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Introduction

Resource Development Associates (RDA) is contracted through the Los Angeles (LA) County Probation Department to (1) conduct a year-long comprehensive evaluation of the implementation and effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs in relation to local priorities and best practices, and (2) use this evaluation to make recommendations for system improvements. In December 2017, RDA completed the first phase of the evaluation, which culminated in the Landscape Analysis Report. This report provides quantitative and qualitative descriptions of JJCPA programs, services, and youth populations served, in addition to a discussion of the data availability and capacity to evaluate JJCPA. Based on findings from the Landscape Analysis Report and local stakeholder priorities, we assessed the effectiveness of two JJCPA programs: School-Based Probation and High-Risk/High-Needs Services in the second phase of the evaluation.

As the final phase of the evaluation, the Gap Analysis Report uses data gathered through a best practice review and the results of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 analyses to examine gaps between best practices in delinquency prevention services and JJCPA program and service delivery in LA County. Based on our assessment of how LA County’s practices align with evidence-based and promising practices, this report provides recommendations for JJCPA services and administration moving forward.

Methods and Data Sources

The Gap Analysis uses the following methods and data sources:

- **Literature Review.** A review of the literature on the components of a comprehensive juvenile justice system.
- **Prior Research.** A review of relevant reports regarding JJCPA and probation services in LA County including RDA’s Landscape Analysis and Probation Governance Study, the Los Angeles County Probation Workgroup Report, and the Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study.
- **Documentary Data.** An assessment of contracts with community-based providers, program curriculums and manuals, and budgets and expenditures over the past five years.
- **Qualitative Data.** Interviews and focus groups with JJCPA leadership and program staff, partners, and youth participants and families (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Qualitative Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Focus Groups and Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration and Staff Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Family Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Quantitative Data.** Program enrollment and participation, participant characteristics, and program outcome data from Probation’s databases.


The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

Passed by the California State Legislature in August 2000, the Schiff–Cardenas Crime Prevention Act (Assembly Bill 1913) established a juvenile justice funding source for California counties. Later termed the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, this funding source supports the development and implementation of county juvenile justice plans that provide 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 youth and juvenile offenders.”

Each county’s juvenile justice plan must be developed by a local multi-agency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) which, according to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 749.22, is chaired by the county’s chief probation officer and composed of representatives from specific public agencies spanning criminal justice, education, and social services agencies, as well as community-based organizations and an at-large community representative. The JJCPA legislation tasks the JJCC with developing a Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) that:

- Assesses existing services and resources that target at-risk and justice-involved youth and their families;
- Prioritizes neighborhoods, schools, and other areas with high rates of juvenile crime;
- Lays out a strategy for prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation responses to juvenile crime and delinquency that is based on programs and approaches with demonstrated effectiveness; and
- Develops information-sharing systems to coordinate actions and support evaluation.

Organization of this Report

This report first delineates a set of key recommendations about JJCPA’s guiding philosophy and principles, population focus, service delivery system, and oversight and accountability. After the key recommendations, the report is organized in three sections that provide a more detailed assessment and recommendations across JJCPA’s service approach, service types, and system capacity and administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Areas of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. <strong>Service Approach</strong></td>
<td>• Service frameworks and philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate role of probation officers and other law enforcement in delivering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>youth services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. <strong>Service Types</strong></td>
<td>• Gaps in programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriers and potential solutions to effective programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. <strong>System Capacity and</strong></td>
<td>• Planning process to achieve a comprehensive intervention and prevention plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>• Evaluation and data collection needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JJCPA contracting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaboration and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that the recommendations do not lay out a complete plan for JJCPA services; but rather demonstrate findings and key decisions points that will need to be addressed through a planning process to prioritize and make decisions about funding allocations and contracting.

3 Schiff–Cardenas Crime Prevention Act (AB 1913)
Key Recommendations

Guiding Philosophy and Principles

Since the development of the 2001 CMJJP, there has been little stakeholder engagement in the planning or implementation of JJCPA in LA County. As JJCPA moves to become more collaborative and purposeful, it is important that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of the philosophy that undergirds the JJCPA system and programs. Given JJCPA’s explicit goal to reduce delinquency and the body of research demonstrating that juvenile justice system contact increases subsequent delinquency,\(^4\),\(^5\),\(^6\) we recommend that the following guiding philosophy drive all of the JJCC’s work:

*The JJCC should work to minimize youth contact with the juvenile justice system.*

In addition, we recommend that LA County consider the following four guiding principles, developed based on the JJCPA legislation; our literature review of the components of a comprehensive juvenile justice system (see summary text box); and interviews and focus groups with JJCC members, Probation leadership, JJCPA program managers and providers, and youth and families. In order to truly be collaborative, we do not recommend that LA County adopt any guiding principles without opportunity for JJCC, community, and stakeholder feedback.

**Collaborative:** JJCPA’s design and implementation should be rooted in a collaborative, multidisciplinary process that brings together county agencies, community-based organizations (CBOs), youth and parents that have been impacted by the juvenile justice system, and other interested stakeholders.

**Data-Driven:** JJCPA system- and program-level decision-making should be informed by current and accessible data about youths’ needs and program effectiveness.

**Youth Development-Focused:** The design and implementation of JJCPA should focus on youth’s assets and supports the development of skills and competencies.

**Community-Centered:** All JJCPA programs, processes, and activities should be designed in partnership with youth and families impacted by the justice system in order to provide responsive and effective services for all LA County communities.

---


5. Beardslee, J. B. (2014). *Under the radar or under arrest: How does contact with the juvenile justice system affect delinquency and academic outcomes?* UC Irvine. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mg05819

Population Focus

**Recommendation 1:** As noted above, JJCPA funds can be designated to serve a wide array of youth including “at risk youth and juvenile offenders,” via a broad set of approaches that include prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation, giving counties wide latitude with how they use these funds. Given the dramatic decline in the number of youth formally involved in the delinquency system in LA County (and across California) in the years since the passage of JJCPA—and the subsequent establishment of the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) and Juvenile Probation Camp Funding (JPCF) Program to serve and supervise youth who are in or are at-risk of placement into custodial settings—this evaluation recommends that JJCPA funding be utilized to provide programs and services specifically for youth on probation in non-custodial settings as well as for youth who are not on probation but are considered “at risk” for delinquency system involvement.

- This approach is consistent with a sizeable body of research demonstrating that delinquency system contact can itself be a cause of subsequent juvenile and adult justice system involvement and that for the majority of youth, public safety and youth wellbeing are best served by minimizing justice system involvement.\(^7\)
- Using JJCPA funds to serve youth on probation and youth at risk of juvenile justice system involvement is also supported by RDA’s findings that youth on probation and youth not on probation have similar needs, regardless of their assessed risk level.

**Recommendation 2:** LA County’s JJCC should establish a formal definition of “at risk” youth to determine target population(s) of youth not on probation who would be best served by JJCPA services. Our finding that neighborhood of residence is a good proxy for need is consistent with JJCPA’s mandate that counties prioritize neighborhoods, schools, and other areas with high rates of juvenile crime.

Service Delivery System

**Recommendation 3:** As currently constituted, JJCPA funds a wide variety of activities, interventions, and processes, which include assessments, services, supervision, and more. In order to establish a more coherent service delivery system, LA County’s JJCC should explicitly differentiate between *supervision* and *community-based services* in its funding categories and establish criteria to govern JJCPA funding for each.

- Probation supervision should be reserved for those youth who have been formally processed through the juvenile delinquency court. In addition, supervision should always be paired with access to services.
- Access to services for youth not on probation should be offered through the Office of Diversion and Reentry (ODR) or another County department. JJCPA funds are not required to be administered by the Probation Department, and we recommend that for youth not on probation, services funded by JJCPA not be contracted through the Probation Department.

---

**Recommendation 4:** The County’s approach to JJCPA should be guided by best practices (see text box above). Recommended steps to align with best practices are to define a service delivery model for youth not on probation; ensure that community-based services are available and proportionate to the number of youth being served; and infuse principles of youth development, trauma-informed care, racial equity, and cultural responsiveness in service delivery and system administration.

**Recommendation 5:** The top unmet service needs (either not sufficiently available or accessible) are: behavioral health services, social-emotional and relational services, educational supports, employment/career preparedness, and arts and recreation services. We recommend incorporating new elements into existing programs where possible and using a planning process to prioritize new programs.

- JJCPA does currently fund programs to address many of these needs. However, issues with program design, implementation, and capacity both reduce access to these services and limit their efficacy.
- When determining how to best address unmet needs, the JJCC should also consider the purview of other county funding sources—such as YOBG, DCFS, Title IV-E, and MHSA—and the array of services they currently fund.

**Oversight and Accountability**

**Recommendation 6:** The JJCC should establish a clear planning process by which to develop and update the CMJJP at agreed upon intervals. This should include comprehensive system planning every three to four years paired with opportunities for real-time adjustments on an ongoing basis.

**Recommendation 7:** Toward this end, the JJCC will need improved reporting protocols that allow oversight of both program and system implementation and evaluation of outcomes.

- Doing so will require improved data capacity by Probation and their contracted providers, as well as a mechanism for tracking implementation and outcomes of services for youth not on probation.
A. Service Approach

Through a comprehensive literature review of the components of a comprehensive juvenile justice system, we identified seven key frameworks, approaches, and elements that should guide 1) the JJCPA service delivery model and 2) the implementation of JJCPA services and supervision. This section provides a summary of literature, an assessment of current JJCPA alignment with best practices, and recommendations in each of the following seven areas:

A1. Continuum of Prevention to Intervention Where Services are Aligned to Need
A2. Youth Development Approach
A3. Family and Community-Focused Services
A4. Trauma-Informed Services and Systems
A5. Racial Equities and Disparities
A6. Use of Evidence-Based Practices and Programs
A7. Culturally Respectful and Responsive Programs
### A1. Continuum of Prevention to Intervention Where Services are Aligned to Need

#### Summary of Literature
- The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s (OJJDP) *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders* operates on a continuum: 1) Prevention programs for at-risk youth, and 2) Graduated sanctions and treatment programs for youth who have committed delinquent acts.\(^8\)
- The Risk-Need-Responsivity model lays out the following principles: risk principle—focus treatment on the higher risk offenders; need principle—treatment should target criminogenic need; and the responsivity principle—tailor interventions to the individual.\(^9\)
- Empirical research shows that programs are most effective when applied only to the youth at highest risk of re-arrests or re-offending; the same programs can cause negative effects when applied to youth at lower risk levels. Low-risk youth should be diverted from the juvenile justice system; low-risk, system-involved youth can suffer negative consequences.\(^10\)

#### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- JJCPA funds a range of supervision and services for youth not on probation and youth on probation who are identified as low-to-moderate risk.</td>
<td>- Youth who are not on probation have limited access to community-based services, as most JJCPA services are reserved for youth on formal probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JJCPA developed High Risk/High Need programs in order to ensure that youth at lower risk levels do not experience negative effects from participating in programs designed for youth at higher risk. MST and the home-based programs provide services in the home, which helps prevent mixing of different risk-levels.</td>
<td>- While certain JJCPA programs are intended to target high-risk youth, some of these programs actually serve youth from all three risk levels—low, moderate, and high risk—as assessed by the LARRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The CMJJP does not delineate between services and supervision and categorizes both as programs.</td>
<td>- The CMJJP does not delineate between services and supervision and categorizes both as programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A number of JJCPA service and supervision programs involve probation officers working directly with low-risk youth.(^11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations

1. Develop a clear service delivery framework that reflects the JJCPA strategy. The current categorization of JJCPA into 11 programs across three initiatives does not include all of the JJCPA programs, nor clearly describe the types of services provided within each program. To increase transparency, and for JJCPA to function effectively as a system, it must be clear how programs form a continuum of services.
2. Ensure delineation between probation supervision (which should be based on risk) and treatment or support services. Youth who are low-risk or at-risk should not be supervised, even if these youth have high needs.
   a. As part of this effort, the role of probation officers needs to be more clearly delineated and should focus primarily on referring youth to services and supports.
3. The CMJJP should define a service delivery model for youth who are not on probation. This should include the target population criteria, where coordination of services should be situated (e.g., ODR, school district, CBO), and how referrals to services should occur (e.g., school referral liaison, community outreach workers/navigators).

---


\(^11\) This includes school-based, housing-based, and parks-based probation working with WIC 236 youth, as well as New Directions. Probation is moving to end working with WIC 236 youth in schools.
## A2. Youth Development Approach

### Summary of Literature

- A youth development approach highlights key behavioral differences between youth and adults, which suggest that the treatment and supervision of juveniles should not mimic adult criminal punishment models, but rather should maintain a focus on programming and intervention.\(^\text{12}\)
- A Positive Youth Development (PYD)/Positive Youth Justice (PYJ) approach focuses on strengths and assets instead of deficits and problems; emphasizes building positive relationships; supports the development of skills and competencies; and connects youth to educational, employment, civic, and cultural opportunities.\(^\text{13}\)
- PYD/PYJ recognizes that youth have a tremendous capacity for change; nurtures the strengths of youth with programs designed to foster healthy development, build supportive relationships with adults and peers, and develop new skills that are valued in the community; and, to the greatest extent possible, avoids punitive interventions that lead to building a negative self-identity and social patterns that may result in criminal behavior.\(^\text{14}\)
- Research has shown that programs should use a therapeutic approach to behavior change by focusing on constructive personal development and minimizing programs based on control or deterrence.\(^\text{15}\)

### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation officers currently make referrals and connect youth to programs that include job training, anger management classes, gender responsive programs, and community service.</td>
<td>A youth development approach is not explicitly built into JJCPA supervision and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJCPA programs include skill building and development focused on education, employment, and decision-making.</td>
<td>Ensure that probation officers include youth, families, and CBOs working with youth in the case planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In focus groups, a number of youth described their probation officers as supportive and understanding.</td>
<td>The current process to refer youth on probation to JJCPA services does not center youth and family voice and choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRHN programs take an asset-based approach. Providers form supportive relationships and connect youth and families to needed resources.</td>
<td>In focus groups, a number of youth experienced their probation officers as punitive and threatening. Overall, a punitive approach is used for youth who do not complete programs and positive rewards are not consistently used when youth complete/graduate a program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Develop trainings to support probation officers in using an asset-based approach to case planning and modify Probation job descriptions, policies, and procedures to incorporate PYD. This should include an asset/incentive-based approach to referrals (e.g., reduced terms of probation) and graduated rewards, rather than a punitive approach to non-completion.
2. Adopt the referral process recommendations made in Probation Workgroup Study (Herz), which includes developing an inventory of approved CBO providers and ensuring probation officers are trained and familiar with the specific services and target population for each service.
3. Fund community-based programs that use a youth development approach, including a mentoring/peer support model.

---


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{15}\) Ibid.
A3. Family and Community-Focused Services

### Summary of Literature

- The *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders* sees the family and community, supported by core social institutions, as having primary responsibility for meeting children’s needs and thereby preventing socially harmful or delinquent behavior. Thus, services to support families are crucial to families’ ability to support youth in their care.\(^\text{16}\)
- The Positive Youth Justice framework prioritizes “indigenous institutions and supports”—services located in schools, workplaces, community organizations, social programs, neighborhoods, and families.

### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• JJCPA funds school, community, and family-focused services</td>
<td>• Only approximately 30% of the JJCPA base budget(^\text{17}) is allocated to CBOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most JJCPA programs do not formally include families, yet youth are in their family’s care during non-school hours. Parents/caregivers need more emotional, parenting, and material support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs are not always offered close to youth’s homes—particularly in Antelope Valley—and the need to pay for and/or take lengthy bus or car rides can be a barrier for some youth to attend. In addition to transportation barriers, gang activity in neighborhoods can create unsafe environments such that youth feel afraid to travel to programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Clearly distinguish between supervision and services in the JJCPA program model to align with a community-centered approach. Increase the amount of the program budget that goes toward services and ensure that supervision is always paired with services.
2. Ensure that schools, housing developments, and parks with place-based probation officers also have place-based services.
3. Increase the number of services provided for families. This includes increasing the availability of services that serve youth and families together, as well as adding services specifically for parents/caregivers.
4. Rather than dividing services equally by the five clusters, the service approach should target services by areas with similar needs, demographics, and existing resources, such as the Service Planning Areas (SPA) developed by the LA County Department of Public Health.
5. Involve clients, families, and community-based providers in program design.

---


\(^{17}\) A higher proportion of one-time funding has been allocated to CBOs
A4. Trauma-Informed Services and Systems

Summary of Literature

- A **trauma-informed care** (TIC) approach recognizes that delinquent behavior is often rooted in the adverse effects of trauma on youth. A TIC approach asks, “What happened to you?” instead of “What’s wrong with you?” Services are designed to hinder further trauma from being caused so that trauma-affected individuals can heal and prosper.\(^{18}\)

- A **trauma-informed system** (TIS) approach seeks to establish organizational culture and practices that hinder further trauma from being caused to youth, families, and staff. The principles of a trauma-informed justice system include trauma-informed policies and procedures, staff education on trauma, prevention and management of secondary traumatic stress, trauma-informed partnering with youth and families, and a trauma-informed approach to collaboration and contracting with partner agencies.\(^{19}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most providers and probation officers expressed an understanding of impact of trauma on young people’s behavior.</td>
<td>There is a need for greater emphasis on trauma-informed approaches to service delivery across all programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some programs have trauma-informed care embedded in their operations and program design (e.g., MST)</td>
<td>The Probation Department, other public systems, and community partners do not consistently operate in alignment with the principles of a trauma-informed justice system (e.g., contracting processes, provision of staff training on trauma).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

1. Make trauma-informed care (e.g., trauma-focused screening, assessment, and treatment) more available system-wide.
2. Train probation officers to recognize potential symptoms of trauma, such as mental health issues or learning disabilities, and make appropriate referrals to services.
3. Offer training on secondary trauma for all providers and probation officers.
4. Conduct a trauma-informed system (TIS) organizational assessment and create a TIS plan for the Probation Department.\(^{20}\) This may include:
   a. Training for Probation administration in TIS to identify areas where policies and procedures can be adapted;
   b. Processes for centralized intakes and transfers of case plans to avoid re-traumatization of youth/families that have to repeat their story;
   c. Programs are provided in spaces that are warm and welcoming and promote physical and psychological safety.

---


\(^{20}\) See organizational assessment resources from: [http://traumatransformed.org/resource-grid/](http://traumatransformed.org/resource-grid/)
### A5. Racial Equity and Disparities

#### Summary of Literature
- Racial and ethnic disparity (RED, formerly known as disproportionate minority contact) refers to unequal treatment of youth of color in the juvenile justice system. Attention to RED in the justice system includes using data on race/ethnicity to drive decision making.\(^2\)
- Stemming racial and ethnic disparities requires that system stakeholders responsibly collect data, use standardized tools to guide their decision-making, and regularly analyze the data they collect to assess the performance. These processes must include system stakeholders at all levels.

#### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation administrators, probation officers, and program providers demonstrate an awareness of racial inequities in the juvenile justice system.</td>
<td>• Racial equity is not explicitly built in to the JJCPA plan • Black and Hispanic/Latino youth are overrepresented among youth participating in JJCPA programs compared to the County’s youth population. These trends align with racial disparities among the overall juvenile probation population compared to the county’s youth population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations
1. Ensure that the Probation Department and contracted partners collect reliable data on race/ethnicity.
   a. For youth on probation, collect and monitor data to ensure equity in the race/ethnicity of the population receiving services compared to the population on supervision.
   b. Use data and impact assessment tools to target investments to yield the greatest impact for children of color.
2. Establish diversion guidelines to ensure youth of color are diverted at equitable rates.
   a. Collect and monitor data on diversion processes.
3. Involve communities of color in the CMJJP planning process.
4. Include a focus on racial equity, historical trauma, and racism in RFPs for community-based programs.
5. Ensure involvement in cross-system coalitions to address RED reduction efforts.

---

### A6. Use of Evidence-Based Practices and Programs

#### Summary of Literature
- Evidence-based practices (EBPs) can be understood in three categories: brand name programs that use a defined delivery structure with a specific population (e.g., MST); models that have been proven to be effective (e.g., Special Needs Court, Substance Abuse Treatment, Social Learning Model); and practices used by individual practitioners that have proven to be effective (e.g., Motivational Interviewing).
- EBPs must demonstrate: 1) intervention impact, 2) evaluation quality, 3) intervention specificity, and 4) guidelines and tools for dissemination.
- Experimental studies undertaken to establish the evidence for EBPs can involve inflexible research methodologies and ways of approaching communities of color. As a result, the “evidence” established may not be aligned with the perceptions and experiences of communities of color. “Practice-based evidence” and “community-defined evidence” demonstrate proof of a program’s effectiveness as program delivery occurs.
- It is important to match clients to EBPs that align with their culture and worldview.

#### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The Probation Department prioritizes EBPs and includes them in CBO contracts.</td>
<td>- The CMJJP describes an evidence base for every JJCPA program, but in many cases, the program is loosely based on the cited research and the research base has not been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The design of most JJCPA programs have not substantially changed in 17 years, though new research has emerged about youth development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Probation Department’s guidelines for the use of evidence-based programs are not aligned with the needs of the population and reduce the ability of CBOs to draw on lived experience and meet youth’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HRHN programs use a condensed version of a Social Learning Model curriculum that is outdated, not grounded in youth development, and not applicable or appropriate for all youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The service length allowed in CBO contracts is often not long enough to achieve an impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Current EBP programming does not include programming rooted in creative options (e.g., arts programs, arts/music-based vocational training).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The use and consistency of EBPs varies across JJCPA programs and providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations
1. Re-center the Probation Department’s approach to EBPs to focus more on the seven principles of evidence based practice instead of evidence based programs; this approach will allow flexibility to develop and implement practices that are more responsive to the specific needs of youth in LA County as well as promising practices that may not have had the opportunity to be formally validated.
2. Update CBO contracts to allow flexibility in implementing EBPs that are culturally responsive and may include promising practices, not only documented EBPs, and extend the service length.
3. Provide technical assistance to contracted providers on the use of evidence-based and promising practices/programs.

---

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
## A7. Culturally Respectful and Responsive Programs

### Summary of Literature

- Culturally responsive services acknowledge and respect the wide array of beliefs and attitudes of the youth and families with which providers interact and encourage youth to express their own cultural identity.\(^{26}\)
- Culturally responsive practice involves programmatic decisions to support services that are accessible and accepting, such as client-provider matching based on key cultural factors and lived experience, as well as treatment coordination with culturally-specific healers.
- Cultural responsiveness increases youth and family engagement and satisfaction with services.
- Gender responsiveness includes programs that address the realities of women’s lives\(^{27}\) and programs that address gender attitudes among men and promote alternative notions of masculinity.\(^{28}\)

### Areas of Alignment with Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps in Alignment with Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Gender-based programs are designed to focus on female youth, but not male, transgender, or gender non-conforming youth. Gender-Specific Home Based curriculum may not address female-specific needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most youth who receive JJCPA services are male, but many CBO service providers are female, which may not always be the most effective match between provider and client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• JJCPA services do not explicitly address population-specific issues, such as the particular needs of LGBTQ, commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC), crossover youth, and youth experiencing homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As mentioned in the section on EBPs above, the selection of program curricula does not include an attention to cultural relevance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Provide population-specific programming and/or staff training:
   a. Programming specifically for black and brown males.
   b. Training for staff on working with transgender and gender non-conforming youth.
   c. Training for staff on working with LGBTQ+ youth.
2. As mentioned in the section on EBPs, allow flexibility to develop and implement promising and evidence-based programs and practices focused on improving outcomes for children and youth of color.

---


B. Service Types

JJCPA funds a variety of services and interventions, including probation supervision, targeted treatment and support services designed to address particular needs, one-time interventions, and community interventions. This section focuses primarily on the targeted service needs of youth who are involved in or at risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. Probation supervision is separate from a service and is therefore not included in this section.

As noted in the Service Approach section above, services should be based on need, and the level of need is often the same regardless of a youth’s probation status. As such, the service needs discussed in this section can apply to both youth on probation and youth not on probation. This section addresses service alignment and unmet needs in the following areas:

- Behavioral Health
- Education
- Employment and Career
- Housing
- Life Skills
- Social-Emotional/Relational Support
- Parent/Caregiver Support
- Arts and Recreation

These areas were defined through RDA’s review of the literature on best practices in juvenile justice, review of prior research, and qualitative data gathered during the JJCPA evaluation.

It is important to note that these recommendations do not represent a complete plan for JJCPA services, but instead include potential service options that will need to be prioritized through a planning process.

Following the analysis of service needs, we provide a brief overview of currently funded JJCPA programs that involve co-case management and service provision between Probation and another entity.

---

29 As stated above, probation offices should refer youth on probation to services; for youth not on probation, referrals to services should be through another department such as the Office of Diversion and Reentry (ODR).
Existing Services, Unmet Needs, and Recommendations

The table below presents an overview of service needs identified through this analysis. For each area of need, we discuss the following:

i. Whether or not JJCPA currently funds services to address it;
ii. If so, whether or not the currently-funded service is implemented in alignment with best practice approaches discussed in Section A;
iii. What, if any, unmet needs exist in this domain; and
iv. Recommendations to better meet the identified need.

**Table B2. Existing Services and Unmet Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>JJCPA Services</th>
<th>Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Unmet Service Needs</th>
<th>Recommendations³⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Behavioral Health Services | • Youth Substance Abuse  
• Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment  
• Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)  
• Juvenile Mental Health Court | • Providing mental health screening, assessment, and treatment for youth involved in the delinquency system is in alignment with best practices. However, the Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment program currently funded by JJCPA is more accurately described as part of a necessary custodial intake process than as a service designed to address youths’ needs.  
• MST is an EBP and includes technical assistance and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure it is implemented with fidelity | • Substance abuse services in or near youth’s neighborhoods  
• Services for transition age youth (TAY)/17 year olds about to age out  
• Substance abuse services that utilize evidence based practices, are age-appropriate (e.g., AA/NA programs for teens), and are appropriate for the level of substance use/abuse  
• Affordable or no cost juvenile sex offending counseling, cognitive behavioral interventions in the community, and detox services | • Fund more community-based substance abuse treatment in neighborhoods with high density of youth on probation  
• Differentiate between in-custody mental health screening as a routine process compared to services intended to respond to youth’s mental needs; use JJCPA funding to support the latter |

³⁰ Recommendations do not necessarily need to be addressed through JJCPA funds. When determining how to address unmet needs, the JJCC should consider funding sources such as YOBG, DCFS, Title IV-E, MHSA, or others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>JICPA Services</th>
<th>Alignment with Best Practices</th>
<th>Unmet Service Needs</th>
<th>Recommendations[^30]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Education</td>
<td>• Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT)</td>
<td>• ACT is based, at least in part, on a “scared straight” model and takes an intimidation approach that warns parents and children about the legal consequences of truancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safe Passages</td>
<td>• As currently operated in LA County, Safe Passages is not implemented with fidelity to the evidence-based model, which should include a partnership between schools, law enforcement agencies, local faith-based organizations and other community-based organizations, business owners, residents, and others. All of these partners have a critical role to play in creating safe environments for youth to travel to and from school. As currently implemented, JICPA’s Safe Passages program involves increased deployment of law enforcement resources without leveraging or partnering with other community resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational advocacy</td>
<td>• Replace ACT with an asset-based, family and community centered approach to truancy reduction that helps families address issues that limit regular school attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• System navigation for parents</td>
<td>• Fund community-based providers in schools to provide tutoring/academic support for high need youth, and educational advocacy and system navigation for youth and families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tutoring/academic support</td>
<td>• The Positive Youth Development School Liaison position piloted by Vallejo Unified School District as part of the Positive Youth Justice Initiative and the Academic Achievement Program implemented in Oakland Unified School District by the Oakland Human Services Department offer promising models for using community-based providers to supporting school needs of youth on probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reassess need for Safe Passages across different LA County neighborhoods. If a service need is identified, ensure a program is implemented with fidelity to a best practice model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>JICPA Services</td>
<td>Alignment with Best Practice Service Approach</td>
<td>Unmet Service Needs</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Career</td>
<td>• High-Risk/High-Need Employment&lt;br&gt;• Economic Workforce Development&lt;br&gt;• Educational Pathways and Vocational Opportunities (EPVO)&lt;br&gt;• Parks and Recreation Services</td>
<td>• Educational programming providers take an asset-based approach to working with youth, providing both job readiness and job retention support for youth on probation.&lt;br&gt;• Current employment programming contracts do not provide enough support for job development or allow providers to subsidize employment, which can support job development&lt;br&gt;• Services are not focused on youth development and have a limited emphasis on skill development and career pathways</td>
<td>• Career readiness and professional skill-building&lt;br&gt;• Vocational training&lt;br&gt;• Creative and alternative career training&lt;br&gt;• Services for TAY/17 year olds about to age out&lt;br&gt;• Access to community college courses</td>
<td>• Increase focus on job development; toward this end, providers should be able to subsidize employment for up to 6-months to increase the likelihood that employers will hire youth&lt;br&gt;• Increase opportunities for vocational skill development, and align vocational training with career opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Many of the programs offered through New Earth in LA County – including FLOW, YouthBuild, and Explore – involve vocational skill-building and linkage to paid employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Not funded by JICPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Housing linkage assistance for youth and families with unstable housing&lt;br&gt;• Alternative housing for youth who cannot live at home&lt;br&gt;• Services for TAY/17 year olds about to age out</td>
<td>• Partner with the LA County Homeless Initiative, particularly housing navigation and housing problem-solving for TAY&lt;br&gt;• Establish pathways to LA County’s Coordinated Entry System (CES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>JICPA Services</td>
<td>Alignment with Best Practice Service Approach</td>
<td>Unmet Service Needs</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Skills</strong></td>
<td>Not funded by JICPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Independent living type services for youth on probation (similar to what foster youth receive)</td>
<td>• Add a financial literacy component to employment and educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Emotional and Relational Support</strong></td>
<td>HRHN Home-Based and Gender-Specific Home-Based Community Cadet Leadership Program</td>
<td>• Home-Based provides accessible services to high-risk individuals in home, engages families, and is cognitive in nature</td>
<td>• Gender-specific, culturally-responsive services for males</td>
<td>• Update HRHN Home-Based and Gender-Specific Home-Based curriculum and extend the length of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Home-Based curriculum is not implemented with fidelity to the evidence-based model and is currently implemented in 6-8 weeks, not the 6 months recommended by the model. In addition, the curriculum is outdated, largely punitive, and not culturally responsive</td>
<td>• Programs focusing on self-regulation and distress tolerance, decision-making, relationships skills with family, peers, and adults</td>
<td>• Broaden the definition of gender-specific services to include boys/young men, transgender, and gender non-conforming youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is unclear how the Gender-Specific Home Based curriculum is tailored to girls and whether it addresses female-specific needs</td>
<td>• Peer and adult mentoring services</td>
<td>• Provide mentoring services, particularly for young men of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No data is collected on the implementation of the Cadet Leadership Programs, therefore it is not possible to assess its alignment with best practices. In addition, the program is not currently included in the CMJJP, despite being provided with JICPA funding.</td>
<td>• Leadership and community skills</td>
<td>o The Transformative Mentoring Program, developed by Oakland’s The Mentoring Center is an intensive group mentoring program that is based on a cognitive-based curriculum developed by African American men working primarily with African American boys and young men. It has been adapted in New York City as part of the Arches Transformative Mentoring program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict resolution such as restorative and transformative justice programs</td>
<td>• Services for TAY/17 year olds about to age out</td>
<td>• Contract with community-based organizations to provide programming focused on personal growth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>JJCPA Services</td>
<td>Alignment with Best Practice Service Approach</td>
<td>Unmet Service Needs</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/ Caregiver Support</td>
<td>Not funded by JJCPA&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Wraparound services that include the family&lt;br&gt;• Support with basic needs, homelessness&lt;br&gt;• Parenting support for families</td>
<td>• Add programs that provide individual and group mental health support to parents/caregivers&lt;br&gt;• Increase awareness of and linkage to parenting skill-building programs&lt;br&gt;• Incorporate family liaisons into existing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Recreational Services</td>
<td>Writing Program (Inside Out Writers)&lt;br&gt; Afterschool Enrichment&lt;br&gt; o Parks and Rec&lt;br&gt; o Housing Based</td>
<td>Inside Out Writers focuses on creative expression and youth development&lt;br&gt; JJCPA funding supports a wide array of youth arts and recreational programming. Because little information is shared with Probation about these services, it is not possible to assess their alignment with best practices.</td>
<td>• Arts-focused programming in the areas of employment/ career and socio-emotional development</td>
<td>• As noted above, incorporate more art and recreation focus into both Employment/ Career and Socio-Emotional and Relational Support services&lt;br&gt;• Define a service delivery model for current Afterschool Enrichment programs provided via Parks and Rec and Housing-based programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>31</sup> Home-Based programs and MST work with parents to support their children but do not include services for parents as the primary target.
JJCPA-Funded Co-Case Management Models

In addition to the services discussed above, there are three JJCPA-funded programs that involve co-case management between Probation and another entity.\(^{32}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Service Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Directions                       | • Coordinated Probation and CBO case management for youth on informal probation combined with access to a range of needed services. | • Services span behavioral health, parent support, education, employment and more. | • Work with ODR to define role of Probation in diversion as part of countywide diversion  
• Low-risk youth should not be placed on probation supervision |
| Housing-Based Supervision and Services | • Coordinated Probation and City and County housing authorities case management for youth on probation and at-risk youth  
• Housing services include field trips, ad hoc events, and employment training | • Services span arts and recreation, education, and employment | • Delineate supervision from services  
• Probation officers should not supervise at-risk youth  
• Define service delivery model for youth not on probation  
• Low-risk youth should not be placed on probation supervision |
| Parks-Based Supervision and Services   | • Coordinated Probation and City and County Parks & Rec Departments case management for youth on probation and at-risk youth  
• Parks services include an afterschool program, teen club, youth sports league, youth employment internship program, and ad hoc events | • Services span arts and recreational, education, and employment | • Delineate supervision from services  
• Probation officers should not supervise at-risk youth  
• Define service delivery model for youth not on probation  
• Low-risk youth should not be placed on probation supervision |

\(^{32}\) School-Based Probation is not included here because it does not involve co-case management with another entity. RDA’s evaluation of School-Based Probation is presented in our Program Effectiveness Report.
C. System Capacity and Administration

This section presents findings and recommendations related to the overall capacity and administration of the Probation Department and contracted public and community agencies involved in JJCPA. We review the following domains: C1) data collection and evaluation, C2) service delivery collaboration and coordination, C3) the contracting process, C4) staffing and training, and C5) the CMJJP planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1. Data Collection and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collection and ongoing monitoring and evaluation are crucial to developing and maintaining a data-driven system that responds to needs and promotes equity in the system. Collecting and analyzing data on program implementation and program-specific outcomes will help increase transparency about what programs do, who they serve, and the impact they achieve, including both short-term program specific outcomes related to youth wellbeing and longer-term delinquency outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current System Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data availability varies across programs and providers. There is little standardization of the data that the Probation Department receives from JJCPA service providers, and several public agencies do not provide any data to the Probation Department. Data primarily supports program impact measurements as defined by long-term outcomes (e.g., recidivism or crime rates), rather than short- or intermediate-term outcomes. Overall, limits on data standardization, quality assurance measures, and IT infrastructure and staff capacity create challenges for data extraction and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outcome measures intended to measure impact do not always align with the goals of each individual program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Probation has limited capacity to conduct evaluations or support evaluation activities. Though Probation stores JJCPA data, they do not have quality assurance measures in place to maintain accurate and complete data. Data pulls require assistance from Probation’s IT department, the Information Services Bureau, whose staff are not familiar with JJCPA operations. The lack of data standardization makes data extraction and analysis time-consuming and challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing data and evaluation capacity—which includes data collection, quality assurance, data extraction, and analysis—requires investments in staff and data systems. We recommend the Probation Department follow recommendations regarding data capacity and data collection outlined in the Los Angeles County Probation Workgroup Report33 and the Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study,34 including recommended data measures, a plan for evaluation, recommendations for the creation of a Probation Research and Evaluation Unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### C2. Service Delivery Collaboration and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Current System Capacity</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Collaboration and communication are key elements of a well-coordinated system that meets the needs of youth and families. | - The Probation Department does not specify a model to guide how public agencies should coordinate service delivery across programs. Due to the unique nature of each program’s scope, each public agency program generally operates independently from other JJCPA programs. Many public agencies shared that they would like to have more regular communication with other JJCPA program providers.  
- There are few structured avenues for communication among contracted CBO providers.  
- There are gaps in awareness of both probation officers and service providers about the available JJCPA programs and their eligibility and referral criteria.  
- Cluster meetings that include Probation Supervisors and contracted providers are useful in sharing information across staff. However, there is inconsistency in the structure and content of these meetings depending on the cluster. | - Establish opportunities for public agencies and CBOs to coordinate service delivery and inform program design. Providers hold on-the-ground knowledge, but do not have many opportunities to learn from each other’s experiences or, in the case of CBOs, shape program design. There should be venues for providers to convene in a more active planning and coordination capacity. The Probation Department could create additional forums or leverage existing forums, such as the cluster meetings or JJCC meetings.  
- Provide regular onboarding and training for all probation officers on available programs, eligibility criteria, and the referral process.  
- Ensure policies and procedures are in place that incorporate the participation of youth and families in determining service needs and preferences. |

### C3. Contracting Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Current System Capacity</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - The contracting process has a significant impact on the design and delivery of JJCPA programs. Contracting agencies are gatekeepers for JJCPA funding and determine the scopes of work for contracted partners. | - Some JJCPA programs have clearly defined populations and services, while others do not. CBOs have more detailed and stringent contracting and reporting requirements than public agencies.  
- The level of standardization across CBO contracts promotes consistency in service delivery, but limits the degree to which CBOs can tailor their delivery of services to the needs of clients and families.  
- Community-based organizations experience the contracting process as burdensome, punitive, and inflexible.  
- Underspending of JJCPA contracts has historically been a significant issue.  
- There are CBOs that could provide useful services but do not have the technical capacity to win a contract. | - Provide providers discretionary funding that can be used for supplemental services to support youth and their families.  
- Provide capacity building technical assistance to community-based organizations around how to successfully apply to an RFP and provide high-quality services to youth and families.  
- For services for youth not on probation, JJCPA funding should be contracted through another County department, not the Probation Department.  
- Consider having contracts not by cluster/area but by areas with similar needs, demographics, and existing resources, such as the Service Planning Areas (SPA) developed by the LA County Department of Public Health. |
## C4. Staffing and Training

### Importance
- For programs and administration to function effectively, it is important to ensure that staff have the requisite training and preparation.

### Current System Capacity
- Public agency staffing and training varies across programs.
- There is not consistent training in trauma-informed care or youth development among JJCPA providers and administrators.
- Staff have training needs around data and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Provide trauma-informed care/systems, youth development, and adolescent brain development training for all JJCPA service providers, including Probation (including administrative staff), public agencies, and CBOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide training in data collection and evaluation for identified staff in each agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C5. Planning and Oversight

### Importance
- A transparent and collaborative planning and oversight processes is essential for creating a plan that is responsive to local needs and is co-owned by all stakeholders.

### Current System Capacity
- Agency leadership agreed that the CMJJP development process has not been inclusive, collaborative, or participatory. There has not been sufficient opportunity for stakeholders to inform or provide input on draft plans.
- JJCC meetings have not been participatory; the structure, agenda, and facilitation of the meetings has not allowed for full participation and discussion among stakeholders.
- The decision to add members to the JJCC and create an advisory body is a step in the right direction toward a more inclusive planning and oversight structure.

### Recommendations
- The JJCC should engage in ongoing community planning and oversight of implementation. “Key stakeholder groups including youth and families, should be invited to discuss the report findings and identify policy and practice changes needed to effectively address current challenges and support for positive youth development” (Probation Outcomes Study, pp. 140-141). See Appendix A. *Recommendations for CMJJP Planning Process* for detailed planning recommendations.
  - JJCC members should have the knowledge and capacity necessary to meaningfully engage in planning and oversight
  - In addition, there should be a process to conduct regular reassessments of community needs and resources. There should be policies and procedures for the inclusion of communities of color and justice system-impacted communities in regular assessments of community needs and assets.
  - The development of JJCC meeting agendas should be more transparent and collaborative than it currently is, with a clear set of objectives related to ongoing oversight of the service delivery system.
    - Agendas and materials should be disseminated in advance.
    - Meeting schedule and location, materials, minutes, reports, etc. should be posted on a dedicated website.
Appendix A. Recommendations for CMJJP Planning Process

Roles & Responsibilities

**Project Manager:** Point person who will lead the process, including facilitating working group meetings, preparing for and leading presentations to the steering committee, scheduling meetings, preparing materials, following up on next steps.

**Working group:** Team of 4-6 individuals who will work with the project manager to implement steps of the planning process (described below). While the project manager will move the process forward, the workgroup will “do the work” of creating the content for the process, and working group members should be prepared to dedicate a minimum of 15 hours a month.

This group should be comprised of individuals who sit on the JJCC and the JJCC Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and can represent key stakeholders to the CMJJP plan, such as Probation, community members, CBOs and other public agencies that play a central role in the County juvenile system of care. To ensure efficacy and productivity, no more than 5 people, beside the Project Manager, should participate in the working group.

**Steering Committee:** The JJCC and the CAC should act as the steering committee to the planning process. At each stage in the process, the PM and working group should present their work to the steering committee, solicit their input, and make changes to reflect this input. They will need to meet monthly to develop a plan within four months.

Planning Process

Assessment

The purpose of this step is to review available data to determine the landscape of clients, services, and needs for the CMJJP to address. Given the volume of reports on and analyses of justice-involved youth and systems in LA County over the past several years, and the available timeline for CMJJP planning, this process should focus reviewing existing reports rather than primary data collection. Examples of reports for suggested inclusion are:

- JJCPA Evaluation Landscape Analysis (2017)
- A Roadmap For Advancing Youth Diversion In Los Angeles County (2017)
- LA County Probation Workgroup Report (2017)
- LA County Public Defender CARE Project Evaluation (2017)
- Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study (2015)
The working group should review these reports to identify themes that can inform service delivery planning, and then review and validate these with the steering committee via the following steps:

1. Each working group member reviews reports independently to develop his/her own initial set of themes.
2. The project manager facilitates a work session in which working group members discuss their individual impressions and develop a set of agreed upon themes.
3. The working group and project manager present these themes to the steering committee to solicit input and validate themes.
4. Based on steering committee feedback, the working group revises and finalizes assessment area themes.

Once developed, these themes act as a set of priority areas for the JJCC to focus on and develop a plan to address. This involves two key further steps: strategy development and plan development.

**Strategy Development**

After agreeing on a set of priority areas for the JJCC to focus on, the working group will convene again to develop a set of strategies with which to address these areas. To the extent possible, the project manager should prepare examples of interventions to address similar issues from other jurisdictions and initiatives, in addition to leveraging the knowledge and expertise of working group members. Similar to the assessment process, working group members will need to prepare independently for a work session, which the project manager will then facilitate so the group can coalesce around a set of core strategies for addressing the agreed upon issues. After the working group develops a preliminary set of strategies, they should present these strategies to the steering committee for their input, and then revise the strategies accordingly. Depending on the number of strategies developed, the working group and/or the steering committee may want to have a prioritization discussion to agree on the relative importance of each strategy. This will ensure that all strategies are not given equal weight or funding in plan development.

**Plan Development**

Having developed (and possibly prioritized) a set of strategies for addressing the issues raised through the assessment, the working group will reconvene, using the strategies as a framework for developing a plan. Working group members should delineate a set of actions or implementation steps for how each of these strategies should be implemented via the CMJJP. These steps will describe what activities the CMJJP will fund in order to address issue areas related to each strategy. After developing a set of steps for implementing each strategy, the working group will present them to the steering committee to solicit their input and then make revisions accordingly.

---

35 These should be issue areas that could be addressed through the investment of JJCPA resources. Examples of possible themes include topics such as service gaps, geography, best practices, populations with special needs, and data collection.
Appendix B. Evaluation Stakeholder Advisory Committee

The Evaluation Stakeholder Advisory Committee met five times over the course of the project with the RDA evaluation team and the Probation Department to guide evaluation priorities and activities. The committee was composed of key project stakeholders including public agencies, community-based organizations, and a community at-large representative.

Committee Members

Akuyoe Graham, Spirit Awakening  
Albert Gomez, LA County Parks and Recreation  
Anne Tremblay, City of LA - Mayor's Office  
Betsy Lindsay, LA County Housing Authority  
Blinky Rodriguez, Communities in Schools  
Carol Biondi, At-Large Community  
Jeff Farber, Helpline Youth Counseling  
Jewel Forbes, LA County Office of Education  
Jose Esqueda, Asian American Drug Abuse Program  
Karen Streich, Department of Mental Health  
Kimberley Daughton, Asian Youth Center  
Natasha Khamashta, LA County Public Defender's Office  
Sheila Mitchell, LA County Probation  
Tricia Penrose, Superior Court (Juvenile)

Final Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

On April 3, 2018, the JJCPA Evaluation Stakeholder Advisory Committee met to discuss the Gap Analysis findings and recommendations. Participants broke into two groups: Service Needs and System Administration/Capacity. The Service Needs group discussed the array of services that they believe JJCPA should and should not fund, as well as modifications to existing programs. The System Administration/Capacity group discussed the prioritization of recommendations. Notes from the meeting are presented below and reflect group discussion, but not committee consensus.

Service Needs. The Service Needs group discussed the following:

- There is an overarching need for countywide data, including information about existing gaps/resources and needs and available resources and initiatives in other systems
- JJCPA should fund services, not supervision. JJCPA should not fund probation or police officer salaries, other money is available to fund supervision
- Safe Passages, the Cadet Program, and Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT) should no longer be funded by JJPCA, as there are better ways to meet these needs
- The JJCC should decide whether JJCPA should fund services for transition-age youth (TAY). Individuals can be on juvenile probation until 25 years old, but individuals 18+ would not be at-risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system.
- JJCPA-funded services should be trauma-informed; available to all youth; collaborative; have mechanisms to ensure quality control and be evaluated; and be supported by technical assistance and training.
- JJCPA should fund the following additional activities: intentional, pro-social youth development; substance abuse (community-based services); mental health; programs in facilities; life

---

36 April 3rd meeting attendees included: Akuyoe Graham, Anne Tremblay, Betsy Lindsay, Carol Biondi, Jewel Forbes, Karen Streich, Kimberley Daughton, Natasha Khamashta, Patricia Soung, Winston Peters, Sheila Mitchell, Jack Sims, and Jennifer Kaufman.
skills/ongoing services; mentoring; housing supports, services; and family-focused services/Family Functional Therapy (FFT). *The group did not reach consensus about this list.*

**System Administration/Capacity.** Table 4 reflects the system administration/capacity group’s recommendations about the prioritization of recommendations.

**Table 4. System Administration/Capacity Report Back**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Recommendations</th>
<th>Long Term Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and oversight</td>
<td>Conduct ongoing assessments of youth/community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‧ Engage in a collaborative planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‧ Assess of community needs and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‧ Ensure transparent and collaborative development of JJCC meeting agendas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a cross-training summit (outside of JJCC) for providers from Probation, other public agencies, and CBOs</td>
<td>Provide ongoing professional development and cross-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align evaluation with program design, get a county definition of recidivism</td>
<td>Strengthen data and evaluation systems, infrastructure, and data sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a community capacity fund to support equity by providing technical assistant to CBOs about how to successfully apply for a RFP and deliver services effectively</td>
<td>Provide ongoing communication capacity technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical alignment of partners</td>
<td>Philosophical alignment of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain Office of Youth Diversion and Development (OYDD) support for non-system involved youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>