



LOS ANGELES COUNTY

PROBATION OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

**September 16, 2025**

**Published on December 11, 2025**

# **INSPECTOR REPORT FOR CAMP GLENN ROCKEY (CGR)**

***Prepared By:***

**Sarah Gongora, Psy.D.**



## INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles County Probation Oversight Commission (POC), in its mission to oversee and make recommendations to the Los Angeles County Probation Department (Probation), is completing the 2025 Annual Inspections of all of Probation’s detention facilities, marking the fifth year of inspections.

The POC has found it of critical importance to provide substantial feedback to Probation, the Board of Supervisors (Board), and public stakeholders after each inspection of the conditions observed within the facilities. This summary presents the findings of the third facility inspected during this annual cycle: Camp Glenn Rockey (CGR). While the POC collected a large amount of information at this inspection, takeaways were derived from the most impactful observations and interviews made during the day.

**The following list represents key findings from the inspection of Camp Glenn Rockey (CGR):**

- ***A rapidly increasing population and plans for other facilities strains the facility’s long running successful functioning*** – Since the closure of Camp Joseph Paige (CJP) earlier this year, the number of youth steadily increased at CGR, with staffing numbers that may decrease in 2026 due to the expiration of a yearlong contract with a handful of officers. The number of youth dispositioned to CGR from Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall continues to rise, placing strain on youth already there, decreasing the amount of time and energy that Probation Officers can dedicate to each youth’s transition into the facility, and straining the supervision abilities of a small number of officers.
- ***Probation Officers need support during transitions*** – The integration of CJP youth, increases in population, and the intensive needs of young people coming to this facility indicates that the Probation Department needs to provide their officers with more than basic training. Staff need two-way communication, consideration of their expertise, and response to their professional needs.

## BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles County Probation Oversight Commission (POC) was established in 2021 as a civilian-led oversight commission focused on systemic reform of the Probation Department. The POC advises the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (Board) and the Los Angeles County Probation Department (Probation) about progress and challenges within Probation. The POC has considerable authority and responsibilities directly related to juvenile institutions. Specifically, Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations, section 1313 (f), requires the POC to conduct annual inspections of the buildings, grounds, and services delivered to the young people detained in each of the County’s juvenile facilities on an annual basis. The Board also granted the POC specific authority to “as permitted by law... conduct unannounced inspections of any facility, and its non-confidential records, where any juvenile probationer can be held or where probationers receive services and “prepare reports on inspection findings” for the Board



(LACC Sections 3.80.040(B) and 3.80.050(A)). The POC submits these annual reports to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), a statutory agency that inspects for compliance of standards of detention facilities in California, by December 31<sup>st</sup> each year and shares the report with the Board and the public. This report marks the fifth round of annual inspections conducted by this body.

## METHODS

### **Details about the inspection of Camp Glenn Rockey (CGR):**

- Two POC Commissioners conducted the inspection. Two POC staff members provided support during the inspection.
- The CGR inspection was conducted on September 16, 2025, and took six hours to complete.
- Dates for the inspections were coordinated with Probation's Executive Leadership and leaders from the facility were aware in advance of the inspection.
- The BSCC does not have a required template for the inspection report, so the POC previously developed a detailed facility inspection template that was updated this year and reviewed by Probation and the BSCC. Within the inspections template, key themes are included to ensure a thorough inspection of both physical structure and environment. The template also highlights the need to examine practices and the treatment of youth at the facility.

The information below depicts data gathered directly from the Camp Glenn Rockey inspection. It should be noted that the data is a "snapshot" of information recorded only on the day of the inspection. The data collected was provided to the POC staff by the facility's Director; and each of these numbers was reported as received. The findings stated in this report are a compilation of POC Commissioner and staff observations made while conducting the inspections.

## GENERAL DATA FOR CGR

- **Address:** 1900 N Sycamore Cyn Road, San Dimas, California 91773
- **Facility Type:** Camp
- **Housing:** Open dorm sleeping quarters and a Hope Center with individual locking rooms
- **Rated Capacity:** 125
- **Youth population present at facility:** 52 (1 released during inspection)
- **Number of boys/young men:** 52
- **Youth at Court/Medical:** 0
- **Youth with DCFS services:** 4
- **Youth with developmental disabilities:** 1
- **Total number of Probation employees assigned to the facility (sworn and non-sworn):** 112
- **Probation Officers on duty at time of inspection:** 23-AM, 18-PM



## FACILITY AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Upon entering front building door, Probation Officers were present and managing the front door scanner and using a wand as an additional security precaution which all visitors were observed being cleared through during the day. The facility structure and outdoor structures were aged but clean and well kept. The campus has a full grassy field where young people reported having physical education and participating in sports with Probation staff, especially on weekends. Young people reported that they liked the outdoor openness of the environment at the camp. Grievance information, Youth Bill of Rights, Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) and Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) posters were mounted on walls in sleeping quarters, the dining hall, and throughout buildings.

On the day of the inspection, CGR housed young people ages 13-19. Prior to this year, the camp was primarily used to house younger youth, but in the last several months since the closure and integration of Camp Joseph Paige (CJP), attempts to separate youth with wide age differences were abandoned due to a rapid increase that nearly doubled the camp's population. POC inquired about the upper limits of population based on available staffing and it was indicated that to continue operations with the current number of staff, the population should remain at 60 or under.

Young people reported that they were oriented to the rules and procedures upon arrival and received refreshers periodically. New young people also received peer mentoring from other motivated youth to assist with camp integration. The peer mentoring model was included with orientation due to the increase in fights, tensions, and other serious incidents following the increase in new arrivals from Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH).

Visitation took place every Sunday from 1pm-4pm. It was reported that accommodations were made for those families that were not available during regular visitation hours, which included Probation's standard of offering special visits to ensure that youth were able to maintain important family connections before release. It was reported that Probation's canine unit was used for security purposes during visitation on Sundays. It was also reported that youth and parents were allowed to share a hug and have other monitored physical contact which had not resulted in contraband issues nor illicit substance use at the facility. It was reported that Probation Officers were able to monitor any physical contact. There appeared to be recognition among the facility's leadership and various officers interviewed about the positive impact that physical contact with a parent or grandparent has on young people.

Young people receive a minimum of one phone call per week which are supervised by Probation Officers. It was reported that young people who had worked up to a higher reward level for being able to follow the program and behavioral expectations of the facility earned the ability to have FaceTime calls, which were also monitored by the young persons' assigned Probation Officer.



Facility leadership shared that there were many young people on a Special Supervision Program (SSP), and all young people in the facility received at least three multi-disciplinary team (MDT) meetings while at CGR. The first meeting was expected to occur upon entry, where partner-agencies, parents, and the young person meet to discuss the plan for the young person's stay, the second meeting then adds Credible Messenger partners who work closely with the young person, and the third meeting includes all mentioned above to plan for transition into release from the facility. MDT meetings could also be held as needed, including to address any ongoing behavioral or mental health issues posing a barrier to the young person struggling to adapt to some part of the CGR program. A young person was interviewed just prior to being released on the day of the inspection. They shared that they had recently had their last MDT and were informed of who their assigned field Probation Officer was. The young person shared that they were planning on attending a construction trade school and finishing their driver's test as they had only completed the written portion with the assistance of their current Probation Officer. The young person explained that their stay at Camp Rockey "was good... it went by quick... the staff were good" compared to their stay at Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH) where they "could do whatever we wanted".

The sleeping quarters for the young people was a camp style multi-occupancy unit with a day room facing the west side upon entrance, and the washroom with urinals were on the northside. Beds were divided into four sections; Alpha, Bravo, Charlie and Delta. The facility preferred to house youth in the wings of the dorm according to behavior stage whenever possible (See *Discipline/Positive Behavior Reinforcement*). Young people in the sleeping quarters shared that they had a hard time falling asleep due to the night lights.

### KITCHEN AND FOOD

The kitchen appeared clean and well-kept, with all machinery in good operation. The meal menu was posted on the wall which also had a list of young people with dietary restrictions who signed after receiving their special meal. The kitchen had two young people in the kitchen program, who were assisting with cleaning, passing out food, and other kitchen related work. The kitchen program was a paid program through the American Jobs Center of California (AJJC) and considered a vocational program.

During the lunch hour, the youth assigned to each wing of the dorm were escorted to the dining hall and entered one-by-one, in a very orderly and calm way. As young people were entering, Probation Officers provided them with lunch, and it was noted that young people were offered the option to have additional portions. It was reported that Probation Officers eat the same meal as young people unless they bring their own food to work. Seating in the cafeteria was assigned by unit. Young people were allowed to converse quietly once they finished their meal. Probation staff were present and supervised, and interacted with young people, answered questions, joked, and were seen listening to the expressed concerns of young people. Lunch consisted of hot dogs and condiments, including mustard and ketchup, coleslaw, potato salad, watermelon, and milk. Food appeared



ample, nutritious and appetizing. A commissioner sampled the lunch and had no complaints.

## EDUCATION

- **Number of full-time LACOE teachers: 6**
  - **Assigned: 4**
  - **Day-to-Day (not long-term) Substitutes: 2**
- **High School Students:**
  - **In School: 47**
  - **Suspended: 0**
- **Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs): 20**
- **High School Graduates: 5**
- **College Students: 1**
- **Dual enrollment students: 0**
- **College(s) supporting this facility: Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC)**

A LACOE math class was observed, where there were four LACOE staff including a paraprofessional, principal, math teacher, and a special education teacher along with two Probation officers sitting in. The classroom was clean, bright and decorated with educational posters and student work. The young people appeared engaged, as the teacher was able to regain their attention from the distraction caused by the inspection and they participated in the class activity. It was reported that the math teacher had been awarded LACOE teacher of the year. Posters for grievances, Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) Ombudsperson, Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), and Youth Bill of Rights were not observed in LACOE classrooms, nor on the outside of LACOE administration building.

---

## College

Probation Education Services managed college operations delivered by Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC) at CGR. It was reported that there was a community helper that assisted with bringing laptops, workbooks, and school materials to the student. It was reported that in accordance with what was required for the Rising Scholars program, The Mt. SAC counselor visited students, though it was noted that a regular visiting schedule had not yet been established for ongoing counseling. The college student reported taking one course at a time, currently Psychology during the summer A-session term, and then planned to take Sociology during the summer B-session. All college classes were asynchronous, with lectures available through a web-based learning management system, Canvas, and professors were willing to virtually meet with enrolled students on a monthly basis. No tutoring services were provided by Mt. SAC, and it was reported that Probation Education Services staff were ready to assist when the current college student did not understand course material. Probation Education Services shared that there were several obstacles in providing college courses at the facility including not having a designated classroom and having to work in the sleeping quarter's day room where there



were several distractions. The distractions were described as “constantly trying to compete with video games and movies”.

In addition to managing college operations, Probation Education Services also managed programs such as Money Smart - a financial literacy course, Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), Career Zone, paid work programs sponsored by AJCC for graduates, and other paid work programs sponsored by LACOE for high school students.

## GRIEVANCES

- **Total Grievances<sup>1</sup>:** 29
- **Grievance system:** Paper only
- **Emergency grievances:** 4

Grievance rules and procedures were posted throughout the facility, including in the dormitory. Interviews with youth indicated that they understand the grievance procedure. All grievances reviewed were responded to within three business days as required by [Probation’s Grievance Policy](#).<sup>2</sup> Grievances included concerns about rights violations, services, concerns about Probation Officers and partner agency staff interactions, and other issues. Four emergency (Prison Rape Elimination Act/Health/Suspected Abuse) grievances were observed. All PREA related grievances were responded to immediately as required by policy and indicated steps taken to follow up including referring the complaints to Probation’s PREA coordination team. Some grievances noted that young people declined a copy of their grievance. This information was written in on the grievance form, as there was no “declined” option for the young person in the “*Received a copy of grievance*” section of the form. All grievances reviewed had documentation support attached to the original form, which clearly displayed the steps taken to resolve the grievance.

## DISCIPLINE/POSITIVE BEHAVIOR REINFORCEMENT

Facility leadership indicated that the camp used a combination of a Behavior Management Program (BMP) also utilized at the juvenile hall, in addition to the casework model which included journaling which is used at the Secure Youth Treatment Facilities. It was reported that Probation generally made bed assignments for youth in accordance to their achieved “level” for four quarters of the dorm, Alpha, Beta, Charlie, and Delta. Those sleeping in Alpha were generally on stage one with an approximate average length of stay of seven days. Bravo was for those on stage two with an approximate average length of stay of at least 14 days, Charlie was for those on stage three and an approximate average length of stay of at least 21 days, and Delta was for those on stage four and an approximate average length of stay longer than 21 days. With each level achieved, youth receive additional positive behavior reinforcements.

---

<sup>1</sup> POC generally requests all the grievances from the current calendar year, unless that number is deemed too small to get a reasonable sense of common grievance themes for the facility. The grievances provided and reviewed were from January 2025 onward.

<sup>2</sup> [Los Angeles County Probation 2020 RTSB Policy Manual](#)



Interviews with young people at the facility indicated that the Probation Officers' demonstrations of empathy and consistency yielded positive results for all. Young people reported that they felt that most officers were fair, tried to understand them, and provided helpful, honest guidance. Various officers throughout the day discussed having understanding for the behavior of young people while helping them to address and change some of those behaviors. Many officers repeatedly remarked that they could immediately tell which youth spent extended time at the juvenile hall by the level of violence they attempted when arriving at CGR. Officers expressed concern and understanding for the trauma of that experience and reported that they would work intensively with some youth to "get the LP out of them" so they could successfully function at the camp.

### ACCESS TO MEDICAL/MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Department of Health Services-Juvenile Court Health Services (JCHS) reported hours of operation from 6:30am-10:00pm seven days per week including holidays. They reported that a physician was available on-site on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and medical services at LPJH could be utilized for after-hours care, or, depending on the urgency, young people were taken to directly to a hospital.

The Department of Mental Health (DMH) reported hours of operation from 7:00 or 7:30am to 8:00pm, seven days per week and access to a 24-hour on-call psychiatrist for psychiatric emergencies after-hours. DMH reported full staffing and expressed concern about the rapidly rising population numbers as continual increases would eventually cause workload strain. It was reported that in addition to individual therapy services, DMH was conducting approximately 10-15 family therapy sessions a month for youth when clinically indicated. It was reported that participating youth and their family had one to two sessions a month and that when family was available to do therapy in person, DMH provided transportation to the camp. Family therapy was also offered via virtual teleconference or over the phone if needed.

Young people reported having easy and regular access to medical and mental health services as needed and whenever requested without needing to write a formal request. Young people reported that they only needed to ask Probation Officers in the dorm to call their JCHS or DMH counterparts to be seen with minimal wait. Young people reported feeling heard and respected both by DMH and JCHS employees. DMH reported concern surrounding the complex and profound effects of trauma on youth dispositioned to CGR in the last year and reflected that childhood experiences, whatever brought the young person into detention, and the effects of detention itself were seriously impairing youth functioning and well-being to the extent that mental health professionals questioned why some youth were not sent to The Dorothy Kirby Center instead<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Dorothy Kirby Center has historically been Probation's residential locked facility providing intensive mental health services and psychiatric care to youth who go through a multi-pronged clearance process assessing level of need.



## AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

JCHS staff shared that agency relationships had recently improved but indicated that more improvement was needed. It was reported that issues with Probation transportation services to get youth to scheduled appointments outside of the facility was a source of tension that had recently resolved. JCHS staff shared that although there had been improvements in transportation, there were still communication issues amongst both Probation and JCHS because nurses found it inappropriate to treat young people in the dorm, citing privacy issues and lack of medical equipment, which they reported prevented them from being able to deliver the best care possible.

DMH reported that they felt that the relationship with Probation was at an all-time high. This was largely attributed to the long-term and stable relationships between mental health clinicians and Probation Officers who worked side by side to support young people who were often struggling with serious mental health symptoms. It was reported that ongoing and casual consultation between officers and clinicians helped improve the camp environment and served as a way to support Probation Officers' understanding of how trauma looks when it manifests into behavior. DMH reported they were pleased to see the facility fully staffed and expressed concern for young people and their Probation colleagues as the population of the facility continued to climb upward.

It was reported by both DMH and JCHS that there were multi-agency meetings every Wednesday, which representatives from both agencies found helpful and helped to keep communication fluid between all co-located departments and partners. It was also reported that all partners participated in the Multi-disciplinary Team Meetings which were used to plan transitions for each young person.

## STAFFING

- **Callouts by Supervision Staff (16-hour shift): 6**
- **Supervision Staff on Leave(s) (AM and PM Shifts Combined): 16**
- **Deployed Staff Providing Supervision (AM and PM Shifts Combined): 0**
- **Supervision Staff on Holdovers and Overtime (AM and PM Shifts Combined): 0**

Probation Officers shared that they were content with their assignment at Camp Rockey, and numerous officers indicated that facility leadership fostered a positive work environment and that collaborative relationships with LACOE, JCHS, and DMH colleagues brought a sense of teamwork. Probation officers cited having “enough” coverage as a positive feature at Camp Rockey, where they usually had about 18 officers working and 25 during overlap days. The current coverage was attributed to the deployed staff with one-year contracts, which meant that overtime was “rare”, and holdovers did not occur at the facility. There was significant concern however about what would happen when the contracts expire in February 2026, as most predicted that the items would be sunk into the efforts to bring the juvenile hall into compliance.



Leadership and Probation Officers at the camp expressed a great deal of pride about their ability to work with and deescalate young people in a way that minimized violence and disruption to their lives. Officers talked about the young people in ways that exemplified the understanding they had about the complex histories of young people and lessons they learned and regularly applied to be able to establish rapport and provide mentorship. While officers acknowledged the challenges of having a more crowded population at the camp, they expressed grit and positivity in facing that challenge. Many young people reported that they had at least one Probation Officer at the camp to whom they felt “very connected”. When discussing their favorite staff one youth said, “Some staff connect different but I got a lot of support here, and here is where I’ve been able to put together my goals. The best thing I ever learned was here, and that’s routine.”

However, there was disappointment with the lack of career mobility, as it was shared that those in the DPO I position were rarely given the opportunity to promote. It was reported that some Probation officers had been a DPO I for more than twenty years without the opportunity of promotion. Various Probation Officers also remarked that the widely promoted bonuses offered for officers to transfer from other jurisdictions was demoralizing while they consistently show up with years of experience and “We can’t get promoted, can’t get a 24k bonus, and aren’t recognized by Downey.”

### HOPE CENTER/ROOM CONFINEMENT

Camp Rockey had a Hope Center in the facility for young people to decompress after an incident or due to medical fragility. Four young people were housed in the Hope Center with two from Camp Afflerbaugh (CBA) and two from CGR. It was reported that youth from CGR rarely used the Hope Center as a result of the de-escalation approaches used by the officers. It was reported that while youth regularly come from CBA to the CGR Hope Center, in the last year, youth were staying for less time and the CGR officer felt that the administration and supervisors at CBA made positive changes in communication and planning to take youth back to that camp more quickly. Officers noted that CBA often picked up “late night fighters” who stayed the night in the Hope Center between 7:00-7:30am the following day. No youth in the Hope Center were in room confinement nor self-separation. Due to the dorm setting, room confinement in the dorm at CGR is not possible.

### PROGRAMMING

All programs on site matched the program schedule and were occurring at their reported time. Commissioners observed young people participating in the Substance Abuse group programming provided by DMH. The group appeared engaging as young people were focused and actively participating. Gang Reduction and Youth Development (GRYD) was also observed taking place in a classroom, and those young people appeared engaged and enjoying the program content. Young people reported their wishes for programming to “have more visual arts, more vocational”. One youth said, “We could just use more programs, but it’s alright right now.” High school graduates were able to rotate participation in a transitional work program where they were paid to complete domestic



tasks in the dorm, kitchen, and laundry. Young people reported having good relationships with the regular programming providers and trying to make the most of their time and the opportunities at CGR. It was noted that during programming time at the facility, a no phone call and no screens rule was implemented.

### HARM REDUCTION

CGR facility leadership shared that contraband had not been a major issue at the facility at any point since the POC's last Annual Inspection. It was reported that regular searches only found "excessive personals", like having too much food, pens, etc. as contraband, but nothing else. The staff at CGR have never had to deploy Narcan, a life-saving opioid overdose reversal medication. It was reported that there were no concerns of contraband either thrown into the facility or being dropped by drone. All Probation Officers interviewed throughout the day were observed carrying Narcan on their uniform belts, which they reported were inspected daily as a part of a standard uniform check. It was reported that young people were trained on the identification of opioid intoxication, and in how to access and use Narcan in case of emergency. It was reported that trainings for youth took place during their orientation to the facility and there was a weekly opportunity to refresh those skills. Youth also had access to Narcan at the facility since a dose was stored in a defibrillator case on the wall of the dorm.

Facility leadership empowered partner agencies to carry Narcan and offered training. DMH and JCHS staff were trained by their own departments, but it was reported that LACOE declined to participate though LACOE did reportedly have Narcan in the main office.

Facility leadership reported that Department of Public Health-Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (DPH-SAPC) was set to begin delivery of substance abuse related services in October, and to assist the facility with substance use related matters, including the potential to provide training and consultation in addition to service for youth. It was reported that in order for DPH-SAPC to start, they required space and so the facility was planning to install a trailer over the existing sand volleyball area.

### OC SPRAY

Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray was not available as a use of force option at CGR at any point since the last annual inspection of the facility.