



# Office of Youth and Community Restoration

Ombudsperson Division  
California Health & Human Services Agency

December 8, 2025

TO: Probation Oversight Commission

FROM: Alisa Hartz, Ombudsperson  
Office of Youth and Community Restoration

RE: *LA County Probation request for model visitation policy language*

The OYCR Ombudsperson Division received a request for technical assistance from the Los Angeles County Probation Department, specifically requesting model visitation recommendations that the LA County Probation Department could use to inform their review and revision of their visitation policy and procedures. The attached memorandum to Director Robert Arcos (“Re: Request for model visitation policy language”) was developed in response to the request and is drafted as recommendations for all juvenile justice facilities operated and staffed by Los Angeles County Probation, including juvenile halls (detention), youth camps, and secure youth treatment facilities (SYTFs). As explained in more detail in the memorandum, these model policy provisions are informed by research on the efficacy of focusing on family engagement and visitation, vetted standards for visitation, and on-the-ground practice and lessons learned from across the country.



# Office of Youth and Community Restoration

Ombudsperson Division  
California Health & Human Services Agency

November 21, 2025 (updated December 5, 2025)

TO: Robert Arcos, Deputy Director  
Los Angeles County Probation Department

FROM: Alisa Hartz, Ombudsperson  
Office of Youth and Community Restoration

RE: *Request for model visitation policy language*

**Background:** In September 2025, the Los Angeles Probation Department asked OYCR to provide technical assistance with their visitation practices. You requested that OYCR provide model visitation policy language that could be used at the local level. This document is a response to that request. The document begins with framework of how the model policy language was developed. The remainder of the document presents language for consideration. As you can see, OYCR relied upon three specific resources of information and expertise in crafting the model policy language now being submitted for your consideration.

**Research on the efficacy of focusing on family engagement and visitation:** Research has repeatedly shown that engaging families is not only an important value; it is a smart and effective strategy when working with youth in or at risk of entering the youth justice system. Youth outcomes are improved when justice system practitioners – from the front door of the system to the deepest stages of system involvement – view family members as resources and engage them at every step of the way.<sup>1</sup> Encouraging and fostering regular and meaningful family visitation when youth are in facilities is a critically important aspect of family engagement. Regular visits between youth in juvenile justice facilities and their families and other important people in their lives have been found to help improve educational outcomes, institutional adjustment, psychological well-being, motivation to participate in programming, likelihood of gaining employment post release, parent-child relationships, reentry success, as well as decrease behavioral incidents in the facility.<sup>2</sup>

**Vetted standards for visitation:** Ongoing revisions to California’s Title 15 regulations (pending approval and adoption) elevate the need to not just allow visitation but actively promote it.<sup>3</sup> The model policy language in this document draws from those revisions, with citations included when relevant. Additionally, the model policy language in this document is heavily informed by – and in places directly cites from – the newly revised national standards on youth confinement from Juvenile Justice

Advocates International.<sup>4</sup> The national standards are built upon 30+ years of research and best practice and have been refined numerous times over that period.

**On-the-ground practice and lessons learned from across the country:** Working alongside a team of OYCR consultants from JustSolve, OYCR has tapped into the expertise of national leaders from justice systems in jurisdictions such as New York City, Washington D.C., Houston, and other large metropolitan areas to compare visitation policies and practices and incorporate lessons learned. OYCR also researched current visitation policies and practices in every county probation department across California, as well as visited various county juvenile facilities to identify what is working well with visitation practices and learn about local strategies for addressing common visitation issues, such as contraband.

### **MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE FOR CONSIDERATION**

The model policy language set forth in this document is responsive to the request from the Department and is grounded in guidance from research and expert consultants. The Department and decision makers, as would be the case with any jurisdiction, will need to ascertain what is feasible now and what can be adopted, planned, and implemented with more time, more training, and nestled within broader system reforms. The purpose of this document is to provide a model to work toward that would best serve the needs of youth and families. The language is broken into five policy sections: (1) purpose, (2) visitation rights, (3) procedures, (4) communication, and (5) special protections and considerations. However, the order and breakdown are less important than the content itself.

While a strong written policy around visitation is certainly important, the core values of the policy itself will only be seen in practice if the *culture* of the agency supports and aligns with it, requiring an organizational culture that values families and recognizes the importance of family engagement. The effectiveness of family engagement efforts is limited when family members feel rejected or judged by juvenile justice systems.<sup>5</sup> An organizational culture that supports families can be realized through staff trainings on related topics such as family engagement, cultural learning, and trauma informed care, as well as through discussions between probation staff regarding the important role of family and visitation and how to make family members partners in a youth's process of healing and accountability.

#### **I. Policy Purpose**

A clear purpose statement grounds the policy in why visitation matters and in the core objectives of the policy. It can demonstrate to anyone reading the policy – staff or family members – commitment to family inclusion, which is important in promoting effective family engagement.<sup>6</sup> For example:

A young person's success in the community is linked to supportive relationships with family members and other loved ones. Because both detention and placement in a secure youth treatment facility (SYTF) are inherently disruptive to those relationships, facility administrators and staff shall ensure there are frequent, accessible, and meaningful opportunities to maintain such connections, including those beyond the youth's immediate biological or legal family.<sup>7</sup>

This visitation policy applies to juvenile halls (detention), youth camps, and secure youth treatment facilities (SYTFs). It establishes uniform procedures for visitation that:

- Maximize opportunities for youth to maintain family and community connections;
- Provide guidance to help comply with visitation requirements in California's Title 15;<sup>8</sup>
- Are informed by the national [Conditions of Youth Confinement Facility Standards](#);<sup>9</sup>
- Aim to prioritize the safety of youth, families, and staff in the facilities; and
- Promote safe reentry and reduced recidivism.

## **II. Visitation Rights**

From the time of a youth's admission, it is critical for facility staff to view family members as resources and partners and recognize the negative effects of detention and longer-term out of home placement on youth and their families.<sup>10</sup> Young people need frequent access to and interactions with parents, siblings, extended family, and supportive adults throughout their time in a facility.<sup>11</sup> These interactions should also be meaningful and reflect the typical family interactions youth have outside of custody, including appropriate physical contact, as these kinds of interactions are crucial for positive mental health outcomes and less violent behavior in youth.<sup>12</sup> To support this, consider the potential policy language below.

### **1. Access**

Visitation is a right, not a privilege, and youth in facilities shall have access to the important people in their life.<sup>13</sup> Youth shall be allowed to receive visits from parents, guardians, persons standing in loco parentis, siblings, children of youth, extended family members, and any other important people in their lives during both regular visitation hours and arranged special visits.<sup>14</sup> Facilities shall not withhold or restrict visits as a form of punishment or discipline.<sup>15</sup>

A visitor shall not be denied solely based on the visitor's criminal history or immigration status.<sup>16</sup> However, a visitor shall be denied or removed if the facility administrator or designee has determined that the visitor:

- Presents a direct threat to the safety of youth, staff, or other visitors;
- Is restricted by court order;
- Is identified by a youth in a written request as someone the youth does not want visiting; or
- Appears to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Any denial or removal of a visitor shall be documented, including the reason for the denial, and communicated to the youth and visitor denied. The facility administrator shall regularly review denials and document such review.

Visiting shall only be cancelled if the facility administrator or designee has determined that an operational or safety and security concern exists. All cancelled visits must be documented, including the reason for the cancellation. The facility administrator or designee shall notify youth and all scheduled visitors of the cancellation as soon as reasonably possible and provide the opportunity to reschedule the visit. The facility administrator shall regularly review cancelled visits and document such review.

Visitors denied or removed by facility staff shall be allowed subsequent visits at the earliest safe opportunity. Any conditions precedent to denied visitors being allowed to visit at a later date will be documented and clearly communicated to the visitor.

Visitors should arrive at least 15 minutes prior to their designated visitation time to allow enough time to check-in and undergo security processes. However, visits shall not be denied or cancelled due to a visitor's late arrival.

Visitors under the age of 18 must be accompanied by an adult unless prior arrangements have been made and approved by the facility administrator or designee. Facilities cannot deny a visitor or exclude them from regular visiting hours in the regular visitation space solely because of their age.

Facilities shall facilitate family time between youth and their children in child-friendly spaces, including private breastfeeding/lactation accommodations, access to diaper change tables and extended contact time to enhance bonding and attachment and extended contact time.

When a youth does not have an in-person visit during their normal visitation hours, facility staff shall provide access to alternative methods for youth to connect with their loved ones during visitation hours, such as extra phone time, virtual visitation, or prompted letter writing activities.

## **2. Frequency, Duration, and Number of Visitors**

Facilities are encouraged to work with youth and their families to schedule as many visits as possible, and youth shall be afforded as many in-person visits and visitors as facility schedules, space, and number of personnel will allow.<sup>17</sup>

Visitation shall be available on both weekdays and weekends, as well as outside normal business hours. At a minimum, each youth shall be allowed – and encouraged to have – two visits per week, with each visit allowed to last at least one hour, ideally two.<sup>18</sup>

If potential visitors are unable to visit a youth due to transportation difficulties or scheduling issues (such as having to work during visitation hours), they may contact the facility to arrange a special visit (see Special Visit section below). If a youth and/or family requests a visit with a greater number of visitors than what is allowed during normal visitation or additional visits outside of the regular visiting hours, facility staff shall work with youth and family to arrange special visits as much as facility schedules, space, and number of personnel allows.

## **3. Contact**

Visitors and youth may engage in appropriate affection and contact during visitation, including a hug/kiss at the beginning and end of the visit and holding hands while seated, unless a specific, immediate, and documented safety concern exists.<sup>19</sup> Young children are allowed to sit next to or on the lap of the youth they are visiting, and to have similar appropriate contact with youth throughout the visit. If the youth's own infant is visiting, the youth shall be allowed to hold, play with and change the baby as needed. There will be no physical barrier preventing contact between youth and visitors.

Contact visits are the standard, non-contact visits will only be required when a significant safety and security consideration is present, including pursuant to any court ordered restrictions on visitations/visitors for the youth or in the case of a temporary and specific health concern such as youth with an active Covid case or other infectious disease.<sup>20</sup> Such cases shall be documented and include details on the specific health/safety concern.

## **4. Visitation Activities**

Staff shall maintain enough distance from youth and visitors to allow for private conversations. Staff may maintain visual supervision and listen for disruptive behavior (such as loud arguments) during visitation, but conversations between youth and visitors shall not be directly monitored unless there is a clear and documented security or safety need. Youth and visitors are allowed to communicate in their native language.

Visitation should be an opportunity for youth and visitors to have genuine, meaningful interactions resembling those they might have in typical home or community environments. To this end, facilities are encouraged to provide appropriate interactive activities to visitors and youth. These activities can include, but are not limited to, board games, puzzles, activity books, paper and writing utensils. Additionally, facilities are encouraged to facilitate youth and visitors taking pictures together and allow both youth and visitors to receive a copy of pictures taken.

Youth and visitors shall be allowed to engage in appropriate cultural or religious activities together, only limited by specific concerns of space, safety, and disruption to other visitors. Such activities may include, but are not limited to, birthday celebrations, hair braiding, prayer, and religious/cultural ceremonies, as long as these activities are not disruptive towards other visitors, youth, or staff. Visitors shall be allowed to bring in appropriate items for these activities, subject to search and approval by probation staff. Any denial of activities or refusal of items shall be documented and include details on specific health/safety concerns.

All visitors and youth are expected to conduct themselves appropriately during visiting. Any activity that threatens facility security or the safety of youth, other visitors, or facility staff may result in termination of the visit and may impact the ability of the visitor to visit in the future. Any early termination of visit will be documented by facility staff, including the reason for termination.

### **III. Procedures**

For youth placed in facilities, visitation procedures dictate what is often their only opportunity to see their loved ones in person. It is therefore crucial that these procedures encourage visitation and foster meaningful family engagement while also preserving the security of facilities. Giving families a variety of opportunities to engage with youth outside of regular visitation hours helps to address practical barriers that often prevent regular visitation.<sup>21</sup> Comfortable visitation environments and positive staff interactions with visitors and youth are also key factors in fostering the genuine family engagement linked with positive youth outcomes.<sup>22</sup>

Security procedures during visitor intake are particularly important both for maintaining facility safety and demonstrating an organizational culture which respects families and fosters family engagement. Security measures should accurately prevent real threats without denying visitors that do not have contraband or otherwise present a direct threat to security.

To support this, consider the potential policy language below.

## 1. Special Visits

Special visits are any visits outside of regularly scheduled times or which include individuals not already on a youth's approved visitors list.<sup>23</sup> Youth and visitors shall be informed that they may request special visits for review and approval from the facility administrator or designee. Staff shall communicate with visitors to schedule special visits during times that work best for visitors and shall include family in the youth's significant milestones such as birthdays and graduations.

Youth should be allowed to participate in significant life events such as the birth of their own children and family funerals.

Facilities are encouraged to plan special group visits/events, including multiple youth and their families, for special occasions including but not limited to graduations, holidays, family days, and community building events. These events are important opportunities for youth and family to build community and connect with loved ones during important life events in a way that fosters age-appropriate bonding, connection, and a sense of belonging. Facilities are encouraged to allow families to bring food items to share with youth for these special group events/visits, subject to appropriate security procedures.

## 2. Alternative Visitation

For visitors that have difficulty travelling to the facility, facilities shall provide access to virtual visitation platforms (e.g., Zoom, FaceTime), as often as facility schedules, space, and number of personnel will allow. These virtual visits may supplement, but do not replace, in-person visits.<sup>24</sup> Any virtual visitation should be in a private space, with appropriate staff supervision and should not be recorded. The platform selected should be readily available on all common communication devices.

## 3. Professional and Volunteer Visits

Visits by professionals and program volunteers shall not count toward a youth's regular visitation requirements or otherwise impact a youth's ability to visit their loved ones. Attorneys and support staff/paralegals are allowed to visit the youth at any reasonable time. Religious or community leaders, counselors, or therapists are permitted to visit upon request of the child or guardian and included in the approved visitation list. Volunteers may visit in accordance with all provisions of this policy.

## 4. Visitor Identification

All visitors age 14 and older shall be asked to show ID. Forms of ID may include:

- Valid driver's license with photo

- Valid state identification with photo
- Passport with photo
- Military identification with photo
- Photo identification card issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service
- Certificado de Matricula Consular identification cards
- Department of Justice Identification with photo
- Valid school ID
- For youth in long term custody the probation department can create a probation generated ID with a photo which allows the family member to visit the youth without stress and/or delay.

So that no child is denied visits due to a visitor's economic situation or immigration status, alternative forms of ID will be considered, upon review by the facility administrator or designee.<sup>25</sup>

## **5. Security**

Visitors are prohibited from bringing into the facility any weapons, alcohol, narcotics, or other items that pose a direct threat to the health and safety of youth, other visitors, or facility staff. All visitors shall be subject to non-invasive search protocols upon entering the facility.<sup>26</sup> These search protocols may include but are not limited to the following or any combination thereof: metal detectors, full-body scanners, handheld wands/tracing units, or cell phone interruption and detection technology (Managed Access System). Sniffer/detector dogs are not advised and, if used, shall not be the reason alone that a visitor is denied.<sup>27</sup> Appropriate and culturally responsive policies shall be applied to searches involving religious attire of any sort including headcovers or clothing accessories.

A visitor may stop a search at any point but may be asked to exit the facility without visiting their youth if a search is refused. Posted policies shall explain search procedures simply, accessibly, and in multiple languages. Any denial of visitation based on the results of security/search protocols will be documented by facility staff, including a detailed description of search methods utilized and the reason for denial.<sup>28</sup> Youth must be notified of their visitor being denied as soon as reasonably possible, and no later than the same day.

Facilities will provide free and securable lockers to visitors or otherwise designate a secure space where visitors can store their belongings (e.g., handbags, keys, cell phones) for the duration of the visit.

Staff may inspect the visiting area for contraband before and after each visit and shall document such inspections.

## 6. Environment

Staff shall treat visitors with respect and dignity, welcoming them into the facility as a key component of their youth's rehabilitation and well-being, and only turning visitors away when immediate safety and security concerns exist.<sup>29</sup>

Visitation spaces shall be comfortable, family-friendly, and furnished to resemble typical home or community settings as much as is possible.<sup>30</sup> Facility staff shall create interactive spaces for youth and visitors to enhance visitation and promote positive relationship building.

Public restrooms and entrances shall be accessible to persons with limited mobility.

## 7. Dress Code

Visitors are required to follow a dress code that ensures a safe environment, while still preserving visitors' comfort and self-expression. Staff shall only deny visitation due to dress code as a last resort, and work to resolve dress code issues collaboratively with visitors.<sup>31</sup> If any of the following dress code requirements are not met at the time of the scheduled visit, staff shall demonstrate flexibility and help visitors make adjustments in order to meet requirements, including instructing the visitor to remove disallowed clothing or turn it inside out, or providing access to a clothing bank, when available. If visitation is denied solely for dress code violation, staff shall document the denial, including a detailed description of how requirement(s) were not met, how/why the dress code violations were a direct safety concern, and listing the actions that staff took to attempt to work with the visitor to resolve the issue.<sup>32</sup>

Dress Code:

- Shoes, shirts, and bottoms (pants, shorts, skirts, or dresses) must be worn at all times
- No transparent (see through) clothing
- No clothing or accessories that could be used as a weapon, such as pins and broaches
- No clothing or accessories with content that is explicitly violent, pornographic, or contains hate speech

Tattoos: Visitors will **only** be required to cover tattoos when content is explicitly violent, pornographic, or contains hate speech. The presence alone of such tattoos shall not be a reason to turn away a visitor. If the visitor is willing to cover the concerning content with clothing or bandages, visitation can proceed. Facilities shall have bandages on hand to offer, when needed.

#### **IV. Communication with Youth and Family**

Open and frequent communication between probation and a youth's family is essential in fostering meaningful visitation, promoting family engagement, and overall program success.<sup>33</sup> To accomplish this, staff should regularly initiate communication with family members to both plan visitation and seek their input on making decisions that affect their youth.<sup>34</sup> To support this, consider the potential policy language below.

Facilities shall create and maintain lines of communication between case managers/facility staff, youth, and family members regarding visitation. This communication shall be initiated by facility staff shortly after a youth is placed at a facility. Facility staff shall discuss future visits with youth and family members, with the goal of encouraging and helping to foster regular visits for each youth. Staff shall work with family members to address potential obstacles to regular visitation, such as transportation issues or scheduling conflicts, and aid family members in addressing these issues as much as possible, such as by referring to local resources or scheduling special visits. Staff shall demonstrate an understanding that each youth and family's visitation needs are individualized and practice flexibility and cooperation in identifying and accommodating individual needs to the extent operationally feasible.

Given the fact that youth placed in SYTFs are separated from their families for an extended length of time, SYTFs shall place a greater emphasis on collaborating with youth and their families to facilitate visitation. To this end, SYTF leadership shall create a written visitation plan along with the youth and their family members. Youth shall be consulted to identify family members to target with visitation efforts. Staff, youth, and family members will collaborate to document each family members' planned visitation schedule in the visitation plan. When planned visits do not occur, staff shall follow-up as much as possible with the youth's family to discuss the reasons for missed visits, make reasonable efforts to prevent similar problems in future visits, and document the results in the youth's visitation plan.

When a youth has not received an in-person visit for 90 calendar days or is unable to identify any family members or close supportive adults they wish to visit, even with documented attempts from facility staff to identify potential family visitors and address any potential barriers to visitation, facility staff shall work to connect the youth to a supportive adult that can regularly visit.<sup>35</sup> Staff shall initiate a Family Finding effort for youth who have no identifiable family in partnership with either their Child Welfare partners or a local CBO. Staff should prioritize natural connections to the youth's community or culture, such as distant relatives, religious/community leaders, teachers, coaches, CASAs, credible messengers or other trusted adults the youth has had positive interactions with, even if they do not currently have a close or familial relationship. If staff are unable to assist the

youth with connecting with adults such as these, facility staff should work with community-based organizations to connect youth with volunteers and/or mentors that can regularly visit the youth during normal visitation hours.

Facilities shall post up-to-date visiting hours, rights, and procedures in English, Spanish and other needed languages in visiting areas and online and distribute them directly to youth and families as appropriate and upon request. Facilities will include both the hours and the visitation policies in the Parent Orientation packet and online. The packet shall be available for parents of youth upon admission to the juvenile facility, available in the lobby areas of the facilities that are accessible to the public, and provided to the courthouse to be shared with parents of youth who may be remanded to custody from court.

Facilities shall also post and distribute age-appropriate and youth- and family-friendly versions of the Youth Bill of Rights (provided by the Office of Youth and Community Restoration) in English, Spanish, and other languages, pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code § 224.72(c).

## **V. Special Protections and Considerations**

Lastly, including protections and considerations in visitation policies that express a commitment to and actions towards transparency, non-discrimination, and staff development works to demonstrate both a high standard of care as well as a commitment to youth and family members. This demonstrates respect for youth and family members that is essential for quality family engagement, including visitation.<sup>36</sup>

### **Non-Discrimination**

Visitation rights apply without discrimination of any kind, including race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, nationality, disability, religious, or immigration status.

### **Emergency Continuity of Contact**

In emergencies (e.g., public health), any temporary restrictions on in-person visits must be necessary, proportionate, time-limited, documented, and subject to oversight. Alternative communication must be ensured.

### **Trauma-Informed, Positive Youth Development, and Family-Engagement Practice**

Facility staff shall receive training on trauma-informed approaches, family engagement, and positive youth development to help inform and support effective implementation of this policy.

### **Review and Oversight**

Children and families shall be informed of their right to file grievances regarding visitation. Independent oversight bodies (Ombudspersons, oversight committees) shall have regular and unannounced access to facilities to monitor conditions, with private interviews of children.

## Citations

1. Lipsey, M. W., Howell, J. C., Kelly, M. R., Chapman, G., & Carver, D. (2010). *Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice*. Georgetown University Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.  
<https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/improving-effectiveness-juvenile-justice-programs-new-perspective>

Shanahan, R. & diZerega, M. (2016). *Identifying, Engaging, and Empowering Families: A Charge for Juvenile Justice Agencies*. The Vera Institute of Justice.  
<https://vera-institute.files.svdcdn.com/production/downloads/publications/family-engagement-for-juvenile-justice-agencies.pdf?dm=1568746318>

National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, p. 11.  
<https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/14685/reforming-juvenile-justice-a-developmental-approach>.

Villalobos, S. (2013). *The Impact of Family Visitation on Incarcerated Youth's Behavior and School Performance: Findings from the Families as Partners Project*. The Vera Institute of Justice. <https://vera-institute.files.svdcdn.com/production/downloads/publications/impact-of-family-visitation-on-incarcerated-youth-brief.pdf?dm=1647369891>

The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022). *Family Engagement in Juvenile Justice Systems: Building a Strategy and Shifting the Culture*.  
<https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/family-engagement-in-juvenile-justice-systems/>

Mikytuck, A., Woolard, J. & and Umpierre, M. (2019). *Improving Engagement, Empowerment, and Support in Juvenile Corrections through Research*. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, Volume 5, Number 2: 182–92.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Ftps0000190>

2. Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2013). *Blessed Be the Social Tie That Binds: The Effects of Prison Visitation on Offender Recidivism*. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. Volume 24. Issue 3: 271-296. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0887403411429724>

Campion Young, B., Collier, N., & Brown, S. (Fall 2021). *Visitation Policies in Residential Facilities in all 50 States*. *Justice Policy Journal*, Volume 18, Number 2. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.  
[https://www.cjcj.org/media/import/documents/visitation\\_young\\_et.al.pdf](https://www.cjcj.org/media/import/documents/visitation_young_et.al.pdf)

Villalobos, S. (2013).

National Institute of Corrections. *Video Visiting In Corrections: Benefits, Limitations, And Implementation Considerations.*

<https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/029609.pdf>

Shanahan, R. & diZerega, M. (2016).

Campion Young, B., Nadel, M., Pesta, G., & Bales, W. (2019). *Family Attachment and Juvenile Justice Outcomes: An Assessment of Visitation of Juvenile Delinquents in Residential Facilities.* U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.

<https://www.ojp.gov/library/publications/family-attachment-and-juvenile-justice-outcomes-assessment-visitation-juvenile>

3. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025). *Juvenile Titles 15 and 24 Regulations Revision ESC Materials.* <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/juvenile-titles-15-and-24-regulations-revision-esc-materials/>

4. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025). *Conditions of Youth Confinement: Facility Standards and Resources.* Juvenile Justice Advocates International.

[https://www.jjadvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/JJAI\\_2025\\_Detention\\_Standards.pdf](https://www.jjadvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/JJAI_2025_Detention_Standards.pdf)

5. The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).

6. The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).

7. This language comes nearly verbatim from the *Conditions of Youth Confinement: Facility Standards and Resources.* Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

Lipsey, M. W., Howell, J. C., Kelly, M. R., Chapman, G., & Carver, D. (2010).

Shanahan, R. & diZerega, M. (2016).

The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).

Mikytuck, A., Woolard, J. & and Umpierre, M. (2019).

8. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

9. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

10. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).

Mikytuck, A., Woolard, J. & and Umpierre, M. (2019).

11. Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2013).

Villalobos, S. (2013).

12. Takeuchi, M.S., Miyaoka, H., Tomoda, A. et al. (2010). *The Effect of Interpersonal Touch During Childhood on Adult Attachment and Depression: A Neglected Area of Family and Developmental Psychology*. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 19: 109-117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-009-9290-x>

Field, T. *Violence and Touch Deprivation in Adolescents*. (2002). *Adolescence*. Volume 37(148): 735-49. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12564826/>

13. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

Office of Youth and Community Restoration. (n.d.). *Youth Bill of Rights*. <https://oycr.ca.gov/ombudsperson/>

California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

14. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

15. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

16. Proposed revisions to Title 15 requirements state that visitors shall not be denied because of criminal history alone. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

17. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

Takeuchi, M.S., Miyaoka, H., Tomoda, A. et al. (2010).

18. Proposed revisions to Title 15 requirements state that each youth shall be allowed the opportunity for a minimum of two visits totaling at least two hours per week. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

19. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

Contact visits are standard across multiple counties of California, including Alameda, San Joaquin, Sonoma, Tuolumne, and Yolo. Leaders who have overseen facilities in large jurisdictions such as New York City, D.C., and Houston also shared that contact visits were the standard for them.

20. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

Takeuchi, M.S., Miyaoka, H., Tomoda, A. et al. (2010).

21. Campion Young, B., Nadel, M., Pesta, G., & Bales, W. (2019).

22. American Institutes for Research (AIR), prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). (2024). *Creating Conditions that Promote Safety, Healing, and Growth in Child-Parent Visits*.

<https://www.ojp.gov/library/publications/creating-conditions-promote-safety-healing-and-growth-child-parent-visits>

23. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

24. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

25. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

26. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).

27. Leaders who have overseen facilities in large jurisdictions such as New York City, D.C., and Houston shared that they do/did not use sniffer dogs in youth facilities while overseeing operations.

Alerts from dogs being the sole reason to reject potential visitors has raised concerns of both inaccuracy and feelings of disrespect from visitors. Although lab testing finds detector dog accuracy to be ~90%, visitor concerns are supported by evidence that these dogs are significantly less accurate in real world settings and that handler behavior unconsciously impacts dog alerts on a regular basis.

Jeziarski, T., Adamkiewicz, E., Walczak, M. et al. (2014). *Efficacy of Drug Detection by Fully-Trained Police Dogs Varies by Breed, Training Level, Type of Drug and Search Environment*. *Forensic Science International*. Volume 237:112-8.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0379073814000371?via%3Dihub>

Peralta, E. (2011,). *Report: Drug-Sniffing Dogs are Wrong More Often Than Right*. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2011/01/07/132738250/report-drug-sniffing-dogs-are-wrong-more-often-than-right>

Lit, L., Schweitzer, J., & Oberbauer, A. (2011). *Handler Beliefs Affect Scent Detection Dog Outcomes*. *Animal Cognition*. Volume 14. Number 3: 387-394.  
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3078300/>

J., J., Papet, E., & and L. E. (2011). *Cueing and Probable Cause: Research May Increase Defense Attacks on and Judicial Skepticism of Detection Dog Evidence*. Animal Law Legal Center. <https://www.animallaw.info/article/cueing-and-probable-cause-research-may-increase-defense-attacks-and-judicial-skepticism#:~:text=Cueing%20in%20Criminal%20Law,cued%20her%20dog%20to%20alert>

28. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).
29. American Institutes for Research (AIR), prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). (2024).
30. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).
31. Many California probation departments do not include detailed dress code policies in their visitation guidelines. Site visits and conversations with probation leaders both in California and across the country revealed that a visit being denied for a dress code violation alone is a rarity for many, if not most, juvenile justice facilities.
32. Proposed revisions to Title 15 requirements state that any denial of visitation shall be documented. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).
33. The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).
34. Keillor, D., News, J., & JJI, R. (2025).
35. California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2025).

36. The Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2022).