

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

COMPREHENSIVE MULTI-AGENCY JUVENILE JUSTICE PLAN

Fiscal Year 2022-23

A Youth Development Mission, Continuum, and Funding Strategy

JJCC Draft – December 03, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
II. JJCPA AND CMJJP BACKGROUND.....	6
a. Origins and Foundations of the JJCPA.....	6
b. History of the CMJJP (2001-2020)	6
c. CMJJP Requirements and Limits under Government Code Sections 30061 and 30062.....	8
d. JJCC’s Collaborative Approach to the CMJJP	8
III. ORGANIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CMJJP	10
a. Structure of the CMJJP.....	10
b. Key Stakeholders	11
c. FY 2022-23 CMJJP Planning, Development, and JJCPA Funding Allocation Approval Process	11
IV. MISSION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES	14
1. CMJJP Mission Statement.....	14
3. CMJJP Guiding Principles.....	15
4. Growth Fund-Specific Goals and Guiding Principles	16
V. FRAMEWORK.....	18
a. Youth Development and Empowerment.....	18
b. Continuum of Services	19
c. Continuum-Based Funding Strategies	21
VI. SERVICE STRATEGY	23
a. Landscaping the Need	23
c. System, Service Delivery, and Youth/Family Outcomes	30
VII. CMJJP FUNDING ALLOCATIONS AND JJCPA FUNDING	33
a. Overview	33
b. Additional Funding Parameters	33
c. Model Base-Funding Allocation.....	34
Appendix A	35
Recommended Format of Community Feedback on Programs and Projects	35
Recommended Notification Flyer Format for Community Feedback on Programs and Projects	36

Appendix B	37
Recommended Format for Governmental Partner Funding Requests	37
Recommended Notification Letter Format for Governmental Partner Funding Requests	38
Appendix C	39
Sample of Existing, Relevant Programs, Services, and Initiatives	39
Appendix D	42
At-Promise Youth Demographic Data	42
Appendix E	48
Probation Youth Demographic Data	48
Appendix F	54
Summary of Results from the 2020 Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Community Advisory Committee County of Los Angeles Youth Service Needs Assessment	54

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), formerly known as Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000, provides the County of Los Angeles (the “County” or “LAC”) with an annual allocation of State funds to develop and implement a comprehensive multiagency juvenile justice plan (CMJJP).¹ As mandated by the JJCPA, the CMJJP is developed by the local juvenile justice coordinating council (JJCC).² The CMJJP shall include, but not be limited to, all the following components:³

1. An assessment of existing law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol and youth services resources which specifically target “at-risk,” also known as “at-promise” youth,⁴ juvenile offenders, and their families.
2. An identification and prioritization of the neighborhoods, schools, and other areas in the community that face a significant public safety risk from juvenile crime, such as gang activity, daylight burglary, late-night robbery, vandalism, truancy, controlled substance sales, firearm-related violence, and juvenile alcohol use within the council’s jurisdiction.
3. A local action plan for improving and marshaling resources to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime and delinquency in the areas targeted pursuant to the prioritized areas and the greater community. The JJCC shall prepare their plans to maximize the provision of collaborative and integrated services of all relevant resources and shall provide specified strategies for all elements of response, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation, to provide a continuum for addressing the identified male and female juvenile crime problem, and strategies to develop and implement locally based or regionally based out-of-home placement options for youth who are deemed a ward of the court by the juvenile court.

Since its inception, the County’s CMJJP has included strategies that provide community-level prevention and intervention programs, and services that target “high-risk” neighborhoods and focus on achieving success for probationers and at-promise youth. These services have been and continue to be provided through the collaborative efforts of governmental agencies and community-based organizations. Proper use of JJCPA funding and development of the CMJJP is guided by an integrated and collaborative approach to reducing crime and delinquency through leveraging existing resources and resourcing a continuum of evidence-based and promising programs for youth in communities of high need.

¹ Government Code, section 30061

² See: Welfare and Institutions Code, section 749.22

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Government Code, section 30061 uses the term “at-risk,” however, the modern trend is to substitute the term “at-promise.” For example, in 2019 California Assembly Bill No. 413 removed the term “at-risk” and replaced it with “at-promise” in the California Education and Penal Codes, such that “at-promise” has the same meaning and effect as “at-risk.” While AB 413 did not change the JJCPA’s use of “at-risk,” the JJCC adopts and affirms the use of “at-promise” to validate the experiences and potential of the young people along the continuum of need and level of interaction with the justice system. Therefore, the JJCC and this CMJJP shall use the term “at-promise” in lieu of “at-risk.”

The process to develop the annual CMJJP and JJCPA funding allocations legally must include:

- A Mission Statement and clear goals
- Guiding Principles to ensure programs and services align with intended outcomes
- A framework based on a Continuum of Care Model to allocate relevant resources
- Unbiased evaluation of services provided
- Data to prioritize neighborhoods, schools, and other areas that pose a risk to public safety

The methodology used to develop the annual CMJJP and funding allocations ensures that:

- The JJCC maintains the alignment of JJCPA funded services to the youth population to ensure the County is meeting the needs of its at-risk and justice-involved youth
- The underlying CMJJP framework used to allocate JJCPA resources remains relevant
- The JJCC uses the best data available to define the needs of youth in the County
- The JJCPA funding allocation process remains transparent, efficient, and in line with County budgeting process guidelines
- The CMJJP is based on “programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation,” in accordance with the law that governs JJCPA funding.

The JJCC allocates JJCPA funds to:

1. Programs, which are ongoing services supporting at least one strategic goal with clearly defined objectives and outcomes, funded by ongoing revenues. Programs are selected by the JJCC based upon the CMJJP Mission and the Based Funded Goals and Guiding Principles, which may be found in *Section IV., Mission and Guiding Principles*, on pages 14-16 of this document.
2. Projects, which are temporary endeavors undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result in support of a strategic goal. Projects are considered based upon the CMJJP Mission and the Growth Funded Goals and Guiding Principles, which may be found *Section IV., Mission and Guiding Principles*, on pages 16-17 of this document.

II. JJCPA AND CMJJP BACKGROUND⁵

a. Origins and Foundations of the JJCPA

The Schiff–Cardenas Crime Prevention Act was passed by the California State Legislature in 2000 to establish a juvenile justice funding source for California counties. Later termed the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), the funds support the development and implementation of county juvenile justice plans that provide a “continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency and demonstrates a collaborative and integrated approach for implementing a system of swift, certain, and graduated responses for at-risk youth and juvenile offenders.”

Each county must establish a local multi-agency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) which, according to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 749.22, must be chaired by the county’s chief probation officer and composed at minimum of representatives from specific, listed public agencies, as well as community-based organizations and an at-large community representative. The JJCC is charged with developing a Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) that:

- Assesses existing services and resources that target at-risk and justice-involved youth and their families;
- Prioritizes neighborhoods, schools, and other areas with high rates of juvenile crime;
- Lays out a strategy for prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation responses to juvenile crime and delinquency that is based on programs and approaches with demonstrated effectiveness; and
- Develops information-sharing systems to coordinate actions and support evaluation.”⁶

While the JJCC oversees the development of the CMJJP, the LAC Probation Department plays the primary role of coordinator and administrator of JJCPA funds at the local level in the County.

b. History of the CMJJP (2001-2020)

Since 2001, the County has received approximately \$28 million each year in base JJCPA funding, in addition to variable growth JJCPA funds since 2015. While JJCPA-funded programming was regularly updated, the CMJJP remained mostly unchanged from 2001-2018. Between March and December 2017, the Board of Supervisors (Board) worked with the LAC Probation Department and community stakeholders to update membership for the JJCC, including adding ten community representatives as voting members to the JJCC.

Noting that the CMJJP had not been changed significantly in almost two decades, on December 19, 2017⁷ the Board mandated that the CMJJP be revamped to reflect best practices, incorporate evaluation findings, and be informed by the needs of youth. In response, on March 28, 2018 the JJCC created a 13-member ad hoc CMJJP Taskforce (Taskforce) composed of nine community

⁵ Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Landscape Analysis Report, prepared by RDA on 12/22/2017.

⁶ Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Gap Analysis Report, prepared by RDA on 4/30/2018.

⁷ Motion by Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas and Chair Sheila Kuehl: “Establishing Effective and Diverse Governance of Juvenile Justice Funds”

representatives and four County agency representatives. In November 2018 a community representative and a FUSE Executive Fellow were selected to co-lead the Taskforce. The Taskforce was charged to update and revise a FY 2019-20 CMJJP and to make recommendations as to the spending of FY 2019-20 JJCPA funds. The updated FY 2019-20 CMJJP included a formalized, ongoing planning process to annually redesign the CMJJP and to develop a revised spending plan based on the Resource Development Associates, Inc. evaluation, general research, and other relevant information about the County's population needs, and available youth services and funding resources.⁸

The Taskforce met more than 13 times from March 2018-April 2019 to develop a revised FY 2019-20 CMJJP⁹ based on a philosophy of partnership between diverse public agencies and community-based organizations to promote positive youth development and prevent youth delinquency through shared responsibility, collaboration, and coordinated action. The FY 2019-20 CMJJP served as a theoretical and practical foundation on which programs and services are selected, implemented, and evaluated to maximize benefit to the youth population served.¹⁰ Of particular interest to the Taskforce was finding meaningful ways to fund community-based organizations in areas and service categories with the highest needs in the most time efficient way possible while also empowering community-based organizations that had not previously been party to a County contract.

On March 18, 2019, the Taskforce submitted the FY 2019-20 CMJJP to the JJCC for approval. The JJCC unanimously approved the updated FY 2019-20 CMJJP. A March 26, 2019 Board motion praised the FY 2019-20 CMJJP as "data-driven" and stated that it "creates the foundation for improved JJCPA allocation for years to come that can serve to enhance youth development and delinquency prevention Countywide."¹¹ The March 26, 2019 Board motion also required that the JJCC, to the best of its ability, adopt a FY 2019-20 JJCPA fiscal allocation that was aligned to the FY 2019-20 CMJJP.

On April 5, 2019 the Taskforce finalized the FY 2019-2020 fiscal allocation, which allocated \$68.9 million in JJCPA funds to provide services to more than 25,000 justice-involved and at-risk youth. The spending plan also passed as much as 75-80% of the funding to community-based organizations, reversed from previous spending plans where funds were 67%+ spent by governmental agencies. The FY 2019-2020 fiscal allocation was approved by the JJCC on April 15, 2019 and then by the Board on April 30, 2019.

⁸ In 2017, Resource Development Associates was contracted by the Los Angeles Probation Department to conduct a more comprehensive evaluation of JJCPA than has been attempted in the County since the funding was created.

Their three reports -- Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Landscape Analysis Report, Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Gap Analysis Report and Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Program Effectiveness Report -- are based on quantitative data and qualitative research conducted over the course of approximately one year.

⁹ Full Title: "County of Los Angeles Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan and Annual Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Budget 2019-2020: *A Youth Development Mission, Continuum, and Funding Strategy*"

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.9.

¹¹ Motion by Supervisors Janice Hahn and Mark Ridley-Thomas: "Supporting a Revamped Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan and Improved JJCPA Grant Administration"

In accordance with the FY 2019-20 CMJJP, on December 10, 2019 the JJCC appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to update and revise the FY 2020-21 CMJJP and to make recommendations as to the spending of FY 2020-21 JJCPA funds (FY 2020-21 CMJJP Subcommittee). The FY 2020-21 CMJJP Subcommittee met in the months of December 2019-February 2020 and delivered its final report, the FY 2020-21 CMJJP, and the FY 2020-21 JJCPA funding allocation at the JJCC meeting on February 7, 2020. The JJCC unanimously approved the FY 2020-21 CMJJP.

c. CMJJP Requirements and Limits under Government Code Sections 30061 and 30062

Under the JJCPA, a CMJJP must serve “at-risk,” also known as “at-promise,” and/or probation youth.¹² It must also be based on components like an assessment of available resources and priority areas to fund, a continuum of effective responses, collaboration and integration, and data collection and evaluation. Specifically, the law requires:

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

JJCPA-funded programs, strategies, and system enhancements must:

- Be based on programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.
- Collaborate and integrate services of all the resources set forth in the assessment of available resources.
- Employ information sharing systems to ensure that county actions are fully coordinated and designed to provide data for measuring the success of juvenile justice programs and strategies.

Pursuant to Government Code 30062, JJCPA funds allocated by the JJCC shall not be used by local agencies to supplant other funding for Public Safety Services, as defined in Section 36 of Article XIII of the California Constitution.

d. JJCC’s Collaborative Approach to the CMJJP

The approach to annually revise the CMJJP in Los Angeles recognizes that there has already been a wealth of collaboration and coordination across City and County agencies, researchers,

¹² *Supra* n. 4.

advocates, youth and community-based organizations to develop strategies and recommendations to improve youth, family and community well-being, and that there is increasingly so. The JJCC aims to capture, adopt, and build on – and not recreate – the frameworks and recommendations already proposed through existing and prior cross-agency and community collaborations, including:

- Resource Development Associate reports: *Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Landscape Analysis Report* (December 2017), *Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Gap Analysis Report* (April 2018) and *Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Program Effectiveness Report* (April 2018)
- Denise Herz and Kristine Chan, *The Los Angeles County Probation Workgroup Report* (March 2017)
- Los Angeles County Office of Child Protection, *Paving the Road to Safety for Our Children: A Prevention Plan for Los Angeles County* (June 2017).
- Los Angeles County Office of Violence Prevention, *Early Implementation Strategic Plan: A Blueprint for Peace and Healing* (June 2020)
- Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration, *Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report: Health and Racial Justice Strategies for Safer Communities* (March 2020)

The work of the Probation Working Group in 2017 to develop a “Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan” is especially relevant. The principles adopted by the JJCC for the CMJJP are in large part lifted from that Plan, calling for “a comprehensive strategic framework focused on greater interagency collaboration, resources, and systemic changes to prevent additional trauma, reduce risk factors, and increase protective factors by connecting families, youth, and children to supportive systems within their communities.”

III. ORGANIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CMJJP

This section describes the components of the CMJJP and the process by which the CMJJP and JJCPA funding allocation should be revisited annually.

a. Structure of the CMJJP

The CMJJP has been developed based on a philosophy of partnership between diverse public agencies and community-based organizations to promote positive youth development and prevent youth delinquency through shared responsibility, collaboration, and coordinated action. The CMJJP serves as a theoretical and practical foundation on which programs and services are selected, implemented, evaluated, and continuously improved to maximize benefit to the youth population served.



b. Key Stakeholders

- California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC)
- Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (Board)
- Public Safety Cluster (District 1-5 Board Justice Deputies)
- Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC)
 - JJCC's Community Advisory Committee (JJCC-CAC), a Standing Subcommittee
 - Annual CMJJP and JJCPA Spending Allocation Ad Hoc Subcommittee (CMJJP Subcommittee), an Ad Hoc Committee
 - Youth Justice Advisory Group
- LAC Probation Department
- Governmental departmental partners
- Community-Based Organization (CBO) service providers
- RAND Corporation, the contracted JJCPA evaluator
- Los Angeles County Youth Commission

c. FY 2022-23 CMJJP Planning, Development, and JJCPA Funding Allocation Approval Process

Step 1:

JJCC Convene CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee to Review JJCPA Gap Analysis and Update CMJJP (March 2022 and Complete May 2022) and reconvene to review funding submissions in Fall 2022 (September 2022 through December 2022)

JJCC Adopts a Resolution to Create the FY 2023-24 JJCC-CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee (January 2022)

The FY 2022-23 CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee is formed by the JJCC to utilize the data and recommendations prepared by the JJCC, the JJCC-CAC, and JJCPA Evaluator (RAND Corporation) to draft an annual update to the CMJJP and JJCPA funding allocations for the ensuing fiscal year. The membership of the FY 2022-23 CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee should proportionally reflect the composition of permanent and non-permanent members of the JJCC.

The JJCPA Evaluator (RAND) will review the methodologies for evaluation to include literature reviews of effective programs. The evaluation process of JJCPA funded programs will include the following: interviews and/or focus groups with program staff and clients; analysis of program utilization data and program-specific outcome data; and evaluation of justice outcomes to adequately assess the effectiveness of its programs at reducing crime and delinquency. The evaluation of JJCPA funded programs is carried out to assess services and programs impacts on youth, families and communities served. The JJCPA evaluator will also conduct a gap analysis, which may help to understand the disproportionate involvement of JJCPA funded program youth in the juvenile justice system and identify youth service gaps that might exist. See *Appendix B* for data to be submitted by funded organizations.

The gap analysis and evaluation of funded programs to update the CMJJP is especially needed in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have exacerbated service challenges. What we now know about ACEs (Adverse Childhood Experiences). Equally important is assessing how information sharing of data governed by Federal and State Laws...

Step 2: JJCC-CAC Community Survey (Publish July 1, Close October 1, 2022)

The JJCC-CAC shall engage the community in identifying needs, proven strategies, and systemic issues of JJCPA operations by means of a survey. The survey is meant to gather information from stakeholders connected to or impacted by the juvenile justice system (e.g. community members, youth and families, governmental agencies, and community-based organizations) about the unmet needs of justice-involved and at-risk youth in the County of Los Angeles. This information will provide insight and guidance to the JJCC-CAC and the JJCC on how JJCPA funding can better support young people and close gaps in the services provided to them. Convene a JJCC-CAC survey ad hoc committee to be done in coordination with the JJCPA Governance Subcommittee update. The survey should at minimum be designed to solicit answers to the following questions:

- ☐ What types of services and strategies are most in need of funding in the County of Los Angeles to better serve at-risk youth and/or youth who have had contact with the justice system?
- ☐ What categories of youth programming should be targeted to?
- ☐ What geographic areas in the County are in most need of services?
- ☐ Formalize survey process to improve coordination of the survey design (including sample size), ensure survey reliability, and outreach and engagement efforts, supervisorial districts to align with RAND findings community/youth/provider input and develop and communication and outreach plan.

Step 3: JJCC-CAC Community Feedback on Programs and Projects (Publish July 1, Close September 1, 2022)

The JJCC-CAC shall solicit and accept feedback on programs and projects that improve youth and family wellness and community safety by increasing access to opportunities to strengthen resiliency and reduce delinquency consistent with the CMJJP. While the JJCC-CAC may learn about programs or projects, it cannot and will not recommend specific providers receive funding.¹³ The purpose of this feedback process is informational only. See *Appendix A* recommended submission format and example.

¹³ Consistent with the opinion of LAC Counsel, the JJCC can recommend categories (e.g. primary prevention or intervention), programs and projects (e.g. gang reduction in SPA No. X or substance abuse prevention in Y City) but can only recommend specific providers receive funding if those providers are governmental agencies or subject to certain Board contracts. The JJCC may not recommend any other specific providers (i.e. named CBOs).

The LAC Probation Department will solicit requests for funding from relevant governmental partners who provide or contract for services and resources consistent with the CMJJP Mission Statement and Guiding Principles. See *Appendix B* for a recommended request format and example.

Step 4: JJCPA Evaluation Report Presented to the JJCC (Spring 2022)

Based on the submission of required data from JJCPA funded agencies, throughout the year, the JJCPA Evaluator (RAND Corporation) will conduct process and outcome evaluation of some JJCPA funded programs and services and will provide data collection support for all JJCPA-funded programs at Probation Department direction.

RAND will provide the JJCC with an analysis of target population and community needs in addition to reports that document the outcomes of select JJCPA funded programs and services, providing recommendations as requested by the JJCC to ensure alignment with literature reviews of effective programs. The presentation to the JJCC will include public feedback and discussion of recommended changes. Thereafter, the JJCC will appoint a FY 2023-24 CMJJP and JJCPA Spending Allocation Ad-Hoc Subcommittee (FY 2022-23 CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee) to develop a draft of the FY 2023-24 CMJJP and JJCPA funding allocation for JJCC consideration and approval.

Step 5: CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee Presents Draft FY 2022-23 CMJJP and FY 2022-23 JJCPA Funding Allocation to the JJCC-CAC in October 2022

The CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee presents a draft of the FY 2022-23 CMJJP and high-level FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation to JJCC-CAC approximately half-way through the Ad-Hoc Subcommittee's allocated meeting time. The JJCC-CAC holds a public meeting to receive input on the drafts. Feedback from the JJCC-CAC is considered and incorporated into the draft CMJJP and annual JJCPA funding allocation by the CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee.

Step 6: JJCC Approves the FY 2022-23 CMJJP and the CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee Presents its Final FY 2022-23 JJCPA Funding Allocation Recommendations (December 2022)

The FY 2022-23 CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee presents its findings and recommendations as well as a draft FY 2022-23 CMJJP and FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation for the JJCC's consideration. All drafts should be submitted to the JJCC seven calendar days before the JJCC meets to ensure adequate time for JJCC member review.

Step 7: CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee Presents Draft FY 2022-23 CMJJP and FY 2022-23 JJCPA Funding Allocation to the JJCC-CAC (December 2022)

The CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee presents its FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation to JJCC-CAC. The JJCC-CAC holds a public meeting to receive input on the final CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee recommendations. A report summarizing the community feedback is prepared by the Chair of the JJCC-CAC and submitted to the JJCC seven calendar days before the JJCC meets in January 2022 to ensure adequate time for JJCC member review.

Step 8: JJCC Approves the FY 2022-23 JJCPA Funding Allocation (January 2023)

The JJCC approves the FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation and the FY 2022-23 CMJJP Ad-

Hoc Subcommittee is dissolved. The JJCC-approved versions of the FY 2022-23 CMJJP and the FY2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation are forwarded to the County of Los Angeles's Board of Supervisors for initial review by their justice deputies at a Public Safety Cluster meeting.

Step 9: Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Approves CMJJP and Annual JJCPA Funding Allocation (Spring 2023)

The Board of Supervisors considers and adopts the FY 2022-23 CMJJP and FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation by means of a Board Motion.

Step 10: Annual JJCPA Funding Allocation Submitted to Board of State and Community Corrections (May 1 2023)

As required by statute, the FY 2022-23 CMJJP is submitted annually to the BSCC no later than May 1st, 2022.

IV. MISSION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. CMJJP Mission Statement

The mission of the Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan is to improve youth and family wellness and community safety by increasing equitable investments in and access to opportunities to strengthen resiliency and reduce delinquency.

The Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) provides the County of Los Angeles with a strategy that focuses on building healthy and safe communities, using a comprehensive and coordinated plan partially funded by JJCPA to prevent recidivism and reduced delinquency.

2. Statement on Racial Equity


The youth justice system reflects racial and ethnic disparities (RED) resulting from historical, structural inequities – including greater investments in the custody, control and punishment of Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC), purported to achieve public safety, and underinvestment in public and community institutions promoting health and well-being. In 2020, the discourse and contention with racial equity, especially in the context of the criminal justice system, has reached an inflection point. On July 21, 2020, the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors passed a motion creating an Antiracist, Diversity and Inclusion Initiative “to identify and confront explicit institutional racism.”¹⁴ In the meantime, projects like the Alternatives to Incarceration Initiative and the Youth Justice Workgroup are embarking on sweeping transformations to the youth and criminal justice systems that are explicitly guided by racial equity principles.

In keeping with the realities of and current confrontations with structural racism, the CMJJP should embrace a call for anti-racism as it is guided by a commitment to and investment in BIPOC and their communities.

¹⁴ Revised Motion by Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas: “Establishing an Antiracist Los Angeles County Policy Agenda.”

3. CMJJP Guiding Principles

To accomplish this mission, the following guiding principles were developed to drive the work of key partners in Los Angeles County to:



Specifically, the Guiding Principles encompass the following objectives:

1. Align, coordinate, and oversee policies, practices, and services along a continuum of prevention and intervention programming focused on holistic youth development. The youth development system should:
 - Whenever possible, reduce contact between youth and the juvenile justice system with diversion programs and other community-based resources.
 - Deliver services using a continuum of promising practices, best practices, and evidence-based programs that build on youth's strengths and assets and support the development of youth's skills and competencies.
 - Use strength-based screening and assessment tools to assess youth and family needs, build meaningful case plans and appropriately connect youth and families to appropriate services.
 - When the use of out of home placements—non-secure or secure—is necessary, utilize family-based settings (e.g., relative, a nonrelative extended family member, and foster care placements) whenever possible, maintain safe environments in placements, engage/deliver services within a therapeutic milieu, and provide reentry services to ensure a seamless and positive return to the community.

2. Drive decision-making about systems coordination and integration, programming and direct services, evaluation and funding through identifying, developing and resourcing opportunities for collaborative, multidisciplinary partnerships among county agencies, community-based organizations (CBOs), youth and parents that have been impacted by the juvenile justice system, and other interested stakeholders.
3. Recognize and reduce the racial and ethnic and geographic disparities related to investments in custody, control and punishment approaches, access to services and juvenile justice processing and the needs of special populations including (but not necessarily limited to): females, LGBTQ-2A youth, crossover/dually-involved youth, youth who become parents, undocumented, and transitional age youth without family/caretakers/support systems.
4. Ensure transparency and accountability from all partners engaged in youth development service delivery for fiscal management, measuring outcomes related to their work, and implementing effective practices.
 - Collect and report consistent and meaningful outcomes on program impact and effectiveness on an annual basis (at minimum) to assess the effectiveness and equitable impact of policies, practices, and programs.
 - Develop and support capacity of all partners to conduct consistent and meaningful data collection and evaluation.
 - Ensure studies involve research methodologies that are aligned with the perceptions and experiences of communities of color.

4. Growth Fund-Specific Goals and Guiding Principles

The goal of the JJCC in allocating JJCPA Growth Funds is to promote innovative services, programs, and strategies through JJCPA funding to change and transform lives of youth involved in or at-risk of involvement in the probation system, and lower recidivism.

The Guiding Principles for Growth Funds are to:

1. Provide financial support across the continuum of youth development prevention, intervention, and diversion.
2. Support innovative projects, including pilot projects or one-time costs (consistent with County Board policy that ongoing costs be funded by ongoing revenues/continuing expenditures with continuing revenues, in compliance with *Board Policy 4.030 - Budget Policies and Priorities*). Examples of these include:
 - a. Training and capacity building to improve organizations in more effective and efficient programming
 - b. One-time events/programs

- c. Enhancements to and evaluations of existing programming and employment opportunities for youth (enhanced arts programming, tutoring, sports, internships, and activities that allow youth to connect with natural and cultural resources in the LA area)
 - d. Improvements to environments where youth programming is provided
 - e. Technology, art supplies, books, etc.
 - f. Improvements for energy efficiency and environmental sustainability and long-term cost savings
 - g. Youth emergency funds, such as for:
 - i. Life necessities (housing, food, clothing, etc.)
 - ii. Transportation
 - iii. Counseling
3. Prioritize funding for community-based service provision, including:
- a. By community-based service providers with less access to funding and potential to provide and scale up services effectively
 - b. In areas with high levels of youth arrest (based on up-to-date data) and/or under served
 - c. Organizations who target programming to youth with highest needs
 - d. May support JJCC infrastructure, evaluation, juvenile justice cross-system collaboration and coordination development (including both County agencies and CBOs), and governance beyond base-fund allocations, as deemed appropriate by the JJCC.

V. FRAMEWORK

Based on the mission and guiding principles, the CMJJP uses the following definitions for Youth Development and model for a continuum of services, to outline five funding strategies: primary prevention, focused prevention/early intervention¹⁵, intervention, capacity-building, and evaluation and infrastructure.

a. Youth Development and Empowerment

Youth Development has become recognized both as theoretical framework and practice based on adolescent stages of development. In theory, Youth Development supports research that youth are continuing to change and develop; and as practice, Youth Development programs prepare youth to meet the challenges of adolescence by focusing and cultivating their strengths to help them achieve their full potential. For systems including justice, child welfare and education, Youth Development approaches can serve “as an alternative approach to community health and public safety that builds on the strengths of youth, families and communities, addresses the root causes of crime and violence, prevents youth criminalization, recognizes youth leadership and potential, and turns young people’s dreams into realities.”¹⁶ Youth Development as a framework for service delivery works with youth in a place-based, asset-based, holistic and comprehensive way

Based on research, youth development should be a system, a collective impact model, with its own infrastructure and resources to ensure effective coordination, efficacy and accountability across public agencies and community-based organizations.¹⁷ Ultimately, Youth Development systems and supports would achieve outcomes through activities and experiences that help youth develop social, ethical, emotional, physical, and cognitive competencies. For instance, youth development should:

- ❑ Help young people develop identity, agency, and orientation towards a purposeful future;
- ❑ Cultivate young people’s academic and critical thinking skills, life-skills and healthy habits, and social emotional skills;
- ❑ Link youth to holistic support systems; and,
- ❑ Empower youth to engage in the betterment of their communities and the world.

Additionally, we understand that child-serving systems alone do not fully meet the needs of vulnerable youth. Youth and children are part of family units, and further are connected to their larger community, and social ecology which necessitates looking comprehensively at the underlying social, economic, and environmental conditions that impact vulnerable children, youth, and families. Therefore, a key aspect of advancing positive youth outcomes, is ensuring that there are youth and family empowerment opportunities to engage with the systems throughout all stages of their system involvement.

¹⁵ It is recognized that systems may use different terminology, like “focused prevention” or “secondary prevention,” to describe similar youth populations and stages of prevention and intervention.

¹⁶ LA for Youth report: “Building a Positive Future for LA’s Youth: Re-imagining Public Safety of the City of Los Angeles with an Investment in Youth Development” (2016).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

b. Continuum of Services

As stated above in *Section II.a.*, state law requires that the CMJJP include a “local juvenile justice action strategy that provides for a continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency.” Funding should go to “programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency and addressing juvenile crime for any elements of response to juvenile crime and delinquency, including prevention, intervention, suppression, and incapacitation.” Thus, the CMJJP should be grounded in a continuum of responses in Los Angeles County, even though JJCPA funds may only fund part of that continuum.

Research and local cross-sector initiatives have supported the importance of developing a continuum of services targeted at discrete populations of youth. The CMJJP defines the following three populations as its focus:

- **Pre-system connected/at-promise youth**¹⁸ – Risk or “risk factors” are considered alongside strengths or “protective factors” in determining what responses should happen to prevent or reduce the likelihood of delinquency. The CMJJP adopts the definition of risk from a 2011 guidebook on delinquency intervention and prevention by the National Conference of State Legislators:

There are identified risk factors that increase a juvenile’s likelihood to engage in delinquent behavior, although there is no single risk factor that is determinative. To counteract these risk factors, protective factors have also been identified to minimize a juvenile’s likelihood to engage in delinquent behavior. The four areas of risk factors are: individual, family, peer, and school and community.

Individual risk factors include early antisocial behavior, poor cognitive development, hyperactivity, and emotional factors, such as mental health challenges. Family risk factors include poverty, maltreatment, family violence, divorce, parental psychopathology, familial antisocial behaviors, teenage parenthood, single parent family and large family size. Peer factors of association with deviant peers and peer rejection are identified as risk factors. School and community risk factors include failure to bond to school, poor academic performance, low academic aspirations, neighborhood disadvantage, disorganized neighborhoods, concentration of delinquent peer groups, and access to weapons. Many of these risk factors overlap. In some cases, existence of one risk factor contributes to existence of another or others.¹⁹

¹⁸ A federal definition of “at-risk youth” also exists under 20 U.S. Code § 6472: “The term ‘at-risk’, when used with respect to a child, youth, or student, means a school aged individual who is at-risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, has a drug or alcohol problem, is pregnant or is a parent, has come into contact with the juvenile justice system or child welfare system in the past, is at least 1 year behind the expected grade level for the age of the individual, is an English learner, is a gang member, has dropped out of school in the past, or has a high absenteeism rate at school.”

¹⁹ National Conference of State Legislators, *Delinquency Prevention and Intervention: Juvenile Justice Guidebook for Legislators* (2011).

- **LAC Departments that have funding for this population include:**
 LAC Department of Children and Family Services
 LAC Department of Public Social Services
 LAC Department of Mental Health
 LAC Department of Parks and Recreation
 LAC Arts and Culture
 LAC District Attorney's Office
 LAC Public Library
 LAC Workforce Development and Aging Community Services
 LAC Office of Education
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 LAC Chief Executive Office
 My Brother's Keeper
 City of Los Angeles Gang Reduction Youth Development
 LAC Department of Health Services
 LAC Office of Violence

Prevention
 LAC Department of Public Health

- **Youth with initial and early contacts with law enforcement** – These youth have had initial and early contacts with law enforcement or would likely otherwise have had law enforcement contacts through referrals, such as from communities, education, or other systems.

Departments that have funding for this population include:

LAC District Attorney's Office
 LAC Department of Children and Family Services
 LAC Department of Mental Health
 LAC Department of Health Services

- **Probation youth** – These youth include those under community supervision as informal and formal wardship (Welfare and Institution Code sections 654, 654.2, 725, 790, 601 and 602).

To support these populations, the CMJJP will fund the following continuum of youth development services that must be part of a broader continuum of responses to prevent or reducedelinquency in Los Angeles County. The continuum below is based on the holistic youth development framework defined above. Recognizing that the terms primary prevention, focused prevention/early intervention and intervention are used in a variety of fields – including juvenile justice, delinquency, dependency and child welfare, public health, and education, the CMJJP alsoFurther defines these terms in the next section, adopting the holistic, health-oriented terms that the field of juvenile justice has increasingly embraced.²⁰


²⁰ The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's definitions also provide helpful context when considering the development of a continuum of services:

-Prevention: "Programs, research, or other initiatives to prevent or reduce the incidence of delinquent acts and directed to youth at risk of becoming delinquent to prevent them from entering the juvenile justice system or to

Target Population	Estimated Numbers ¹	Continuum of Youth Development services	Service categories (discussed further in the sections below)
Pre-system connected/at-promise youth	706,147	Primary Prevention	-Behavioral Health Services -Education/Schools -Employment/Career/Life Skills -Socio-emotional supports -Housing -Parent/caregiver support -Arts and recreation
Youth with initial and early contacts with law enforcement	10,000	Focused Prevention/Early Intervention	
Probation youth	4,054	Intervention	

c. Continuum-Based Funding Strategies

The following funding strategies for the CMJJP correspond with the continuum of services. Each strategy is designed to be flexibly applied based on the individuals and specific services involved, but should always adhere to the CMJJP guiding principles and youth development framework:



- **Strategy 1: Primary Prevention:** Provide children and families (focusing on those at-promise) and the identification of conditions (personal, social, environmental) that contribute to the occurrence of delinquency) with an array of upfront supports within their own communities to minimize their chances of entering the juvenile justice system and maximize their chances of living healthy and stable lives.²²

intervene with first-time and non-serious offenders to keep them out of the juvenile justice system. This program area excludes programs targeted at youth already adjudicated delinquent, on probation, and in corrections.”

-Intervention: “Programs or services that are intended to disrupt the delinquency process and prevent a youth from penetrating further into the juvenile justice system.”

²¹ See Section VI., Service Strategy and Appendix E, Probation Youth Demographic Data for data supporting these estimates.

²² Adapted from definition in OCP Prevention Plan; Denise Herz, Probation Workgroup Report, 3.3.17.

- **Strategy 2: Focused Prevention/Early Intervention:** Provide upfront supports and services to children and families, whose holistic needs put them at greater risk of delinquency system involvement, in order to intervene early and prevent involvement or further penetration into the delinquency system (see pages 18-19 for a definition of "risk").
 - o *Diversion Intervention to Community-Based Services* – Redirects system responses and provides children and families to avoid involvement or further involvement in delinquency with community-based supports and services to prevent a young person's involvement or further involvement in the justice system. Although there is wide variation in diversion programming nationwide, evidence suggests that diverting young people from the juvenile justice system as early as possible is a promising practice.²³

Departments or agencies that may refer youth to diversion programs include, but are not limited to, schools, service organizations, police, probation, or prosecutors.²⁴
- **Strategy 3: Intervention:** Provide children and families who are already involved in delinquency with supports and services to address the factors leading to their behavior and reduce the likelihood of reoccurring delinquency.²⁵
 - o *During Community Supervision* – Provide children who are on community supervision (including those reentering their homes and communities after a period of placement or detention) and their families with community-based supports and services to prevent the further involvement in the justice system.
 - o *In-Custody* – Provide in-custody children and their families with community-based supports and services prior to and while preparing to reenter their homes and communities to prevent their further involvement in the justice system.
- **Strategy 4: Capacity Building of Community-Based Organizations:** Support community-based organizations with capacity-building, training, and cross-training, evaluation, and to regularly track and monitor outcomes and use the results to drive County policy and practice change.
- **Strategy 5: JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure:** Support annual evaluation and ongoing training and supports for the JJCC and JJCC-CAC to provide leadership on the development and implementation of the CMJJP.

²³ A Roadmap for Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County.

²⁴ Definition from Board of State and Community Corrections, *Youth Reinvestment Grant Program: Request for Proposals* (2018).

²⁵ Denise Herz, Probation Workgroup Report, 3.3.17.

VI. SERVICE STRATEGY

Based on a broad needs assessment, the CMJJP has identified additional service parameters and priorities within the continuum of youth development prevention and intervention strategies.

a. Landscaping the Need

Strategically targeting JJCPA funds should be informed by a landscape of “need” – consistent with state law requirements that a CMJJP be based on assessment of resources and priority areas to fund. To define need, the following categories of information have been deemed important:

- **Youth** – demographic data about at-promise and probation youth
- **Programs and services** – mapping of existing programs and services for the focus populations
- **Funding** – available resources and gaps for such programs and services.

The information presented in the CMJJP are consolidated from available and accessible sources; they do not reflect a comprehensive mapping, only an attempt to be more informed about how JJCPA is situated in a broader context. Ultimately, the question that should drive the CMJJP and funding allocation is: “how should JJCPA funds best serve at-promise and probation youth’ needs in Los Angeles County given its available programs and funding resources?”²⁶

i. At-Promise Youth²⁷

	Estimated Number
Estimated Total Youth in Los Angeles County (under age 18)	2,144,549
Estimated at-promise groups	
-Number of youth living below poverty line	514,692
-Number of chronically absent youth, minus those in the SES disadvantaged group (2019)	33,570
-Number of unduplicated suspensions (2019)	29,819
-Number of youth using substances, above poverty threshold	142,120
Total in at-promise groups	720,201 (33.58% of youth)

²⁶ See Appendix C for a list of Sample Existing, Relevant Programs, Services, and Initiatives.

²⁷ See Appendix D for At-Promise Youth Demographic Data

Identifying at-promise youth is not a straightforward process, as the definition is expansive and there are limited data sources available that provide information about relevant risk factors. Some potential indicators are more widely available, such as those related to poverty and suspensions. Others are difficult to estimate at the population level, such as family violence, parental psychopathology, and association with deviant peers. Moreover, available data come from a variety of sources, which use different methods and have different operational definitions of some constructs (e.g., poverty), making it difficult to synthesize estimates while accounting for duplicates (as some youth are likely to be identified as “at-promise” based on multiple indicators). However, estimates based on available data provide some guidepost as to the size of this population, which in turn helps to inform funding levels across categories (i.e., prevention, intervention).

ii. Youth with initial and early contacts with law enforcement Los Angeles County Overall Youth Arrests

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Juv. Pop. ²⁸	2,342,708	2,318,007	2,295,315	2,274,801	2,253,113	2,221,435	2,188,893
Total Arrests ²⁹	25,581	20,076	17,279	13,237	11,399	9,788	8,133
Felony arrests	9,271	7,806	6,906	5,224	4,827	4,538	3,943
Misdemeanor arrests	12,362	9,702	8,184	6,716	5,709	4,636	3,843
Status Offense arrests	3,948	2,568	2,189	1,277	863	614	347

The table of Overall Youth Arrests shows marked decreases in the total arrests as well as felony, misdemeanor and status offense arrests from 2012 to 2018. These reductions are part of a steep decline in juvenile arrests in the State over the past decades (<http://www.cjcj.org/news/11883>).

iii. Probation Youth³⁰

1. Probation Youth – Snapshot by Disposition and Psychotropic Medications

Youth in Probation System	2018 (Dec. 31 snapshot)	2019 (Dec. 31 snapshot)	2020 (Oct. 31 snapshot)	2021 (Oct. 31 snapshot)
Active Supervision	5,098	4,412	3,538	2,281
Supervision Dispositions				
- 654	448	306	125	68
- 654.2	247	169	145	95
- 725(a)	299	285	222	143
- 727(a)	1	0	0	0
- 790	277	246	197	108
- Home on probation	2162	1992	1,746	1029
- Suitable Placement	646	631	435	301
- DJJ	61	60	35	56
- Bench warrant	760	607	549	423
- Out of State/Courtesy Supervision/Transfer to LA	25	23	11	52

²⁸ https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/asp/profile_display.asp

²⁹ <https://openjustice.doj.ca.gov/crime-statistics/arrests>

³⁰ See Appendix E for Probation Youth Demographic Data

Youth in Probation System	2018 (Dec. 31 snapshot)	2019 (Dec. 31 snapshot)	2020 (Oct. 31 snapshot)	2021 (Oct. 15 snapshot)
Intercounty Transfer to LA	79	67	56	39
Pending	118	26	17	6
Juvenile Halls	538	550	325	248
- On psychotropic meds	149 (27.7%)	160 (29.1%)	132 (40.6%)	99 (38.9%)
Camps	259	300	133	79
- On psychotropic meds	93 (35.9%)	124 (41.33%)	72 (54.1%)	50 (63.3%)
Dorothy Kirby Center	48	53	58	50
- On psychotropic meds	37 (77%)	42 (79.25%)	46 (79.3%)	43 (86.0%)

From 2018 to the present, there appears to have been a reduction in the youth on active supervision. Reductions were observed across all supervision dispositions, but proportionally speaking, were notably large for 654 (a 85% reduction from the 2018 snapshot to the 2021 snapshot), 654.2 (a 62% reduction from the 2018 snapshot to the 2021 snapshot), and DJJ (a 43% reduction from the 2018 snapshot to the 2020 snapshot).³¹ Of note, it is somewhat difficult to determine what might account for these reductions, especially from 2019 to 2020, given the influence of COVID-19 on County agencies (e.g., Courts were only hearing a subset of cases). In addition, stay at home orders may have reduced the number of youth interacting with Probation during 2020.

2. Youth on Probation by Geography

The highest numbers of youth under probation supervision live in the following areas and zip codes:

2021


- a. 93535 Lancaster/Quartz Hill
- b. 90044 Athens (City of LA)
- c. 90003 South Central (City of LA)
- d. 90037 South Central (City of LA)
- e. 93550 Palmdale



County of Los Angeles Probation Department

Youth by Zip Code

10/31/2021



2020

- 90044 Athens (City of LA)
- 93535 Lancaster/Quartz Hill
- 90003 South Central (City of LA)

- d. 93550 Palmdale
- e. 90011 South Central (City of LA)


³¹ The number of youth on out-of-state/courtesy supervision also declined substantially but includes a relatively small number of youth.



County of Los Angeles Probation Department

Youth by Zip Code

10/31/2020



2019


- a. 93535 Lancaster
- b. 90044 Athens (City of LA)
- c. 93550 Palmdale
- d. 90003 South Central
- e. 90805 North Long Beach



County of Los Angeles Probation Department

Juveniles by Zip Code

01/24/2020



2018


- a. Northeast Los Angeles (93535 (Lancaster, Lake, Hi Vista, Wilsona Gardens, Redman, Roosevelt) and 93550 (Palmdale));
- b. Compton, Lynwood, South Los Angeles, View Park-Windsor Hills, West Athens, Westmont, and Willowbrook (90003, 90011, 90037, 90043, 90044, 90047, and 90059);
- c. Baldwin Park and Irwindale (91706).



County of Los Angeles Probation Department

Juveniles by Zip Code

10/22/2018



These data indicate the areas of the County with the most Probation-involved youth have remained stable over the past three years. This may suggest the ongoing need for investment in these areas, not just in intervention services but also in prevention services.

b. Recommended Service Categories and Approaches

Along the continuum of youth development prevention and intervention, the CMJJP should support the following service categories and approaches. With a few modifications, these categories and approaches were the recommendations of the JJCPA evaluation conducted by Resource Development Associates. These approaches should be built into requests and contracts for services by public and community-based service-providers.

Physical Health, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Treatment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide target youth populations with appropriate health, mental health, and substance abuse treatment that target their individual needs • Specifically, fund community-based, trauma informed behavioral health interventions and more community-based substance abuse treatment in neighborhoods with high density of youth on probation
Schools/Educational Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund educational advocacy and system navigation for parents/guardians • Fund an asset-based, family and community centered approach to truancy reduction that helps families address issues that limit regular school attendance • Fund community-based providers in schools to provide tutoring/academic support for youth, and educational advocacy and system navigation for youth and families • Fund intervention workers to facilitate violence prevention and safe neighborhoods • Fund access to support remote/online learning
Employment/Career/Life Skills
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase focus on job development, including career readiness and professional skill-building, vocational training, creative and alternative career training • Strengthen educational pathways to community college courses to promote Career Technical Educational Certifications • Providers should be able to subsidize employment for up to 6-months to increase the likelihood that employers will hire youth • Increase opportunities for vocational skill development, and align vocational training with career opportunities • Loosen the restrictions on the type of accepted employment opportunities to support internships, seasonal employment, and subsidized employment that support career pathways • Leverage and align high-risk/high-need employment with existing LA County youth employment programs, such Youth Workforce Innovations and Opportunity Act-funded Youth Source Centers • Support life skills (e.g., financial literacy, self-care, and stress management) components to employment and educational programs

Socio-Emotional Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support community-based programs with a focus on racial equity, historical trauma, and racism • Provide programming focused on personal growth and expression, including creativity, mindfulness, and spirituality • Provide peer and adult mentoring services, particularly for young people of color • Provide gender-specific, culturally, and racially responsive services to at-risk youth • Provide LGBTQ+ specific support services for youth • Partner with schools and CBOs to provide social justice curriculum and restorative justice models in spaces serving youth to promote youth advocacy and voice • Provide CBOs discretionary funding that can be used for supplemental services to support youth and their families (e.g., incentives, household goods, field trips) • Increase services that serve youth and families together, as well as those specifically for parents/caregivers • Prioritize providers who work across the continuum to provide continuity of services for youth
Housing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support housing linkage assistance for youth and families with unstable housing • Support alternative housing for youth who cannot live at home • Partner with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and LA County Homeless Initiative, particularly housing navigation and housing problem-solving for transitional aged youth (TAY) • Establish pathways to LA County's Coordinated Entry System (CES)
Parent/Caregiver Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund wraparound services that include the family • System navigation and referral to basic needs providers • Fund individual and group mental health support to parents/caregivers
Arts, Recreation and Well-Being
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support arts-focused programming in the areas of employment/career and socio-emotional development • Provide out-of-school time opportunities in safe spaces and access to mentors • Access to health, fitness, life skill and self-care classes and workshops • Support for cultural events, sports, and recreational activities that promote positive youth development

c. System, Service Delivery, and Youth/Family Outcomes

Ultimately, the success of the CMJJP and any program funded by JJCPA must be guided by an evaluation of its implementation and impact. The following outcomes at three levels – system implementation, service provision, and youth and family impact – can guide evaluation and systems and program improvement.³²

³² The outcomes for service delivery and improved youth and family well-being are adopted from the 2017 Probation Working Group's report.

Systems level	Service provider level	Youth/Family level
See CMJJP guiding principles	<p>Probation Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Successful completion rates for supervision - Average length of time under supervision and in specific Probation programming - Average length of detention in juvenile hall pending disposition or post-disposition awaiting placement or camp - Factors related to the increase or decrease of length of time under supervision - Level and type of interaction and contact between supervising probation officers and their clients - Relationship between the use of a validated risk and needs tool, case plan goals, and referred/completed services - Relationship between risk and needs identified by a validated tool and the services received - Relationship between services, supervision, and achieving case plan goals - Amount and type of service delivery for youth in placements - Continuity of services once youth leave placements and reentry the community - Level of coordination between agencies (e.g., Probation, the Department of Children and Family Services, and the Department of Mental Health) - Strengths and challenges related to interagency collaboration <p>Program Delivery by Community-Based Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Types of programs accessed by clients 	<p>Improvement in Protective Factors—Individual and Family Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change in protective/strength assessment scores - Stable living situation - Stable educational plan (enrollment in school, improvement in attendance, improvement in performance, improved behavior at school, access to an IEP, school progressions (increase in credits, graduation, GED)) - Economic stability (e.g., employment for older youth) - Increase in positive, supportive family relationships - Connection to positive, supportive adults - Connection to positive, extracurricular activities - Connection to employment <p>Reduction in Risk and Need Factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk/need assessment scores - Decreased family conflict - Decreased substance misuse/abuse - Decreased mental health stress - Access to basic legal documents needed for employment <p>Supervision Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion of probation - Completion of community service - Completion of restitution - Probation violations and whether sustained (WIC 777—e.g., violations related to school, drugs) <p>Recidivism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New camp/Dept. of Juvenile Justice placements - New arrests

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Successful completion rates for programs - Average length of time in programs - Retention rates for programs - Fidelity of service delivery across programs - Average time between service referral and provision of services - Cultural competency of programs (including gender specific programs) <p>Youth and Family Engagement and Experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which youth and family felt they understood juvenile justice process - Extent to which youth and family were satisfied with their experience in the juvenile justice system - Extent to which youth and family found experiences with Probation and community-based providers helpful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustained petitions
--	---	---

VII. CMJJP FUNDING ALLOCATIONS AND JJCPA FUNDING

a. Overview

Each year, the County receives approximately \$28 million in JJCPA funds from the State at the beginning of the new fiscal year– these are known as “base funds” and support ongoing programs.³³ Mid-way during the fiscal year, the County also receives an allocation of “growth funds” – the amount of which varies. Growth funds have been used for one-time projects.³⁴

Below are additional funding parameters and the allocation goals of the CMJJP. It is important to note that:

- ☐ The FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding allocation will more closely reflect the model allocation – considering variables including the one-time allocation of accumulated funds in recent years that still need to be spent down, and the need to conduct further assessment and/or planning to significantly reduce or end JJCPA funding for some programs. Additional time should be committed to further research, especially about other available funding sources to accurately assess whether a program or service should receive JJCPA funding versus other funds, or no funds because the program is not supported by outcomes data or best practices research.
- ☐ The JJCC should ensure that the implementation of the model allocation continues to be phased in over the next several fiscal years.

b. Additional Funding Parameters

The following funding parameters should further focus the allocation of JJCPA funds in each of the five funding strategies (primary prevention, focused prevention/early intervention, intervention, capacity-building and evaluation and infrastructure):

- 1) Maintain the increased amount of JJCPA funding that goes toward programming and direct services provided to clients by and in coordination with CBOs.³⁵
- 2) Prioritize the funding of public agency personnel’s time to specifically facilitate service referral to, coordination, and delivery partnerships with CBOs.
- 3) Rather than dividing services equally by the five clusters, target services by needs, demographics, gaps in services, and existing resources, such as the Service Planning Areas (SPA) developed by the LA County Department of Public Health.³⁶
- 4) Leverage and prioritize existing partnerships that facilitate service coordination and delivery and have demonstrated good results or are promising (e.g. the

³³ CEO policy 4.030 – Budget Policies and Priorities

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ As has been discussed over many years, successful implementation of any CMJJP will need to improve the referral systems to and contract challenges with community-based service providers.

³⁶ Gap Analysis, 9

Public/Private Partnership, Prevention-Aftercare Networks and the Youth Development and Diversion division of the Office of Diversion and Reentry.

c. Model Base-Funding Allocation

The following allocation goals of the CMJJP for base funding were based on an assessment of youth, program, and funding needs in Los Angeles County. The intent of having allocations is to provide the JJCC a set of guidelines for making funding decisions, not a firm set of rules to adhere to.

5)

<i>Funding strategy</i>	<i>Allocation</i>	<i>Approximate \$ (based on \$27.5 million funding)</i>
Primary Prevention	25%	6,875,000
Focused Prevention/Early Intervention	35%	9,625,000
Intervention	30%	8,250,000
Capacity-building of community-based organizations	5%	1,375,000
JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure	5%	1,375,000

Appendix A

Recommended Format of Community Feedback on Programs and Projects

- ☐ Title of Program or Project You Would Like to Share Information About (up to 81 characters)
- ☐ Submitting Individual or Organization and Contact Information (optional)
 - ☐ Individual or Organization name
 - ☐ Contact name (if different from above)
 - ☐ Contact email
 - ☐ Contact phone
- ☐ Program or Project Summary (up to 500 characters)
- ☐ What Service Planning Area (SPA) does the Program or Project serve?
- ☐ How many young people does the Program or Project serve?
- ☐ Describe How the Program or Project Addresses a Need Existing in LA County, including the Population Identified as in Need of Services or Support (up to 500 characters)
- ☐ How does the Program or Project Align with the CMJJP Mission and Guiding Principles (up to 300 characters)?
- ☐ You may optionally include up to three additional pages of supporting materials (e.g. logic models, charts/graphs, references to academic publications, etc.)

Recommended Notification Flyer Format for Community Feedback on Programs and Projects

County of Los Angeles

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Community Advisory Committee(JJCC-CAC)

Fiscal Year 2022-23

Community Input on Programs and Projects

Each year the County of Los Angeles supports programs and projects that prevent and reduce youth crime. To help guide programming decisions, the JJCC developed and adopted a Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP), which serves as a theoretical and practical guide for selection, implementation, and evaluation to maximize benefit to the youth population served. The CMJJP can be accessed at: [Microsoft Word - 2020.11.23_FY 2021-22 CMJJP_03 Dec 20 JJCC Draft_kmb_Final \(lacounty.gov\)](#)

The JJCC is accepting input on existing or proposed programs and projects that improve youth and family wellness and community safety by increasing access to opportunities to strengthen resiliency and reduce delinquency consistent with the CMJJP.

The JJCC is interested in learning about both programs (ongoing services supporting at least one strategic goal with clearly defined objectives and outcomes, funded by ongoing revenues) and projects (temporary endeavors undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result in support of a strategic goal).

- Programs are considered in light of the CMJJP Mission and Guiding Principles, which may be found on pages 14-16 of the CMJJP
- Projects are considered in light of the Growth Fund Goals and Guiding Principles, which may be found on pages 16-17 of the CMJJP

While the JJCC may learn about programs or projects, it cannot and will not recommend specific providers receive funding. The purpose of this input process is informational only.

Format of Community Input on Programs and Projects

- Title of Program or Project You Would Like to Share Information About (up to 81 characters)
- Submitting Individual or Organization and Contact Information (optional)
 - Individual or Organization name
 - Contact name (if different from above)
 - Contact email
 - Contact phone
- Program or Project Summary (up to 500 characters)
- What Service Planning Area (SPA) does the Program or Project serve (if applicable)?
- What Supervisorial District does the Program or Project serve (if applicable)?
- How many young people does the Program or Project serve?
- Describe How the Program or Project Addresses a Need Existing in LA County, including the Population Identified as in Need of Services or Support (up to 500 characters)
- How does the Program or Project Align with the CMJJP Mission and Guiding Principles (up to 300 characters)?
- You may optionally include up to three additional pages of supporting materials (e.g. logic models, charts/graphs, references to academic publications, etc.)

Email your input to: JJCC-Admin@probation.lacounty.gov with the subject line: 2022 Community Input on Programs and Projects

Please respond by 5:00 P.M. on September 01, 2022

Disclaimer: This is not an application for funding! Any individual or organization who submits information to the JJCC is under no guarantee for future contracts, including under the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act. All interested providers must participate in the contracting process in accordance with applicable County contracting procedures. Do not include proprietary, confidential information, or trade secrets in your input.

Appendix B

Recommended Format for Governmental Partner Funding Requests

Section 1. Program/Project Executive Summary (up to one page)

Section 2. Statement of Need (up to one page)

- a. Describe the problem that the program/project will attempt to address.
- b. Describe the population that will be served.

Section 3. Program/Project Description (up to two pages)

- a. Describe the program/project and provide information on how it will be implemented. Include information on what will be accomplished and the desired outcomes.
- b. Provide the evidence upon which the program/project is based; include site applicable research studies.
- c. How many young people will the program/project serve?
- d. What Service Planning Area(s) (SPA) does the program/project serve?
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/chs/SPAMain/ServicePlanningAreas.htm>
- e. Which Supervisorial District(s) does the program/project serve?
- f. Which service strategies does the program/project support (Primary Prevention, Focused Prevention/Early Intervention, Intervention, Capacity-building of community-based organizations, JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure)?

Include percentage of requested funding allocation designated for CBO contracts/sub-contracts

Service Strategies include the following:

- Primary Prevention
- Focused Prevention/Early Intervention
- Intervention
- Capacity Building of Community-Based Organizations
- JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure

CMJJP Service Strategy category definitions are included for submitters to complete the applicable required information that align(s) with the program/project submitted.

“Strategy 1: Primary Prevention: Provide children and families (focusing on those at-risk) and the identification of conditions (personal, social, environmental) that contribute to the occurrence of delinquency) with an array of upfront supports within their own communities to minimize their chances of entering the juvenile justice system and maximize their chances of living healthy and stable lives.

Strategy 2: Focused Prevention/Early Intervention: Provide upfront supports and services to children and families, whose holistic needs put them at greater risk of delinquency system involvement, in order to intervene early and prevent involvement or further penetration into the delinquency system (see pages 18-19 for a definition of "risk").

Diversion Intervention to Community-Based Services – Redirects system responses and provides children and families to avoid involvement or further involvement in delinquency with community-based supports and services to prevent a young person’s involvement or further involvement in the justice system. Although there is wide variation in diversion

programming nationwide, evidence suggests that diverting young people from the juvenile justice system as early as possible is a promising practice.²³ Departments or agencies that may refer youth to diversion programs include, but are not limited to, schools, service organizations, police, probation, or prosecutors.²⁴

- o
- o **Strategy 3: Intervention:** Provide children and families who are already involved in delinquency with supports and services to address the factors leading to their behavior and reduce the likelihood or reoccurring delinquency.²⁵
- o
- o *During Community Supervision* – Provide children who are on community supervision (including those reentering their homes and communities after a period of placement or detention) and their families with community-based supports and services to prevent the further involvement in the justice system.
- o
- o *In-Custody* – Provide in-custody children and their families with community- based supports and services prior to and while preparing to reenter their homes and communities to prevent their further involvement in the justice system.
- o
- o **Strategy 4: Capacity Building of Community-Based Organizations:** Support community-based organizations with capacity-building, training, and cross-training, evaluation, and to regularly track and monitor outcomes and use the results to drive County policy and practice change.
- o
- o **Strategy 5: JJCPA Evaluation and Infrastructure:** Support annual evaluation and ongoing training and supports for the JJCC and JJCC-CAC to provide leadership on the development and implementation of the CMJJP.”
- o
- o Note: If your program supports more than 1 Service Strategy category, it is recommended that you divide the allocation amounts proportionally between the service categories.

Section 4. Timeline and Milestones (e.g. contracting processes, when service delivery will begin, report submissions, etc.).

Section 5. Budget by Service Strategy

- a. For each service strategy category, provide a budget breakdown explaining by category how the funds will be used (e.g. salaries and benefits, services, supplies, indirect costs, etc.).
 Note: If your program supports more than one service strategy, it is recommended that you divide the administrative and overhead costs proportionally between the service categories. See pp.30-33 of the CMJJP for descriptions of the service strategies.
 Note: It is recommended that you include a brief narrative of expenses along with a table of individual cost components.
- b. What is the cost per youth served?
- c. Why was this program/project not included in your departmental budget?
 - Alternatively, list the amount of departmental funding or support the program/project will receive from other source(s)

Section 6. Evaluation (up to one page) Provide information on the metrics that will be used to determine the effectiveness of the program/project.

Recommended Notification Letter Format for Governmental Partner Funding Requests

DATE

TO: NAME, POSITION TITLE AGENCY NAME

FROM: CHIEF DEPUTY PROBATION OFFICER JUVENILE SERVICES

SUBJECT: **FISCAL YEAR 2022-23 JUVENILE JUSTICE CRIME PREVENTION ACT FUNDING**

Dear NAME,

We greatly appreciate your continued partnership in support of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act's (JJCPA's) programs and services for our Los Angeles County's at-promise young people and youth on probation. During Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-23 **AGENCY** received an approved Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funding allocation in the amount of \$ to support **PROGRAM NAME**. We are requesting your assistance with providing information to the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), through the Probation Department, for the FY 2022-23 JJCPA funding approval process.

JJCPA funded agencies are required to submit estimated expenditures on a monthly basis to the JJCPA Administration email address by the 15th of the following month. For October 2022, the due date for this information is October 31, 2022.

JJCPA funded agencies are required to collect and submit data to Probation for all youth participants in each JJCPA program and service in order to adequately assess the effectiveness of those programs at reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. JJCPA funded agencies are required to collect and submit additional program specific data to Probation and participate in the evaluation process for all JJCPA programs (see CMJJP Appendix B, Section 7 for additional detailed information).

- Required Data for JJCPA Program/Service to evaluate youth justice outcomes shall include, but not be limited to the following:

Monthly submission of the following data, by program/program site (automated data collection template to be provided by Probation):

- o Agency Name
- o Name and Type of Program/Service
- o One Time or On-Going
- o Date and Timeframe
- o Session Location
- o Full Youth Last Name
- o Full Youth First Name
- o Date of Birth (for At-Promise Youth)
- o Ethnicity (for At-Promise Youth)
- o Gender (for At-Promise Youth)
- o Zip Code of Residence (for At- Promise Youth)
- o Program/Service Start Date
- o Program/Service End Date

- o At the end of the funded Fiscal Year, status of each youth: completed, did not complete and reason or in progress (for applicable program/service)
- Required additional data in order to adequately assess program effectiveness at reducing juvenile crime and delinquency (justice outcome reporting and full evaluation)
- If the applicant believes that one or more of the requested data is in contradiction to any State and/or Federal law and/or regulation, the applicant must present such position for consideration and discussion. Once funds are received the applicant agrees to provide all above listed data unless there are changed circumstances that necessitate re-consideration of what data cannot be provided. "Changed Circumstances" include changes in legislation and/or regulations.

To better align the JJCPA funding schedule with the County budget timeline, this year, the Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) and JJCPA Spending Allocation Ad-Hoc Subcommittee (CMJJP Ad-Hoc Subcommittee) will be meeting in early Spring 2022 and between September – December 2022 to prepare recommendations for the FY 2023-24 spending allocation plan. The spending plan will be considered for approval by the full JJCC at their meeting on December 2022. To begin this process:

- ☐ If your agency is interested in continued funding for FY 2023-24 to support PROGRAM NAME, please send an email, with the information requested in *Attachment I*, describing how the funds will be utilized to serve at-promise or probation youth, to: JJCC-Admin@probation.lacounty.gov with a courtesy copy (CC) to: JJCPA ADMINISTRATOR EMAIL ADDRESS at probjjcpaadmin@probation.lacounty.gov
- ☐ and a subject line of: *FY 2023-24 AGENCY NAME JJCPA Funds for PROGRAM NAME*
- ☐ If your agency would like to request funding for a new or additional program or project, please use same format as for existing programs (above) and a subject line: *FY 2023-24 New Program/Project, AGENCY NAME.*
- ☐ **Please email your requests by 5:00 PM on September 1, 2022.**

I look forward to continuing our work together in advancing partnerships between diverse public agencies and community-based organizations to promote positive youth development and prevent youth delinquency through shared responsibility, collaboration, and coordinated action.

Please contact me at PHONE NUMBER if you have any questions or require additional information, or you may contact PROBATION CONTACT NAME, JJCPA Administration, at PHONE NUMBER or SECOND PROBATION CONTACT NAME, JJCPA Administration, at PHONE NUMBER.

Section 7. Required Data Collection and Evaluation of JJCPA Programs

According to a recent JJCPA State audit (The California State Auditor's Report: Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Weak Oversight Has Hindered Its Meaningful Implementation (ca.gov) Report 2019-116, issued May 12, 2020), the following finding was documented: "Los Angeles should collect data on all participants in each JJCPA program and service to adequately assess the effectiveness of those programs at reducing juvenile crime and delinquency."

This restates the requirement for JJCPA funded agencies to collect and submit data to the Probation Department for purposes of reporting on and evaluating specific program and justice outcomes (by the JJCPA Evaluator) through the full evaluation process.

By submitting this request for JJCPA funding and upon the County's/JJCC approval/adoption, agencies agree to be responsible for developing the process to collect and submit the mandatory identifiable data for all youth served through the JJCPA funded program/service to Probation.

Submission of this required JJCPA Data on all youth served includes, but is not limited to the following:

Monthly submission of the following data, by program/program site will be due on the 15th of the following month; for the last month of the Fiscal Year, 2022-23, the data will be due on July 15, 2023

- Agency Name
- Name and Type of Program/Service
- One Time or On-Going
- Date and Timeframe
- Session Location
- Full Youth Last Name
- Full Youth First Name
- Date of Birth (for At-Promise Youth)
- Ethnicity (for At-Promise Youth)
- Gender (for At-Promise Youth)
- Zip Code of Residence (for At- Promise Youth)
- Program/Service Start Date
- Program/Service End Date
- At the end of the funded Fiscal Year, status of each youth: completed, did not complete and reason or in progress (for applicable program/service)
- Required additional data in order to adequately assess program effectiveness at reducing juvenile crime and delinquency (for full program specific evaluation)

Failure to submit the required data to Probation may result in loss of grant funds in accordance with monthly reporting submissions.

Appendix C

Sample of Existing, Relevant Programs, Services, and Initiatives

The CMJJP should leverage, link and resource existing collaborations and programs and services that can serve at-risk and probation youth. The following is a non-exhaustive list of potentially relevant initiatives and service providers.

1. **Office of Diversion and Reentry, Youth Diversion and Development (YDD)** – YDD was created in 2017 as the result of a collaboration to develop a countywide blueprint for expanding youth diversion at the earliest point possible; in January 2018, YDD selected 9 service providers as the first cohort to receive law enforcement diversion referrals.
2. **Public/Private Partnership (P/PP) with California Community Foundation and Liberty Hill Foundation** – The P/PP was created to serve as a passthrough for county funding to be granted directly to community-based service organizations; technical assistance will also be available to those service providers.
3. **Office of Child Protection's Prevention Plan** – Created in 2015, the Office of Child Protection released a comprehensive countywide prevention plan in 2017 for reducing child maltreatment. The plan was developed through collaboration across public agencies and community groups.
4. **Department of Children and Family Services Prevention-Aftercare Networks** – DCFS institutionalized its community-based networks of service providers in 2015 and established ten countywide Prevention and Aftercare networks (P&As). These include a broad range of public, private, and faith-based member organizations—groups that bring resources to the shared goal of preventing child abuse and neglect, along with designated lead agencies responsible for convening, organizing, and leading local grassroots groups. The P&A organizations are part of a critical web of providers across the county that effectively reach out to and engage parents, assisting them as they navigate often-complex systems of services. In so doing, providers develop relationships with these parents, building upon their natural assets through the Strengthening Families Approach. Those relationships in turn create trusting environments that encourage parents to disclose family needs and access appropriate services earlier, as family stressors occur.³⁷
5. **Trauma-informed schools** – A new initiative was launched by the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) in September 2018 to support a trauma-informed approach in schools countywide. The initiative brings together LACOE, the County Department of Mental Health, UCLA, and other agencies to enhance schools' capacity to address trauma, which impacts at least one in four students. The effort will involve professional

³⁷ OCP prevention plan.

development as well as enhancing resources at or near schools through partnerships with county agencies.³⁸

6. **Performance Partnership Pilot (P3)** – has a 2017-2020 strategic plan to improve education, employment, housing and well-being for disconnected youth; an effort of the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles Community College District, local Cal State Universities (CSU 5), Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles Housing Service Agency, and over 50 public, philanthropic and community-based organizations to improve the service delivery system for a disconnected young adult population ages 16-24 and improve their educational, workforce, housing and social well-being outcomes.
7. Office of Violence Prevention
8. Trauma Prevention Initiative
9. Capacity Building Training and Technical Assistance
10. Incubation Academy
11. My Brother's Keeper
12. Whole Person Care
13. SEED School
14. Master Service Agreement Vendors as of DATE (RFSQ #6401706)
 - Alma Family Services
 - Asian American Drug Abuse Program (AADAP)
 - Asian Youth Center
 - Boys and Girls Club of the Foothills
 - Boys and Girls Club of the West Valley
 - Boys and Girls Clubs of the LA Harbor
 - Boys Republic
 - Catholic Charities
 - Center for Living & Learning
 - Center for the Empowerment of Families, Inc
 - Centinela Youth Services
 - Change Lanes Youth Support Service
 - Child and Family Guidance Center
 - Coalition for Engaged Education
 - Coalition for Responsible Community Development
 - Communities in Schools of the San Fernando
 - Community Career Development, Inc.
 - Compator, Inc.
 - El Nido Family Centers
 - First Place for Youth
 - Helpline Youth Counseling, Inc
 - Insideout Writers, Inc.
 - Jewish Vocational Services
 - Justice Children Deserve
 - Keep Youth Doing Something, Inc.
 - Koreatown Youth and Community Center
 - L.A. Boys & Girls Club
 - L.A. Conservation Corps
 - LA Brotherhood Crusade
 - Let Us! Inc.
 - Living Advantage Inc.

³⁸ <https://www.lacoe.edu/Home/News-Announcements/ID/4232/Effort-aims-to-build-school-capacity-to-address-trauma>

- New Directions for Youth
- New Earth
- New Hope Academy of Change
- New Hope Drug & Alcohol Treatment
- North Valley Caring Services
- Optimist Boys Home & Ranch, Inc.
- Our Saviour Center
- People for Community Improvement
- Phillips Graduate University
- Playa Vista Job Opportunities & Business Services
- San Gabriel Valley Conservation Corps
- Social Justice Learning Institute
- Soledad Enrichment Action Inc.
- South Bay Workforce Investment
- Special Service for Groups, Inc.
- Spirit Awakening Foundation
- StudentNest
- Tarzana Treatment Centers, Inc.
- The Community College Foundation
- Turning Point Alcohol and Drug Education
- Venice Community Housing Corp
- Vermont Village Community Development
- Watts Labor Community Committee
- Whole Systems Learning
- Women of Substance Men of Honor
- Workforce Development Board City of LA
- Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.
- Youth Incentive Programs, Inc.
- Youth Policy Institute

Appendix D

At-Promise Youth Demographic Data

Data Sources

- Chronically absent youth data, California State Department of Education
 - Total numbers/proportions and broken out by socioeconomically disadvantaged youth
 - <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/AttChrAbsRateLevels.aspx?cds=19&agglevel=County&year=2018-19&ro=y>
- Suspended youth, California State Department of Education
 - <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqCensus/DisSuspRate.aspx?cds=19&agglevel=County&year=2018-19>
- Estimates of marijuana and alcohol use in youth ages 12-17 in LA County from the LA County Department of Public Health
 - <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/sapc/prevention/PP/StrategicPreventionPlan0716-0619.pdf>

-0619.pdf

- U.S. Census data
 - Used to obtain total youth population in LA County (0-17), and the youth population 10-19
 - <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/losangelescountycalifornia,CA/PST045218>
 - <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=los%20angeles&g=0500000US06037&tid=ACSDP1Y2019.DP05&hidePreview=true>
- Data from the Lucile Packard Foundation (citing the U.S. Census Bureau)
 - Proportion of youth age 0-17 living below the Federal poverty threshold and qualifying for free/reduced lunch
 - <https://www.kidsdata.org/export/pdf?loc=364>

Method

Attempts were made to deconflict data sources to the extent possible.

- For example, though the California State Department of Education defines “socioeconomic disadvantage” more broadly than individuals living below the poverty line, the assumption was made that these could be approximating the same group.
- A study in Washington State suggests that 70% of youth who use marijuana also use alcohol (<https://adai.uw.edu/mjsymposium/slides/2018/Lee.pdf>).
- Proportion of youth estimated to be using substances using those youth living above the poverty threshold as the base, so as not to re-count those in the population living below the poverty threshold.

Limitations:

- As noted, some of the data sources focused on restricted ranges of ages. For example, the substance use data focused on youth age 12-17, but I was only able to find the census breakdown for youth age 10-19. The population of youth age 10-19 is used as

the base population, but there may be different rates of substance use in those age 10/11 and 18/19.

- Certain data sources could not be unduplicated because they did not report on subgroups, like the suspension data.

**Los Angeles County School Districts with Absenteeism and Expulsion Rates Above the California State Average
2018-19 Absenteeism³⁹**

District Name	<u>Cumulative</u> <u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Chronic</u> <u>Absenteeism</u> <u>Eligible</u> <u>Cumulative</u> <u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Chronic</u> <u>Absenteeism</u> <u>Count</u>	<u>Chronic</u> <u>Absenteeism</u> <u>Rate</u> <u>(by Percentage)</u>
SBE - Barack Obama Charter	480	464	161	34.7
Centinela Valley Union High	10,971	8,622	2,783	32.3
Antelope Valley Union High	24,340	23,536	4,821	20.5
Inglewood Unified	12,516	12,055	2,433	20.2
Eastside Union Elementary	3,741	3,545	673	19
Lynwood Unified	14,413	14,117	2,666	18.9
SBE - Anahuacalmecac International University Preparatory of North America	345	321	60	18.7
Lancaster Elementary	17,216	16,611	3,085	18.6
Palmdale Elementary	25,209	24,342	4,523	18.6
Los Angeles Unified	630,838	617,871	113,784	18.4
Acton-Agua Dulce Unified	28,517	23,005	4,028	17.5
Los Angeles County Office of Education	12,136	10,125	1,769	17.5
Long Beach Unified	76,554	75,038	11,303	15.1
SBE - Academia Avance Charter	422	407	59	14.5
West Covina Unified	15,301	14,629	2,092	14.3
Compton Unified	25,016	24,171	3,334	13.8
Keppel Union Elementary	3,734	3,517	484	13.8

³⁹California Department of Education chronic absenteeism data for students above the California average. Note: 2019-20 data not available at the time of publishing. See: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/fsabd.asp>

<u>District Name</u>	<u>Cumulative Enrollment</u>	<u>Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Cumulative Enrollment</u>	<u>Chronic Absenteeism Count</u>	<u>Chronic Absenteeism Rate (by Percentage)</u>
Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union 211 Elementary		208	28	13.5
Monrovia Unified	5,632	5,547	750	13.5
Montebello Unified	26,643	25,929	3,466	13.4
El Monte Union High	9,083	8,848	1,172	13.2
SBE - The School of Arts and Enterprise	820	781	103	13.2
Pasadena Unified	18,871	18,255	2,394	13.1
Pomona Unified	24,875	24,158	3,125	12.9
CA Statewide Total/Average	6,329,883	6,258,845	755,950	12.1

Cumulative and Enrollment regardless of

Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a school or district. Cumulative enrollment is calculated at each reporting level (e.g., school, district, county, and state) and therefore is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in multiple schools within a district during the academic year, they are counted once at each school, but only once in the district's cumulative enrollment.

Chronic Absenteeism This count uses the Cumulative Enrollment of the selected entity as the baseline and removes students that were **not** eligible to be considered chronically absent at Enrollment that entity. Students that are expected to attend less than 31 instructional days at the

selected entity or who were enrolled but did not attend the selected entity are not eligible to be considered chronically absent at that entity. This is calculated by looking at the number of expected days to attend and actual days attended that LEAs submit for each student in CALPADS. Students with exempt status are also removed from Chronic Absenteeism eligibility. Students are exempt if they are enrolled in a Non-Public School (NPS), receive instruction through a home or hospital instructional setting or are attending community college full-time.

Chronic Absenteeism Count	Total count of ALL chronically absent students at the selected entity for the selected population using the available filters. Students are determined to be chronically absent if they were eligible to be considered chronically absent at the selected level during the academic year and they were absent for 10% or more of the days they were expected to attend. Chronic absenteeism is calculated for each student at each reporting level (e.g., school, district, county, and state) based on the expected days of attendance and actual days attended reported by local educational
	agencies (LEAs) in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data Systems (CALPADS). Expected attendance days are determined for each student at each reporting level based on the total number of days a student was scheduled to attend. Days attended are determined for each student at each reporting level based on the total number of days the student attended the school. A day attended is defined as any day a student attended for all or part of a school day.
Chronic Absenteeism Rate	The unduplicated count of students determined to be chronically absent (Chronic Absenteeism Count) divided by the Chronic Absenteeism Enrollment at the selected entity for the selected population using the available filters.

2018-19 Expulsions⁴⁰

2019-2020 Expulsions

<u>District Name</u>	<u>Cumulative Enrollment</u>	<u>Total Expulsions</u>	<u>Expulsion Count Violent Incident (Injury)</u>	<u>Expulsion Count Violent Incident (No Injury)</u>	<u>Expulsion Count Violent Incident (Weapons Possession)</u>	<u>Expulsion Count (Illicit Drug Related)</u>	<u>Expulsion Count (Defiance Only)</u>	<u>Expulsion Count (Other Reasons)</u>
Whittier Union High	11,642	28	1	0	1	26	0	0
Antelope Valley Union High	22,534	30	9	7	6	5	0	3
Bellflower Unified	12,040	9	1	0	3	5	0	0
Alhambra Unified	16,804	12	2	7	1	1	0	1
Bassett Unified	3,575	4	0	2	0	2	0	0
Beverly Hills Unified	3,675	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bonita Unified								
Centinela Valley Union High	6,693	10	1	4	0	5	0	0
Covina Valley Unified	12,119	4	0	2	2	0	0	0
El Rancho Unified	8,571	7	0	5	1	1	0	0
El Segundo Unified	3,546	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Virgenes Unified	11,144	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles County Office of Education	4,199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Torrance Unified	23,699	11	1	3	0	7	0	0
William S. Hart Union High	22,749	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles County	1,260,271	244	37	69	37	88	0	13
CA								
Statewide Total	5,624,643	3,111	863	853	417	871	22	85

- **Note:** As a result of the statewide physical school closures that occurred in February/March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the CDE has determined that the 2019–20 absenteeism data are not valid and reliable for the 2019–20 academic year; therefore, the CDE has not processed these data and they are unavailable for public release. For more information about the impact of

COVID-19 on data reporting for the 2019–20 academic year, please visit the CDE [COVID-19 and Data Reporting](#) webpage.

⁴⁰ California Department of Education expulsion data for school districts at or above the California average. Note: 2019-20 data not available at the time of publishing. See: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/fsed.asp>

Cumulative short-Enrollment	Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a school or district. Cumulative enrollment is calculated at each reporting level (e.g., school, district, county, and state) and therefore is not necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in multiple schools within a district during the academic year, they are counted once at each school, but only once in the district's cumulative enrollment.
Total Expulsions	Total count of ALL expulsions at the selected entity for the selected population using the available filters. Some students may be expelled multiple times and all Expulsions are counted.
Unduplicated Count of Students Expelled (Total)	Total distinct count of ALL students expelled one or more times at the selected entity for the selected population using the available filters. Students who are expelled multiple times are only counted once.
Unduplicated Count ONLY of Students Expelled Students (Defiance-Only)	Total distinct count of all students expelled one or more times for DEFIANCE-ONLY at the selected entity for the selected population using the available filters. Students who are expelled multiple times are only counted once.
Expulsion Rate at (Total)	The unduplicated count of students expelled divided by the cumulative enrollment the selected entity for the selected student population.
Expulsion Count Violent Incident (Injury)	<p>This Federal Offense Category includes the following California Education Code sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual Battery/Assault: 48915(c)(4), 48900(n) • Caused Physical Injury: 48915(a)(1)(A) • Committed Assault or Battery on a School Employee: 48915(a)(1)(E) • Used Force or Violence: 48900(a)(2) • Committed an act of Hate Violence: 48900.3 • Hazing: 48900(q)

<p>Expulsion Count Violent Incident (No Injury)</p>	<p>This Federal Offense Category includes the following California Education Code sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual Harassment: 48900.2 • Caused, Attempted, or Threatened Physical Injury: 48900(a)(1) • Aided or Abetted Physical Injury: 48900(t) • Harassment or Intimidation: 48900.4 • Harassment, Intimidation of a Witness: 48900(o) • Made Terrorist Threats: 48900.7 • Obscene Acts, Profanity, and Vulgarity: 48900(i)
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bullying: 48900(r)
Expulsion Count Weapons Possession	<p>This Federal Offense Category includes the following California Education Code sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possession, Sale, Furnishing a Firearm: 48915(c)(1) Possession, Sale, Furnishing a Firearm or Knife: 48900(b) Brandishing a Knife: 48915(c)(2) Possession of a Knife or Dangerous Object: 48915(a)(1)(B) Possession of an Explosive: 48915(c)(5)
Expulsion Count Illicit Drug-Related	<p>This Federal Offense Category includes the following California Education Code sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sale of Controlled Substance: 48915(c)(3) Possession of Controlled Substance: 48915(a)(1)(C) Possession, Use, Sale, or Furnishing a Controlled Substance, Alcohol, Intoxicant: 48900(c) Offering, Arranging, or Negotiating Sale of Controlled Substances, Alcohol, Intoxicants: 48900(d) Offering, Arranging, or Negotiating Sale of Drug Paraphernalia: 48900(j) Offering, Arranging, or Negotiating Sale of Soma: 48900(p)
Expulsion Count a Defiance-Only	<p>Any expulsion associated with a student in which the only offense committed by student is Disruption is considered a "Defiance-Only" incident. The Defiance-Only Category includes the following California Education Code section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption, Defiance: 48900(k)(1)
Expulsion Count Other Reasons	<p>This category includes the following California Education Code sections, most of which are NOT included in any of the Federal Offense Categories. The only offense that is reportable in the Federal category of "Other" is EC 48900(m)— Possession of an Imitation Firearm, the rest of the offenses are not part of the federal hierarchy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possession of an Imitation Firearm: 48900(m) Possession or Use of Tobacco Products: 48900(h)(2) Property Damage: 48900(f) Robbery or Extortion: 48915(a)(1)(D) Property Theft: 48900(g) Received Stolen Property: 48900(l)

Appendix E

Probation Youth Demographic Data

1. WIC 652 Investigations by Probation Disposition

Year	WIC 654	WIC 654 Teen Court	WIC 654 Victim Offender Restitution Services (VORS)	WIC 654 Early Intervention and Diversion Program (EIDP)	District Attorney	Closed	Citation Diversion	Sealed	Total
Nov 2017- Dec 2018	383 (27.2%)	200 (14.2%)	6 (0.4%)	17 (1.2%)	518 (36.7%)	278 (19.7%)	5 (0.4%)	3 (0.2%)	1410
Jan- Oct 2019	272 (18.9%)	147 (10.2%)	7 (0.5%)	47 (3.3%)	476 (33.1%)	345 (24.0%)	16 (1.1%)	130 (9.0%)	1440
Nov 2019- Jun 2020	219 (35.0%)	63 (10.1%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.6%)	206 (33.0%)	110 (17.6%)	16 (2.6%)	6 (1.0%)	625
July 2020- Jun 2021	66 (15.9%)	24 (5.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	135 (30.5%)	126 (30.5%)	8 (1.9%)	54 (13.0%)	413

Comparisons across the last four reporting periods were limited by the differing lengths of the first three reporting periods (14 months, 10 months, 8 months), as well as the impact of COVID-19 on provision of services beginning in March 2020. However, there are still certain trends worth considering:

- First, accounting for the different reporting periods, there appears to have been substantially fewer investigations in the last two reporting periods (November 2019 to June 2021). However, this might reflect a reduced likelihood to be referred for an investigation during the COVID-19 stay-at-home orders, as youth were more likely to be home and not in school, and are the top arresting agency.
- Second, there have been some changes in the proportion of WIC 654 dispositions over time. In the reporting period from January to October 2019, a smaller proportion of investigations were resolved through WIC 654 dispositions (a combined 33%). In the period from November 2019 to June 2020, the proportion resolved through WIC 654 dispositions had increased to 46%, more like the data from 2017-2018, however, for July 2020 through June 2021, decreased to approximately 22%.
- Third, fewer cases were sent to the District Attorney in the most recent period, though these cases reflected a similar proportion of the overall number of investigations as in previous periods (about 33%).

2. WIC 652 Investigations by Arrest Charge (Most Serious)

Arrest Category	Nov 2017- Dec 2018	Jan- Oct 2019	Nov 2019- Jun 2020	July 2020 – June 2021
Accessory After the Fact	0	1	0	0
Advise/Encourage Suicide	1	0	0	0
Aid/Participate in a Speed Contest	0	0	1	3
Alcohol Related (Pos./Open Container)	0	0	2	2
Alcohol/Drug Related (DUI)	x	x	11	25
Allow/Cause Injury to Elder/Dependent Adult	1	3	0	0
Annoy/Molest Child	0	0	1	0
Arson Related Charges	6	1	2	4
Assault with Deadly Weapon	9	10	5	1
Assault-Related Charges	559	435	5	9
Battery Related	x	x	224	65
Begging	0	0	2	0
Bring into State Matter Depicting Minor in Sex Act/ Indecent Exposure	13	14	0	0
Burglary Related Charges	93	59	23	14
Business & Professional (B&P) Code	10	8	0	0
Carjacking	0	4	0	3
Child Abuse/Assault	0	0	0	2
Civil Code Violation	1	5	0	1
Civil Rights Violation w/ Injury	0	1	0	0
Conspire to Commit Crime	3	8	2	4
Contempt of Court	0	3	0	2
Corporal Injury/Domestic Relations	3	9	3	4
Criminal Threat	57	37	20	3
Defraud Innkeeper of \$950	4	3	0	0
Discharge Fireworks with Likelihood of Injury	0	0	0	2
Disobedience of Court Order	1	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	0	25	4	4
Disturbing the Peace	5	2	3	0
Distribute Private Images	x	x	4	0
Drug Related Charges	87	96	35	15
Education Code Violations	6	2	0	0
Electronically Distribute Harassing Material	1	0	0	0
Embezzlement	1	1	0	0
Engage/Solicit Lewd Conduct in Public Place	19	0	0	0
Evading a Peace Officer and/or Driving Reckless	x	x	3	13
Extortion	1	2	1	1

Fail to Obey Peace Officer	x	x	x	1
Fail To Present DI/Financial Responsibility Information	x	x	x	1
False Identity to a Peace Officer	0	4	1	3
False Imprisonment	2	0	0	0
False Report to a Peace Officer	0	2	2	1
Falsely Impersonate through Internet Website	1	0	0	0
Fight in a Public Place	x	x	1	0
Firearm/Weapons Related Charges	45	48	34	42
Forgery	0	1	2	0
Fraud Related Activity	0	4	0	0
Grand Theft (Over \$400) Charges	0	24	9	6
Harass by Telephone	3	1	0	0
Hit & Run (Property Damage)	x	x	4	1
Illegal Distribution of Electronic Identifying Information	x	x	4	1
Illegal Poss of Explosives/Fireworks	x	x	2	0
Illegal Possession of a False ID	0	3	0	0
Illegal Possession of Tear Gas	0	3	1	0
Inhumane Tx/Torture/Kill Living Animal	0	4	0	0
Injure/Remove Wireless Communication Device	1	0	0	0
Kidnapping	0	2	0	1
Lewd Act with Children Under 14/Aggravated Sexual Assault of Child Sex Penetration/Sex Penetration by Object by Force/Sodomy	33	21	14	14
Litter on Public/Private Property with 1 Prior	2	0	0	0
Lynching	0	2	0	0
Make Obscene/Threatening Phone Call	0	1	5	1
Municipal Code Violations	5	7	0	2
Obstruct/Resist Officer	0	5	0	2
Oral Copulation	x	x	1	1
Participate in a Street Gang	0	3	0	1
Peeking in a Public Building/Inhabited Building	x	x	2	2
Petty Theft Related Charges	160	198	55	25
Promote Criminal Street Gang				0
Poisoning	0	1	0	0
Possess Bill/Note/Check (over \$950)	1	0	0	0
Possession of Illegal Substances	x	x	2	3
Property Theft Related Charges	28	17	3	5
Resisting Officer	60	50	20	26
Robbery/Attempted Robbery	17	33	10	18
Send/bring/Possess obscene matter	0	14	2	1

During the last reporting period, the most common arrest categories remained consistent with previous reporting periods. These included battery-related, theft-related, drug-related, and vandalism-related charges. Absolute numbers of charges in each of these categories declined, consistent with the overall reduction in WIC 652 investigations.

3. School-based Probation

	2018 (Dec. snapshot)	2019 (Dec. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)	2021 (Oct. snapshot)
Number of youth	1238	736	681	435
Number probation officers	93 (65 funded by JJCPA)	46	43	41
Average caseload	13.31	16	15	11
Number of schools	111	71	75	72

Probation Youth in School-Based Probation Supervision – Select Years 2003-2016								
	2003-2004	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
High School	6,520	6,443	5,518	4,685	4,021	3,561	2,650	1,905
Middle School	731	213	180	129	85	112	80	85
Total	7,251	6,656	5,698	4,814	4,106	3,673	2,730	1,990

From 2018 to 2019, the number of youth served by School-Based Supervision decreased substantially, as did the number of probation officers. In part, this reflects a scaling back of the School-Based Supervision program to focus on youth in high school who are under supervision by Probation. The size of the population served by School-Based Supervision remained similar in 2020.

4. Probation Youth by Race/Ethnicity

	2018 (Dec. snapshot)	2019 (Dec. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Active supervision	5098	4,412	3538
- Hispanic	3035 (60%)	2643 (60%)	2140 (60%)
- Black	1571 (31%)	1342 (30%)	1074 (30%)
- White	302 (6%)	257 (6%)	194 (5%)
- API	36 (<1%)	30 (1%)	19 (1%)
- American Indian	7 (<1%)	2 (0%)	3 (<1%)
- Other	93 (2%)	88 (2%)	73 (2%)
- Unstated	54 (1%)	50 (1%)	35 (1%)

	2018 (Oct. snapshot)	2019 (Dec. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Camps	301	300	194
- Hispanic	181 (60%)	191 (63.7%)	123 (63.4%)
- Black	107 (36%)	102 (34%)	56 (28.9%)
- White	4 (2%)	4 (1.3%)	9 (4.6%)
- API	2	0	0
- American Indian	0	0	0
- Other	4 (1%)	3 (1%)	6 (3.1%)

	2018 (Oct. snapshot)	2020 (Jan. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Halls	569	550	322
- Hispanic	319 (56%)	313 (56.9%)	208 (64.6%)
- Black	218 (38%)	198 (36%)	101 (31.4%)
- White	22 (4%)	31 (5.6%)	13 (4%)
- API	2	1 (0.2%)	0
- American Indian	0	1 (0.2%)	0
- Other	5	6 (1.1%)	0

	2018 (Dec. snapshot)	2019 (Dec. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Active Supervision	5098	4,412	3538
- Male	4047 (79%)	3,521 (80%)	2874 (81%)
- Female	1051 (21%)	891 (20%)	664 (19%)

	2018 (Oct. snapshot)	2019 (Dec. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Camps	301	300	194
- Male	252 (4%)	260 (87%)	165 (85.1%)
- Female	49 (16%)	40 (13%)	29 (14.9%)

	2018 (Oct. snapshot)	2020 (Jan. snapshot)	2020 (Oct. snapshot)
Halls	569	550	322
- Male	480 (64%)	465 (85%)	272 (84.5%)
- Female	89 (16%)	85 (15%)	50 (15.5%)

As reported by the United States Census Bureau as of 2020, the percentage of youth (ages 10-17) race/ethnic groups in the County of Los Angeles, 55.7% of youth are Hispanic or Latino and 7.5% are African American. Based on these data, Black youth continue to be overrepresented among those on active supervision, in camps, and in halls.

Appendix F

Summary of Results from the 2020 Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Community Advisory Committee County of Los Angeles Youth Service Needs Assessment

Background: Each year since 2001, counties across the state have received roughly \$100 million in Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funds meant for effective programs that prevent and reduce youth crime. The County of Los Angeles receives approximately \$28 million in JJCPA funds at the beginning of the new fiscal year, with additional variable growth funds each Fall based on a legislative change in 2011. To help guide funding decisions, the JJCC developed and adopted a new Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) in February 2020, which serves as a theoretical and practical guide for funding, implementation, and evaluation to maximize benefit to the youth population served. To better refine this framework and plan, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) and the JJCC's Community Advisory Committee (JJCC-CAC) are seeking community input on how funds can best be allocated to improve youth and family wellness and community safety by increasing access to opportunities to strengthen resiliency and reduce delinquency.

The CMJJP can be accessed at: [Microsoft Word - 2020.11.23_FY 2021-22 CMJJP_03 Dec 20 JJCC Draft_kmb_Final \(lacounty.gov\)](#)

Purpose of this Survey: This survey is meant to gather information from stakeholders connected to or impacted by the juvenile justice system (e.g. community members, governmental agencies, and community-based organizations) about the unmet needs of justice-involved and at-risk youth in the County of Los Angeles. This information will provide insight and guidance to the CAC and the JJCC on how JJCPA funding can better support young people and close gaps in the services provided to them.


You will be asked about:

- ☐ Types of services and the strategies that are most in need of funding in the County of Los Angeles to better serve at-risk youth and/or youth who have had contact with the justice system;
- ☐ Categories of youth you feel this programming should be targeted towards;
- ☐ Geographic areas in the County which are in most need of these services; and,
- ☐ A few questions about yourself to better understand your perspective.

Disclaimer: This is not an application for funding. Any individual or organization who submits information to the CAC is under no guarantee for future contracts under the JJCPA. All interested providers must participate in the contracting process in accordance with applicable County contracting procedures. Do not include proprietary, confidential information, or trade secrets in the fields below.

Q1 What category of services for youth do you feel are most important to fund in the County of Los Angeles based on the greatest unfulfilled need?
Choose up to 3

Answered: 37 Skipped: 1



Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Community Advisory Committee 2021 County of Los Angeles Youth Service Needs Assessment

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Physical Health, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Treatment -Provide target youth populations with appropriate health, mental health, and substance abuse treatment that target their individual needs-Specifically, fund community-based, trauma informed behavioral health interventions and more community-based substance abuse treatment in neighborhoods with high density of youth on probation	40.54%	15
Schools/Educational Support-Fund educational advocacy and system navigation for parents/guardians-Fund an asset-based, family and community centered approach to truancy reduction that helps families address issues that limit regular school attendance-Fund community-based providers in schools to provide tutoring/academic support for youth, and educational advocacy and system navigation for youth and families-Fund intervention workers to facilitate violence prevention and safe neighborhoods-Fund access to support remote/online learning	43.24%	16
Employment/Career/Life Skills-Increase focus on job development, including career readiness and professional skill-building, vocational training, creative and alternative career training- Strengthen educational pathways to community college courses to promote Career Technical Educational Certifications-Providers should be able to subsidize employment for up to 6-months to increase the likelihood that employers will hire youth-Increase opportunities for vocational skill development, and align vocational training with career opportunities-Loosen the restrictions on the type of accepted employment opportunities to support internships, seasonal employment, and subsidized employment that support career pathways-Leverage and align high-risk/high-need employment with existing LA County youth employment programs, such Youth Workforce Innovations and Opportunity Act-funded Youth Source Centers-Support life skills (e.g., financial literacy, self-care, and stress management) components to employment and educational programs	64.86%	24
Socio-Emotional Support-Support community-based programs with a focus on racial equity, historical trauma, and racism-Provide programming focused on personal growth and expression, including creativity, mindfulness, and spirituality-Provide peer and adult mentoring services, particularly for young people of color-Provide gender-specific, culturally, and racially responsive services to at-risk youth-Provide LGBTQ+ specific support services for youth-Partner with schools and CBOs to provide social justice curriculum and restorative justice models in spaces serving youth to promote youth advocacy and voice-Provide CBOs discretionary funding that can be used for supplemental services to support youth and their families (e.g., incentives, household goods, field trips)-Increase services that serve youth and families together, as well as those specifically for parents/caregivers-Prioritize providers who work across the continuum to provide continuity of services for youth	45.95%	17
Housing-Support housing linkage assistance for youth and families with unstable housing-Support alternative housing for youth who cannot live at home-Partner with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and LA County Homeless Initiative, particularly housing navigation and housing problem-solving for transitional aged youth (TAY)-Establish pathways to LA County's Coordinated Entry System (CES)	40.54%	15
Parent/Caregiver Support-Fund wraparound services that include the family-System navigation and referral to basic needs providers-Fund individual and group mental health support to parents/caregivers	10.81%	4
Arts, Recreation and Well-Being -Support arts-focused programming in the areas of employment/career and socio-emotional development-Provide out-of-school time opportunities in safe spaces and access to mentors-Access to health, fitness, life skill and self-care classes and workshops-Support for cultural events, sports, and recreational activities that promote positive youth development	43.24%	16
Total Respondents: 37		

Q2 Based on what you selected in your last answer, please further describe what type of programming you feel is most in need of funding for youth in the County of Los Angeles, and/or what you feel is the greatest unmet need: Short answer, 500 character limit


Answered: 38 Skipped: 0

Q3 Are there existing programs or services in the community already providing this programming that could be further supported or expanded? If so, please describe, including the name of the program, organization, and/or area covered by the program: Short answer, 500 character limit

Answered: 33 Skipped: 5

Q4 If you are under 19 years old, where do you feel most safe and comfortable receiving services?

Answered: 30 Skipped: 8




Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Community Advisory Committee 2021 County of Los Angeles Youth Service Needs Assessment

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
My home	0.00%	0
Schools	0.00%	0
Mental health provider	0.00%	0
Physical health care provider	0.00%	0
Library	0.00%	0
Park/Recreation	0.00%	0
Church/religious organization	3.33%	1
Community-based organization (please specify)	6.67%	2
I do not have a safe space to access services	0.00%	0
I do not have a safe space to access services	0.00%	0
I am 19 years old or older	83.33%	25
Other (please specify)	6.67%	2
TOTAL		30

Q5 What are the greatest obstacles or barriers for youth in the County of Los Angeles? Choose up to 3


Answered: 38 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Access to technology (e.g. computer or phone)	21.05%	8
Access to internet/WiFi	10.53%	4
Access to transportation	34.21%	13
Access to a safe educational space to learn and do homework	34.21%	13
Access to safe recreational spaces	42.11%	16
Access to mental health services	47.37%	18
Access to a mentor or caring adult	73.68%	28
Ability to access and navigate government and community-based services	42.11%	16
Total Respondents: 38		


Q6 Which category of youth do you feel are in most need of services?
Please rank the categories below by which group of youth you feel is most in need of the services described above. 1=highest need 2=second highest need 3=third highest need Expanded definitions of these categories can be found on pages 18-20 of the CMJJP.

Answered: 37 Skipped: 1



	1	2	3	TOTAL	SCORE
"At-promise" youth – Youth who have not yet had contact with the juvenile justice-system but who face an array of internal and/or external circumstances which make it likely they will have future contact with the system. Primary prevention programming.	22.22% 8	22.22% 8	55.56% 20	36	1.67
Youth with initial and early contacts with law enforcement – These youth have had initial and early contacts with law enforcement or would likely otherwise have had law enforcement contacts through referrals, such as from communities, education, or other systems	16.67% 6	66.67% 24	16.67% 6	36	2.00
Probation youth – These youth include those under community supervision as informal and formal wardship (Welfare and Institution Code sections 654, 654.2, 725, 790, 601 and 602).	62.16% 23	10.81% 4	27.03% 10	37	2.35


Q7 Are there particular demographics of youth who you feel services should be targeted towards? Select all that apply for the specific group(s) of youth you had in mind and, if needed, clarify further in the following question. Racial/Ethnic Identities:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Black or African American	91.89%	34
Latinx	86.49%	32
Asian/Pacific Islander	48.65%	18
Native American	54.05%	20
White	13.51%	5
Other	16.22%	6
Total Respondents: 37		

Q8 Select all that apply for the specific group(s) of youth you had in mind and, if needed, clarify further in the following question. Racial/Ethnic Identities: Gender:


Answered: 36 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Male (cisgender male)	91.67%	33
Female (cisgender female)	83.33%	30
Gender non-conforming and/or two-spirit	69.44%	25
Transgender youth	77.78%	28
Total Respondents: 36		

Q9 Select all that apply for the specific group(s) of youth you had in mind and, if needed, clarify further in the following question. Sexual Orientation:


Answered: 28 Skipped: 10



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
LGBTQ+ youth	100.00%	28
Total Respondents: 28		

Q10 Are there particular demographics of youth who you feel services should be targeted towards? Select all that apply for the specific group(s) of youth you had in mind and, if needed, clarify further in the following question. Age Groups:


Answered: 38 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Pre-K or Younger Aged	23.68%	9
Elementary School-Aged	31.58%	12
Middle School-Aged	92.11%	35
High School- Aged	86.84%	33
Total Respondents: 38		

Q11 Are there particular demographics of youth who you feel services should be targeted towards? Select all that apply for the specific group(s) of youth you had in mind and, if needed, clarify further in the following question. Additional challenges:

Answered: 37 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Youth with disabilities	43.24%	16
Homeless Youth	81.08%	30
Youth in the foster care system	81.08%	30
Gang-involved youth	94.59%	35
Youth impacted by the immigration system	64.86%	24
Other (please specify)	5.41%	2
Total Respondents: 37		

Q12 Would you like to further clarify what group you feel is most in need of the services listed above? Short answer, 300 character limit

Answered: 24 Skipped: 14

Q13 The County of Los Angeles is divided into 8 geographic regions called Service Planning Areas, or SPAs. These distinct regions allow the Department of Public Health to develop and provide more relevant public health and clinical services targeted to the specific health needs of the residents in these different areas. What best describes you?

Answered: 37 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Service provider working directly with youth	35.14%	13
Youth (age 15-25)	10.81%	4
Concerned community member	8.11%	3
County employee	13.51%	5
Youth (age 15-25) impacted by the justice system	0.00%	0
Adult or family member impacted by the justice system	2.70%	1
Educator	8.11%	3
Juvenile justice advocate	21.62%	8
TOTAL		37

Q14 If applicable, please name the agency, department or organization that you work with, or please briefly describe it: Short answer, 300 character limit

Answered: 27 Skipped: 11

Q15 What Service Planning Area (SPA) do you live in? See map and definition of SPA in Question 12. More specifics on each SPA.


Answered: 37 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
SPA 1 (Antelope Valley)	0.00%	0
SPA 4 (Metro LA)	18.92%	7
SPA 7 (East)	5.41%	2
SPA 2 (San Fernando Valley)	18.92%	7
SPA 5 (West)	10.81%	4
SPA 8 (South Bay)	21.62%	8
SPA 3 (San Gabriel Valley)	8.11%	3
SPA 6 (South)	16.22%	6
TOTAL		37

Q16 What Service Planning Area (SPA) do you work in? Select all that apply. See map and definition of SPA in Question 12.

Answered: 37 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
SPA 1 (Antelope Valley)	8.11%	3
SPA 4 (Metro LA)	40.54%	15
SPA 7 (East)	24.32%	9
SPA 2 (San Fernando Valley)	16.22%	6
SPA 5 (West)	13.51%	5
SPA 8 (South Bay)	18.92%	7
SPA 3 (San Gabriel Valley)	18.92%	7
SPA 6 (South)	43.24%	16
Total Respondents: 37		

Q17 Is there anything else you would like us to know about yourself or the project or program you have described? Short answer, 500 character limit


Answered: 14 Skipped: 24

Q18 If you would like us to have the ability to contact you with any additional questions, please provide your name, email, and phone number below: Short answer, 300 character limit

Answered: 18 Skipped: 20

Q19 The County of Los Angeles is divided into 8 geographic regions called Service Planning Areas, or SPAs. These distinct regions allow the Department of Public Health to develop and provide more relevant public health and clinical services targeted to the specific health needs of the residents in these different areas. Which geographic area, as defined by county Service Planning Areas (SPAs), do you feel is in highest need of this programming or services? (Limit to 3 - See Descriptions Below)


Answered: 19 Skipped: 19



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
SPA 1 (Antelope Valley)	31.58%	6
SPA 2 (San Fernando Valley)	36.84%	7
SPA 3 (San Gabriel Valley)	21.05%	4
SPA 4 (Metro LA)	36.84%	7
SPA 5 (West)	5.26%	1
SPA 6 (South)	68.42%	13
SPA 7 (East)	31.58%	6
SPA 8 (South Bay)	21.05%	4
Total Respondents: 19		

Q20 This question intentionally left blank

Answered: 16 Skipped: 22



Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council - Community Advisory Committee 2021 County of Los Angeles Youth Service Needs Assessment

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
SPA 1 (Antelope Valley)	12.50%	2
SPA 1 (Antelope Valley)	0.00%	0
SPA 4 (Metro LA)	12.50%	2
Spa 4 (Metro LA)	0.00%	0
SPA 7 (East)	6.25%	1
Spa 7 (East)	0.00%	0
SPA 8 (South Bay)	6.25%	1
Spa 2 (San Fernando Valley)	0.00%	0
SPA 3 (San Gabriel Valley)	6.25%	1
Spa 5 (West)	0.00%	0
SPA 6 (South)	56.25%	9
Spa 8 (South Bay)	0.00%	0
Spa 3 (San Gabriel Valley)	0.00%	0
Spa 6 (South)	0.00%	0
You are limited to 3 choices. Please list all three Spa choices in the Comment Box below.	0.00%	0
TOTAL		16