

LA Probation Governance Study

Crosswalk Report: Comparing LA Probation Department Practices to Best Practices in the Field



Prepared by:

Resource Development Associates

November 2017





LA Probation Governance Study

Crosswalk Report: Comparing LA Probation Department Practices to Best Practices in the Field

Patricia Marrone Bennett, PhD

Vincent Schiraldi, MSW

Jorja Leap, PhD

David Muhammad

Mikaela Rabinowitz, PhD

Karra Lompa, MSW

Ardavan Davaran, PhD

Debbie Mayer, MPP

Sarah Garmisa, MPP, MPH

Stephanie Benson, PhD

Lupe Garcia

Shannon Leap

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

Copyright 2017 by Resource Development Associates

About Resource Development Associates

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





Acknowledgements

The following report could not have been completed without the support and participation of the Los Angeles County Probation Department, which made all staff available for interviews and focus groups during work hours, ensured access to all Department facilities and field offices, and provided an extensive array of quantitative data and internal documentation.



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
1. Organizational Assessment	1
2. Hiring, Staffing, and Training	4
3. Client Service Delivery.....	6
4. Juvenile Facilities.....	10
5. Fiscal Management	13



Introduction

As part of the Los Angeles Probation Governance Study, Resource Development Associates (RDA) has been working since September 2016 to document best practices in community corrections, identify jurisdictions that are implementing those practices, and assess the processes and practices underway in the Los Angeles County Probation Department (the Department).ⁱ The purpose of this crosswalk report is to synthesize findings from these activities and to provide recommendations to guide the Department towards greater implementation of best practices.

This report is organized in five sections: Organizational Assessment; Staffing, Hiring, and Training; Client Service Delivery; Facilities; and Fiscal Operations. In each section, we provide an overview of best practices, followed by a description of those practices in LA County and recommendations for improving the Department in the future. This report is not intended to be exhaustive, but instead highlights practices and processes that we believe are most critical for Department improvement.

1. Organizational Assessment

BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL JURISDICTIONS

Organizational culture: A probation department should frame its mission toward the direct goals of being rooted in the community, effecting positive behavior change, reducing unnecessary incarceration and supervision, and minimizing risk of reoffending.¹ If a probation department expects to reduce recidivism, ensure against the unnecessary deprivation of liberty, provide meaningful support towards rehabilitation, and work as a partner in the community, it must explicitly embrace these concepts in its mission, vision, and values, communicate them widely, and ensure that all staff have the infrastructure, tools, and training to fulfill the mission.²

Organizational structure and capacity: There is no data to suggest that juvenile and adult probation functions should be split into two separate departments. However, effective operations require a streamlined organizational structure with clearly defined accountability and oversight for different operations, strong internal communication, and capacity for data-driven decision-making. This includes streamlined structures for juvenile and adult client service functions and for coordinated fiscal operations (see Section 5). To ensure effective service delivery, probation departments should establish structured partnerships with organizations in the communities in which their clients live.

Racial disparities: While there is substantial variation in the total numbers and rates of individuals on probation in counties across the country, clear racial disparities exist with regards to who is under

ⁱ Findings from these activities are detailed in three prior reports: Review of Best Practices in Probation, Model Jurisdiction Report, and LA Probation Department Assessment.



supervision. Departments should use data to identify disparities and work regularly with cross-systems stakeholders to identify where these disparities exist and how they can be reduced.³

LA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Organizational culture: Turnover at the leadership level, limited succession planning, and shifting organizational and County priorities have resulted in a Department without a shared sense of purpose. The tension between rehabilitation and punishment creates a divide across the Department and leads to confusion about the Department's approach to various functions, including hiring, training, client relationships, and outside partnerships. On top of this, regular criticism of the Department by the County Board of Supervisors, the media, and the community have contributed toward low morale among staff.

Organizational structure and capacity: The Department's current organizational structure does not align with staff roles and responsibilities, information flow, and, in some cases, span of control. The district model, in which the Department is organized into districts that have a combination of geographically specific and countywide responsibilities, is especially inefficient. The move toward an agency model, with one deputy chief overseeing all juvenile operations and one deputy chief overseeing all adult operations, with a shared administrative infrastructure is a clear step in the right direction.

The Department has extremely limited data capacity and infrastructure. IT systems are out of date and the Information Services Bureau (ISB) is understaffed. In addition, the absence of a research and evaluation unit creates a burden on both IT and operations staff, limiting the Department's ability to implement data-driven processes.

Racial disparities: In recent years, there have been few concerted efforts to address racial disparities despite the massive overrepresentation of black youth and adults on probation relative to their proportion of the county population. In interviews, few staff members identified this as an issue and those who did noted that there have not been any recent efforts to address it. The Department does not regularly report on disparities among its client population. However, the Department is currently working with RDA to develop and implement a dispositional matrix, which may help reduce disparities based on officer discretion.



RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Establish a mission and vision that centers on client well-being and rehabilitation.
 - a. Incorporate this mission and vision into every job description and performance evaluation, promotional process, request for services, personnel manual, and policies and procedures manual.
2. Hire a communications team to promote the mission internally and externally, including online, on social media, and on the Department intranet, in order to build Department-wide cohesion and commitment.
3. Reorganize operations, from the executive management level down, to align with the agency model and eliminate the current district model.
 - a. Continue progressing toward an internal reorganization of fiscal functions to allow for a more service-oriented approach to fiscal operations.
4. Invest in data/IT capacity by updating data/IT systems, increasing staffing for ISB, and establishing a research and evaluation unit that can act as a bridge between ISB and operations staff and can respond to regular requests for data and information from the Board of Supervisors and other stakeholders.
5. Assess racial disparities at different junctures in the probation system in order to develop a plan to reduce these disparities.



2. Hiring, Staffing, and Training

BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL JURISDICTIONS

Recruitment and hiring: Departments must align job descriptions and recruitment practices with the organizational mission of client well-being and community engagement. Job descriptions for sworn staff should emphasize evidence-based practices, principles of social and correctional case and group work, communication, and more.⁴ Background check processes must balance protecting client safety and department liability with enough flexibility to hire the best candidates.

Staffing: Departments should focus on workload over caseload⁵ and should define and track metrics to measure both. Periodic workload studies can ensure that staffing activities align with organizational priorities and that management and line staff have a common understanding of workload and priorities.

Training: All probation departments must meet state mandated standards for the content and length of both core and ongoing training. In addition to these requirements, training on restorative practices, trauma-informed care, positive youth development, crisis de-escalation, EPICS, and leadership skills is especially important. Booster trainings, observational assessments, and individual coaching are necessary to reinforce and deepen skill development and ensure uniform implementation.⁶

LA PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Recruitment and hiring: The Department's two entry-level positions for sworn staff, Detention Services Officer and Group Supervisor Nights, work in the juvenile facilities. Job descriptions for sworn staff positions convey a tension between a rehabilitation orientation and a correctional orientation. This is especially true for the Detention Services Officer position in juvenile halls. In addition, recruitment functions are understaffed. The Department likely loses many quality candidates due to the extensive and prolonged hiring process, which takes longer than other criminal justice departments in LA County. The Department's hiring process also screens out potentially qualified candidates with unnecessarily stringent criteria, including a credit check and prohibition against any prior criminal record, even if the criminal conduct was relatively minor and long ago.

Staffing: Uneven workload distribution and staffing vacancies create challenges for offices in high-density areas, juvenile institutions, administrative staff, and research and evaluation. The absence of clear metrics for staff workload and performance, and the lack of data capacity to track them, make it difficult to accurately measure workload and staffing needs. However, administrative functions are clearly taxed, creating inefficiencies elsewhere in the Department. Additionally, given the significant declines in the client population, sworn positions are likely overstaffed. The Department has experienced significant reductions in the number of youth and adults under its supervision. Implementing RDA's recommendations for "Right Sizing" the Department would result in further reduction in caseloads and facility populations, therefore minimizing the need for massive hiring.



Training: The majority of staff meet mandated training requirements and engage in a range of elective training opportunities. The Department offers a wide array of trainings and has made an effort to increase access to them. Staff who transfer between positions need additional training. In addition, staff need more training both in technical functions, such as data systems and writing court reports, as well as in topics related to client well-being and supervision, such as mental health, trauma-informed care, and positive youth development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Change hiring processes so that all entry-level staff do not begin in facilities. This will ensure that staff working in facilities are interested in and equipped to work with youth. This will also prevent the most entry-level staff from working with the highest-risk youth.
2. Redesign job descriptions to clearly focus on client well-being and rehabilitation, and highlight important characteristics such as communication and the use of data.
3. Establish a recruitment unit to centralize and coordinate recruitment efforts.
4. Reduce the hiring timeline and keep candidates notified of processes and procedures.
5. Adjust the background check process to create a larger pool of qualified applicants by eliminating the credit check and creating exemptions for individuals with low-level (misdemeanor) criminal justice system involvement.
6. Require staff to receive training for new positions prior to assuming these responsibilities. Ensure that staff have adequate ongoing training in data/IT systems and other technical functions, such as court reports.
7. Increase the availability of trainings in topics related to client supervision and development, such as mental health, trauma-informed care, client and family involved case planning, and positive youth development.
8. Regularly monitor and forecast staff workloads to inform hiring and staffing decisions.



3. Client Service Delivery

BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL JURISDICTIONS

Supervise the right people the right amount: Probation departments should only supervise and recommend conditions for clients that are necessary to fulfill the goals of disposition and sentencing. Toward that end, they should “bank” (not actively supervise) low-risk caseloads and recommend early release for individuals in consistent compliance with their probation terms. Youth should be diverted from formal processing to the greatest extent possible and similarly incentivized to excel on probation through grants of early discharge.⁷ These practices are consistent with evidence-based community corrections and help to reduce potential harms that come from supervising low-risk populations. Actively supervising fewer individuals helps conserve resources so that probation departments can implement innovative programs and have greater access to resources dedicated for higher-risk cases.⁸ Further, it is well-established in the research that supervising low-risk clients increases their risk of recidivism.⁹

Approach to service delivery: Probation departments should pursue the following approaches to service delivery.

Structured Decision Making (SDM): Probation should implement SDM processes to guide probation officers' recommendations to the court around client dispositions and placements, as well as the provision of rewards/incentives and graduated sanctions. In implementing SDM for client dispositions and placements, probation departments generally use a grid that lists what sorts of recommendations should be made based on risk assessment results and offense severity. Probation departments also utilize graduated response matrices that account for infraction frequency and severity to guide decision-making practices around revoking probation for non-compliant behavior. This helps bring a greater degree of consistency, reliability, and equity to decision-making processes.¹⁰

To support SDM, probation officers should utilize validated risk and needs assessment tools that identify static and dynamic risk factors in order to determine supervision intensity, develop case plans and goals in consultation with clients, and make necessary referrals to county and community-based services.¹¹ During the assessment phase, probation officers should identify their clients' strengths in order to help build rapport and promote prosocial behaviors that can connect individuals back to the communities in which they committed crimes.¹² Probation officers should also reassess clients at established intervals (e.g., every six months) and after key life events (e.g., obtaining stable housing or full-time employment) in order to update case plans and adjust supervision intensity as appropriate.¹³

Positive Youth Development (PYD): PYD is a strength-based, asset-based, youth-involved development process. PYD seeks to build on young people's strengths, instead of focusing on their deficits, while providing them with services, supports, and opportunities.¹⁴ Engaging youth and their families in their own case planning process is a significant PYD principle. Family group conferencing is a model that has



been used in the child welfare system to involve youth and their families in a group planning and decision-making process. A few juvenile justice agencies around the country have begun to utilize such models.

Services (availability and linkage) and supervision: In order to provide individuals under community supervision with an opportunity to change course and not further penetrate the justice system, it is imperative to offer an accessible suite of services. Structured partnerships should exist with service providers who help to address the following needs:

- ❖ Physical health
- ❖ Mental health
- ❖ Trauma/PTSD
- ❖ Substance use
- ❖ Housing
- ❖ Education/workforce development
- ❖ Employment
- ❖ Legal aid
- ❖ Family support/reunification
- ❖ Benefits
- ❖ Mentorship
- ❖ Criminal thinking
- ❖ Transportation
- ❖ Positive youth development

Probation departments should collaborate with community members in the planning process in order to best identify the needs of the community and develop a continuum of services that meets the needs of individuals on probation. Above and beyond developing a system of services to support clients on probation, model departments have shifted their approach to maintain a central focus on leveraging indigenous supports and providing meaningful services to justice-involved youth and adults within the communities they live.

Collaboration between probation, community-based organizations (CBOs), and other departments: For individuals under community supervision, probation should focus on community-based services. Probation departments should collaborate with community members to develop community-based continuums of care that leverage stakeholder knowledge and input. Departments should also anticipate that this type of authentic collaboration with community-based partners will require a substantial time investment. These connections are the best way to ensure that probation meets the needs of the community. These efforts also align with research that indicates that cohesive communities and informal controls more effectively reduce crime than government interventions. Research also shows that using capable community partners can save money compared to either incarceration or probation-delivered services.^{15 16 17 18 19}

LA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Approach to service delivery: Most staff convey a desire to help their clients, but there is not a clear Department-wide approach for how to accomplish this end. The Department is moving toward greater use of SDM based on validated assessments and evidence-based practices. However, full implementation of these processes will require more work. The Department must address challenges with data systems and insufficient training in SDM, assessments, and case management to support a more systematic approach to client services. In addition, the Department currently supervises many low-risk clients,



including youth who are not court-involved but work with probation officers pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 236.

Probation staff who administer assessments noted concerns about the accuracy and consistency of both the youth and adult assessment tools. Risk assessment scores provided by the Department also indicated a high degree of variability. Staff across the Department noted the need for continuous training about assessment tools to increase quality assurance.

Service availability: Department staff noted gaps in service availability, most notably services for transition-aged youth, clients with mental health needs, and community transition plans for individual clients. Additionally, a lack of effective service linkage results in inconsistent service delivery and presents an increasing challenge to effective monitoring. While the PAUR (Prospective Authorization Utilization Review) system was cited as a useful tool, it is limited in its scope, as it is composed exclusively of agencies with Department contracts or memoranda of understanding (MOUs).

Collaboration between probation, CBOs, and other departments: Providing services to juveniles in facilities, as well as juveniles and adults in the field, requires collaboration with both intersecting agencies and community-based services. The Department's ability to collaborate and effectively communicate with intersecting agencies, such as the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (DMH) or the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), was cited as a major strength that improves service delivery and client treatment plans. Yet, the relationship between CBOs and the Department is strained by a lack of administrative coordination in service delivery and poor communication or information sharing.



RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Implement validated risk and needs assessments to help determine supervision intensity and identify the needs of probation clients so that probation officers can make appropriate connections to service. Clients should be reassessed every six months or after key life events (e.g., attaining full-time employment) to make appropriate adjustments to their case plans and supervision terms.
2. Require probation officers to directly connect their clients with services, supports, and opportunities that address their needs and build on their strengths.
3. Bank all low-risk clients and consider implementing additional practices to continue reducing the County's probation population. These might include implementing credit days for compliance (e.g., 20 days credit for every 30 days in compliance), terminating probation early by coordinating with the court to reassess individuals who are in compliance with the terms of their supervision for long periods of time, and/or placing medium-risk clients on banked caseloads after a sufficient period of compliance with conditions.
4. Enhance the use of SDM, a data-driven, research-based approach intended to create a greater degree of consistency, reliability, and equity to decision-making processes. The Department should implement the Juvenile Disposition Matrix developed by RDA in consultation with key LA County stakeholders.
5. Continue the Department's shift to a rehabilitative-focused and positive development approach by involving probation clients in the development of their case plans and implementing evidence-based supervision practices.
6. Establish processes for program implementation and case plan quality assurance.
7. Share information with and collaborate with community members to develop community-based continuums of care that leverage stakeholder knowledge and input. This will help develop stronger and more trusting relationships with the community and local CBOs.



4. Juvenile Facilities

BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL JURISDICTIONS

Location: Probation departments should locate juvenile detention and placement facilities in or near the communities where the youth live. This allows youth to remain in close proximity to their prosocial supports (e.g., parents, other supportive family members, and mentors) and promotes ongoing connection to positive social influences while limiting interruption to education during confinement. This is ideal because research indicates that frequent family visits are associated with good behavior and improved school performance for youth who are incarcerated.^{20 21}

Physical layout and conditions: Juvenile facilities should not look like jails. Rooms should be open and well lit; walls should be painted vibrant colors; and pictures, motivational quotes, and other developmentally appropriate artwork should be interspersed around the facility. Youth should sleep in open spaces, and if this is not possible, each locked dormitory should be decorated nicely and include furniture such as a desk, bookshelf, bed, colorful bedspread, rug, etc. Facilities should be clean; meet fire and safety codes; and have properly functioning temperature controls, light, and ventilation. Ultimately, every effort should be made to ensure that the physical environments of juvenile facilities are developmentally appropriate and conducive to the rehabilitative goals of the probation department.²²

Safety in custody: Probation should create a safe institutional environment by providing sufficient staffing and supervision. Departments should ensure that all staff working in detention facilities and camps receive trauma training to reduce the likelihood of triggering a trauma response and inadvertently escalating youth.²³ Staffing ratios should be sufficient for staff to establish meaningful relationships with youth in their care and to mitigate any staff concerns about their own physical safety. Youth should be supervised closely to ensure the resolution of conflicts are resolved safely and that injury is prevented.²⁴ However, staff should never use room confinement for discipline, punishment, administrative convenience, retaliation, staffing shortages, or reasons other than a temporary response to behavior that threatens immediate harm to a youth or others.

Programming in custody: All facility staff, including mental health and educational staff, custody staff, and even maintenance, administrative, and culinary staff, should have position descriptions that define their jobs in PYD terms. Facility staff should implement a cognitive behavioral model to help address criminogenic thinking among youth who are detained and/or in placement. In addition, probation should ensure that youth receive medical care, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, translation services, and access to religious services, as needed and required by law.²⁵ Probation should also strongly advocate that juvenile detainees receive uninterrupted, high-quality education services while in residential care or detention.²⁶

Longer term, post-adjudication facilities should have a focus on education, treatment, and rehabilitation. Such facilities should have small units with no more than 10-15 youth, prioritize quality education, and



provide enrichment programs and services. These facilities should work with outside community organizations to provide some of these programs and services. Youth should be positively engaged in education, treatment, enrichment, or recreational activities from the time they wake until they go to sleep.²⁷

LA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Location: The Department operates three juvenile halls, 12 camps, and one residential placement facility. The juvenile halls are located in the county's urban core and in the western part of the county near Sylmar. However, nearly all the camps are on the outlying areas of the county, often cutting youth off from their families and community support networks for the duration of their confinement.

Physical layout and conditions: The County built all three of its juvenile halls at least 50 years ago. Department staff and community partners that provide services agree that Central Juvenile Hall is the most in need of repair and renovation, but all three facilities require work. The physical layout of the halls and camps is not conducive to youth rehabilitation and safety. Youth live and sleep in an "open bay" area, consisting of large rooms with lines of beds, making it difficult to monitor youth or to prevent gang conflicts.

The Department's new Campus Kilpatrick is an excellent example of a youth facility designed to support a therapeutic model instead of a correctional, deficit-focused approach. Campus Kilpatrick is a state-of-the-art youth facility with one of the best physical structures in the county.

Safety in custody: Department staff and youth described the juvenile halls as unsafe environments for everyone inside them. Though the number of youth in the halls and camps has decreased, staff assert that detained youth are now higher-risk and have more severe mental health needs than they did in the past. Insufficient training and inconsistent staffing levels lead staff to feel underprepared to face day-to-day challenges.

Programming in Custody: All halls and camps have on-site, full-time DMH and LACOE staff to provide mental health and education services, respectively. In camps and the residential placement facility, DMH, LACOE, Department line staff, and management regularly meet with each other to discuss treatment plans for youth clients. Across facilities, the Department, DMH, LACOE, and CBOs provide a variety of programs, though these are often offered at a basic level and have varying availability across halls and camps.



RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Close camps furthest from youth's homes and families.
2. Invest in renovations and repairs of halls to improve health and safety conditions.
3. Continue transitioning camps toward the LA model that better supports rehabilitation through small, homelike facilities located close to youth's neighborhoods in alignment with best practices.
4. As referenced in Section 2 above, change hiring processes so that all entry-level staff do not begin in facilities. This will ensure that staff working in facilities are interested in and equipped to work with youth and that the most entry-level staff do not work with the most high-risk youth.
5. Increase training about trauma and alternative disciplinary tools such as de-escalation or positive behavioral approaches.
6. Regularly collect and analyze data to ensure that comprehensive, high quality programming — including custody-to-community transition — is offered across facilities and that it meets youth's needs and is effective.



5. Fiscal Management

BEST PRACTICES AND MODEL JURISDICTIONS

Participatory management: Probation departments should implement participatory management approaches to financial and fiscal operations in order to transform the work culture. Steps toward participatory management include: developing a clear vision; creating a team environment; empowering and communicating with employees; putting clients first; cutting red tape; and creating clear accountability. Change management strategies — such as catalyzing change by developing a shared vision; overcoming conflict by creating a team dynamic; emphasizing quality improvement by prioritizing high-quality client services; finding opportunities to partner with communities; and devolving decision-making authority to empower and communicate with staff — can streamline the delivery of services. The literature has shown that participatory management reduces employee stress, increases job satisfaction, and reduces turnover.^{28 29 30} Hiring specialized staff for key administrative activities and implementing more inclusive decision-making processes help the agency be more efficient and responsive to community needs.

Community partnerships: In addition to increasing the efficiency of fiscal processes and orienting towards larger departmental goals, probation departments should formalize community partnerships in a structured manner in order to circumnavigate lengthy contracting requirements and other bureaucratic burdens. This also enables departments to more effectively and often, more quickly, partner with the communities they serve. One alternative to traditional financial management practices is agency-to-agency partnership, in which funds are transferred to another public agency that can either obtain contracted services or provide those services directly. Another alternative is public-private partnership, in which public agencies partner with a foundation or community-based nonprofit, through vehicles like master service agreements, to deliver direct services, to provide administrative and fiscal services, or to subcontract services out to other entities. Public agencies should also help the community cut through red tape by providing technical assistance to providers and producing more suitable programs, funding structures, and competitive proposals.³¹

LA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Structure of fiscal and administrative management: The Department's fiscal and administrative functions are siloed from each other and from programmatic operations. This hinders the Department's ability to establish effective collaboration practices and encourages a "head's down" approach, in which fiscal and administrative staff focus on their specific spans of authority rather than on a larger Departmental mission.

Within the Department, each fiscal function operates as a separate team, without established pathways for collaboration and information sharing. Fiscal and Budget do not coordinate financial data, nor do they deliver program-specific reports to Adult or Juvenile operations. However, the Department has realized



the need for additional analytic resources and has requested budget analysts to provide more direct analytical support for specific grant programs.

Neither operations nor administrative and fiscal staff feel empowered to own a problem or its resolution. This disconnect causes bottlenecks in administrative processes, such as contracting. This creates a barrier to effective delivery of services and takes a toll on morale. Program requests to Budget, Procurement, or Contracts filter up through the chain of command rather than through inclusive and transparent conversations with executive decision-makers. There is a wide communication gap between program operations and Contracts, and no effective processes by which fiscal functions collaborate to ensure that operations staff have updated information on their budget to inform service delivery. As a result, significant administrative delays and bottlenecks prevent the Department from getting allocated community funds into service contracts.

Ability to partner with communities: One way the Department has successfully implemented community services is through the use of inter-agency fund transfers. Other public agencies, such as the Office of Diversion and Reentry, can sometimes contract more rapidly with community providers, at least in the near term, until the Department improves its practices in this area. To the extent that the Department has developed MOUs and transferred funds, the Department has created successful agency-to-agency partnerships that are more nimble with providers and contracts. Probation recently established a “Master Services Agreement” process for juvenile services to make the contracting process more streamlined and supportive.

CBOs struggle to “do business” with the Department because of bureaucratic and financial challenges, which limits the ability to partner with the community. The separation of Budget, Procurement, Contracts, Fiscal, and other administrative functions compounds this barrier. The structural disconnect between fiscal functions and the lack of clear direction leads to disengagement from process improvement, and prevents adequate planning to get funding into the community-based system of care.



RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include middle management in participatory fiscal management processes that include clearly delineating the Department's vision for how fiscal operations support the delivery of client services; creating an environment wherein different fiscal and contracting teams work together to achieve that vision; and creating clear accountability for mission-critical services.
2. Redistribute workload and responsibilities of fiscal and administrative staff to streamline communication and approval processes for program and operations staff. As part of this, increase information sharing across fiscal and administrative functions and establish a single point for program staff. This will allow for a more service-oriented staff that engages with programs and provides line-item budget details, among other business process information.
3. Provide technical assistance to community providers to build their capacity to bid on and deliver community services.
4. Establish public/private partnerships with foundations and/or nonprofits to deliver community services more effectively through vehicles such as master service agreements. While Probation improves its internal procurement capabilities, the Department should temporarily partner with a local philanthropic foundation to more efficiently distribute much needed funds to community service providers as soon as possible.



¹“Statement on the Future of Community Corrections (Harvard Kennedy School Executive Session on Community Corrections, August 2017), <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/centers/wiener/programs/criminaljustice/research-publications/executive-session-on-community-corrections/publications/less-is-more-how-reducing-probation-populations-can-improve-outcomes/statement-on-the-future-of-community-corrections>

² “Program Evaluation” (University of Cincinnati, 2016), http://www.uc.edu/corrections/services/program_evaluation.

³ Interview with James Bell, Scott Taylor, and Sheila Mitchell, 2017.

⁴ “Probation: Chief Probation Officer” (National Center for the Courts), <http://www.ncsc.org/topics/human-resources/job-descriptions/probation/chief-probation-officer.aspx>.

⁵ Matthew T. DeMichele, “Probation and Parole’s Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making” (The American Probation & Parole Association, May 4, 2007), <https://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/appa/pubs/SMDM.pdf>.

⁶ Standards and Training for Corrections Division, “Policy and Procedure Manual for Participating Agencies” (Board of State and Community Corrections, January 2014), http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Participating_Agency_Manual_FINAL__011014.pdf.

⁷ Ryan C. Wagoner, Carol A. Schubert, and Edward P. Mulvey, “Probation Intensity, Self-Reported Offending, and Psychopathy in Juveniles on Probation for Serious Offenses,” *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online* 43, no. 2 (June 1, 2015): 191–200.

⁸ Michael P. Jacobson et al., “Less is More: How Reducing Probation Populations Can Improve Outcomes,” (New Thinking in Community Corrections Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, *forthcoming*).

⁹ Elizabeth Seigle, Nastassia Walsh, and Josh Weber, “Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System” (New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014).

¹⁰ “Disposition Matrices: Purpose,” (National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 2015), http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/disposition-matrices-purpose_handout.pdf.

¹¹ Nathan James, “Risk and Needs Assessment in the Criminal Justice System,” (Congressional Research Service, October 13, 2015), <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44087.pdf>.

¹² Cormac Russell, “Making the Case for an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) Approach to Probation: From Reformation to Transformation,” *Irish Probation Journal* 7 (September 2010): 119-132, http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/16533/1/Irish_Probation_Journal_2010.pdf#page=120.

¹³ James Byrne, Adam Gelb, and Jake Horowitz, “Maximum Impact: Targeting Supervision on Higher-Risk People, Places and Times, Public Safety Policy Brief no. 9, (PEW Center on the States, July 2009).

¹⁴ Jeffrey A. Butts, Gordon Bazemore, and Aundra Saa Meroe, “Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development” (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2010), <https://positiveyouthjustice.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/pyj2010.pdf>.

¹⁵ Nancy La Vigne et al., “Release Planning for Successful Reentry A Guide for Corrections, Service Providers, and Community Groups” (The Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, 2008), <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32056/411767-Release-Planning-for-Successful-Reentry.PDF>.

¹⁶ Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, and Kendra Bradner, “Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults. New Thinking in Community Corrections.”

¹⁷ Joseph Gagnon and Curtis Richards, “Making the Right Turn: A Guide About Improving Transition Outcomes for Youth Involved in the Juvenile Corrections System.”

¹⁸ Edward J. Latessa et al., “A Statewide Evaluation of the RECLAIM Ohio Initiative.”

¹⁹ Doug McVay, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg, “Treatment or Incarceration? National and State Findings on the Efficacy and Cost Savings of Drug Treatment Versus Imprisonment.”

²⁰Sandra Villalobos Agudelo, “The Impact of Family Visitation on Incarcerated Youth’s Behavior and School Performance: Findings from the Families as Partners Project” (VERA Institute of Justice, April 2013),



<http://archive.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/impact-of-family-visitation-on-incarcerated-youth-brief.pdf>.

²¹ Kathryn C. Monahan, Asha Goldweber, and Elizabeth Cauffman, "The Effects of Visitation on Incarcerated Juvenile Offenders: How Contact with the Outside Impacts Adjustment on the Inside," *Law and Human Behavior* 35, no. 2 (April 2011): 143–51, doi: 10.1007/s10979-010-9220-x.

²² Ibid.

²³ "Trauma Among Youth in the Juvenile Justice System" (National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, September 2016), <https://www.ncmhjj.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Trauma-Among-Youth-in-the-Juvenile-Justice-System-for-WEBSITE.pdf>.

²⁴ "Juvenile Federal Performance-Based Detention Standards Handbook" (Department of Justice, February 2011) <https://www.justice.gov/archive/ofdt/juvenile.pdf>.

²⁵ "Juvenile Detention Facility Assessment: A Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform."

²⁶ Amber Farn and Jill Adams, "Education and Interagency Collaboration: A Lifeline for Justice-Involved Youth," (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, 2016), http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Lifeline-for-Justice-Involved-Youth-August_2016.pdf.

²⁷ Such examples include the Missouri Division of Youth Services' juvenile facilities and the New Beginnings Youth Development Center in Washington, DC.

²⁸ Mitchell, Ojmarrh, Doris Layton Mackenzie, Gaylene J. Styve, and Angela R. Gover. "The impact of individual, organizational, and environmental attributes on voluntary turnover among juvenile correctional staff members." *Justice Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (2000): 333-357.

²⁹ Lee, Won-Jae, Hee-Jong Joo, and W. Johnson. "The effect of participatory management on internal stress, overall job satisfaction, and turnover intention among federal probation officers." *Fed. Probation* 73 (2009): 33.

³⁰ Kim, Soonhee. "Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership." *Public administration review* 62, no. 2 (2002): 231-241.

³¹ Kramer, Ralph M., and Bart Grossman, "Contracting for social services: Process management and resource dependencies," *Social Service Review* 61, no. 1 (1987): 36-37.