

LA Probation Governance Study

120 Day Status Report



Prepared by:

Resource Development Associates

February 7, 2017



This page intentionally left blank.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... 2

Introduction 7

Review of Existing Research, Reports, and Recommendations..... 8

Preliminary Meetings with Stakeholders..... 19

Preliminary Findings and Recommendations 25

 Findings 25

 Recommendations 26

Conclusion and Next Steps..... 28

Appendix A: Probation Governance Study Revised Workplan 32

Appendix B. Documents Reviewed 38



Executive Summary

This 120-day report provides an interim update on project progress, including activities completed to date, initial findings, and preliminary recommendations. Moreover, this report, coming one-third of the way into the implementation of the Governance Study, is intended to ensure that the Board, Chief Executive's Office (CEO), Probation Department, and other entities invested in the implementation and impact of this project remain active partners to this effort and have the information necessary to ensure the project aligns with the County's goals and objectives. Table 4 presents a summary of activities to date.

Table 1. Summary of Project Activities Completed

Activity	Date Completed
Phase I: Project Launch and Discovery	
Project Kickoff Meeting	Sept. 20, 2016
Review and Analysis of Existing Reports and Documentation	Sept. 21, 2016–Nov. 30, 2016
Preliminary Meetings with Project Stakeholders	Sept. 21, 2016–Oct. 27, 2016
Launch Project Advisory Committee	Nov. 30, 2016, Jan. 11, 2017
Finalize Project Workplan	Dec. 6, 2016
Phase II: Best Practice Research	
Begin Best Practice Literature Reviews	Dec. 2016–Jan. 2017
Phase III: Assessment of LA Probation Structure and Operations	
Submit Request for LA Probation Department Client Data	Dec. 6, 2016
Review Probation Client Data Systems Adult Probation System (APS) and Probation Case Management System (PCMS)	Dec. 21, 2016

Review of Existing Research, Reports, and Recommendations

Over the past three months, the RDA Project Team reviewed more than 100 existing reports and documentation related to the structure and operations of the LA County Probation Department to gain insight into (1) how the Department currently operates; (2) what other research, reports, audits, and assessments have identified as the Department's strengths and challenges; and (3) the Department's stated goals and objectives, and plans for achieving those.

Table 2. Examples of Documentation Reviewed

Document Type	Sample of Documents Reviewed
Current Operations	Probation Department Policies and Procedures Manuals
	Job descriptions
	Organization charts
Investigative Reports	Internal Audits (Auditor-Controller's Office)
	External Audits (Consultants)



	US Department of Justice (DOJ) investigation findings, settlement agreements, and monitoring reports for camps and juvenile halls
External Research and Evaluation	Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study
	Rising Up, Speaking Out
	JJCPA Evaluations
Planning Documents	Probation Department Strategic Plan 2015-2018
	Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan
	LA County AB 109 Implementation Plan

Preliminary Meetings with Stakeholders

Between September and October 2016, members of the RDA Project Team sat down for more than 30 face-to-face discussions with approximately 50 Los Angeles County Probation Department stakeholders. See Table 7 for an inventory of stakeholders interviewed.

Table 3. Preliminary Interview Participants

Stakeholder Group	Meeting Participants
County Leadership	Board of Supervisors Offices
Probation Department Executive Management	Interim Chief Probation Officer
	Administrative Deputy
	Dep. Chief Residential Treatment
	Dep. Chief Facilities
	Dep. Chief Field Services (2)
	Dep. Chief Professional Standards
	Chief Information Officer
Unions Representing Probation Department Staff	AFSCME Local 685
	AFSCME Local 1967
	SEUI Local 721
	SEUI Local 721/BU 702
Legal System Agencies	Presiding Judges, Supervising Judges, Court Executive Officers
	Alternative Public Defender's Office
	District Attorney's Office
	Public Defender's Office
Partner Public Departments	City of LA Gang Reduction Youth Development Program (GRYD)
	County Office of Education
	Dept. of Health Services
	Dept. of Children & Family Services
	Dept. of Mental Health
	Sheriff's Department
Community-based Organizations	LA Regional Reentry Partnership Steering Committee
	United Healthcare Housing Partners
Justice Reform Advocates	ACLU of Southern California
	Children's Defense Fund – California



	Urban Peace Institute
	Youth Justice Coalition
Research Partners	Dr. Denise Herz and Ms. Kristine Chan
	Children's Data Network
	County Executive's Office's Research and Evaluation Services

Preliminary Findings and Recommendations

Preliminary Findings

The following findings, based on activities to-date, are preliminary and will continue to evolve as we dive deeper into Probation Department operations over the next several months.

- **Strategic Vision.** Stakeholders report a varying sense of purpose or strategic vision for the Department.
- **Organizational Culture.** There does not appear to be a culture or process for acknowledging the hard work and achievements of individual employees or of the Department as a whole, which makes staff feel defensive and underappreciated.
- **Communication.** There is a desire for intentional and regular messaging from leadership to provide an organized and articulated vision for the Department and appreciate staff for their hard work.
- **Staff Shortages.** Understaffing impedes the Department's ability to carry out a number of tasks and implement recommendations raised in previous reports, in addition to lowering staff morale due to staff feeling unsupported.
- **Operational Inefficiencies.** Hiring, contracting, procurement, etc. appear to move extremely slowly, reducing the availability of staff and service providers to work with clients
- **Data and Evaluation.** The Department is still working to fully define how to use data and data systems for case management, supervision, and evaluation.
- **Lack of Implementation of Previous Recommendations.** There has been slow progress in addressing many of the core issues delineated in existing studies and audits.

Preliminary Recommendations

As with the findings, the recommendations provided here are based on our preliminary analysis of Department processes and operations. They are not comprehensive and will be built upon over the course of this project.

- **Strategic Planning.** The Department needs to definitively define a core strategic mission and vision, express it broadly and frequently, and use that unified strategic vision to drive all of its efforts to address other issues described.
- **Client Service Delivery**
 - **Unified Systemic Planning for Juvenile Operation.** The County should convene an ongoing stakeholders group to fully analyze and plan for juvenile and transition aged youth (TAY) services. The Department should work collaboratively with the foundation



community, including and especially the Annie E. Casey Foundation, to retain consultants and form a collaborative decision making process with key stakeholders to comprehensively assess and plan for its juvenile service needs.

- **Assessments and Planning.** Replace the current risk assessment tools with evidence-based, validated tools that measures risk and needs, and spell out circumstances when they may be overridden. If not already in place, develop and implement juvenile and adult Response Matrixes to provide graduated sanctions and rewards that respond consistently, appropriately, and developmentally to behavior.
 - **Community-based Services.** Expedite the disbursement of funds for community-based services—especially those that have gone unspent—including Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG), Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), Title IV-E Waiver and SB 678.
 - **Adult Services.** Expand the availability of services offered by AB 109 programs to all adults on active supervision (there is no rule or statute prohibiting this).
 - **Voluntary Probation.** Examine the use of “voluntary”/WIC 236 supervision. Clear criteria, measurable outcomes, and monitoring of its use should be systematically reported.
- **Organizational Culture**
- Begin a system-wide practice of appreciative inquiry and asset identification.
 - Develop an intra-agency communications plan and process.
 - Establish a regular Probation Department newsletter that can be distributed on a monthly or bi-monthly basis to provide updates and appreciations and a brief intranet page to provide updates to staff.
 - Develop and promote a schedule of organizational events, including optional trainings for sworn and non-sworn staff, as well as other events for employees to engage with each other across the Department chain-of-command.
- **Staffing and Hiring.** Prior to making recommendations to streamline and simplify the background check process for new job applicants, we should understand what the current process is, how it is implemented and where bottlenecks occur.
- **Data Collection and Use.** Expedite the process of purchasing or developing a modern data system for adult probation client. At the same time, the Department should establish clear guidelines around required data entry for juvenile and adult clients and ensure that all staff—including line staff, managers, supervisors and executive staff—review this data on an ongoing basis.

Next Steps

Key next steps include:

- **Identification of Best Practices and Model Jurisdictions**
 - The Project Team will identify best practices in key domains as identified through preliminary data collection activities, including 1) Organizational systems and management in probation and community corrections; 2) juvenile probation service delivery models; and 3) adult probation service delivery models.



- Through our research into best practices, the Project Team will identify a series of jurisdictions that are implementing practices that may be adapted and/or adopted in LA County.
- **Assessment of Practices and Processes Currently in Use in LA County.** The Project Team has begun collecting qualitative and quantitative data in order to document and assess the Probation Department's juvenile and adult service delivery models.
- **Facilities.** The Project Team will work with the Probation Department, CEO, and juvenile court partners to understand and analyze County decision-making processes regarding youth out-of-home placement. We will work with these partners to develop a structured decision-making process for serving and supervising youth.
- **Staffing.** The Project Team is currently in the process of assessing Department policies, procedures, and processes regarding recruitment, hiring, training, and promotion for sworn and non-sworn staff.
- **Management and Leadership Practices.** The Project Team will identify best practices in management and leadership as they pertain to probation agencies and other types of public agencies. We will compare and contrast currently management practices and leadership methods with those.
- **Fiscal.** Through an analysis of Department and County fiscal documentation, we will assess Department fiscal operations and expenditures

Conclusion

Over the past several years, numerous reports, audits, assessment, etc. have delineated a lengthy—and very impressive—list of recommendations for improving the LA County Probation Department. Given the repeated recommendations for improvement, we believe it is important to focus on operational processes and to ensure that future recommendations are considered in light of the entire system. Each step of the next phase of this study will incorporate a focus on obtaining an understanding of systemic operational processes.



Introduction

On Sept. 20, 2016, Resource Development Associates (RDA) and the County of Los Angeles Chief Executive's Office (CEO) and Probation Department kicked off the LA County Probation Governance Study, a 12-month project intended to assess the structure and operations of the LA County Probation Department (the Department) in relation to best practice and based on that assessment, to make recommendations for improvements. Stemming from a motion put forth by Supervisors Mark Ridley-Thomas and Sheila Kuehl and amended by Supervisors Hilda Solis and Don Knabe, this project will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Probation Department's current structure, including examining 1) budgets and funding sources, 2) staffing, 3) facilities, and 4) operations, in particular the efficacy of those operations for serving both juvenile and adult populations. In addition, this project will 1) document best practices in the field of probation supervision and service delivery; 2) identify local, national, and international model jurisdictions against which to compare the Department's structure and operations; and 3) make recommendations regarding whether the Department would better serve clients from different age groups if it were divided into separate departments for juveniles and adults and, if so, where transition aged youth (TAY) would be best served.

120 Day Report

This report provides the LA County Chief Executive's Office and the Board of Supervisors with an interim update on project progress, including activities completed to date, initial findings, and preliminary recommendations. Moreover, this report, coming one-third of the way into the implementation of the Governance Study, is intended to ensure that the Board, CEO, Probation Department, and other entities invested in the implementation and impact of this project remain active partners to this effort and have the information necessary to ensure the project aligns with the County's goals and objectives. Table 4 presents a summary of activities to date.

Table 4. Summary of Project Activities Completed to Date

Activity	Date Completed
Phase I: Project Launch and Discovery	
Project Kickoff Meeting	September 20, 2016
Review and Analysis of Existing Reports and Documentation	September 21, 2016–November 30, 2016
Preliminary Meetings with Project Stakeholders	September 21, 2016–October 27, 2016
Launch Project Advisory Committee	November 30, 2016
Finalize Project Workplan	December 6, 2016
Phase II: Best Practice Research	
Begin Best Practice Literature Reviews	December 2016–January 2017
Phase III: Assessment of LA Probation Structure and Operations	



Submit Request for LA Probation Department Client Data	December 6, 2016
Review Probation Client Data Systems (Adult Probation System (APS) and Probation Case Management System (PCMS))	December 21, 2016

As this table evidences, two of the central components of the launch of this project were 1) reviewing and analyzing existing reports and documentation and 2) conducting preliminary meetings with project stakeholders. Both of these activities are critical for project success for a number of reasons. First and foremost, over the past decade or so, the LA County Probation Department has been subject to intense scrutiny, including two separate US Department of Justice (DOJ) settlement agreements with ongoing monitoring, multiple internal and external audits, and both County-contracted and independently sought evaluations of Department programs and services. In this context, it is important that this project understand the work that has come before to ensure that we build upon this work rather than duplicating it. Moreover, because the majority of prior reports and recommendations have focused on particular aspects of the Department's operations rather than on a comprehensive assessment of the Department, this project represents a unique opportunity to integrate these disparate analyses into one place, identify patterns that may have been missed previously, and allow for a broader set of findings and recommendations.

It is important to note that, as of the writing of this report, the RDA project team has not yet conducted our own assessment of Probation Department structures and practices. Thus, we see this report and the analysis herein not as final and conclusive, but rather as a critical starting point for our assessment. In particular, we cannot yet determine the extent to which issues or concerns raised in past reports still exist, or whether and to what extent prior recommendations have been implemented. Our assessment of how the Department measures up to best practices and our identification and analysis of systemic problems will shed light on these issues in the coming months.¹

Review of Existing Research, Reports, and Recommendations

Over the past three months, the RDA Project Team reviewed more than 100 existing reports and documentation related to the structure and operations of the LA County Probation Department to gain insight into (1) how the Department currently operates; (2) what other research, reports, audits, and assessments have identified as the Department's strengths and challenges; and (3) the Department's stated goals and objectives, and plans for achieving those. Documents included department policies and procedures, external reports and evaluations, internal audits, and department plans. The bulk of the documents were provided by the Probation Department in response to a document request. To supplement the Department's compiled documents, the Project Team also sought guidance from project

¹ We appreciate the feedback and additional information that Probation staff have provided to our initial review of previous studies and reports. This information will support our efforts and help inform our research in the next stages of this study.



stakeholders regarding important background documentation and conducted our own internet search to identify additional reports and news media articles.

Table 5. Examples of Documentation Reviewed²

Document Type	Sample of Documents Reviewed
Current Operations	Probation Department Policies and Procedures Manuals
	Job descriptions
	Organization charts
Investigative Reports	Internal Audits (Auditor-Controller's Office)
	External Audits (Consultants)
	US Department of Justice (DOJ) investigation findings, settlement agreements, and monitoring reports for camps and juvenile halls
External Research and Evaluation	Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study
	Rise Up, Speak Out!
	JJCPA Evaluations
Planning Documents	Probation Department Strategic Plan 2015-2018
	Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan
	LA County AB 109 Implementation Plan

In addition to familiarizing the Project Team with the unique context and circumstances facing the Probation Department, the document review was particularly valuable in helping situate this project within the past and current Departmental assessments. Though extant reports do not necessarily reflect current conditions, learnings from past audits and evaluations provide a useful foundation from which this project can build. Additionally, pinpointing which previous recommendations for improvement have or have not been successfully implemented and why, we can help ensure that this project's recommendations are actionable and effective.

Using the domains delineated in the Governance Study Board Motion described above as our guiding framework, the Project Team analyzed documents within the following domains: client service delivery model, facilities, staffing, and fiscal operations. In addition, because obtaining data on Department clients and services are central to this project, we added the additional domain of Data/IT. This section presents a summary of key findings within each domain along with a summary of prior recommendations.

It is important to note that many of these reports and audits were requested in response to a perceived or documented deficiency within the Probation Department's structure or operations. For example, DOJ Monitoring Reports were intended to address documented civil rights violations within the County's juvenile halls and camps, while many of the internal and external audits were intended to further examine reported issues with the Department's processes such as use of funds, hiring, etc. As a result, the findings presented in these reports and summarized below are overwhelmingly negative and point to a need for reform. This should not be interpreted to mean that there are not high quality people and practices in the Department. To the contrary, despite the largely negative findings described below, through the course of our work to date, it has become clear that, across LA County—both within the Department and from

² See Appendix B for an inventory of all documents reviewed by the evaluation team.



the outside—there is a deep commitment to establishing a model Probation Department that provides high quality services for and supervision of clients and life long career and learning opportunities for its staff. One of the primary goals of this project is to leverage on this commitment and identify strengths that the Department can build on moving forward. Nonetheless, as our findings below indicate, there are a number of long-standing issues for the Department and County to address.

Client Service Delivery

The Probation Department has approximately 430 independent or joint contracts with agencies providing an array of human and social services to juvenile and adult populations, as well as contract services that support the Department's needs.¹ This includes 71 contracts with community-based organizations, in addition to a variety of other social service agencies, and contracting services to meet Departmental needs. There is limited information documenting the programs and services available to individuals on probation, particularly for adults. The bulk of information on adult programs is from AB 109 reports, however, these services are not available to all individuals under adult probation supervision.

As of March 31, 2016, there were about 7,000 people on post-release community supervision (PRCS) under AB 109.² These individuals receive risk assessments using the LS/CMI and, when appropriate, Department of Mental Health (DMH) staff conduct behavioral health assessments and the Department of Public Health, Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (DPH-SAPC) staff conduct substance abuse assessments. There are 12 providers that offer substance abuse services at 75 locations across the county.³ DMH offers a range of mental health services and HealthRight360 provides housing and employment services. Other AB 109 programs include:

- Breaking Barriers, a collaboration between DHS and Probation that provides housing, treatment, employment, and case management services;
- COIN, a residential co-occurring treatment program with a capacity of 20; and
- the Skid Row Homeless Pilot Program, a collaboration between Probation and the Los Angeles Police Department that undertakes operations to stop drugs from entering Skid Row and provides treatment outreach twice per month.⁴

Outside of AB 109 programming, the Back on Track Los Angeles pilot program—a collaboration between the California Attorney General's Office, Probation and the Sheriff's Department—provides jail-based and community-based reentry services for adults.

For youth in-custody programming and services, Department of Justice investigations found insufficient mental health care services in both the juvenile halls and camps, and insufficient educational services, medical health care, and rehabilitative programming in the juvenile halls.⁵ Additionally, a 2010 federal class-action lawsuit alleging that the rehabilitative and educational programs at Challenger youth probation camps were constitutionally deficient led to a settlement agreement that included an action plan to bring about systematic educational reform in the camps.⁶ The Department has been found in full compliance with provisions in the DOJ and class action settlement agreements, but recent audits indicate that Probation is not meeting all of its training requirements in juvenile halls or complying with



rehabilitation and behavior management policies and staff training requirements in the camps. In regard to camp reentry, a Camp Community Transition Program was put in place over two years ago, but youth and youth advocates cite a need for more resources to assist with youth reentry.⁷

Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs, many of which are offered by DMH and community-based organizations, fit into three categories: enhanced mental health services, enhanced services to high-risk/high-need youths, and enhanced school- and community-based services.⁸ Annual evaluations of these services found slightly more positive outcomes for JJCPA program participants than comparison youth,⁹ although these evaluations have been the source of significant controversy and the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) and Probation Department recently revised their expectations for evaluating JJCPA-funded programs and services.

With the exception of JJCPA programs, there are limited evaluations of programs and services. In particular, there is virtually no information about programs and services—or a general service delivery approach—for individuals under adult probation supervision unless they are AB 109 populations.

Last, there are opportunities to improve Probation's contracting practices. A 2015 contracting audit completed by the Department of Auditor-Controller indicated that, overall, the Department is in compliance with County policies and procedures regarding contracting. However, they found that Probation's scoring categories were very broad, thereby diminishing the transparency and objectivity of the scoring process.¹⁰ Additionally, Probation did not always document the reasons for certain decisions, such as how they chose which references to contact, why evaluators changed their scores, and why sole source contracts were necessary.¹¹

Previous Client Services Recommendations

Almost all program and service recommendations focus on youth, suggesting a greater emphasis on juvenile, rather than adult programming despite the fact that the Department has four times as many adults under supervision, compared to youth.¹² In addition to the DOJ recommendations outlined in the facilities section, other program-related recommendations include creating an integrated treatment system for all youth in camps¹³ and increasing the availability and diversity of programs offered in camps.¹⁴

In particular, a number of reports recommend increasing the amount of vocational training and life skills programs available to youth in camps and those out of custody.¹⁵ Reports also advise expanding or adding programs like dialectical behavior therapy (DBT), life skills, parenting programs, family therapy, celebrations of birthdays, and credit recovery.¹⁶ Based on interviews with youth in camps, one report recommended starting a mentorship program and changing the emphasis of substance abuse programs from abstinence to more engaging discussions about addiction and recovery.¹⁷

To better serve youth, a number of reports recommended increasing interagency collaboration, particularly with CBOs, to provide stronger support services to youth in camps.¹⁸ To support camp-to-community reentry, one report recommends creating a position of care coordinators to help youth access resources while they are in the camp and upon release.¹⁹



Facilities

Over the last fifteen years, the US Department of Justice (DOJ) has investigated, and subsequently monitored LA County's juvenile halls and probation camps. DOJ investigations found the conditions of the halls and camps to violate youth's rights in regards to medical and mental health care, protection from harm, and rehabilitative programming.²⁰ As a result of these investigations, LA County entered into a settlement agreement with DOJ that included ongoing monitoring of agreed-upon reforms from 2004-2009 in the juvenile halls and 2008-2014 in the camps. Upon conclusion of DOJ monitoring, the County was in full compliance with each settlement's requirements. However, recent Auditor-Controller reviews have found that Probation is not consistently meeting its staff training requirements in juvenile halls or complying with rehabilitation and behavior management policies and staff training requirements in the camps.²¹

Other reports and evaluations document similar concerns to the DOJ investigation findings, such as regimented, boot camp-like procedures in camps and widespread use of punitive approaches as behavior management including excessive use of force, pepper spray, verbal abuse, and group punishments.²² One recent sign of progress, due to a May 2016 Board of Supervisors' motion, is the end of juvenile solitary confinement. All special housing units are in the process of being redesigned to Healing Opportunity and Positive Engagement (HOPE) Centers.²³

A number of external reports highlight ongoing issues within Probation's juvenile halls and camps. Various reports identified safety and hygiene concerns within facilities.²⁴ For example, the 2015-16 Civil Grand Jury report described Central Juvenile Hall, a 100-year-old facility, as "deplorable and unacceptable for human inhabitation," though they did not find any problems in other two juvenile halls.²⁵ Youth reported unsanitary conditions in camp bathrooms, with limited access to meet their personal hygiene needs (e.g., three-minute showers, low-quality hygiene products, disposable paper underwear for girls).²⁶

Partially due to the remote location of most camps, youth had limited communication with family when they were detained in facilities. In camps, phone calls and visits were limited to once per week, and could be taken away as punishment.²⁷ In juvenile halls, the 2003 DOJ investigation found that youth received inconsistent access to telephones.²⁸

The facility design of juvenile halls and camps does not support rehabilitation. Large open dorms "can foster competition, deepen factions and further gang problems,"²⁹ creating an environment that feels unsafe for youth.³⁰ To address these issues, Camp Kilpatrick³ will have a smaller, rehabilitative home-like environment with a small group treatment model.³¹ Known as the LA model, there is hope that the design and treatment-approach in Camp Kilpatrick will positively influence the other camps and the whole Probation Department.³²

Last, there is indication that Probation is not making risk-based detention decisions. The Los Angeles Detention Screener (LADS) only classifies a small proportion of youth as high risk, but Probation

³ It is likely that Camp Kilpatrick will be renamed.



consistently overrides this score. While some overrides are done in order to comply with mandatory detention criteria or court orders, the DOJ found that other detention overrides appeared arbitrary and/or inconsistent, which has resulted in the detention of low and medium-medium risk youth.³³ The final DOJ camp monitoring report, from February 2015, included an evaluation of LADS and found that “Although the County completes the LADS for each youth brought to a juvenile hall, it has virtually no bearing on the detention decision that is eventually made.”³⁴

Previous Facilities Recommendations

The DOJ juvenile hall investigation report concludes with 66 remedial measures to address deficiencies in the areas of mental health care, juvenile confinement practices, medical care, education, safety and sanitation, and quality assurance.³⁵ The DOJ camp investigation’s list of 17 remedial measures span the areas of protecting youth from harm, suicide prevention, and mental health care.³⁶ In both reports, recommended measures focus on the development or improvement of programs, policies, and procedures to meet youths’ needs. These measures were incorporated into the DOJ settlement agreements, with which the Department achieved full compliance.

Through focus groups with youth who spent time in probation camps, a youth policy brief identified five key ways to improve probation camps: Increase availability and diversity of programs; foster mentorship and supportive relationships with probation officers; cultivate the dignity of youth at camp through increased privacy, cleanliness and nutrition; increase connections with family and community; and improve camp discipline and management procedures.³⁷ Many of these recommendations—particularly around cleanliness and privacy in the restrooms, food quality, family visitation, and group punishments—are echoed in a recent report based on interviews with 104 youth in camps.³⁸

In regards to risk-based detention decisions, the final DOJ camp monitoring report from February 2015 recommended convening key stakeholders to discuss the LADS evaluation’s findings, creating a plan to address main issues, and then monitoring LADS overrides monthly. After the override rate is lowered, they recommend conducting an outcome study to document the effect on public safety.³⁹

Staffing and Hiring

The Probation Department has approximately 6,600 budgeted positions and more than 80 facilities across the county, including 24 area offices and a number of pretrial service locations, day reporting centers, AB 109 offices, and juvenile halls and camps.⁴⁰ Approximately 70% of staff are sworn.⁴¹

Numerous reports pointed to staff vacancies and understaffing, particularly in facility classifications for entry-level positions such as Detention Services Officer (DSO) and Group Supervisor Night (GSN).⁴² As noted in the DOJ investigations, lack of sufficient staffing in facilities results in inadequate supervision in the juvenile halls and camps.⁴³

A key contributing factor to Probation’s understaffing is the Department’s inability to recruit and hire qualified candidates efficiently. A recent review of Probation’s hiring processes found that it takes an average of 9-11 months for new recruits to complete the background investigation process in LA County,



as compared to 3-9 months in the benchmark counties of Riverside, Sacramento, Orange, and San Diego.⁴⁴ The majority of applicants for sworn positions do not pass the background investigation; the Probation Department's website currently states that "80 percent of candidates who apply for sworn positions fail to make it through the background investigation phase."⁴⁵ Additionally, individuals in sworn positions must complete an academy within their first year. In 2014 and 2015, only 76% of candidates passed the academy, compared to 100% of candidates in benchmark counties.⁴⁶

Audits and investigations have found inadequate staff training across a variety of areas including proper use of force, mandated reporting, suicide prevention, and peace officer training.⁴⁷ Unmet training needs extended beyond officers alone, to proper administrative training for management in areas such as grants management, budgeting, and ethics.⁴⁸

The staff promotion process lacks transparency and is viewed as unfair by many staff. As noted in a 2010 assessment, "Staff have voiced concerns about the feeling of unfairness in promotions and special assignments, and the feeling that it isn't what you know, but who you know when promotions occur."⁴⁹ In a 2012 survey of over 100 Probation managers, only 16 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the promotion of staff is objective and fair.⁵⁰

Numerous reports describe low staff morale. This has been partially attributed to the understaffing throughout the Department, which leads staff to feel unsupported.⁵¹ Other factors leading to low morale include negative portrayals of the Department in the media and a promotion process that is perceived as unfair,⁵² as well as poor internal communication.

Communication between management and staff is lacking throughout the Department:

*...it is apparent that one of the Department's weaknesses is being able to effectively communicate at all levels. The Department's Executive Leadership Team members need to communicate more effectively amongst themselves and ensure that key information to the success of the organization is being communicated throughout all levels.*⁵³

Without clear communication or many opportunities to provide input, staff feel disconnected from management and the Department. In the 2012 manager survey, 57% of managers agreed or strongly agreed that decisions were often made without the input of the staff who will be most impacted.⁵⁴

Previous Staffing and Hiring Recommendations

A 2015 audit of Probation's recruitment, examination, hiring, and promotional practices found that the Department's hiring and promotional practices were generally in compliance with County policies and procedures.⁵⁵ To improve the hiring process, it recommended that the Department focus on improving its hiring and recruitment practices to address its underqualified staff and staff vacancies at all levels of the department.

Specific recommendations included creating a formal recruitment strategy, requiring some college courses for GSNs, adding steps to the recruitment process to ensure candidates are a good fit, and



reconsidering neighborhood canvassing (a time-consuming process that involves officers knocking on candidates' neighbors' doors to conduct interviews).⁵⁶ It also recommended strengthening the Department's internal control processes over hiring by establishing procedures to ensure candidates meet all minimum qualifications and more systematically documenting background screenings and that candidates possess necessary work experience.⁵⁷

Numerous reports emphasized the need to provide adequate training for all staff across the Department, including management teams and staff who work directly with youth and adults. Recommended management team trainings include: strategic planning, performance measurement, budgeting, and organizational management.⁵⁸ To provide employees with competency-based training before entering facilities and engaging with youth, reports recommended training in crisis intervention, diversity, working with youth with mental health needs, racial bias, and suicide prevention.⁵⁹

To address low staff morale and increase staff engagement, recommendations included establishing communication mechanisms to periodically provide department-wide updates and share Department successes.⁶⁰ To bring about culture change, one report recommends establishing a new governing structure and ensuring that all decision making is transparent and inclusive.⁶¹

Fiscal

A number of internal and external audits of the Probation Department underscore a range of issues with the Department's fiscal operations, including the lack of fiscal controls, poor grant administration, and management of capital funded projects. A 2014 report by the Auditor-Controller found that the Department failed to comply with the County Fiscal Management (CFM) requirements for establishing and cancelling commitments to vendors.⁶² Seventy percent of the commitments reviewed—totaling \$1.6 million—should have been cancelled because they were no longer needed, which would have resulted in funds being returned to the County General Fund. This audit also found that the Department did not maintain adequate subsidiary ledgers for trust funds.

A 2015 report identified several issues with Department fiscal controls, including cash handling, trust funds, accounts payable and commitments.⁶³ For examples, Department staff received cash from clients without providing receipts; area offices did not have a safe to secure funds; there was no accountability system in place to ensure that all monies received were verified by a second party; and receipts were not reconciled by a third party.⁶⁴ The report found that donation receipts were not issued to donors when donations were received at the juvenile halls, nor did the Department maintain a complete log or sequential receipt book to track donations received. For example, the Department received a \$10,000 donation from a donor in 2009 designated for a scholarship fund, but after 3 years less than \$500 of that donation had been expended and the donor requested and received a refund.⁶⁵ Additionally, despite the CFM policy stating that multiple individuals observe the intake of client property and cash, staff shortages impeded the ability of Probation to comply with this policy. By not strengthening its cash handling procedures, the Department increased the risk that payments can be stolen or lost during the collection process.



Audits by the County Auditor-Controller's Office and external auditors have investigated the Department's grant administration, particularly the administration of state funds earmarked for client services, such as the Community Incentive Corrections Performance Incentive Act (CCPI or SB 678), the Youthful Offenders Block Grant (YOBG), and the Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA). A 2015 audit by Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting (SEC) noted that for some funding sources, such as SB 678 and YOBG, fund balances have increased by \$82 million and \$11.6 million, respectively, over the last two fiscal years. In the case of YOBG, the balance increased because funds were not spent due to higher staff vacancy rates resulting in lower cost reimbursement claims, and Probation's use of General Fund revenue instead of submitting claims for allowable program costs.⁶⁶

The audit uncovered numerous instances in which the Department used the General Fund to cover costs that could have been funded through other sources. For examples, when FY 2014-15 YOBG expenditures outpaced annual allocations, the Department used County general funds to cover YOBG costs rather than using the \$5.6 million cash fund balance in YOBG trust funds.⁶⁷ At the end of FY 2014-15, JJCPA had a \$23.3 million cash balance, yet some eligible program expenditures were charged to the General Fund.⁶⁸ A 2015 audit of funding of the Department's facilities similarly found that Probation did not submit claims to draw down grant and program funds for reimbursement for SB 678 program costs from the CCPI Fund in FYs 2012-13 and 2013-14. This resulted in the Department using \$10.2 million of the county's General Fund monies to fund SB 678 program expenses.⁶⁹

Additionally, there have been significant balances of JJCPA funds that were allocated to community-based organizations (CBOs) that were not spent. In FY 2014-15, of the \$28.1 million JJCPA allocation, the Department budgeted approximately \$6.7 million for CBOs, but only awarded \$6.4 million to CBOs.⁷⁰ Of this \$6.4 million, the Department only spent \$3.2 million on CBOs' services, due to low referrals to services and CBOs' inability to achieve the outcomes required in JJCPA's deliverable-based contracts.⁷¹ As Table 6 shows, in FY13-14 and FY14-15, CBOs only drew down 59% and 54% of their program budgets, respectively. Additionally, over FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15, the Department used the County General Fund to cover \$450,000 of JJCPA CBO expenditures that could have been funded through JJCPA funds (see Net County Cost column in Table 6).⁷²

Table 6. JJCPA CBO Allocations and Expenditures⁷³

Fiscal Year	CBO Program Budget	Amount Claimed to Grant	Net County Cost	Total Expenditure	% of Budget Expended
FY 2013-14	\$6,651,013	\$3,644,827	\$303,089	\$3,947,916	59%
FY 2014-15	\$6,393,750	\$3,277,786	\$147,753	\$342,5539	54%

The Department also has a number of critical unfunded capital and deferred maintenance projects. A July 2015 Auditor-Controller audit reported that the Department had \$25.8 million in critical unmet needs in FY 2015-16, including a roof replacement at one juvenile hall, generator replacements to address air quality violations, and 28 crucial administrative positions within the Department.⁷⁴ Of the \$197.5 million needed to support 20 capital projects in FY 2015-16, only \$500,000 was funded.⁷⁵



Previous Fiscal Recommendations

To better utilize grant funding streams, the SEC audit recommended the Department better track grant-expenditures, reevaluate CBO contracts and monitoring, and develop spending plans to optimize grant spending.⁷⁶ To strengthen Probation's controls over cash handlings, donations, and trust funds, the Auditor-Controller made 35 recommendations around receipt issuance, lock boxes, and internal controls.⁷⁷ However, 22 months after these recommendations were shared, only 16 recommendations had been implemented, with an additional 8 partially implemented.⁷⁸ For some recommendations, the Department responded that they were unable to comply due to low staffing levels.⁷⁹

In regards to capital projects, the 2015 Auditor-Controller report recommended that the Department work with the CEO to develop better oversight and reporting practices of capital projects and create a plan to fund unmet needs.⁸⁰ Since the Department did not forecast beyond the upcoming fiscal year, the Auditor-Controller also recommended that Probation create long-range forecasts, to which the Department responded that it will begin implementing a five-year scorecard.⁸¹

Data/IT

Probation uses 46 different data systems to manage clients, staff, contracted providers, and a range of other information. Of these 46 systems, 25 are operated by Probation and 21 are systems operated by other County Departments or vendors, but accessed by Probation. Many of these systems are electronic document systems, not databases from which data can be extracted. Across data systems, there is a limited ability to link data and limited data sharing with other County departments, which reduces data utility and creates a number of challenges across all levels of Probation staff. According to Newell and Salazar (2010):

*It is not only difficult for the leadership in the Probation Department to aggregate and analyze data when it is spread across different intra and inter-County databases, it is also difficult and time-consuming for POs to conduct adequate research on their clients to plan for the appropriate reentry services.*⁸²

In some cases, interagency data sharing has been stalled due extremely restrictive interpretations of the confidentiality provisions within federal statutes and regulations.⁸³ Other California counties share data much more freely and effectively across agencies.

In addition to the lack of extractable data and linked data, the Probation Department's outdated data systems and insufficient resource for IT staff, staff training, and systems upgrades impede the Department's ability to make data-driven decisions.⁸⁴ In particular, the Department has a limited capacity to track client outcomes.⁸⁵ The absence of outcome data prevents the Department from comprehensively evaluating the effectiveness of its programs, making it difficult to ascertain whether or not programs are working.⁸⁶ Client outcomes, including education, employment, community stabilization, and personal growth and opportunity are tracked for the AB 109 population through a web-based data system, the Treatment, Court, Probation eXchange (TCPX) System.⁸⁷



Previous Data/IT Recommendations

Over the past ten years, multiple reports have recommended Probation, often through a taskforce or committee, conduct a capacity assessment of the Department's current data systems.⁸⁸ The 2015 Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study recommends the creation of an interagency Juvenile Justice Data Systems Task Force with leadership from DCFS, DMH, DPSS, DHS, judges, and external stakeholders and experts, as well as the creation of a separate taskforce internal to Probation.⁸⁹

A number of reports also recommend that Probation collect more outcome data to better evaluate the effectiveness of its programs.⁹⁰ The Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study provides some guidance about the type of individual data that should be collected, which includes elements around risk level, other system involvement, education, mental health, substance abuse, housing stability, family relationships, positive support systems, services, employment, and recidivism.⁹¹ It also recommends collecting program-level data about implementation and adherence to evidence-based practices.⁹²



Preliminary Meetings with Stakeholders

Between September and October 2016, members of the RDA Project Team sat down for more than 30 face-to-face discussions with approximately 50 Los Angeles County Probation Department stakeholders. Table 7 provides an inventory of stakeholders interviewed. (Most meetings had more than one stakeholder participant.)

Table 7. Preliminary Interview Participants

Stakeholder Group	Meeting Participants
County Leadership	Board of Supervisors Offices
Probation Department Executive Management	Interim Chief Probation Officer
	Administrative Deputy
	Dep. Chief, Residential Treatment
	Dep. Chief, Facilities
	Dep. Chief, Field Services (2)
	Bureau Chief, Professional Standards
	Chief Information Officer
Unions Representing Probation Department Staff	AFSCME Local 685
	AFSCME Local 1967
	SEUI Local 721
	SEUI Local 721/BU 702
Legal System Agencies	Presiding Judges, Supervising Judges, Court Executive Officers
	Alternative Public Defender's Office
	District Attorney's Office
	Public Defender's Office
Partner Public Departments	City of LA Gang Reduction Youth Development Program (GRYD)
	County Office of Education
	Dept. of Health Services
	Dept. of Children & Family Services
	Dept. of Mental Health
	Sheriff's Department
Community-based Organizations	LA Regional Reentry Partnership Steering Committee
	United Healthcare Housing Partners
Justice Reform Advocates	ACLU of Southern California
	Children's Defense Fund – California
	Urban Peace Institute
	Youth Justice Coalition
Research Partners	Dr. Denise Herz and Ms. Kristine Chan
	Children's Data Network
	County Executive's Office's Research and Evaluation Services



The purpose of these meetings, similar to our review of prior reports and documentation, was to situate this project within the larger context of work related to the Probation Department. Toward this end, we participated in open-ended conversations with County and Department leadership, the four unions representing Probation sworn and non-sworn staff, legal system agencies, public departments whose work intersects with Probation's, community-based organizations that work with Probation clients, local advocates involved in justice system-reform efforts, and researchers who understand the Department's data and data sharing practices. These conversations sought to understand the current strengths and challenges of the Department from the perspective of a diverse range of stakeholders. These interviews are preliminary and will help to direct our formal data collection process over the course of the next several months.

Below is a brief summary of the major themes that emerged across these discussions; like the documentation reviewed above, these themes are primarily organized around the domains delineated in the Governance Study Board Motion, supplemented by several additional themes that emerged from these meetings but did not fit into one of these domains. As the section below demonstrates, many issues raised in these interviews echo findings from the research and documentation review.

Client Service Delivery

Stakeholders offer a number of critiques in the area of client service delivery, especially available community-based programs and services to support client wellbeing and success. Interviewees report that linkages to community-based programs are insufficient, that programs and services within the Department are not rehabilitative, therapeutic, or aligned with what research shows to be effective (best practices and evidence-based practices), that mental health needs of the Department's clients are not being met, and that approaches like school-based probation officers and the use of flash incarceration may indicate that Department programs and services are more invasive than they should be. Others praise the school-based probation officer program as having good outcomes.

Many interviewees, occupying a variety of roles in the probation system, report that there are very poor linkages to services for the reentry and diversion populations, both adult and youth. Some of the reasons identified were that Probation does not hold enough resources with community-based providers through contracts, that there are no systems for referral, that DPOs are not making referrals, and that there are not enough social workers to do this in their place.

Stakeholders also point out that community programs and resources have never been inventoried and mapped, and that there is no clear system for making referrals. A number of stakeholders specifically complained about a highly onerous bidding and contracting process, which prevents CBO services from being contracted with Probation and contributes to the lack of linkages and the poor usage of services available in the community. Once they have contracted, many reported that CBOs find the relationship with Probation to be non-collaborative and the billing and auditing processes unduly cumbersome.

Several staff that work for the Department perceive that probation services are moving toward being more rehabilitative, but also state that this is not happening in a consistent way. Some participants use



language describing trauma-informed care to describe improvements to services, but there is little or no language that describes exposure to or endorsement of risk-need-responsivity model, reducing the level of intervention for low-risk offenders, or targeting criminogenic risk, in general. There appears to be a risk assessment tool being used (beyond the detention screening tool), but few mentioned it, other than to say that they didn't understand it. The perception of stakeholders outside of the Department is that there is generally a lack of rehabilitative or therapeutic orientation in how programs and services are delivered by the Department.

Several stakeholders point to the mental health needs of Probation clients, and indicate that they are not being met. Many perceive that the percentage of juveniles with mental health issues is increasing (including serious mental illness). Adults with mental health needs are also mentioned repeatedly. It is generally perceived that the linkages between Probation and community mental health services are weak, and that mental health needs are likely not being fully met. Furthermore, with reduced use of incarceration for youth, a concern is raised that detention facilities may be becoming de-facto mental health institutions without actual therapeutic services or recovery orientation. For Probation staff, there is some recognition that training in brain science, adolescent development, trauma-informed care, motivational interviewing, cognitive-behavioral interventions, vicarious trauma, and related areas would be useful.

Some stakeholders mention a program for placing DPOs in schools. There is a fair amount of support for this program among those who know about it, and they claim good outcomes documented in a RAND report. Advocates, however, raise the question of net-widening (i.e., that this program may be, in effect, reaching deeper into the community to identify lower-risk youth and increase their likelihood of arrest, when research shows lower-risk youth can actually be harmed by the application of probation programs and services, however well-intentioned).

Many advocates also raised major concerns over LA Probation Department's unique use of "voluntary probation" under the state's Welfare and Institutions Code 236. So-called "236 youth" are placed under supervision even though they have not been adjudicated for any delinquent act and often at young ages. Nearly 5,000 such youth are under supervision in LA County.⁹³

For adults, stakeholders point to the over reliance of flash incarceration as problematic. They report that Probation clients are locked up on the spot, without warnings or use of graduated sanctions. This practice keeps people unnecessarily in custody, disrupts any strides probationer clients may be making in terms of employment, education, and treatment programs, and inflates recidivism numbers. It is also inconsistent with best practice research.

There is a sense that the service delivery model is not set up well for diversion. Interviewees report that probation recently took back responsibility for juvenile screening reports from the DA's Office. This has resulted in reduced filings, but some (judges and prosecutors) feel there needs to be a structure for diverting the other cases and supervising misdemeanants. Judges also report that they have little understanding of Probation's pre-trial screening tools. It also seems that there is a dearth of pre-trial diversion programs, and that judges do not often follow probation recommendations in this area.



Facilities

In terms of facilities, stakeholders report that the juvenile detainee population is significantly lower than it has been in any time during the past, so that LA's multiple facilities are all filled to only about 30% of capacity. Several propose closing some of the camps and juvenile halls. A detention screening tool was mentioned, which, if used properly, could reduce reliance on incarceration, although questions arise around consistency in the use of this tool and inter-rater reliability on scoring.

Staffing and Hiring

Staffing and hiring concerns emerged as central in the interviews and discussions. Stakeholders point to an onerous hiring process, a flawed career ladder, and unclear promotional process. The low juvenile population count also raises questions about the department's ability to downshift staffing in tandem with population reductions.

Several people cite high staff vacancy rates—between 700 and 1,000 vacancies—mostly in field Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) positions. They attribute the high vacancy rate to a very cumbersome hiring process, including lengthy background checks in particular. Many are highly critical of the human resources (HR) division within the Probation Department.

According to one interviewee, the Probation Department and contracted CBOs are prohibited from hiring former offenders. It should be noted that this is not consistent with what is recommended by American Correctional Association Performance-Based Standards.

Several interviewees indicate that the career ladder requires that people who are hired must work first in the halls and then the camps to become DPOs. This process does not recognize that the skills for these roles vary considerably. More professionalization of Detention Service Officers (DSO) positions is one proposed solution. Stakeholders suggest that the criteria, qualifications, and educational requirements for Directors are not clear, and that this may be leading to unqualified people being promoted. There was also discussion of the need for educational to professional pathways from local university programs in criminal justice and social welfare (e.g., CSULA, CSULB, UCLA, USC) to probation.

In addition, interviewees indicated that some basic operational functions have fallen behind due to staffing shortages. Some report that the detention services manual is not up-to-date, resulting in differences in perception of what is allowed; for example, in use of solitary confinement and isolation. Since the policy manual has not been updated to reflect the policy that has been officially adopted by the Department many staff continue to follow the old manual and use old practices. Others mentioned that much of the needed training for non-sworn staff simply has not occurred, resulting in clerical errors, which obstruct smooth operations.

It is difficult to accurately state what staffing needs exist. On the one hand, several stakeholders report that staffing shortages impact Department operations, and quality of programs, and services. Conversely, with the reduction in the juvenile hall and camp population, there is a question about whether staffing needs have also been reduced and whether staff have been properly redeployed.



Fiscal

Several of the issues identified in the audits described above were the topics brought up in stakeholder interviews, especially related to the appropriate expenditure of State funds for probation services. Interviewees report that SB 678 funds have not been drawn down to serve the adult population and, on the juvenile side, several stakeholders report that JJCPA money has not been spent (up to \$20 million). Some wonder if there are savings from Prop 47 and if there are, if those monies can be used to support better programs. People seem unaware of how various pots of money are being utilized and expressed frustration with perceived staffing shortages given the availability of additional funds. Respondents also expressed concern that the Department was not maximizing opportunities to utilize funds to provide more comprehensive services to clients.

Data/IT

Current data capacity in the department is reported to be very low. Current data practices only track the most basic information, many important pieces of information are not in electronic or automated form, and data systems do not carry the ability to evaluate the impact of anything. The data systems were not designed with tracking outcomes or conducting research in mind. In order to use data for outcomes, and not just case management or court reporting, it is suggested by a number of stakeholders that the department enlist a university partner, and create a unit dedicated to collect and manage data.

Several stakeholders indicate that a better case management data system (or more consistent use of such systems) is needed, and would enable some automation and save time on reports. Many individuals noted that the current data situation makes it difficult for sharing of data among agencies serving the same population (mental health, child welfare, etc.). There is a general desire to see an increased use of electronic data systems, particularly to track outcomes and to automate reports. A need for a research unit in partnership with a university has been identified and a plan/proposal is being developed. Data sharing and mobile data platforms are also named as ways to increase the utility of data in probation. A few people expressed the opinion that a mobile feature would be helpful (especially for field officers) to actually use electronic case management systems.

Department Structure

Several operational issues emerged from the interviews, particularly around the question of splitting the Department into distinct administrations for juveniles and adults. Other operational issues cited include factors that contribute to operational fragmentation, operational barriers to using diversion as a strategy, and basic operational functions that are not current nor aligned with best practices.

In general, we found a lack of support for splitting Probation among people within the Department, while there is considerable support for a split Department within the advocacy community. RDA team members asked stakeholders what they thought might be the advantages and disadvantages of splitting the department into two. The disadvantages most frequently cited of a departmental split are cost and the time and energy it would take to create two departments out of one. The most frequently cited positives



are that the Department and County are enormous by comparison to other counties/departments and that some of the Department's challenges may result from its unwieldy size. There is also concern that the Department is driven by an adult correctional/law enforcement culture that fails to sufficiently attend to the needs of youth as a result. This is exacerbated by how little differentiation exists at a high level in the Department's organizational structure between adult and juvenile services. If the Department were to remain unified, stakeholders recognize a need for greater separation and specialization for juveniles and adults. Many express the opinion that transition aged youth (TAY) would be better served in a single Department that recognized differential needs of young people.

Stakeholders interviewed point to factors that make operations cumbersome. There were several references to the current size of the Department and how it makes managing operations a challenge and also contributes to fragmentation. Some of the stakeholders interviewed feel the division of the Department along Board of Supervisor districts makes operations difficult to manage, and also may contribute to a sense of fragmentation and splitting in perceived management loyalty by staff in district offices.

Overarching Issues

There were a few overarching themes that cut across all categories of this study including commitment to the rehabilitative ideal, the role of the Board of Supervisors, staff morale, the practices and positions of unions, and racial disproportionality.

Feedback provided throughout these initial interviews indicate that there is not a commonly held set of values supporting rehabilitation or treatment as a focus within the Probation Department, and that many in the Department hold a more public safety or even punitive orientation to the work of Probation.

There is widespread agreement among multiple types of stakeholders that the Board of Supervisors "micromanages" the Chief Probation Officer (CPO), and that this is a key factor in the high turnover of chiefs, which has been highly disruptive to positive progress. These stakeholders indicate that the CPO, and therefore the entire upper administrative levels of the organization, are overly reactive to the Board and to various short-term directives, reports, and critiques, and thus have trouble planning strategically.

Many people, from union representatives to outside stakeholders, cite the existence of poor morale within the Department. There is consensus that the Department receives a lot criticism, too much turnover at the top, and frequent commissions and reports, but not a lot of support or recognition of things that go well, either from within the Department or from the Board.

From the perspective of management and some outside stakeholders, there appears to be a good deal of mistrust of unions, a sense that unions are not working as partners, and a belief that they are not focused on building the skills of the workforce. Union representatives themselves express some reciprocal mistrust, but some clearly recognize and articulate that developing worker skills and competencies is in everyone's interests, including those of the unions.



Finally, the data show some acknowledgement (but not much) that the population served is racially disproportionate to the overall population of LA County. The dearth of discussion on this topic indicates that the Probation Department may not have adequate focus or expertise on racial and ethnic disparities.

Preliminary Findings and Recommendations

Findings

Below, we present our initial findings, based on activities to-date. It is important to note that these findings are preliminary and will continue to evolve as we dive deeper into Probation Department operations over the next several months.

Strategic Vision

Probation Department staff, partners, and other stakeholders convey no unified sense of purpose or larger strategic vision for the Department. Despite the Department having developed a new Department Strategic Plan in 2015, only one of the individuals interviewed referenced this plan and, more generally there was limited alignment between the goals set forth in this plan and the stated interests of the stakeholders we interviewed.

Data and Evaluation

While the APS data system for tracking adult probation clients is outdated, the basic problem with the Department's client data and data systems are utilization issues not data system issues. Neither APS nor its juvenile equivalent, PCMS, is utilized to the full extent that it could be to collect data on client supervision and services, nor to report internally or externally on outcomes. The processes for collecting data do not appear to be streamlined, with different staff responsible for entering different information. Some data is collected by DPOs and entered directly into the data systems, while other data is collected on paper and then entered by administrative support staff, increasing the likelihood of error. In addition, there are few mandatory entry fields, limiting the utility of the data for either service delivery or evaluation. There does not seem to be a management practice of holding probation officers accountable for entering data, nor is there a quality assurance (QA) process to review that entry. Finally, while the Department does hold regular PROBSTAT meetings—modeled on the data-driven law enforcement COMPSTAT process—to review data, there are no formally established metrics for review nor documentation of priorities to be assessed via this review process.

Communication

There does not appear to be any consistent communications plan in place within the Department. Without intentional messaging from leadership and mechanisms to communicate there will continue to be morale problems and a lack of adherence to an organized and articulated vision for the Department.



Organizational Culture

Respondents from across the Department hierarchy overwhelmingly commented on the extremely negative organizational culture. Probation Department employees report feeling unappreciated from within the Department as well as from outside, including the Board and CEO. There does not appear to be a culture or process for acknowledging the hard work and achievements of individual employees or of the Department as a whole, which makes people feel defensive and underappreciated.

Operational Inefficiencies

The Department appears to be struggling with certain basic operational inefficiencies. Hiring, contracting, procurement, etc. appear to move extremely slowly, reducing the availability of staff and service providers to work with clients. The contracting process and subsequent contract management is so burdensome as to deter some CBOs from even trying to contract with the Department. The background check process for both Department employees and contractors is slow moving and unnecessarily onerous.

Lack of Implementation of Previous Recommendations

The large number of existing studies and audits have resulted in only limited changes and, as a whole, the perspective of stakeholders is that the Department is struggling and has not implemented the necessary changes that would make it a model Probation Department. At this juncture, it is unclear why the Department has been unable to address the many issues raised, as discussed below, over the next 8 months, this project will provide a more intensive analysis of these and other issues and provide a roadmap for reform.

Recommendations

As with the findings delineated above, the recommendations provided here are based only on our preliminary analysis of Department processes and operations. These recommendations are not comprehensive and will be built upon over the course of this project.

Mission and Vision

The Department needs to definitively define a core strategic mission and vision, express it broadly and frequently, and use that unified strategic vision to drive all of its efforts to address other issues described. Toward this end, the Department should revisit—and rewrite, if necessary—the mission, vision, and values of the Probation Department to reflect the philosophy and practices of a law enforcement agency in the 21st Century. Sources of models are New York City, Sacramento County, and Riverside County.

Client Service Delivery

Unified Systemic Planning for Juvenile Operations





The County, under the leadership of the Chief Probation Officer, Chief Deputy Probation Officer of Juvenile Services and Chief Juvenile Judge, should convene an ongoing stakeholders group to fully analyze and plan for their juvenile and TAY services, including detention alternatives, post-adjudication placement, field services, assessment and court recommendations, structured decision making, and camps and residential services. The Department should work collaboratively with the foundation community, including and especially the Annie E. Casey Foundation, to retain consultants and form a collaborative decision making process with key stakeholders to comprehensively assess and plan for its juvenile service needs. A similar planning process can and should be enacted for adults on probation as well, but there are more and better examples of the juvenile process in California and nationally so we suggest the county start there and use lessons learned with the juveniles to launch a similar adult services planning process.

Assessments and Planning

Replace the current risk assessment tools—including the juvenile detention screening, post-adjudication juvenile risk assessment, and the felony probation adult risk assessment—with evidence-based, validated tools that measures risk and needs, and spell out circumstances when they may be overridden.

If not already in place, the Department should immediately develop and implement juvenile and adult Response Matrixes, to provide graduated sanctions and rewards that respond consistently, appropriately, and developmentally to youth behavior.

Community-based Services

With the various pots of funds that have grown and gone unspent for years, Probation should expedite the disbursement of funds for community-based services, especially from YOBG, JJCPA, Title IV-E Waiver and SB 678.

The Probation Department should expand the availability of services offered by AB 109 programs to all adults on active supervision (there is no rule or statute prohibiting this).

LA Probation should examine the use of “voluntary”/WIC 236 supervision. Clear criteria, measurable outcomes, and monitoring of appropriate its use should be systematically examined and reported on to determine the future use and place of this practice within the county.

Organizational Culture

Positive Organizational Culture

Begin a system-wide practice of appreciative inquiry and asset identification. There should be processes in place for acknowledging and celebrating both individual staff members and whole units or divisions for their hard work. Every Department employee whom we spoke with—both sworn and non-sworn across the Department hierarchy—expressed a high level of commitment to the Department, its clients, and its services. This is a great asset and needs to be recognized, celebrated, and regularly acknowledged.

Communication





Develop an intra-agency communications plan and process. Executive Management should send regular emails to ALL staff within the Department providing details on the new vision, updates and appreciations. There should also be a brief intranet page created to provide updates to staff and computers can be designed that when they turn on they are directed to this intranet page/site.

Establish a regular Probation Department newsletter that can be distributed on a monthly or bi-monthly basis to provide updates and appreciations; develop and promote a schedule of organizational events, including optional trainings for sworn and non-sworn staff, as well as other events for employees to engage with each other across the Department chain-of-command.

Staffing and Hiring

There is a problem with staffing and hiring. Prior to making recommendations for changes that that will streamline and simplify the background check process for new job applicants we should understand what the current process is, how it is implemented and where bottlenecks occur.

The Department should examine why other county departments are able to hire staff much faster and recruit larger pools of applicants.

Data Collection and Data Use

The Department should expedite the process of purchasing or developing a modern data system for adult probation client. At the same time, the Department should establish clear guidelines around required data entry for juvenile and adult clients, ensure that all staff—including line staff, managers, supervisors and executive staff review this data on an ongoing basis to ensure quality, and report regularly on client progress and outcomes.

Conclusion and Next Steps

As noted above, as of the writing of this report the RDA project team had not yet begun our own assessment of the Probation Department's structures, practices, and processes. While we have not yet verified many of the analyses presented in prior reports and recommendations or the concerns raised by the various stakeholders with whom we met, there is ample evidence to indicate a wide range of problems in the Department's operations. Over the past several years, numerous reports, audits, assessment, etc. have delineated a lengthy—and very impressive—list of recommendations for improving the LA County Probation Department. Given the repeated recommendations for improvement we believe it is important to focus on operational processes and to ensure that future recommendations are considered in light of the entire system. Each step of the next phase of this study will incorporate a focus on obtaining an understanding of systemic operational processes. We also understand that some of these problems may have been addressed prior to this analysis and, where possible, we will look to identify and build upon these changes.



The approved workplan for this study is attached in Appendix A: Probation Governance Study Revised Workplan. Key next steps include:

Identification of Best Practices and Model Jurisdictions

Research and best practices in probation staffing, programs, and interventions

Through targeted literature reviews and interviews with experts, the project team will identify best practices in key domains as identified through preliminary data collection activities, including 1) Organizational systems and management in probation and community corrections; 2) juvenile probation service delivery models; and 3) adult probation service delivery models.

Identify and Inventory Best Practice Jurisdictions

Through our research into best practices, the Project Team will identify a series of jurisdictions across California, the United States, and internationally that are implementing practices that may be adapted and/or adopted in LA County. In particular, we will examine the following elements:

- a. Mission, Vision, Values
- b. Staffing (span of control, background checks, credentials, training) and Promotions
- c. Juvenile Probation Service Delivery Model
- d. Adult Probation Service Delivery Model
- e. Leadership Identification and Development Succession planning
- f. Funding Structure and Fiscal Operations

Assessment of Practices and Processes Currently in Use in LA County

The Project Team is conducting a range of qualitative and quantitative data collection activities in order to document and assess the Probation Department's operations across the domains discussed above. In particular, we focus on the following issues:

Client Service Delivery Models

The Project Team has begun collecting qualitative and quantitative data in order to document and assess the Probation Department's juvenile and adult service delivery models. In particular, we will document the following information:

Juvenile probation service delivery model

- Structured decision making processes for diversion, detention, out-of-home placement, violations, warrants, etc.
- Assessment, case planning, referral, and linkage processes for in-custody and community-based services including:
 - Use of evidence based practices
 - Use of validated assessment tools



- Use of risk/responsivity principles
- Fit between client location and needs and service location and needs

Adult service delivery model

- Structured decision making processes for violations, revocations, warrants, etc.
- Assessment, case planning, referral, and linkage processes for community-based services including:
 - Use of evidence based practices
 - Use of validated assessment tools
 - Use of risk/responsivity principles
- Fit between client location and needs and service location and needs
- Role in pretrial release
- Role in pre-release planning

Facilities

As part of the project, the Project Team will work with the Probation Department, CEO, and juvenile court partners—including the judiciary, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, and the Alternative Public Defender's Office—to understand and analyze County decision-making processes regarding placing youth out-of-home. We will work with these partners to develop a structured decision-making process for serving and supervising youth in county facilities, in other out-of-home placements, or in the community. Based on this decision-making process and Countywide population trends, the project team will project needed bed-space and make recommendations regarding facility use.

Staffing

The Project Team is currently in the process of assessing Department policies, procedures, and processes regarding recruitment, hiring, training, and promotion for sworn and non-sworn staff. This analysis will include an examination of spans of control, staffing vacancies, and caseloads and workloads for DPOs.

Management and Leadership Practices

The Project Team will identify best practices in management and leadership as they pertain to probation agencies and other types of public agencies. We will compare and contrast currently management practices and leadership methods with those.

Fiscal

Though an analysis of Department and County fiscal documentation including annual Department budgets and County Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports, we will assess Department fiscal operations and expenditures, including:

1. Department Costs:





- a. Juvenile Supervision
 - b. Juvenile Facilities
 - c. Adult Supervision
 - d. Administration (including HR, admin, IT, etc.)
2. Use of state and federal revenue streams:
 - a. Juvenile: JJCPA, Youthful Offender Block Grants (YOBG), Juvenile Probation Camp Funding (JPCF), Title IV-E, Medical claims, collect call funds
 - b. Adult: SB 678, AB 109
3. Total funding for community-based services within and across different funding streams



Appendix A: Probation Governance Study Revised Workplan

Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
Phase I: Preliminary Activities & Project Launch													
I.1 Project Launch Meetings													
I.2 Stakeholder Outreach Meetings													
a. Board of Supervisors Justice Deputies (all 5 Districts)													
b. Interim Chief Probation Officer													
c. Administrative Deputy													
d. Dep. Chief Residential Treatment													
e. Dep. Chief Facilities													
f. Dep. Chief Field Services (2)													
g. Dep. Chief Professional Standards													
h. District Attorney's Office													
i. Public Defender's Office													
j. Alternative Public Defender's Office													
k. Judiciary													
l. LA Regional Reentry Partnership Steering Committee													
m. United Homeless Healthcare Partners													
n. City of LA GRYD													
o. Justice Reform Advocates (ACLU, CDF-CA, Urban Peace Initiative, Youth Justice Coalition)													
p. LA County Office of Education													
q. Department of Children and Family Services													
r. LA County Health Agency													
s. LA County Sheriff's Department													
I.3 Review and Analyze Existing Reports and Documentation													
I.4 Convene Project Advisory Committee													
I.5 Revise and Finalize Workplan													



Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
Phase II: Best Practice Research													
A. Research and best practices in probation staffing, programs, and interventions													
2.1 Conduct Literature Reviews on Key Domains													
a. Organizational systems & management in Probation and Community Corrections													
b. Juvenile Probation Service Delivery Model													
c. Adult Probation Service Delivery Model													
2.2 Conduct Key Informant Interviews with Experts													
2.3 Draft Best Practices Report													
B. Identify models that promote identified best practices													
2.4 Identify and Inventory Best Practice Jurisdictions													
2.5 Develop Site Visit Data Collection Tools and Protocols													
2.6 Site Visit Outreach and Coordination													
2.7 Site Visits (Elements for Consideration Below)													
a. Mission, Vision, Values													
b. Staffing (span of control, background checks, credentials, training) and Promotions													
c. Juvenile Probation Service Delivery Model													
d. Adult Probation Service Delivery Model													
e. Leadership Identification and Development Succession planning													
f. Funding Structure and Fiscal Operations													
2.8 Summarize Findings from Site Visits													
2.9 Draft Model Jurisdictions Report													



Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
Phase III: Study of LACPD's Current Structure and Effectiveness													
Document LACPD Department Structure													
3.1 Request Probation Department Data													
a. Juvenile Probation Client-level data													
b. Adult Probation Client-level data													
c. eHR Data													
d. Bed Night Cost data													
e. Other Data as identified through project activities													
f. Department & Auditor-Controller's Office Budgets, Funding, Allocations & Expenditures FY 2015-16, FY 2014-15, FY 2013-14 and FY 2012-13													
3.2 Interviews & Focus Groups to Understand Probation Operations													
a. IT Staff													
b. Probation Department HR Staff													
c. Probation Department Contracts and Procurement Staff													
d. DPOs, DSOs, GSNs													
e. District Attorney Staff													
f. Public Defender/ Alternative Public Defender Staff													
g. Dept. of Mental Health													
h. Dept. of Children and Family Services													
i. LA County Office of Education													
j. Clients													
k. Family members													
l. Contracted providers and other providers													



Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
3.3 Site Visits to Probation Offices & Facilities													
a. Juvenile/Adult Regional Offices													
b. Juvenile Halls													
c. Juvenile Camps													
d. Day Reporting Centers													
3.4 Review and Analysis of Probation Organizational Documentation													
a. Staff training													
b. Job descriptions													
c. Staff and volunteer background check process													
d. Assessment tools and protocols for use													
e. CBO Contracts													
f. Union Contracts & promotional policies													
g. Contracting and Procurement Process Documentation													
3.5 Process Flow Mapping													
3.6 Draft Report on LA Probation Staffing, Training, Hiring Report													
3.7 LA Fiscal Practice Analysis													
a. Identify annual federal and state revenues, allocations for adults and juveniles													
b. Assessment revenue management, alignment with statutory requirements													
3.8 Draft Report of LA Probation Fiscal Practices													
3.9 Review and Analysis of Juvenile and Adult Client Data													
a. Map client home locations													
b. Assess client risk/need profiles													
c. Analyze current use of facilities for juvenile populations													



Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
3.10 Draft Report on Current Use of Facilities													
3.11 Compare Client Locations, Risks, Needs to Service Types and Locations													
3.12 Facilities Use Analysis													
a. Convene Facility Workgroup													
b. Workgroup Meetings to Discuss Detention and Placement Policy Decisions													
c. Analysis of Current v. Recommended Facility Use & Cost Implications													
d. Report Back to Advisory Committee													



Activities By Project Month	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
Phase IV: Compare LA Probation to Best Practices/Model Jurisdictions													
Cross-Walk Current LACPD Structure with Best Practices													
4.1 Draft Report on LA Probation Organizational Structure and Systems													
4.2 Compare LA Probation Staffing to Best Practices													
4.3 Compare LA Fiscal Practices to Best Practices													
4.4 Compare LA Facilities Use to Best Practices													
Phase V: Findings and Recommendations													
5.1 Comprehensive Organizational Assessment Report													
5.2 Logistics of Proposed Restructuring Probation Department													
Ongoing: Communication, Coordination, Project Management													
Project Management and Monthly Project Calls													
Advisory Committee Meetings													
120-Day Report													
Quarterly Briefing of Justice Deputies													



Appendix B. Documents Reviewed

Table 8. Facilities

	Title	Author/ Department	Date
1.	Agreement Between the United States, Los Angeles County, and the Los Angeles County Office of Education; Juvenile Halls	County of Los Angeles	2003
2.	Camp Scott Report Feasibility of Renovating Dorm to Incorporate LA Model for Girls + Young Women	Calvin C, Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer	September, 2016
3.	Casey A: Final TCA Team Report	Technical, Consulting, and Advisory Team; Challenger Memorial Youth Center	May 2015
4.	Casey A: Proposed Settlement Agreement	United States District Court	September 2010
5.	Critical Incident Protocols to Protect Probation Youth		
6.	Department of Justice Settlement Agreement Monitoring Fact Sheet	Department of Auditor-Controller	May 2016
7.	Department of Justice Settlement Agreement Monitoring Fact Sheet	Department of Auditor-Controller	April 2016
8.	Documenting System Change: Kilpatrick Replacement Project	Leap Associates	July 2015
9.	Eleventh Monitoring Report for the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles County Probation Department Camps	Michael Graham, Lead Monitor	September, 2014
10.	Ending the Practice of Juvenile Solitary Confinement and Establishment of Hope Centers Implementation Plan- Interim Report Back	Calvin C. Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer	August 2016
11.	Ending the Practice of Juvenile Solitary Confinement and Establishment of Hope Centers Implementation Plan- Second Status Report	Calvin C. Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer	October 2016
12.	Investigation of Conditions at the Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls, Findings Report	United States Department of Justice	2003
13.	Investigation of Conditions at the Los Angeles County Probation Camps, Findings Report	United States Department of Justice	2008
14.	Los Angeles County Daily Juvenile Camp Population Report	County of Los Angeles	November 2016
15.	Los Angeles County Juvenile Hall Population Report	County of Los Angeles	November 2016



16.	LA Times: Should Probation Split	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles Juvenile Division	December 2015
17.	Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles Probation Camps	United States Department of Justice	October 2008
18.	Order Regarding Interviewing and Voice Recording of Delinquent Children	The Board of Supervisors and Probation; Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles Juvenile Division	February 2016
19.	Parent Handbook	Los Angeles Probation Department Residential Treatment Services Bureau	January 2013
20.	Probation Department Juvenile Halls- Department of Justice Settlement Agreement Monitoring; FY 2013-2014	Department of Auditor- Controller	February 2015
21.	Reforming the Nation's Largest Juvenile Justice System	Michelle Newell, MPP Jorja Leap, PhD	November 2013
22.	Resolution Relating to Solitary Confinement	Los Angeles County Probation Commission	April 2016
23.	Review of Probation Department's Compliance with the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement for the Juvenile Camps	Department of Auditor- Controller	June 2016
24.	Rising Up, Speaking Out: Youth Transforming LA County's Juvenile Justice System	Children's Defense Fund California	January 2015
25.	Rules and Rights Handbook	Los Angeles Probation Department Residential Treatment Services Bureau	
26.	Second Amendment to Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles County Probation Camps	United States Department of Justice	October 2012
27.	Strengthening Critical Incident Protocols to Protect Probation Youth and Promote Accountability	Department of Auditor- Controller	November 2016
28.	Strengthening Critical Incident Protocols to Protect Probation Youth and Promote Accountability- Report Back	Calvin C. Remington	November 2016
29.	Twelfth Monitoring Report for the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles County Probation Camps	Michael Graham, Lead Monitor	February 2015



Table 9. Fiscal Operations

	Title	Author/ Department	Date
30.	Accept Sixteen Year Grant Funds Under the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program- Fiscal Year 2014-15	William T. Fujioka; Chief Executive Officer	June 2014
31.	Approval of Reallocation of Fifth Year Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) Funds and Approval of an Appropriation Adjustment for the Department of Parks and Recreation	Robert B. Taylor; Chief Probation Officer	May 2006
32.	Audit of Probation Department- Welfare and Institutions Code Section 275 (b)	Department of Auditor-Controller	December 2015
33.	California Welfare Institutions Code Chapter 2, Section 275 Audit FY 2012-2013 and 2013-2014	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	July 2015
34.	Community Corrections Performance Incentive Grant Allocations 2015-2016	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	2016
35.	County of Los Angeles, California - Comprehensive Annual Financial Report Fiscal Year Ended June 30,2014	Department of Auditor-Controller	June 2014
36.	County of Los Angeles 2012-13 Final Budget	Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County	June 2012
37.	County of Los Angeles 2013-14 Final Budget	Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County	June 2013
38.	County of Los Angeles 2014-15 Final Budget	Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County	June 2014
39.	County of Los Angeles 2015-16 Final Budget	Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County	June 2015
40.	Cover Sheet with Board Agenda	Management Services Bureau	July 2016
41.	Distribution of AB 109 Funds: Community Corrections and District Attorney/ Public Defender Subaccounts; Final Recommendation of Realignment Allocation Committee (RAC)	The California State Association of Counties	October 2014
42.	Funded Capital Projects- Fiscal Year 2016-17	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	July 2016
43.	Funded Deferred Maintenance Projects Fiscal Year 2016-2017	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	July 2016
44.	Legislature Passes 2013-2014 Budget; SB 678 Funding Allocations FY 14/15	Danielle Higs, Legislative Representative	June 2014



45.	Probation Department- Budget, Juvenile Halls and Camps Operating Costs, and Departmental Contracting Procedures Review	Department of Auditor-Controller	July 2015
46.	Probation Department- Cash Handling, Trust Funds, Accounts Payable, and Commitments Review	Department of Auditor-Controller	February 2014
47.	Probation Department- Hiring Practices and Grant Administration	Department of Auditor-Controller	January 2016
48.	Promising Los Angeles Juvenile Diversion Program Anxiously Awaits Hoarded Probation Cash	Jeremy Loundeback, Chronicles of Social Change	February 2016
49.	Proposition 47- Analysis of Cost Savings and Service Improvements	Department of Auditor-Controller	April, 2016
50.	Public Safety Realignment: Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Fourth Quarter Report on Budget	Sachi A. Hamai; Interim Chief Executive Officer	September 2015
51.	Public Safety Realignment Act Review- Probation Department, Fiscal Year 2013-2014	Department of Auditor-Controller	November 2014
52.	Public Safety Realignment Act Review- Probation Department, Fiscal Year 2014-2015	Department of Auditor-Controller	October 2015
53.	Public Safety Realignment Budget, Program and Performance AB 109		November 2017
54.	Recommended AB 109 Distribution: 2014-15 and beyond; Briefing to County Administrative Officers Association of California	Realignment Allocation Committee (RAC)	September 2014
55.	Unfunded Capital Projects Fiscal Year 2016-17	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	July 2016
56.	Unfunded Deferred Maintenance Projects Fiscal Year 2016-17	Juvenile Institutions and Field Area Office	July 2016

Table 10. Client Service Delivery

	Title	Author/ Department	Date
57.	Back on Track- Los Angeles	State of California, Department of Justice	October 2016
58.	Back on Track- Los Angeles Infographic	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Probation Department	May 2016
59.	Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan, Los Angeles County JJCPA Programs	Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council	
60.	Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan Review FY 2015-16	Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council	March 2017



61.	Contract by and between County of Los Angeles and ABC Unified School District, Success through Awareness and Resistance	County of Los Angeles	October 2015
62.	Contract by and between County of Los Angeles and A.R.C. (Anti-Recidivism Coalition)	County of Los Angeles	October 2015
63.	Contract by and between County of Los Angeles and 1736 Family Crisis Center	County of Los Angeles	August 2015
64.	Contracts- Community Based Organization	County of Los Angeles	
65.	Enhancing Services to Strengthen 241.1 Project for Crossover Youth Annual Report	County of Los Angeles, Department of Children and Family Services	September 2016
66.	Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Annual Report	State of California Board of State and Community Corrections	March 2014
67.	Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Annual Report	State of California Board of State and Community Corrections	March 2015
68.	Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Annual Report	State of California Board of State and Community Corrections	March 2016
69.	Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act- Application for Continuation Funding	County of Los Angeles	June 2015
70.	Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act FY 2014-2015 Report	RAND Corporation	2016
71.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Program Audit Report	Child Welfare League of America	September 2005
72.	Probation Department- Contracting Review	Department of Auditor - Controller	May 2015
73.	Probation Development Disabilities Study	Denise C. Hertz, Lois A. Weinberg, Jolan Smith, Kristen Chan, Michael Oshiro	May 2016

Table 11. Staffing and Hiring

	Title	Author/ Department	Date
74.	Job Description: Crew Instructor	County of Los Angeles	May 2001
75.	Job Description: Deputy Probation Officer	County of Los Angeles	March 2003
76.	Job Description: Deputy Probation Officer I (Residential Treatment/ Detention Services)	County of Los Angeles	July 2016



Los Angeles County Executive's Office

LA Probation Governance Study

77.	Job Description: Deputy Probation Officer II (Residential Treatment/ Detention Services)	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
78.	Job Description: Deputy Probation Officer II (Field)	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
79.	Job Description: Detention Services Officer	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
80.	Job Description: Group Supervisor, Nights, Probation	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
81.	Job Description: Supervising Deputy Probation Officer	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
82.	Job Description: Supervising Detention Services Officer	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
83.	Job Description: Transportation Deputy, Probation	County of Los Angeles	July 2016
84.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Policy Manual	County of Los Angeles Probation Department	January 2010
85.	Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department	Department of Auditor-Controller	November 2005
86.	Memorandum of Understanding: Clerical and Office Services Employee Representation Unit 111	County of Los Angeles SEIU Local 721	October 2015
87.	Memorandum of Understanding: Joint Submission to Board of Supervisors Regarding the Deputy Probation Officers Employee Representation Unit	County of Los Angeles	July 2013
88.	Memorandum of Understanding: Joint Submission to Board of Supervisors Regarding the Deputy Probation Officers Employee Representation Unit	County of Los Angeles	September 2015
89.	Memorandum of Understanding: Joint Submission to Board of Supervisors Regarding the Deputy Probation Officers Employee Representation Unit	County of Los Angeles	November 2015
90.	Memorandum of Understanding: Supervising Deputy Probation Officers Representation Unit 702	County of Los Angeles SEIU Local 721	October 2015
91.	Probation Department- Hiring Practices and Grant Administration	Department of Auditor-Controller	January 2016
92.	Restoring Credibility and Integrity to the Department	Altmayer Consulting Inc.	April 2012



Table 12. Overarching

	Title	Author/ Department	Date
93.	AB 109 in Los Angeles County: A Process and Outcome Evaluation	Cassia Spohn, PHD ; Katharine Tellis PHD	2016
94.	AB 109 County of Los Angeles Budget	County of Los Angeles	2011-2014
95.	AB 109/ 117 Implementation Plan	County of Los Angeles, Community Corrections Partnership	September 2011
96.	AB 109 Implementation Update- Year One Report	Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee	November 2012
97.	AB 109 Year Two Report	The Public Safety Realignment Team (PRST)	December 2013
98.	AB 109 Year Three Report	The Public Safety Realignment Team (PRST)	January 2015
99.	All APS Database Files		September 2016
100.	Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward	Calvin C. Remington, Chief Deputy	August 2010
101.	California Legislative Opinion Regarding Function in Lieu of Juvenile Justice Commission	Legislative Counsel of the State of California	November 2006
102.	Citizens' Complaints Committee Report 2000	Los Angeles County Grand Jury	2000
103.	County of Los Angeles Probation Department: Departmental Overview	Calvin C. Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer	March 2016
104.	County of Los Angeles: Probation Department Strategic Plan 2015-2018	Los Angeles County Probation Department	August 2015
105.	Editorial: Starting over from scratch at the L.A. County Department. Again.	The LA Times Editorial Board	September 2016
106.	EHR Data warehouse Diagram		
107.	Establishing a Blue Ribbon Commission on Probation Reform	Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas and Chair Hilda Solis	October 2016
108.	Evaluating the Effects of Prop 47 in the City of Los Angeles One Year After Implementation	Groff, Wartell, & Ward	July 2016
109.	Implementation of the Management and Program Audit Recommendations- 13 th Quarter	Robert B. Taylor, Chief Probation Officer	August 2009
110.	Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers, and Policy Options	Michelle Newell and Angelica Salazar	December 2010
111.	L.A. County Supervisors consider breaking up Probation Department	Abby Sewell; LA Times	February 2016
112.	Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study	Denise C. Hertz, Ph.D; Kritine Chan, MSW; Susan K. Lee, Esq; Melissa Nalani Ross, MPP; Jacquelyn McCroskey, DSW;	April 2015



		Michelle Newell, MPP; Caneel Fraser, Esq.	
113.	Los Angeles County Probation Data Systems	Los Angeles County Probation Department	February 2010
114.	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report 1999-2000	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury	1999
115.	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report 2013-2014	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury	2013
116.	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report 2014-2015	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury	2014
117.	Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report 2015-2016	The Los County Civil Grand Jury	2015
118.	Los Angeles County Office of Education Presentation	Debra Duardo, Superintendent	August 2016
119.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Annual Report	Office of Independent Review	February 2012
120.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Second Annual Report	Office of Independent Review	March 2013
121.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Annual Report	Office of Independent Review	April 2016
122.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Field Services Population	Los Angeles County Probation Department	March 2016
123.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Education Services Presentation	Jesus Corral, Senior Director of Education Services; Rahman Williams, Supervising Program Analyst	May 2016
124.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Existing Commissions, Committees, and Agencies	Los Angeles County	May 2016
125.	Los Angeles County Probation Department Existing Commissions, Committees, and Agencies' Roles and Responsibilities	Los Angeles County	June 2016
126.	Los Angeles Reform- Landscape 2016	Children's Defense Fund of California	2016
127.	Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department	Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates	November 2005
128.	Memorandum: Empowerment Congress; Justice & Public Safety Committee	Probation Department Oversight Working Group	May 2016
129.	Organizational Rules of the Los Angeles County Probation Commission	Los Angeles County Probation Commission	February 2009
130.	PCMS ERD		
131.	PEMRS Data Models		2012
132.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Amendment to the Minutes of 9/14/16	Carol Biondi	September 2016



133.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee Presentation	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group	April 2016
134.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group- JJCPA Presentation	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group	September 2016
135.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Meeting Schedule	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group	April 2016
136.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Motion	Supervisor Sheila Kuehl and Mark Ridley-Thomas	January 2016
137.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Motion	Supervisor Don Knabe	February 2016
138.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Motion	Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich	February 2016
139.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group- Working Document of Recommendations	Carol Chodroff, Chair	June 2016
140.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group- Working Document of Recommendations	Carol Chodroff, Chair	June 2016
141.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group- Working Document of Recommendations	Carol Chodroff, Chair	September 2016
142.	Probation Oversight Commission Working Group- Working Document of Recommendations	Carol Chodroff, Chair	October 2016
143.	Powers and Duties of the Probation Commission Motion	County of Los Angeles Office of the County Counsel	August 2006
144.	Probation Department- Budget, Juvenile Halls and Camps Operating Costs, and Departmental Contracting Procedures Review	Department of Auditor-Controller	July 2015
145.	Probation Department- Cellular Telephones and Other Wireless Data Devices Review	Department of Auditor-Controller	February 2015
146.	Probation Department- Interviews of Youth Under Supervision of the Probation Department	Department of Auditor-Controller	November 2016
147.	Proposal to Improve Oversight of the Probation Department	Joe Gardner, President, Probation Commission	March 2016
148.	Proposition 47 Technical Appendix	Groff, Wartell, and Ward	2016
150.	Questions for Dr. Michael Schumacher, Probation Consultant, Research and Evaluation	Probation Oversight Committee	May 2016
151.	Questions for Vincent Holmes, CEO Services Integration Branch	Probation Oversight Committee	July 2016
152.	Response to Auditor- Controller's Information Technology and Security Review	Department of Auditor-Controller	June 2015



153.	Risk Needs Assessment Tools	Los Angeles County Probation Department	
154.	Should L.A.'s probation agency be split between youth and adults?	Abby Sewell; LA Times	December 2015
155.	Strategic Plan Staff Survey Summary Data		July 2015
156.	Youth in the Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice System: Current Conditions and Possible Directions for Change	Jacquelyn McCroskey	April 2006

¹ Los Angeles County Probation Department, "Los Angeles County Probation Department Strategic Plan 2015-2018" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Probation Department, August 2015).

² Public Safety Realignment Team, "California Public Safety Realignment Act (AB 109)," July 19, 2016, <http://ccjcc.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=2vP4u93-c4Q%3d&portalid=11>.

³ Public Safety Realignment Team, "Public Safety Realignment: Year-Three Report" (Los Angeles, CA, January 2015).

⁴ Cal Remington, "Public Safety Realignment Implementation – July 2016 Update" (Los Angeles, CA: Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee, July 19, 2016).

⁵ Ralph F. Boyd Jr., "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, April 9, 2003); Grace Chung Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, October 31, 2008).

⁶ Casey A. v. Gundry Class Action Settlement Agreement, No. CV 10-00192 (November 2010).

⁷ Alex Reed and Veronica Quezada, "Juveniles, Their Advocates Unhappy with Lack of Re-Entry Resources from LA Probation," *Juvenile Justice Information Exchange*, February 16, 2016, <http://jjie.org/2016/02/16/juveniles-their-advocates-unhappy-with-lack-of-re-entry-resources-from-la-probation/>.

⁸ Terry Fain, Susan Turner, and Mauri Matsuda, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act: Fiscal Year 2014-2015" (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2016).

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ John Naimo, "Probation Department - Contracting Review" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller, May 29, 2015).

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Calvin C. Remington, "County of Los Angeles Probation Department Departmental Overview: Prepared for Probation Oversight Commission Working Group" (Los Angeles, CA, March 10, 2016).

¹³ Calvin C. Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Probation Department, August 24, 2010).

¹⁴ Angela M. Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System" (Los Angeles, CA: Children's Defense Fund - California, January 2015).

¹⁵ Los Angeles Probation Oversight Working Group, "Draft - Working Document: Mission/Vision; Findings; and Recommendations" (Los Angeles, CA, October 18, 2016), <https://www.lacounty.gov/files/Probation%20Oversights/Recommendations-As%20of%2010-18-16.pdf>; Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System"; Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report" (Los Angeles, CA: Violence Intervention Program, October 31, 2016).

¹⁶ Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report."

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Denise C. Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study," April 2015; Los Angeles Probation Oversight Working Group, "Draft - Working Document: Mission/Vision; Findings; and Recommendations"; Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System."

¹⁹ Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report."

²⁰ Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps"; Boyd, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls."



- ²¹ John Naimo, "Review of Probation Department's Compliance with the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement for the Juvenile Camps" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller, June 10, 2016); John Naimo, "Probation Department Juvenile Halls - Department of Justice Settlement Agreement Monitoring - Fiscal Year 2013-14" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller, February 11, 2015).
- ²² Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System"; Michelle Newell and Jorja Leap, "Reforming the Nation's Largest Juvenile Justice System" (Los Angeles, CA: Children's Defense Fund - California and UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs, November 2013).
- ²³ Calvin C. Remington, "Ending the Practice of Juvenile Solitary Confinement and Establishment of Hope Centers Implementation Plan (Item No. 8, Agenda of May 3, 2016) - Second Status Report" (Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Probation Department, October 31, 2016).
- ²⁴ Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System"; Garrett Therolf, "'It Appears That No One Cares': Report Slams Juvenile Hall for Filthy Conditions and Poor Leadership," *Los Angeles Times*, March 7, 2016, <http://www.latimes.com/local/countygovernment/la-me-juvenile-hall-problems-20160307-story.html>.
- ²⁵ Civil Grand Jury, "2015-2016 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury Final Report" (Los Angeles, CA, June 2016), 427, <http://grandjury.co.la.ca.us/pdf/LOSANGELESCOUNTY2015-2016CIVILGRANDJURYFINALREPORT.pdf>.
- ²⁶ Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System"; Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report."
- ²⁷ Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System."
- ²⁸ Boyd, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls."
- ²⁹ Newell and Leap, "Reforming the Nation's Largest Juvenile Justice System," 4.
- ³⁰ Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System."
- ³¹ Newell and Leap, "Reforming the Nation's Largest Juvenile Justice System."
- ³² Jorja Leap, Karrah R. Lompa, and Marjan Goudarzi, "Documenting System Change: LA County's Camp Kilpatrick Replacement Project" (Los Angeles, CA: Leap and Associates, July 2015).
- ³³ Michael Graham et al., "Twelfth Monitoring Report for the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles County Probation Department Camps" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, February 24, 2015).
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 68.
- ³⁵ Boyd, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls."
- ³⁶ Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps."
- ³⁷ Chung et al., "Rising Up Speaking Out: Youth Transforming Los Angeles County's Juvenile Justice System."
- ³⁸ Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report."
- ³⁹ Graham et al., "Twelfth Monitoring Report for the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States and the County of Los Angeles Regarding the Los Angeles County Probation Department Camps."
- ⁴⁰ Los Angeles County Probation Department, "Los Angeles County Probation Department Strategic Plan 2015-2018."
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴² Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities" (Sacramento, CA: Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., December 2015); Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department" (Torrance, CA: Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, November 28, 2005).
- ⁴³ Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps"; Boyd, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls."
- ⁴⁴ Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities," December 2015.
- ⁴⁵ "Los Angeles County Probation Department: Work With Us - Employment Opportunity," *County of Los Angeles Probation Department*, accessed December 20, 2016, <http://probation.lacounty.gov/wps/portal/probation/work/employment/>.
- ⁴⁶ Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities," December 2015.
- ⁴⁷ Naimo, "Review of Probation Department's Compliance with the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement for the Juvenile Camps"; Naimo, "Probation Department Juvenile Halls - Department of Justice Settlement



Agreement Monitoring - Fiscal Year 2013-14"; Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps"; Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department."

⁴⁸ Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward"; Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department."

⁴⁹ Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward," iii.

⁵⁰ Alt Mayer Consulting, "Probation Department Final Report: Restoring Credibility and Integrity to the Department" (Pasadena, CA: Alt Mayer Consulting, April 2012), 21.

⁵¹ Alt Mayer Consulting, "Probation Department Final Report: Restoring Credibility and Integrity to the Department."

⁵² Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward."

⁵³ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁴ Alt Mayer Consulting, "Probation Department Final Report: Restoring Credibility and Integrity to the Department,"

⁵⁵ Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities" (Sacramento, CA: Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc., December 2015).

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department"; Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward."

⁵⁹ Violence Intervention Program, "VIP Probation Interview Report"; Becker, "Investigation of the Los Angeles County Probation Camps"; Boyd, "Los Angeles County Juvenile Halls."

⁶⁰ Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department."

⁶¹ Alt Mayer Consulting, "Probation Department Final Report: Restoring Credibility and Integrity to the Department."

⁶² Wendy L. Watanabe, "Probation Department - Cash Handling, Trust Funds, Accounts Payable, and Commitments Review" (Los Angeles: County of Los Angeles Department of Audit-Controller, February 19, 2014).

⁶³ Simpson & Simpson Certified Public Accountants, "Probation Department Biennial Trust Controls Financial and Compliance Audit for Fiscal Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014" (Los Angeles, June 2, 2015).

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities," December 2015.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ John Naimo, "Probation Department - Budget, Juvenile Halls and Camps Operating Costs, and Departmental Contracting Procedures Review" (Los Angeles: County of Los Angeles Department of Audit-Controller, July 24, 2015).

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, "Review of the Department of Probation's Hiring and Grant Administration Activities," December 2015.

⁷⁷ Simpson & Simpson Certified Public Accountants, "Probation Department Biennial Trust Controls Financial and Compliance Audit for Fiscal Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014."

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Naimo, "Probation Department - Budget, Juvenile Halls and Camps Operating Costs, and Departmental Contracting Procedures Review."

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Michelle Newell and Angélica Salazar, "Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers and Policy Options" (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School of Government, December 2010), 22.



⁸³ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study."

⁸⁴ Ibid.; Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department."

⁸⁵ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study"; Newell and Salazar, "Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers and Policy Options."

⁸⁶ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study"; Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward"; Newell and Salazar, "Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers and Policy Options."

⁸⁷ Public Safety Realignment Team, "Public Safety Realignment: Year-Three Report."

⁸⁸ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study"; Newell and Salazar, "Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers and Policy Options"; Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC, "2004-05 Management Audit of the Los Angeles County Probation Department."

⁸⁹ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study," 145.

⁹⁰ Remington, "Back to the Basics: The Steps Required While Moving Forward"; Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study"; Child Welfare League of America, "Los Angeles County Probation Department Program Audit Report" (Los Angeles, CA: Child Welfare League of America, September 2005); Newell and Salazar, "Juvenile Reentry in Los Angeles County: An Exploration of Strengths, Barriers and Policy Options."

⁹¹ Herz et al., "The Los Angeles County Juvenile Probation Outcomes Study," 143.

⁹² Ibid., 144.

⁹³ Jeremy Loudanback, "Voluntary Probation for L.A. County Youth," *The Chronicle of Social Change*, September 13, 2016, <https://chronicleofsocialchange.org/analysis/voluntary-probation-l-county-youth/20952>.