



JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL (JJCC) MEETING

November 9, 2012

MINUTES

Members

Roy Brasil, Chair
Acting Chief Probation
Officer

David Pine
Board of Supervisors

John Maltbie
County Manager

Susan Etezadi
Superior Court

Steve Wagstaffe
District Attorney

Stephen Kaplan
Behavioral Health and
Recovery Services

Loc Nguyen
Human Services Agency

Rick Halpern
Private Defender

Susan Manheimer
Chief, San Mateo Police
Department

Trisha Sanchez
Sheriff's Office

Joan Rosas
County Office of Education

Richard Boitano
Jefferson Union High
School District

Jane Smithson
At-large community
representative

Susan Swope Juvenile
Justice Delinquency
Prevention Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Stuart J. Forrest, Chief Probation Officer,

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. INTRODUCTIONS

Welcome to Rick Boitano

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- Edit to minutes from 5/18/12 by Trisha Sanchez via email. Susan Swope moved to approve; Seconded by Susan Manheimer.
- All aye in approval to modify as suggested.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2011-2012 JJCPA and JPCF Annual Evaluation (PPT presentation by Lisa Colvig Amir and Pat Reyes of ASR)

- Overview of local action plan, 2012 Planning Process
- Spectrum of desired outcomes
- Overall approach
- Spectrum of programs
- Array of services
- Outcomes measures
- Evaluation of activities – Year 1 – 3
- Evaluation of findings
- JJCPA mandated outcomes

In response to a question from Susan Manheimer on whether these are programs for youth on probation: the answer is yes; the programs serve many of the youth already in the probation system.

- Chief Forrest commented on the probation rates for San Mateo County and what that communicates. The assumption is that youth in SMCO is kept on probation longer than in other counties with longer periods of incarceration.

In response to a question from Susan Manheimer about why a six-month methodology seemed standard for probation programs: the response was that because of varying lengths of programs, six months seemed to be the average mid-point.

In response to a question from Susan Swope on whether it makes sense to measure the success of those that are on track to complete probation, (or making regular payments) vs. those that have completed: the response was that this could be a consideration for the recidivism study.

In response to a question from John Maltbie on why the arrest rate is higher than the incarceration rate: the response was that incarceration might be for things other than arrests or new violations, or possibly probation violations.

In a follow up question as to why the rates between arrests and incarcerations are so much higher for SMCO vs. the rest of the state: It was suggested that SMCO possibly incarcerates more vs. arresting fewer. (The definition of incarceration may be only post-disposition).

In response to a question from Susan Manheimer regarding the state comparison /JJCPA statewide evaluation methodology: The methodologies are different.

- Comment: There should be additional drill-down in these areas to better understand the varying rates of incarceration and probation, as well as the impact on services to help stabilize these numbers.

Assessment Center (PPT slide)

In response to a question by Jane Smithson: The amount of effort is different than the days associated cohort days; this does not equate to units of service. It's more of a general look at when kids enter/exit the Assessment Center.

In response to question by Susan Manheimer: regarding whether or not this is an efficacy measure or not: The response was not to identify whether or not efforts are worth it; instead focus on youth referred to formal probation.

- Comment: Chief Forrest - A multidisciplinary judgment is required to make the call of whether or not a case should be sent to the DAs office or handled informally. The numbers indicating whether or not they return would probably be a better way to gauge efficacy.
- Comment: Pat Reyes - Of the 50% currently receiving services, only 10% end up with a new violation. For the efforts contributed, the rate of arrests for new violations is relatively low.

Local Outcomes (PPT slide)

In response to question from Jane Smithson question regarding attendance rate of 86.5% for Cleo Eulau benchmark, and how it relates other programs, or kids not receiving services: Response is that most kids in court-community schools are receiving services. While these results are specific to the Cleo Eulau program; the number are similar to other programs that also measure school attendance. However, it is difficult to say if the programs themselves are comparable.

- Comment: Rick Boitano - General HS population has 94-95% attendance rate; a rate of 86.5% for court-community schools is quite good.

Conclusion

In response to a question from Susan Manheimer on the standardization of the criminogenic recidivism risk factors and developmental assets; the

Developmental Asset Protocol (DAP) was developed by the Search Institute and is widely regarded as the validated tool to follow. There is no standardized assessment tool across agencies; as long as the tools are validated outcomes will be similar.

B. Proposed JJCPA/JPCF Recidivism Scope of Work
Standard definition of 3 or 4 useful measures

- Comment from Chief Forrest - After seeing a presentation while in Sacramento, it seems that we should focus on system integrity; are the arrests and violations reflecting risk high, moderate, and low and not just recidivism alone. If we categorize our kids by high, medium, low risk (or no services needed) we want to ensure that the rate of arrests and violations is reflected within those categories.

In response to question from Aila Malik as to whether there is an agreed upon definition of recidivism within the Probation Chiefs Association: response is yes, but the definition does not satisfy all; recidivism means different things to different people.

In response to a question by Susan Manheimer around the life factors of youth in the system, and if the question is open-ended or categorized based on criminogenic factors: these factors would be put in a separate presentation and used with secondary data to see if outcomes can be mapped back to predicted factors.

- Comment from Christine Villanis - There definitely needs to be data indicating the risk for re-offending based on demographic factors.
- Suggestion from Chief Forrest – the California Program Assessment Process (that measures whether a program is evidenced-based or not) should be incorporated into the next study.
- Comment from Susan Swope – We really need to know how many of the kids we serve end up being successful. Follow up after completion program, including probation needs to extend beyond the two-year mark; six-month data is not useful.
- Comment from Susan Manheimer – Perhaps we should consider including reduction of incarceration time and disproportionate minority contact in the outcomes.
- Comment from Rick Halpern – Would like to see if incarceration time is measured pre-disposition, post-disposition, or if it is listed as one figure; this makes a difference:

C. Creation of JJCC Evaluation Subcommittee

- Team will meet in person, on a quarterly basis.
- Volunteers: Chief Stu Forrest, Susan Swope, Aila Malik, Judith Jones, Erica Brittan, Jane Smithson, and Marie Ciepela
- Approval was requested to re-allocate use contract funds for the purpose proposed.

- Susan Swope move go forward with the proposal as presented.
- Susan Manheimer seconds and commends the work done thus far.
- All Ayes to accept proposal.

D. Restoration of Juvenile Competency (Chief Forrest)

- Santa County has a program from University of Virginia (UVA) to help restore/establish youth competency by educating them on the court process, the consequences and how to testify in court.
- Program geared toward younger children lacking the capacity to understand the process due to developmental or mental health issues. (This is not a mental health program, or for the developmentally disabled.)
- There would be a 90-day curriculum with a progress report every 30 days; Average turn-around is between 112 - 120 days.
- Cost would be about \$5, 000 per child, or about \$20,000 annually; possibly funded by JPCF.
- Additional request for funds could come later but nothing has been settled yet.
- The program heads willing to give an overview/presentation to address any questions/concerns.
- Santa Clara is willing to enter into a contract with SMCO that includes a \$20,000 one-time fee.
- UVA will meet with stake-holders on Friday, December 7.

E. Budget/Contracts (Hong)

- No update; funding is stable.
- Management Analyst, Ashnita Narayan is currently working on contract amendments; should be finalized by December.
- Q 1 invoices were due on 10/15/2012; please submit any outstanding Q1 invoices ASAP to Anessa.

F. Introduction of Management Analyst, Michelle Cherie Mendez

- In 2013 Michelle will assume all JJCC Meeting duties going forward. Please submit Q2 invoices to her.

G. JJCC Meeting dates for 2013:

- February 8, 2013
- May 10, 2013
- August 9, 2013
- November 8, 2013

Conclusion

VI. ADJOURNMENT