

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



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

Jill Silva, Stanislaus County Chief Probation Officer, Chair

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

Jeff Anderson, Director, Sierra Vista Child and Family Services

Timothy P. Bazar, Stanislaus County Public Defender

Birgit Fladager, Stanislaus County District Attorney

Adam Christianson, Stanislaus County Sheriff

Art de Werk, Chief of Police, Ceres Police Department

Galen Carroll, Chief of Police, Modesto Police Department

Cindy Duenas, Executive Director, Center for Human Services

Kathryn Harwell, Director Community Services Agency

Thomas Changnon, Superintendent, Stanislaus County Office of Education

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

Pam Able, Superintendent, Modesto City Schools District

Monica Nino, Stanislaus County Chief Executive Officer

Madelyn Schlaepfer, Director, Behavioral Health & Recovery Services

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

William W. Dyer, Public Member

Historical Summary of Juvenile Justice Planning in Stanislaus County

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

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

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

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

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

Prevention/Early Intervention

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

Intermediate Sanctions

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

Facilities/Facility Programs

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

Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2013 Update of the Local Action Plan

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

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

Information Gathering About Programs and Services

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

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

Evaluation of Available Programs

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

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

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

Incapacitation – Services offered to youth in custodial settings.

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

Analysis of Gaps in Services

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

The following gaps in services were identified:

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

Goals

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

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

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

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

Progress

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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