



CALIFORNIA REDUCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY

TITLE II 2015 PLAN

February 2017



Board of State & Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento CA 95833
www.bsc.ca.gov

**PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE REDUCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY (R.E.D.)
CORE PROTECTION**

Phase I: Identification

1. Updated R.E.D.¹ Identification Spreadsheets

In this final update to California's 2015-2018 R.E.D. Three Year Plan, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) has included the Relative Rate Index (RRI) Analysis Tracking Sheets for California (statewide) as well as for four counties with focused R.E.D. efforts: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Santa Barbara, and Mono. Corresponding data has also been entered into the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) DMC Web-Based Data Entry System and uploaded into OJJDP's on-line Compliance Tool.

2. R.E.D. Data Discussions

California is divided into 58 counties that have 111 juvenile detention facilities including 54 camps, 54 juvenile halls and three special purpose juvenile halls (small facilities designed for short periods of detention). 45 counties have at least one juvenile hall and 27 counties have at least one camp. Los Angeles County, with the largest general population, has three juvenile halls and 17 camps. At a point in time average across California, nearly 5,274 juveniles are housed in local juvenile detention facilities. Another 15,215 juveniles are "detained" (i.e., receiving custody credits) in home detention or another form of alternative confinement (e.g., work programs, day schools and special purpose juvenile halls).

RRI data is collected by the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and distributed upon request to the BSCC and annually to Chief Probation Officers. DOJ's Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) collects a variety of juvenile statistical data, including information regarding R.E.D. from 56 county probation departments on a yearly basis. Each year, there is a difference between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as "referred to juvenile court and probation" via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). The differences are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the California DOJ. However, there are two primary reasons for the difference:

- Probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests.
- The JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the California DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other "community based" programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

When reviewing and interpreting RRI results, there are several caveats that need to be taken into account. Different jurisdictions may interpret the definitions of various data elements and decision points differently or use different sources of information to collect them based on their available data. To help combat this, both the JCPSS manual and the BSCC R.E.D. grantee Progress Report guidelines provide a set of definitions for counties to use. In addition, the data are based on an "event" within the juvenile system so counts along the continuum at each decision point cannot be interpreted as a count of the number of youth as a single youth may have multiple events during the reporting periods. Therefore, the RRI values provided cannot be directly compared to those reported by other government agencies nor can they be exclusively relied upon to shape California's R.E.D. Compliance Plan.

¹ The State of California refers to DMC as R.E.D. – Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities

However, because R.E.D. efforts are an intensely local matter, and the most successful R.E.D. efforts appear to derive from local leadership rather than state prescribed efforts, we allow for the RRI to inform local decision-makers, and the state responds accordingly by providing continued guidance, monitoring, and evaluation.

All four of the current county probation departments receiving Title II funds to undertake the reduction of disparity and disproportionality continue to use a data-driven process to guide their efforts. In addition to the RRI data collected through the California DOJ, the BSCC also requires R.E.D. grantees to submit the following local data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender on a quarterly basis:

- Juvenile Arrests
- Juvenile Hall Bookings
- In-Custody Holds for Detention Hearings
- Petitions Filed
- Petitions Sustained
- Institutional Commitments

BSCC's R.E.D. Coordinator continues to monitor progress within the four R.E.D. grantee sites. This year's focus is largely on monitoring and best practices. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Quality assurance when addressing R.E.D.
- Gender/race intersection
- Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) specifically for race, gender, and culture
- Decision-point analyses
- Data protocols aligned with California and federal requirements

California: Statewide Relative Rate Index Comparison

2013 National RRI's are roughly equal to those of 2015 California for 'All Minorities,' with the exception of cases transferred to adult court where California is higher (1.3 National. vs. 1.85 California). Across the board, California has evidenced a steep decrease in cases transferred to adult court from 2011 to 2015 (see row 10). However, the data tell a different story for 'Black/African American' where California's RRI exceeds the national RRI for cases for juvenile arrests (4.1 to 1.8, respectively), cases involving secure detention (1.6 vs. 1.3, respectively), and cases transferred to adult court (1.9 vs. 1.3, respectively), all of which show substantial volume (number of occurrences) and magnitude (percent of total occurrences by race/ethnicity). Ethnicity data for 'Hispanic/Latino' is not available for 2013 at the national level; however, it is important to note that 2015 California 'Hispanic/Latino' RRI's for decision points with substantial volume and magnitude are still greater than those for 'Whites' held constant at 1.0 (arrests 1.3, secure detention 1.3, cases petitioned 1.2, and cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities 1,0).

See next page.

**California: Statewide Relative Rate Index
2015 / 2011 Comparison
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

Race/ Ethnicity	African-American		Hispanic/ Latino		Asian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander*		American Indian/ Alaska Native*		Other/ Mixed		All Minorities	
	2015	2011	2015	2011	2015	2011	2015	2011	2015	2011	2015	2011	2015	2011
1. Population at Risk (10-17)	225K 5.5%	265K 6.0%	2.1mil 51.2%	2.1mil 50.4%	439K 10.8%	430K 10%	14.8K 0.4%	16K 0.4%	16.6K 0.4%	26K 0.6%	171K 4.2%	---	2.9mil 72.6%	2.9mil 67.6%
2. Juvenile Arrests	4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K	3.81 S=Yes M=16% V=25K	1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K	1.54 S=Yes M=54.8% V=85K	0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K	0.38 S=Yes M=2.6% V=4140	*	1.72 S=Yes M=.5% V=708	*	0.86 S=Yes M=.4% V=576	0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K	--- S=- M=2.4% V=3.8K	1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K	1.62 S=Yes M=77% V=120K
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K	3.85 S=Yes M=17% V=23K	1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K	1.46 S=Yes M=53.9% V=71K	0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K	0.31 S=Yes M=2.3% V=3,015	*	1.53 S=Yes M=.4% V=557	*	1.32 S=Yes M=.6% V=779	0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K	--- S=- M=1.7% V=2,248	1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K	1.54 S=Yes M=76% V=101K
4. Cases Diverted	0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K	0.72 S=Yes M=16% V=2.0K	0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K	0.72 S=Yes M=49% V=6,320	0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94	1.06 S=No M=3% V=391	*	0.45 S=Yes M=.2% V=31	*	0.53 S=Yes M=.4% V=51	1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141	--- S=- M=2.1% V=280	0.65 S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K	0.73 S=Yes M=70% V=9,089
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K	1.71 S=Yes M=23% V=6.8K	1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K	1.31 S=Yes M=55% V=16K	0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237	0.92 S=No M=1.6% V=481	*	1.55 S=Yes M=.5% V=149	*	1.84 S=Yes M=.8% V=248	0.84 S=Yes M=.9% V=176	--- S=- M=1.5% V=441	1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K	1.39 S=Yes M=82% V=24K
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K	1.34 S=Yes M=20% V=13K	1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K	1.19 S=Yes M=55% V=35K	1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571	1.02 S=No M=10% V=1,269	*	1.40 S=Yes M=.5% V=322	*	1.34 S=Yes M=.7% V=432	1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442	--- S=- M=1.6% V=1,034	1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K	1.22 S=Yes M=80% V=51K
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K	1.03 S=Yes M=20% V=9.9K	1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K	1.07 S=Yes M=56% V=29K	0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382	0.93 S=Yes M=1.8% V=892	*	1.08 S=Yes M=.5% V=262	*	1.13 S=Yes M=.7% V=370	0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317	--- S=- M=1.5% V=766	1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K	1.06 S=Yes M=81% V=41K
8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K	1.16 S=Yes M=22% V=6.3K	1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K	1.02 S=No M=55% V=16K	0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205	0.94 S=No M=1.6% V=457	*	1.36 S=Yes M=.7% V=194	*	1.07 S=No M=.8% V=216	1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201	--- S=- M=1.5% V=425	1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K	1.05 S=Yes M=81% V=23K
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K	1.10 S=Yes M=17% V=2.3K	1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K	1.41 S=Yes M=63% V=8.5K	1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105	1.21 S=Yes M=1.7% V=229	*	0.69 S=Yes M=.3% V=38	*	1.35 S=Yes M=.8% V=106	0.70 S=Yes M=.6% V=44	--- S=- M=1.4% V=188	1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K	1.32 S=Yes M=85% V=11K
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124	3.55 S=Yes M=29% V=226	1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305	2.59 S=Yes M=56% V=456	1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6	5.51 S=Yes M=4.4% V=35	*	0.62 S=No M=0.1% V=1	*	0.46 S=No M=0.1% V=1	1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6	--- S=- M=1.0% V=8	1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442	2.85 S=Yes M=92% V=727

2015 Statewide Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

Area of Concern	Decision Stages or Contact Points					
	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Native HI/PI	Native American	All Minorities
More than 1.00	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	6. Cases Petitioned 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court
Less than 1.00	4. Cases Diverted	4. Cases Diverted	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement	4. Cases Diverted 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	4. Cases Diverted	4. Cases Diverted

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: San Joaquin County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
2015 Comparison to Statewide
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

San Joaquin county 2015 RRI's for 'Black/African American,' 'Hispanic/Latino,' and Asian are generally less than or similar to those for California, except for juvenile arrests (3 times higher than 'White' for 'Black/African American" and 2 times less than 'White' for Hispanic/Latino), referrals to juvenile court (2 times higher than 'White' for 'Hispanic/Latino', and confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities.

Race/ Ethnicity	African-American		Hispanic/ Latino		Asian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Other/ Mixed		All Minorities	
	SJ	CA	SJ	CA	SJ	CA	SJ	CA	SJ	CA	SJ	CA	SJ	CA
1. Population at Risk (10-17)	6,299 7%	225K 5.5%	45,013 51.1%	2.1mil 51.2%	12,077 13.5%	439K 10.8%	412 0.5%	14.8K 0.4%	370 0.4%	16.6K 0.4%	4,269 4.8%	171K 4.2%	69,272 77.2%	2.9mil 72.6%
2. Juvenile Arrests	3.05 S=Yes M=29% V=631	4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K	0.52 S=Yes M=34% V=785	1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K	0.23 S=Yes M=4.1% V=93	0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K	*	*	*	*	0.30 S=Yes M=2% V=42	0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K	0.71 S=Yes M=71% V=1,618	1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	1.6 S=Yes M=19% V=1,122	1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K	2.02 S=No M=45% V=1,688	1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K	1.83 S=Yes M=4.8% V=181	0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K	*	*	*	*	1.14 S=Yes M=1% V=51	0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K	1.78 S=Yes M=81% V=3,071	1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K
4. Cases Diverted	1.27 S=No M=12% V=18	0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K	1.98 S=No M=56% V=42	0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K	2.19 S=No M=6.7% V=5	0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94	*	*	*	*	**	1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141	1.71 S=No M=88% V=66	0.65 S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.20 S=No M=20% V=153	1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K	0.86 S=No M=40% V=164	1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K	0.68 S=No M=3.4% V=14	0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237	*	*	*	*	**	0.84 S=Yes M=0.9% V=176	0.96 S=No M=81% V=334	1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	1.13 S=No M=19% V=356	1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K	0.97 S=No M=43% V=462	1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K	0.81 S=No M=3.8% V=41	1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571	*	*	*	*	0.63 S=No M=1% V=9	1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442	1.01 S=No M=81% V=874	1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	0.97 S=No M=19% V=216	1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K	0.98 S=No M=43% V=283	1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K	0.74 S=No M=2.9% V=19	0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382	*	*	*	*	**	0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317	0.96 S=No M=81% V=526	1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K
8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	0.63 S=Yes M=31% V=44	1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K	0.46 S=Yes M=32% V=42	1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K	0.32 S=Yes M=1.5% V=2	0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205	*	*	*	*	**	1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201	0.53 S=Yes M=69% V=90	1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.49 S=Yes M=14% V=146	1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K	1.57 S=Yes M=48% V=201	1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K	1.51 S=Yes M=3.1% V=13	1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105	*	*	*	*	**	0.70 S=Yes M=0.6% V=44	1.53 S=Yes M=86% V=363	1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124	**	1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305	**	1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6	*	*	*	*	**	1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6	**	1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442

2015 San Joaquin County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

Area of Concern	Decision Stages or Contact Points					
	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Native HI/PI	Native American	All Minorities
More than 1.00	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court	4. Cases Diverted 8. Placement 10. Adult Court	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent	3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement	3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court
Less than 1.00	4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det.	2. Juvenile Arrests 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Det. 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine	5. Secure Det. 6. Cases Petitioned 9. Secure Confine	2. Juvenile Arrests 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent	2. Juvenile Arrests 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: Stanislaus County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
2015 Comparison to Statewide
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

Stanislaus County 2015 RRI's are similar to those of California in general for 'All Minorities', except that Stanislaus shows slightly more cases resulting in secure detention, 2 times more cases diverted from entry to the juvenile justice system, and 2 times less cases resulting in secure confinement in juvenile correctional facilities. Arrests, secure detention, and cases petitioned are higher than 'White' held constant at 1.0 for both 'Black/African American' and 'Hispanic/Latino.' The highest RRI was arrest for 'Black/African American' at 5.1.

Race/ Ethnicity	African-American		Hispanic/ Latino		Asian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Other/ Mixed		All Minorities	
	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA	Stan.	CA
1. Population at Risk (10-17)	1,604 2.5%	225K 5.5%	36,533 56.6%	2.1mil 51.2%	2,827 4.4%	439K 10.8%	323 0.5%	14.8K 0.4%	238 0.4%	16.6K 0.4%	2,243 3.5%	171K 4.2%	43,768 67.8%	2.9mil 72.6%
2. Juvenile Arrests	5.12 S=Yes M=11% V=131	4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K	1.28 S=Yes M=60% V=744	1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K	0.49 S=Yes M=1.8% V=22	0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K	*	*	*	*	0.36 S=Yes M=1% V=13	0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K	1.32 S=Yes M=73% V=918	1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	1.04 S=Yes M=11% V=156	1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K	1.02 S=Yes M=60% V=868	1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K	**	0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K	*	*	*	*	**	0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K	1.02 S=Yes M=74% V=3,071	1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K
4. Cases Diverted	**	S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K	S=No M=66% V=61	S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K	**	S=Yes M=1.4% V=94	*	*	*	*	**	S=No M=2.0% V=141	S=No M=74% V=66	S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.71 S=Yes M=13% V=64	1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K	1.52 S=Yes M=65% V=316	1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K	**	0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237	*	*	*	*	**	0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176	1.55 S=Yes M=81% V=334	1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	1.44 S=Yes M=13% V=80	1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K	1.29 S=Yes M=63% V=399	1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K	**	1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571	*	*	*	*	**	1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442	1.32 S=Yes M=79% V=874	1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	0.92 S=No M=12% V=61	1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K	0.98 S=No M=64% V=325	1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K	**	0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382	*	*	*	*	**	0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317	0.96 S=No M=78% V=526	1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K
8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	1.22 S=Yes M=13% V=48	1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K	1.19 S=Yes M=65% V=248	1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K	**	0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205	*	*	*	*	**	1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201	1.20 S=Yes M=81% V=90	1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K	0.71 S=No M=64% V=35	1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K	**	1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105	*	*	*	*	**	0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44	0.63 S=No M=69% V=363	1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124	**	1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305	**	1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6	*	*	*	*	**	1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6	**	1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442

2015 Stanislaus County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

Area of Concern	Decision Stages or Contact Points				
	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Native HI/PI	All Minorities
More than 1.00	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement	2. Juvenile Arrests	*	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement 10. Adult Court
Less than 1.00	7. Find Delinquent	7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine	**	*	7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: Santa Barbara County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
2015 Comparison to Statewide
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

Santa Barbara County 2015 RRIs for 'All Minorities' showed 2 times as many cases diverted and less cases resulting in placement on probation than those for California. However, Santa Barbara had higher RRIs than California and 'White' held constant at 1.0 for 'All Minorities' for secure detention, cases petitioned, delinquent findings, and secure confinement in juvenile correctional facilities. Santa Barbara 2015 RRI data showed 'Black/African American' as more than 4 times more likely to be arrested and more than 2 times more likely to be placed in secure detention as 'White' youth.

Race/ Ethnicity	African-American		Hispanic/ Latino		Asian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Other/ Mixed		All Minorities	
	SB	CA	SB	CA	SB	CA	SB	CA	SB	CA	SB	CA	SB	CA
1. Population at Risk (10-17)	555 1.3%	225K 5.5%	26,585 62.4%	2.1mil 51.2%	1,276 3.0%	439K 10.8%	52 0.1%	14.8K 0.4%	163 0.4%	16.6K 0.4%	1,276 3.0%	171K 4.2%	29,907 70.3%	2.9mil 72.6%
2. Juvenile Arrests	4.22 S=Yes M=4.5% V=69	4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K	1.35 S=Yes M=69% V=1,058	1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K	0.27 S=Yes M=0.6% V=10	0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K	*	*	*	*	0.82 S=Yes M=2% V=31	0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K	1.33 S=Yes M=76% V=1,168	1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	0.91 S=Yes M=4% V=126	1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K	1.05 S=Yes M=71% V=2,239	1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K	**	0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K	*	*	*	*	0.53 S=Yes M=1% V=33	0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K	1.03 S=Yes M=76% V=2,420	1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K
4. Cases Diverted	**	0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K	1.22 S=No M=77% V=116	0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K	**	0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94	*	*	*	*	**	1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141	1.16 S=No M=79% V=119	0.65 S=No M=71% V=4.9K
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	2.27 S=Yes M=5.3% V=40	1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K	1.94 S=Yes M=80% V=608	1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K	**	0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237	*	*	*	*	1.3 S=No M=1% V=6	0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176	1.94 S=Yes M=86% V=656	1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	1.61 S=Yes M=4.5% V=68	1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K	1.56 S=Yes M=78% V=1,174	1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K	**	1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571	*	*	*	*	1.18 S=No M=1% V=13	1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442	1.56 S=Yes M=83% V=1,263	1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.12 S=No M=4.5% V=45	1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K	1.14 S=Yes M=79% V=794	1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K	**	0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382	*	*	*	*	**	0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317	1.15 S=No M=85% V=856	1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K
8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	0.9 S=No M=5.1% V=24	1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K	0.76 S=Yes M=75% V=356	1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K	**	0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205	*	*	*	*	**	1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201	0.76 S=Yes M=81% V=384	1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.7 S=Yes M=4.5% V=19	1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K	1.84 S=Yes M=86% V=362	1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K	**	1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105	*	*	*	*	**	0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44	1.82 S=Yes M=91% V=386	1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124	**	1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305	**	1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6	*	*	*	*	**	1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6	**	1.85 S=No M=90% V=442

2015 Santa Barbara County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

Area of Concern	Decision Stages or Contact Points					
	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Native HI/PI	Native American	All Minorities
More than 1.00	2. Juvenile Arrest 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Find Delinquent	**	*	*	2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine
Less than 1.00	3. Court Referrals 8. Placement	8. Placement	2. Juvenile Arrests	*	*	8. Placement

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: Mono County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
2015 Comparison to Statewide
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

The R.E.D. Executive Steering Committee's original request for proposals for the R.E.D. Enhanced 2014-2018 grant cycle allowed for funding to go to small, medium, and large counties. Due to its small overall and at-risk youth population, Mono has race/ethnic groups that are either below the 1% threshold requiring separate analysis or that have an insufficient number of cases for analysis (very small number of occurrences at each decision point). It is significant to note that 'Hispanic/Latino' makes up over 49% of the total at-risk youth population and 87% of 'All Minorities' at-risk youth in Mono County. Mono has focused on implicit bias training and expanding collaborative partnerships to meet service needs.

Race/ Ethnicity	African-American		Hispanic/ Latino		Asian		Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Other/ Mixed		All Minorities	
	Mono	CA	Mono	CA	Mono	CA	Mono	CA	Mono	CA	Mono	CA	Mono	CA
1. Population at Risk (10-17)	2 0.2%	225K 5.5%	615 49.2%	2.1mil 51.2%	12 1.0%	439K 0.1%	1 0.1%	14.8K 0.4%	28 2.2%	16.6K 0.4%	46 3.7%	171K 4.2%	704 56.3%	2.9mil 72.6%
2. Juvenile Arrests	*	4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K	**	1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K	*	0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K	*	*	**	*	**	0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K	**	1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K
3. Referrals to Juvenile Court	*	1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K	**	1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K	*	0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K	*	*	**	*	**	0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K	**	1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K
4. Cases Diverted	*	0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K	**	0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K	*	0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94	*	*	**	*	**	1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141	**	0.65 S=No M=71% V=4.9K
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	*	1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K	**	1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K	*	0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237	*	*	**	*	**	0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176	**	1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	*	1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K	**	1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K	*	1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571	*	*	**	*	**	1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442	**	1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	*	1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K	**	1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K	*	0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382	*	*	**	*	**	0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317	**	1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K
8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	*	1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K	**	1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K	*	0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205	*	*	**	*	**	1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201	**	1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	*	1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K	**	1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K	*	1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105	*	*	**	*	**	0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44	**	1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	*	1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124	**	1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305	*	1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6	*	*	**	*	**	1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6	**	1.85 S=No M=90% V=442

2015 Mono County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

Area of Concern	Decision Stages or Contact Points					
	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Native HI/PI	Native American	All Minorities
More than 1.00	*	**	*	*	**	**
Less than 1.00	*	**	*	*	**	**

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

Phase II: Assessment

The OJJDP Title II FY 2017 solicitation requires a summary of the findings of the statewide DMC assessment study published from 2005-2014. The California DMC Assessment Report dated July 2013 provided a foundation for the state DMC/R.E.D. Committee to prioritize race/gender issues for the 2015 Three Year Plan. It also provided an examination of the extent to which R.E.D. exists within local jurisdictions. Assessment findings illustrated that California's past DMC grant counties have been able to, at various points, reduce both the number of Youth of Color in contact with the justice system and, at various points, reduce the disproportionate rates at which specific racial and ethnic groups come in contact with the justice system. Data limitations challenge the development of overarching observations regarding progress and opportunity for improvement statewide; however, the findings of the Assessment show where specific jurisdictions have been able to make important and measurable strides toward reducing the representation of Youth of Color in contact with the justice system and reducing their contact rates relative to their White counterparts. The Assessment also provided some invaluable recommendations including:

- "California must continue to work toward the implementation of the best practices with respect to uniform data collection and reporting such that the local jurisdictions produce information in a manner that can be reliably analyzed along with data from other jurisdictions."
- "...the conversation about race and ethnicity and the efforts to reduce racial disparity must include an intersectional lens where data collection and disparity reduction strategies apply a gender equity lens that accounts for males and females, their different pathways into and out of the justice system, and how efforts to address racial disparities might need to be tailored to address the specific needs of boys and girls who are uniquely positioned at and impacted by contact with various points along the justice continuum."

Phase III: Intervention

Progress Made in FY 2016

Activities Implemented

The BSCC has long recognized the significance of disproportionality data and the implications for California's youth and families. Through the leadership of the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP) California has been prominent in its efforts to transform juvenile justice toward reducing racial and ethnic disparity across the justice system with the ultimate goal of a fair and equitable system.

The FY 2016 R.E.D. activities consist of a three-track initiative: (1) direct service through grants aimed at reducing racial and ethnic disparity; (2) education/awareness through our implementation of education for subgrantees and stakeholders; and (3) advocacy and support.

Track 1. Direct Service:

Beginning in FY 2005, Title II has funded the following 18 subgrantees (county probation departments) in an effort to reduce the disparity within their juvenile justice systems:

- DMC Technical Assistance Program (TAP) 2006-2009
 - Alameda
 - Contra Costa
 - Los Angeles
 - San Diego
 - Santa Cruz

- DMC Support Grant 2010-2012
 - Alameda
 - Contra Costa
 - Los Angeles
 - San Diego
 - San Francisco
 - Santa Clara
 - Santa Cruz

- DMC Enhanced TAP-II 2010-2012
 - Fresno
 - Humboldt
 - Marin
 - Orange
 - Sacramento
 - Ventura
 - Yolo

- R.E.D. Support Grants 2014
 - Humboldt
 - Marin
 - Orange
 - Sacramento
 - Yolo

- R.E.D. Enhanced 2014-2018
 - Mono
 - San Joaquin
 - Santa Barbara
 - Stanislaus

In 2006-09, the BSCC implemented a pioneering approach focused on reducing the number of youth detained who do not pose a public safety risk. Subgrantees worked with an expert consultant to identify and quantify disparity at decision points involved with detention in Juvenile Hall. Subgrantees then worked to identify strategies for reducing detentions of youth (in particular youth of color) who do not pose an unreasonable risk of public safety, i.e., detentions based on a failures to appear (FTAs) in court.

That approach has continued to be used by our R.E.D. subgrantees. The R.E.D. Enhanced 2014-18 subgrants are structured with a R.E.D. identification stage; further assessment, education and infrastructure phase; development of a community collaborative to design intervention strategies; and an implementation and monitoring phase.

BSCC has budgeted \$1 million dollars for R.E.D. annually since FY 2014 with the purpose of ensuring the prioritization of reducing youth of color coming into contact with the justice system.

Track 2: Education

The second component of the multi-faceted approach is the educational component. Widespread education across youth-serving systems is a necessary step in shifting youth-serving systems toward improved outcomes for youth of color.

- BSCC provides training opportunities whereby project directors and other local criminal justice stakeholders receive training that includes discussions of implicit bias and racial and ethnic disparity.
- Through its direct service grants, BSCC also makes Title II funds available to subgrantees who can choose to use some of that funding to hire their own R.E.D. experts and sponsor their own R.E.D. trainings for staff and stakeholders.

Track 3: Advocacy and Support

The third component to reducing racial and ethnic disparity is BSCC advocacy/support. The DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator/BSCC staff attend relevant trainings, conferences, participate in conference calls, and monitor developments in the field. As examples, in 2015, 3 BSCC staff and 2 SACJJDP members participated in Georgetown University's R.E.D. Capstone project and in 2017 received certificates and were entered into the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) Fellows Network. In 2016, the DMC/R.E.D. coordinator took the Harvard Implicit Bias test and attended Muslim American Cultural Responsiveness Training sponsored by the California Department of Social Services. The DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator and BSCC staff also attended the 2016 National DMC Conference in Baltimore, Maryland and participated in the CJJ Western Region Meeting. The DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator also attended the 2017 Alliance for Boys and Men of Color Policy Briefing. The BSCC typically includes a requirement that applicants take R.E.D. considerations into account in Requests for Proposals submitted to the BSCC for grant funds.

R.E.D. Plan for FY 2017

Activities

The BSCC activities in 2017 will primarily focus on continued state-level leadership with a focused effort toward policy development (while maintaining current activities associated with Direct Service). This will include support and/or development/implementation of the following:

- Local Initiative - R.E.D. Probation Grants: 4 County Probation Departments (Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Santa Barbara) are involved in a four-year grant program focused on reducing racial and ethnic disparity through data driven decision making and implicit bias trainings.
- Trainings: Implement R.E.D. trainings for subgrantees/stakeholders;
- Data: Develop recommendations and best practices regarding standardization of juvenile justice race and ethnicity data collected or reported by counties as required by the recently enacted state legislation. (Assembly Bill 1998, Ch. 880, Stats. 2016.)
- BSCC R.E.D. Georgetown Certificate Program Participation/ Implementation of Capstone Project: The BSCC's Capstone Project has three steps. The first step is the completion of a BSCC evaluation that examines BSCC's operations and how they might impact community

racial and ethnic disparities. The second and third steps are an internal staff survey and training informed by the report and survey results. Completion of the Capstone Project will include Board consideration of any recommendations resulting from the evaluation and implementation of any that may be approved.

Performance Measures: Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities (R.E.D.)

State Program Designator: 10 Standard Program Area: 10

California's minority youth are disproportionately represented as they progress through the juvenile justice system. The differences between minority and non-minority juveniles' representation become amplified at each successive decision point - from contact through commitment.

Goal: Reduce the number of youth of color coming into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

1. Continue support for County Probation Departments that have a data driven R.E.D. initiative under way;
2. Continue to monitor the four funded R.E.D. subgrants to county probation departments, originally based on a competitive process RFP process and now in Year 3 of a 4 Year project cycle; and
3. Provide R.E.D. education.
4. Implement the Georgetown R.E.D. Certificate Capstone Project.

Activities:

- The R.E.D. grants include three incremental phases (resulting in a four-year grant cycle). Grants are entering their 3rd year in FY 2017
- Through the leveraging of state and/or federal funds, continue providing education and awareness.

Performance Measures (Optional Outputs and Outcomes to be determined):

- The amount of federal funds in whole dollars that are allocated to address R.E.D. during the reporting period;
- The number of staff trained on R.E.D. within each R.E.D. grant initiative; and
- The number of staff trained on R.E.D. within the agency

Number of Subgrants: 4

Budget: Formula Grant Fund

 \$1,000,000

SMART: N/A

Phase IV and V: Monitoring

Evaluation and Monitoring

Evaluation: A formal process evaluation was conducted in 2009, indicating that the BSCC's phased approach, focusing on enhancing local leadership and technical assistance, could successfully reduce disparity and disproportionality.

Monitoring: The BSCC works closely with probation departments, project managers and evaluators to help projects achieve programmatic objectives. This year, the BSCC has taken another step toward increased collaboration and understanding of the complex issues related to DMC/R.E.D. by combining the Juvenile Justice Specialist and DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator roles into one staff position.

Trends are tracked by the DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator reviewing the RRI along with the data counties submit in their quarterly progress reports. The R.E.D. Coordinator/BSCC Staff also monitor grantee effectiveness and changes in R.E.D. trends by conducting periodic onsite visits to observe program operations, review financial records, and provide oversight of data collection efforts. BSCC staff provide technical assistance on program implementation, operation, and evaluation issues. Staff also receive quarterly progress reports from subgrantees that provide specific updates on administrative and operational issues as well as data collection and analysis efforts. These reports help to identify issues that may warrant technical assistance, which staff provides on an ongoing basis, in carrying out their project monitoring and support responsibilities.

Time Line

The table below indicates the timeline and funding amount (where applicable) for the proposed activities that continue to ensure R.E.D. is a priority within California.

Activity	Time Frame	Funding
R.E.D. Trainings	Ongoing	Approximately \$302,060
R.E.D. Grants	Ongoing (annually)	\$697,940
R.E.D. Technical Assistance	Ongoing	N/A