Monte Rio School	1	Elementary
Ramparts	1	Russian River
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Sebastopol Schools</b>	<b>32</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>10.85%</b>	

**ROHNERT PARK**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Rancho Cotati High	14	High School
El Camino High	4	Continuation High School
Rohnert Park Community	3	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Rohnert Park Schools</b>	<b>21</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>7.12%</b>	

**SONOMA**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Sonoma High	12	High School
Sonoma Community	8	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Sonoma Schools</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>6.78%</b>	

**HEALDSBURG**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Healdsburg Community	11	High School
Healdsburg High	5	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Healdsburg Schools</b>	<b>16</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>5.42%</b>	

**WINDSOR**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Windsor High School	6	High School
Windsor Community	5	High School
Windsor Oaks	1	Continuation School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Windsor Schools</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>4.07%</b>	

**FORESTVILLE**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
El Molino High	8	High School
Nueva Leon	1	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Forestville Schools</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	

**MISCELLANEOUS**

School	Number of Youth on Probation	Type of School
Washington High	6	High School
Salmon Creek	1	High School
West Sonoma Charter	1	Charter School
<b>Total Number of Other Youth on Probation in Schools in Miscellaneous Regions of Sonoma County</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	<b>2.71%</b>	

**CLOVERDALE**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Youth on Probation</b>	<b>Type of School</b>
Cloverdale High	7	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Cloverdale Schools</b>	7	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	2.37%	

**TOMALES**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Youth on Probation</b>	<b>Type of School</b>
Tomales High School	1	High School
<b>Total Number of Youth on Probation in Tomales Schools</b>	1	
<b>Percentage of Total Youth on Probation in Sonoma County</b>	.34%	

## B. NEIGHBORHOOD DATA

Below is a one-day snapshot of the cities of origin for youth in Sonoma County Juvenile Institutions taken on February 28, 2001.

Additionally, the Santa Rosa Police Department submitted detailed arrest information to the Probation Department broken down by residential area. From January – December 2000, the Santa Rosa Police Department experienced a total of 968 juvenile cited arrests and 503 juvenile booked arrests. The Santa Rosa Plaza neighborhood accounted for the largest number, with 94 cited arrests and 57 booked arrests. As the following table illustrates, more than 50 percent of youth in Sonoma County's Juvenile Institutions come from the City of Santa Rosa.

As described in the previous section, this data guided the County in its determination of which high schools to select for its new Probation Officer on campus program.

CITY OF ORIGIN	NUMBER OF YOUTH IN SONOMA COUNTY JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL YOUTH IN SONOMA COUNTY JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS
Santa Rosa	73	59.35%
Sonoma	12	9.76%
Rohnert Park	7	5.69%
Windsor	5	4.07%
Healdsburg	4	3.25%
Forestville	3	2.44%
Guerneville	3	2.44%
Petaluma	3	2.44%
Miscellaneous	3	2.44%
Cloverdale	2	1.63%
Cotati	2	1.63%
Boyle Hot Springs	1	.81%
Camp Meeker	1	.81%
Clearlake Oakes	1	.81%
Madera	1	.81%
Sebastopol	1	.81%
St. Helena	1	.81%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>123</b>	



### III. LOCAL JUVENILE JUSTICE ACTION STRATEGIES

#### A. ENHANCE CONTINUUM OF CARE

##### 1. Continue to Expand Early Intervention Services to Reduce Need for Detention

Since 1996, Sonoma County has aggressively implemented procedures to identify and assist youth in need prior to their introduction into the juvenile justice system. It has also greatly expanded its diversion and early intervention programs in various regions of the County. The overall goals of these efforts, as noted previously, are to further enhance options within the Continuum of Care and reduce dependence on expensive secure detention facility needs.

The number of new case referrals to the Probation Department dropped to 4,320 in 1998, representing a rate of 86.69 per thousand at risk age group. Since 1996, the number of referrals to the Probation department has decreased 23 percent (from 5,613 in 1996 to 4,320 in 1998). This decrease may be attributed to the increased availability of diversion and other early intervention programs.

Sonoma County's application for CPA 2000 funding continues this emphasis on increasing the availability of early intervention services by adopting a Functional Family Therapy model and initiating Family Group Conferencing.

##### 2. Strengthen Aftercare Services

While Sonoma County places emphasis on providing early intervention services to prevent entry into the Juvenile Justice System, it also recognizes the importance of a strong aftercare system to reduce the risk of recidivism and assist youth in their transition back into the community. Without the provision of aftercare services, much of the investment made in youth through the provision of other services may be lost.

Since 1996, Sonoma County has expanded its ability to graduate qualifying youth out of secure detention and into appropriate community programs as expeditiously as possible. Using CPA 2000 funding, the County plans to build upon these previous efforts by establishing a day reporting center as well as mentoring support. These programs are designed to provide support and services to youth presently or formerly in placement.

#### B. Continue to Leverage Community Resources

Through the development and operation of new and ongoing programs for all aspects of its juvenile justice system, Sonoma County has demonstrated a sustained commitment to leveraging existing community resources. The County's Probation Department considers other local agencies and community based organizations (CBOs) key partners in its mission to serve youth and their families.

Given the size of Sonoma County, the Probation Department recognizes the necessity of linking with existing resources to maximize the available services, rather than "reinventing the wheel." As can be seen in earlier discussions, CBOs contract with the Probation Department to operate programs in many parts of the County's Continuum of Care, particularly in the diversion and

aftercare areas. This linkage with existing community resources can also be seen in the County's CPA 2000 application as the County anticipates it will contract much of the proposed programs to CBOs.

The County not only contracts with numerous CBOs to deliver a variety of services, it also actively includes all partners in the planning and on-going evaluation of overall juvenile justice needs. As previously discussed, Sonoma County enjoys a highly functioning Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) that meets regularly to assess strengths and, more importantly, to identify system gaps. Membership on the JJCC includes partner agencies such as RECOURSE, Rohnert Park Youth and Family Services and Social Advocates for Youth.

The JJCC took a prominent role in the development of this application, including forming a subcommittee to develop program details and desired outcomes/objectives. These partnerships certainly require an investment of time and trust, but the County believes such investment provides immense benefits to its citizens.

### **C. Improve Data Collection Capabilities**

The establishment of a strong computer tracking system remains an ongoing need for the Sonoma County Probation Department. As discussed above, the County does not have the necessary infrastructure for tracking probationers or program participants. Most records are maintained manually, on paper. The necessary technology is available but has not been developed for managing case files, extracting tracking information and/or producing key studies or reports. As a result, the County will be hard-pressed to detail outcomes and will face great difficulty in accurately managing information about program participants. To respond to this issue, the County has included funding in its CPA application to hire an analyst to coordinate data requirements for CPA 2000. Additionally, the County has contracted for a study to address their short and long-term data needs.

**D. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOME MEASURES TO DETERMINE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LOCAL JUVENILE JUSTICE ACTION STRATEGIES**

Outcome	Measure	Benchmark/Baseline
Reduce Rate of Juvenile Arrests in County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of referrals to Probation (citations and bookings)</li> <li>• Rate of juvenile arrests per 100,000 population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referral data from 1999-2000</li> <li>• Arrest/referral data from 1999-2000</li> </ul>
Reduce Juvenile Incarceration in County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average Length of Stay (LOS) in Juvenile Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average LOS data from 1999-2000</li> </ul>
Reduce Recidivism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See individual programs (baselines vary)</li> </ul>
Increase Probation Completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of CPA youth who complete probation (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See individual programs (baselines vary)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Restitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of CPA youth who complete payment of victim restitution (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See individual programs (baselines vary)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete court-ordered community service (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See individual programs (baselines vary)</li> </ul>
Improved Data Collection Capability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of youth that are tracked and outcomes data collected through new coordinated data system</li> <li>• # of programs (Probation and contracted) utilizing the new system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

## IV. PROPOSED PROGRAMS

### A. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Adoption of Functional Family Therapy Model

#### *Program Goals*

During planning for its CPA application, Sonoma County's Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) recommended that a portion of funding be used to provide new services to '601' youth. Referrals for these services will come from Probation Officers, the Countywide SARB, schools, police agencies, families and other sources. Functional Family Therapy represents one approach to providing specialized services to this target population.

The goal of Functional Family Therapy is to resolve immediate crises through the mobilization and utilization of individual, family, school, peer and community resources. This model is based on the assertion that the family or living unit of the youth is the best context within which to both understand the nature of youths problems and to search for long-term solutions. Interventions seek to strengthen the ability of families to resolve the problems they face through reducing risk factors and increasing positive factors.

To be administered by the community based organization Social Advocates for Youth (SAY) located in Santa Rosa, Functional Family Therapy relies on active participation by youth and their families and involves phases and techniques designed to engage and motivate youth and families to change their communication, interaction and problem solving skills. These phases consist of:

- Engagement, designed to emphasize within youth and family factors that prevent early program dropout;
- Motivation, designed to change maladaptive emotional reactions and beliefs, and increase alliance, trust, hope and motivation to lasting change;
- Assessment, designed to clarify individual, family system and larger system relationships, especially the interpersonal functions of behavior and how they related to change techniques;
- Behavior Change, which consists of communication training, specific tasks and technical aids, basic parenting skills, contracting and response-cost techniques; and
- Generalization, during which family case management is guided by individualized family functional needs; their interface with environmental constraints and resources and the alliance with the Functional Family Therapist/Family Case Manager.

During short-term counseling, a risk assessment is completed for each participating family. The counselor evaluates the five areas of individual, peer group, school, family and community. Together with the family, the counselor then develops a plan to reduce the areas of risk and promote the protective factors with the involved youth and family.

In brief counseling, counselors work with those youth and their families who exhibit early signs of substance abuse, learning difficulties and/or other problem behavior. In six to eight intensive sessions, youth and their families are redirected to the positive support systems in themselves and their community. The program generally requires 20 hours of direct service time for referred youth and their families and usually no more than 26 hours of direct service time for the most severe problem situations.

The County expects that 100 youth will participate in this service during the initial year of CPA 2000 funding.

### ***Collaboration and Integration with Service Providers***

In making its recommendation to enhance early intervention by funding the Functional Family Therapy and Family Group Conferencing approaches (Family Group Conferencing is described in detail in the following section), the JJCC recognized that both are designed to impact the same target population. To ensure collaboration between these two early intervention efforts, the Probation Department will deploy its existing Early Intervention Officer as a link between, SAY, Restorative Resources, the other participating community based organizations and the community.

Both of these expanded early intervention efforts involve extremely close collaboration and integration with service providers. As previously discussed, the County will be contracting with local community agencies to administer these services. Smooth operations will not only depend upon close collaboration between the Probation Department and its contracting agencies, but also with those other entities that may refer youth for services, including schools, law enforcement, social service and mental health agencies. Finally, close collaboration between SAY and Restorative Resources will be ongoing to integrate services for the target population.

### ***Basis of Program Effectiveness - Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence***

According to research produced by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence located in Boulder, Colorado and published in the document, Blueprint for Violence Prevention, a number of clinical trials have demonstrated that Functional Family Therapy is capable of the outcomes listed below. Sonoma County plans to replicate the model studied in this research. The County's target population of 601 youth is comparable to the youth served in the researched programs.

- Effectively treating at-risk adolescents with a variety of conduct disorders, including alcohol and other drug abuse, truancy and other delinquent and/or pre-delinquent behaviors;
- Interrupting the matriculation of those adolescents into more restrictive, higher cost services;
- Reducing recidivism between 25 percent and 60 percent;
- Reducing the access and penetration of other social services by these adolescents;
- Generating positive outcomes with the entire spectrum of intervention personnel;
- Preventing further incidence of the presenting problem;
- Preventing younger children in the family from penetrating the system of care;
- Preventing adolescents from penetrating the adult criminal system; and
- Effectively transferring treatment effects across treatment system.

***Budget and Timeframe***

Sonoma County proposes to utilize \$162,773 in CPA funding to support the Functional Family Therapy Component. The program will begin accepting participants on June 1, 2001 and will operate through June 30, 2002. The following chart provides further budget detail.

<b>Months</b>	<b>Type of Expense</b>	<b>Amount</b>
13	<i>Personnel</i> - Probation Department	\$8,521
13	<i>Personnel</i> - Social Advocates for Youth	\$107,591
13	<i>Operational Expenses</i> - Social Advocates for Youth	\$38,409
13	<i>Evaluation</i>	\$8,252
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$162,773</b>

***Identification of Specific Objectives and Outcome Measures and their Relation to Program Goals***

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Benchmark/Baseline</b>
Reduce Arrests and Recidivism of CPA Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth who would have been eligible for the program will be utilized (Data To Be Determined)</li> </ul>
Reduce Incarceration of Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Reduce Probation Violations for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of probation violations per CPA youth (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Probation Completion for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete probation (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>

(Because this measure will not usually apply to this program's target population, no significant difference from the baseline is expected)		
Completion of Restitution (No significant difference expected)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete payment of victim restitution (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service (No significant difference expected)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete court-ordered community service (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of past 601 youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Per Capita Costs for program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Improvement in Risk/Protective Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth with improvement in risk/protective factors in the following areas: safety, health, home, school and behavior</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre/post test at program entry and program exit</li> </ul>
Completion of program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth successfully completing contract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not available</li> </ul>

## **B. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Initiation of Family Group Conferencing**

### ***Program Goals***

A second strategy to enhance early intervention services targeted toward 601 youth involves the initiation of Family Group Conferencing, a mediation process whereby the victim and the offender, as well as family and friends, participate in deciding the appropriate response to criminal actions. A key requirement is that the offender must admit to the offense and be willing to participate in the mediation.

Directed by a facilitator, a Family Group Conference typically involves the offender and sometimes the victim, recounting the incident and the other participants describing how the act impacted their lives. Following a thorough discussion in which all participants are able to express their feelings and ask questions, participants sign an agreement that outlines expectations and commitments.

Family Group Conferencing is designed to reduce recidivism, assist youth in accepting responsibility for their offending behavior and repair the harm to victims and the community through restitution and reparation. Basic program goals include supporting the youth and their families in taking full responsibility and accountability for the offense; supporting victim(s) through safe and meaningful involvement in securing reparation and restitution for the harm they experienced; empowering the youth and family in creating a plan 'to put things right' with the victim(s) and community as well as to decrease recidivism; and monitoring the plan to ensure effective implementation and successful completion.

Family Group Conferencing will be operated by five community based organizations, Restorative Resources (which will serve as the lead agency), Petaluma People Services Center, Rohnert Park Youth and Family Services, RE COURSE Mediation Services and West County Community Services. This early intervention effort will target 10 to 18 year-old male and female at risk youth and other youth referred to the Probation Department. Other program eligibility criteria include alcohol and drug usage; truancy history; gang affiliation; and arrest and delinquency history. During the initial year, offenders highly entrenched in the Juvenile Justice System will not be eligible for the Family Group Conferencing Intervention.

The minimum length of participation will be three months while the maximum will be six months. Sonoma County estimates 60 youth will receive Family Group Conferencing during the initial year of CPA 2000 funding.

### ***Collaboration and Integration with Service Providers***

As previously discussed, in making its recommendation to enhance early intervention by funding the Functional Family Therapy and Family Group Conferencing approaches, the JJCC recognized that both are designed to impact the same target population. To ensure collaboration between these two early intervention efforts, the Probation Department will deploy its existing Early Intervention Officer as a link between, SAY, Restorative Resources, the other participating community based organizations and the community.



Both of these expanded early intervention efforts involve extremely close collaboration and integration with service providers. The County will be contracting with local community agencies to administer these services. Smooth operations will not only depend upon close collaboration between the Probation Department and its contracting agencies, but also with those other entities that may refer youth for services, including schools, law enforcement, social service and mental health agencies. Finally, close collaboration between SAY and Restorative Resources will be ongoing to integrate services for the target population.

### ***Basis for Program Effectiveness***

#### *United States Department of Justice Information*

According to information collected by the United States Department of Justice, numerous research studies have shown that the victim-offender mediation process can serve to humanize the criminal justice experience for both victim and offender. Specifically, research demonstrates that:

- Victims of crime who meet with their offenders are far more likely to be satisfied with the justice system response to their cases than victims of similar crimes who go through the traditional court process (Umbreit, 1994a and 1994b).
- After meeting with their offenders, victims are significantly less fearful of being revictimized (Umbreit and Coates, 1993; and Umbreit, 1994a and 1994b).
- Offenders who meet with their victims are far more likely to be held directly accountable for their behavior and to successfully complete restitution (Umbreit, 1994a and 1994b).
- Offenders who meet their victims commit considerably fewer and less serious crimes (Nugent and Paddock, 1995; Schneirder, 1986; and Umbreit, 1994a and 1994b).

#### *Dakota County, Minnesota Evaluation*

Dakota County, Minnesota began using Family Group Conferencing for juvenile offenses in 1996. Their data results from 455 interview found that:

- 93% of crime victims and 94% of juvenile offenders were satisfied with the handling of their case;
- 95% of victims felt that the negotiated restitution plan was fair to them;
- 95% of victims and offenders were satisfied with the outcome of the conference;
- 90% of victims felt that the offender was adequately held accountable during the Family Group Conference process; and
- 98% of victims, 94% of offenders and 99% of support people would recommend conferencing to others.

**Budget and Timeframe**

Sonoma County proposes to utilize \$110,374 in CPA funding to support the Family Group Conferencing component. This program will be operational from June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002. The following chart provides more budget detail.

Months	Type of Expense	Amount
13	Personnel – Probation Department	\$5,775
13	Personnel – Restorative Resources	\$81,600
13	Operational Expenses – Restorative Resources	\$17,400
13	Evaluation	\$5,599
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$110,374</b>

**Identification of Specific Objectives and Outcome Measure and their Relation to Program Goals**

Outcome	Measure	Benchmark/Baseline
Reduce Arrests and Recidivism of CPA Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth</li> <li>% of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>% of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth will be utilized (Data To Be Determined)</li> </ul>
Reduce Incarceration of Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA per CPA youth</li> <li>% of CPA youth with no new commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Reduce Probation Violations for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of probation violations per CPA youth (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Probation Completion for Program Participants  (Because this measure will not usually apply to this	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of youth who complete probation (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>

program's target population, no significant difference from the baseline is expected)		
Completion of Restitution  (No significant difference expected)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete payment of victim restitution (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service  (No significant difference expected)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete court-ordered community service (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Diversion Program youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Per Capita Costs for program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Improvement in Risk/Protective Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth with improvement in risk/protective factor areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-conference survey given at program entry and post-conference survey given 6 months after FGC plan completed</li> </ul>
Completion of program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth with successful completion of Family Group Conference Plan/Contract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not available</li> </ul>

## **C. Placement of Probation Officers on Selected High School Campuses**

### ***Program Goals***

As a way to provide services to youth who have not yet reached the juvenile justice system or who are at risk for further penetration, Sonoma County proposes to target a portion of its CPA 2000 funding to place Probation Officers on selected high school campuses. These Probation Officers will carry a caseload consisting of those youth on campus already on formal probation. Additionally, they will serve as a resource for other at-risk youth, providing networking services and problem solving assistance.

Among other outcomes, the program will seek to reduce delinquent offenses; provide for higher rates of successful completion of probation and restitution requirements; and improve participating students' school attendance and performance. To implement this program, Sonoma County proposes to place one Probation Officer on a high school campus in Rohnert Park and a second officer who would split their time between one high school and one continuation school in the City of Santa Rosa. Stationed Probation Officers will partner with those School Resource Officers already present on the selected campuses.

In selecting site locations, the County looked at which schools experience the highest levels of criminal activity in and around the campus. Elise Allen High School, which is situated in southwest Santa Rosa, exhibited the highest level of criminal incidents and for that reason was selected as one site. The school also has a large number of gang members among its student population as well as other high visibility issues.

Further, due to the zero tolerance policy on campus, students are removed from school when any criminal activity is discovered and referred to continuation high school or a local community school. In checking the enrollment of the countywide schools, the Probation Department learned the Ridgeway Continuation High School has the highest enrollment of probation cases in the County. As a result, the County decided to split the assignment of one of the Probation Officers between Elise Allen High School and the Ridgeway continuation campus.

Additionally, Sonoma County plans to partner with the Rohnert Park School Resource Officer and place a second probation officer on the Rancho Cotati High School campus. Rancho Cotati High School is the largest high school in the County with close to 2,200 students. The school has recently seen a rise in gang activity as well as an increase in racial difficulties. Rohnert Park is proactive in dealing with members of their community and has made a conscious effort to provide local service to those residing in the area. Rohnert Park was the first community to offer a diversion program and prides themselves on their ability to be forward thinking.

By partnering with the existing police officers on campus, Probation Officers will provide intensive supervision to the wards already known to the Probation Department. According to the one-day snapshot data described earlier in the CMJJP, on February 15, 2001, Ridgeway Continuation School had 20 youth on probation, Elise Allen High School had 13 and Rancho Cotati High School had 14 youth on probation.

At the same time, the Probation Officers will also provide diversion and intervention services designed to improve behavior in the community, home and school as well as to restrict further entry of minors into the juvenile justice system.

It will be interesting to see whether the Probation Officer/School Resource Officer team makes any greater impact than the police officer working alone. It will also be interesting to observe if the Officer/School Resource Officer combination with access to community services (such as the Rohnert Park model) produces different results than the Probation Officer/School Resource Officer combination without access to additional community resources and services.

#### ***Collaboration and Integration with Service Providers***

Because the two Probation Officers for this program will be located on high school campuses that already have police officers in place, collaboration between the Probation and School Resource Officer will be extremely important. To ensure that youth receive needed attention and services, it will be critical that the Probation and School Resource Officer maintain open and regular communication.

Other critical players will be the administrators, staff and teachers of the participating high schools. Their attitudes toward the Probation Officer will impact the program's success. Open and ongoing communication will prove crucial here as well.

Finally, the Probation Officers must also have links to other community resources so that they may refer youth to needed services. One of the primary goals of this program is to match youth and their families with available services to decrease the likelihood they will enter the juvenile justice system. It is clear that Probation Officers must be aware of resources and have a means of assisting youth in accessing them.

#### ***Basis of Program Effectiveness – Contra Costa County Challenge I Program Evaluation***

An in-depth evaluation performed at four of the schools participating in Contra Costa County's Challenge I Program found that the interventions and specialized referrals coordinated by the on-site probation officers resulted in numerous positive outcomes for program participants as compared to the control group. For example, the evaluation found that program participants became more attached to their school communities. This attachment, in turn, led to more opportunities for pro-social development and productive behavior patterns.

Additionally, the evaluation showed that, compared with a control group, the program participants exhibited reductions in truancy, offending behavior and the seriousness of offenses on occasions where youth did re-offend. As a result, the program generated a reduction in law enforcement costs and damage to crime victims. During the intervention period, participating youth were also more successful in completing probation requirements.

Another significant program outcome was the development of new and collaborative relationships among probation officers, school administrators and staff members, law enforcement officials, mental health service providers and social service providers. Many school personnel, for example, stated that having a probation officer on campus had improved overall

school safety and also helped the school staff identify those students facing problems, including those in trouble with alcohol and other substance abuse or gang activity.

By physically locating on high school campuses and working closely with partner agencies to secure needed services, the evaluation noted, probation officers created new roles for themselves and became part of the school community. This close working relationship led to a better understanding of each partner's perspective and, more importantly, improved service delivery for youth.

Finally, the evaluation showed that having a probation officer on campus changed the way youth viewed the Probation Department. The program design afforded probation officers the opportunity to see their wards and other students on a day-to-day basis, immersed in their community of school. The evaluation found that the youth no longer had to go out of their way (i.e. take a trip to the probation office) to meet with their officer. In many cases, this accessibility led to youth relying on their probation officer as an informal counselor. Some even called for their officer to serve as an advocate and provide assistance in speaking with administrators when the youth were called into the school office for disciplinary action. Additionally, the evaluation noted that the presence of a probation officer on campus served as a deterrent to inappropriate behavior.

#### ***Budget and Timeframe***

A total of \$235,712 in CPA funding will support the salaries and other associated costs for the placement of two Probation Officers from June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002. The selected schools operate summer sessions and the program will commence during that period and continue throughout the traditional school year. Budget detail is as follows:

<b>Number of Months</b>	<b>Expense</b>	<b>Amount</b>
13	Personnel – Probation Department	\$160,742
13	Operational Expenses*	\$64,626
13	Evaluation	\$10,344
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$235,712</b>

\*Operational expenses include furniture, laptops, travel costs, office supplies and other miscellaneous items.

**Identification of Specific Objectives and Outcome Measures and their Relation to Program Goals**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Benchmark/Baseline</b>
Reduce Arrests and Recidivism of CPA Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth (for probation youth at school site)</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year will be utilized (Data To Be Determined)</li> </ul>
Reduce Incarceration of Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA per CPA youth (probation youth)</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Reduce Probation Violations for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of probation violations per CPA youth (for probation youth)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Probation Completion for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete probation (for probation youth)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Restitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete payment of victim restitution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete court-ordered community service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of youth on probation for the prior school year (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Per Capita Costs for program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Improve School Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of juvenile crimes on campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 1999 and Year 2000 school safety/ crime statistics</li> </ul>

This program has been discontinued

#### **D. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Creation of a Day Reporting Center**

##### ***Program Goals***

To strengthen its aftercare services, Sonoma County proposes to focus a portion of its CPA 2000 funding on the development of a day reporting center for high-risk youth deeply entrenched in the Juvenile Justice System. Although the County's Juvenile Hall will serve as the primary referral source, youth returning to the community from other placements may also participate in the program. Program goals include reducing recidivism, providing further alternatives to detention and preparing youth for return to their community and life as an adult.

The day reporting program will target those 17 and 18 year old wards with a commitment time of 90 to 120 days who have already accessed all existing community resources. After receiving 30 days of in-custody programming in Juvenile Hall where they will be assessed for both educational and service needs, participating youth will live at home with their families or an appropriate caregiver. Once released from Juvenile Hall, participants will be required to attend a 7-day-a-week center where they will participate in programming from dawn until dusk. After completing programming at the center (typically 90 days), youth will receive further services in their community of origin from community based organizations.

With the R House community based organization serving as the lead agency, the day reporting program will include services designed to address an array of needs, including alcohol and drug treatment, family counseling, anger management, life skills training and vocational training/job readiness. R House will contract with other community based organizations for the provision of needed services.

Each youth will be assigned a case manager who, working closely with the assigned Probation Officer, will design with the child and family an individualized structured program with the goal of returning the youth to his/her community with enough resources to decrease the probability of re-offending. Additionally, the case manager will perform weekly home visits and actively work with the home school district as well as a vocational counselor.

After being picked up at their homes in a van operated by R House, each DRC youth will spend much of their morning in a school at the center. All youth will be academically assessed at program entry. The primary goal for all students participating in the program will be passing the GED if age appropriate, or returning to a classroom setting in their own community. If appropriate, some youth may continue to attend their traditional school and come to the DRC for the afternoon and evening sessions.

Youth will spend their afternoons participating in vocational training and gaining job skills. Afternoon sessions will also include time to address individual treatment needs, such as family counseling, anger management and mental health treatment. Saturday programming will focus on work crews as a means of making restitution and/or paying back the community by repairing the harm caused by the youth's offense. Sundays will be devoted to intensive family groups.



Initially scheduled to serve 15-20 youth at a time, the program will last from 90 days to 6 months, depending on the needs of the youth.

### ***Collaboration and Integration with Service Providers***

Sonoma County Probation Department's strong linkage with existing community resources is evident in all of the proposals for CPA 2000 funding. Like the other programs discussed previously, enhancement of its aftercare services also relies heavily upon collaborating and linking with service providers. The day reporting center will be operated by a community based organization that will in turn work with other community based organizations to ensure that needed services are available. It will also rely upon close collaboration with the Probation Department.

### ***Basis of Program Effectiveness***

#### ***Sacramento County Challenge I Program***

Sacramento County received Challenge I Program funding to create a community based, multi-service day reporting center. Designed for 602-youth with second time referrals who exhibit risk factors of family, substance abuse, education and criminal peers, the program's goal is to minimize the incidence and impact of crime. Additional goals include decreasing future arrests; increasing probation completion; increasing restitution payments; increasing school attendance; and improving family functioning through a decrease of placements and secure detention.

Services available to program participants include on-site mental health treatment; individual, group and family counseling; academic and special education; vocational skill development; life skills training; and referrals to other community agencies.

According to information submitted to the Board of Corrections by Sacramento County in January 2001, the program has produced a number of positive outcomes at the end of the six-month follow-up period. Some of these include:

- At the time of the follow-up study, 43% of the day reporting clients had not faced a subsequent arrest, compared with 31% of the field.
- When compared to the broader field, youth who had participated in the day reporting program experienced 11% fewer arrests for felony or misdemeanor offenses.
- By the end of the six-month follow-up period, day reporting center youth had 12% fewer petitions than the field.
- Participation in the day reporting experience impacted the severity of offense for those youth that did re-offend. Participants in the day reporting program were less likely than the field to commit the most serious felony offenses.
- Finally, 36% of the day reporting youth experienced no further criminal justice problems compared to 28% of the field, an 8% difference.

#### ***Evaluation of the Philadelphia Intensive Aftercare Program***

The Philadelphia Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) focused on youth transitioning from placement in juvenile correction facilities back into their communities. Participants were randomly assigned to either the program where they received additional services and more focused supervision or to a control group where they received only traditional aftercare services.

According to information produced by the United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, an evaluation of the Philadelphia IAP found that program participants experienced a significantly lower average number of re-arrests than the control group (1.65 versus 2.79) and a significantly lower number of felony arrests (0.41 versus 0.76). However, the percentage of re-arrests from the experimental and control groups were roughly equivalent. In summary, the evaluation findings suggest that the provision of intensive aftercare services reduces the likelihood that participating youth will re-offend multiple times and also reduces the severity of offenses for those that do re-offend.

***Budget and Timeframe***

Sonoma County has targeted \$1,070,196 of its CPA 2000 funding to operate the day reporting program. Funding is included for 1 Probation Officer and 1 Probation Assistant. The chart below presents the program budget in more detail.

Months	Type of Expense	Amount
13	Personnel – Probation Department	\$184,710
13	Contract with R House to Operate Program	\$800,000
13	Associated Expenses*	\$32,026
13	Evaluation	\$53,460
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,070,196</b>

\*Associated expenses include office supplies, mileage and modular equipment.

***Identification of Specific Objectives and Outcome Measures and their Relation to Program Goals***

Outcome	Measure	Benchmark/Baseline
Reduce Arrests and Recidivism of CPA Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study of Juvenile Hall commitment youth will be utilized (Data To Be Determined)</li> </ul>
Reduce Incarceration of Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new commitments to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study of Juvenile Hall Commitment youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>

	Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA	
Reduce Probation Violations for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of probation violations per CPA youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study of Juvenile Hall Commitment youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Probation Completion for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of youth who complete probation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study of Juvenile Hall Commitment youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Restitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of youth who complete payment of victim restitution (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study of Juvenile Hall Commitment youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of youth who complete court-ordered community service (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study of Juvenile Hall Commitment youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Per Capita Costs for program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Improve Educational Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of youth who improve educational competency</li> <li>% of youth enrolled in school program, job or complete GED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre/Post Assessment of educational competency</li> <li>School enrollment status at program entry compared to enrollment/employment/GED completion at end</li> </ul>

This program has been discontinued

## **E. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Establish Mentoring Program**

### ***Program Goals***

The second aftercare component involves the establishment of a mentoring program for 65 residents of the Juvenile Hall, Sierra Youth Center and Probation Camp. Youth will be referred to the Mentor Coordinator by individual program supervisors.

Mentors will serve as one more support system for youth during the transition back into their communities. The overall goal of the mentoring program is to improve the likelihood that participating youth avoid re-entry into the justice system. after release from custody. Evaluations of similar mentoring programs have found that this type of support is welcomed by the youth. Further, they have found that mentors can serve as a source of inspiration that so many of these youth lack.

### ***Collaboration and Integration with Service Providers***

Like the other programs discussed previously, enhancement of Sonoma County's aftercare services also relies heavily upon collaborating and linking with service providers. The Mentoring Program will rely upon links with the community to identify potential mentors and to assist youth in locating needed services and resources upon release.

### ***Basis of Program Effectiveness***

#### ***Public/Private Ventures Evaluation of the Big Brother/Big Sister Program***

An evaluation of the Big Brother/Big Sister Mentoring Program performed by Public/Private Ventures showed that mentoring produces positive results. Researchers found a number of positive outcomes for those youth matched with a Big Brother or Big Sister as compared to youth assigned to a waiting list or control group. Youth assigned to a Big Brother or Big Sister were:

- 46 % less likely to begin using illegal drugs;
- 27 % less likely to begin using alcohol;
- 53 % less likely to skip school;
- More confident of their performance in schoolwork;
- Less likely to engage in violent behavior; and
- More likely to get along better with their families.

#### ***Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Report to Congress***

In a 1998 report to Congress detailing findings from evaluation of the Juvenile Mentoring Program's (JUMP), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) concluded that mentoring produces positive and promising results, for youth as well as for mentors.

Through JUMP, youth who may be at risk for delinquency, gang involvement drug use or school failure are matched with an adult mentor to provide support, guidance and supervision. Operated by community based organizations and local education agencies, JUMP is located at 93 sites

nationwide. The program affords grantees the opportunity to shape the program so it meets individual community needs.

In the JUMP evaluation process, mentors and participating youth were asked a number of questions to determine whether they saw benefits from the mentoring relationship. Overwhelmingly, both youth and mentors responded that the experience produced positive results and provided resources and skills to assist youth in a number of risk areas, including improving school performance; avoiding alcohol and drug usage, refraining from gang activity and preventing violent and other destructive behaviors. Importantly, 70% of youth and 76% of mentors responded that they liked their partner and 68% of youth and 62% of mentors responded that they got along well with each other.

***Budget and Timeframe***

To operate the mentoring program from June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, Sonoma County proposes to use \$59,012 in CPA 2000 funding. Funding is included for 1 Probation Assistant. The chart below presents the program budget in more detail.

Months	Type of Expense	Amount
13	Personnel – Probation Department	\$48,910
13	Associated Expenses*	\$7,109
13	Evaluation	\$2,993
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$59,012</b>

\*Associated expenses include office supplies and vehicle.

***Identification of Specific Objectives and Outcome Measures and their Relation to Program Goals***

Outcome	Measure	Benchmark/Baseline
Reduce Arrests and Recidivism of CPA Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of arrests and sustained petitions per CPA youth</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new arrests</li> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new sustained petitions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth will be utilized (Sierra Youth Center) (Data To Be Determined)</li> </ul>
Reduce Incarceration of Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA per CPA youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of CPA youth with no new commitments to Juvenile Hall, Ranches or CYA</li> </ul>	
Reduce Probation Violations for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of probation violations per CPA youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Probation Completion for Program Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete probation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Restitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete payment of victim restitution (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Increase Completion of Court-Ordered Community Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of youth who complete court-ordered community service (where applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study group of Probation Ranch youth (Data TBD)</li> </ul>
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Per Capita Costs for program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Improve School Attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of school attendance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School attendance 6 months prior to program entry compared to attendance during mentorship</li> </ul>
Increase Self Esteem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score on Children's Self-Concept Scale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre/post test at program entry and at 6 months</li> </ul>

---

## **F. DEVELOPMENT OF COORDINATED INFORMATION SHARING SYSTEMS**

Sonoma County Probation Department certainly recognizes that a coordinated system of exchanging information benefits clients and enhances overall program operations. They also recognize that automation can greatly assist this effort. However, given the state of the Sonoma County Probation Department's computer system discussed previously, an automated system for information exchange is not currently feasible. While the necessary technological infrastructure is available, it has not yet been developed for managing case files, extracting tracking information and/or producing key studies or reports.

To enhance its data collection capacity and respond to the need to accurately track information, the County plans to hire or contract for an analyst whose position will be dedicated to maintaining and tracking statistics and data for the Juvenile Division of the Probation Department and specifically for the CPA 2000 programs. This individual will work closely with the service providing CBOs and other agencies to ensure that data collection tools are developed, maintained and used correctly and that necessary information is generated, interpreted and reported accurately, consistently and appropriately. This analyst will also serve as a conduit for the exchange of needed information amongst partner agencies.

Additionally, Sonoma County has entered into a contract with Michael Wiley to address short and long-term data needs. The contractor will lead the development of a data collection system that will ultimately provide the outcome measurement data and statistical reports required by the Board of Corrections for CPA 2000. He will also direct implementation of an outcome measurement system.

Finally, although Sonoma County does not have access to a highly functioning computer system, it does do benefit from close working relationships with other local agencies and community based organizations. Monthly Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council meetings that are regularly attended by a wide range of interests represent just one forum for the exchange of information. The County's commitment to collaboration and open communication facilitates such exchange and will continue through the operation of CPA 2000-funded programs.

**APPENDIX:**

**BUDGET AND**

**PROGRAM PRIORITY**

**INFORMATION**



**JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR  
CRIME PREVENTION ACT 2000 FUNDING**

**SONOMA COUNTY**

<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>	<b>TOTAL PROJECTED COST</b>	<b>TOTAL CPA FUNDING</b>
1. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Creation of a Day Reporting Center	\$1,070,196.00	\$1,070,196.00
2. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Adoption of Functional Family Therapy Model	\$162,773.00	\$162,773.00
3. Enhance Early Intervention Efforts: Initiate Family Group Conferencing	\$110,374.00	\$110,374.00
4. Placement of Probation Officers on Selected High School Campuses	\$235,712.00	\$235,712.00
5. Strengthen Aftercare Services: Establish Mentoring Program	\$59,012.00	\$59,012.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,638,067.00*</b>	<b>\$1,638,067.00*</b>

\* Total includes anticipated interest earnings of \$48,000