REVISED

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING
ORANGE COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Thursday, February 25, 2021, 3:30 P.M.

STEVE SENTMAN, Chair
Probation

DEBRA BAETZ
Social Services Agency

KELLI BELTRAN
Juvenile Court Representative

HETHER BENJAMIN
Community Based Organization Rep.

DOUG CHAFFEE
Orange County Board of Supervisors

JARED DAHL
Sheriff-Coroner

TOM DARÉ
Local Law Enforcement

LYNN GARRETT
Education Representative

JEFFREY NAGEL
Health Care Agency, Mental Health

MEGHAN MEDLIN
At Large Community Representative

NAZLY RESTREPO
Community Based Drug & Alcohol Rep.

TODD SPITZER
District Attorney

DARREN THOMPSON
Public Defender

VACANT
Business Representative

ATTENDANCE: Members Beltran, Benjamin, Dahl, DaRé, Chaffee, Garrett, Medlin, Restrepo, Sentman, Spitzer, Thompson, Lopez (Alternate for Nagel; did not participate in voting) and Santini (Alternate for Baetz) (all members participated via zoom)

EXCUSED: Members Baetz and Nagel

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL: Jamie Ross & Sonia Acuna, Deputy Clerks (participated via zoom)

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS: (Items 1 - 6)

1. Welcome and Introductions

CHAIR SENTMAN DEDICATED MEETING TO JOHN REYNOLDS, GARDEN GROVE POLICE DEPARTMENT

CHAIR CALLED ROLL AND CONFIRMED A QUORUM

2. Discussion and approval of revised bylaws

11 12 123456789 10 13 14 **APPROVED AS PRESENTED**
x x

3. Discussion and approval of report – Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council – Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations: Building an Effective and Meaningful Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan, Focus Area 4 *(Continued from 10/22/20, Item 2)*

871234569 10 11 12 13 14 **APPROVED TO STRIKE FOCUS AREA 4; PREVIOUS AD HOC COMMITTEE TO BRING BACK RECOMMENDATIONS TO 4/22/21, 3:30 P.M. REGULAR MEETING REGARDING METRICS TO BE MEASURED AND HOW OFTEN THEY SHOULD BE REVIEWED**
x x

4. Review and approve transition from existing Truancy Response Program services to a new contract/scope for Truancy Response Program

11 12 123456789 10 13 14 **APPROVED PROBATION TO MONITOR CONTRACT THROUGH 6/30/21; DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO RETURN 4/22/21, 3:30 P.M. REGULAR MEETING WITH TRANSITION OPTIONS**
x x

COUNCIL MEMBER SPITZER ASKED FOR BOYS & GIRLS CLUB TO PROVIDE UPDATE WITH METRICS

5. Discussion and approval of nominees for new Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) SB 823 subcommittee

11 213456789 10 12 13 14 **APPROVED NOMINEES TO SB 823 SUBCOMMITTEE:**
x x

PROBATION – STEVE SENTMAN, CHAIR
DISTRICT ATTORNEY – KIMBERLY DOYLE
PUBLIC DEFENDER – LAURA JOSE
SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY – KEN SANTINI
HEALTH CARE AGENCY – DAWN SMITH
ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION - LYNN GARRETT
JUVENILE COURT – PRESIDING JUDGE JOANNE MOTOIKE
COMMUNITY MEMBERS – RAYMOND SANCHEZ, MEGHAN MEDLIN, STEVE KIM AND NAZLY RESTREPO

FIRST MEETING TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, 4/22/21, 4:30 P.M.

6. Discussion and approval of FY 2021-22 proposed Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funding allocation and allow for adjustments between programs to maximize funding

11 612345789 10 12 13 14 **APPROVED AS PRESENTED**
X NX N N

C.O. **MEMBERS BELTRAN, MEDLIN AND RESTREPO REQUESTED OUTCOMES OF PROGRAMS AND REASONS FOR INCREASES/DECREASES IN FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS VERSUS PREVIOUS YEAR; STAFF TO RETURN AT 4/22/21, 3:30 P.M., REGULAR MEETING**

REVISED

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

PUBLIC & COUNCIL COMMENTS:

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

COUNCIL COMMENTS:

Member Restrepo – Oral Re.: When JJCC site is Googled, it brings up old site that is no longer active.

ADJOURNED: 5:12 P.M.

*** KEY ***

Left Margin Notes

1 Debra Baetz	A = Abstained
2 Kelli Beltran	X = Excused
3 Hether Benjamin	
4 Doug Chaffee	
5 Jared Dahl	
6 Tom DaRé	
7 Lynn Garrett	
8 Meghan Medlin	
9 Jeff Nagel	N = No
10 Nazly Restrepo	C.O. = Council Order
11 Steve Sentman	
12 Todd Spitzer	
13 Darren Thompson	
14 Ken Santini (Alternate)	

(1st number = Moved by; 2nd number = Seconded by)

STEVE SENTMAN
Chair

Jamie Ross
Clerk of the Council

DRAFT
Version 1.1
January 11, 2021

BY-LAWS

OF THE ORANGE COUNTY

JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

ARTICLE I

NAME

The name of this organization shall be THE ORANGE COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL.

ARTICLE II

AUTHORITY

The organization is authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code Section 749.22 and Orange County Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 96-830 dated December 3, 1996.

ARTICLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council shall be to:

1. Develop and implement a continuation of county-based responses to juvenile crime and to set priorities for the uses of grant funds.

2. Develop a comprehensive multi-agency plan that identifies resources and strategies for providing an effective continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of juvenile offenders, including strategies to develop and implement local out-of-home placement options for the offender.

ARTICLE IV

DUTIES

The Council shall have the following duties:

1. Assist the Chief Probation Officer in developing a comprehensive, multi-agency juvenile justice plan to develop a continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of juvenile offenders, in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 749.22 and 1995 and Government Code Section 30061.

2. Serve as the Local Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition in accordance with Title 28 Code of Federal Regulations – Chapter 1, Part 31, Section 31.502, for the purpose of securing Federal Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant funding for the County of Orange.

3. Serve as the parent body for the realignment subcommittee in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Division 2.5, Chapter 1.7, Section 1995, for the purpose of securing Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant funding for the County of Orange.

ARTICLE V

MEMBERSHIP

1. Along with the Chief Probation Officer who shall serve as Chairperson, voting members shall include a representative from the following:

   - The District Attorney's Office,
   - The Sheriff-Coroner Department,
   - The Public Defender's Office,
   - The Board of Supervisors,
   - The Social Services Agency,
   - The Health Care Agency,
   - A community-based drug and alcohol program,
   - A city police department,
   - The County Department of Education or a school district,
   - An at-large community representative,
   - A non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization,
   - Juvenile Court,
   - A member of the business community (for Local Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition purposes only).

2. The District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, and the Health Care Agency shall each designate a representative from its respective office, department, board or agency to serve as a member of this Council.

3. For all other member representatives indicated in Section 1 of Article V, nominations shall be made to the Chairperson, approved by the Council, and then forwarded to the Orange County Board of Supervisors for approval.

4. A member representative may resign at any given time by providing written notice to the Chairperson. The resignation shall become effective the date the notice is received or at a later time specified in the notice.

5. The District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, or the Health Care Agency shall designate a new

member representative whenever a member representative from its office, department, board or agency resigns.

6. For all other members, upon the resignation of a member representative, the process described in section three (3) of this Article shall be followed.

7. Alternate Members

   a. Each Council member shall designate, in writing provided to the Chairperson, an alternate member to represent the member at a Council meeting in the event the Council member is unable to attend a Council meeting.

   b. When representing a Council member at a Council meeting, the alternate shall have the same voting power as the regular Council member.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

1. Officers of the Council shall be a Chairperson, and an Acting-Chairperson and such other officers as the Council may choose to elect.

2. Responsibilities of Officers:

   a. Chairperson – In accordance with Section 749.22 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, the Chief Probation Officer shall serve as the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall supervise and direct the Council's activities, affairs and officers. The Chairperson shall preside at all Council meetings. The Chairperson shall have such other powers and duties as the Council or Bylaws may prescribe.

   b. Acting Chairperson – In the event of the temporary absence of the Chairperson, the Chairperson's alternate member as designated pursuant to Section 7 of Article V shall be the Acting Chairperson and perform the responsibilities of the Chairperson.

3. Membership Terms

   The membership term for the Chairperson shall be concurrent with his/her term as Chief Probation Officer. Member representatives of the District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, and the Health Care Agency shall serve an indefinite term until the member representative resigns or a new member representative is designated by his or her office, department, board, or agency. All other member representatives shall serve an indefinite term until the member representative resigns or is replaced by the Board of Supervisors.

DRAFT
Version 1.1
January 11, 2021

ARTICLE VII

MEETINGS AND PROCEDURES

Meetings of the Council and its committees shall be governed by the Brown Act and open to the public as required by the Brown Act.

1. Regular Meetings

   Regular meetings shall be held quarterly on the fourth Thursday of the month of February, April, July, and October at 3:30 p.m. unless an alternate date and time is announced in advance. The regular meeting location shall be at the Orange County Probation Department ~~raining~~ training facility, located at 1001 S. Grand Avenue, Santa Ana, California 92705, unless an alternate location is announced in advance.

2. Special Meetings

   Special Meetings may be called at any time by the Chairperson, upon written request, specifying the general nature of the business proposed. An agenda and 24-hour notice must be given to the public.

3. Quorum and Voting Procedure

   a. A simple majority of the members of the council shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of members.

   b. Decisions shall be reached through majority voting which is defined as a majority of the quorum members present.

   c. The Council shall use parliamentary procedures (the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order) to conduct business.

4. Setting the Agenda

   The Chairperson shall approve items on the agenda. Anyone wishing to provide input shall request inclusion on the agenda no later than one week prior to the scheduled meeting. Nothing in this section prohibits any member of the Council from adding an agenda item with seven (7) days' notice to the Chair, or the Chair's designee.

5. Public Comments

   Public comments at meetings are limited to two (2) minutes for each agenda item for individuals and five (5) minutes for each agenda item for representatives of organizations. The Chairperson has the discretion to extend the time based on the complexity of the issue.

DRAFT
Version 1.1
January 11, 2021

ARTICLE VIII

COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES

1. There shall be committees and subcommittees established as the Council shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes set forth in Article III of these bylaws.

2. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Division 2.5, Chapter 1.7, Section 1995, a realignment subcommittee of the Council shall be established to develop a plan describing the facilities, programs, placements, services, supervision and reentry strategies that are needed to provide appropriate rehabilitation and supervision services for the population described in subdivision (b) of Section 1990 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The subcommittee shall be composed of individuals defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1995 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

3. For all committee and subcommittee members, nominations shall be made to the Chairperson and approved by the Council.

~~ARTICLE VIII~~ ARTICLE IX

AMENDMENTS

These By-laws may be adopted, amended or repealed by a majority vote of the Council after written proposal for such actions has been in the hands of the Council for thirty (30) days.

DRAFT
Version 1.1
January 11, 2021

BY-LAWS

OF THE ORANGE COUNTY

JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

ARTICLE I

NAME

The name of this organization shall be THE ORANGE COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL.

ARTICLE II

AUTHORITY

The organization is authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code Section 749.22 and Orange County Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 96-830 dated December 3, 1996.

ARTICLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council shall be to:

1. Develop and implement a continuation of county-based responses to juvenile crime and to set priorities for the uses of grant funds.

2. Develop a comprehensive multi-agency plan that identifies resources and strategies for providing an effective continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of juvenile offenders, including strategies to develop and implement local out-of-home placement options for the offender.

ARTICLE IV

DUTIES

The Council shall have the following duties:

1. Assist the Chief Probation Officer in developing a comprehensive, multi-agency juvenile justice plan to develop a continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of juvenile offenders, in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 749.22 and 1995 and Government Code Section 30061.

2. Serve as the Local Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition in accordance with Title 28 Code of Federal Regulations – Chapter 1, Part 31, Section 31.502, for the purpose of securing Federal Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant funding for the County of Orange.

3. Serve as the parent body for the realignment subcommittee in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Division 2.5, Chapter 1.7, Section 1995, for the purpose of securing Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant funding for the County of Orange.

ARTICLE V

MEMBERSHIP

1. Along with the Chief Probation Officer who shall serve as Chairperson, voting members shall include a representative from the following:

   - The District Attorney's Office,
   - The Sheriff-Coroner Department,
   - The Public Defender's Office,
   - The Board of Supervisors,
   - The Social Services Agency,
   - The Health Care Agency,
   - A community-based drug and alcohol program,
   - A city police department,
   - The County Department of Education or a school district,
   - An at-large community representative,
   - A non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization,
   - Juvenile Court,
   - A member of the business community (for Local Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition purposes only).

2. The District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, and the Health Care Agency shall each designate a representative from its respective office, department, board or agency to serve as a member of this Council.

3. For all other member representatives indicated in Section 1 of Article V, nominations shall be made to the Chairperson, approved by the Council, and then forwarded to the Orange County Board of Supervisors for approval.

4. A member representative may resign at any given time by providing written notice to the Chairperson. The resignation shall become effective the date the notice is received or at a later time specified in the notice.

5. The District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, or the Health Care Agency shall designate a new member representative whenever a member representative from its office, department, board or agency resigns.

6. For all other members, upon the resignation of a member representative, the process described in section three (3) of this Article shall be followed.

7. Alternate Members

   a. Each Council member shall designate, in writing provided to the Chairperson, an alternate member to represent the member at a Council meeting in the event the Council member is unable to attend a Council meeting.

   b. When representing a Council member at a Council meeting, the alternate shall have the same voting power as the regular Council member.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

1. Officers of the Council shall be a Chairperson, and an Acting-Chairperson and such other officers as the Council may choose to elect.

2. Responsibilities of Officers:

   a. Chairperson – In accordance with Section 749.22 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, the Chief Probation Officer shall serve as the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall supervise and direct the Council's activities, affairs and officers. The Chairperson shall preside at all Council meetings. The Chairperson shall have such other powers and duties as the Council or Bylaws may prescribe.

   b. Acting Chairperson – In the event of the temporary absence of the Chairperson, the Chairperson's alternate member as designated pursuant to Section 7 of Article V shall be the Acting Chairperson and perform the responsibilities of the Chairperson.

3. Membership Terms

   The membership term for the Chairperson shall be concurrent with his/her term as Chief Probation Officer. Member representatives of the District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff-Coroner Department, the Public Defender's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Social Services Agency, and the Health Care Agency shall serve an indefinite term until the member representative resigns or a new member representative is designated by his or her office, department, board, or agency. All other

member representatives shall serve an indefinite term until the member representative resigns or is replaced by the Board of Supervisors.

ARTICLE VII

MEETINGS AND PROCEDURES

Meetings of the Council and its committees shall be governed by the Brown Act and open to the public as required by the Brown Act.

1. Regular Meetings

   Regular meetings shall be held quarterly on the fourth Thursday of the month of February, April, July, and October at 3:30 p.m. unless an alternate date and time is announced in advance. The regular meeting location shall be at the Orange County Probation Department training facility, located at 1001 S. Grand Avenue, Santa Ana, California 92705, unless an alternate location is announced in advance.

2. Special Meetings

   Special Meetings may be called at any time by the Chairperson, upon written request, specifying the general nature of the business proposed. An agenda and 24-hour notice must be given to the public.

3. Quorum and Voting Procedure

   a. A simple majority of the members of the council shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of members.

   b. Decisions shall be reached through majority voting which is defined as a majority of the quorum members present.

   c. The Council shall use parliamentary procedures (the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order) to conduct business.

4. Setting the Agenda

   The Chairperson shall approve items on the agenda. Anyone wishing to provide input shall request inclusion on the agenda no later than one week prior to the scheduled meeting. Nothing in this section prohibits any member of the Council from adding an agenda item with seven (7) days' notice to the Chair, or the Chair's designee.

5. Public Comments

Public comments at meetings are limited to two (2) minutes for each agenda item for individuals and five (5) minutes for each agenda item for representatives of organizations. The Chairperson has the discretion to extend the time based on the complexity of the issue.

ARTICLE VIII

COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES

1. There shall be committees and subcommittees established as the Council shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes set forth in Article III of these bylaws.

2. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Division 2.5, Chapter 1.7, Section 1995, a realignment subcommittee of the Council shall be established to develop a plan describing the facilities, programs, placements, services, supervision and reentry strategies that are needed to provide appropriate rehabilitation and supervision services for the population described in subdivision (b) of Section 1990 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The subcommittee shall be composed of individuals defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1995 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

3. For all committee and subcommittee members, nominations shall be made to the Chairperson and approved by the Council.

ARTICLE IX

AMENDMENTS

These By-laws may be adopted, amended or repealed by a majority vote of the Council after written proposal for such actions has been in the hands of the Council for thirty (30) days.

Item 3

ORANGE COUNTY
OC Probation

STEVEN J. SENTMAN
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

BRYAN PRIETO
ASSISTANT CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

TELEPHONE: (714) 569-2000

1055 N. MAIN STREET, 5TH FLOOR
SANTA ANA, CA 92701

MAILING ADDRESS:
P.O. BOX 10260
SANTA ANA, CA 92711-0260

DATE: February 16, 2021

TO: Steven J. Sentman - Chair, Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council
Members, Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

CC:

FROM: Bryan Prieto - Chair, Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Ad Hoc Commitee

SUBJECT: February 2021 OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee Report

On behalf of the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) Ad Hoc Committee, I am pleased to present the February 2021 OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee Report. As you'll note, the report incorporates revisions that were suggested during the October 22, 2020 regularly scheduled meeting of the OCJJCC. I, along with other Ad Hoc Committee members, will be on hand during the February 25, 2021 OCJJCC meeting to answer any questions/concerns about the report.

I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude for the assistance provided to me by the OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee, namely: Kimberly Doyle (Orange County District Attorney), Jose Pelayo (Orange County Sheriff's Department), Darren Thompson (Offices of the Orange County Public Defender), Lynn Garrett (Orange County Department of Education), Betsy DeDarmoe (Orange County Department of Education – Ret.), Ken Santini (Social Services Agency), Dawn Smith (Health Care Agency), Meghan Medlin (Medlin Workforce & Reentry Solutions LLC), and Nazly Restrepo (Orange County Bar Foundation). The original October report, and this subsequent revised version would not have come to be had it not been for the contributions provided by the above-named individuals. Finally, I'd like to recognize Jamie Ross (Clerk of the Board) for her work in coordinating and facilitating the meetings on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council – Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Building an Effective and Meaningful Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Ad Hoc Committee Report

~~October 2020~~February 2021

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Contents

Executive Summary 1

Introduction 5

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) 7

Target Population 8

~~OCJJCC Comprehensive Plan 10~~

Metrics to Measure Success ~~11~~ 10

JJCPA Funding ~~12~~ 11

Conclusion ~~15~~ 14

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Executive Summary

During their regularly scheduled meeting this past July, the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) approved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to review Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs approved by the OCJJCC, as part of its comprehensive multiagency juvenile justice plan, and any outcome reporting of that plan required under JJCPA. The creation of this Ad Hoc Committee came after review of an audit report that was released by the state auditor in May of 2020. Representatives of the OCJJCC as well as the public were invited to provide recommendations on how the comprehensive plan may be better managed, the population of youth that should be the target of the plan and how the plan can be measured for success.

With the above in mind, the Ad Hoc Committee focused its analysis, findings and recommendations on ~~five~~ four key areas: the membership/composition of the larger OCJJCC body, the definition of the target population, ~~the process for developing the plan,~~ the metrics that should be used to measure success and ultimately how JJCPA funds ought to be used. The recommendations were developed with an eye towards establishing a template that can be overlaid on the existing comprehensive plan and other plans created in the future. Additionally, these recommendations can be relied on to weather funding fluctuations or shortfalls, and/or manage any legislative changes that influence diversion efforts or have direct impacts on juvenile justice related operations.

Findings and Recommendations

Focus area: **Membership/Composition of existing OCJJCC**

Findings: The existing composition/membership of the OCJJCC complies with legal requirements.

Recommendations: In order to ensure consistent oversight of the OCJJCC comprehensive plan and balance government and community involvement the OCJJCC should consider:

- Maintaining an additional seat for a community-based juvenile service provider, or non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization, and;
- Update the OCJJCC by-laws and refine the requirements for OCJJCC membership.

Focus area: **Definition of the target population**

Findings: The OCJJCC has not adopted a uniform definition of local youth that may benefit from services provided through the OCJJCC's comprehensive plan.

Recommendations: In order to provide the OCJJCC with the flexibility to develop comprehensive plans that benefit youth in Orange County, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Adopting the definition of "at promise" youth as defined by 13825.4 PC. At promise youth are defined as, "persons age 5 to 20 years of age and who fall into one of more of the following categories…"

    1. Live in a high-crime or high-violence neighborhood as identified by local or federal law enforcement agencies.

2. Live in a low-economic neighborhood as identified by the U.S. Census or come from an impoverished family.
3. Are excessively absent from school or are doing poorly in school as identified by personnel from the youth's school.
4. Come from a socially dysfunctional family as identified by local or state social services agencies.
5. Have had one or more contacts with the police.
6. Have entered the juvenile justice system.
7. Are identified by the juvenile justice system as being at risk.
8. Are current or former gang members.
9. Have one or more family members living at home who are current or former members of a gang.
10. Are identified as wards of the court, as defined in Section 601 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

~~**Focus area:**~~ ~~**Development/Management of OCJJCC Comprehensive Plan**~~

~~***Findings:***~~ ~~Currently, the OCJJCC meets quarterly, but reviews the plan and plan metrics once per fiscal year. Until recently, committee members would review key metrics and plan outcomes during the same meeting that the recommended plan for the next fiscal year, along with the funding for that plan, is approved.~~

~~***Recommendations:***~~ ~~In order to remain more current on the progress of youth participating in JJCPA funded programs, the OCJJCC should consider:~~

- ~~Creating a permanent OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee, or OCJJCC Working Group Sub-committee. This new committee would be required to meet regularly (e.g. monthly), review key metrics of the current comprehensive plan, seek out additional strategies that may be added to the plan in response to community safety or legislative changes, and report out/make recommendations at each OCJJCC quarterly meeting.~~

Focus area: **Metrics Used to Measure Comprehensive Plan Success**

Findings: The OCJJCC relies on demographic data (e.g. age at entry, gender, ethnicity, city of residence) to track program participants as well as certain behaviors (e.g. days in program, types of program exits, re-arrest) to "measure" program success.

Recommendations: In order to provide a more complete description of individual progress, and/or the development of youth within an identified group of youthful offenders, or at promise youth within a JJCPA funded program, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Implementing a "pre" and "post" ~~program participation~~ assessment ~~in order to measure~~ of the program's ~~participant against him/herself~~ outcome.

    1. Measurement of expected outcome(s) will be provided by the program providers as follows:

a. How program providers will measure their outcome to metrics established by the OCJJCC,
b. How program providers expect to achieve their outcomes,
c. How program providers will set realistic goals and;
d. How program providers will set a timeframe to achieve their expected outcomes.

2. Suggested areas of outcome measurement are as follows:
   a. Measure program participant against him/herself and/or
   b. Measure program group against group.

- Tracking improvement of "protective factors" which may mitigate or reduce problematic behavior.
- Tracking the amount and influence of any training that was provided.

1. Measure the expected outcome of training, to the measurable returns.

Focus area: **How JJCPA Funds Should be Utilized**

Findings: The OCJJCC currently uses JJCPA monies to fund strategies intended to divert youth from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate the incidents of violence committed on local school campuses, address substance use disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Recommendations: In order to ensure limited JJCPA funds/resources are used appropriately, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Funding programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity (increase protective factors) of youthful participants.
- Funding programs that support comprehensive plans that are developed by the council described in 749.22 WIC and align with legislative requirements. Namely, comprehensive plans should include the following:

1. An assessment of existing law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol and youth services resources that specifically target at-risk (at promise) juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families.
2. An identification and prioritization of the neighborhoods, schools, and other areas in the community that face a significant public safety risk from juvenile crime, such as gang activity, daylight burglary, late-night robbery, vandalism, truancy, controlled

substances sales, firearm-related violence, and juvenile substance abuse and alcohol use.

3. A local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk (at promise) youth and juvenile offenders.

- Programs proposed to be funded shall satisfy all of the following requirements:

  1. Be based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.
  2. Collaborate and integrate services of all existing resources (see above resources identified within the assessment process)
  3. Employ information sharing systems to ensure that county actions are fully coordinated, and designed to provide data for measuring the success of juvenile justice programs and strategies.
  4. Adopt goals related to the outcome measures that shall be used to determine the effectiveness of the local juvenile justice action strategy.[1]

[1] Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (AKA: Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act) https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=199920000AB1913

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council
Ad Hoc Committee Report

October 2020

Introduction

On June 26, 2019, during its regularly scheduled meeting, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) approved an audit of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) spending, decision-making, and reporting.[2] The decision to approve the audit came about following concerns raised by assembly members Jones-Sawyer and Garcia, along with senators Bradford and Skinner. In their letter to the JLAC, the above-mentioned legislative members indicated that counties use grant dollars to offset county salary and employee benefits (primarily probation department personnel) rather than collaborate with community providers, convene incomplete Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils (JJCC), if at all, that do not include community based organizations, and provide incomplete or meaningless program data.[3]

Following audit approval, the state auditor conducted a JJCPA related audit of Kern, Los Angeles, Mendocino, San Joaquin, and Santa Barbara counties. The purpose of the audit was to review the counties' spending and reporting out of JJCPA funds received. Additionally, the state auditor reviewed the "... decision-making processes and evaluation of programs..." each of the five counties used in order to determine how JJCPA funds should be used. The findings of the audit were released to the public in May of 2020.

In general, the state auditor found that counties had weak JJCC oversight, operationalized inappropriate or outdated comprehensive plans, and misreported or failed to include outcomes information to the state that supported the use of JJCPA funding. Additionally, the state auditor noted that state level oversight was weak as well. Rather than working with counties to ensure comprehensive plans were up to date and met grant fund criteria, the Board of State and Community Corrections (Community Corrections) simply relegated its role to receiving comprehensive plans and posting these plans on its website, no matter how error ridden or outdated the plans were.[4] The findings prompted other counties to review their own JJCPA related activities.

On July 23, 2020, during its regularly scheduled meeting, the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) created an Ad Hoc Committee to review current JJCPA approved programs and reporting requirements. The Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by the Probation Department, met over the subsequent weeks to discuss the scope of the analysis, the process the group would use to develop its areas of focus, and determine how its review/recommendations would be provided to the

---

[2] https://legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/sites/legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/files/June%2026_Roll%20Call%20Votes_FINAL.pdf

[3] https://legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/sites/legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/files/2019-116%20Juvenile%20Justice%20Crime%20Prevention%20Act%20Funds%20%28Asm.%20Jones-Sawyer%29.pdf

[4] https://www.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2019-116.pdf

OCJJCC. It was ultimately determined the following report, including its recommendations, would be presented during the regularly scheduled OCJJCC meeting on October 22, 2020.

In brief, the Ad Hoc Committee concentrated its analysis and recommended actions on ~~five~~ four focus areas: ***1) membership/composition of the existing OCJJCC, 2) the definition of the target population, ~~3) development/management of the OCJJCC comprehensive plan, 4)~~ 3) metrics used to measure comprehensive plan success, and ~~5)~~ 4) how JJCPA funds ought to be used.*** The Ad Hoc Committee's findings/recommendations in each of these focus areas highlights areas where plan development and oversight can be improved. Ultimately, the recommendations were developed to ensure the OCJJCC can weather any/all funding fluctuations and/or legislation impacting juvenile operations that may materialize in the future.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks go to the OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee members (please see insert), members of the County Executive Office, Probation Research and members of the public for their time and significant contribution in analyzing information for this report as well as developing recommendations for the OCJJCC. Finally, thanks go to Jamie Ross (Clerk of the Board) for coordinating and moderating the meetings on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee.

AD HOC COMMITTEE
ORANGE COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE
COORDINATING COUNCIL

Bryan Prieto, Chair
Probation

Kimberly Doyle
District Attorney

Lynn Garrett
Orange County Department of Education

Betsy DeGarmoe
Orange County Department of Education

Jose Pelayo
Sheriff-Coroner

Meghan Medlin
At Large Community Rep.

Ken Santini
Social Services Agency

Nazly Restrepo
Community Based Drug/Alc Rep.

Darren Thompson
Public Defender

Dawn Smith
Health Care Agency

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC)

In its review, the state auditor determined local oversight of the JJCPA comprehensive plan including, but not limited to, development, management and funding of that local plan was generally weak in the counties reviewed. Of note, assuming the county had an operational Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, was the fact that counties had a few key representative seats vacant especially those occupied by members of the community (e.g. community-based organizations). The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the membership/composition of Orange County's local committee (i.e. OCJJCC) and determined that the existing group met all requirements.

History of the OCJJCC

On December 3, 1996, the Orange County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 96-830, authorizing the Chief Probation Officer to apply for Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program Planning funds. The Resolution also established the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) to fulfill the purposes of 749.22 WIC. The Chief Probation Officer was appointed Chair of the OCJJCC which included 10 other representatives:

1. County Board of Supervisors representative
2. County Sheriff representative
3. County District Attorney representative
4. Local law enforcement representative
5. County Office of Education/local school districts representative
6. County Public Defender representative
7. County Department of Mental Health representative
8. County Department of Social Services representative
9. Community-based drug and alcohol program representative
10. At-large community representative

On November 10, 1998, the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved an expansion of the group to include three additional members in accordance with the grant funding requirement of the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG). This grant required the establishment of a Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) which included many of the same members as the OCJJCC. Additionally, the JCEC was required to conduct a jurisdiction-wide needs assessment and develop a local juvenile justice plan. Orange County's JCEC included the above-mentioned 11 members (including the Chief Probation Officer) and the following three expanded members.

11. A non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization
12. The Juvenile Court
13. The business community

Although the County would eventually stop pursuing JAIBG funding, the expanded OCJJCC remained to this day.

Current OCJJCC

Despite the fact that it is not a requirement of 749.22 WIC or JJCPA, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC consists of its original eleven members and continues to have a membership seat for the Juvenile Court and a member of the community (preferably a juvenile services provider, or a community-based juvenile social services organization). Moving forward, this group will strike the necessary balance between government, court and community interests when it comes to crime reduction through the use of effective and/or research supported youth services. The existing vacant seat (i.e., Business Representative seat) can be set aside and occupied by a member of the community that aligns with the above description. Finally, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC by-laws be revised to outline the requirements for membership. For example, the by-laws may be rewritten to include a regularly scheduled (e.g. annual) affirmation of a member's desire to remain on the council. Furthermore, the by-laws can be further refined to describe what should occur when a sitting member decides to withdraw from OCJJCC involvement.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **Membership/Composition of existing OCJJCC**

Findings: The existing composition/membership of the OCJJCC complies with legal requirements.

Recommendations: In order to ensure consistent oversight of the OCJJCC comprehensive plan and balance government and community involvement the OCJJCC should consider:

- Maintaining an additional seat for a community-based juvenile service provider, or non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization, and;
- Update the OCJJCC by-laws and refine the requirements for OCJJCC membership.

Target Population

According to state auditor findings, four of the five counties reviewed did not formally define the "at-risk" population being served by the local plan. In fact, the same four counties did not formally identify the risk factors that made youth eligible to participate in (or be served by) JJCPA funded programs. While a review of the Orange County comprehensive plan provides some detail, the target population and the risk factors that make a youth eligible for support can be better defined.

The previous focus of Orange County's comprehensive plan was on a very specific group of youthful offenders. Based on research conducted by the Orange County Probation Department, JJCPA monies were utilized to support a collaborative partnership intended to manage youthful offenders known as the 8% population.[5] Generally speaking, these "chronic recidivists" were 15 years or younger at the time of their first case disposition, and exhibited at least three of the following "risk" behaviors: poor performance/behavior at school, dysfunctional family dynamics, substance abuse, and/or delinquent

[5] https://www.ocgov.com/gov/probation/about/8percent/findings

behavior. Over time, the funds required to support Probation's Youth and Family Resource Center (YFRC) model of intervention for 8% youth diminished and the program closed.

While there are no specific youth risk factors currently identified, the present comprehensive plan does look to divert first time offenders away from the juvenile justice system, reduce/mitigate violent crime on school campuses, use youth reporting center interventions, rather than secure detention, to address youthful offender acting out behavior (including low level criminal offenses), and address substance use disorder issues amongst wards of the court.

In light of the above, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the adoption of a formal target population definition. Leveraging a unified target population definition would greatly assist the OCJJCC in developing and maintaining a comprehensive plan that focuses support/services to the needs of its specific youthful offenders. Through its deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee believes the definition of "at promise" youth as defined in 13825.4 PC should be utilized to support the OCJJCC's current and future efforts.

13825.4 PC was amended on October 12, 2019 to replace the term "at risk" with the term "at promise." There was no substantive change that occurred as a result because the definition included 10 specific characteristics that were to be considered if a youth were to be identified as belonging to this specific category. Currently the definition of "at promise" youth is, "… persons age 5 to 20 years of age and who fall into one or more of the following categories…"

1. Live in a high-crime or high-violence neighborhood as identified by local or federal law enforcement agencies.
2. Live in a low-economic neighborhood as identified by the U.S. Census or come from an impoverished family.
3. Are excessively absent from school or are doing poorly in school as identified by personnel from the youth's school.
4. Come from a socially dysfunctional family as identified by local or state social services agencies.
5. Have had one or more contacts with the police.
6. Have entered the juvenile justice system.
7. Are identified by the juvenile justice system as being at risk.
8. Are current or former gang members.
9. Have one or more family members living at home who are current or former members of a gang.
10. Are identified as wards of the court, as defined in Section 601 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Although the above definition was created in support of the California Gang, Crime and Violence Prevention Partnership[6], it does provide the OCJJCC with broad latitude to develop diversion and other juvenile justice strategies that reduce crime and meet the needs of its specific targeted youth population.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **Definition of the target population**

[6] See 13825.2 PC – definition of California Gang, Crime and Violence Prevention Partnership program administered by the Department of Justice.

Findings: The OCJJCC has not adopted a uniform definition of local youth that may benefit from services provided through the OCJJCC's comprehensive plan.

Recommendations: In order to provide the OCJJCC with the flexibility to develop comprehensive plans that benefit youth in Orange County, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Adopting the definition of "at promise" youth as defined by 13825.4 PC

~~OCJJCC Comprehensive Plan~~

~~The state auditor noted counties made little or no changes to their local juvenile justice coordinating council plans despite significant legislative changes. For example, San Joaquin County indicated it made no changes because its local plan met the minimum requirements of Community Corrections. Kern County simply stated that there was no need to change its plan, while Mendocino County could offer no explanation as to why its local plan was rarely updated.~~

~~Although Orange County's local comprehensive plan underwent several significant changes, the process for review/approval became rote over time. As indicated previously in this report, a great deal of JJCPA funding was utilized to manage Probation's 8% population through the YFRC model. JJCPA funds were also used to support incarcerated youth that were dealing with substance use disorder issues. When the aforementioned JCEC was established, JAIBG dollars were leveraged to support the District Attorney and Probation's efforts in prosecuting and managing a burgeoning juvenile sex offender population. Although other strategies would ultimately be added to the plan when funding was available, the OCJJCC/JCEC only met once a year for the purposes of reviewing population trends and the prior year's outcomes and approving the proposed plan for the next fiscal year. This process continued until April of 2020.~~

~~On April 23, 2020, during a special meeting, the OCJJCC met to approve the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 JJCPA recommended program budget, and the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 comprehensive plan. Additionally, the OCJJCC approved changes to the by-laws to require more frequent meetings (i.e. quarterly rather than annually) of the group. Although requiring more frequent OCJJCC meetings is a step in the right direction, the Ad Hoc Committee agrees a more frequent review/analysis of the approved plan may further assist the OCJJCC in its quarterly deliberations.~~

~~Upon review of the OCJJCC/JCEC's history and considering the group's desire to convene more frequent meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the formation of a permanent Ad Hoc Committee, or OCJJCC Working Group. This latter group would be required to meet regularly (e.g. monthly) to review elements that may influence the OCJJCC's comprehensive plan such as population trends, program outcomes, and changes in the juvenile justice landscape. Additionally, this group could serve as the first stop for any community based, or for-profit service provider that wishes to be considered to offer services to the OCJJCC's targeted population. The chair of the group could provide a report out (at each quarterly meeting), which in turn could greatly assist the OCJJCC in determining the effectiveness of the existing plan or discuss options for plan modification/enhancement.~~

~~In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:~~

~~**Focus area: Development/Management of OCJJCC Comprehensive Plan**~~

~~***Findings:*** Currently, the OCJJCC meets quarterly, but reviews the plan and plan metrics once per fiscal year. Until recently, committee members would review key metrics and plan outcomes during the same meeting that the recommended plan for the next fiscal year, along with the funding for that plan, is approved.~~

~~***Recommendations:*** In order to remain more current on the progress of youth participating in JJCPA funded programs, the OCJJCC should consider:~~

- ~~Creating a permanent OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee, or OCJJCC Working Group Sub-committee. This new committee would be required to meet regularly (e.g. monthly), review key metrics of the current comprehensive plan, seek out additional strategies that may be added to the plan in response to community safety or legislative changes, and report out/make recommendations at each OCJJCC quarterly meeting.~~

Metrics to Measure Success

In its review, the state auditor noted that counties visited could not generally prove the effectiveness of their JJCPA funded programs. In fact, four of the five counties simply used JJCPA funds to offset the costs of their probation department operations. Ultimately, it was determined that counties could not coalesce its data to produce meaningful evaluations of program effectiveness. In the end, the general finding was that counties could improve their ability to measure program effectiveness by using JJCPA dollars to improve data collection.

Orange County has established a long history of relying on data and research analysis to support its business operations. The reliance on data and the analysis of that data, particularly by Probation's research function, has greatly assisted in the development of the comprehensive plan and other strategies that have been proven to reduce crime. More specifically, Probation's research team has greatly assisted the department in improving upon its effectiveness in both the juvenile and adult arenas. That being said, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC turn to the body of research evidence that is present within the field of mental/behavioral health when considering the effectiveness of its JJCPA funded programs.

There exists a body of research that indicates increasing the presence of "protective factors" in young people has a positive effect on reducing the prevalence of future mental health/behavioral health issues later in life. A protective factor is defined as, "a characteristic at the biological, psychological, family, or community (including peers and culture) level that is associated with a lower likelihood of problem outcomes or that reduces the negative impact of a risk factor on problem outcomes."[7] A youth, for example, exhibiting poor performance at school, showing aggression towards peers, or associating with groups that accept drug/alcohol as part of their social norm would benefit from the increase of protective factors such as mentors/support systems that encourage positive engagement in school/social activities, establish clear expectations of behavior, and physical/psychological safety.

[7] O'Connell, M. E., Boat, T., & Warner, K. E.. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2009).

The Ad Hoc Committee agrees that the goal of the OCJJCC plan is to reduce certain behaviors in youthful offenders (e.g. re-arrest). The effectiveness of the plan's strategy, however, should also include how certain protective factors increased. Ultimately, the Ad Hoc Committee believes that a youth's likelihood to re-offend and/or remain in the juvenile justice system will be significantly reduced if the individual's capacity for more successful autonomy is increased.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **Metrics Used to Measure Comprehensive Plan Success**

Findings: The OCJJCC relies on demographic data (e.g. age at entry, gender, ethnicity, city of residence) to track program participants as well as certain behaviors (e.g. days in program, types of program exits, re-arrest) to "measure" program success.

Recommendations: In order to provide a more complete description of individual progress, and/or the development of youth within an identified group of youthful offenders, or at promise youth within a JJCPA funded program, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Implementing a "pre" and "post" ~~program participation~~ assessment ~~in order to measure~~ of the program's ~~participant against him/herself~~ outcome.
    1. Measurement of expected outcome(s) will be provided by the program providers as follows:
        a. How program providers will measure their outcome to metrics established by the OCJJCC,
        b. How program providers expect to achieve their outcomes,
        c. How program providers will set realistic goals and;
        d. How program providers will set a timeframe to achieve their expected outcomes.
    2. Suggested areas of outcome measurement are as follows:
        a. Measure program participant against him/herself and/or
        b. Measure program group against group.
- Tracking improvement of "protective factors" which may mitigate or reduce problematic behavior.
- Tracking the amount and influence of any training that was provided.
    1. Measure the expected outcome of training, to the measurable returns.

JJCPA Funding

As indicated previously in this report, the OCJJCC approved its comprehensive plan for Fiscal Year 2020/2021. That plan and the funding for that plan was submitted to the Orange County Board of Supervisors for review as well as Community Corrections for acceptance/posting. The focus of the plan for Fiscal Year 2020/2021 will be to divert eligible youth away from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate incidents of violence on local school campuses, address substance use disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Moving forward, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC use its JJCPA resources to support programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity of the OCJJCC's intended/targeted population. In other words, JJCPA funds should be utilized to support "at promise" and/or youthful offenders that cannot, or do not qualify for other youthful programs. This is not to suggest that the current approved OCJJCC plan is not a laudable pursuit. Rather, it is a reminder that other initiatives—in existence today, or soon to be—may address the needs of youth that are the focus of the current plan.

The County of Orange is currently developing its Integrated Services Model for Community Corrections. The focus of this model is to use existing resources to reduce the number of individuals with mental illness and/or substance use disorder issues from cycling in and out of the County's jail system, treat those that are causing harm to society or themselves, and diverting juveniles and young adults from the criminal justice system. In order to achieve the model's goals the County is leveraging existing facilities/resources and working towards enhancing its partnerships with community-based organizations to increase "in reach services" intended on improving re-entry of juvenile and adult system involved individuals and fortifying post custody services for juveniles/adults transitioning back out into their respective communities. As the initiative continues to develop, some youth once served by the OCJJCC comprehensive plan may instead be eligible to participate in the County's more comprehensive system of care.

Now more than ever is an opportunity to focus resources on a targeted population determined by the OCJJCC. By focusing its finite resources on specific youthful offenders and their needs, the OCJJCC runs less of a risk of providing duplicative support, or servicing youth that may have derived benefit from other support systems such as the County's larger Integrated Services Model. With a more focused effort, the OCJJCC also has greater opportunity to collaborate with the community to operationalize alternative strategies that have proven results.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **How JJCPA Funds Should be Utilized**

Findings: The OCJJCC currently uses JJCPA monies to fund strategies intended to divert youth from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate the incidents of violence committed on local school campuses, address substance use disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Recommendations: In order to ensure limited JJCPA funds/resources are used appropriately, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Funding programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity (increase protective factors) of youthful participants.
- Funding programs that support comprehensive plans that are developed by the council described in 749.22 WIC and align with legislative requirements. Namely, comprehensive plans should include the following:

    1. An assessment of existing law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol and youth services resources that specifically target at-risk (at promise) juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families.
    2. An identification and prioritization of the neighborhoods, schools, and other areas in the community that face a significant public safety risk from juvenile crime, such as gang activity, daylight burglary, late-night robbery, vandalism, truancy, controlled substances sales, firearm-related violence, and juvenile substance abuse and alcohol use.
    3. A local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk (at promise) youth and juvenile offenders.

- Programs proposed to be funded shall satisfy all of the following requirements:

    1. Be based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.
    2. Collaborate and integrate services of all existing resources (see above resources identified within the assessment process)
    3. Employ information sharing systems to ensure that county actions are fully coordinated, and designed to provide data for measuring the success of juvenile justice programs and strategies.
    4. Adopt goals related to the outcome measures that shall be used to determine the effectiveness of the local juvenile justice action strategy.[8]

[8] Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (AKA: Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act) https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=199920000AB1913

Conclusion

In May of 2020, the state auditor conducted a review of five counties. The focus of that evaluation was to review the spending and reporting out of funds received as required by JJCPA. In general, the state auditor found that local and state oversight of comprehensive plan development was weak, plans were found to be outdated and outcome reporting of those plans was misreported or non-existent.

The above review prompted the OCJJCC to create an Ad Hoc Committee tasked with reviewing its own local oversight mechanisms, process of developing/managing the comprehensive plan and measuring for success in order to determine if further funding is appropriate. The Ad Hoc Committee met, and, along with the public, completed an analysis as requested by the OCJJCC. Additionally, the Ad Hoc Committee developed a few recommendations that are believed to assist the OCJJCC in weathering funding fluctuations as well as any upcoming legislative changes that will have direct impacts on juvenile diversion program efforts, and/or formal juvenile justice operations. In light of recent legislation including Senate Bill 823, which adds a new level of bureaucracy to the development/oversight of multidisciplinary juvenile justice plans, and Assembly Bill 901 which effectively removes the ability of the juvenile court to manage a youth determined to be a habitual truant, the recommendations will greatly assist the OCJJCC in fashioning a plan that will address the needs of its targeted youth population now and into the future.

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council – Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Building an Effective and Meaningful Comprehensive Multiagency Juvenile Justice Plan

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Ad Hoc Committee Report February 2021

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Contents

Executive Summary 1

Introduction 5

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) 7

Target Population 8

Metrics to Measure Success 10

JJCPA Funding 11

Conclusion 14

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Executive Summary

During their regularly scheduled meeting this past July, the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) approved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to review Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs approved by the OCJJCC, as part of its comprehensive multiagency juvenile justice plan, and any outcome reporting of that plan required under JJCPA. The creation of this Ad Hoc Committee came after review of an audit report that was released by the state auditor in May of 2020. Representatives of the OCJJCC as well as the public were invited to provide recommendations on how the comprehensive plan may be better managed, the population of youth that should be the target of the plan and how the plan can be measured for success.

With the above in mind, the Ad Hoc Committee focused its analysis, findings and recommendations on four key areas: the membership/composition of the larger OCJJCC body, the definition of the target population, the metrics that should be used to measure success and ultimately how JJCPA funds ought to be used. The recommendations were developed with an eye towards establishing a template that can be overlaid on the existing comprehensive plan and other plans created in the future. Additionally, these recommendations can be relied on to weather funding fluctuations or shortfalls, and/or manage any legislative changes that influence diversion efforts or have direct impacts on juvenile justice related operations.

Findings and Recommendations

Focus area: **Membership/Composition of existing OCJJCC**

Findings: The existing composition/membership of the OCJJCC complies with legal requirements.

Recommendations: In order to ensure consistent oversight of the OCJJCC comprehensive plan and balance government and community involvement the OCJJCC should consider:

- Maintaining an additional seat for a community-based juvenile service provider, or non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization, and;
- Update the OCJJCC by-laws and refine the requirements for OCJJCC membership.

Focus area: **Definition of the target population**

Findings: The OCJJCC has not adopted a uniform definition of local youth that may benefit from services provided through the OCJJCC's comprehensive plan.

Recommendations: In order to provide the OCJJCC with the flexibility to develop comprehensive plans that benefit youth in Orange County, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Adopting the definition of "at promise" youth as defined by 13825.4 PC. At promise youth are defined as, "persons age 5 to 20 years of age and who fall into one of more of the following categories…"

    1. Live in a high-crime or high-violence neighborhood as identified by local or federal law enforcement agencies.

2. Live in a low-economic neighborhood as identified by the U.S. Census or come from an impoverished family.
3. Are excessively absent from school or are doing poorly in school as identified by personnel from the youth's school.
4. Come from a socially dysfunctional family as identified by local or state social services agencies.
5. Have had one or more contacts with the police.
6. Have entered the juvenile justice system.
7. Are identified by the juvenile justice system as being at risk.
8. Are current or former gang members.
9. Have one or more family members living at home who are current or former members of a gang.
10. Are identified as wards of the court, as defined in Section 601 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Focus area: **Metrics Used to Measure Comprehensive Plan Success**

Findings: The OCJJCC relies on demographic data (e.g. age at entry, gender, ethnicity, city of residence) to track program participants as well as certain behaviors (e.g. days in program, types of program exits, re-arrest) to "measure" program success.

Recommendations: In order to provide a more complete description of individual progress, and/or the development of youth within an identified group of youthful offenders, or at promise youth within a JJCPA funded program, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Implementing a "pre" and "post" assessment of the program's outcome.
    1. Measurement of expected outcome(s) will be provided by the program providers as follows:
        a. How program providers will measure their outcome to metrics established by the OCJJCC,
        b. How program providers expect to achieve their outcomes,
        c. How program providers will set realistic goals and;
        d. How program providers will set a timeframe to achieve their expected outcomes.
    2. Suggested areas of outcome measurement are as follows:
        a. Measure program participant against him/herself and/or
        b. Measure program group against group.
- Tracking improvement of "protective factors" which may mitigate or reduce problematic behavior.

- Tracking the amount and influence of any training that was provided.
    1. Measure the expected outcome of training, to the measurable returns.

Focus area: **How JJCPA Funds Should be Utilized**

Findings: The OCJJCC currently uses JJCPA monies to fund strategies intended to divert youth from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate the incidents of violence committed on local school campuses, address substance use disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Recommendations: In order to ensure limited JJCPA funds/resources are used appropriately, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Funding programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity (increase protective factors) of youthful participants.
- Funding programs that support comprehensive plans that are developed by the council described in 749.22 WIC and align with legislative requirements. Namely, comprehensive plans should include the following:
    1. An assessment of existing law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol and youth services resources that specifically target at-risk (at promise) juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families.
    2. An identification and prioritization of the neighborhoods, schools, and other areas in the community that face a significant public safety risk from juvenile crime, such as gang activity, daylight burglary, late-night robbery, vandalism, truancy, controlled substances sales, firearm-related violence, and juvenile substance abuse and alcohol use.
    3. A local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk (at promise) youth and juvenile offenders.

- Programs proposed to be funded shall satisfy all of the following requirements:
    1. Be based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.

2. Collaborate and integrate services of all existing resources (see above resources identified within the assessment process)
3. Employ information sharing systems to ensure that county actions are fully coordinated, and designed to provide data for measuring the success of juvenile justice programs and strategies.
4. Adopt goals related to the outcome measures that shall be used to determine the effectiveness of the local juvenile justice action strategy.[1]

[1] Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (AKA: Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act) https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=199920000AB1913

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council
Ad Hoc Committee Report

October 2020

Introduction

On June 26, 2019, during its regularly scheduled meeting, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) approved an audit of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) spending, decision-making, and reporting.[2] The decision to approve the audit came about following concerns raised by assembly members Jones-Sawyer and Garcia, along with senators Bradford and Skinner. In their letter to the JLAC, the above-mentioned legislative members indicated that counties use grant dollars to offset county salary and employee benefits (primarily probation department personnel) rather than collaborate with community providers, convene incomplete Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils (JJCC), if at all, that do not include community based organizations, and provide incomplete or meaningless program data.[3]

Following audit approval, the state auditor conducted a JJCPA related audit of Kern, Los Angeles, Mendocino, San Joaquin, and Santa Barbara counties. The purpose of the audit was to review the counties' spending and reporting out of JJCPA funds received. Additionally, the state auditor reviewed the "... decision-making processes and evaluation of programs..." each of the five counties used in order to determine how JJCPA funds should be used. The findings of the audit were released to the public in May of 2020.

In general, the state auditor found that counties had weak JJCC oversight, operationalized inappropriate or outdated comprehensive plans, and misreported or failed to include outcomes information to the state that supported the use of JJCPA funding. Additionally, the state auditor noted that state level oversight was weak as well. Rather than working with counties to ensure comprehensive plans were up to date and met grant fund criteria, the Board of State and Community Corrections (Community Corrections) simply relegated its role to receiving comprehensive plans and posting these plans on its website, no matter how error ridden or outdated the plans were.[4] The findings prompted other counties to review their own JJCPA related activities.

On July 23, 2020, during its regularly scheduled meeting, the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) created an Ad Hoc Committee to review current JJCPA approved programs and reporting requirements. The Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by the Probation Department, met over the subsequent weeks to discuss the scope of the analysis, the process the group would use to develop its areas of focus, and determine how its review/recommendations would be provided to the

---

[2] https://legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/sites/legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/files/June%2026_Roll%20Call%20Votes_FINAL.pdf

[3] https://legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/sites/legaudit.assembly.ca.gov/files/2019-116%20Juvenile%20Justice%20Crime%20Prevention%20Act%20Funds%20%28Asm.%20Jones-Sawyer%29.pdf

[4] https://www.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2019-116.pdf

OCJJCC. It was ultimately determined the following report, including its recommendations, would be presented during the regularly scheduled OCJJCC meeting on October 22, 2020.

In brief, the Ad Hoc Committee concentrated its analysis and recommended actions on four focus areas: ***1) membership/composition of the existing OCJJCC, 2) the definition of the target population, 3) metrics used to measure comprehensive plan success, and 4) how JJCPA funds ought to be used.*** The Ad Hoc Committee's findings/recommendations in each of these focus areas highlights areas where plan development and oversight can be improved. Ultimately, the recommendations were developed to ensure the OCJJCC can weather any/all funding fluctuations and/or legislation impacting juvenile operations that may materialize in the future.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks go to the OCJJCC Ad Hoc Committee members (please see insert), members of the County Executive Office, Probation Research and members of the public for their time and significant contribution in analyzing information for this report as well as developing recommendations for the OCJJCC. Finally, thanks go to Jamie Ross (Clerk of the Board) for coordinating and moderating the meetings on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee.

AD HOC COMMITTEE
ORANGE COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Bryan Prieto, Chair
Probation

Lynn Garrett
Orange County Department of Education

Jose Pelayo
Sheriff-Coroner

Ken Santini
Social Services Agency

Darren Thompson
Public Defender

Kimberly Doyle
District Attorney

Betsy DeGarmoe
Orange County Department of Education

Meghan Medlin
At Large Community Rep.

Nazly Restrepo
Community Based Drug/Alc Rep.

Dawn Smith
Health Care Agency

Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC)

In its review, the state auditor determined local oversight of the JJCPA comprehensive plan including, but not limited to, development, management and funding of that local plan was generally weak in the counties reviewed. Of note, assuming the county had an operational Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, was the fact that counties had a few key representative seats vacant especially those occupied by members of the community (e.g. community-based organizations). The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the membership/composition of Orange County's local committee (i.e. OCJJCC) and determined that the existing group met all requirements.

History of the OCJJCC

On December 3, 1996, the Orange County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 96-830, authorizing the Chief Probation Officer to apply for Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program Planning funds. The Resolution also established the Orange County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (OCJJCC) to fulfill the purposes of 749.22 WIC. The Chief Probation Officer was appointed Chair of the OCJJCC which included 10 other representatives:

1. County Board of Supervisors representative
2. County Sheriff representative
3. County District Attorney representative
4. Local law enforcement representative
5. County Office of Education/local school districts representative
6. County Public Defender representative
7. County Department of Mental Health representative
8. County Department of Social Services representative
9. Community-based drug and alcohol program representative
10. At-large community representative

On November 10, 1998, the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved an expansion of the group to include three additional members in accordance with the grant funding requirement of the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG). This grant required the establishment of a Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) which included many of the same members as the OCJJCC. Additionally, the JCEC was required to conduct a jurisdiction-wide needs assessment and develop a local juvenile justice plan. Orange County's JCEC included the above-mentioned 11 members (including the Chief Probation Officer) and the following three expanded members.

11. A non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization
12. The Juvenile Court
13. The business community

Although the County would eventually stop pursuing JAIBG funding, the expanded OCJJCC remained to this day.

Current OCJJCC

Despite the fact that it is not a requirement of 749.22 WIC or JJCPA, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC consists of its original eleven members and continues to have a membership seat for the Juvenile Court and a member of the community (preferably a juvenile services provider, or a community-based juvenile social services organization). Moving forward, this group will strike the necessary balance between government, court and community interests when it comes to crime reduction through the use of effective and/or research supported youth services. The existing vacant seat (i.e., Business Representative seat) can be set aside and occupied by a member of the community that aligns with the above description. Finally, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC by-laws be revised to outline the requirements for membership. For example, the by-laws may be rewritten to include a regularly scheduled (e.g. annual) affirmation of a member's desire to remain on the council. Furthermore, the by-laws can be further refined to describe what should occur when a sitting member decides to withdraw from OCJJCC involvement.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **Membership/Composition of existing OCJJCC**

Findings: The existing composition/membership of the OCJJCC complies with legal requirements.

Recommendations: In order to ensure consistent oversight of the OCJJCC comprehensive plan and balance government and community involvement the OCJJCC should consider:

- Maintaining an additional seat for a community-based juvenile service provider, or non-profit community-based juvenile social services organization, and;
- Update the OCJJCC by-laws and refine the requirements for OCJJCC membership.

Target Population

According to state auditor findings, four of the five counties reviewed did not formally define the "at-risk" population being served by the local plan. In fact, the same four counties did not formally identify the risk factors that made youth eligible to participate in (or be served by) JJCPA funded programs. While a review of the Orange County comprehensive plan provides some detail, the target population and the risk factors that make a youth eligible for support can be better defined.

The previous focus of Orange County's comprehensive plan was on a very specific group of youthful offenders. Based on research conducted by the Orange County Probation Department, JJCPA monies were utilized to support a collaborative partnership intended to manage youthful offenders known as the 8% population.[5] Generally speaking, these "chronic recidivists" were 15 years or younger at the time of their first case disposition, and exhibited at least three of the following "risk" behaviors: poor performance/behavior at school, dysfunctional family dynamics, substance abuse, and/or delinquent

[5] https://www.ocgov.com/gov/probation/about/8percent/findings

behavior. Over time, the funds required to support Probation's Youth and Family Resource Center (YFRC) model of intervention for 8% youth diminished and the program closed.

While there are no specific youth risk factors currently identified, the present comprehensive plan does look to divert first time offenders away from the juvenile justice system, reduce/mitigate violent crime on school campuses, use youth reporting center interventions, rather than secure detention, to address youthful offender acting out behavior (including low level criminal offenses), and address substance use disorder issues amongst wards of the court.

In light of the above, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the adoption of a formal target population definition. Leveraging a unified target population definition would greatly assist the OCJJCC in developing and maintaining a comprehensive plan that focuses support/services to the needs of its specific youthful offenders. Through its deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee believes the definition of "at promise" youth as defined in 13825.4 PC should be utilized to support the OCJJCC's current and future efforts.

13825.4 PC was amended on October 12, 2019 to replace the term "at risk" with the term "at promise." There was no substantive change that occurred as a result because the definition included 10 specific characteristics that were to be considered if a youth were to be identified as belonging to this specific category. Currently the definition of "at promise" youth is, "… persons age 5 to 20 years of age and who fall into one or more of the following categories…"

1. Live in a high-crime or high-violence neighborhood as identified by local or federal law enforcement agencies.
2. Live in a low-economic neighborhood as identified by the U.S. Census or come from an impoverished family.
3. Are excessively absent from school or are doing poorly in school as identified by personnel from the youth's school.
4. Come from a socially dysfunctional family as identified by local or state social services agencies.
5. Have had one or more contacts with the police.
6. Have entered the juvenile justice system.
7. Are identified by the juvenile justice system as being at risk.
8. Are current or former gang members.
9. Have one or more family members living at home who are current or former members of a gang.
10. Are identified as wards of the court, as defined in Section 601 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Although the above definition was created in support of the California Gang, Crime and Violence Prevention Partnership[6], it does provide the OCJJCC with broad latitude to develop diversion and other juvenile justice strategies that reduce crime and meet the needs of its specific targeted youth population.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **Definition of the target population**

[6] See 13825.2 PC – definition of California Gang, Crime and Violence Prevention Partnership program administered by the Department of Justice.

Findings: The OCJJCC has not adopted a uniform definition of local youth that may benefit from services provided through the OCJJCC's comprehensive plan.

Recommendations: In order to provide the OCJJCC with the flexibility to develop comprehensive plans that benefit youth in Orange County, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Adopting the definition of "at promise" youth as defined by 13825.4 PC

Metrics to Measure Success

In its review, the state auditor noted that counties visited could not generally prove the effectiveness of their JJCPA funded programs. In fact, four of the five counties simply used JJCPA funds to offset the costs of their probation department operations. Ultimately, it was determined that counties could not coalesce its data to produce meaningful evaluations of program effectiveness. In the end, the general finding was that counties could improve their ability to measure program effectiveness by using JJCPA dollars to improve data collection.

Orange County has established a long history of relying on data and research analysis to support its business operations. The reliance on data and the analysis of that data, particularly by Probation's research function, has greatly assisted in the development of the comprehensive plan and other strategies that have been proven to reduce crime. More specifically, Probation's research team has greatly assisted the department in improving upon its effectiveness in both the juvenile and adult arenas. That being said, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC turn to the body of research evidence that is present within the field of mental/behavioral health when considering the effectiveness of its JJCPA funded programs.

There exists a body of research that indicates increasing the presence of "protective factors" in young people has a positive effect on reducing the prevalence of future mental health/behavioral health issues later in life. A protective factor is defined as, "a characteristic at the biological, psychological, family, or community (including peers and culture) level that is associated with a lower likelihood of problem outcomes or that reduces the negative impact of a risk factor on problem outcomes."[7] A youth, for example, exhibiting poor performance at school, showing aggression towards peers, or associating with groups that accept drug/alcohol as part of their social norm would benefit from the increase of protective factors such as mentors/support systems that encourage positive engagement in school/social activities, establish clear expectations of behavior, and physical/psychological safety.

The Ad Hoc Committee agrees that the goal of the OCJJCC plan is to reduce certain behaviors in youthful offenders (e.g. re-arrest). The effectiveness of the plan's strategy, however, should also include how certain protective factors increased. Ultimately, the Ad Hoc Committee believes that a youth's likelihood to re-offend and/or remain in the juvenile justice system will be significantly reduced if the individual's capacity for more successful autonomy is increased.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

---

[7] O'Connell, M. E., Boat, T., & Warner, K. E.. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2009).

Focus area: **Metrics Used to Measure Comprehensive Plan Success**

Findings: The OCJJCC relies on demographic data (e.g. age at entry, gender, ethnicity, city of residence) to track program participants as well as certain behaviors (e.g. days in program, types of program exits, re-arrest) to "measure" program success.

Recommendations: In order to provide a more complete description of individual progress, and/or the development of youth within an identified group of youthful offenders, or at promise youth within a JJCPA funded program, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Implementing a "pre" and "post" assessment of the program's outcome.
    1. Measurement of expected outcome(s) will be provided by the program providers as follows:
        a. How program providers will measure their outcome to metrics established by the OCJJCC,
        b. How program providers expect to achieve their outcomes,
        c. How program providers will set realistic goals and;
        d. How program providers will set a timeframe to achieve their expected outcomes.
    2. Suggested areas of outcome measurement are as follows:
        a. Measure program participant against him/herself and/or
        b. Measure program group against group.
- Tracking improvement of "protective factors" which may mitigate or reduce problematic behavior.
- Tracking the amount and influence of any training that was provided.
    1. Measure the expected outcome of training, to the measurable returns.

JJCPA Funding

As indicated previously in this report, the OCJJCC approved its comprehensive plan for Fiscal Year 2020/2021. That plan and the funding for that plan was submitted to the Orange County Board of Supervisors for review as well as Community Corrections for acceptance/posting. The focus of the plan for Fiscal Year 2020/2021 will be to divert eligible youth away from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate incidents of violence on local school campuses, address substance use

disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Moving forward, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the OCJJCC use its JJCPA resources to support programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity of the OCJJCC's intended/targeted population. In other words, JJCPA funds should be utilized to support "at promise" and/or youthful offenders that cannot, or do not qualify for other youthful programs. This is not to suggest that the current approved OCJJCC plan is not a laudable pursuit. Rather, it is a reminder that other initiatives—in existence today, or soon to be—may address the needs of youth that are the focus of the current plan.

The County of Orange is currently developing its Integrated Services Model for Community Corrections. The focus of this model is to use existing resources to reduce the number of individuals with mental illness and/or substance use disorder issues from cycling in and out of the County's jail system, treat those that are causing harm to society or themselves, and diverting juveniles and young adults from the criminal justice system. In order to achieve the model's goals the County is leveraging existing facilities/resources and working towards enhancing its partnerships with community-based organizations to increase "in reach services" intended on improving re-entry of juvenile and adult system involved individuals and fortifying post custody services for juveniles/adults transitioning back out into their respective communities. As the initiative continues to develop, some youth once served by the OCJJCC comprehensive plan may instead be eligible to participate in the County's more comprehensive system of care.

Now more than ever is an opportunity to focus resources on a targeted population determined by the OCJJCC. By focusing its finite resources on specific youthful offenders and their needs, the OCJJCC runs less of a risk of providing duplicative support, or servicing youth that may have derived benefit from other support systems such as the County's larger Integrated Services Model. With a more focused effort, the OCJJCC also has greater opportunity to collaborate with the community to operationalize alternative strategies that have proven results.

In light of the above, the following is offered for consideration:

Focus area: **How JJCPA Funds Should be Utilized**

Findings: The OCJJCC currently uses JJCPA monies to fund strategies intended to divert youth from the juvenile justice system, reduce school truancy, reduce/mitigate the incidents of violence committed on local school campuses, address substance use disorders of juvenile probation youth, and utilize youth reporting centers, rather than secured detention, to address youthful acting out (including low level criminal acts) behavior.

Recommendations: In order to ensure limited JJCPA funds/resources are used appropriately, the OCJJCC should consider:

- Funding programs that have been proven to reduce crime and/or build the capacity (increase protective factors) of youthful participants.
- Funding programs that support comprehensive plans that are developed by the council described in 749.22 WIC and align with legislative requirements. Namely, comprehensive plans should include the following:

1. An assessment of existing law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol and youth services resources that specifically target at-risk (at promise) juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families.
2. An identification and prioritization of the neighborhoods, schools, and other areas in the community that face a significant public safety risk from juvenile crime, such as gang activity, daylight burglary, late-night robbery, vandalism, truancy, controlled substances sales, firearm-related violence, and juvenile substance abuse and alcohol use.
3. A local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk (at promise) youth and juvenile offenders.

- Programs proposed to be funded shall satisfy all of the following requirements:

  1. Be based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.
  2. Collaborate and integrate services of all existing resources (see above resources identified within the assessment process)
  3. Employ information sharing systems to ensure that county actions are fully coordinated, and designed to provide data for measuring the success of juvenile justice programs and strategies.
  4. Adopt goals related to the outcome measures that shall be used to determine the effectiveness of the local juvenile justice action strategy.[8]

[8] Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (AKA: Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act) https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=199920000AB1913

Conclusion

In May of 2020, the state auditor conducted a review of five counties. The focus of that evaluation was to review the spending and reporting out of funds received as required by JJCPA. In general, the state auditor found that local and state oversight of comprehensive plan development was weak, plans were found to be outdated and outcome reporting of those plans was misreported or non-existent.

The above review prompted the OCJJCC to create an Ad Hoc Committee tasked with reviewing its own local oversight mechanisms, process of developing/managing the comprehensive plan and measuring for success in order to determine if further funding is appropriate. The Ad Hoc Committee met, and, along with the public, completed an analysis as requested by the OCJJCC. Additionally, the Ad Hoc Committee developed a few recommendations that are believed to assist the OCJJCC in weathering funding fluctuations as well as any upcoming legislative changes that will have direct impacts on juvenile diversion program efforts, and/or formal juvenile justice operations. In light of recent legislation including Senate Bill 823, which adds a new level of bureaucracy to the development/oversight of multidisciplinary juvenile justice plans, and Assembly Bill 901 which effectively removes the ability of the juvenile court to manage a youth determined to be a habitual truant, the recommendations will greatly assist the OCJJCC in fashioning a plan that will address the needs of its targeted youth population now and into the future.

Truancy Prevention Program
Presentation to
Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

Regarding AB901 Transition Plan

February 19, 2021

Boys & Girls Clubs Community Health Services (BGC-CHS) is a division of Boys & Girls Clubs of Garden Grove, Inc. (BGCGG) and the trade name utilized to provide community health services throughout Orange County. BGCGG has been the contracted provider of truancy reduction and prevention services for the Garden Grove Unified School District for 25 years. BGCGG has also been a contracted provider of Garden Grove Police Department for youth diversion, prevention, and intervention services for 25 years. BGC-CHS's Truancy Prevention Program (TPP) is built on an individualized, goal-driven case management model that utilizes an inter-disciplinary team of school personnel, law enforcement, parents, and the student to identify and eliminate social barriers that contribute to truant behaviors. TPP also provides a Parent and Teen Empowerment Program (PEP) and other classes in order to educate parents on how to develop and maintain healthy and productive relationships with their child, as well as improve their academic engagement.

The onset of AB901 has required the revision of the current truancy processes in Orange County. Instead of being referred to Informal Probation, students who have not completed the SARB process within their own districts would be referred to BGCGG. BGCGG would then process the referral using existing community-based resources to help divert youth from the criminal justice system. BGCGG had previously started some of these components before the onset of AB901. BGCGG - TPP will provide case management to parents only for children twelve years old and younger, or to both parent and student for teens thirteen and older.

BGCGG has attended and forged relationships with existing school districts to attend SARB meetings, host parenting classes on Orange County School District campuses and facilities, and provide resources beyond parenting classes. BGCGG has seen a higher completion and engagement rate among youth and families who are engaged at the SARB level, in comparison to the engagement after being processed by Truancy Court.

BGCGG will continue to work with Truancy Court partners such as Social Services Agency, OCDE, District Attorney's Office, and Waymakers. The collaborative nature of the group is inherent to the success of the youth.

Process:

1. Youth will be referred directly to BGCGG from school districts for chronic absenteeism/truancy
   a) Referrals can be sent at any time to BGCGG
   b) BGCGG -can obtain referrals at district SARB meetings where a BGCGG - representative will be in attendance
2. Enter referral into database and assign regional Field Liaison
3. If youth has presenting serious Emotional Disturbance or Mental Health issues that meet criteria for Waymakers the youth will be referred to Waymakers.
4. Field Liaison will call the family to set up individual/group informational meetings and complete a brief intake form, which includes a Protective Factors Survey
5. Meetings would occur regionally in the Three Service Planning Areas of Orange County ideally at school locations, Community Resource Centers, or other CBOs.

Students and families referred will be scheduled for an intake session at the student's school or other central community locations that are easily accessible to students and their families. Intake sessions seek to identify deep-rooted socioeconomic barriers leading to truant behaviors through a combined parent-student assessment which evaluates:

1. Background of Situation
2. Social & Family History
3. Mental Health
4. Basic Needs
5. Health Behaviors
6. Access to Health Insurance and Health Care
7. Socioeconomic and Health Determinant Barriers

Once the combined assessment is complete, individual intakes are conducted with the student and parents in order to confidentially assess specific needs and barriers each face. Individualized intakes allow clinical staff to evaluate and identify more deeply rooted causes of behavioral issues. Utilizing the information gathered during the combined and individual intakes, a treatment plan is developed based on goals set by students and parents to address identified behavioral and academic needs. Goals established by students foster a greater motivation and proactive response to achieve milestones and reach their goals. External social and financial barriers identified during the intake will be referred to FRC's, CBO's, and case management services in local SPA's.

Following the intake, and continuing for the duration of each student and family's open case, Field Liaisons will conduct bi-weekly telephonic check-in meetings. This model of truancy prevention builds accountability and motivation for students/families to feel supported in seeking additional assistance and achieving their academic and personal goals. Support groups and parent education sessions will also be available throughout the county. These sessions will educate parents on how to develop and maintain healthy productive relationships with their children and empower parents to be proactive in improving their child's attendance and engagement in school.

Outcomes:

To measure the effectiveness of outcomes we use the framework of Check and Connect a program from University of Minnesota Check & Connect is a model to promote student engagement with school, reduce dropout and increase school completion. Student attendances is monitored on an on-going basis for the duration of the open case. The program also monitors those students who proceed on to

Truancy Court. In addition to attendance, youth and parents will participate in a pre/post-test on Protective Factors.

Other Goals/Options/TBD

***Building a Juvenile Justice CBO Collaborative**
BGCGG would like to be aware of other Juvenile Collaboratives or be tasked with building a taskforce, similar to Alameda and Santa Barbara, in which we can discuss clients, learn about resources, and leverage resources to improve service delivery for youth and families. Preferred client referrals.

***Incentives for participation/completion**
BGCGG would like to be able to provide incentives for completion of programs, increased attendance, or positive academic trends.

*Currently not included in budget

Operations and Staffing

The program will be staffed with a .25 Program Director, three (3) full-time field liaisons, and .5 FTE Administrative Coordinator. Additionally, a total of 0.06 FTE indirect staff will be provided through finance and general programing staff to support the administrative functions and success of the program.

3% COLA

Position	FTE	Rate	Total	Benefits	**Year 1**	**Year 2**
Program Director	.25 FTE	$28/hr	14560	1019.20	15579.20	
Field Liaison	3 @ 1.0 FTE	$20/hr	124,800	8736	133536	
Admin	.5 FTE	$18/hr	18,720	1310.40	20030.40	
					169145.6	
Supplies						
3 cell phones					1800	
Office supplies					2200	
Technology					2000	
					6000	
Total						
Indirect 6%					10508.74	
Total annually					$185,654.34	**191,223.97**

Program Costs

Resources for truancy prevention and parent education services will be entirely invested into qualified staffing to provide programs and support to students and their families.

TPP Program Director: oversees and provides support, direction, and guidance for all aspects of TPP. This position will provide 10 hours per week (0.25 FTE) to training and supervising staff involved with the additional case load, as well as evaluation and reporting to the county. Main responsibilities for this position include administrative networking with school districts, OC Probation, and other high-level stakeholders.

Field Liaison: case management of referrals, follow-up, family case management, and parent education. Ensures timely reporting and regular auditing of files. This person will attend district level SARB meetings and actively build resource network in appropriate SPA. This position will provide 40 hours per week, maintaining accurate and up to date case records of all services rendered in accordance with state and county regulations, while maintaining an active caseload.
Direct Administrative Support: .5 FTE will be allocated to the entering of referrals into database tracking, coordinating referrals, and follow ups with CBOs in local SPAs.

Indirect Administrative Support: A total 0.06 FTE administrative support will be provided through finance and accounting responsibilities (0.03 FTE) as well as general program support and direction (0.03 FTE). These positions comprise 6% of total resources dedicated to this program.

A total of 7% of salaries will be used to support payroll taxes and staff benefits. Additionally, an annual 3% increase on all positions and stipends will support BGCGG's ability to provide competitive compensation and quality truancy prevention and parent education services when considering increases in cost of living and inflation.

Contact:

Christina Sepulveda, MA
Vice President, Community Impact
Boys & Girls Clubs of Garden Grove
csepulveda@bgcgg.org

Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA)
FY 2021/22 Proposed Budget Allocation

	Department Requests FY 2021-22	Proposed Allocations (Budget) FY 2021-22
Estimated Carryover Funds from Prior Year	3,300,000	3,300,000
Estimated FY 21-22 Net Interest	75,000	75,000
Anticipated Allocation for FY 2021-22	13,977,063	13,977,063
Estimated Funding Available	**17,352,063**	**17,352,063**
Programs Proposed for Funding:		
Substance Use Disorder	7,723,134	7,723,134
Juvenile Recovery Court	880,879	880,879
Decentralized Intake/Sheriff's Prevention	379,523	379,523
Truancy Response	575,205	575,205
School Mobile Assessment & Response Team - South	1,486,256	1,486,256
School Mobile Assessment & Response Team - North (pilot - 6 month) **Note 2**	801,694	801,694
Youth Reporting Centers	4,338,773	4,338,773
Active Recidivism Reduction Initiative via Engagement (ARRIVE)	500,000	500,000
School Threat Assessment Team Training	-	-
Administrative Costs (0.5%) **Note 1**	69,885	69,885
Total Funding Proposed for Programs	**16,755,349**	**16,755,349**
Future Obligations for Consideration by Committee		
School Mobile Assessment & Response Team - North (Jan - June 2022)	537,647	537,647
Anticipated Funding Balance	**59,066**	**59,066**

Totals may not foot due to rounding.

NOTE 1: Administrative Costs includes administrative support services provided by CEO Budget and Clerk of the Board. Government Codes 30062(c)(1) and 30062(d)(2).

NOTE 2: OCJJCC approved allocation for the SMART Team North pilot project for 2 years spread over 3 FYs as follows: FY 19/20 6-month award, FY 20/21 12-month award, and FY 21/22 6-month award. OCJJCC approval on 8/29/19 and 10/24/19.

NOTE 3: HCA in-kind services for SMART Team FY 2021/22 projected cost is $123,718 for 1 Behavioral Health Clinician I or II.

Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA)
FY 2021/22 Proposed Budget Details

PROGRAM DETAILS	FY 2021/22 Department Requests	FY 2021/22 Proposed Allocations (Budget)
Substance Use Disorder		
Probation	$ 7,135,225	$ 7,135,225
Health Care Agency	587,909	587,909
Total Substance Use Disorder	**7,723,134**	**7,723,134**
Juvenile Recovery Court		
Probation	371,277	371,277
Health Care Agency	360,000	360,000
Public Defender	50,000	50,000
District Attorney	99,602	99,602
Total Juvenile Recovery Court	**880,879**	**880,879**
Decentralized Intake/Sheriff's Prevention		
Probation	15,842	15,842
Orange County Sheriff's Department	363,681	363,681
Total Decentralized Intake/Sheriff's Prevention	**379,523**	**379,523**
Truancy Response		
Probation	54,593	54,593
Public Defender	175,000	175,000
District Attorney	345,612	345,612
Total Truancy Response	**575,205**	**575,205**
School Mobile Assessment & Response Team (South)		
Orange County Sheriff's Department	1,486,256	1,486,256
Total SMART (South) Team	**1,486,256**	**1,486,256**
School Mobile Assessment & Response Team (North)	July - Dec 2021	July - Dec 2021
Probation	11,685	11,685
Orange County Sheriff's Department	648,299	648,299
District Attorney	141,711	141,711
Total SMART (North) Team Note 2	**801,694**	**801,694**
Youth Reporting Centers		
Probation	3,966,773	3,966,773
Health Care Agency	372,000	372,000
Total Youth Reporting Centers	**4,338,773**	**4,338,773**
Active Recidivism Reduction Initiative via Engagement (ARRIVE)		
Probation	500,000	500,000
Total ARRIVE	**500,000**	**500,000**
School Threat Assessment Team Training		
Orange County Sheriff's Department	-	-
Total School Threat Assessment Team	**-**	**-**
Administrative Cost (0.5%) NOTE 1	**69,885**	**69,885**
Total Funding Proposed for Programs	**$ 16,755,349**	**$ 16,755,349**

Extension of Project for Consideration

School Mobile Assessment & Response Team (North)	Jan - June 2022	Jan - June 2022
Probation	11,685	11,685
Orange County Sheriff's Department	384,252	384,252
District Attorney	141,711	141,711
Total SMART (North) Team - Extension	**$ 537,647**	**$ 537,647**

DEPARTMENT SUMMARY	FY 2021/22 Department Requests	FY 2021/22 Proposed Allocations (Budget)
Probation*	**12,067,079**	**12,067,079**
Orange County Sheriff's Department*	**2,882,488**	**2,882,488**
Health Care Agency	**1,319,909**	**1,319,909**
Public Defender	**225,000**	**225,000**
District Attorney*	**728,635**	**728,635**
Administrative Cost (0.5%)	**69,885**	**69,885**
Total Funding Proposed for Departments	**17,292,996**	**17,292,996**

**Includes extension of SMART North*

Estimated Funding Available	**$ 17,352,063**	**$ 17,352,063**
Anticipated Funding Balance	$ 59,066	$ 59,066

Totals may not foot due to rounding.

NOTE 1: Administrative Costs includes administrative support services provided by CEO Budget and Clerk of the Board. GC 30062(c)(1) and 30062(d)(2).

NOTE 2: OCJJCC approved allocation for the SMART Team North pilot project for 2 years but spread over 3 FYs as follows: FY 19/20 6-month award, FY 20/21 12-month award, and FY 21/22 6-month award. OCJJCC approval on 8/29/19 and 10/24/19.