



LOS ANGELES COUNTY

PROBATION OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

May 7, 2025

SUMMARY REPORT FOR THE CBO RELATIONSHIPS AD HOC COMMITTEE

***Memorializing the Work of the Community-
Based Organizations (CBO) Relationships
Ad Hoc Committee***

Prepared By:
Sarah Gongora, Psy.D.



Since the inception of the Probation Oversight Commission (POC), programs and services delivered within the Probation Department's (Probation or "Department") detention facilities has been a centralized focus in the overall work of the commission and in facility inspections conducted. Observations made by the POC, and reports received from youth, families, and probation employees about a shortage of programming, quality and relevance of programming available, and the conditions in which programming is delivered emphasized the need for the POC to further focus attention.

On May 9, 2024, the commissioners of the POC formed the Community Based Organizations (CBO) Relationships ad hoc committee. The committee was formed specifically to make inquiry regarding several reports received from various CBOs regarding challenges related to the contracting process, scheduling programming within the facilities, and background check clearances. The committee was also set to seek information about the department's fiscal year 2023-2024 budget including how funding was allocated to CBOs the Department contracted with during that time. The committee made plans to discuss these issues with CBOs and the Probation Department and report back to the full POC at public meetings.

The committee worked to gather information regarding the expressed and observed difficulties and provided relevant questions to Probation ahead of meeting to facilitate preparation and ability to pass this information to the public (see Appendix A). Given the shortage of clear answers to many of the questions posed during that meeting, the committee moved to gather in-depth data from CBO programming providers to focus the work. Due to concerns of retaliation expressed by providers, a private listening session was conducted on September 5, 2024, to gather information from providers to answer the following questions:

- What is it like to be a service provider in the facilities right now?
- What was your experience like getting cleared to work in the facilities?
- How does scheduling work for you? How do you find out if there's a change? Who do you go to if an issues comes up?
- What feels most challenging when you think about your work and the facilities? How did these challenges impact your work?
- Is there anything that is working well when it comes to working with Probation in providing programming in the facilities?
- What recommendations would you have for Probation leadership to make bringing programming into the facilities easier? What does the department need to start, stop or continue doing?

The results from the listening session townhall were documented in a report¹ which included recommendations to provide community sourced, strength-based solutions for improving programming delivery, which were also presented at a public townhall meeting on October 21, 2024².

¹ [CBO Listening Session](#)

² [Virtual Town Hall: Report on Community Based Organizations \(10/21/24\)](#)



The committee met with Probation Executive Leadership on November 1, 2024, to review the recommendations. Probation agreed to address every concern and provide the ad hoc committee with regular progress updates on implementation. Two updates were provided following the November 1, 2024, meeting, which indicated that steps were taken by Probation to address all but one of the recommendations. After a meeting with Probation on December 13, 2024, communication from Probation ceased for months despite regular outreach and requests to meet. This prompted the commissioners of the POC to approve a motion calling for Probation's responsiveness and provision of regular updates on implementation of the recommendations³. Following this motion, probation participated in one meeting with the committee and was unable to provide any updates; instead, they communicated that they needed to determine the feasibility of implementing the previously agreed upon recommendations. To date, multiple meetings and written requests from the committee to receive a comprehensive update from Probation have not been received.

³ [POC Motion: March 13, 2025](#)

Appendix A

Questions provided to the Los Angeles County Probation Department (Probation) prior to the first meeting with the CBO Relationships ad hoc committee:

1. Reportedly, some contracts flow through Probation and others Probation Education Services. Why isn't programming centralized through one place?
2. We have heard from the Chief and Ms. Epps that the department identifies individualizing programs and services for youth as a goal for the future, where is the department in launching that process? What is the timeframe to launch?
3. Are procedures for scheduling centralized anywhere (or through a manager) or different at each facility?
4. What are the timeframes for notification to providers for each month's schedule?
5. Who is responsible for notifying provider of their schedule each month?
6. What is the rate at which CBO providers are not showing up to provide program?
7. POC has observed nearly all placeholder programs (scheduled programs that do not occur/staff and youth are unaware of) are Probation and DMH led. What is the tracking process on Probation and other co-located county partner programming?
8. What is the current process to get clearance?
9. Is there an existing written document describing the background check clearance process? If not, can that be created and used across all facilities?
10. Is there a procedural or timeframe difference for obtaining clearance between Probation or Probation's education services?
11. When there's been an extensive wait for clearance, what contributes to that hold up?
12. Please explain to us how or if being contracted for one facility makes it easier or has no effect on gaining a contract/expanding for another facility?
13. Is there a formalized document or other notification of clearance that is provided to the individual cleared?
14. How long is a clearance valid once granted?
15. FY22-23 total individual community-based program providers granted clearance?
16. FY22-23 total number that applied for clearance?
17. FY22-23 Average wait times for background clearances?
18. If someone has been denied clearance by mistake, meaning an error on behalf of Probation, what is the appeal process?