

ATTACHMENT A

Juvenile Justice Data Working Group Meeting Notes May 27, 2015

Board of State and Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Training Room
10:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Meeting convened at 10:34 a.m. by Chair David Steinhart.

- 1. Welcome & Introductions.** Chair David Steinhart welcomed the group.
- 2. Minutes Approved.** The group voted to approve meeting notes from the last meeting, held on March 11, 2015.
- 3. Formulating recommendations for the January 2016 Report to the Legislature.**

Discussion: Extension to the January deadline

- Would like to consider an extension to March 1, 2015 (60 days)
- Timeline we have is conducive to a bad product
- Concerns around extension?
 - BSCC management would like JJDWG to stick to the deadline and not have to approach Legislature
 - We can stick with the timeline if we do a very high-level report; 30,000 foot level. We cannot get into the weeds. We will not be able to answer every question.
 - We cannot forget that we have done a lot of work at the first few meetings. We should go back and revisit that.
- How do we ask for an extension? Find a legislator to sponsor a statutory change. BSCC Exec would have to work through the Administration first, before approaching a legislator.
- Even if we were able to get it into a bill, we would not know until September whether the legislation would be approved; not sufficient time.
- We could make some safe assumptions that it would be approved; it is non-controversial.
- Need to create Plan A and Plan B.
- For now, stick to the timeline.
- Does the BSCC Board have to approve the report before it goes to the Legislature? Is the JJDWG an independent body or a part of the Board?
 - Up until now, the JJDWG has operated as a committee of the Board.
 - Yes, the report will have to go through the Board for approval before being submitted to the Legislature.

4. Review JJDWG Scope of Work and Report Development Timelines.

- The group should revisit and review the group's charge (AB 1468, 2014).

ATTACHMENT A

- The group has already made progress toward some of the tasks:
 - Analyzed capacities and limitations of current systems
 - Reviewed the work of other states – done in December
 - Considered agency roles and responsibilities
- Consider a statewide data clearinghouse.
- Continue to consider technological and infrastructure challenges.

5. Defining Juvenile Justice Data System Development Needs for California

- Decided not to start with a list of data elements, but rather to back up and think about what questions would want to be answered.
- What are the questions people would want answered in a statewide database? What is it that we want to know?
- We will categorize them, Denise will draft corresponding data elements that would be needed to answer the questions. Group will rank the items in order of importance.

Brainstorming Session: The group called out data variables and decision points within the juvenile justice system they think would be important to capture and track.

✓ **Unique identifier for every juvenile**

✓ **Demographics**

- Gender
- LGBT
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Socioeconomic status
- Zip code
- School status
 - What school
 - Type of school – mainstream, community, court
 - Attendance status
 - Special Ed.
 - Grade Level Performance
 - Credits

✓ **Adult Court Transfers**

✓ **Facility Information**

- via Detention Profile Survey
- How are kids being processed?
- Where are they being placed?

ATTACHMENT A

- ✓ **Performance**
- ✓ **School Reentry**
 - Type
 - Length to enroll
 - Duration of attendance
- ✓ **Involvement with Social Service System**
 - Child welfare
 - Mental Health
 - Placement history – type of placement (foster home, group home, relative)
 - Public assistance – general relief, food stamps
 - Medi-Cal
 - Citizenship status
- ✓ **Referrals coming from schools**
 - By type (law enforcement, school admin., etc.)
 - School discipline history
- ✓ **Law enforcement contacts/arrests/citations**
- ✓ **Referrals to probation**
- ✓ **Probation dispositions**
- ✓ **D.A. filing decisions**
 - Filing petition
 - Sustained petition
 - Wobblers
- ✓ **Probation recommendations v. Court orders**
 - What is the process?
 - Role of other stakeholders
 - Timing of probation recommendations (pre- or post- adjudication)
- ✓ **Diversion, by Schools**
 - Law enforcement
 - Probation
 - Court
 - Diversion, type of program
 - Diversion, outcomes
 - Success
 - Failure – what next?

ATTACHMENT A

- ✓ **Risk/Needs Assessment Results**
 - By decision point
 - Trauma assessment
 - Pre-Dispo / Post-Dispo
 - Relationship to case planning and services
 - Protective factors

- ✓ **Probation Violations**
 - Supervision level
 - What conditions were violated
 - Results of violation
 - Detention – supervision level
 - Alternatives to detention
 - Community detention programs
 - EM / GPS
 - House arrest

- ✓ **Family Involvement in the Justice System**
 - Parents
 - Siblings

- ✓ **Important Decision Points**
 - Arrest
 - Probation dispositions
 - D.A. filing decisions (adult v. juvenile)
 - Direct filing v. Fitness motions
 - Outcomes of fitness motions (fit, unfit, competency)
 - Adult filing – charges, outcomes
 - Reverse remand
 - Original filing v. adjudicated offense
 - Probation Recommendation v. Court Orders
 - Role of other stakeholders
 - Timing of recommendations (pre- or post-adjudication)
 - Length to Disposition/Adjudication/Case Processing
 - Sentencing Outcome
 - Custody – DJJ, Prison

- ✓ **Other Identifiers**
 - Employment
 - Education Level
 - Substance Abuse
 - Psych Meds
 - Peer Relations
 - Gang Involvement
 - Domestic Violence

ATTACHMENT A

- Trauma History
 - Victim Restitution
 - ILP Eligibility/Services
- ✓ **Sealed Records – whether / when / how / tracking**
- ✓ **Offense**
- What is it?
 - Type? Misdemeanor/Felonly
 - Violent/Non-Violent
- ✓ **Detention**
- Recommendation for detention decision
 - Probation discretion
 - Risk and offense
 - 300 status
 - Length of stay – pre-disposition across decision points
 - Use of alternatives to detention
 - Release on home detention prior to detention hearing
 - Conditions in detention – pepper spray, solitary confinement
- ✓ **Detention Facilities**
- Population breakdown
 - Services available
 - School credits earned in custody
 - Graduations occurred in custody
- ✓ **Group Homes**
- Level (RCL)
 - In-state / out-of-state
 - In-county / out-of-county
- ✓ **Foster Care**
- Non-relative extended family member (NREFM)
 - Family Foster Agency (FFA)
 - Generic
- ✓ **Camps**
- Length of stay
 - Return to custody
 - Services available/programming
 - Educational pre- and post-testing
 - ADP
 - Capacity
 - Dual Jurisdiction

ATTACHMENT A

- ✓ **DJJ**
 - Admissions
 - 707(b)
 - Length of stay
 - 290.008
 - Registration – sex, gang, arson
 - Programs – Mental Health, Education, Rehabilitation

- ✓ **Medical/Mental Health issues**
 - Psychiatric hospitalizations
 - Developmental disability/Regional centers
 - CSEC (sexual exploitation) involved

- ✓ **AWOLs / escapes**

- ✓ **Bench warrants**

- ✓ **Recidivism outcomes**
 - New arrest
 - New sustained petitions
 - By type
 - Probation violations
 - Return to custody
 - Successful completion of probation
 - Tracking time – 6 months, 1 year
 - Crossover into the adult system
 - Return to WIC 300 system
 - Transition to WIC 450 (extended foster care)
 - Death
 - 241.1 hearings
 - Outcomes – 300, 600, dual
 - System cost

- ✓ **System ownership**
 - Who owns the record?
 - Multiple data entry points
 - Local/state
 - How to interface multiple systems? Firewalls, access

- ✓ **Database/Data Warehouse versus Operational System**
 - 58 different databases feeding into a system?
 - Or, one statewide system operationalized at the local level?
 - CWCMS system is an example

ATTACHMENT A

6. Next Steps

- Form a subcommittee to organize the data elements/questions and begin to formulate recommendations on the data universe to bring to larger group
- Subcommittee should meet mid-June, via phone conference or webinar
- Next full JJDWG meeting – Tuesday, July 14th
- Subcommittee membership
 - Denise
 - Sue
 - Laura

7. Sealing Juvenile Records

- New law allows for automatic sealing of juvenile court records
- Pending AB 666 would extend automatic sealing to arrest and probation records
- Will DOJ and local agencies be cut-off from access to data?
- Pursuing an amendment to allow access by 1) public agencies for data collection and reporting purposes and 2) research entity/organization for research purposes under controlled circumstances and as long as no personally identifying information is released
- DOJ: When DOJ is noticed of a sealing order for juveniles, staff will attempt to match record with JCPSS. Record is not deleted, but DOJ marks a box “Sealed” – data is still accessible for statistical purposes. Sealed records are included in the annual Juvenile Justice in California report.
- In Automated Criminal History System, record is sealed (deleted). Source documentation is held for a specified time; can be pulled only with court order. DOJ would not be able to access sealed records from ACHS.
- In Stanislaus County, box is checked when record is sealed. Record can no longer be searched by name, but statistical information is there for JCPSS and for other research purposes.
- In SLO County, sealed records are not deleted from the system until they turn 18.
- Research needs to have access to identifying information in order to track unique cases, but cannot release that information

ATTACHMENT A

- A written agreement with BSCC will not get someone access to DOJ or CDCR records. BSCC has not yet agreed to take this on.
- Distinction is not clear between releasing information to the researcher and then researcher releasing the information beyond that – and to what/whom is the information released?
- Should there be standardized agreement through Judicial Council versus individual agreements among counties

8. Statutory Changes Tied to Revised YOBG/JJCPA Reporting Requirements

- Question: Leave high-level budget allocations or remove (in plans)?
- Decision: Strip out language on projected budgets within plans. BSCC oversees program plans from a policy perspective, not funding allocations. What is the value for BSCC to have this information up front?

- Question: Consolidated plan versus two plans within one document
- Decision: Consolidated, comprehensive plan – reflect this in the statute

- Question: Calendar year versus fiscal year for expenditure versus outcome data
- Decision: Expenditure data – fiscal year
System data – calendar year
Program outcome data – may vary by county

9. Closing Discussion

- What do you need to know to follow one individual longitudinally?
- Might not make sense for us to try to generate that across the whole state
- Not how to define the outcome measure, but rather how to define the population being looked at
- Is there value in narrowing the population we look at versus looking at the universe?

10. Meeting Adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.