

# LA Probation Governance Study

---

## Review of Best Practices in Probation



**Prepared by:**

**Resource Development Associates**

**April 10, 2017**





# LA Probation Governance Study

---

## Review of Best Practices in Probation

**Patricia Marrone Bennett, Ph.D.**

**Mikaela Rabinowitz, Ph.D.**

**Ardavan Davaran, Ph.D.**

**Moira DeNike, Ph.D.**

**Ron Soto, M.S.W, M.P.H.**

**Lupe Garcia**

This report was published by Resource Development Associates under contract with the Los Angeles County Executive's Office.

Copyright 2017 by Resource Development Associates

### **About Resource Development Associates**

Resource Development Associates (RDA) is a consulting firm based in Oakland, California, that serves government and nonprofit organizations throughout California as well as other states. Our mission is to strengthen public and non-profit efforts to promote social and economic justice for vulnerable populations. RDA supports its clients through an integrated approach to planning, grant-writing, organizational development, and evaluation.





## Acknowledgements

The following *Review of Best Practices in Probation* could not have been completed without the support and contributions of Vincent Schiraldi, David Muhammad, Dr. Jorja Leap, and Karrah Lompah. Mr. Schiraldi is the Senior Research Fellow and Director of the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at Harvard Kennedy School, as well as former Director of Juvenile Corrections in Washington, DC and former Commissioner of the New York City Department of Probation. Mr. Muhammad is the Executive Director of the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform and a leader in the fields of criminal justice, violence prevention, and youth development. Dr. Jorja Leap is an Adjunct Professor of Social Welfare; Director of Health and Social Justice Partnership at UCLA; and Principal of Leap and Associates. Ms. Lompah is the Chief of Staff at Leap and Associates, where she helps direct the Health and Social Justice Partnership at UCLA.



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	1
Introduction .....	2
Section 1. Probation Department Management, Structures, and Systems .....	4
Organizational Culture .....	6
Collaboration, Partnerships, and Linkages.....	11
Staffing Standards in Probation .....	18
Management Practices and Systems .....	25
Collection and Use of Data .....	28
Section 2. Adult Probation Services .....	33
Assessment and Case Planning .....	34
Pre-Release Planning .....	39
Pretrial Services and Court Assistance .....	41
Section 3. Juvenile Service Delivery .....	44
Pre-Adjudication Diversion .....	46
Detention Diversion .....	50
Assessment and Case Management .....	53
Juvenile Detention and Placement Facilities .....	59
Section 4. Transition Aged Youth .....	66
Appendix of Tools, Practices, Programs, and Approaches Referenced in Document.....	70



## Introduction

American Probation was originally invented by Boston shoemaker John Augustus in 1841, a court volunteer who took errant neighbors under his wing, helped them pay off their debt to society, and reported back to the court on their progress to help them to avoid being detained.<sup>1</sup> At that time no one could have envisioned the current system, where almost 4 million people on probation are supervised by 2,000 departments around the country.<sup>2</sup> As the above numbers indicate, probation agencies, including Los Angeles County Probation, have grown to impact the lives of U.S. residents far beyond anything anticipated by the original designers. In large jurisdictions like Los Angeles County, where 6,500 staff operate under an \$820 million budget to supervise approximately 50,000 system-involved adults and juveniles, the imperative for well-designed and well-operated organizational systems and practices is paramount.<sup>3</sup>

Driven by a large body of research, probation departments across the country are under transformation, implementing new strategies and processes including evidence-based practices and community-based services, and placing increased emphasis on rehabilitation and youth development as a means for promoting public safety.<sup>4 5</sup> Within this landscape, probation agencies should focus on harm reduction by supervising only those who need to be supervised, for only the amount of time they need to be under supervision, and by relying more on incentives like shortening probation terms for good behavior, rather than sanctions like revocation and incarceration. For individuals under community supervision, probation should focus on improving supervision practices by implementing evidence-based and best practices identified in the field, couched within a community-involved approach, as research indicates that cohesive communities and informal controls are more effective at reducing crime than government interventions.<sup>6 7 8 9 10 11</sup>

With the probation profession being transformed throughout the nation, there is great need for guidance around identifying and implementing evidence-based and best practices to promote public safety, affect positive behavior change, and minimize the risk of reoffending.<sup>12</sup> In order to develop the following review of best practices in probation, RDA synthesized research across a number of subject areas, including criminal and juvenile justice as well as organizational development and leadership, developed by government and professional Probation agencies; non-profit and private organizations; and, independent researchers published in peer reviewed journals.

## Organization of this Document

This document is organized into four distinct sections focusing on best practices in:

- Probation Department Management, Structure, and Systems;
- Adult Service Delivery;
- Juvenile Service Delivery; and,
- Transitional Age Youth.



Each section begins with an introduction highlighting key developments in the subject area, followed by a more detailed review of evidence-based and best practices across a number of domains within each area. Appendices are included at the conclusion of the document in order to highlight specific tools, practices, programs, and approaches referenced throughout the document.



## Section 1. Probation Department Management, Structures, and Systems

Propelled by over 25 years of research describing what works to develop and rehabilitate both young people and adults, the probation profession is now being transformed as departments across the country are implementing new strategies and processes, including evidence-based practices and community-based services.<sup>13</sup> Twenty first century probation departments emphasize rehabilitation and youth development as core components of their mission and as a means of promoting public safety.<sup>14</sup> Collaboration with community-based organizations and other public systems involved in the lives of individuals in the probation system is now seen as critical to achieving this mission, as is measuring and reporting on client processes and outcomes. The use of data to direct decision-making both at the individual- and systems-level is a major change that is demanded in order to ensure improved outcomes, smarter use of taxpayer dollars, and better conditions for both those under the charge of probation and those who work within the system.<sup>15 16</sup>

At the same time that the probation profession is experiencing these rapid changes, the workplace in America is also changing. The use of computers and the practice of using data to inform all decision-making are now common practice both in the private and public sectors. Entry-level requirements in most professions call for higher levels of education, specialized training, and continuing education. Flexibility in hours and place of work is becoming the norm, along with a shift away from centralized offices requiring long commutes.<sup>17 18</sup>

In addition to changes in the workplace, the demands and needs of the workforce are also changing. A recent Gallup study entitled “The American Workplace” describes new generations of workers who require that their jobs have purpose and be driven by a mission that they feel passionate about. They also want to continuously learn and grow while being able to maintain flexibility and a healthy work-life balance.

In light of these changes, sectors across the United States are experiencing increased competition for qualified employees, and the ability to attract and retain a competent workforce is being challenged. Unlike 25 years ago, a worker is much more likely to leave their job and look for another if the conditions of employment do not satisfy their needs.<sup>19</sup> This is a particularly important issue for the Los Angeles Probation Department to consider, as they currently face filling 800 staff vacancies and have an aging workforce.

In the face of a rapidly changing American workplace generally, and the probation profession more specifically, the Los Angeles Probation Department must grapple with transforming their own organizational structure and systems if they are to adapt to the standards and practices that are now expected of them. Many probation departments find themselves having to make extensive changes in:

- Staff hiring and training policies and practices;
- Personnel management and supervision;
- The use of data and data systems;
- Internal and external communication strategies;





- Collaboration and partnerships; and,
- Contract procurement and management.

This section provides standards and best practices that touch on all of these subjects, with identified subsections focusing on best practices in Organizational Culture; Collaboration, Partnerships, and Linkages; Staffing Standards in Probation; Management Systems and Practices; and the Collection and Use of Data. The information is compiled from standards put forth by professional probation organizations; recognized best practices in probation; and research, theory, and practice in modern management and organizational development.





## Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a system, both explicit and implicit, of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs, which govern how people behave in an organization. This shared culture has a strong influence on the people in the organization and dictates how they act, talk, and perform their jobs.<sup>20</sup> Research shows that a positive organizational culture is characterized by staff that are engaged in their work. An engaged workforce is measured by the degree to which workers understand what is expected of them, believe their work matters, have the materials and resources necessary to do their work, and trust that their supervisors have their best interests at heart.<sup>21</sup> When a person is engaged in his/her work he/she are less likely to watch the clock, file a worker's compensation claim, or leave their job for another. They are more productive, committed to quality, and speak highly of their workplace. These are all important for establishing higher employee morale.<sup>22</sup>

The table below is a compilation of best practices in probation that address some of the primary building blocks to establishing a positive organizational culture, with specified focus on the following components:

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Leadership
- Best Practices, Evidence-Based Practices, and Continuous Learning
- Organizational Change Management
- Managing Resistance to Change

Much of the research is derived from the US Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections, the Office of Justice Programs, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (and the Urban Institute), as well as independent research by criminologists and management and organizational development experts.

**Table 1. Organizational Culture**

Organizational Culture Components	Best Practices
<b>Mission, Vision, and Values</b>	<p>A critical component of any organizational culture is the establishment, implementation, and ongoing communication of a compelling and aspirational mission and vision for the future of the organization, as well as articulated values that are constantly reinforced. An organization's mission, vision, and values should reflect the organization's purpose, ideal state, and the beliefs and practices that will help the organization arrive at that ideal. These statements guide organizational operations, progress, and shifts in practice.<sup>23</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is no specific time when mission statements should be revised; rather, they should always be under review. Shifts in the environment, organization,</li></ul>



	<p>or field will often require revisions to these statements.<sup>24</sup></p> <p>Achieving “public safety” is a distal outcome of probation services, requiring complex community engagements beyond probation alone.<sup>25</sup> Therefore probation departments should reframe their mission toward the more direct goals of being rooted in the community,<sup>26</sup> effecting positive behavior change, and minimizing risk of reoffending.<sup>27</sup></p> <p>If a probation department expects to reduce recidivism, provide meaningful support towards rehabilitation, and work as partners in the community it must explicitly embrace these concepts in its mission, vision, and values.<sup>28</sup></p>
<b>Leadership</b>	<p>Leadership exists throughout an organization, and should not be confused with authority or position. The qualities and behaviors described below result in successful organizational leadership.<sup>29 30</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Model the Way:</b> Leaders establish principles concerning the way people (including constituents, peers, colleagues, and clients) should be treated. They create standards of excellence and then set an example for others to follow. Because the prospect of complex change can overwhelm people and stifle action, leaders set interim goals so that people can achieve small wins as they work toward larger objectives.</li><li>• <b>Inspire a Shared Vision:</b> Leaders passionately believe that they can make a difference. They envision the future, creating an ideal and unique image of what the organization can become. Leaders enlist others in their dreams. They breathe life into their visions and get people to see exciting possibilities for the future.</li><li>• <b>Challenge the Process:</b> Leaders search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization. In doing so, they experiment and take risks.</li><li>• <b>Enable Others to Act:</b> Leaders foster collaboration and build spirited teams. They actively involve others. Leaders understand that mutual respect is what sustains extraordinary efforts; they strive to create an atmosphere of trust and human dignity.</li><li>• <b>Encourage the Heart:</b> Accomplishing extraordinary things in organizations is hard work. To keep hope and determination alive, leaders recognize the contributions that individuals make. In every winning team, the members need to share in the rewards of their efforts, so leaders celebrate accomplishments.</li></ul> <p>When organizational culture needs to be changed or improved, leaders are responsible for strategically undertaking a deliberate culture shift. Organizational change and improvement efforts require a series of steps that include:<sup>31</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Assessment:</b> Leaders must understand the current practices, strengths and challenges as well as understanding the organizations readiness for change</li><li>• <b>Intervention:</b> Intervention activities are designed to respond to the needs and issues identified in the assessment/diagnosis process.</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Performance Measurement:</b> On both a short- and long-term basis, leaders provide data on changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behavior.</li></ul> <p>Leaders are most effective when they create a shared desire in a group to attain a goal or to move in a particular direction. In order to be most successful in organizational change, leaders must empower others to provide leadership. Champions of change need to be identified and recognized throughout the organization.</p> <p>Leaders in correctional agencies should possess the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ability for reflection;</li><li>• Acknowledgement of personal strengths and weaknesses;</li><li>• Willingness to take risks and receive feedback;</li><li>• Ability to motivate others; and</li><li>• Demonstration of the fundamental principles of honesty, openness, respect, and trust</li></ul> <p>Leaders must repeatedly articulate the values that drive their beliefs about needed change, and support and reward others who do so.<sup>32</sup> People who enter the profession of probation may not have been selected for the skills that are now essential for leading departments. Some of these skills or competencies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strategic thinking,</li><li>• Change management,</li><li>• Communication,</li><li>• Collaboration,</li><li>• Coaching and mentoring, and</li><li>• Relationship building.<sup>33</sup></li></ul>
<b>Best Practices, Evidence-Based Practices, and Continuous Learning</b>	<p>A strong organizational culture in probation is associated with greater adoption of evidence-based and best practices.<sup>34</sup> Best practices include embracing the implementation of culturally appropriate community-based services, the engagement of community and other public agencies, the use of validated assessment tools, and data-driven decision-making at both the organizational and individual level.</p> <p>In order to implement these practices, leadership must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Create a climate for continuous learning and reward those who participate;</li><li>• Become performance-oriented (driven by common, tangible goals and articulated measurable outcomes);</li><li>• Encourage innovation that is adaptable; and,</li><li>• Emphasize quality service provision (e.g., supervisors focus more on providing appropriate services than on simply number of contacts per client).<sup>35</sup></li></ul>



<b>Organizational Change Management</b>	<p>Probation departments should conduct initial assessments of organizational culture prior to enacting organizational transitions, and focus on understanding the reactions and responses of personnel as the organizational culture shifts.<sup>36</sup></p> <p>Research indicates that in order for deliberate change efforts to succeed, leaders need to:<sup>37</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understand the proposed change;</li><li>• Agree that a change is needed;</li><li>• Believe that leadership support the change;</li><li>• Believe that their peers support the change; and,</li><li>• Understand how the change benefits them.</li></ul> <p>Continuous assessment needs to occur to measure and monitor the degree to which staff agree or disagree with these five items. Probation must strategically address those areas where staff measure low. Strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:<sup>38</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “Sell the problem” in order to establish a challenge, problem, or opportunity and create an opening for new ideas in people’s minds;<sup>39</sup></li><li>• Continuously demonstrate their commitment to the change;</li><li>• Develop support and elevate those who support the change;</li><li>• Over-communicate about all aspects of the change; and,</li><li>• Create a positive rewards system to recognize employees who demonstrate skills, values, and proficiencies in alignment with the shifting organizational culture.<sup>40</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation departments making changes in hiring, training, and performance measurement will see that, over time, these changes create a critical mass of employees who hold a new mindset, which will signal the change from the old way of doing things to the new.<sup>41</sup></p> <p><i>Please see Table 13 for a list of the stages of organizational transition.</i></p>
<b>Managing Resistance to Change</b>	<p>Communication during organizational transition is key, as managing the psychological transitions of the people impacted by system changes may be more difficult than the set of tasks associated with operational system changes. Department leaders should recognize there will be a sense of loss and anxiety as culture and practices begin to shift, and they should expect some overreaction to these feelings.</p> <p>To manage resistance to change, probation department leaders should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide frequent, direct communication to all levels of the organization;<sup>42</sup></li><li>• Repeat messages often, through multiple mediums, and with sensitivity;<sup>43</sup></li><li>• Not rely on “trickle-down” communication, as supervisors are in a state of transition and the “grapevine” will be actively spreading messages which may</li></ul>



or may not accurately convey information;<sup>44</sup>

- Acknowledge feelings of loss openly and sympathetically, identify and compensate for losses as appropriate, and communicate clear expectations for the transition;<sup>45</sup>
- Discourage denigration of past practices, and help to position the past as a positive legacy that paved the way for what's new;<sup>46</sup> and,
- Measure and celebrate successes as change takes hold.<sup>47 48</sup>



## Collaboration, Partnerships, and Linkages

Successful case planning, diversion, and reentry planning and support are strategies that reduce recidivism and require authentic collaboration and coordination among multiple public agencies and community-based organizations. Probation departments should intentionally foster structured partnerships with multiple public agencies and community-based organizations in order to meet the treatment, housing, educational, employment, and health-related needs of clients, and to result in better outcomes and reduced costs associated with these services.<sup>49</sup> In addition, probation officers should develop relationships with community members and other informal community supports to provide an opportunity for community corrections agencies to improve outcomes in highly impacted neighborhoods.<sup>50</sup>

Table 2 below highlights best practices for probation to maximize effective collaboration with public agencies, community-based organizations, and community members, with emphasis placed in the following areas:

- Community-Based Probation Sites
- Structured Partnerships
- Coordination with County Behavioral Health
- Coordination with Local Housing Authority
- Coordination with Child Welfare
- Coordination with Gang Intervention and Prevention Efforts
- Coordination with Other Public Agencies

To inform these findings, RDA synthesized research gathered from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the National Institute of Justice, the National Center for State Courts, the National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, the U.S. Department of Urban Housing, and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice, as well as from New York City's Probation Department and other independent criminologists.

**Table 2. Collaboration, Partnerships, and Linkages**

Collaboration/Linkages Components	Best Practices
<b>Community-based Probation Sites</b>	<p>Probation departments should identify neighborhoods where large numbers of probation clients live and establish office and other operations in these neighborhoods.</p> <p><b><u>New York City's NeON Model</u></b><sup>51 52</sup></p> <p>Establishing probation offices and operations in neighborhoods where large numbers of probation clients live:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Promotes an ethic that elevates natural neighborhood supports over</li></ul>



temporary government intervention in the lives of probation clients;

- Supports clients in providing restorative works to the communities that they have harmed through their offenses;
- Makes it easier for probation officers to develop relationships with indigenous neighborhood stakeholders and community-based organizations that can provide services, support, and opportunities for clients living in the neighborhood; and
- Ties clients to services, supports, and opportunities that exist in their home communities to facilitate their participation with such opportunities after the term of probation is over.

Leadership and staff should create community stakeholder groups or advisory panels to inform community members of probation's work and learn from neighbors what challenges and opportunities exist in their home communities. In this way, probation can engage with indigenous supports, business associations, neighborhood organizations, faith leaders, and local service providers, becoming more familiar with the types of services, supports, and opportunities that are available within the community. This enables probation departments to better link clients to useful opportunities and partner with local stakeholders to advocate for/create missing services and supports.

Probation should also collaborate with community members to establish satellite offices co-located with local non-profits or community associations that host probation staff in environments that are conducive to client engagement. Some of the benefits of collaborating with community-based organizations include:

- Having an "ear to the ground" in high-impact communities to improve community corrections work;
- Garnering support from key community stakeholders in helping probation clients turn their lives around;
- Discerning what services and supports are lacking that are key to crime control;
- Providing a community-based space for clients to meet with probation officers and promote staff/client relationships;
- Helping probation officers and their clients build rapport; and,
- Allowing probation officers to more easily connect clients with local resources.

Community embedded probation offices and satellites should also collaborate with local stakeholders to host neighborhood works projects and work, education, and health fairs that are open to the community. In addition. Community offices can also collaborate with arts organizations where individuals on probation can engage in a range of arts activities and neighborhoods that are often "art deserts" can experience performance and visual arts by their neighbors on probation.<sup>53 54</sup>



	<p>Probation departments should anticipate that authentic collaboration with community-based partners will require a substantial time investment; these connections are nevertheless essential for several reasons:<sup>55</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Using capable community partners effectively can save money compared to either incarceration or probation-delivered services.<sup>56 57</sup></li><li>• As noted above, after probation is completed, clients who are enmeshed in services, supports, and opportunities in their home communities can continue to benefit from them.</li></ul> <p>Extensive research highlights that youth who receive community-based programming to address key factors including treatment and therapy, education, family outreach and counseling, and interpersonal skills training experience lower recidivism rates than youth receiving these programs in institutional settings.<sup>58 59 60</sup> Research also suggests that adults who receive drug treatment in the community as opposed to serving a prison term have greater treatment results and reduced rates of recidivism.<sup>61</sup></p>
<b>Structured Partnerships</b>	<p>The Probation Department should establish structured partnerships with community-based service providers and other County departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prioritize establishing partnerships with service providers who are implementing evidence-based and best practices in order to reduce the likelihood of recidivism for clients enrolling in these programs.</li><li>• Ensure that services and supports are culturally appropriate. The definition of cultural competence must include race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual identification, language, age, and even geographic neighborhood.</li></ul> <p>Structured partnerships should exist with service providers who help to address the following needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Physical health</li><li>• Mental health</li><li>• Trauma/PTSD</li><li>• Substance use</li><li>• Housing</li><li>• Education/workforce development</li><li>• Employment</li><li>• Legal aid</li><li>• Family support/reunification</li><li>• Benefits</li><li>• Mentorship</li><li>• Criminal thinking</li><li>• Transportation</li><li>• Positive youth development</li></ul>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Civic engagement</li></ul> <p>Partnerships with community-based organizations and County providers should be systematic rather than <i>ad hoc</i>, to include formalized and collaborative relationships, rather than haphazard referrals by probation officers or monitoring activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation departments should map all community-based service providers and treatment programs that exist in the community.<sup>62</sup></li><li>• Probation departments should assess the quality of community-based programs for their ability to address risks and needs – high-quality programs utilizing evidence-based and best practices should be formally established as collaborative partners.<sup>63</sup></li></ul> <p>Bi-directional feedback and communication should exist with all partners in order to help to reduce duplicative efforts, and remove barriers to success for clients under community supervision.<sup>64</sup></p>
<b>Coordination with County Behavioral Health</b>	<p>People with mental illness and/or substance use issues on average have significantly longer lengths of stay under community supervision, irrespective of criminal charge and risk index. They are revoked more frequently as well.<sup>65</sup></p> <p>In order to improve public safety and treatment outcomes, while reducing recidivism as well as costs, probation and county behavioral health departments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coordinate with each other to ensure that individuals under community supervision are consistently assessed for behavioral health needs upon intake;</li><li>• Share assessment information (using appropriate consent and privacy protections) among county behavioral health, probation, defense counsel, and relevant mental health service providers to develop case plans for community-based supervision and treatment;</li><li>• Work together to ensure judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, county behavioral health staff, probation staff, and community behavioral health providers receive cross-training to understand and recognize behavioral health needs, and identify community-based supervision and treatment options.<sup>66</sup></li><li>• Develop systems of care and wraparound services that allow funds to come from multiple sources and case planning to be multi-jurisdictional.<sup>67 68</sup></li><li>• Identify crossover youth who are being served in child welfare/mental health and probation and ensure that coordination of services is occurring.<sup>69</sup></li><li>• Regularly review data regarding the number of crossover youth, the services they receive, the cost to the county, and the outcomes of</li></ul>



	<p>services.</p> <p>Together the agencies should coordinate to expand the availability of community-based supervision and treatment for people with mental illness and/or substance use issues (both pretrial and post-release).<sup>70</sup></p>
<b>Coordination with Local Housing Authority</b>	<p>People who are under community supervision and suffer from housing instability and/or homelessness need support to address this basic need. The Housing First approach suggests it is critical to support housing needs and help individuals attain permanent housing, which can serve as a platform for addressing other risks and needs. As such,</p> <p>Probation should partner with local public housing agencies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Create specific coordinated programs that prioritize low-cost, subsidized, or free housing opportunities for returning citizens and or homeless probation clients; and</li><li>• Lift/modify restrictions and screening policies that prevent individuals with criminal convictions from living in public housing.<sup>71</sup></li></ul>
<b>Coordination with Child Welfare</b>	<p>For more than two decades the Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has advocated for greater coordination between juvenile justice and child welfare systems in order to ensure better outcomes for youthful clients who also have child welfare system involvement (dual-system or crossover youth).<sup>72</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Leadership from the county's child welfare agencies, juvenile justice agencies, and the judiciary should come together to analyze and plan improved systems integration. Ideally this leadership effort should also include county mental health, substance abuse, housing, and education agencies.<sup>73</sup></li><li>• Juvenile probation divisions should develop protocols and a formalized agreement (memorandum of understanding) with the county child welfare agency for coordinated case planning for crossover youth, data-sharing, and cross-system training.<sup>74</sup></li></ul> <p>To help eliminate foster care detention bias (child welfare system-involved youth are more likely to be detained in the juvenile justice system, and for longer periods) foster-care providers, social workers, and juvenile justice case workers should attend detention hearings and work as a team to determine how to best address the needs of all crossover youth.<sup>75</sup></p> <p>Special attention must be given to changing laws and practices occurring in the child welfare arena in California, as these changes will impact crossover youth.</p>
<b>Coordination with</b>	<p>Probation should actively collaborate with any comprehensive gang</p>



## Gang Intervention and Prevention Efforts

reduction efforts taking place within the County. The OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model includes five core strategies highlighted below.<sup>76</sup> Probation should participate in each core strategy area, if at all possible.

### **OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model's five core strategies:**

**Community Mobilization:** Involvement of local citizens, including former gang members and community groups and agencies, and the coordination of programs and staff functions within and across agencies.

- Probation should participate in a formal community-wide leadership structure(s) (i.e., steering committees) where local citizens, including youth, community groups, and education, as well as other public and community based service agencies are involved.

**Opportunities Provision:** The development of a variety of specific education, training, and employment programs targeting gang-involved youth.

- Probation departments, in collaboration with partners, should coordinate existing resources through a collaborative funding approach, and develop a variety of social and economic opportunities such as educational, training, and employment programs targeted towards gang-involved youth and youth at risk of gang involvement.

**Social Intervention:** Youth-serving agencies, schools, street outreach workers, grassroots groups, faith-based organizations, law enforcement agencies, and other criminal justice organizations reaching out and acting as links between gang-involved youth and their families, the conventional world, and needed services.

- Probation should collaborate with other jurisdictions, including nearby cities, to create a network of youth-serving agencies that assist them (and their families) to adopt pro-social values and provide them with access to services that will meet their personal development, family development social, educational, and vocational needs.
- Probation departments should support the utilization of street outreach services as an effective means of linking gang impacted youth and families to necessary services.

**Suppression:** Formal and informal social control procedures, including close supervision or monitoring of gang-involved youth by criminal justice agencies as well as community-based agencies, schools, and grassroots groups.

- Probation should utilize formal and informal social control procedures and accountability measures, including close supervision or monitoring of gang involved youth. Gang suppression efforts should be structurally



	<p>related to community-and problem-oriented policing, as well as gang enforcement and tactical units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation departments and other law enforcement agencies should regularly share aggregate-level data bearing on the gang problem and all components of the gang prevention and intervention strategy.</li><li>• All targeted enforcement operations, when and where necessary, should be consistent with program goals and coordinated with the gang prevention and intervention partners, street outreach, and service providers (as appropriate) to maximize the positive impact.</li></ul> <p><b>Organizational Change and Development:</b> Development and implementation of policies and procedures that result in the most effective use of available and potential resources to better address the gang problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Structured communication practices should be established between probation officers, street outreach workers, service providers and other law enforcement agencies.</li><li>• Probation should collaborate with community agencies and help to understand the multifaceted nature of gang issues as they work together to develop and implement gang reduction strategies.</li><li>• Probation should also participate in creating policies and procedures to help efficiently allocate resources within and across agencies towards gang prevention and intervention.</li></ul> <p><i>Refer to Table 14 for a sample of gang prevention and intervention strategies and programs.</i></p>
<b>Coordination with Other Public Agencies</b>	<p>Probation should collaborate with other county and public agencies in order to promote sustained positive outcomes for individuals under community supervision and to reduce rates of recidivism.<sup>77</sup> This collaboration should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Systematically sharing information with all public agencies that serve individuals under community supervision in order to reduce duplicative efforts and remove clients' barriers to success.<sup>78</sup></li></ul>



## Staffing Standards in Probation

The American Parole and Probation Association (APPA) and the American Correctional Association (ACA) provide staffing guidelines for hiring and promotional practices, including suggested educational requirements, and caseload ratios.<sup>79</sup> A summary of these guidelines is provided alongside research which shows that higher educational attainment is associated with increased effectiveness in working with youth;<sup>80</sup> that probation personnel trained in culturally competent, evidence-based, and best practices produce lower recidivism than those providing traditional probation services;<sup>81 82 83</sup> and that probation departments should focus on workload rather than caseload in determining how cases are allocated, with special attention to assessed risk and needs.<sup>84</sup> Professional standards state that the selection, retention, and promotion of field personnel should be based on merit, and that people who have been on parole or probation should not be categorically excluded from employment.<sup>85</sup> It should be noted however, that hiring standards for Peace Officers in California are governed by various statutes and codes, including POST regulation 1950-1955 and Government Codes 1031 and 1029, which set strict guidelines prohibiting anyone with a felony conviction working for the department.

Table 3 below highlights best practices in these topics, maintaining focus on the following areas:

- Hiring Practices
- Promotion Practices
- Hiring and Detaining a Diverse Workforce
- Training
- Caseloads and Types of Caseloads
- Tenure and Pay Scale
- Disciplinary Practices

A summary of recommended standards around these topics gathered from reports and guidelines from the American Correctional Association (ACA), American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC), Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), and independent research are presented below.

**Table 3. Staffing Standards in Probation**

Staffing Standards in Probation Components	Best Practices
Hiring Practices	Job descriptions for probation officers generally frame supervision duties as assessing the risk and needs of clients, providing counseling, making sentencing recommendations to the court, and understanding legal processes. <sup>86</sup> The selection (as well as retention and promotion) of probation officers should be based on merit, competitive oral and/or written examinations, and specified qualifications demonstrably related to the skills required to perform the work. <sup>87</sup>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation officers should be formally educated – a vast majority of states and ACA standards require a minimum of a bachelor's degree.<sup>88 89</sup> Among juvenile detention officers, a college education is associated with increased effectiveness of behavior management, and greater development of verbal skills in supervised youth.<sup>90</sup></li><li>• Probation officers who work with youth should have youth development backgrounds and/or formal education in childhood development.<sup>91</sup></li><li>• Probation departments should consider ex-clients to be potentially valuable resources, and they should not be discriminated against when seeking employment with a field agency, within the parameters of relevant statutes and regulations.<sup>92</sup></li></ul> <p>Job qualifications and hiring policies should be examined with the assistance of equal employment specialists from outside of the agency in order to ensure that hiring practices promote diversity in the workforce.</p>
<b>Promotion Practices</b>	<p>The promotion system must be structured to value organizational goals and reward desired performance; in other words, promotion should occur when behavior is consistent with organizational goals, individual goals are achieved, and evidence-based practices are embraced.<sup>93</sup> Probation departments should implement performance-driven personnel management practices which use data to track how well individuals' performance aligns with organizational goals</p> <p><i>Please refer to Table 4 (Management Practices and Systems) and Table 5 (Collection and Use of Data) for additional information about data driven performance management.</i></p> <p>Probation departments' performance-driven personnel management practices should promote and reward recidivism reduction. Specifically, probation personnel (both field and custody) should be assessed, rewarded, and promoted for things like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Communication skills, problem solving skills, initiative, and commitment to mission;</li><li>• Time spent targeting criminogenic needs (based on probationers' assessment results);</li><li>• Consistent use of rewards systems when probationers do well and graduated sanctions when they have set-backs; and,</li><li>• Eventually recidivism, based on risk-level of caseload, for field officers.<sup>94, 95</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation departments should put in place client-level data systems to monitor client needs, case planning, progress, and outcomes.<sup>96</sup> These client-level data should then feed into the performance-driven personnel management system which informs how personnel are rewarded, supported, and promoted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Client outcome data should be disaggregated by unit, probation officer, and region to help determine if some staff need additional support, training, or re-assignment, or if some staff are demonstrating exemplary skills, which should</li></ul>



	<p>be recognized through promotion.<sup>97</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation departments should integrate client-level process and outcome data into individual staff performance review processes, and recognize with increased leadership roles when staff members are on track with desired practices.<sup>98 99</sup></li></ul>
<b>Hiring and Retaining a Diverse Workforce</b>	<p>While there is little research demonstrating that a diverse workforce <i>alone</i> will promote a more equitable justice system,<sup>100</sup> there are clear benefits to having a workforce that is diverse across race/ethnicity, gender, and age.</p> <p>In order to sustain a diverse workforce, hiring and promotion practices with probation departments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recognize the value of a workforce that reflects the demographics of the jurisdiction in order to create a multicultural workforce of men and women whose values reflect the principles of reform and the reduction of racial disparities;<sup>101 102</sup></li><li>• Ensure that key positions have enough bi/multilingual staff to meet the community's linguistic needs;<sup>103</sup></li><li>• Promote gender diversity, as women in correctional professions are found to have lower occupational stress than their male counterparts,<sup>104</sup> and to demonstrate skills and characteristics consistent with new recidivism-reducing approaches to probation;<sup>105</sup> and,</li><li>• Recognize the benefits of a cross-generational workforce, including the different assets various age-groups bring to the workplace (e.g., innovation, creative problem-solving, comfort with change, and flexibility among younger staff; work ethic, collaboration, and achievement-orientation among older staff).<sup>106 107</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation departments should anticipate that workers from different age groups may need different supports, accommodations, and incentives to remain engaged and do their best work.<sup>108</sup></p>
<b>Training</b>	<p>Because probation officers play a vital role in maintaining public safety, all probation officers should receive training prior to supervising anyone on probation, and should continue to receive training on an ongoing basis. All staff trainings should be formally evaluated either internally or by an outside evaluator.<sup>109</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Probation Officers:</b> ACA recommends 40 hours of orientation within the first year of job assignment, and 40 hours of ongoing training annually.<sup>110</sup> BSCC guidelines require 196 hours of "core course" instruction within the first year of job assignment as a probation officer, and 40 hours of ongoing training annually.<sup>111</sup></li><li>• <b>Juvenile Detention Officers:</b> ACA recommends 160 hours for first year of employment, plus 40 hours annually thereafter.<sup>112</sup> BSCC requires 160 hours</li></ul>





	<p>initially, and 24 hours of ongoing training annually.<sup>113</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Supervisor/Manager/Administrator:</b> BSCC requires 80 hours within the first year, and 40 hours of ongoing training annually.<sup>114</sup></li></ul> <p>As noted above, the BSCC identifies two distinct types of trainings that all probation officers should receive – core trainings and annual trainings.<sup>115</sup></p> <p><b>Core trainings</b> focus on subject matter directly related to job tasks and are designed as a pre-service training model. Although standards allow up to one year to complete core courses, participating agencies should have eligible staff complete this training before establishing an actual work assignment.<sup>116</sup></p> <p><b><u>Examples of core trainings include:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Basic Peace Officer Training;</li><li>• Fundamentals of Probation Practice; and,</li><li>• Understanding and Addressing Risks and Needs.</li></ul> <p><b>Annual trainings</b> include refresher courses and specialized trainings for implementing evidence based and evidence informed practices. These trainings should focus on the continuous development and the enhancement of jobs skills.<sup>117</sup></p> <p><b><u>Examples of specialized annual trainings include:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Motivational Interviewing;</li><li>• Cognitive Behavioral Intervention;</li><li>• Trauma-Informed Care;</li><li>• Positive Youth Development;</li><li>• Alternative Models for Youth Camps (e.g., the Missouri Model); and,</li><li>• Effective Practices in Community Supervision.</li></ul> <p><i>See Table 15 for a more detailed description of the training requirements for the Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) model.</i></p> <p>Research indicates that training alone is insufficient to enable employees to perform at their best. In addition to conducting trainings, the probation departments should also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify staff who are proficient in evidence-based practices and subject matter areas listed above;</li><li>• Assign these staff to mentor and coach other staff in these methods; and,</li><li>• Create an environment of appreciation and recognition of these staff.</li></ul>
<b>Caseloads and Types of Caseloads</b>	Community supervision caseloads and supervision intensity should be determined in part by the assessed risk levels of clients. This approach leads to low-, medium-, and high-risk supervision types. Below are APPA's general recommended





supervisee-to-probation officer ratios:

- **High-risk intensive supervision** - 20:1 for adult probation, 15:1 for juvenile probation (clients in this designation are at a very high risk for reoffending, but have been diverted from incarceration).
- **Moderate- and high-risk non-intensive supervision** - 50:1 for adult probation, 30:1 for juvenile probation (risk levels determined by validated risk assessment tool).
- **Low-risk** - 200:1 for adult probation, 100:1 for juvenile probation.
- **Administrative** - 1000:1 for administrative probation (very low risk, primarily telephone check-ins -- note, administrative probation is not recommended for juveniles).<sup>118 119120 1</sup>
- **Secure juvenile facility** - 8:1 during resident waking hours and 16:1 during resident sleeping hours, except during limited and discrete exigent circumstances, which must be fully documented. Only security staff should be included in these ratios.<sup>121</sup>

Probation departments usually create supervision units based on risk level. Some probation departments also have specialized units. Some departments have gone to computer-based distance supervision of their low risk caseloads. Distance supervision along with early discharge from probation can be used as an incentive for people on probation to earn gradual step-down and ultimately early termination from probation.<sup>122</sup>

- Specialized unit types include units for clients with gang affiliations, sexual offenses, mental health issues,<sup>123</sup> and domestic violence cases,<sup>124</sup> as well as units for transitional age youth (TAY) and pre-disposition investigation caseloads.<sup>125</sup>
- Some counties organize juvenile probation services into specific units (e.g., diversion, out-of-home placement, etc.), and most designate between "formal" and "informal" probation.<sup>126</sup>

APPA advises that the allocation of cases not be guided by caseload recommendations alone, but instead should consider workload and ways to ensure most effective use of time.

The workload approach entails:

- Conducting an assessment of how many hours probation officers typically spend on various tasks (*see Table 16 for a brief description of findings*);
- Analyzing the extent to which hours spent on certain tasks correspond to the interventions and approaches that should be targeted (i.e., are POs spending too much time supervising low-risk clients, or could administrative task time be reduced through automated data systems or tablets that POs can bring with them to the field); and,
- Making adjustments to caseloads to and probation practices, based on

<sup>1</sup> RDA recommends that low risk youth and adults not be actively supervised.



	<p>workload assessment.<sup>127</sup></p> <p>Statewide in California, average client to staff ratios are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 87:1 adult client to probation officer ratio</li><li>• 51:1 juvenile client to probation officer ratio</li><li>• 18:1 client to probation staff (all personnel) ratio<sup>128 1291302</sup></li></ul>
<b>Tenure and Pay Scales</b>	<p>Probation employee turnover is generally thought to be high as compared with other public sector jobs. High staff turnover and vacancy rates can hinder change and improvement efforts.</p> <p>Research on best practices for management in the workplace indicates that 75% of why employees fail in their jobs relates to poor management and supervision, and surveyed employees generally report that the primary reason they leave their job is because of their supervisor or manager. Managers and supervisors who pay little or no attention to those they are responsible for do the most damage to staff morale.<sup>131 132</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traumatic stress levels are directly related to the length of time working in probation, indicating that, while very high staff turnover is clearly disruptive to agency function, longer tenures without supports for job stressors and trauma may not produce a healthier agency.<sup>133</sup></li></ul> <p>The average tenure for probation officers in California is approximately 8-10 years,<sup>134 135 136</sup> and average probation salaries in California are higher than in any other state.<sup>137</sup> Below are the overall ranges, as well as the average base salary and the average upper limit for typical probation employees across the state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation officers earn between \$31,174 and \$92,240 (low mean – high mean: \$43,553 - \$67,348).</li><li>• Probation supervisors earn between \$42,824 and \$110,656 (low mean – high mean: \$63,768 - \$80,616).</li><li>• Juvenile detention officers earn \$23,846 and \$80,049 (low mean – high mean: \$37,001 - \$47,869).</li><li>• Juvenile detention supervisors earn \$31,530 and \$90,428 (low mean – high mean: \$47,955 - \$61,752).<sup>138</sup></li></ul> <p>In 2012, in California's nine largest probation departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Managers earned average salaries of \$120, 987;</li><li>• Supervisors earned average salaries of \$88,295;</li><li>• Senior line staff earned average salaries of \$77,108;</li></ul>

<sup>2</sup> Calculated using the CPOC 2012 report and 2013 Census county populations <http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>. Note: because the CPOC 2012 report did not include probation staffing data for Modoc, Alpine, or Kings Counties, these population counts were removed from the statewide population-to-probation staff average calculation.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Journey level staff earned average salaries of \$70,966; and,</li><li>• Entry level staff earned average salaries of \$61, 987.<sup>139</sup></li></ul> <p>Research indicates that 71% of juvenile probation staff who were surveyed after leaving their profession indicated favorable feelings for their profession. Sixty percent (60%) cited "lack of advancement" as their reason for leaving, and those who expressed overall dissatisfaction working for probation pointed to poor agency leadership, inappropriate funds allocation, daily job stress, and the frustration of trying to help youth within the system. Only a minority (33%) indicated that an increase in pay would have enabled them to stay longer in the job, and in general these staff earned salaries on the low end of the salaries provided above.<sup>140</sup></p>
<b>Disciplinary Practices</b>	<p>Disciplinary practices vary by jurisdiction, and are defined by state law or agency policy.<sup>141</sup> Disciplinary practices may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Counseling/Admonishment</li><li>• Retraining</li><li>• Transfer</li><li>• Suspension</li><li>• Demotion</li><li>• Dismissal</li></ul>



## Management Practices and Systems

Management practices in probation include the management of both programs and personnel, as research shows that an evidence-based approach to program and personnel management, aligned with the principles of risk/need/responsivity, results in better outcomes and cost savings.<sup>142 143</sup> Best practice recommends that probation departments put in place performance-driven personnel management practices that promote and reward recidivism reduction, as well as the intermediary steps required to get there (e.g., use of new tools and strategies designed to target risks and needs).<sup>144 145</sup> These recommendations are provided in this section, along with useful information about span of control.

Table 4 below catalogues best practices in Management Systems and Practices across the following domains:

- Program Management
- Process Management
- Supervisor Ratios: Span of Control
- Governing and Operational Structure

In each of these sections, RDA provides a summary of standards recommended in reports and guidelines coming from the National Institute of Corrections, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Council of State Governments Justice Center, and the California Judicial Council Administrative Office of the Courts.

**Table 4. Management Systems and Practices**

Management Systems Components	Best Practices
<b>Program Management</b>	<p>Probation departments should manage programs by using validated risk and needs assessment tools. Risks and needs should be distinct and separate. When risks and needs are comingled, there is often a result of higher degrees of supervision than warranted by risk levels. Assessments should also include individual strengths and assets, making sure that interventions are tailored to both client needs and client strengths.<sup>146</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation departments should consistently use validated screening and assessment tools to guide the allocation of supervision and service resources and strategies.</li><li>• Larger probation departments should consider creating a special unit for assessment of risks and needs and protective factors – this reduces inter-rater reliability problems.</li><li>• Probation may use a single tool for screening, assessment, and case planning; this reduces time spent on assessment (e.g., from 18 to 8 hours).<sup>147</sup></li><li>• Probation administration should use protocols and tools for monitoring program fidelity.<sup>148</sup></li></ul>



<b>Process Management</b>	<p>Probation departments seeking to implement evidence-based practices and become outcomes-driven organizations must utilize both an <i>outside/in</i> approach and an <i>inside/out</i> approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Outside/In Approach:</b> Brings insights gleaned from external research evidence to bear on internal organizational practices.</li><li>• <b>Inside/Out Approach:</b> Places increased emphasis on organizational capacity to internally measure performance and outcomes for current practices.<sup>149</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation management should reframe the following processes so that they all focus on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to reduce an client's risks and needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recruit and hire for communication and problem-solving skills as well as rehabilitative orientation/belief system;</li><li>• Train probation personnel in skills needed to relate to clients in respectful and constructive ways, in order to enhance intrinsic motivation in clients;<sup>150</sup></li><li>• Implement performance-driven personnel management practices that promote and reward recidivism reduction.</li><li>• Belief in and behaviors that demonstrate commitment to being helpful, supportive and using positive development or strength-based approaches</li></ul> <p>Management/supervisors should assess, reward, and promote personnel for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Communication skills, problem solving skills, initiative, and commitment to mission;</li><li>• Ability to work with clients in a community setting and to engage clients in community services, supports, and opportunities;</li><li>• Time spent targeting risk and need based on assessment results;</li><li>• Consistent use of rewards systems when clients do well and graduated sanctions when they have set-backs; and,</li><li>• Recidivism outcomes, based on risk-level of caseload.<sup>151, 152</sup></li></ul>
<b>Supervisor Ratios: Span of Control and Personnel Management</b>	<p>The ratio of probation field officers-to-supervisors should ideally be between 5:1 and 7:1, and should not exceed 10:1, although there are factors that influence the appropriate span of control, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More complex tasks and more task diversity among supervised staff requires more supervision (smaller span of control);</li><li>• When staff are not fully trained, or are being trained in new approaches, closer supervision is required (smaller span of control);</li><li>• Effective use of information technology to improve communication, performance monitoring, and support of supervised staff can reduce the need for supervision (larger span of control); and</li><li>• Harmonious work conditions, wherein all staff and supervisors are of like minds and working toward the same objectives can reduce the need for</li></ul>



	<p>supervision (larger span of control).<sup>153</sup></p> <p>In many organizations, including probation departments, supervisors are promoted into positions where they are responsible for overseeing the work of other employees without the benefit of any specialized training on human resources or supervision methods and frameworks.<sup>154 155</sup></p> <p>Probation departments should:<sup>156 157 158</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adopt a philosophical framework for supervision that emphasizes the use of coaching methods, positive reinforcement, and performance management using measureable employee goals and objectives</li><li>• Provide training and coaching to supervisors on 21<sup>st</sup> Century workforce changes and modern day human resource practices.</li></ul> <p>Supervisors should serve as advocates for staff and support their efforts to develop, continuously learn and see a career path in the Department</p> <p>Supervisors should hold employees accountable. This requires that organization wide expectations regarding the role of probation officers need to be communicated.</p>
<b>Governing and Operational Structure</b>	<p>The Judicial Council's Probation Services Task Force came up with five fundamental principles for the governance and operational structure of probation in California. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Principle 1:</b> Authority over and responsibility for the conduct, support, funding, oversight, and administration of probation services, including the appointment of the chief probation officer, must be connected.</li><li>• <b>Principle 2:</b> Courts and counties should develop and implement partnerships to administer probation departments and work collaboratively to ensure appropriate levels of service, support, funding, and oversight.</li><li>• <b>Principle 3:</b> Probation services should be administered primarily at the local level.</li><li>• <b>Principle 4:</b> Standards with measurable outcomes are necessary.</li><li>• <b>Principle 5:</b> Adult and juvenile probation services should be administered in a single department.<sup>159</sup></li></ul> <p>While there not established based practices in governance and oversight of probation departments, it is worth noting that these principles correspond with a consolidation of oversight functions, rather than a dispersion in oversight across a variety of bodies.</p>



## Collection and Use of Data

The systematic collection and use of data is a pivotal topic in the literature surrounding effective probation practices. Any organization concerned with the quality and impact of its services must track critical data elements over time to monitor improvements and identify areas of need.<sup>160</sup> Client-level data must be regularly assessed and re-assessed for improvements and changing needs on an individual level.<sup>161</sup> These data, when taken in the aggregate, can also provide a picture of organizational-level improvements and needs.<sup>162</sup> Streamlined, simplified electronic records help move a probation department toward greater efficiency and effectiveness, with automated reports and more accurate reviews of how personnel, teams, divisions, and reform efforts are doing.<sup>163</sup> Thorough data collection and use are essential to monitoring and tracking whether the department is producing equitable outcomes across race and ethnicity, and if its efforts to address bias and disproportionate minority confinement are succeeding.<sup>164 165</sup>

Maintaining focus on the topics described above, the table below lists best practices in probation's collection and use of data across the following domains:

- Information Systems
- Client-Level Data
- Agency-Level Data
- Use of Data
- Data Sharing
- Data-Driven Decision-Making and Performance Management

In each of these sections, RDA provides a summary of standards recommended in reports and guidelines from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the National Institute of Corrections, the National Center for State Courts, the National League of Cities, and the California Child Welfare Co-Investment.

**Table 5. Collection and Use of Data**

Collection and Use of Data Components	Best Practices
<b>Information Technology Systems</b>	<p>Ideally, probation departments should utilize a single case-management data system that can be used to maintain individual case information, as well as to create aggregate reports.<sup>166</sup></p> <p>Probation case management data systems should track, among other data points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demographic information</li><li>• Assessment results</li><li>• Supervision activities</li><li>• Dispositions</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Diversion</li><li>• Violations</li><li>• Transfers to adult court</li><li>• Recidivism (arrest, incarceration, new adjudications/convictions),</li><li>• Outcomes in “wellness” areas such as education, mental health, employment, housing, and program completions<sup>167</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation departments should assemble an information technology team tasked with reducing redundant data collection processes and increasing the utilization of effective data systems.<sup>168</sup> Probation departments should also dedicate adequate employee time, software, and training to ensure that the data are reliable and comprehensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inaccurate data are useless and can even be misleading and dangerous.<sup>169</sup> One of the surest ways to help ensure accuracy of data is to continuously review it, talk about it, and have it matter in all meetings.</li></ul> <p>Probation information technology should be designed and utilized consistently so that reports on population indicators can be generated automatically, including aggregate and disaggregated reports on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Caseload size,</li><li>• Workload measures,</li><li>• Probation revocations, and</li><li>• Successful completions.<sup>170</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation should hire and/or train staff who are adept at and committed to translating data into useful information for use by line staff and community members.<sup>171</sup></p>
<b>Client-Level Data</b>	<p>Probation departments must uniformly and accurately capture client-level data to monitor client needs, case planning, progress, and outcomes, not least of which because the basic units of analysis in determining how a probation department is performing are its client-level outcomes.<sup>172</sup> Those client-level data should then be used to encourage clients and to inform employee performance reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Every person who enters the probation system should receive an assessment that measures both static and dynamic risks and needs.<sup>173 174</sup> It is also essential to measure clients’ strengths and protective factors that can be built on in case planning.<sup>175</sup></li><li>• Reassessments should be done periodically while clients are under supervision so that their incremental change can be noted and recognized.<sup>176</sup></li><li>• Demographic data must be captured and tied to client outcomes so that analyses can consider race and other demographic data points.<sup>177 178</sup></li></ul>
<b>Agency-Level</b>	<p>Probation departments should measure their performance on an ongoing basis to ensure that they are successfully reaching their goals of delivering high-quality</p>





<b>Data</b>	<p>probation services, advancing positive outcomes for clients, reducing likelihood of recidivism and, ultimately, improving public safety. Performance measurement relies on monitoring both process and outcome measures.</p> <p>Some process measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of individuals screened for risk, needs, substance use, mental illness, or other issues;</li><li>• Number who have attended and completed treatment or social service programs;</li><li>• Weekly or monthly contacts each client made with an officer and/or service provider; and,</li><li>• Court-ordered fees, fines, or child support collected.</li></ul> <p>Outcome measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number and type of probation terminations/revocations;</li><li>• Reasons for violations;</li><li>• Rates of re-arrests, and the reasons for re-arrests; and</li><li>• Improvements in mental health, substance use recovery, or other social service outcomes (this may require data sharing or cooperation among agencies).<sup>179</sup></li></ul> <p>Agency-level data should be transparent and reported out regularly. Best practice suggests implementing a data report that is released monthly on the department website and which includes population counts and some outcome data.<sup>180</sup></p>
<b>Use of Data</b>	<p>Client and agency-level data are needed to conduct performance assessments of a probation department as a whole, and to assess the effectiveness of specific units, strategies, and staff members.<sup>181</sup> Probation departments should use data systems to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyze caseload assignments and adherence to risk- and need-driven supervision strategies to identify opportunities for reallocating cases and supervision resources;</li><li>• Use process measures to determine if actual practices are matching the protocols for the evidence-based practices that the department has instituted;</li><li>• Analyze changes in client-level data over time, including incremental improvements in dynamic risks and needs, and reductions in probation revocations, and rearrests, to see if adoption of evidence-based strategies is having the desired impact;</li><li>• Use client outcome data disaggregated by unit, probation officer, and region to determine if some staff need additional support, training, or reassignment;<sup>182</sup></li><li>• Integrate client-level process and outcome data into staff performance review processes, and recognize when staff members are on track with desired practices;<sup>183184</sup></li><li>• Analyze the impact of probation practices by race, ethnicity, and gender to</li></ul>



	<p>address disparities;<sup>185</sup> and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advocate for certain practices with policymakers, stakeholder groups, and the community.<sup>186</sup></li></ul>
<b>Data Sharing</b>	<p>Probation departments should enter into agreements with other agencies serving the same population to reduce redundancy, save money, and increase the chances of positive client outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation data systems should be linked to social service and treatment program information systems - if this is not possible, other systems for information sharing (which respect confidentiality and privacy parameters) should be put in place.<sup>187</sup></li><li>• Sharing data among juvenile probation, child welfare, mental health, and education agencies helps to reduce assessments, and allows case workers from each agency to better understand youths' life circumstances and their involvement with other agencies.<sup>188 189</sup></li></ul> <p>While data sharing raises legitimate legal concerns both in terms of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) privacy protections and to protect clients from self-incrimination, some information can legally be shared, and the availability of this data is valuable.<sup>190 191 192</sup></p>
<b>Data-Driven Decision-Making and Performance Management</b>	<p>Probation departments should systematically use data to measure staff performance and make decisions about budget allocation, organizational structures, and changes in practices in order to promote positive organizational- and client-level outcomes.<sup>193</sup></p> <p>The probation department's executive management team should have a set of measurable goals (e.g., increased use of EBPs, reduced recidivism, reduced disproportionate contact, increased community collaboration) to collect data on, and should hold regular meetings to assess the data and decide what practices to change, maintain, and/or amend in order to meet goals.<sup>194 195</sup></p> <p>In moving toward data-driven decision-making and performance management, probation departments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify champions who will help drive the approach among coworkers;<sup>196</sup></li><li>• Consider university partnerships to ensure capacity to conduct accurate and objective analyses to drive decision-making;<sup>197</sup> and,</li><li>• Analyze outcomes by race to measure differential outcomes and monitor racial and ethnic disparities in negative contact and outcomes and identify some of the sources of bias.<sup>198 199</sup></li></ul> <p>Outcomes analyses should consider individuals for whom supervision was terminated as well as those remaining under supervision - comparing the two groups on risk, supervision level, and demographics. Analyzing the reasons for</p>



	revocation can help the department understand why people do or do not succeed under supervision, and can inform future supervision practices.
--	---



## Section 2. Adult Probation Services

In order to reduce jail and prison overcrowding and associated costs, jurisdictions across the United States have increased the use of community supervision. In 2015, approximately 3,789,800 individuals spent time under community supervision;<sup>200</sup> in Los Angeles County alone, there were approximately 55,265 individuals under community supervision. With growing numbers of individuals under probation supervision, a strength-based and evidence-based approach to community supervision has burgeoned to replace more punitive approaches proven less effective.

The literature on adult community supervision reflects this shifting paradigm, and has evolved over the years to begin providing the field with guidance about evidence-based policies and practices that help to reduce recidivism and support individuals in becoming productive community members. Evidence-based policies and practices reflect the highest form of empirical evidence, using objective, balanced, and responsible research on policies and practices that are most likely to produce improved outcomes for clients, victims, and communities.<sup>201</sup>

Research demonstrates that in order to reduce rates of recidivism, probation officers should utilize validated risk assessment and need assessment tools. These tools determine each client's risk for recidivism and supervision intensity, including static and dynamic risk factors as well as service needs to be addressed through strengths-based case management and connections with services.<sup>202</sup> The move toward a strengths-based case management approach which targets criminogenic needs, coupled with the utilization of validated risk assessments to guide supervision intensity and needs assessments referrals to services, has been one of the greatest shifts in community supervision.

Research also suggests that successful community supervision is highly dependent on the rapport built between POs and their clients. POs who are able to strike a balance between law enforcement and intervention roles, and who are able to establish clear roles and expectations with clients while modeling prosocial behaviors, demonstrate the most successful relationships and client outcomes.<sup>203</sup> More and more, probation officers are applying motivational interviewing techniques, cognitive behavioral interventions, and trauma-informed approaches in order to help build rapport with their clients and enhance their readiness for change.

In addition to shifts in case management approaches, probation officers are currently taking on additional responsibilities. Probation officers are supervising larger numbers of pretrial individuals in order to help reduce jail crowding and minimize disruption in the lives of people who pose minimal risk to public safety and have not yet been convicted of criminal offenses.<sup>204</sup> Probation officers are also participating in pre-release planning for individuals who do spend time in custody. This helps promote a smooth custody-to-community transition, a best practice that reduces uncertainty and apprehension upon release and, as a result, reduces recidivism.<sup>205</sup>

In line with emerging trends in adult probation service delivery, the sections below highlight best practices in Assessment and Case Planning; Pre-release Planning; and Pretrial Services, as identified in the literature.





## Assessment and Case Planning

Conducting risk assessments and needs assessments to guide case management is an evidence-based practice that a majority of probation departments have integrated into their practices to help reduce recidivism and provide individuals under community supervision with the necessary resources to successfully reenter the community. The table below highlights best practices in probation case management, broken down across the following components:

- Assessments: Risk and Needs
- Screening: Basic Needs
- Screening: Psychosocial Needs
- Case Planning and Supervision Intensity
- Evidence-Based Practices in Case Management
- Structured Decision-Making: Incentives and Graduated Sanctions
- Referrals to Services, Supports, and Opportunities

Across each of these components RDA summarizes best practices from reports and guidelines coming from the National Institute of Corrections, the National Center for State Courts, the Council for State Governments Justice Center, and the Urban Institute, among other independent researchers.

**Table 6. Assessment and Case Management**

Assessments and Case Management Components	Best Practices
<b>Assessments: Risk and Needs</b>	<p>Use validated risk assessment and needs assessment tools that identify static and dynamic risk factors in order to guide supervision practices (e.g., supervision intensity, referrals for services). Static risk factors do not change and include factors such as age at first arrest, gender, and previous mental health and/or substance use issues. Dynamic risk factors, also referred to as “criminogenic needs”, can be addressed through intervention and lower one’s assessed risk for recidivism, and as a result, their level of supervision.</p> <p>Examples of dynamic risk factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education level,</li><li>• Marital status,</li><li>• Employment status,</li><li>• Housing stability, and</li><li>• Enrollment in substance abuse treatment.<sup>206</sup></li></ul> <p>Several risk and needs assessment tools follow the risk, need, responsivity (RNR) model that identifies criminogenic risks, needs, and responsivity as key principles</p>



	<p>for reducing recidivism.<sup>207</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Risk</b> - Supervision and treatment levels should match risk levels</li><li>• <b>Needs</b> - Services should target a client's dynamic risk factors</li><li>• <b>Responsivity</b> - Treatments should use cognitive learning strategies and be tailored to individual characteristics of individual on probation (e.g., cognitive behavioral interventions, culturally-responsive, gender responsive programming)</li></ul> <p>During the assessment phase, probation officers should also identify the strengths of their clients in order to help build rapport and promote prosocial behaviors that can help to connect individuals back to the communities in which they committed crimes.<sup>208</sup></p> <p><i>See Table 17 for criminogenic risk and needs assessment tools.</i></p>
<b>Screening: Basic Needs</b>	<p>In addition to using criminogenic risk and needs assessments, probation officers should screen their clients for basic needs including:<sup>209 210</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Housing</li><li>• Education</li><li>• Employment</li><li>• Benefits Enrollment</li></ul> <p>Probation Officers should refer individuals to community-based and/or county service providers they have structure partnerships with in order to address these needs.</p> <p><i>See Table 18 for list of basic needs screening tools.</i></p>
<b>Screening: Psychosocial Needs</b>	<p>Probation officers should also conduct psychosocial screenings on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Substance use disorder</li><li>• Mental illness</li><li>• Co-occurring substance use disorder and mental illness</li></ul> <p>Probation officers should refer individuals to community-based and/or county service providers for further assessment on an as needed basis.</p> <p><i>See Table 19 for list of psychosocial screening tools.</i></p>
<b>Case Planning and Supervision Intensity</b>	<p>Probation officers should conduct risk and need assessments to determine supervision intensity, develop case plans and goals in consultation with clients, and make necessary referrals to county and community-based services.</p> <p><i>Refer to the "Structured Partnerships" section in Table 2 for greater detail about the types of partnerships probation departments should have with county and</i></p>



	<p><i>community-based providers in order to help clients address their identified needs.</i></p> <p><u>Supervision intensity should be based on each client's risk for recidivism, as indicated by a validated risk and needs assessment tool or tools:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Low risk/administrative caseload:</b> Supervised on administrative or banked caseloads, which require infrequent check-ins (once every few months) and primarily involve monitoring client progress through written or verbal self-report and formal criminal record checks.</li><li>• <b>Low risk:</b> Supervised to some extent with greater number of check-ins, usually monthly, with a focus on providing any necessary stabilization services (i.e., survival needs). Probation officers should avoid referring low risk individuals to services where large numbers of individuals have antisocial, pro-criminal attitudes, which includes avoiding incarceration to the greatest extent possible.<sup>3</sup></li><li>• <b>Moderate/High risk:</b> Supervised with frequent check-ins that are typically bi-weekly or weekly; case planning focused on stabilization and risk reduction strategies (i.e., criminogenic risk).<sup>4</sup></li><li>• <b>High risk/intensive supervision:</b> Supervised with frequent check-ins, with a focus on risk containment (focus on control and stabilization efforts).<sup>211</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation officers should reassess clients at established intervals (e.g., every six months) and after key life events (e.g., obtaining stable housing, obtaining full-time employment) in order to update case plans and adjust supervision intensity as appropriate.<sup>212</sup></p>
<b>Length of Probation</b>	<p>Probation departments should shorten the length of supervision for individuals who follow the conditions of their supervision, as research indicates there are diminishing returns to supervision after fifteen months.<sup>213</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shortening supervision periods for lower to moderate risk clients who comply with the terms of their supervision will help reduce caseloads and allow for increased supervision intensity on the highest risk clients.<sup>214</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation officers should use early termination of supervision as an incentive to create positive behavioral change and compliance to supervision terms.</p>
<b>Evidence-based Practices in Case Management</b>	<p>Probation officers should utilize evidence-based and best practices in case management to ensure they implement a client-centered, strength-based approach, and to reduce the likelihood that clients recidivate.<sup>215</sup> Below are examples of evidence-based practices in case management that probation officers should implement to the greatest extent possible:</p>

<sup>3</sup> Case plans for these individuals should be short, outcome-focused and should allow them to “earn” their way onto distance reporting and, ultimately if their behavior warrants, early discharge.

<sup>4</sup> Moderate risks clients should also be able to earn their way onto distance reporting and eventually early discharge if their performance warrants.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS):</b> A supervision model “designed to use a combination of monitoring, referrals, and face-to-face interactions to provide the client with a sufficient ‘dosage’ of treatment interventions, and make the best possible use of time to develop a collaborative working relationship.”<sup>216</sup></li><li>• <b>Motivational Interviewing:</b> A counseling style where probation officers are helpers in the change process, with the goal of eliciting self-motivational statements and behavioral change from the client as opposed to using coercive tactics to try and change behaviors.<sup>217</sup></li><li>• <b>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions:</b> Interventions that focus on exploring relationships between a person’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in order to replace negative thoughts by restructuring them in positive ways.<sup>218</sup></li><li>• <b>Trauma-Informed:</b> A framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma, helping to create a safe environment for clients, and ensuring that probation services do not re-traumatize clients.<sup>219</sup></li><li>• <b>Gender Responsive:</b> Strategies that address the realities of women’s lives through gender-responsive policy and programs.<sup>220</sup> When working with men, programs should explicitly address gender attitudes and promote alternative notions of masculinity.<sup>221</sup></li></ul> <p><i>See Table 20 for an overview of case management frameworks.</i></p>
<b>Structured Decision-Making: Incentives and Graduated Sanctions</b>	<p>In order to enhance transparency and reduce bias, probation officers should implement structured decision-making processes to guide the provision of rewards/incentives and graduated sanctions.</p> <p><u>Structured Decision-Making: Incentives and Graduated Sanctions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Providing incentives and recognition to promote behavioral change rather than negative accountability methods of punishment and criticism increase the likelihood of success for individuals under community supervision.<sup>222</sup></li><li>• Research suggests a 4:1 reward/reinforcement to sanction ratio is ideal,<sup>223</sup> and that utilizing structured, incremental responses to non-compliant behavior helps promote behavioral change and reduce recidivism occurrences.<sup>224</sup></li><li>• Implementing a graduate response matrix matrix that accounts for infraction frequency and severity to guide decision making practices around revoking probation for non-compliant behavior brings a greater degree of consistency, reliability, and equity to the assessment and decision-making process.<sup>225</sup></li></ul> <p>Procedural justice theory suggests that individuals are more likely to comply with the terms of probation if they are considered fair and transparent.<sup>226</sup> As such, implementing a structured system of graduated sanctions that takes into account the history of each individual and the severity of their violation can help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increase compliance with probation terms for all populations, and</li></ul>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduce racial and ethnic disparities in technical violations and revocations.</li></ul>
<b>Referrals to Services, Supports, and Opportunities</b>	<p>Based on the needs identified through a validated assessment tool, probation officers should make referrals for clients to county providers and community-based organizations with which probation has established structured relationships. Probation officers should have information concerning the different providers in the county, and refer clients to the most effective, culturally appropriate, and gender responsive programming closest to their clients' places of residence.</p> <p>Probation should place emphasis on referrals to partners that provide education, employment, housing, drug treatment, mental health treatment, and mentoring services.<sup>227</sup> Additionally, POs should be familiar with informal community supports that provide neighborhood cohesion and support clients in their efforts to acclimate to their communities as law-abiding citizens.<sup>228</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bi-directional feedback and communication should exist between probation officers and all partners in order to help to reduce duplicative efforts and remove clients' barriers to success.<sup>229</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation offices should also regularly host service providers and other government agencies that provide these services in their waiting areas so that probation offices, particularly neighborhood offices, can serve as resource hubs for such services and supports. Secure computer terminals with references to local services and supports should be available in these hubs, as should printed schedules indicating when specific providers will be there so clients can coordinate their time in the office to be there when the resources they need will be there.<sup>230</sup></p> <p><i>Refer to the "Structured Partnerships" section in Table 2 for greater detail about the types of partnerships Probation should have with County and community-based providers.</i></p>



## Pre-Release Planning

Jail and prison staff, probation staff, and other county and community-based service providers must work together to meet the needs of individuals transitioning from custody to the community in order to help reduce recidivism and improve reentry outcomes. Probation officers should provide “in reach” services to ensure there is a smooth handoff from custody to the community upon release, as well as to clarify expectations, conditions, and terms of supervision, and to establish individualized case plans and referrals to service providers. Table 7 below reviews best practices in pre-release planning across the following components:

- Screening
- Assessment and Case Management
- Custody-to-Community Transition

RDA reviewed documentation derived from the National Institute of Corrections, Urban Institute, and the National Center for State Courts to synthesize the information in the table provide below.

**Table 7. Pre-Release Planning**

Pre-release Planning Components	Best Practices
<b>Screening</b>	<p>Best practices and the “Transition from Jail to Community” (TJC) model suggest that successful reentry planning should begin as close to intake as possible. Probation staff is not expected to participate with in-custody screenings; however, it is a best practice for jail staff to conduct screenings at intake in order to identify medium to high-risk individuals that probation officers should try to meet with prior to their release from custody.<sup>231</sup> Intake screenings should identify risk of re-offense as well as the following needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Physical health</li><li>• Homelessness</li><li>• Mental health</li><li>• Substance use</li><li>• Co-occurring disorders</li></ul>
<b>Assessment and Case Management</b>	<p>Jail staff should refer individuals with identified physical health, mental health, and/or substance use issues to qualified professionals who can issue proper assessments and develop treatment plans while they are in custody. Individuals identified at medium or high risk for recidivism should receive in-custody case management and programming.<sup>232</sup></p> <p>Case management should be guided by the use of validated risk and needs assessment(s). As noted above, several risk and needs assessment tools follow the risk, need, responsivity (RNR) model that identifies risk, need, and responsivity as</p>



	<p>key principles for reducing recidivism.<sup>233</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Risk</b> - Supervision and treatment levels should match risk levels</li><li>• <b>Need</b> - Services should target a client's dynamic risk factors</li><li>• <b>Responsivity</b> - Treatment should use cognitive learning strategies and be tailored to individual characteristics of individuals on probation (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, gender responsive programming)</li></ul> <p>Assessment should also help to identify individuals' talents, accomplishments, and strengths as a basis for client development.</p> <p><i>See Table 17 for a list of validated criminogenic risk and needs assessment tools.</i></p> <p>Ideally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The in-custody risk and need assessment tool(s) being used in custody should be the same instrument that probation uses post-release so that staff are using the same vocabulary and addressing similar criminogenic risk categories;</li><li>• One case plan should be used by all agencies interacting with the client, including the sheriff's department, probation, and community-based providers, among others;<sup>234</sup> and</li><li>• The risk and needs assessment tool(s) being used should be shared electronically by all involved agencies.<sup>235</sup></li></ul>
<b>Custody to Community Transition</b>	<p>Probation officers should have a larger role supporting the custody to community transition for individuals who will be under community supervision upon release. In order to help establish a smooth custody to community transition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation officers should work in county jails, if resources allow;</li><li>• Probation officers should provide "in-reach" services to individuals they will be supervising prior to their release. "In-reach" should include<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Clarifying expectations, conditions, and terms of supervision; and</li><li>○ Review of individualized case plans, and establishing referrals to community-based providers.<sup>236</sup></li></ul></li></ul> <p>To the greatest extent possible, service providers should provide in custody and community-based programming to promote continuity of care; referrals and appointments with community-based services should also be established prior to individuals being released from custody.</p>



## Pretrial Services and Court Assistance

In many jurisdictions, probation officers are currently taking on additional responsibilities, including assessing and supervising larger numbers of individuals pretrial in order to help reduce jail crowding and minimize disruption in the lives of people who pose minimal risk to public safety and have not yet been convicted of criminal offenses.<sup>237</sup> Table 8 below highlights best practices in pretrial services across the following components:

- Pretrial Investigations
- Pretrial Risk Assessment
- Pretrial Supervision

RDA draws on research from the Chief Probation of Officers California, California Forward, and the Arnold Foundation to identify best practices in pretrial services.

**Table 8. Pretrial Services<sup>238</sup>**

Pretrial Services and Court Assistance Components	Best Practices
<b>Pretrial Investigations</b>	<p>Assigned probation officers should collaborate with the court by conducting pretrial investigations in order to help make evidence-based, informed decisions about releasing or detaining individuals pretrial.<sup>239</sup></p> <p>Pretrial investigations typically include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An interview with the defendant during which a validated pretrial risk assessment instrument is administered and scored;</li><li>• A review of court records and other collateral information; and,</li><li>• A formal report presented to court.</li></ul> <p>In addition to assessing criminal history and prior failures to appear, judges may consider a number of other factors in pretrial investigations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The nature of the alleged offense;</li><li>• Drug and alcohol use;</li><li>• Mental health; and,</li><li>• Community ties.<sup>240</sup></li></ul> <p>As a part of the investigation evidence-based agencies conduct objective pretrial risk assessments in order to evaluate the risk of flight and re-offense.<sup>241</sup></p>
<b>Pretrial Risk Assessment</b>	<p>Probation officers should conduct validated pretrial risk assessments as a part of pretrial investigations. Judges should consider the identified risk for re-offense and/or flight when making decisions about releasing or detaining</p>



	<p>individuals rather than relying on the money bail system.<sup>242</sup></p> <p>Pretrial risk assessment tools consider a number of factors to determine the level of risk for re-offense and/or flight. Each factor is assigned a point value, and the total number of points for each individual translates into a risk level (typically low, moderate, or high). Some of the factors that are typically related to pretrial risk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Criminal history;</li><li>• Prior failures to appear;</li><li>• Substance abuse; and,</li><li>• Transportation.</li></ul> <p>There are a number of pretrial risk assessment tools used across the United States. Research demonstrates that factors related to pretrial risk can vary across jurisdictions, and that each jurisdiction should conduct a local analysis when adopting a tool in order to determine its reliability. As such, any tool utilized should be empirically based and validated locally.</p> <p><i>For a sample of pretrial risk assessment tools, please refer to Table 21.</i></p> <p>The Arnold Foundation has developed the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) to assess pretrial risk for flight and re-offense without an in-person interview.<sup>5</sup> <sup>243</sup> Judges can use this tool to make determinations around pretrial release. The PSA does not require an in-person interview, and was developed and validated using data from jurisdictions across the United States. Therefore this tool can be used across jurisdictions.<sup>244</sup></p>
<b>Pretrial Supervision</b>	<p>Supervision intensity of individuals released pretrial should be determined based on risk of flight or re-offense.<sup>245</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Low risk</b> individuals should receive passive supervision or no supervision at all. This might include period reviews of their terms of their release to identify changes in eligibility, such as changes in employment status.</li><li>• <b>Moderate risk</b> individuals should receive active supervision and meet with probation officers less often than high risk individuals.</li><li>• <b>High risk</b> individuals should receive active supervision and meet with probation officer regularly, either weekly or bi-weekly. This includes court reminders, electronic monitoring, and/or home confinement.</li></ul> <p>To the extent possible, supervisors should connect individuals released pretrial to services such as employment services and medical care, but their release should not be conditioned on these services unless it can be shown that they are reasonably related to their likelihood of flight and/or re-arrest.</p>

<sup>5</sup> If this is able to reliably predict risk for flight and re-offense in LA County, it could save the Probation Department a large amount of time necessary for pretrial investigations.<sup>5</sup> RDA recommends diversion efforts only employ case planning for high-risk youth.



Clients who perform well under pretrial supervision should be rewarded with reduced office visits and lessened sanctions.<sup>246</sup>

*Refer to the "Structured Partnerships" section in Table 2 for greater detail about the types of partnerships Probation should have with County and community-based providers.*



## Section 3. Juvenile Service Delivery

The institutional model of juvenile justice is rooted in a history that dates back 170 years, beginning with the opening of the Massachusetts Lyman School for Boys in 1846.<sup>247</sup> At that time, institutionalization was viewed as a humane alternative for youth living in “poorhouses” or on the street, as well as a means to control an unruly immigrant youth populace. Research indicates that the institutional model has largely been a failure, as recidivism rates for detained youth are high. In addition, in many instances, poor institutional conditions have led to youth inmate abuse and resulting in federal legal interventions and mandates to downsize or close detention facilities.<sup>248</sup>

Research on juvenile justice service delivery over the last 15 years has largely come in response to the failures of punitive institutional models. This research reflects a shifting juvenile justice paradigm acknowledging that youth should be diverted from formal processing to the greatest extent possible because youth on probation experience higher reoffending rates than comparable youth whose cases are diverted rather than processed in juvenile court.<sup>249</sup> For youth who are justice involved, the shifting paradigm maintains the overarching goal of the juvenile justice system, to promote public safety through the prosocial development of youth who become system involved, while utilizing evidence-based systems and practices informed by a youth developmental approach.

The youth developmental approach highlights key behavioral differences between youth and adults, which suggest that the treatment and supervision of juveniles should not mimic adult criminal punishment models, but rather should maintain focus on programming and intervention. Unduly harsh interventions or treatment, and negative interactions between youth and juvenile justice system personnel, can undermine youth respect for legal authority, reinforce an “us versus them” mentality for justice involved youth, and delay or prevent a transition to prosocial adulthood which.<sup>250</sup> Research has verified that the brains of adolescents don’t mature until young adulthood or the late twenties, and that adolescents differ from adults and children in three important ways that lead to differences in behavior:

1. Adolescents have less capacity for self-regulation in emotionally charged contexts, relative to adults;
2. Adolescents have a heightened sensitivity to proximal external influences, such as peer pressure and immediate incentives, relative to children and adults; and
3. Adolescents show less ability than adults to make judgments and decisions that require future orientation.<sup>251</sup>

As a result, adolescents prefer and engage in risky behaviors that have a high probability of immediate reward but can have harmful consequences. As such, adolescent therapeutic interventions need to be developmentally appropriate and responsive in order to be rehabilitative and promote improved outcomes.<sup>252</sup>

Diverting youth from unnecessary contact and involvement with the front-end of the juvenile justice system should be probation’s first objective, as diverting youth from negative associations and influences within the juvenile justice system has been shown to reduce system involvement and



penetration. For youth who do enter the system, a therapeutic positive youth development (PYD) approach balanced by comprehensive and fully integrated treatment is an evidence-based practice. The PYD approach includes recognizing that youth have a tremendous capacity for change, and nurturing their strengths with programs designed to foster healthy development. It also includes building supportive relationships with adults and peers, and developing new skills that are valued in the community, while avoiding punitive interventions to the greatest extent possible. This evidence-based juvenile justice approach also includes structured decision-making processes; age appropriate risk, need, and strength assessments; and connections with developmentally appropriate, culturally- and gender-responsive programs and services that support prosocial development.

The sections below highlight the components of juvenile service delivery described above, and identify best practices in Pre-Adjudication Diversion, Assessment and Case Management, and Juvenile Detention and Residential Programming. Across each area, RDA summarizes best practices identified in research, and key program characteristics for probation departments to consider.





## Pre-Adjudication Diversion

Across the nation, the implementation of programs diverting youth from juvenile justice system has become an emerging response to the recognition of the harm it causes. Pre-adjudication diversion programs seek to reduce recidivism, decrease crowding in detention facilities, increase family participation, and promote the use of more appropriate treatments at the community level.<sup>253</sup> The table below highlights best practices in pre-adjudication diversion broken down across the following components:

- Partners
- Entry Points
- Diversion at Intake by Juvenile Probation Officers
- Eligibility Considerations
- Written Agreements
- Data Collection and Program Evaluation

RDA synthesized best practices from reports and briefs issued by the Models of Change Initiative and the National League of Cities.

**Table 9. Pre-Adjudication Diversion**

Youth Diversion Program Components	Best Practices
<b>Partners</b>	<p>Probation should collaborate with other county and community-based partners to establish juvenile justice diversion programs within the county; successful programs depend on long term involvement, commitment, and support from many key stakeholders including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Law enforcement</li><li>• Courts</li><li>• District attorneys' offices</li><li>• Public defenders' offices</li><li>• Schools and public education agencies</li><li>• Children and youth agencies</li><li>• Mental health agencies</li><li>• Substance use agencies</li><li>• Managed care organizations</li><li>• Child advocates</li><li>• Victim advocates</li><li>• Community-based partners</li></ul> <p>Probation should consider following the Community Assessment and Referral Centers (CARC) model, where diversion programs established by interagency collaborations provide a single point of entry for crisis intervention, assessment,</p>



	<p>service integration, and referral of arrested youth (e.g., San Francisco's Huckleberry Center). CARC's community-wide, rehabilitative approach towards non-violent youth has effectively diverted youth from detention and formal probation.</p> <p>In addition to these partnerships, it is crucial for diversion programs to work with the victims and family members of high risk diverted youth in order to develop their case plans and written agreements.<sup>254 6</sup></p>
<b>Entry Points</b>	<p>Probation, in collaboration with program partners, should establish decision points for diversion; this helps to systematize the process by which youth are diverted from the juvenile justice system.<sup>255 256</sup></p> <p>Pre-adjudication diversion can take place at four levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• School</li><li>• Law enforcement</li><li>• Magisterial district judge</li><li>• Juvenile court<sup>257</sup></li></ul> <p>Typical decision points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Initial police contact</b>- When a police officer first observes youth violating the law;</li><li>• <b>Intake conference</b>- When youth, after apprehension, are referred for an intake conference with a juvenile PO;</li><li>• <b>Petitioning</b>- When (or immediately before) the court would be petitioned to begin the process leading to adjudication.</li><li>• <b>Pretrial probation contact</b>- When a court staff member or probation officer engages in pretrial interviewing of a youth and family in the course of formal processing.</li></ul> <p>Probation should also work with schools to encourage the establishment of diversion practices so that individuals with disciplinary issues are able to avoid formal processing to the greatest extent possible.</p>
<b>Diversion at Intake by Juvenile Probation Officers</b>	<p>Probation officers should use intake as an opportunity to screen, identify, and divert eligible youth from entering the juvenile justice system by collecting information about the case, and balancing the interests of the youth, the victim, and the safety of the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Utilize a structured decision making process that establishes clear parameters for considering eligibility factors such as the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ First youth offense<sup>7</sup></li></ul></li></ul>

<sup>6</sup> RDA recommends diversion efforts only employ case planning for high-risk youth.

<sup>7</sup> RDA recommends consideration of all youth with relatively short offense histories



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Youth cited for misdemeanors, non-violent felonies, or status offenses</li><li>○ Youth referred by magisterial district judge for failure to comply with lawful sentence in summary offense cases</li><li>○ Youth between the ages of 10 and 17<sup>8</sup></li><li>○ Youth with mental health and/or substance use disorders.<sup>258 259</sup></li></ul> <p>• If initial screening indicates that youth may have mental health and/or substance use issues, more targeted assessments should be conducted by behavioral health partners.</p> <p><i>See Table 23 for a list of targeted assessment tools.</i></p> <p>Probation officers should be aware of the range of diversion programs available as an alternative to formal processing and, to the extent possible, prioritize diverting youth into evidence-based programs, or programs implementing best practices in youth case management and service delivery.<sup>260</sup></p>
<b>Written Agreements</b>	<p>“The conditions of any diversion program should be clearly and completely reflected in a formal written agreement between the youth, family, and the diversion program. The agreement should be individually tailored to a youth’s specific risk factors and needs in order to maximize his/her ability to successfully complete the program requirements.”<sup>261</sup></p> <p>Diversionary agreements should be short, avoid being unnecessarily onerous, and only include requirements directly related to redressing the alleged offense. Failure to successfully complete diversion should never result in sanctions harsher than what the youth would have experienced if they hadn’t been diverted.<sup>262</sup></p> <p>All written agreements should contain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Measurable objectives to be met by youth</li><li>• Identification of others with specific responsibilities described in detail</li><li>• A formal process for monitoring compliance</li><li>• A system of rewards for compliance and consequences for failing to meet measurable objectives or comply with the terms of the agreement</li><li>• Statement of definite, limited duration of agreement</li><li>• Verification that victim input was sought and taken into account</li><li>• Demonstrated family involvement</li><li>• Informed consent for right to refuse diversion and request a hearing before a judge<sup>263</sup></li></ul>
<b>Data Collection and Program Evaluation</b>	<p>Data should be collected by all diversion programs to track outcomes and evaluate the effectiveness of diversion policies and practices. At a minimum, programs should track:</p>

<sup>8</sup> RDA recommends consideration be given to applying diversion to TAY population as well



- Demographic characteristics
- Completion rates
- Recidivism and re-arrest rates
- Victim satisfaction
- Participant satisfaction

Diversion programs should also monitor the extent to which collaboration between partners has been accomplished through memoranda of understanding, protocols, and trainings.<sup>264</sup>



## Detention Diversion

Detention alternative programs within the juvenile justice system aim to provide highly structured and well-supervised activities for youth in pending delinquency proceedings in order to ensure court appearances and reduce the likelihood of re-arrest, while allowing youth to continue attending school without disruption and remain at home during this time period.<sup>265</sup> Effective programs place lower risk youth in less costly programs, while assuring the most serious individuals are appropriately supervised in a secure setting. The table below highlights best practices in detention diversion broken down across the following components:

- Collaboration
- Models of Alternative Diversion Programs
- Eligibility and Admission Practices
- Length of Stay

RDA synthesized best practices in detention diversion from reports issued by the Annie E. Casey Foundation based on results from the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) which has been implemented across over 300 counties nationwide.

**Table 10. Detention Diversion**

Detention Diversion Components	Best Practices
<b>Collaboration</b>	<p>To be effective, a detention alternative program needs broad-based support and acceptance from juvenile justice practitioners, local government and non-profit agencies, and community members. To generate support and acceptance, probation and stakeholders should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develop consensus (relying heavily on data) about the narrow and explicit purpose of a secure detention;</li><li>• Develop a vision of what the new system should look like;</li><li>• Develop and implement a plan of action;</li><li>• Understand the nature and purpose of any proposed detention alternative;<sup>266</sup></li><li>• Define program responsibilities and system expectations for all parties involved;</li><li>• Implement a formal mandate in order to determine desired outcomes through formal appointment such as a steering or executive committee;<sup>267</sup></li></ul> <p>Collaborative partners should include all juvenile justice system stakeholders and additional partners including:<sup>268</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Judiciary</li><li>• Prosecution</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Defense</li><li>• Probation</li><li>• Detention</li><li>• Representatives of state agencies responsible for youth corrections</li><li>• Representatives of the county or city administration and local legislators</li><li>• Representatives from other youth-serving public systems</li><li>• Community-based providers</li></ul> <p>Probation should consider contracting community-based providers to help generate successful detention alternative programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Partnerships and contracts with local community-based agencies are ideal because these organizations may have easier access to youth and can often supervise youth within their own neighborhoods.<sup>269</sup></li></ul> <p>Recommended steps for developing detention alternatives include:<sup>270</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Organizing a stakeholders' group;</li><li>• Analyzing data on the detention population and juvenile court caseload;</li><li>• Collecting written information about alternative programs;</li><li>• Visiting model programs and reformed detention systems;</li><li>• Agreeing on target populations and program approaches;</li><li>• Developing a screening mechanism;</li><li>• Promoting the program with those who will refer cases;</li><li>• Beginning operations and carefully building to capacity; and,</li><li>• Constantly monitoring performance and making necessary adjustments</li></ul>
<b>Models of Alternative Detention</b>	<p>Several program models have proven to be effective alternatives to detention in secure facilities. The continuum of detention alternatives generally includes three basic program models for youth held prior to a disposition hearing.<sup>271</sup></p> <p>Probation, in partnership with local stakeholders, should establish a continuum of alternative detention programs that include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Home or community detention alternatives:</b> Home or community detention alternative programs are non-residential, non-facility-based supervision. They should be used to supervise youth who can safely reside in their own residence or with relatives. Supervision typically entails staff performing, random, unannounced, face-to-face visits at the clients' residence. Youth are also required to be on a curfew and have limited movement outside the home unless pre-authorized.<sup>272</sup></li><li>• <b>Day or evening reporting centers:</b> Day or evening reporting centers are non-residential, facility-based supervision that provide six to 12 hours of face-to-face daily supervision in the community. These centers refer youth to recreational, educational, and vocational opportunities in the community, and require daily check-ins on school attendance and curfew. These centers should provide structured activities for youth who require more intensive</li></ul>



	<p>oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Shelter or foster care:</b> Shelter or foster care is non-secure residential placement that provides an alternative for youth that either need 24-hour residential supervision to be considered for release from secure detention, or for youth who have no suitable or safe home or relative placement available. Shelter programs provide time-limited housing where youth are typically supervised by staff 24 hours a day, seven days a week and are provided consistent and structured activities, typically including both educational and recreational activities. Foster care placement can supplement non-residential programs as they can host younger children, sexually exploited youth, lower-risk cases or other youth who may not be suitable for placement in a shelter. Length of stay in these programs should not exceed 30 days.<sup>273</sup></li></ul> <p>Each model may have a range of supervision levels.</p>
<b>Eligibility and Admission Practices</b>	<p>Probation or detention alternative program staff should use an age appropriate validated risk assessment tool, such as the Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI), to identify cases that are low to medium risk and diversion eligible to determine overall eligibility of youth placement in alternative programs. Youth should be placed in the appropriate level of restriction based on their likelihood of flight and potential danger to the community.<sup>274</sup></p> <p>Eligibility decisions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Be data-driven;</li><li>• Use objective standards and structured decision-making processes; and</li><li>• Be monitored regularly to track consistency of intake decisions and accuracy of assessments.</li></ul>
<b>Length of Stay</b>	<p>Alternative detention programs are designed to provide a time-limited form of detention supervision and not longer-term treatment. Probation, in collaboration with partners, need to emphasize the capped length of stay in detention alternative programs to avoid negative consequences.</p> <p>Extensive lengths of stay in detention alternative programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increase the likelihood of youth violating program rules; youth who do violate program rules are then often automatically placed in secure detention.</li><li>• Lead to waiting lists; longer lengths of stay may result in detention alternatives quickly reaching full capacity.</li></ul> <p>Youth should be discharged from detention alternatives when their cases are adjudicated and the court decides upon a disposition.<sup>275</sup></p>



## Assessment and Case Management

Juvenile probation officers working with youth should implement a strength-based, positive youth developmental case management approach, in addition to conducting risk and needs assessments and identifying the strengths of youth to guide their case management practices.<sup>276</sup> The table below highlights best practices in juvenile probation case management, broken down across the following components:

- Training
- Risk and Needs Assessments
- Case Planning
- Case Management
- Length of Probation
- Evidence-Based Practices
- Structured Decision-Making: Graduated Response Approach
- Connections to Developmentally Appropriate Services, Supports and Opportunities
- Legal Support
- Reentry Planning

In each of these components, RDA provides a summary of best practices recommended in reports and guidelines issued by the National Institute of Justice, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center, Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Council of State Governments Justice, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

**Table 10. Assessment and Case Management**

Assessment and Case Management Components	Best Practices
<b>Training</b>	<p>All probation officers working with the juvenile population should receive specialized training to better understand the psychosocial development and social contexts of youth.<sup>277 278</sup></p> <p>Some relevant areas of training include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Brain development</li><li>• Moral decision-making</li><li>• Impulsivity</li><li>• Trauma-informed care</li></ul> <p>Probation staff should also be trained in other evidence-based approaches including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Positive youth development</li><li>• Cognitive based interventions</li></ul>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Motivational interviewing</li></ul>
<b>Risk and Needs Assessments</b>	<p>Probation officers should conduct validated youth risk and needs assessments in order to identify individuals' risk for re-offending as well as their criminogenic risks and needs, including stability needs. Implementing a comprehensive youth risk and needs assessment helps guide case planning and can contribute to positive outcomes including:<sup>279</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minimizing bias in assigning risk levels to youth;</li><li>• Providing a common language between agencies;</li><li>• Reducing costs by decreasing use of intensive supervision, over-use of incarceration, and provision of services to youth who do not need them;</li><li>• Improving the targeting of services;</li><li>• Reducing unnecessarily restrictive supervision and attendant probation violations for less risky clients;</li><li>• Providing a means of data collection on the problem areas of youth; and,</li><li>• Reducing rates of re-offense.</li></ul> <p>Juvenile probation officers should conduct assessments every six months in order to determine changes in risks and needs.</p> <p><i>See Table 22 for a list of validated youth risk and needs assessments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trauma, mental health, and substance use screenings are included in assessment protocols. Youth with identified needs in these areas should be referred to specialists to conduct more thorough assessments.</li></ul> <p><i>See Table 23 for a list of targeted mental health and substance use assessments</i></p>
<b>Case Planning</b>	<p>Probation officers should develop individualized case plans with youth and their families. Numerous systems such as child welfare, education, and juvenile justice, have effectively applied structured family group conferencing strategies to case planning processes. Such team decision-making processes have been shown to produce positive outcomes and high rates of compliance for clients.<sup>280</sup></p> <p>Family group conferencing should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Engage families in the case work process and be family-centered;</li><li>• Ensure case managers attend conferences, especially at the initial case planning stage;<sup>281</sup></li><li>• Include strength-based approaches to making decisions, setting goals, and achieving desired outcomes for children and families;<sup>282</sup></li><li>• Employ supportive behaviors, institute family team models, use motivational interviewing, and integrate cultural competence;<sup>283</sup></li></ul> <p>Individualized case plans should be tailored for each youth and address the risk and needs identified during assessments. Ultimately, case plans should be:</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Developed with each youth and their family;</li><li>• Structured around small, achievable goals that build up to larger goals;</li><li>• Built to withstand relapses into destructive behaviors, because this is a natural occurrence during the developmental and maturation process.</li></ul> <p>Plans developed during family group conferencing should be presented to the court and implemented.<sup>284</sup> Individualized case plans should also clearly identify community-based programs and services youth will work with to address criminogenic risks and needs, as well as be flexible to reflect changes in risk and needs and document progress made towards goals.</p>
<b>Case Management</b>	<p>Probation officers should implement a positive youth development (PYD) approach in their work with youth. A PYD approach includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recognizing that youth have a tremendous capacity for change;</li><li>• Nurturing the strengths of youth with programs designed to foster healthy development, build supportive relationships with adults and peers, and develop new skills that are valued in the community;</li><li>• To the greatest extent possible, avoiding punitive interventions that lead to building a negative self-identity and social patterns that may result in criminal behavioral.</li></ul> <p>Implementing a PYD strategy requires significant changes to how staff and communities work with youth, and will require a culture shift in organizations with traditional deficit-based approaches.</p> <p>In addition to implementing a PYD approach, probation officers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consistently provide youth with feedback addressing their risk and needs, as well as the extent to which they have reached defined goals;</li><li>• Seek to provide greater amounts of positive than negative reinforcement (4:1 ratio); and,</li><li>• Use infractions and/or violations as teachable moments and opportunities to enhance motivation and growth.</li></ul> <p>As noted above, probation officers should utilize individual case plans as tools to improve case management practices and client outcomes. Individual plans such as New York City's Supervision Individual Achievement Plan (IAP) restructure and improve the way probation officers and clients interact by emphasizing progress and goal achievement.<sup>285</sup> Probation officers should work together with the client to identify focus areas for improvement during the time the client will be on probation, such as employment, positive peer interaction, and remaining crime free.</p> <p>Case management utilizing individual plans should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Goal setting within focus areas;</li><li>• Agreements on how probation officers will help support the client in achieving these goals;</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agreements on how the client will participate in selected services to achieve set goals;</li><li>• Meetings between probation officers and youth that focus primarily on discussing progress, challenges, and needs related to the goals in the focus areas; and,</li><li>• Updating and revising the plan as needed (when new challenges arise, a goal is met, etc.).<sup>286</sup></li></ul>
<b>Length of Probation</b>	<p>Probation should minimize the length of formal supervision, as youth placed on probation experience significantly higher reoffending rates than comparable youth whose cases were not processed in juvenile court and are instead placed in diversion programs.<sup>287</sup></p> <p>Probation should adopt a developmentally appropriate approach towards supervision<sup>288</sup> and avoid using a fixed term of supervision.<sup>289</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation should minimize supervision for youth who are at a low risk of reoffending.<sup>290</sup></li><li>• Probation supervision terms should be based on a youth's risk of reoffending and the severity of offense while allowing those who need additional support services to receive them.<sup>291</sup></li><li>• Early termination of supervision should be used as an incentive.</li></ul>
<b>Evidence-Based Practices</b>	<p>As noted in the "Adult Probation Services: Assessment and Case Planning" section, there are a number of additional evidence-based case management approaches that juvenile probation officers should integrate into their case management practices.</p> <p>Some of these evidence-based approaches include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Motivational Interviewing:</b> A counseling style where probation officers are helpers in the change process, with the goal of eliciting self-motivational statements and behavioral change from the client as opposed to using coercive tactics to try and change behaviors.<sup>292</sup></li><li>• <b>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions:</b> Interventions which focus on exploring relationships between a person's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in order to replace negative or false thoughts by restructuring them in positive ways.<sup>293</sup></li><li>• <b>Trauma-Informed:</b> A framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma, helping to create a safe environment for clients, and ensuring that probation services do not re-traumatize clients.<sup>294</sup></li><li>• <b>Gender Responsive:</b> Strategies that address the realities of women's lives through gender-responsive policy and programs.<sup>295</sup> When working with men, programs should explicitly address gender attitudes and promote alternative notions of masculinity.<sup>296</sup></li><li>• <b>Positive Youth Development/Justice:</b> Building on youth assets as a vehicle to promote behavior change, rather than merely trying to extinguish their deficits.<sup>297</sup></li></ul>



<b>Structured Decision-Making: Graduated Response Approach</b>	<p>In order to enhance transparency and reduce bias in decision-making, juvenile probation officers should implement a structured decision-making model to guide the provision of rewards/incentives and graduated sanctions.</p> <p><u>Graduated Response Approach:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “A graduated response approach uses research in adolescent brain development and behavior modification to guide probation officers and case managers on appropriate and available sanctions and rewards for youth currently being supervised in the community.”<sup>298</sup></li></ul> <p><u>Disposition Matrix:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A tool to organize sanctions and programs by risk level and offense severity, placing youth along a continuum of disposition options, typically including secure out-of-home placements, placement alternative programs, probation, intensive services, and other community options.</li></ul> <p><u>Incentives and Recognition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Incentives and recognition to promote behavioral change rather than negative accountability methods of punishment and criticism increase the likelihood of success for individuals under community supervision.<sup>299</sup> Research suggests a 4:1 reward/reinforcement to sanction ratio is ideal.<sup>300</sup></li></ul> <p><i>See Table 24 for a description of the NCCD’s Structured Decision-Making Model and the Center for Children’s Law and Policy’s Graduated Response Toolkit.</i></p>
<b>Connections to Developmentally Appropriate Services, Supports, and Opportunities</b>	<p>Based on the needs identified through a validated, age-appropriate needs assessment tool, juvenile probation officers should connect youth with therapeutic interventions, supports, and opportunities that are effective, developmentally and culturally appropriate, and gender responsive in order to improve probationary service outcomes and reduce the likelihood of recidivism.<sup>301</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation should prioritize establishing partnerships with service providers who are in geographic regions that individuals under juvenile probation live, and who are implementing evidence-based services.</li></ul> <p>Some services that are age-appropriate for youth are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mentoring</li><li>• Family support</li><li>• Peer associations</li><li>• Skills supports</li><li>• Civic engagement</li><li>• Education/educational assistance</li><li>• Employment readiness training/workforce development</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Positive arts, sports, and recreational opportunities</li></ul> <p>As noted above, bi-directional feedback and communication should exist between juvenile probation officers and all partners to help reduce duplicative efforts and remove barriers to success for clients under community supervision.<sup>302</sup></p> <p><i>Refer to the "Structured Partnerships" section in Table 2 above for greater detail about the types of partnerships probation should have with county and community-based providers.</i></p>
<b>Legal Support</b>	<p>Probation personnel should brief all youth on their rights as specified in Assembly Bill (AB) 1843, including that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An adjudication by a juvenile court is not a "conviction" which has implications for future employment and</li><li>• Employers may not consider any arrest or detention that did not result in a conviction, a referral to or participation in any pretrial or post-trial diversion program, or any conviction that has been judicially dismissed or ordered sealed.<sup>303</sup></li></ul> <p>It is a legal requirement in California that county probation inform juveniles of their rights and procedures for sealing and expunging their records (California Welfare &amp; Institution Code, § 781.).<sup>304</sup> <sup>9</sup> Youth should also be informed of the procedures required to expunge their juvenile records, and probation officers should work with youth to fill out and file expungement applications. Once records are expunged, the individual has the legal right to tell potential landlords, employers, licensing agencies, and others that they were never arrested or adjudicated as a juvenile.</p> <p>While the ultimate decision to try a youth as an adult does not rest with probation, when probation officer recommendations are sought, in the interests of public safety, probation should attempt to keep juveniles within juvenile courts and facilities. Probation departments should not advocate for the transfer of juveniles to the adult court system, as research shows such transfers increase their risk of violence and recidivism, and severely decrease the likelihood that they will receive the education and mental health services to which they are legally entitled<sup>305</sup></p>
<b>Reentry Planning</b>	<p>Juvenile probation officers should participate in discharge planning for youth who have been detained. This should include conducting validated and age-appropriate risk, need, and strengths assessments in order to guide the case planning and management process, described in greater detail in the components above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reentry planning should including continuity of medication and support youth access to health insurance coverage upon release.<sup>306</sup></li></ul>

<sup>9</sup> If records are to be expunged while youth are on probation or when they are about to terminate, RDA recommends probation officers should be required to routinely work with youth with the process such as filling out and filing expungement applications for them.



## Juvenile Detention and Placement Facilities

Best practices in juvenile detention and placement are described in Table 11 below. The table highlights best practices in a number of areas including:

- Intake
- Safe and Developmentally Appropriate Juvenile Detention Facilities
- Community-Based Detention Sites
- Programming in Custody
- Education in Custody
- Safety in Custody: Trauma-Informed Care Climate
- Safety in Custody: Staff Disciplinary Practices and Conduct
- Cultivating a Positive Climate

In each of these sections RDA provides a summary of standards and recommendations from reports and guidelines coming out of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detentions Alternatives Initiative, the National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the Juvenile Law Center, the Vera Institute of Justice, and independent researchers.

**Table 11. Juvenile Detention and Placement Facilities**

Custody Topic	Best Practices
<b>Intake</b>	<p>Probation departments should create and adhere to admissions policies and practices that minimize the use of involuntary confinement to avoid exposing lower-risk youth to additional criminogenic risk, and to prevent over-crowding. Classification systems should ensure that high-risk and low-risk youth are not housed together, and that the needs of youth are identified and met during detention.<sup>307</sup></p> <p>Intake and admissions staff should not detain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Children under the age of 12;</li><li>• Youth who have not committed a delinquent or criminal act (being undocumented does not constitute such an act);</li><li>• Youth with status offense without a valid violation of a court order and due process (as specified in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 28 CFR § 31.303(f)); or,</li><li>• On the grounds that there is no other place to put them (e.g., if a parent refuses to take the youth home).<sup>308</sup></li></ul> <p>Intake and admission staff should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Only admit youth transferred from or cleared by outside medical or mental health facilities if the detention center has the capacity to provide appropriate ongoing care;</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use a race- and gender-appropriate validated youth risk assessment instrument (RAI) to determine the appropriate pre-dispositional placement or status necessary to accomplish the purposes of detention;</li><li>• Place eligible youth in the least restrictive detention alternative needed to accomplish those purposes (e.g., a non-secure setting, home supervision, evening reporting centers, home electronic monitoring); and,</li><li>• Gather information necessary to make housing and programming decisions for special populations including limited English proficient (LEP) youth; youth with physical or intellectual disabilities; youth at risk of sexual victimization; youth at risk of victimizing other youth; and youth who are or are perceived to be lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or gender non-conforming, questioning, or intersex (LGBTQI);<sup>309</sup></li></ul> <p><u>Medical Evaluation:</u></p> <p>A qualified medical professional should conduct a medical screening designed to detect any urgent health needs or ongoing health concerns that require immediate attention. This screening should be conducted in a confidential setting immediately upon the youth's admission. Female health professionals should be available to conduct the screening for girls.<sup>310</sup></p>
<b>Safe and Developmentally Appropriate Juvenile Detention and Placement Facilities</b>	<p>Juvenile detention and placement facilities should be clean; meet fire and safety codes; have properly functioning temperature controls, light, and ventilation; and offer youth appropriate living conditions. Every effort should be made to ensure that the facilities do not look like or operate as jails, but rather as developmentally-appropriate environments conducive to the rehabilitate goals of the probation department.<sup>311</sup></p> <p>Detention and placement facilities should be physically reconfigured into welcome physical spaces at enables both staff and youth to feel safe and promotes behavioral and cognitive change.<sup>312</sup></p> <p>Key features to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Small group living in residential cottages with open, dormitory-style housing to accommodate "core groups" of 8-12 youths;<sup>313 314</sup></li><li>• Cottages furnished with comfortable beds, amenities, and ample natural light and fresh air;<sup>315</sup></li><li>• Living room areas and private restrooms;</li><li>• Strong emphasis on a holistic Integrated Treatment Model; and,</li><li>• Close proximity to youth's communities.<sup>316</sup></li></ul> <p>Collaborative, data-driven efforts should be made to reduce lengths of stay in detention and placement facilities. System-wide efforts probation should consider to reduce the length of stay in placement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implement weekly detention case reviews where department staff and supervisors gather to review the status of each youth being held. If a case</li></ul>





	<p>change is reported, action should be taken.<sup>317</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Create a position dedicated to tracking all cases in the system and expediting those suitable for earlier scheduling and release.</li><li>• Reduce detention admissions resulting from probation violations and placement failures.<sup>318</sup></li></ul> <p>Probation should also consider case processing reforms that expedite the flow of cases through the system, reduce lengths of stay in detention, expand the availability of non-secure program slots and ensure that interventions with youth are timely and appropriate. Probation should ultimately minimize youth placement in a secure pretrial detention facility, as research has shown that such placement has a negative impact on ultimate case outcomes.<sup>319</sup></p>
<b>Post-Adjudication Placement</b>	<p>To the greatest extent possible, juvenile placement facilities should be located in close proximity to youths' prosocial supports (parents, other supportive family members, and mentors) in order to ensure ongoing connection to positive social influences during confinement. Frequent family visits are associated with good behavior and improved school performance for youth who are incarcerated.<sup>320 321</sup></p> <p><b><u>The Missouri Model:</u></b></p> <p>The Missouri model is associated with substantially lower recidivism rates compared to conventional juvenile custody practices. The model includes creating a homelike and non-correctional environment with programming and staffing inside the facility, as well as parent-family engagement bridging the facility and the community. Treatment and developmental programming are trauma-informed; delivered by well-trained, well-supervised, and well-supported staff; and address prosocial skill development, academic or vocational instruction, work readiness, and work experience.</p> <p>Facilities in the Missouri model are characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Carpeted, warmly appointed dorm rooms containing 10-12 beds, with a dresser and closet space for each youth;</li><li>• Pods containing living rooms, couches, and coffee tables; and,</li><li>• Policies that allow youth to dress in their own clothes rather than uniforms, and keep personal mementos in their rooms.<sup>322</sup></li></ul> <p>Key tenets of the Missouri Model are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continuous case management;</li><li>• Decentralized residential facilities;</li><li>• Small-group, peer-led services;</li><li>• Restorative, rehabilitation-centered treatment environment;</li><li>• Strong organizational leadership;</li><li>• An organizational culture shift from providing services under the court and correctional system to using the department of social services as the primary service provider, and ensuring that staff are both highly qualified and highly</li></ul>





	<p>trained;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Highly effective treatment strategies and approaches and ensuring that the program consistency reflects on, improves, and discards any ineffective initiatives; and,</li><li>• Larger constituency and increased buy-in from stakeholders.</li></ul>
<b>Programming</b>	<p>Facilities should ensure that youth receive medical care, mental health treatment, translation services, and access to religious services, as needed and required by law.<sup>323</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Youth must have access to any medical or mental health care that they require; if the facility is for any reason not able to ensure that each detainee receives the care he/she needs, accommodations must be made to move youth to a setting where such care can be delivered.</li><li>• Translation services should be readily available for youth and families with limited English proficiency.</li><li>• Youth must have access and opportunity to attend optional religious services and practice their faiths – youth who do not choose to participate may not be confined during religious programs.<sup>324</sup></li></ul> <p>Facilities should provide programming that is consistent with what research shows is most likely to improve detainees' ability to succeed following release, including substance abuse services among other services noted above.<sup>325</sup></p> <p>Additionally, custody programming should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Teach detainees skills around self-awareness, communication, emotional regulation, and problem-solving;<sup>326</sup></li><li>• Target criminogenic needs;<sup>327</sup></li><li>• Include gender-specific programs to help ensure that gender-specific pathways to offending are addressed – for both girls<sup>328</sup> and for boys;<sup>329</sup></li><li>• Be culturally-responsive and delivered by individuals who have received training in cultural competency;<sup>330</sup> and,</li><li>• Include field trips and community service projects for as many youth as possible (Missouri model includes moderate-to-higher risk youth).<sup>331</sup></li></ul> <p>All in custody programs should be regularly evaluated, whether they are run by the probation department or by community-based partners. Evaluations should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Program quality measures;</li><li>• Client satisfaction measures;</li><li>• Measures to assess changes to clients' criminogenic risk; and</li><li>• Methods to assess any reduction of recidivism as a result of program.<sup>332</sup></li></ul>
<b>Education in</b>	<p>Every effort should be made to ensure that juvenile detainees receive high-quality education while in residential care or detention, so that their involvement</p>



## Custody

with the juvenile justice system does not increase their criminogenic risk by disrupting their academic path.<sup>333</sup> While probation departments are not usually directly responsible for educating detainees, they partner with county offices of education and local school districts, as well as nearby community colleges to ensure that education is delivered.

In these partnerships, probation departments should advocate strenuously that the following best practices be employed:

- Education should be delivered to students in custody for approximately six hours a day, five days a week.<sup>334 335</sup>
- Students in juvenile justice facilities should never be denied school time as punishment for misbehavior inside or outside of the classroom.<sup>336</sup>
- In custody education should include individualized student success plans implemented and monitored by school personnel.<sup>337 338</sup>
- Students should be screened for special education needs, and information on Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) should be obtained from each student's school. IEPs should be created, followed, and updated for students with identified special needs who do not have IEPs in place. All in custody schools should have Special Education Resource Specialists.<sup>339 340</sup>
- Youth in detention should not simply be given "busy work." Lessons should all have stated educational goals that include advancing critical thinking and align with state standards.<sup>341</sup>
- Students should be grouped by age and ability, not residential unit, taught by single-subject credentialed teachers in the subject of their expertise, and assigned standards-based credit-bearing school work that can be easily transferred to their destination school.<sup>342</sup>
- If the detention facility school has high teacher/administrator turnover, or teachers consistently assessed as poor quality, an agreement should be reached with the district or county office of education to designate the site(s) as hard-to-staff sites, and to provide high quality teachers with extra incentives to work and persist in these positions.<sup>343 344</sup>
- Teachers should be trained in culturally responsive pedagogy, trauma-informed de-escalation and classroom management techniques, restorative practices (community circles and harm circles), and basic mental health.<sup>345</sup>
- Youth should be connected with the most appropriate educational institution immediately upon release.<sup>346</sup> To the greatest extent possible, youth should be returned to a comprehensive high school, rather than to an alternative/continuation school.<sup>347</sup>
- Juvenile facilities should also partner with local community colleges to provide college courses. Courses should be targeted at inspiring students to attend college or develop a career after they leave custody, and focus on time management, career assessment, and career development that includes aptitude testing.<sup>348</sup>
- Rigorous efforts should be made to assure a smooth "hand-off" between the in custody schooling and the community school so that credits and work are transferred and youth make a successful transition to their next educational



	<p>environment.<sup>349</sup></p> <p>Probation should seek support from the Center for Educational Excellence in Alternative Settings (CEEAS) in order to implement the blended learning initiative. The goal of the initiative is to implement comprehensive blended learning models, which combine face-to-face teaching with online instruction to improve student engagement and learning at schools operating in long-term secure juvenile facilities.</p>
<b>Safety in Custody: Trauma-Informed Care</b>	<p>Institutional staff should create a safe environment by providing sufficient staffing and supervision, as well as safeguarding against triggers that are likely to result in conflicts, violence, and injury. All staff working in detention facilities and camps should receive trauma training to reduce their likelihood of triggering a trauma response, or inadvertently escalating youth who are dysregulated because of trauma histories.</p> <p>Trauma training should cover (at minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and skills around creating trauma-informed environments;</li><li>• The impact of trauma on youth development, behavior, and delinquency;</li><li>• Common trauma triggers and how to avoid them;</li><li>• Recognizing signs of trauma reactions;</li><li>• Safety planning and de-escalation strategies;</li><li>• Working with traumatized youth; and</li><li>• Vicarious trauma.<sup>350</sup></li></ul> <p>Trauma screening is recommended for all youth <i>only if there are legal protections in place</i> to ensure that information disclosed during the screening/assessment will not be used against them by probation or the courts.<sup>351</sup></p>
<b>Safety in Custody: Staff Disciplinary Practices and Conduct</b>	<p>Youth should be supervised closely to ensure any detainee-on-detainee conflicts are resolved safely and that injury is prevented.<sup>352</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Staff should not ever use room confinement for discipline, punishment, administrative convenience, retaliation, staffing shortages, or reasons other than a temporary response to behavior that threatens immediate harm to a youth or others.</li><li>• Staff may use room confinement when a youth is engaging in property destruction that threatens immediate harm to youth or others.<sup>353</sup></li><li>• Frequent room checks should be made by staff while youth are in custody and youth in room confinement should not be needlessly deprived of access to programming and education. The department should establish threshold lengths of time in room confinement beyond which escalating levels of supervisorial approvals are required.<sup>354</sup></li></ul>



	<p>Allegations of staff abuse of detainees should be investigated thoroughly by an independent unit.<sup>355</sup> As allegations of abuse are being investigated, alleged victim(s) should be protected from harm and kept separate from alleged perpetrator(s).<sup>356</sup> <sup>357</sup> Termination is the presumptive consequence for substantiated cases of abuse and neglect. (Additional detail on PREA compliance at 28 CFR §§ 115.376, 115.377).<sup>358</sup></p>
<b>Cultivating a Positive Climate</b>	<p>Implementing system-wide positive behavior supports drastically reduces behavioral infractions among detained youth.<sup>359</sup> To implement positive behavior supports, institutional staff and educators must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Establish 3-5 clear behavior expectations that are positively stated (e.g., “everyone treats everyone else with respect,” or “we all support each other to be our best selves”);</li><li>• Consistently teach and model these behavior expectations;</li><li>• Formally, regularly, and positively acknowledge youth when they display desired behavioral expectations and engage in established routines;<sup>360</sup> and,</li><li>• Form and sustain supportive rather than coercive relationships with youth.<sup>361</sup></li></ul> <p>Staff must also examine and shift their own attitudes about “positive” supports.<sup>362</sup> Probation staff, particularly those working inside detention facilities, may have difficulty adjusting from a punitive frame to one oriented toward positive behavior, as punishment is an assumed function of juvenile detention for many institutional staff.<sup>363</sup> Changes in policy and practice can, however, result in less punitive attitudes among juvenile detention personnel.<sup>364</sup></p>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>Every 2 years, detention and placement facilities should assess their conditions and practices against the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative detention facility standards (revised in 2014). These standards were developed and refined by juvenile facility managers and experts, and are informed by best practices in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maintaining safety;</li><li>• Assessing and grouping youth according to validated risk assessment;</li><li>• Providing gender- and culturally-responsive housing environments; and,</li><li>• Ensuring detainees experience the least restrictive settings and conditions possible within legal and safety requirements.<sup>365</sup></li></ul>



## Section 4. Transition Aged Youth

Young adulthood is a transitional period that can range from age 18 to 25. Recently, neurological research has verified that young adults are developmentally distinct from older adults and more similar to their younger counterparts. Studies have shown that significant brain development continues well into the 20s, particularly in the prefrontal cortex region, which regulates impulse control and reasoning.<sup>366</sup> During this period of substantial growth and change, young adults exhibit clear developmental differences from older adults. Young adults are developmentally distinct from older adults in that they demonstrate heightened risk taking and poor decision-making. However, the social contexts that young adults operate within are different from those of juveniles; young adults are more likely to be influenced by peer groups, have different sets of social expectations, develop a greater degree of independence from family, and have greater access to employment opportunities as well as alcohol or other controlled substances.<sup>367</sup>

The transition to adulthood is especially challenging for justice-system-involved young adults, as they are more likely to have personal histories that can further disrupt psychosocial development.<sup>368</sup> In fact, crime-involved young adults have a higher likelihood of parental incarceration, poverty, foster care, substance abuse, mental health needs and learning disabilities, all of which have been linked to impeding psychosocial maturity.<sup>369</sup>

As a group, young adults comprise a disproportionately high percentage of arrests and prison admissions, and about half of all young adults return to prison within three years following release.<sup>370</sup> Current systems are not effectively reducing future criminality among this age group, and the unique needs of young adults are not being met in either the juvenile or adult justice systems. Studies suggest that incarceration creates additional barriers to educational attainment, stable employment, housing, health care, and relationships. The multiple disadvantages that these young adults face suggest that correctional programming, both in secure facilities and in the community, must include more robust options than skills training alone. Young adults must also build the prosocial skills to succeed in adult roles — exercising impulse control, emotional self-regulation, and better interpreting others' intentions — in addition to the technical skills of their work.<sup>371</sup>

When someone between the ages of 18 and 24 commits a crime, neither the juvenile nor the adult criminal justice system is exclusively responsible for providing services and supervision to this individual. The table below highlights considerations and best practices for transition aged youth (TAY) across criminal and juvenile justice systems.



Table 12. Transitional Age Youth

Transitional Age Youth Components	Best Practices
<b>Case Planning and Management</b>	<p>Research supports that 18 to 25 year olds are less successful than their older counterparts in complying with their court ordered terms and conditions; these individuals should receive enhanced and motivational case management services to assist them while on probation.<sup>372</sup> Similar to case planning for youth, case planning for young adults should be individualized, developed in collaboration with the client, and structured around achievable goals. Setting small, achievable goals helps young adults gain confidence and optimism about their own abilities.</p> <p>In order to work with the TAY population effectively, probation officers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Be trained to understand the psycho-social development and social contexts of young adults, as well as in facilitating evidence-based practices; and,</li><li>• Be granted broader discretion so that they can create and amend supervision conditions, shorten supervision terms for good behavior, and divert cases to community services or treatment, where appropriate, based on young adults risk and needs assessment or progress toward prosocial goals.<sup>373</sup></li></ul> <p>Case planning strategies with the TAY population should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Utilize techniques that employ sequential direction. Breaking down the court's orders into individual tasks and directing the 18 to 25 year old client to complete one task at a time will be more effective than requiring all to be managed simultaneously.<sup>374</sup></li><li>• Anticipate and incentivize positive growth and behavior. Plans should be structured to allow for frequent and tangible rewards for positive behavior (e.g., decreased reporting frequency, shortened supervision terms, or possible expungement of records).</li><li>• Anticipate and withstand relapse into previous destructive behaviors, and recognize this as a natural occurrence within the process of maturation and behavioral change for justice involved young adults.<sup>375</sup></li><li>• Assist young adults in thinking strategically about how to use their time, especially if they are transitioning out of a highly structured incarceration environment.<sup>376</sup></li></ul> <p>An additional tool that can assist probation officers developing case plans for clients between the ages of 18 to 25 is the Search Institute's "40 Developmental Assets" which outlines internal and external youth characteristics that help to identify risk and resiliency factors. Assets are identified in eight categories: support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, constructive use of time, commitment to learning, positive values, social competencies, and positive</p>



	<p>identity).</p> <p>Ultimately, the community supervision approach taken with the TAY population should shift from a law enforcement-oriented approach to a strength-based approach where practitioners engage in behavior-change work with the person on supervision.<sup>377</sup></p> <p>Supervision strategies for TAY should include those used with youth, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Positive youth development;<sup>378</sup></li><li>• Motivational interviewing;</li><li>• Cognitive behavioral approaches to address criminal thinking and anti-social behavior;</li><li>• Shorter periods of community supervision; and,<sup>379</sup></li><li>• Expectations that are compatible with prosocial goals and adapt to work, school, and family schedules of supervised young adults.</li></ul> <p><i>See Table 26 for a list of TAY-specific programs that have been effective for serving this population.</i></p>
<b>Substance Abuse &amp; Mental Health Treatment</b>	<p>Traditional substance abuse and mental health treatment approaches can be less effective with the TAY population.</p> <p>Recommendations for working with this population include.<sup>380</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least one year of treatment provided, with the potential for ongoing treatment;</li><li>• More extensive assessment provided;</li><li>• Greater emphasis on psychoeducational and supportive approaches;</li><li>• Use of the Seven Challenges Model; and,</li><li>• Cognitive-behavioral treatment approaches.</li></ul> <p><i>See Table 25 for a description of Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults, an adaptation of the MST evidence-based treatment with decades of research supporting its effectiveness.</i></p>
<b>Linkage to Community-based Services, Supports, and Opportunities</b>	<p>Based on identified needs, probation officers should refer TAY clients to appropriate services with which the department has structured partnerships. Priority should be placed on keeping young adults in the community whenever possible, where they are able to maintain and build prosocial relationships through education, housing, family, and employment.<sup>381</sup> Probation officers should also connect TAY clients to life skills training to ensure that young adults are ready to transition to independence.</p>
<b>Training</b>	<p>Probation should expand the training offered to their staff to focus on the specific developmental needs of emerging adults and effective interventions. Specific training should be provided to all professionals who will be working with</p>



	<p>emerging adults, including police, judges, probation officers, staff in residential facilities, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and providers.</p> <p>Probation should adopt trainings for officers working with TAY clients similar to those provided for juvenile probation officers, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Brain development</li><li>• Moral decision-making</li><li>• Impulsivity</li><li>• Trauma-informed care</li><li>• Positive youth development</li><li>• Cognitive-based interventions<sup>382</sup></li></ul>
<b>Facilities</b>	<p>Special considerations for young adults in jail facilities include the development of a special correctional unit or facility designed for emerging or young adults with targeted programming for the needs of this age group.<sup>383</sup> Detained young adults should be housed separately from older, more sophisticated inmates whenever possible.</p>





## Appendix of Tools, Practices, Programs, and Approaches Referenced in Document

Table 13. William Bridges Stages of Organizational Transition<sup>384</sup>

Ending	Neutral Zone	New Beginning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grieving loss due to change</li><li>• May see overreaction to change</li><li>• Acknowledge losses – get them out in the open</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Anxiety rises and motivation falls</li><li>• People may feel overwhelmed, disoriented, self-doubting</li><li>• People are divided – some want to move forward, others stay the same</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Involves new understandings, new values, and new ways to think about yourself</li><li>• Need to be nurtured like a plant would be</li><li>• Clarify and communicate the purpose</li></ul>

Table 14. Sample of Gang Prevention and Intervention Strategies and Programs

Strategy/Program Type	Description
<b>The Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression</b>	Comprehensive approaches to gang problems implement from the perspective that street gangs are by-products of partially incapacitated communities. The OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model is highlighted in the Collaboration, Partnerships, and Linkages table, Table 2, above. This model has been replicated in whole or in part in locations such as Bloomington, IL; Tucson, AZ; San Antonio, TX; Riverside, CA; Los Angeles, CA; San Jose, CA; and, Mesa, AZ. <sup>385</sup>
<b>Street Outreach Services</b>	Street outreach in the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model occurs inside the framework of a cooperative relationship with other agencies, including probation, law enforcement, social services, and schools. Street outreach worker responsibilities in this model include: 1) Building relationships with clients and other gang members, 2) Recruiting gang members, 3) Serving as intervention teams' eyes, ears, hands, and feet on the street, 4) Linking clients to necessary services and support their participation, 5) Providing quality interaction with clients, 6) Acting as a liaison between project clients and service providers, 7) Working with clients on employability skills, 8) Recognizing and reinforcing positive behavior, 9) Resolving difficulties between clients, their families, other youth, and/or agencies, 10) Providing appropriate crisis responses in conjunction with other agencies following a violent incident, 11) Assisting families in distress, and 12) Documenting their activities. <sup>386</sup>



<b>Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs</b>	Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs (HVIPs) combine the efforts of medical staff and community-based partners to intervene with violently injured young people as soon as possible after hospitalization. HVIPs reach those caught in the cycle of violence immediately after they have been hospitalized. At this critical moment, this vulnerable population is at a crossroads; they can either encourage retaliation for the violence committed against them, or they can turn their traumatic experience into a reason to take themselves out of “the game.” Breaking the cycle of violence means that each patient can begin working with a highly trained “Intervention Specialist” who provides crisis intervention, long-term case management, linkages to community-based services, mentoring, home visits, and follow-up assistance designed to promote health, including mental and physical recovery from trauma. Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of interventions at these moments. <sup>387</sup>
<b>School-Based Programs</b>	Students bring preexisting gang conflicts to the school setting and new conflicts are created when opposing gang members come into contact with one another. Goldstein and Kodluboy (1998) suggest that programs in school settings must, at a minimum, include three types of strategies: 1) In-school safety and control procedures (see also Trump, 1998), 2) In-school enrichment procedures that make the school experience more meaningful, effective, and enjoyable (see also Howell and Hawkins, 1998), and 3) Formal links to community-based programs. <sup>388</sup>
<b>CeaseFire Programs</b>	CeaseFire is a comprehensive violence reduction strategy. Ceasefire uses a data driven process to identify the individuals and groups at the very highest risk of gun violence in a city and engages those individuals in direct communication to inform them of their risks and offer them support. The individuals are then enrolled in services, supports, and opportunities and also receive heightened law enforcement attention if they continue to engage in violence. Ceasefire is a harm-reduction model that first focuses on short-term reductions of gang/group related gun violence. Core components include: 1) A data-driven strategy, 2) Direct Communication to the Highest Risk Groups and Individuals, 3) Services, Supports, & Opportunities, 4) Supervision and Focused Enforcement. <sup>389</sup>
<b>Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach, operated by Boys &amp; Girls Clubs of America</b>	Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach, operated by Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA), is a communitywide gang prevention program that incorporates four objectives: community mobilization, recruitment, mainstreaming/programming, and case management. Police departments, schools, social service agencies, and community



	organizations recruit at-risk youth into club programs in a non-stigmatizing way through direct outreach efforts and a referral network that links local clubs with courts. Programs are offered in five core areas: character and leadership development; education and career development; health and life skills; the arts; and, sports, fitness, and recreation. <sup>390</sup>
<b>Albuquerque's Youth Development Inc. (YDI)</b>	Albuquerque's Youth Development, Inc. (YDI) provides comprehensive services for at-risk youth and others involved in the juvenile justice system. YDI's Gang Prevention and Intervention Program is directed toward preventing initial gang involvement among younger teenagers and providing constructive, nonviolent activities for current gang members. In a structured 7-week program, gang members become involved in community service, learn nonviolent conflict resolution skills, obtain employment and legal assistance, and receive counseling with family members. <sup>391</sup>
<b>Inner-City Games (ICG)</b>	Inner-City Games (ICG) is an urban program that provides alternatives to gang life. Licensed by the National Inner-City Games Foundation, ICG provides opportunities for inner-city youth to participate in athletic, educational, cultural, and community-enrichment programs. The program enables youth to build confidence and self-esteem and encourages them to say "no" to gangs, drugs, and violence and "yes" to hope, learning, and life. Originally assisting youth only in East Los Angeles, ICG expanded to 15 cities, serving more than 1 million young people. <sup>392</sup>
<b>Home Boy Industries/Jobs for a Future</b>	Homeboy Industries and Jobs for a Future provide alternatives to gang life for gang members; they provide access to jobs that can give them an escape from gangs. Jobs for a Future place some 200 gang members in jobs in the community each year. Homeboy Industries merchandises T-shirts and silkscreens and operates Homeboy Bakeries, which sells baked bread to a commercial baker. Both enterprises successfully employ rival gang members. Proceeds from these ventures fund a daycare center, a homeless shelter, an alternative school for gang members, and a tattoo-removal service. <sup>393</sup>
<b>Los Angeles Gang Reduction and Youth Development (GRYD)</b>	Intervention agencies that are contracted with the City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development to provide intervention services to gang-involved youth and young adults, ages 14-25, (clients) and their families who have a presence in the GRYD Targeted Service Zone using the GRYD Intervention Family Case Management Model. Contract agencies also provide Incident Response and Proactive Peacekeeping in and around the zone to preempt, reduce, and respond to gang-related violence. Proactive Peacekeeping efforts



take place on an ongoing basis, through engaging potential perpetrators and victims of gang violence, as well as engaging the broader community in an effort to quell surges in violence. Contract agencies ensure that all staff, including program directors/coordinators and subcontractors, participate in on-going training and debriefing sessions/meetings.<sup>394</sup>

**Table 15. Probation Officer Training for EPICS**

Type of Training	Description	Dosage
<b>Effective Practices in Community Supervision</b>	Covers risks, needs, and responsivity principles and core correctional skills including how to do anti-criminal modeling, effective reinforcement, effective disapproval, effective use of authority, structured learning, problem solving, cognitive restructuring, and supporting the development of relationship skills. The EPICS model ensures that community supervision officers focus on higher-risk clients, treat criminogenic needs, and use treatment strategies that match the learning styles and motivations of clients.	3-4 day training session and 24 coaching sessions through UCCI

**Table 16. APPA workload Study Findings**

Activity	Hours Per Month
<b>Administrative tasks</b>	36
<b>Home visits</b>	20
<b>Motivational interviewing</b>	18
<b>Pre-sentence investigation</b>	14
<b>Court appearances</b>	13
<b>Processing technical violations</b>	13
<b>Verifying collateral contacts</b>	10
<b>Substitute coverage</b>	8



<b>Drug tests</b>	6
<b>Verifying employment</b>	5
<b>Receiving training</b>	4

**Table 17. Validated Criminogenic Risk and Needs Assessment Tools**

<b>Tool</b>
<b>Correctional Assessment and Intervention System (CAIS)</b>
<b>Correctional Offender Management Profile for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)</b>
<b>Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) and Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)</b>
<b>Static Risk and Offender Needs Guide (STRONG)</b>
<b>Offender Screening Tool (OST)</b>
<b>Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)</b>

**Table 18. Basic Needs Screening Tools<sup>395</sup>**

<b>Tool</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
<b>New York City Department of Health Homeless Checklist</b>	Brief homeless screening tool used to identify the living situation of individuals immediately prior to arrest
<b>Texas Uniform Health Status Update</b>	An easy to use medical screening tool that comes with easy to use instructions
<b>PS Plus Assessment</b>	Employment screening tool that surveys for vocational interests, skills, and history; educational levels and qualifications; and, barriers to employment such as driver's license suspension.
<b>The Maryland Correctional Education Program Employment Screen</b>	A 49 question tool intended to identify potential challenges job seekers may face that groups issues by the following six categories: education/training, personal/health, attitude, support, and job search.



**Table 19. Psychosocial Screening Tools<sup>396</sup>**

Tool	Purpose
<b>TCU Drug Screen II</b>	A 15-item substance use screen that identifies individuals with serious substance abuse histories and takes five to ten minutes to administer.
<b>GAINS Brief Jail Mental Health Screen</b>	An eight question mental health screening that takes less than three minutes to administer.
<b>Mental Health Screening Form</b>	A two-page, 17-item mental health screen that because it is longer can help identify symptoms of specific mental health disorders.

**Table 20. Case Management Frameworks**

Case Management Approach	Purpose
<b>Integrated Case Management</b>	<p>A case management approach that seeks to integrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The process of reentry—considering, as one process, all that happens from the time of admission to time in prison to discharge from supervision into the community.</li><li>• The goals of community safety and successful reentry, recognizing that they are mutually reinforcing.</li><li>• Custody, control, and monitoring strategies with targeted intervention and enhanced motivational strategies to reduce the likelihood of future recidivism.</li><li>• Prison-based and community-based efforts.</li><li>• Staff and public-private partnerships into a case management team.</li><li>• Efforts of correctional agencies with those of non-corrections stakeholders to manage the individual's reentry process more effectively.</li><li>• The principles of evidence-based practice with case management efforts.</li><li>• Efforts of case managers and other staff with the efforts of clients themselves.</li></ul> <p>Georgia, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, and Rhode Island have implemented the Transition from Prison to the Community (TPC) model that utilizes the Integrated Case Management Approach.</p>



<b>Strength-based case management (SBCM)</b>	A client centered case management approach that emphasizes people strengths, viewing clients as resources and resilient to adversity. <sup>397</sup> SBCM focuses on future outcomes and strengths that people bring to a problem or crisis. <sup>398</sup>
<b>Forensic Assertive Community Treatment</b>	<p>Forensic Assertive Community Treatment (FACT) is an adaptation of ACT, an evidence-based behavioral health treatment model for people with serious mental illness who are at-risk of or would otherwise be served in institutional settings (e.g. hospitals, jails/prisons) or experience homelessness.</p> <p>The ACT model is a comprehensive community-based model of treatment, support, and rehabilitation for individuals who have serious and persistent mental illness, and who do not seek-out support and/or have trouble engaging in traditional office-based programming. ACT is often referred to as a “hospital without walls” in which the ACT team itself provides the community support.</p> <p>Team members in the FACT model include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Probation officer</li><li>• Psychiatrist</li><li>• Social workers</li><li>• Nurses</li><li>• Substance abuse specialists</li><li>• Vocational rehabilitation specialists</li><li>• Occupational therapists</li><li>• Service coordinators</li><li>• Peer support specialists (individuals who have had personal, successful experience with the recovery process)</li></ul>
<b>Intensive case management (ICM)</b>	Intensive Case Management (ICM) is another behavioral health treatment model that provides a community-based package of care, aiming to provide long term care for severely mentally ill. ICM falls somewhere between typical case management and the ACT model described above and highlights the importance of small caseload (less than 20) and high intensity input.

Table 21. Sample of Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool<sup>399</sup>

<b>Tool</b>
<b>Federal Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument</b>
<b>Coconino County Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool</b>
<b>Colorado Pretrial Assessment Tool</b>



<b>Florida Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument</b>
<b>Kentucky Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument</b>
<b>Indiana Risk Assessment System</b>
<b>Correctional Offender Management Profile for Alternative Sanctions</b>
<b>Ohio Risk Assessment System: Pretrial Assessment Tool</b>
<b>Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument</b>

**Table 22. Evidence-Based Youth Risk and Needs Assessment Tools**

<b>Validated Youth Risk Assessments</b>
<b>Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS)</b>
<b>Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS)</b>
<b>Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT)</b>
<b>Risk &amp; Resiliency Checkup (RRC)</b>
<b>Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY)</b>
<b>Washington State Juvenile Court Assessment</b>
<b>Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI)</b>

**Table 23. Youth Mental Health and Substance Abuse Assessment Tools**

<b>Mental Health and Substance Use, Youth Risk Assessments</b>
<b>Carlson Psychological Survey (CPS)</b>
<b>Comprehensive Addiction Severity Index for Adolescents (CASI-A)</b>
<b>Jesness Inventory – Revised (JI-R)</b>
<b>Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument—Version 2</b>





Table 24. Structured Decision-Making and Graduated Response

Tools	Summary
<b>Graduated Response Toolkit</b> <sup>400</sup>	<p>The Graduate Response Toolkit contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An overview of graduated responses, including research and their use;</li><li>• A step-by-step roadmap for creating or enhancing a graduated response system;</li><li>• Guidance on gathering and using data;</li><li>• Staff training materials and hands-on scenarios;</li><li>• Guidance on integrating graduated responses into case plans;</li><li>• Tools to engage stakeholders; and,</li><li>• Contact from the field.</li></ul>
<b>Structured Decision-making Model in Juvenile Justice</b> <sup>401</sup>	<p>"The Structured Decision-making model for juvenile justice is an evidence- and research-based system that identifies the key points in the life of a juvenile justice case and uses structured assessments that are valid, reliable, equitable, and useful. The model includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Detention screening instruments</b> identify the likelihood of a youth committing a future offense during a specific and short period of time: before the adjudication hearing. This information helps determine whether a secure setting should be considered while a youth awaits an initial custody hearing.</li><li>• <b>Actuarial risk assessments</b> structure decision points, helping agencies know where to allocate resources and target interventions. NCCD works with jurisdictions to design and implement actuarial risk assessment instruments to help make decisions about juvenile cases following adjudication. These decisions involve determining the disposition of a case and whether a youth can be safely diverted from the juvenile justice system.</li><li>• A <b>disposition matrix</b> is used to promote consistency and equity in dispositional recommendations according to the severity of the current offense and risk of future offending. This ensures that youth in similar situations will have similar and appropriate decisions at their case disposition.</li><li>• Once appropriate sanctions and programs have been determined, <b>post-disposition decisions and case management tools</b> are used to inform ongoing supervision and decisions relevant to the care and well being of juvenile justice system-involved youth. Examples of post-disposition decisions and case management tools can include the following: a <b>response matrix</b>, which guides probation and/or parole officers on available sanctions and rewards for youth currently being supervised in the community; and a <b>custody and housing assessment</b> that helps staff decide how to group youth to ensure the protection of all detained youth and helps to alert staff to any special needs youth may have."<sup>402</sup></li></ul>



**Table 25. Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults**

Tools	
<b>Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults</b>	<p>Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults (MST-EA) is an adaptation of MST—an evidence-based intervention that has been effective in reducing reoffending among juveniles—that is specifically tailored to the distinct needs of young adults ages 17 to 21</p> <p>Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults (MST-EA) was designed for young people aged 17-26 at the highest risk for negative long-term outcomes -- those with multiple co-occurring problems and extensive systems involvement. MST-EA is an adaptation of standard MST, an evidence-based treatment with decades of research supporting its effectiveness with juvenile justice populations. MST-EA has been tested thus far with young adults who have justice involvement and co-occurring behavioral health disorders (including mood, anxiety, trauma, psychotic, and/or substance abuse disorders). These young adults present extraordinarily high rates of recidivism and are at elevated risk for expensive placements.</p> <p>MST-EA addresses factors that are the most likely causes of offending and behavioral health problems in emerging adults. Further, MST-EA directly supports the developmentally appropriate life goals (e.g., education, employment, housing) of emerging adults and also helps them build an effective social network, while retaining the underlying principles, processes, and service delivery model of standard MST<sup>403</sup>.</p>

**Table 26. TAY Dedicated Programs<sup>404</sup>**

Dedicated TAY Programs	
<b>San Francisco's Transitional Age Unit</b>	"Relies on uniquely trained staff, intensive community collaboration, and a deep understanding of the problems affecting justice- involved young adults. This unit has a dedicated supervisor as well as seven officers who collectively handle 500 cases per year. TAY unit selects officers based not only on their skills for creating professional alliances but also on their demonstrated passion to provide support for this age group. Officers are trained in cultural competency for this age group."
<b>Young Adult Court, Idaho, Jurisdiction: Bonneville</b>	"The Young Adult Court in Bonneville County, Idaho serves young adults 18 to 24 years old who have misdemeanor or felony charges and are involved in the drug court system. Representatives from felony probation, juvenile probation, and misdemeanor probation departments are involved in the program, as well as the Public Defender, Prosecutor, and Trial Court Administrator, and Administrative



<b>County, Idaho</b>	Judge. Participants are referred through the drug court system. Many participants have multi-generational substance abuse issues. A local substance abuse treatment provider utilizes an adaptation of the Seven Challenges model, a SAMHSA recognized evidence-based program for adolescents with drug problems. The program works with clients to address their drug problems as well as co-occurring life skills deficits, situational problems, and psychological problems. Participants undergo regular drug testing as part of the program. A case manager works with the participants to secure housing and access community services. Communication with participants includes coaching and technology such as texting to promote engagement in the treatment program.”
<b>Young Adult Court (YAC), San Francisco, California</b>	“The Young Adult Court (YAC) is a collaborative justice court program for transitional aged youth (ages 18-25). The program began in July 2015 and is a partnership among the Superior Court of California; Office of the Public Defender; Office of the District Attorney; Adult Probation Department; Family Services Agency (Felton Institute); Goodwill Industries; Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; Sheriff’s Department; Jail Reentry Services; and the Department of Public Health. Persons involved in misdemeanor and felony cases are eligible, with priority given to serious felony cases. Referrals can be made by criminal justice stakeholders on a pre-plea basis; individuals can participate on a pre-plea, deferred entry of judgment (DEJ) or probation basis, depending on the charges All misdemeanor cases are eligible with the exception of those involving drunk driving, gang allegations, hate crimes, domestic violence, elder abuse or crimes against children, potential sex offender registry, and gun cases. Participants must be motivated and willing to participate in program activities, which are designed to provide developmentally aligned, trauma-informed services. This includes intensive clinical case management; individual, group, and family counseling; dialectical behavior therapy; drug monitoring; and referrals for substance abuse treatment, housing, parenting, academic and vocational support provided through linkages in the community. Participants are given an opportunity to engage in a therapeutic process to learn new skills, to reduce and recover from alcohol and/or drug (AOD) addiction and to promote physical, mental and emotional well-being. Participants receive legal advice and assistance with civil legal remedies including reinstatement of suspended driver’s license and expungement/sealing of prior arrests and convictions. Participants may be offered plea or probation reductions including the dismissal of the case and sealing of arrest records, reduction from a felony to a misdemeanor charge, reduction of the length of probation, or dismissal of fines. Most participants are involved in the program for one year or longer.”
<b>Young Adult Diversion Court- Kalamazoo County, Michigan</b>	“Young Adult Diversion Court (YADC) was designed to establish the foundation for and perpetuate the diversion of young adult first-time offenders toward healthy, positive choices and community engagement through therapeutic justice and innovative collaboration with the community. YADC is an 8-24 month program that works with probationers in Kalamazoo County Michigan between 17 and 20 years old who have been sentenced to probation on a misdemeanor charge under a diversion statute and who are at risk of losing the diversion status, resulting in a



	<p>conviction of the criminal charge and a criminal record. The program is based on the standard Drug Court model. Participants are referred by the probation officer or judge for intensive case management through the YADC program. This includes mental health and substance abuse counseling as needed, weekly programming, and biweekly court review sessions. A Program Coordinator facilitates interactive, educational, weekly group discussions and activities focused on life skills, leadership development, and self-esteem growth opportunities. Community service is a requirement of the program. Several community agencies were involved in the development of the program and partner with the YADC program to provide services and support to participants. Graduates of YADC are discharged from probation and have their charge dismissed.”</p>
<b>Lockport Young Adult Court (LYAC), Lockport City, New York</b>	<p>“The Lockport Young Adult Court (LYAC) Program seeks to diminish criminal propensity and recidivism of young adults through intense supervision, education, treatment, and judicial monitoring of Court participants. This program works to break the pattern of behaviors that have caused these young adults to become involved in the criminal justice system. The focus is directed on instilling values of accountability and responsibility by improving the personal and social aspects of each participant. This goal will be accomplished through mandating and overseeing linkages to appropriate programs, including: family counseling, educational and vocational training, anger management, substance abuse counseling, mental health counseling, first offender type programs, and many other programs. The primary impact of the LYAC Program will be on participants becoming productive, responsible, adult members of the community, by teaching them the skills necessary to conquer the issues which led them into the criminal justice system, and ultimately bringing an end to their criminal activity.”</p>
<b>Manhattan Young Adult Court, New York, New York</b>	<p>“Based at the Midtown Community Court, the Manhattan Young Adult Court serves 18-to 20-year olds and operates once a week. Using risk-needs assessment tools and evidence-based practices, the initiative features a range of age-appropriate interventions, including individual and group counseling, substance abuse treatment, mental health and trauma services, and educational and vocational services, as well as referrals to local agencies and service providers. Moving forward, the Center for Court Innovation and the Manhattan District Attorney’s Office have partnered to pilot a program, called Stay on Track, to reduce pretrial detention and incarceration for young adults charged with felonies.”</p>
<b>Youthful Offender Program, Des Moines, Iowa serving Polk County</b>	<p>“The Youthful Offender Program is a pretrial release program serving 16 to 22 year old offenders. Participants must be first-time felony offenders and have no current or prior gang involvement. Successful completion of the program results in the felony being lowered to a misdemeanor offense with the felony removed from their record. The county attorney refers young men and women to the program. Three probation officers and the county attorney meet weekly to discuss referrals and determine suitability for program participation. The program includes cognitive thinking classes, reconciliation, restitution, GED or high school completion (if</p>



	<p>needed), life skills courses, and employment. The program uses evidenced-based practices in the delivery of services. Participants start with weekly supervision, which is gradually decreased to monthly supervision over a period of one to four years, depending on progress and successful completion of program requirements. A partnership with a local community college provides no-cost vocational training, education, and job placement (supported through a federal grant). Participants may be placed in a residential facility for a short period of time if there is a substance abuse relapse or failure to comply with program requirements.”</p>
<b>Young Adult Initiative, District of Columbia-Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia (CSOSA)</b>	<p>“CSOSA’s Young Adult Initiative (YAI) provides supervision and intervention for young adult offenders age 25 years and under by providing wraparound support, guidance and case management. YAI emphasizes early engagement and interventions, specialized programming, and team based supervision. CSOSA engages young adults in meaningful dialogue (motivational interviewing, cognitive behavioral interventions etc.), treatment, job readiness and education programming. Partnerships with community and faith-based organizations provide additional services and community service opportunities for participants. Two Young Adult Teams (YAT) provide services to all males age 18-25 years, except those living in transitional housing or supervised in the sex offender unit. Each young adult (YA) is assigned a primary Community Supervision Officer (CSO), vocational counselor, and a treatment specialist. Young adults (YA) meet with the complete team on each visit to the probation office, either individually or as a group. If not in school or working, participants remain at the CSOSA office for extended hours and receive services (vocational assessment and training, physical and mental assessment, personal and family development). Participants are supervised under a daycare or day reporting model where services are provided in house.”</p>
<b>Intensive Supervision Service (ISS)- South Carolina Department of Corrections</b>	<p>“The Division of Young Offender Parole and Reentry Services (YOPRS) encompasses institutional and community-based programs for males and females sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act (YOA). Eligibility requirements for the programs include young adults who have no previous convictions and are under the age of 25 years. The program is limited to nonviolent, Class D felonies or lesser offenses, carrying maximum penalties of 15 years imprisonment or less. The youth may apply to have their record expunged if they have no other convictions during the five year period following completion of their sentence. The recidivism rate for Youthful Offenders released from South Carolina Department of Corrections in FY 2010-2011 was over 50%. Because this population was the most challenging and least successful under parole supervision, a community supervision service (Intensive Supervision or ISS) was implemented. This Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) Model uses evidence-based practices proven to reduce recidivism, improve family and individual functioning, and ensure community safety. An Intensive Supervision Officer (ISO) works in the community and is assigned to each Youthful Offender upon admission at the South Carolina Department of Corrections. The ISO differs from a traditional parole officer by acting in a proactive manner in the life of each</p>



	young adult. Parole officers.”
<b>Arches: A Transformative Mentoring Program- NYC</b>	“Arches is a group mentoring program that works with justice-involved young adults to transform attitudes and behaviors that led to criminal activity. The program serves young adults on probation between the ages of 16 and 24 years. The program helps participants to get out of the justice system by strengthening their attachment to education, work, and the community. The program includes group support activities, a curriculum delivered by culturally appropriate mentors, and a setting of positive values and practices. The group process is the core component of Arches. Mentors are paid for working with participants and mentees receive stipends for each group session completed. Arches connects participants to educational, vocational, and therapeutic programs when needed. The Arches program is part of the New York City Young Men’s Initiative.”

<sup>1</sup>“History of Probation,” New York City Department of Probation,  
<http://www.nyc.gov/html/prob/html/about/history.shtml>.

<sup>2</sup> Danielle Kaeble and Thomas Z. Bonczar, “Probation and Parole in the United States, 2015,” *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, December 21, 2016, <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5784>.

<sup>3</sup> Edward J. Latessa, “The Challenge of Change: Correctional Programs and Evidenced-Based Practices,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 3 (2004): 547–60.

<sup>4</sup> James C. Howell et al., eds., *Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders: A Sourcebook*, 1st ed. (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1995).

<sup>5</sup> Meghan Guevara and Enver Solomon, “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.” (Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections: Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice, October 2009), <http://static.nicic.gov/Library/024107.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> James Bonta and D. A. Andrews, “Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation,” (Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2007),  
[https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JuvenileTF/Handout/RiskAssessment/Risk\\_Need\\_2007-06\\_e.pdf](https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JuvenileTF/Handout/RiskAssessment/Risk_Need_2007-06_e.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Joseph Gagnon and Curtis Richards, “Making the Right Turn: A Guide About Improving Transition Outcomes for Youth Involved in the Juvenile Corrections System” (National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth, Institute for Educational Leadership, 2008),  
[http://www.ncwdyouth.info/assets/juvenile\\_justice/making\\_the\\_right\\_turn.pdf](http://www.ncwdyouth.info/assets/juvenile_justice/making_the_right_turn.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> Edward J. Latessa et al., “A Statewide Evaluation of the RECLAIM Ohio Initiative,” (Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, March 1998),  
[https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/reports/project\\_reports/Reclaim.PDF](https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/reports/project_reports/Reclaim.PDF).

<sup>9</sup> Doug McVay, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg, “Treatment or Incarceration? National and State Findings on the Efficacy and Cost Savings of Drug Treatment Versus Imprisonment,” (Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute, January 2004), [http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/04-01\\_rep\\_mdtreatmentorincarceration\\_ac-dp.pdf](http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/04-01_rep_mdtreatmentorincarceration_ac-dp.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> Michael P. Jacobson et al., “Less is More: How Reducing Probation Populations Can Improve Outcomes,” (New Thinking in Community Corrections Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, *forthcoming*).

<sup>11</sup> Guevara and Solomon, “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections.”

<sup>12</sup> Scott Walters et al., “A Guide for Probation and Parole Motivating Offenders to Change. National Institute of Corrections” (U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections, June 2007),  
<http://static.nicic.gov/Library/022253.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> Guevara and Solomon, “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections.”





- 
- <sup>14</sup> Howell et al., *Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*.
- <sup>15</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism," *Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Council of State Governments Justice*, 2011, [https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CSG\\_10Step\\_Guide\\_Probation.pdf](https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CSG_10Step_Guide_Probation.pdf).
- <sup>16</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>17</sup> Jeanne C. Miester and Kevin J. Mulcahy, *The Future Workplace Experience: 10 Rules for Mastering Disruption in Recruiting and Engaging Employees* (McGraw-Hill Education, 2017).
- <sup>18</sup> Gallup, "State of the American Workplace," 2017.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>20</sup> Jon Katzenbach, Carolin Oelschlegel, and James Thomas, "10 Principles of Organizational Culture," *Strategy+business*, <http://www.strategy-business.com/article/10-Principles-of-Organizational-Culture?gko=71d2f>.
- <sup>21</sup> Gallup, "State of the American Workplace."
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup> Hildy Gottlieb, "3 Statements That Can Change the World: Mission / Vision / Values," *Help 4 NonProfits*, 2017, [http://www.help4nonprofits.com/NP\\_Bd\\_MissionVisionValues\\_Art.htm](http://www.help4nonprofits.com/NP_Bd_MissionVisionValues_Art.htm).
- <sup>24</sup> Rudolf Grünig and Richard Kühn, "Revision or Production of the Mission Statement," in *Process-Based Strategic Planning* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011), 111–17, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-16715-7\_9.
- <sup>25</sup> Walter J. Dickey and Michael E. Smith, "Rethinking Probation: Community Supervision, Community Safety" (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, December 1998), <https://ojp.gov/probation/rethink.pdf>.
- <sup>26</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, 2017.
- <sup>27</sup> Scott T. Walters et al., "A Guide for Probation and Parole Motivating Clients to Change. National Institute of Corrections," (U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, June 2007) <http://static.nicic.gov/Library/022253.pdf>
- <sup>28</sup> "Program Evaluation," University of Cincinnati, 2016, [http://www.uc.edu/corrections/services/program\\_evaluation](http://www.uc.edu/corrections/services/program_evaluation).
- <sup>29</sup> Barry Z. Posner et al., *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations, Fifth Edition* (Gildan Media, LLC, 2012).
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>31</sup> Gaylene Armstrong, Doug Dretke, and Cassandra Atkin, "The Importance of a Low Span of Control in Effective Implementation of Evidence Based Probation and Parole Practices" (National Institute of Corrections, Correctional Management Institute of Texas, February 15, 2011), <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/024881.pdf>.
- <sup>32</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>33</sup> Dr. Gaylene Armstrong, Doug Dretke, and Cassandra Atkin, "The Importance of a Low Span of Control in Effective Implementation of Evidence Based Probation and Parole Practices."
- <sup>34</sup> Jesse Jannetta et al., "An Evolving Field: Findings from the 2008 Parole Practices Survey" (Urban Insitute/Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2009).
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>37</sup> Achilles A. Armenakis et al., "Organizational Change Recipients' Beliefs Scale: Development of an Assessment Instrument," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 43, no. 4 (December 1, 2007): 481–505, doi:10.1177/0021886307303654.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>39</sup> William Bridges, *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*, 3rd ed. (Da Capo Lifelong Books, 2009).
- <sup>40</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup> William Bridges, *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid.



<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."

<sup>49</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections," New Thinking in Community Corrections Bulletin (Washington, D.C.: Harvard Kennedy School of Government, National Institute of Justice, 2015), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/248900.pdf>.

<sup>50</sup> Vincent N. Schiraldi, "Do More Good: A Progress Report from the NYC Department of Probation" (New York City Department of Probation, December 2013), [http://www.nyc.gov/html/prob/downloads/pdf/dop\\_progress\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/prob/downloads/pdf/dop_progress_report.pdf).

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>53</sup> Vincent N. Schiraldi, "Do More Good: A Progress Report from the NYC Department of Probation."

<sup>54</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>55</sup> Jeffrey A. Butts, Gordon Bazemore, and Aundra Saa Meroe, "Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development" (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2010), <https://positiveyouthjustice.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/pyj2010.pdf>.

<sup>56</sup> Nancy La Vigne et al., "Release Planning for Successful Reentry A Guide for Corrections, Service Providers, and Community Groups" (The Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, 2008), <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32056/411767-Release-Planning-for-Successful-Reentry.PDF>.

<sup>57</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."

<sup>58</sup> James Bonta and D. A. Andrews, "Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation."

<sup>59</sup> Joseph Gagnon and Curtis Richards, "Making the Right Turn: A Guide About Improving Transition Outcomes for Youth Involved in the Juvenile Corrections System."

<sup>60</sup> Edward J. Latessa et al., "A Statewide Evaluation of the RECLAIM Ohio Initiative."

<sup>61</sup> Doug McVay, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg, "Treatment or Incarceration? National and State Findings on the Efficacy and Cost Savings of Drug Treatment Versus Imprisonment."

<sup>62</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Roger H. Peters, Harry K. Wexler, and Arthur J. Lurigio, "Co-Occurring Substance Use and Mental Disorders in the Criminal Justice System: A New Frontier of Clinical Practice and Research," *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 38, no. 1 (February 9, 2015), <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/prj-0000135.pdf>.

<sup>66</sup> Council of State Governments Justice Center, "Improving Outcomes for People with Mental Illnesses Involved with New York City's Criminal Court and Correction Systems," December 2012, [https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/CTBNYC-Court-Jail\\_7-cc.pdf](https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/CTBNYC-Court-Jail_7-cc.pdf).

<sup>67</sup> Shay Bilchik, "Bridging the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems," Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justice Bulletin (U.S. Department of Justice, June 1995), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/cwelfare.pdf>.

<sup>68</sup> Denise Herz et al., "Addressing the Needs of Multi-System Youth: Strengthening the Connection between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice" (The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps, March 2012), [http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MultiSystemYouth\\_March2012.pdf](http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MultiSystemYouth_March2012.pdf).

<sup>69</sup> Shay Bilchik, "Bridging the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems," Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justice Bulletin (U.S. Department of Justice, June 1995), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/cwelfare.pdf>.





- <sup>70</sup> Council of State Governments Justice Center, "Improving Outcomes for People with Mental Illnesses Involved with New York City's Criminal Court and Correction Systems." December 2012, [https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/CTBNYC-Court-Jail\\_7-cc.pdf](https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/CTBNYC-Court-Jail_7-cc.pdf).
- <sup>71</sup> US Department of Housing and Urban Development, "It Starts with Housing: Public Housing Agencies are Making Second Chances Real," June 2016, [https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD\\_It\\_Starts\\_with\\_Housing.pdf](https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_It_Starts_with_Housing.pdf)
- <sup>72</sup> Shay Bilchik, "Bridging the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems," *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justice Bulletin* (U.S. Department of Justice, June 1995), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/cwelfare.pdf>.
- <sup>73</sup> Denise Herz et al., "Addressing the Needs of Multi-System Youth: Strengthening the Connection between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice."
- <sup>74</sup> "From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcomes for Dual Status Youth " *Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice* (Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, Resource Center Partnership Models for Change, May 8, 2014), <http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/539>.
- <sup>75</sup> Shay C. Bilchik, "Addressing the Needs of Youth Known to Both the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems," *National Center for State Courts, Future Trends in State Courts* (2010), <http://cdm16501.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/famct/id/305>.
- <sup>76</sup> Eric H. Holder, Laurie O. Robinson, and Jeff Slowikowski. "Best Practices to Address Community Gang Problems: OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model," (U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, October 2010), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/231200.pdf>.
- <sup>77</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>78</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>79</sup> "Performance-Based Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services 4<sup>th</sup> ed.," *Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services* (American Correctional Association, September 2016), [https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip\\_CSPP.pdf](https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip_CSPP.pdf).
- <sup>80</sup> Laura E. Berk, "Relationship of Care Giver Education to Child-Oriented Attitudes, Job Satisfaction, and Behaviors toward Children," *Child Care Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (June 1985): 103–129, doi:10.1007/BF01113405.
- <sup>81</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>82</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>83</sup> James Bonta and D. A. Andrews, "Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation."
- <sup>84</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making" (The American Probation & Parole Association, May 4, 2007), <https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/appa/pubs/SMDM.pdf>.
- <sup>85</sup> "Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services Second Edition."
- <sup>86</sup> "Probation: Chief Probation Officer," National Center for the Courts, <http://www.ncsc.org/topics/human-resources/job-descriptions/probation/chief-probation-officer.aspx>.
- <sup>87</sup> "Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services Second Edition."
- <sup>88</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>89</sup> "Probation: Chief Probation Officer."
- <sup>90</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>91</sup> David Muhammad, 2017.
- <sup>92</sup> "Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services Second Edition."
- <sup>93</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>94</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>95</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."



- <sup>96</sup> John A. Tuell and Kari L. Harp, "Probation System Review Guidebook 2nd Edition" (Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, 2016), <http://rfknrcjj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Probation-System-Review-Guidebook-2ndEdition.pdf>.
- <sup>97</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>98</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>99</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>100</sup> Geoff K. Ward, "Race and the Justice Workforce: Toward a System Perspective," in *The Many Colors of Crime: Inequalities of Race, Ethnicity, and Crime in America*. Peterson, R.D, Krivo, L.J. and Hagan, J., eds., (New York: New York University Press, 2006).
- <sup>101</sup> Ana T. Aguirre, "Arguments for a Diverse Workforce," *Corrections Today* (August, 2004): 72-75.
- <sup>102</sup> Heidi Hsia, "Disproportionate Minority Contact Technical Assistance Manual 4<sup>th</sup> ed.," (US Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, July 2009), [https://www.ncjrs.gov/html/ojjdp/dmc\\_ta\\_manual/dmcfull.pdf](https://www.ncjrs.gov/html/ojjdp/dmc_ta_manual/dmcfull.pdf).
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>104</sup> Terry Wells, Sharla Colbert, and Risdon N. Slate, "Gender Matters: Differences in State Probation Officer Stress," *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 22 1 (2006): 63 – 79, [https://www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc\\_ta\\_manual.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc_ta_manual.pdf)
- <sup>105</sup> Carl Nink, "Women Professionals in Corrections: A Growing Asset," (MTC Institute, August 2008), <https://www.mtcinstitute.com/sites/default/files/WomenProfessionalsInCorrections-Aug08.pdf>.
- <sup>106</sup> Ron Zemke, Claire Raines, and Bob Filipczak, *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace*. (New York: American Management Association, 2000).
- <sup>107</sup> Ira Levin, "A New Generation Arrives at Work: How Millenials Are Impacting the Workplace," *The California Psychologist* 42 3 (May/June 2009).
- <sup>108</sup> Gallup, "State of the American Workplace."
- <sup>109</sup> "Performance-Based Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services."
- <sup>110</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>111</sup> "About the STC Core Training Program," Board of State and Community Corrections, 2014, [http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s\\_stcaboutcoretrainingprogram.php](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_stcaboutcoretrainingprogram.php)
- <sup>112</sup> David Walter Roush, *Juvenile Detention Training Needs Assessment: Research Report* (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1996), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/jdtna.pdf>.
- <sup>113</sup> Standards and Training for Corrections Division, "Policy and Procedure Manual for Participating Agencies" (Board of State and Community Corrections, January 2014), [http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Participating\\_Agency\\_Manual\\_FINAL\\_\\_011014.pdf](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Participating_Agency_Manual_FINAL__011014.pdf).
- <sup>114</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>115</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>116</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>117</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>118</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, Brian K. Payne, and Adam K. Matz, "Community Supervision Workload Considerations for Public Safety" (The Bureau of Justice Assistance, August 2011), <https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/pubs/CSWCFPS.pdf>.
- <sup>119</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making."
- <sup>120</sup> Bill Burrell, "Caseload Standards for Probation and Parole" (The American Probation and Parole Association, September 2006), [https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip\\_CSPP.pdf](https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/APPA/stances/ip_CSPP.pdf).
- <sup>121</sup> Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) 28 C.F.R. Part 115 Docket No. OAG-131 RIN 1105-AB34 (May, 17, 2012).
- <sup>122</sup> Schiraldi, interview.
- <sup>123</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making."



<sup>124</sup> Andrew Klein, "Lessons Learned About Supervising Domestic Violence Offenders on Probation," (American Probation and Parole Association, 2004), [https://www.appa-net.org/dv/docs/wi04\\_appa34.pdf](https://www.appa-net.org/dv/docs/wi04_appa34.pdf).

<sup>125</sup> John S. Ryals, Jr, "Probation Review Implementation: How Best Practices Meet Everyday Practices," Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice (Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, November 15, 2013), <http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/516>.

<sup>126</sup> Development Services Group, Inc, "Probation Services" (Washington, DC.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2002), [https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Probation\\_Services.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Probation_Services.pdf).

<sup>127</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making."

<sup>128</sup> "2012 Salary Survey of California Probation Departments" (Orange County Probation Department, n.d.), <http://www.cpoc.org/assets/Surveys/2012%20cpoc%20salary%20survey-%20final.pdf>.

<sup>129</sup> Sonya Tafoya and Joseph Hayes, "Juvenile Justice in California (PPIC Publication)," *Public Policy Institute of California*, [http://www.ppic.org/main/publication\\_show.asp?i=1100](http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_show.asp?i=1100).

<sup>130</sup> Erinn J. Herberman and Thomas P. Bonczar, "Probation and Parole in the United States" (U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, January 21, 2015), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus13.pdf>.

<sup>131</sup> Kirsten R. Lewis, Ladonna S. Lewis, and Tina M. Garby, "Surviving the Trenches: The Personal Impact of the Job on Probation Officers," *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 38, no. 1 (April 21, 2012).

<sup>132</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Job Turnover in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice: The Voices of Former Frontline Workers* (Cornerstones for Kids The Human Services Workforce Initiative, 2006), [http://www.cpsr.us/workforceplanning/documents/06.02\\_Job\\_Turn\\_Chld\\_Well.pdf](http://www.cpsr.us/workforceplanning/documents/06.02_Job_Turn_Chld_Well.pdf).

<sup>133</sup> Kirsten R. Lewis, Ladonna S. Lewis, and Tina M. Garby, "Surviving the Trenches: The Personal Impact of the Job on Probation Officers."

<sup>134</sup> Lori Whitten, "Probation Officers' Stress and Burnout Associated With Caseload Events," n.d., <http://community.nicic.gov/blogs/mentalhealth/archive/2013/09/09/probation-officers-stress-and-burnout-associated-with-caseload-events.aspx>.

<sup>135</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Job Turnover in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice*.

<sup>136</sup> Matthew T. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making."

<sup>137</sup> "Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2016: 21-1092 Probation Officers and Correctional Treatment Specialists," Occupational Employment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2015, <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes211092.htm>.

<sup>138</sup> "2012 Salary Survey of California Probation Departments."

<sup>139</sup> "2012 Salary Survey of California Probation Departments."

<sup>140</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Job Turnover in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice*.

<sup>141</sup> 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).

<sup>142</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."

<sup>143</sup> Nancy La Vigne et al., "Release Planning for Successful Reentry A Guide for Corrections, Service Providers, and Community Groups."

<sup>144</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."

<sup>145</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

<sup>152</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."



- <sup>153</sup> Dr. Gaylene Armstrong, Doug Dretke, and Cassandra Atkin, "The Importance of a Low Span of Control in Effective Implementation of Evidence Based Probation and Parole Practices."
- <sup>154</sup> Kirsten R. Lewis, Ladonna S. Lewis, and Tina M. Garby, "Surviving the Trenches: The Personal Impact of the Job on Probation Officers."
- <sup>155</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Job Turnover in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice*.
- <sup>156</sup> Gallup Press and James K. Harter, *First, Break All The Rules: What the World's Greatest Managers Do Differently*, Har/Psc edition (New York, NY: Gallup Press, 2016).
- <sup>157</sup> Gerald Olivero, K. Denise Bane, and Richard E. Kopelman, "Executive Coaching as a Transfer of Training Tool: Effects on Productivity in a Public Agency," *Public Personnel Management* 26, no. 4 (December 1, 1997): 461–69, doi:10.1177/009102609702600403.
- <sup>158</sup> Tim Theeboom, Bianca Beersma, and Annelies E.M. van Vianen, "Does Coaching Work? - A Meta-Analysis on the Effects of Coaching on Individual Level Outcomes in an Organizational Context," *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2013, 1–18.
- <sup>159</sup> Judicial Council and the California State Association of Counties, "Probation Services Task Force Final Report" (California State Association of Counties, Administrative Office of the Courts, June 2003), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/fullreport.pdf>.
- <sup>160</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>161</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>162</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>163</sup> California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group, "Rebuilding California's Juvenile Justice Data System: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth," Report to the Legislature, (January 2016), <http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/JJDWG%20Report%20FINAL%201-11-16.pdf>.
- <sup>164</sup> Jesse Jannetta et al., "Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Probation Revocation" (The Urban Institute and City University of New York, April 2014), <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/22746/413174-Examining-Racial-and-Ethnic-Disparities-in-Probation-Revocation.PDF>.
- <sup>165</sup> Carol R. Flango et al., "Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System. Trends in State Courts 2014: Special Focus on Juvenile Justice and Elder Issues" (National Center for State Courts, 2014), <https://www.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/Future%20Trends%202014/2014%20NCSC%20Trends%20Report.ashx>.
- <sup>166</sup> California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group, "Rebuilding California's Juvenile Justice Data System: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth."
- <sup>167</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>168</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>169</sup> Kristina Childs, "University Partnerships as a Strategy for Promoting Data-Drive Decision Making in Juvenile Justice" (Models for Change, Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice, December 12, 2013), [http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/500/Innovation\\_Brief\\_\\_University\\_Partnerships\\_as\\_a\\_Strategy\\_for\\_Promoting\\_DataDriven\\_Decision\\_Making\\_in\\_Juvenile\\_Justice.pdf](http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/500/Innovation_Brief__University_Partnerships_as_a_Strategy_for_Promoting_DataDriven_Decision_Making_in_Juvenile_Justice.pdf).
- <sup>170</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>171</sup> Schiraldi, interview.
- <sup>172</sup> John A. Tuell and Kari L. Harp, "Probation System Review Guidebook 2nd Edition" (Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, 2016), <http://rfknrcjj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Probation-System-Review-Guidebook-2ndEdition.pdf>.
- <sup>173</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>174</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."



- <sup>175</sup> Chet P. Hewitt and Matt Cervantes, "Sierra Health Foundation's Positive Youth Justice Initiative: Briefing Paper" (Sacramento, CA: Sierra Health Foundation, April 2012), [https://www.sierrahealth.org/assets/PYJI\\_Briefing\\_Paper\\_Reprint\\_2013.pdf](https://www.sierrahealth.org/assets/PYJI_Briefing_Paper_Reprint_2013.pdf).
- <sup>176</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>177</sup> Jesse Jannetta et al., "Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Probation Revocation."
- <sup>178</sup> Carol R. Flango et al., "Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System. Trends in State Courts 2014: Special Focus on Juvenile Justice and Elder Issues."
- <sup>179</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>180</sup> Muhammad, interview.
- <sup>181</sup> California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group, "Rebuilding California's Juvenile Justice Data System: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth."
- <sup>182</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>183</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>184</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>185</sup> Muhammad, interview.
- <sup>186</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>187</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."
- <sup>188</sup> California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership, "Crossover Youth A Shared Responsibility," *Insights x* (Winter 2016), [http://co-invest.org/home/wp-content/uploads/insights\\_volume10.pdf](http://co-invest.org/home/wp-content/uploads/insights_volume10.pdf).
- <sup>189</sup> Leah Binkovitz, "Data-Sharing Efforts Aim to Improve Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice Outcomes," *Government Tech*, August 4, 2016, <http://www.govtech.com/data/Data-Sharing-Efforts-Aim-to-Improve-Child-Welfare-Juvenile-Justice-Outcomes.html>.
- <sup>190</sup> California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership, "Crossover Youth A Shared Responsibility."
- <sup>191</sup> Leah Binkovitz, "Data-Sharing Efforts Aim to Improve Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice Outcomes."
- <sup>192</sup> Stewards of Change, The Business of Public Benefit and National League of Cities, "Sharing Data for Better Results: A Guide to Building Integrated Data Systems Compatible with Federal Privacy Laws," 2014, <http://www.nlc.org/sites/default/files/2016-12/Data%20Sharing%20for%20Better%20Results.pdf>.
- <sup>193</sup> John A. Tuell and Kari L. Harp, "Probation System Review Guidebook 2nd Edition."
- <sup>194</sup> "An Introduction to New York City's NYCStat Reporting Portal and the Citywide Performance Reporting (CPR) Tool" (New York, NY: Mayor's Office of Operations, February 2011), [http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/cpr/downloads/pdf/cpr\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/cpr/downloads/pdf/cpr_fact_sheet.pdf).
- <sup>195</sup> "Collaborating to Deliver Results: Mayor's Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety" (Center for Economic Opportunity, Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, and Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence, n.d.), [http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/operations/downloads/pdf/pmmr2016/mayors\\_action\\_plan\\_for\\_neighborhood\\_safety.pdf](http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/operations/downloads/pdf/pmmr2016/mayors_action_plan_for_neighborhood_safety.pdf).
- <sup>196</sup> Kristina Childs, "University Partnerships as a Strategy for Promoting Data-Drive Decision Making in Juvenile Justice."
- <sup>197</sup> *ibid.*
- <sup>198</sup> Jesse Jannetta et al., "Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Probation Revocation."
- <sup>199</sup> Carol R. Flango et al., "Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System. Trends in State Courts 2014: Special Focus on Juvenile Justice and Elder Issues."
- <sup>200</sup> "U.S. Correctional Population at Lowest Level Since 2002," *Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Statistics*, December 29, 2016, <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/cpus15pr.cfm>.
- <sup>201</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."
- <sup>202</sup> Pamela M. Casey et al., "Offender Risk & Needs Assessment Instruments: A Primer for Courts," (National Center for State Courts, 2014),





[http://www.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/CSI/BJA%20RNA%20Final%20Report\\_Combined%20Files%208-22-14.ashx](http://www.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/CSI/BJA%20RNA%20Final%20Report_Combined%20Files%208-22-14.ashx).

<sup>203</sup> Guevara and Solomon, "Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections."

<sup>204</sup> "An Updated CPOC Adult Probation Business Model to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes in California" (Chief Probation Officers of California, May 2014),

<http://www.cpoc.org/assets/positionpapers/updated%20cpoc%20adult%20probation%20business%20model-%20final.pdf>.

<sup>205</sup> Kevin Warwick, Hannah Dodd, and Rebecca Neusteter, "Transition from Jail to Community Initiative Practice Brief: Case Management Strategies for Successful Jail Reentry," (National Institute of Corrections, Urban Institute, September 2012), <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/25886/412671-Case-Management-Strategies-for-Successful-Jail-Reentry.PDF>.

<sup>206</sup> Nathan James, "Risk and Needs Assessment in the Criminal Justice System," (Congressional Research Service, October 13, 2015), <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44087.pdf>.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid.

<sup>208</sup> Cormac Russell, "Making the Case for an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) Approach to Probation: From Reformation to Transformation," *Irish Probation Journal* 7 (September 2010): 119-132, [http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/16533/1/Irish\\_Probation\\_Journal\\_2010.pdf#page=120](http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/16533/1/Irish_Probation_Journal_2010.pdf#page=120).

<sup>209</sup> Emily Boer Drake and Steven LaFrance, "Findings on Best Practices of Community Re-Entry Programs for Previously Incarcerated Persons," (LaFrance Associates, LLC, May 2007), <http://www.eisenhowerfoundation.org/docs/Ex-Offender%20Best%20Practices.pdf>.

<sup>210</sup> Jocelyn Fontaine, "Examining Housing as a Pathway to Successful Reentry: A Demonstration Design Process," (The Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, November 2013), <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/24206/412957-Examining-Housing-as-a-Pathway-to-Successful-Reentry-A-Demonstration-Design-Process.PDF>.

<sup>211</sup> Peggy Burke et al., "TPC Case Management Handbook: An Integrated Case Management Approach," (U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, June 2010), <http://static.nicic.gov/Library/024393.pdf>.

<sup>212</sup> James Byrne, Adam Gelb, and Jake Horowitz, "Maximum Impact: Targeting Supervision on Higher-Risk People, Places and Times, Public Safety Policy Brief no. 9, (PEW Center on the States, July 2009).

<sup>213</sup> Ibid.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid.

<sup>215</sup> Jonathan Lee and Allen Lim, "Probation: What Works?" (CSU Fullerton Center for Public Policy, n.d.), <http://cpp.fullerton.edu/pdf/Probation-What%20Works.pdf>.

<sup>216</sup> "The EPICS Model: Effective Practices in Community Supervision," *University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute*, 2016.

<sup>217</sup> Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, *Enhancing Motivation for Change in Substance Abuse Treatment*, SAMHSA/CSAT Treatment Improvement Protocols (Rockville (MD): Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US), 1999), <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64967/>.

<sup>218</sup> "Psychotherapy," *NAMI: National Alliance on Mental Illness*, accessed February 21, 2017, <http://www.nami.org/Learn-More/Treatment/Psychotherapy>.

<sup>219</sup> "Trauma Informed Care," *The Trauma Informed Care Project*, accessed February 21, 2017, <http://www.traumainformedcareproject.org/>.

<sup>220</sup> Stephanie S. Covington and Barbara E. Bloom, "Gender Responsive Treatment and Services in Correctional Settings," *Women & Therapy* 29, no. 3-4 (April 10, 2007): 9-33, doi:10.1300/J015v29n03\_02.

<sup>221</sup> "Ensuring Gender-Responsiveness," *United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women*, June 2013, <http://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/306-ensuring-gender-responsiveness.html>.

<sup>222</sup> Faye S. Taxman, David Soule, and Adam Gelb, "Graduated Sanctions: Stepping into Accountable Systems and Offenders," *The Prison Journal* 79, no. 2 (June 1, 1999): 182-204, doi:10.1177/0032885599079002004.

<sup>223</sup> Nathan Lowe, Brett Garland, and Eric Wodahl, "Use of Incentives and Sanctions to Promote Compliance with Supervision during Reentry: An Implementation Strategy" (American Probation and Parole Association, n.d.), [https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/5.15.13\\_Incentives-Sanctions-Implementation-Strategy-for-Reentry\\_NRRRC-Webinar\\_Lowe-Garland-Wodahl\\_May-2013.pdf](https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/5.15.13_Incentives-Sanctions-Implementation-Strategy-for-Reentry_NRRRC-Webinar_Lowe-Garland-Wodahl_May-2013.pdf).



<sup>224</sup> Taxman, Soule, and Gelb, "Graduated Sanctions."

<sup>225</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Disposition Matrices: Purpose," 2015, [http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdf/disposition-matrices-purpose\\_handout.pdf](http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/disposition-matrices-purpose_handout.pdf).

<sup>226</sup> Ibid.

<sup>227</sup> Muhammad, interview.

<sup>228</sup> Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>229</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, "A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism."

<sup>230</sup> Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>231</sup> Kevin Warwick, Hannah Dodd, and Rebecca Neusteter, "Case Management Strategies for Successful Jail Reentry."

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.

<sup>233</sup> Pamela M. Casey et al., "Offender Risk & Needs Assessment Instruments: A Primer for Courts."

<sup>234</sup> Kevin Warwick, Hannah Dodd, and Rebecca Neusteter, "Case Management Strategies for Successful Jail Reentry."

<sup>235</sup> Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>236</sup> Kevin Warwick, Hannah Dodd, and Rebecca Neusteter, "Case Management Strategies for Successful Jail Reentry."

<sup>237</sup> "An Updated CPOC Adult Probation Business Model to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes in California."

<sup>238</sup> Lenore Anderson et al., "Pretrial Detention & Community Supervision: Practices and Resources for California Counties," (California Forward, Partnership for Community Excellence, September 2012), [https://caforward.3cdn.net/7a60c47c7329a4abd7\\_2am6iyh9s.pdf](https://caforward.3cdn.net/7a60c47c7329a4abd7_2am6iyh9s.pdf).

<sup>239</sup> "An Updated CPOC Adult Probation Business Model to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes in California."

<sup>240</sup> Lenore Anderson et al., "Pretrial Detention & Community Supervision: Practices and Resources for California Counties."

<sup>241</sup> Ibid.

<sup>242</sup> Larry Schwartz et al., "Moving Beyond Money: A Primer on Bail Reform" (Cambridge, MA: Criminal Justice Policy Program Harvard Law School, October 2016), <http://cjpp.law.harvard.edu/assets/FINAL-Primer-on-Bail-Reform.pdf>.

<sup>243</sup> "Public Safety Assessment," *Laura and John Arnold Foundation*,

<http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/initiative/criminal-justice/crime-prevention/public-safety-assessment/>.

<sup>244</sup> "Public Safety Assessment."

<sup>245</sup> Lenore Anderson et al., "Pretrial Detention & Community Supervision: Practices and Resources for California Counties."

<sup>246</sup> Ibid.

<sup>247</sup> Jerome G. Miller, *Last One over the Wall: The Massachusetts Experiment in Closing Reform Schools*, 2nd ed. (The Ohio State University Press, 1998), <http://hdl.handle.net/1811/30121>.

<sup>248</sup> Patrick McCarthy, Vincent Schiraldi, and Miriam Shark, "The Future of Youth Justice: A Community-Based Alternative to the Youth Prison Model," *New Thinking in Community Corrections Bulletin* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, Harvard Kennedy School, October 2016), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/250142.pdf>.

<sup>249</sup> Ryan C. Wagoner, Carol A. Schubert, and Edward P. Mulvey, "Probation Intensity, Self-Reported Offending, and Psychopathy in Juveniles on Probation for Serious Offenses," *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online* 43, no. 2 (June 1, 2015): 191–200.

<sup>250</sup> National Research Council, *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach* (National Research Council, 2012), <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/14685/reforming-juvenile-justice-a-developmental-approach>.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid.

<sup>253</sup> Models for Change Juvenile Diversion Workgroup, "Juvenile Diversion Guidebook," March 2011.

<sup>254</sup> Diversion Subcommittee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice State Work Group of the Models for Change Initiative in Pennsylvania, "Guide to Developing Pre-Adjudication Diversion Policy and Practice in Pennsylvania."



- <sup>255</sup> "Alternatives to Arrest for Young People," National League of Cities, 2016, <http://www.nlc.org/alternatives-to-arrest-for-young-people-0>.
- <sup>256</sup> Richard A. Mendel, "Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Progress Report 2014" (Baltimore, Maryland: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014), <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2014JDAIProgressReport-2014.pdf>.
- <sup>257</sup> Diversion Subcommittee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice State Work Group of the Models for Change Initiative in Pennsylvania, "Guide to Developing Pre-Adjudication Diversion Policy and Practice in Pennsylvania."
- <sup>258</sup> "Alternatives to Arrest for Young People,"
- <sup>259</sup> The Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2014. *Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Progress Report 2014* Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2014JDAIProgressReport-2014.pdf>
- <sup>260</sup> Diversion Subcommittee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice State Work Group of the Models for Change Initiative in Pennsylvania, "Guide to Developing Pre-Adjudication Diversion Policy and Practice in Pennsylvania."
- <sup>261</sup> Diversion Subcommittee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice State Work Group of the Models for Change Initiative in Pennsylvania, "Guide to Developing Pre-Adjudication Diversion Policy and Practice in Pennsylvania."
- <sup>262</sup> Schiraldi, interview.
- <sup>263</sup> Diversion Subcommittee of the Mental Health / Juvenile Justice State Work Group of the Models for Change Initiative in Pennsylvania, "Guide to Developing Pre-Adjudication Diversion Policy and Practice in Pennsylvania."
- <sup>264</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>265</sup> JDAI Helpdesk, "Cook County IL Evening Reporting Center Program Description" (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, n.d.), <http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/cookcommunity/Cook%20County%20IL%20Evening%20Reporting%20Center%20Program%20Description.pdf>.
- <sup>266</sup> Kathlen Feely, "Collaboration and Leadership in Juvenile Detention Reform," Pathways to Juvenile Justice Reform (Baltimore, Maryland: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1999), <http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/colltech/JDAI%20Pathway%202%20Collaboration%20and%20Leadership%20in%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Reform.pdf>.
- <sup>267</sup> Paul DeMuro, "Consider the Alternatives: Planning and Implementing Detention Alternatives," Pathways to Juvenile Justice Detention Reform (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, n.d.), <http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/altdettech/JDAI%20Pathway%204%20Consider%20the%20Alternatives%20Planning%20and%20Implementing%20Detention%20Alternatives.pdf>.
- <sup>268</sup> Kathlen Feely, "Collaboration and Leadership in Juvenile Detention Reform."
- <sup>269</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>270</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>271</sup> Paul DeMuro, "Consider the Alternatives: Planning and Implementing Detention Alternatives."
- <sup>272</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>273</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>274</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>275</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>276</sup> Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "Model Programs Guide Literature Review: Risk/ Needs Assessments for Youth" (Development Services Group, Inc., January 2015), <https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/RiskandNeeds.pdf>.
- <sup>277</sup> National Research Council, *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach* (National Research Council, 2012), <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/14685/reforming-juvenile-justice-a-developmental-approach>.
- <sup>278</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>279</sup> Gina Vincent, Laura Guy, and Thomas Grisso "Risk Assessment in Juvenile Justice: A Guidebook for Implementation," Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice (Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, November 2012), [http://njjn.org/uploads/digital-library/Risk\\_Assessment\\_in\\_Juvenile\\_Justice\\_A\\_Guidebook\\_for\\_Implementation.pdf](http://njjn.org/uploads/digital-library/Risk_Assessment_in_Juvenile_Justice_A_Guidebook_for_Implementation.pdf)
- <sup>280</sup> "Family Group Conferencing," *National Institute of Justice*, December 5, 2007, <http://www.nij.gov/80/topics/courts/restorative-justice/promising-practices/pages/family-group-conferencing.aspx>.





- <sup>281</sup>“Case Management Manual,” (Washington, D.C.: Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services Committed Services Administration, March 2010), [https://dyrs.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dyrs/publication/attachments/dyrs\\_case\\_management\\_manual.pdf](https://dyrs.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/dyrs/publication/attachments/dyrs_case_management_manual.pdf).
- <sup>282</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway, “Family Engagement: Partnering with Families to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Children’s Bureau, 2016).
- <sup>283</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>284</sup> “Case Management Manual.”
- <sup>285</sup> “Innovations in New York City Probation Practices,” n.d., <http://www.apainc.org/wp-content/uploads/NYC-Probation-Guide-1.pdf>.
- <sup>286</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>287</sup> Wagoner, Schubert, and Mulvey, “Probation Intensity, Self-Reported Offending, and Psychopathy in Juveniles on Probation for Serious Offenses.”
- <sup>288</sup> “Snapshot: Probation,” National Juvenile Justice Network, August 2016, <http://www.njjn.org/our-work/snapshot-probation>.
- <sup>289</sup> Center for Effective Public Policy, “Dosage Probation: Rethinking the Structure of Probation Sentences” (National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, January 2014), <https://www.fppoa.org/sites/default/files/dosage.pdf>.
- <sup>290</sup> Elizabeth Seigle, Nastassia Walsh, and Josh Weber, “Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System” (New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014).
- <sup>291</sup> Antoinette Davis, Angela Irvine, and Jason Ziendenberg, “Supervision Strategies for Justice-Involved Youth” (National Council on Crime & Delinquency, May 2014), [http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf](http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/supervision-strategies.pdf).
- <sup>292</sup> Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, “Motivational Interviewing as a Counseling Style,” in Enhancing Motivation for Change in Substance Abuse Treatment. (Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series, No. 35, HHS Publication No. (SMA) 13-4212. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 1999), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64964/>
- <sup>293</sup> “Psychotherapy.”
- <sup>294</sup> “Trauma Informed Care.”
- <sup>295</sup> Covington and Bloom, “Gender Responsive Treatment and Services in Correctional Settings.”
- <sup>296</sup> “Ensuring Gender-Responsiveness.”
- <sup>297</sup> Jeffrey Butts and Gordon Bazemore, “Positive Youth Justice”
- <sup>298</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, “Judicial Guide to the Structured Decision Making Model in Juvenile Justice,” November 2015, [http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\\_pdf/judicial\\_guide\\_to\\_sdm\\_in\\_jj\\_reform-general.pdf](http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/judicial_guide_to_sdm_in_jj_reform-general.pdf).
- <sup>299</sup> Taxman, Soule, and Gelb, “Graduated Sanctions.”
- <sup>300</sup> Nathan Lowe, Brett Garland, and Eric Wodahl, “Use of Incentives and Sanctions to Promote Compliance with Supervision during Reentry: An Implementation Strategy.”
- <sup>301</sup> Council, *Reforming Juvenile Justice*.
- <sup>302</sup> Tony Fabelo, Geraldine Nagy, and Seth Prins, “A Ten-Step Guide to Transforming Probation Departments to Reduce Recidivism.”
- <sup>303</sup> Jennifer Mora, “California Employers Can’t Consider Certain Juvenile Records,” *Society for Human Resource Management*, October 4, 2016, <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/legal-and-compliance/state-and-local-updates/pages/california-juvenile-records.aspx>.
- <sup>304</sup> Ave Mince-Didier, “Expunging or Sealing a Juvenile Court Record in California | Criminal Law,” *CriminalDefenseLawyer.com*, 2017, <http://www.criminaldefenselawyer.com/resources/expunging-or-sealing-a-juvenile-court-record-californ>.
- <sup>305</sup> James C. Howell et al., “Bulletin 5: Young Offenders and an Effective Response in the Juvenile and Adult Justice Systems: What Happens, What Should Happen, and What We Need to Know (Study Group on the Transitions



between Juvenile Delinquency and Adult Crime),” (National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and U.S. Department of Justice, July 2013), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/242935.pdf>.

<sup>306</sup> “Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform” (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014), <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-juviledetentionfacilityassessment-2014.pdf#page=3>.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid.

<sup>308</sup> Ibid.

<sup>309</sup> Ibid.

<sup>310</sup> Ibid.

<sup>311</sup> Ibid.

<sup>312</sup> 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), <http://www.cdfca.org/library/publications/2013/reforming-the-nations.pdf>.

<sup>313</sup> Ibid.

<sup>314</sup> “Bernards Tops Out New ‘LA Model’ Facility for Youth Offenders in Malibu,” (Bernards Commercial and Management Services, April 4, 2016), [http://www.bernards.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/040716\\_Kirkpatrick-TpOut.pdf](http://www.bernards.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/040716_Kirkpatrick-TpOut.pdf).

<sup>315</sup> Ibid.

<sup>316</sup> County of Los Angeles Probation Department and National Council on Crime & Delinquency, “Camp Kilpatrick Replacement Project Children’s Commission,” n.d., <http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/107455.pdf>.

<sup>317</sup> Alan Henry, “Reducing the Unnecessary Delay: Innovations in Case Processing,” Pathways to Juvenile Justice Detention Reform (Baltimore, Maryland: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, n.d.), <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECF-ReducingUnnecessaryDelay-1999.pdf>.

<sup>318</sup> Richard A. Mendel. “Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Progress Report 2014.” (Baltimore, Maryland: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014), <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2014JDAIProgressReport-2014.pdf>.

<sup>319</sup> Alan Henry, “Reducing the Unnecessary Delay: Innovations in Case Processing.”

<sup>320</sup> Sandra Villalobos Agudelo, “The Impact of Family Visitation on Incarcerated Youth’s Behavior and School Performance: Findings from the Families as Partners Project” (VERA Institute of Justice, April 2013), <http://archive.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/impact-of-family-visitation-on-incarcerated-youth-brief.pdf>.

<sup>321</sup> Kathryn C. Monahan, Asha Goldweber, and Elizabeth Cauffman, “The Effects of Visitation on Incarcerated Juvenile Offenders: How Contact with the Outside Impacts Adjustment on the inside,” *Law and Human Behavior* 35, no. 2 (April 2011): 143–51, doi: 10.1007/s10979-010-9220-x.

<sup>322</sup> Richard A. Mendel, “The Missouri Model: Reinventing the Practice of Rehabilitating Youthful Offenders” (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2010).

<sup>323</sup> “Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform.”

<sup>324</sup> Ibid.

<sup>325</sup> Richard A. Mendel, “The Missouri Model: Reinventing the Practice of Rehabilitating Youthful Offenders.”

<sup>326</sup> Ibid.

<sup>327</sup> James Bonta and D. A. Andrews, “Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation.”

<sup>328</sup> Development Services Group, Inc., “Gender-Specific Programming: Literature Review” (Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2010).

<sup>329</sup> Nancy Dowd, “Boys, Masculinities and Juvenile Justice,” *Journal of Korean Law* 8 (December 2008): 115–34.

<sup>330</sup> “Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform.”

<sup>331</sup> Richard A. Mendel, “The Missouri Model: Reinventing the Practice of Rehabilitating Youthful Offenders.”

<sup>332</sup> Guevara and Solomon, “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections.”

<sup>333</sup> Amber Farn and Jill Adams, “Education and Interagency Collaboration: A Lifeline for Justice-Involved Youth,” (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, 2016), [http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Lifeline-for-Justice-Involved-Youth-August\\_2016.pdf](http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Lifeline-for-Justice-Involved-Youth-August_2016.pdf).



<sup>334</sup> "Justice for Juveniles: Youth Recommendations to Improve Education Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System" (Juvenile Law Center, April 2015), [http://jlc.org/sites/default/files/topic\\_related\\_docs/J4JEdRecs4-15-15.pdf](http://jlc.org/sites/default/files/topic_related_docs/J4JEdRecs4-15-15.pdf).

<sup>335</sup> "Juvenile Court Schools - Educational Options," California Department of Education, October 13, 2015, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/eo/jc/>.

<sup>336</sup> "Justice for Juveniles: Youth Recommendations to Improve Education Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System."

<sup>337</sup> Amber Farn and Jill Adams, "Education and Interagency Collaboration: A Lifeline for Justice-Involved Youth."

<sup>338</sup> Steve Suitt, Katherine Dunn, and Nasheed Sabree, "The Imperative to Transform Juvenile Justice Systems into Effective Educational Systems: A Study of Juvenile Justice Schools in the South and the Nation," (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Education Foundation, 2014), <http://www.southerneducation.org/getattachment/cf39e156-5992-4050-bd03-fb34cc5bf7e3/Just-Learning.aspx>.

<sup>339</sup> Sue Burrell and Loren Waterboys, "Special Education and the Juvenile Justice System" (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, July 2000), <http://youthjusticenc.org/download/juvenile-justice/juvenile-and-criminal-representation/Special%20Education%20and%20the%20Juvenile%20Justice%20System.pdf>.

<sup>340</sup> Andrea J. Sedlak and Karla S. McPherson, "Youth's Needs and Services: Findings from the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement" (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, April 2010), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/227728.pdf>.

<sup>341</sup> "Justice for Juveniles: Youth Recommendations to Improve Education Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System."

<sup>342</sup> Ibid.

<sup>343</sup> California Department of Education, "Title 5, NCLB Teacher Requirements - NCLB (CA Dept of Education)," *Improving Teacher & Principal Quality*, November 17, 2015, <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/tq/title5tchrequire.asp>.

<sup>344</sup> The Impact of Incentives to Recruit and Retain Teachers in "Hard-to-Staff"

Subjects: An Analysis on the Florida Critical Teacher Shortage Program (Washington, D.C.: CALDER, American Institutes for Research, 2015), <http://www.caldercenter.org/sites/default/files/WP%20141.pdf>

<sup>345</sup> "Justice for Juveniles: Youth Recommendations to Improve Education Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System."

<sup>346</sup> "Reentry Myth Buster: On Youth Access to Education Upon Reentry" (Federal Interagency Reentry Council, January 2017), [https://csgjusticecenter.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/11/Reentry\\_Council\\_Mythbuster\\_Youth\\_Access\\_Ed.pdf](https://csgjusticecenter.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/11/Reentry_Council_Mythbuster_Youth_Access_Ed.pdf).

<sup>347</sup> "Justice for Juveniles: Youth Recommendations to Improve Education Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System."

<sup>348</sup> Catherine Morris, "Illinois Community College Works to Reform Juvenile Offenders," *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, August 7, 2016,

[http://diverseeducation.com/article/85919/?utm\\_campaign=DIV1608%20DAILY%20NEWSLETTER%20AUG8-FINAL&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_source=Eloqua](http://diverseeducation.com/article/85919/?utm_campaign=DIV1608%20DAILY%20NEWSLETTER%20AUG8-FINAL&utm_medium=email&utm_source=Eloqua)

<sup>349</sup> Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>350</sup> "Trauma Among Youth in the Juvenile Justice System" (National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, September 2016), <https://www.ncmhjj.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Trauma-Among-Youth-in-the-Juvenile-Justice-System-for-WEBSITE.pdf>.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid.

<sup>352</sup> Department of Justice, "Juvenile Federal Performance-Based Detention Standards Handbook," February 2011, <https://www.justice.gov/archive/ofdt/juvenile.pdf>.

<sup>353</sup> "Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform."

<sup>354</sup> Schiraldi, interview.

<sup>355</sup> Department of Justice, "Juvenile Federal Performance-Based Detention Standards Handbook."

<sup>356</sup> Ibid.



- <sup>357</sup> Neelum Arya et al., "Preventing the Sexual Abuse of Youth in Correctional Settings," May 10, 2010, <http://www.atsa.com/sites/default/files/LibraryArticles/Prevention%20Resources/Preventing%20Sexual%20Abuse%20of%20Youth%20in%20Correctional%20Settings.pdf>.
- <sup>358</sup> "Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform."
- <sup>359</sup> Kristine Jolivet and C. Michael Nelson, "Adapting Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports for Secure Juvenile Justice Settings: Improving Facility-Wide Behavior," *Behavioral Disorders* 36, No 1. (2010): 28 – 42.
- <sup>360</sup> C. Michael Nelson, George Sugai, and Carl Smith, "Positive Behavior Support Offered in Juvenile Corrections" (The National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2005), [http://www.apbs.org/new\\_apbs/files/PBSinJJS.pdf](http://www.apbs.org/new_apbs/files/PBSinJJS.pdf).
- <sup>361</sup> Richard A. Mendel, "The Missouri Model: Reinventing the Practice of Rehabilitating Youthful Offenders."
- <sup>362</sup> C. Michael Nelson, George Sugai, and Carl Smith, "Positive Behavior Support Offered In Juvenile Corrections."
- <sup>363</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>364</sup> Gordon Bazemore, G., Todd J. Dicker, and Ron Nyhan, "Juvenile Justice Reform and the Difference It Makes: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Policy Change on Detention Worker Attitudes." *Crime & Delinquency* 40, No 1 (1994), <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/001128794040001003>.
- <sup>365</sup> "Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform."
- <sup>366</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>367</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>368</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>369</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>370</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>371</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>372</sup> Chief Probation Officers of California, "Adult Services Plan: Serving 18-25 Year-Olds Best Practices," September 2007.
- <sup>373</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>374</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>375</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>376</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>377</sup> "Improving Approaches to Serving Young Adults in the Justice System" (Justice Policy Institute, December 2016), [http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/jpi\\_young\\_adults\\_final.pdf](http://www.justicepolicy.org/uploads/justicepolicy/documents/jpi_young_adults_final.pdf).
- <sup>378</sup> Chief Probation Officers of California, "Adult Services Plan: Serving 18-25 Year-Olds Best Practices."
- <sup>379</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>380</sup> Chief Probation Officers of California, "Adult Services Plan: Serving 18-25 Year-Olds Best Practices."
- <sup>381</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>382</sup> Chief Probation Officers of California, "Adult Services Plan: Serving 18-25 Year-Olds Best Practices."
- <sup>383</sup> Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections."
- <sup>384</sup> William Bridges, *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*.
- <sup>385</sup> Eric H. Holder, Laurie O. Robinson, and Jeff Slowikowski. "Best Practices to Address Community Gang Problems: OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model." (U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, October 2010). <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/231200.pdf>
- <sup>386</sup> Michelle Arciaga and Victor Gonzalez. "Street Outreach and the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model," (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, National Gang Center Bulletin, June, 2012), <https://www.nationalgangcenter.gov/Content/Documents/Street-Outreach-Comprehensive-Gang-Model.pdf>.
- <sup>387</sup> Key Components of Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs, *Summarizing the Discussions of The National Symposium of Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs*. Oakland, CA, 2009, <http://nnhvip.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/key.pdf>.



<sup>388</sup> James C. Howel. "Youth Gang Programs and Strategies," (U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, National Youth Gang Center Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2000), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/171154.pdf>.

<sup>389</sup> Nancy Ritter, "CeaseFire: A Public Health Approach to Reduce Shootings and Killings," (National Institute of Justice, October 29, 2009), <https://www.nij.gov/journals/264/pages/ceasefire.aspx>.

<sup>390</sup> James C. Howel. "Youth Gang Programs and Strategies," (U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, National Youth Gang Center Institute for Intergovernmental Research, 2000), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/171154.pdf>.

<sup>391</sup> Ibid.

<sup>392</sup> Ibid.

<sup>393</sup> Ibid.

<sup>394</sup> Gang Reduction and Youth Development, Scope of Work for Intervention Providers FY 2014 – 2015, [http://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2014/14-0704\\_misc\\_b\\_07-31-14.pdf](http://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2014/14-0704_misc_b_07-31-14.pdf).

<sup>395</sup> Jeff Mellow et al., "The Jail Administrator's Toolkit to Reentry" (Bureau of Justice Assistance, Urban Institute Justice Policy center, and John Jay College, May 2008), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/222041.pdf>.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid.

<sup>397</sup> Jacqueline Corcoran, "Strengths-Based Models in Social Work - Social Work," *Oxford Bibliographies*, May 25, 2011, <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389678/obo-9780195389678-0006.xml>.

<sup>398</sup> Wayne McCashen, *The Strengths Approach*, ed. Karen Masman (Bendigo, Vic.: St Luke's Innovative Resources, 2005).

<sup>399</sup> "Risk Assessment Instruments, Manuals, and Validation Studies," (Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, n.d.), <http://www.ncjp.org/pretrial/risk-assessment-instruments-validation>.

<sup>400</sup> Jason Szanya and Dana Shoenberg, "Graduated Responses Toolkit: New Resources and Insights to Help Youth Success on Probation" (Center for Children's Law and Policy, 2016), <http://www.cclp.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Graduated-Responses-Toolkit.pdf>.

<sup>401</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Judicial Guide to the Structured Decision Making Model in Juvenile Justice."

<sup>402</sup> National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Judicial Guide to the Structured Decision Making Model in Juvenile Justice."

<sup>403</sup> "Multisystemic Therapy for Emerging Adults (MST-EA)," Multisystemic Therapy Breaking the Cycle of Criminal Behavior, n.d., <http://mstservices.com/target-populations/emerging-adults>.

<sup>404</sup> Connie Hayek, "Environmental Scan of Developmentally Appropriate Criminal Justice Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults" (National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 2016), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/249902.pdf>.