

# California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group:

Recommendations to Revise  
County Reporting Requirements for the  
Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and  
Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Programs

April 30, 2015



# Contents

---

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	3
Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (JJDWG): Membership & Timelines .....	4
Descriptions of the JJCPA and YOBG Programs .....	5
Why are Changes to the Reporting Requirements Recommended? .....	7
JJDWG Grant Report Guiding Principles .....	10
Recommended Changes to the Reporting Requirements .....	10
Recommendations in Detail .....	11
Tables showing side-by-side comparison of current requirements versus recommended modifications:	
<b>Table A.</b> County Annual Plans .....	12
<b>Table B.</b> County Annual Reports.....	13
<b>Table C.</b> BSCC Annual Reports to the Legislature.....	16
Rationale behind Proposed Changes.....	17
Collateral Issues and Challenges Addressed by JJDWG .....	19
Future Efforts and Next Steps.....	20
<b>Appendix A.</b> Side-by-Side Comparison of Current YOBG/JJCPA Grant Requirements.....	22

## Executive Summary

---

Assembly Bill 1468, Statutes of 2014, established the **California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (JJDWG)** to be housed at the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). Members of the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group are designated by statute. They include experts and practitioners representing courts, probation, county government, state data agencies, academia and youth service and advocacy organizations.

The JJDWG is tasked with recommending options to improve, upgrade and modernize state and local juvenile justice data systems in California, with a report due to the Legislature in January 2016. In addition, by April 30, 2015 the JJDWG must submit recommendations to the BSCC Board on improved reporting requirements for two major juvenile justice grant programs—the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and Youthful Offender Block Grant. Those recommendations must include “streamlining and consolidating current requirements without sacrificing meaningful data collection.”

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), adopted in 2000, supports an array of local youth crime prevention and juvenile justice supervision programs. The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) provides counties with resources to manage the caseload of non-violent juvenile offenders shifted from state to local control under California’s juvenile justice realignment law (Senate Bill 81, Statutes of 2007). In Fiscal Year 2013-14 these grant programs provided counties with \$220 million in juvenile justice system funds.

The need to review JJCPA and YOBG reporting requirements was driven by a growing recognition that current statutory reporting requirements are producing disjointed and unreliable data that are not useful in assessing the overall performance of the grants or the juvenile justice systems they support. Additionally, a 2012 report from the California State Auditor was critical of the approach used to report outcomes for the YOBG program, citing poor methodology and flaws in sampling.

The JJDWG, including a subcommittee on grant report revisions, met five times in 2014-15. In these meetings the JJDWG conducted a thorough review of current JJCPA and YOBG requirements, assessed current data system limitations, considered evolving juvenile justice trends and weighed multiple revision options.

The recommendations in this report cover three main areas: county juvenile justice plans that must be submitted annually to BSCC; county annual reports to BSCC on grant outcomes and expenditures; and annual BSCC grant reports to the Legislature. These recommendations, including the discussions leading to them and the rationale behind them, are explained in detail in the text of the report.

**The recommendations are as follows:**

- A. County Plans Submitted to BSCC:** By May 1 each year, counties will submit one consolidated plan for JJCPA and YOBG grant programs, to include:
- Descriptions of the programs and system enhancements to be funded;
  - Expected outcomes for those programs or system enhancements; and
  - An evaluation plan for each program and system-enhancement supported by these funds that follows BSCC guidelines for evaluation plans.
- B. County Annual Reports Submitted to BSCC:** By October 1 of each year counties will submit one consolidated outcome and expenditure report for both grant programs that will include:
- System-level data (as detailed in the report) on county-wide juvenile justice arrest, probation and court-related outcomes as captured in the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System and Monthly Arrest and Citation Register;
  - A description of how the programs and system enhancements have contributed to or influenced system-wide trends;
  - A description of evaluation outcomes tied to local evaluation plans for the unique programs and system enhancements supported by JJCPA or YOBG funds; and
  - Expenditure data listed by program.
- C. Annual BSCC Reports to the Legislature:** By March 1 of each year the BSCC will submit one consolidated summary outcome and expenditure report for both grants for the prior year to the Legislature.

The implementation of these recommendations will require some changes in YOBG and JJCPA statutory provisions. These changes are limited to consolidation, streamlining and improving the plan and report requirements. They would not alter the fundamental structures, goals, allocation criteria or other core features of the grant programs.

The JJDWG is confident that these recommendations will streamline and simplify the grant application process on the front end, as well as the outcome reporting process on the back end. The consolidation of grant plans and reports, including BSCC annual reports, will mean less time spent on routine administrative tasks and more time spent on program implementation, oversight and evaluation. Additionally, these changes will require that all counties report using system-level data available from currently maintained state databases, with supplemental reports for individual programs based on local evaluation plans. As a result the county and the state will be in a better position to make data-driven decisions to improve juvenile justice programs and services and to draw conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the JJCPA and YOBG grant programs.

## Introduction

---

The California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (JJDWG) was established in Penal Code Section 6032 by Assembly Bill 1468 (Budget Trailer legislation, 2014), as amended later by Senate Bill 1054 (2014). The JJDWG is housed at the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), which also provides staffing to the JJDWG.

The overarching mandate of the JJDWG is to examine state and local juvenile justice data collection systems in California, identify gaps and challenges, assess potential modifications and make corresponding recommendations for change. As summarized in the enabling law, "...[t]he purpose of the working group is to recommend options for coordinating and modernizing the juvenile justice data systems and reports that are developed and maintained by state and county agencies." (Penal Code Sec. 6032 (a)).

The JJDWG is charged by statute with a number of tasks and two major deliverables including:

- Analyzing the capacities and limitations of the data systems now in use, including a review of systems, studies and models from California and other states.
- Identifying changes or upgrades to improve the caseload and outcome data in California, including changes in recidivism and other performance outcome measures.
- Submitting a report to the Legislature by January 1, 2016 providing options for improving interagency coordination, modernization and the upgrading of information systems, including recommendations for a juvenile justice data website or clearinghouse, and an implementation feasibility assessment.
- Recommending a plan to the BSCC by April 30, 2015 to improve county reporting requirements for the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) programs.

This report fulfills the JJDWG's statutory requirement to submit a plan to BSCC by April 30, 2015 on revised reporting requirements for the JJCPA and YOBG programs. In this regard, Penal Code Section 6032(c)(2)(A)(3) specifically requires that:

*The working group shall...recommend a plan for improving the current juvenile justice reporting requirements of Section 1961 of the Welfare and Institutions Code and Section 30061 of the Government Code, including streamlining and consolidating current requirements without sacrificing meaningful data collection. The working group shall submit its recommendations to the Board of State and Community Corrections no later than April 30, 2015.*

## Juvenile Justice Data Working Group: Membership and Timelines

---

Membership in the JJDWG is designated by statute and includes representatives of the following agencies and organizations:

- The Department of Justice (DOJ),
- The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC),
- The Division of Juvenile Justice within the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR),
- The Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC),
- The Judicial Council,
- The California State Association of Counties (CSAC),
- Any other representatives that are deemed appropriate by the Board.

The authorizing legislation also specifies that, “Members of the working group shall include persons that have experience or expertise related to the California juvenile justice system or the design and implementation of juvenile justice data systems, or both.” The executive director of the BSCC worked with the chair of the JJDWG and other juvenile justice stakeholders to identify members beyond those specifically listed by organization in the enabling law.

**Membership.** The following individuals were appointed to the JJDWG, as approved by the BSCC Board in September 2014:

Name	Title and Affiliation	Representing
David Steinhart, Chair	Juvenile Justice Program Director, Commonweal	BSCC
Jill Silva, Vice Chair	Chief Probation Officer, Stanislaus County	CPOC
Wayne Babby	Deputy Director, Office of Research, CDCR	CDCR
Julie Basco	Deputy Director, Division of California Justice Information Services, DOJ	DOJ
Sue Burrell	Staff Attorney, Youth Law Center	Other
Mike Ertola	Chief Probation Officer, Nevada County	BSCC
Hon. Donna Groman	Judge, Los Angeles County Superior Court	Other
Denise Herz	Director, California State University Los Angeles, School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics	Other
Sandra McBrayer	Chair, State Advisory Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	Other
Laura Ridolfi	Law and Policy Analyst, W. Haywood Burns Institute	Other
Mike Roddy	Executive Officer, San Diego County Superior Court	Judicial Council
Jim Salio	Chief Probation Officer, San Luis Obispo County	CPOC
Dorothy Thrush	Chief Operations Officer, Public Safety Group, Chief Administrative Office, County of San Diego	CSAC

**Grant Reports Subcommittee.** At its first meeting in October 2014 the JJDWG formed a subcommittee to address the task of analyzing current reporting requirements for the JJCPA and YOBG programs and making recommendations for how to improve them. Members of this subcommittee, known as the Grant Reports Subcommittee, included:

- Sue Burrell
- Denise Herz
- Jim Salio
- Jill Silva
- David Steinhart
- Dorothy Thrush

**Report timelines.** The Grant Reports Subcommittee met in two full-day meetings (December 17, 2014 and February 24, 2015) before forwarding its recommendations to the full JJDWG for review and approval. With minor changes the subcommittee recommendations were adopted on March 11, 2015 and were referred to the staff for production of a draft report. The draft report was circulated for review and comment by JJDWG members prior to its final formatting and submission to the BSCC Board. All meetings of the JJDWG were held in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

## **Descriptions of the JJCPA and YOBG Programs**

---

**Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA).** The JJCPA program was created by the Schiff-Cardenas Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act of 2000 to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth. The provisions establishing the grant program are found in California Government Code Section 30061. Funding for the JJCPA grant program is linked by legislative formula to the Citizens' Options for Public Safety (COPS) grant program, also known as the Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Act, which supplies funds for local law enforcement personnel and operations.

JJCPA involves a partnership between the State of California, 56 counties (excluding Alpine and Sierra Counties that do not participate), and various community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the State Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in developing services.

To receive JJCPA funds a county must adopt a comprehensive, multi-agency Juvenile Justice Plan that meets detailed plan requirements specified in California Government Code Section 30061 (b)(4). The plan must be developed by a local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) of county stakeholders whose membership is defined by California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 749.22. The plan must be reviewed annually for modifications by the JJCC and approved by the county Board of Supervisors. Plans outlining proposed programs and expenditures for the upcoming year must be submitted to BSCC by May 1 of each year. By October 15 of each year counties must submit a report to BSCC on outcomes and expenditures for the previous fiscal year. The

statute lists specific data that must be included in these annual county reports covering program participant arrest, incarceration, probation violation and other outcomes listed in the California Government Code. These report requirements are addressed in further detail in later sections of this report.

**Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG).** The YOBG program was established in 2007 by Senate Bill 81 as the state-local funding component of the California juvenile justice realignment reform that moved all non-violent youth from state correctional facilities (the Division of Juvenile Justice) to local care and control. The YOBG fund provisions are found in California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 1951-56.

YOBG funds are made available annually to counties to support a range of custody and supervision strategies for juvenile offenders that were transferred to county control under SB 81. The amount of YOBG funds allocated to each county is based on a statutorily defined formula that gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population and the number of juvenile felony dispositions. YOBG supports the concept that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders close to their families and communities.

Per the statute, "allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant Fund shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders subject [to the provisions of SB 81]." Based on this provision allowable uses of YOBG funds are very broad. Counties have discretion and flexibility on where and how to spend the funds, including placements, direct services and capacity building and maintenance activities (Welfare and Institutions Code Section 1951).

The reporting provisions of SB 81 were amended in 2009 by SBX4 13, which added specific reporting requirements for counties receiving YOBG funds (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 1961(c)-(e)). An important feature of the 2009 amendments is the language at Section 1961(e), which permits the performance outcome measures listed in the statute to be modified by the Corrections Standards Authority (now, BSCC) if counties are substantially unable to provide the information needed to support the listed measures. As it turned out hardly any of the data supporting the outcome measures listed in the 2009 statute could feasibly be collected by counties, and an Executive Steering Committee of the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) subsequently defaulted to the adoption of the admittedly inadequate YOBG reporting requirements and measures that are now being recommended for revision.

SBX4 13 (Statutes of 2009) established the following annual reporting cycle for counties: by May 1 of each year counties must submit an annual Juvenile Justice Development Plan to the BSCC containing their proposed expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. Internally at BSCC these Development Plans are processed as Funding Applications by the counties. By October 1 of each year counties must submit to the BSCC a report of actual expenditures for the previous year. Also by October 1 of each year counties must report performance outcomes for a random sample of youth from the previous fiscal year.

In addition to these county reports that must be submitted to BSCC, the agency is required to compile and submit to the Governor and/or the Legislature annual state-level reports



summarizing the expenditures and outcomes in the previous cycle for each grant program. To date BSCC (and its predecessor, the CSA) have prepared and submitted separate annual reports for each grant program as required by law. One of the goals of the present effort is to identify options for consolidation, not only of the county reports that must be submitted to BSCC each October, but also of the annual reports that BSCC must prepare and submit to the Governor and the Legislature each year.

**JJCPA and YOBG funding.** Since inception both grant programs have been funded by annual appropriations of state funds to local county governments to support the programs and operations authorized by statute. In 2011 funds for these grants were rolled into a major state-local realignment plan that moved multiple state-funded operations and dollars into local realignment accounts. Since then funds for both the YOBG and JJCPA grant programs have been deposited annually by the state Controller in these county-level public safety realignment accounts. Each county's share is determined by allocation formulas contained in the enabling statutes. For FY 2013-14 and 2014-15 the statewide annual JJCPA allocation was \$107 million, funded through a combination of vehicle license fee and sales tax revenues. The statewide YOBG allocation depends on annual sales tax receipts. The total YOBG allocation for FY 2013-14 was \$104.3 million, with an additional \$9.2 million in what are known as "growth" funds. For FY 2014-15 the total YOBG allocation, including growth funds, is estimated by the Department of Finance to rise to nearly \$130 million, depending on actual sales tax receipts during the calculation year.

## **Why are Changes to the Reporting Requirements Recommended?**

The BSCC and its constituent county stakeholders have long recognized the data collection and reporting limitations inherent in the JJCPA and YOBG programs. Reporting requirements were added to the year 2000 Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act without a great deal of analysis or forethought given to standard definitions or the outcome measures themselves. The YOBG data collection and reporting requirements, as listed in the 2009 amendments to SB 81 (SBX4 13), were quickly determined by the CSA Steering Committee charged with implementing them to be impossible to support with existing data capacity. This led to the adoption of surrogate YOBG outcome measures that have continued to draw criticism.

Meanwhile counties have continued to gather and report the statutorily required data, and the BSCC has continued to produce annual data summary reports knowing that neither program was producing adequate performance outcome data. County and state practitioners responsible for these grant reports came to see the reporting process as simply a grant compliance task rather than as an effort providing meaningful data and analysis that could support juvenile justice program evaluation or inform investment decisions and program improvements. Other factors have intervened to cast doubt on the value of the existing JJCPA and YOBG grant report criteria, including the advent of major juvenile justice and adult corrections realignment reforms, declining crime rates, reduced incarceration levels, improved data-collection technology, and the development of new practice models, including the widely-accepted emphasis on

evidence-based programming. All of these factors compel the present need to revisit and update the reporting structures for both grant programs.

**Concerns identified by the California State Auditor.** In 2012 the California State Auditor conducted an audit of the YOBG program. As directed by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, the Auditor looked at a number of issues related to YOBG specifically and juvenile justice realignment in general. To conclude the audit, the Auditor produced a report titled *Juvenile Justice Realignment, Limited Information Prevents a Meaningful Assessment of Realignment's Effectiveness* (2012). The report was critical of the data collection and reporting methodology used for YOBG, calling it "flawed." Furthermore the report found that BSCC's efforts "focus primarily on the counties' use of block grant funds rather than on their juvenile justice systems as a whole," making it difficult to assess the impact of realignment.

The changes proposed herein by the JJDWG to streamline and consolidate reporting requirements for the JJCPA and YOBG programs are responsive to many of the concerns expressed in the state Auditor's YOBG report. For both grant programs, the recommended revisions are intended to provide more useful and relevant measures of grant impact, not only as to the implementation of the 2007 juvenile justice realignment reform, but also as to the overall performance of the California juvenile justice system across a wider array of relevant trends and outcomes.

**Consolidation and streamlining issues.** The statutory mandate for the JJDWG includes an instruction to consider how reports might be "streamlined and consolidated." Members of the working group spent a good deal of time addressing this concern, including consideration of the points summarized below:

- Both funding streams support similar community corrections programs and purposes. Both JJCPA and YOBG support alternative programming for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Funding through JJCPA supports a continuum of responses to juvenile crime using a collaborative approach to implement swift, certain and graduated responses for at-risk and offender youth. Funding through YOBG supports local and community alternatives to state youthful offender custody (Division of Juvenile Justice).
- Many counties combine JJCPA, YOBG and other local funds to support individual programs, whether those programs are administered by a public agency (e.g., probation) or by a community-based service provider. With co-funding of the programs it is difficult to segregate youth served by a single grant or to attribute outcomes to a single grant source. This problem can potentially be overcome using a consolidated reporting system.
- Counties are using different definitions and different methodologies for preparing and submitting YOBG and JJCPA grant reports. For JJCPA most counties assess their progress by comparing the results for juveniles participating in a JJCPA program to a reference group. That reference group, however, varies from county to county, as some counties consider participants prior to entering a program, some consider prior program participants, and others consider juveniles comparable to those who

received program services or some other external reference group. The length and timing of the evaluation periods for JJCPA vary from program to program as well. YOBG uses only a sample of juvenile offenders extracted from the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). For the 2013-14 reporting period the study sample was 1,156 out of the study population of 11,457 (i.e., all juveniles in the JCPSS database with felony adjudications between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013).

Forcing counties to use entirely different methodologies to track and report outcomes for grant programs that serve similar purposes and overlapping caseload is inefficient and involves duplication of effort.

- Under today's requirements BSCC essentially must double its workload to process plans and reports required by current law for both the YOBG and JJCPA grants. To the extent that plans and reports can be combined or consolidated without sacrificing meaningful data collection, BSCC can perform grant administrative operations more efficiently with the added benefit that BSCC staff can devote a greater share of its effort to providing technical assistance to counties and working directly with county stakeholders to improve the overall quality and utility of their grant related plans and reports.

The statutory goal of consolidating and streamlining reports is qualified by the instruction that proposed revisions must not "sacrifice meaningful data collection." While working toward consolidation, members of the JJDWG also acknowledge important differences in the two grant programs that are embedded in their statutes. Some of the key differences between the grant programs are:

- JJCPA is intended to fund a range of youth crime prevention and intervention programs and strategies linked to a countywide juvenile justice plan. YOBG is oriented mainly around the implementation of 2007 juvenile justice realignment (SB 81), reform that shifted juveniles from state custody (at the Division of Juvenile Justice) to local control.
- JJCPA funds are allocated by a Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) of local stakeholders whose membership is designated by statute, whereas local YOBG spending decisions are made mainly by the local probation department with Board of Supervisor approval.
- JJCPA funds may not be used to supplant other local programs or funds. YOBG does not have an anti-supplantation requirement.
- Other critical differences between the two grant programs are identified in the YOBG/JJCPA grant requirement comparison table developed by the Working Group and attached in Appendix A.

In short, while working toward the goals of consolidating and streamlining grant reports, it is not the intent nor is it the charge of the JJDWG to redefine or to merge these distinct funds into a single grant program. Further blending of the grant programs would be a policy matter properly addressed by the state Legislature.

## JJDWG Grant Report Guiding Principles

---

To help guide the process of recommending revised performance and reporting measures the Grant Reports Subcommittee in its first meeting adopted a set of principles of revision to inform the development of the proposed changes. Those principles were then adopted by the full JJDWG at its January meeting and are listed in the following table:

Juvenile Justice Data Working Group: Guiding Principles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Outcome measures for both funding streams should better reflect overall juvenile justice system performance.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Revised outcome measures for both funding streams should be the same or similar, to the extent possible.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Outcome measures and reports should capture information that is useful for the management of local juvenile populations and programs.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Outcomes should be measured using standardized statewide definitions.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Revised outcome measures should take into account legislative/policy changes and juvenile justice trends that have taken effect since program inception.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Outcome reports may be the same, but expenditures for YOBG and JJCPA must be accounted for separately.</i></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Consistent with any decisions made by the full JJDWG, reporting requirements should include youth wellness or success measures.</i></li></ul>

## Recommended Changes to the Reporting Requirements

---

**Overview.** The reporting changes recommended by the JJDWG, if adopted, will significantly alter the approach taken by state and local agencies to administer and evaluate the JJCPA and YOBG grant programs. The Grant Reports Subcommittee, early in its deliberations, recognized the flaws, disparities and limited utility of current reporting requirements in both grant programs. The Subcommittee acknowledged a present need for a fundamental reconfiguration of report requirements—one that involved discarding many of the program-specific outcome measures that are currently locked into the statutory structures of each grant.

In lieu of the existing measures considered outdated or not useful the Grant Reports Subcommittee has recommended that grant reports be refocused on broader county juvenile crime and outcome trend measures considered to be more useful and relevant indicators of program and investment success. Specific program-level outcomes will continue to be tracked and reported by counties, but going forward this will be done according to a local evaluation plan that takes into account the unique features, client base and service goals of each funded program. The recommended changes in reports –

as to timing, format and content – are summarized in this section. The following section describes the rationale for the changes recommended – describing what was viewed as problematic about the current requirements and how the recommended changes serve as solutions to the problems identified.

**Anticipated statutory changes.** The changes recommended in this report, if adopted and implemented, will require some changes in the statutory language and requirements for both JJCPA and YOBG plans and reports. The anticipated statutory changes will, in the main, be limited to the adjustments pertaining to the data elements to be reported and to the proposed consolidation of plans and reports and their respective submission dates. Depending on BSCC Board action and the legislative time table, these statutory changes conceivably could be adopted in time to be effective for YOBG and JJCPA plans and reports beginning with the FY 2016-17 plans due in May 2016.

## **Recommendations in Detail**

---

Below, we present our recommendations in three main areas:

**Table A.** County annual plans and applications submitted to BSCC

**Table B.** County annual reports on grant expenditures and outcomes submitted to BSCC

**Table C.** BSCC annual reports submitted to the Legislature summarizing expenditures and outcomes statewide

The recommendations are presented in the form of tables for each of these three areas and compare present requirements (left side) with the recommended modifications (right side). Below each comparison table you will find a list of points or comments providing additional detail or guidance on the recommendation made.

**Table A.**

**County Annual Plans:** Counties will submit one consolidated annual plan to BSCC for both YOBG and JJCPA grant programs.

Current Requirement	Change Proposed by JJDWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually, all 58 counties required submit <b>two separate plans</b>:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>For JJCPA: A funding application along with an update to the county's 2000 Juvenile Justice Local Action Plan (developed by the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council).</i></li> <li>(Note: Historically, Alpine and Sierra do not participate in JJCPA.)</li> <li>○ <i>For YOBG: A funding application, also known as a Juvenile Justice Development Plan (developed by the Probation Department).</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually, counties will be required to submit <b>one streamlined, comprehensive plan</b> to cover both programs. The consolidated plan must:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and describe programs or system enhancements to be funded;</li> <li>○ Define expected outcomes for those programs or system enhancements;</li> <li>○ Include their own data collection and evaluation plan for the programs and other system enhancements supported by the grants.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each plan <b>must include planned expenditure information</b>, including a detailed budget to describe how the department plans to spend JJCPA and YOBG funds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counties will <b>not be required to include expenditure or budget information</b>, since allocations are not known at time of plan submission.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC must review and approve <b>114</b> plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC will continue to review the <b>58</b> consolidated plans.</li> </ul>

Comments on recommended revisions to annual plans:

1. The proposed changes in BSCC plan submission requirements will not change the existing statutory requirements underlying the local development of these plans. Specifically, the role of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council is retained as presently outlined in the JJCPA enabling legislation. Thus counties still are subject to existing requirements related to updating, modifying and approving their JJCPA juvenile justice plans and to statutory requirements for local development, modification and BSCC approval of the YOBG plan.

2. The new evaluation component requires that, going forward, counties must include in their annual plans an evaluation plan for each program proposed to be funded. In this mode counties will design and specify their own program-specific outcome measures for funded programs. This approach resolves the current problem of attempting to force one-size-fits-all outcome measures on programs and client groups that may best be evaluated using tailored program criteria. BSCC will provide guidance on what constitutes a program and what level of evaluation planning must be described in the annual plans submitted to BSCC.

In addition county evaluation plans will be required to include a method for describing outcomes related to YOBG or JJCPA expenditures on non-program system enhancements; in this regard counties will be able to use system-wide trend data. BSCC will provide additional guidance to counties on meeting this evaluation component.

3. BSCC will devise the forms and provide counties with other submission instructions for consolidated plans.
4. The plan due date will remain May 1. Plans will continue to be submitted to cover fiscal year programming and expenditures.

**Table B.**

**County Annual Reports:** *Counties will be required to submit one consolidated annual report of expenditures and outcomes covering both JJCPA and YOBG.*

Current Requirements	Change Proposed by JJDWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All counties must submit <b>two separate annual reports</b>: one for JJCPA and YOBG.</li> </ul> <p>(Note: Historically, Alpine and Sierra do not participate in JJCPA.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Counties will submit <b>one consolidated annual report</b> to cover both programs.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All counties must submit separate expenditure reports for each program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within the consolidated report format counties still must provide annual expenditure data separated out for each program.</li> </ul>

Current Requirements	Change Proposed by JJDWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For JJCPA, counties must report the following outcome data (<b>only for juveniles participating in JJCPA funded programs</b>):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Arrest rate</li> <li>○ Incarceration rate</li> <li>○ Probation violation rate</li> <li>○ Rate of successful completion of probation</li> <li>○ Rate of successful completion of restitution</li> <li>○ Rate of successful completion of community service</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For YOBG, counties must report the following outcome data (<b>for only a relatively small sample group</b>):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ School enrollment during the year</li> <li>○ School enrollment at year end</li> <li>○ Graduation during the year</li> <li>○ New felony adjudication during the year</li> <li>○ New felony conviction during the year</li> <li>○ On probation during the year</li> <li>○ On probation at year end</li> <li>○ Committed to DJJ during the year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counties will no longer be required to submit separate, program-specific outcome reporting. Instead, all counties will be required to report on system-level data for <b>all juveniles</b> (disaggregated by race/ethnicity, age and gender):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Arrests (F/M*): Number &amp; Rate</li> <li>○ Diversion Rate                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Probation</li> <li>▪ Court</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Petitions Filed (F/M): Number &amp; Rate</li> <li>○ Sustained WIC 602 Petitions (F/M): Number &amp; Rate</li> <li>○ Placements: Number &amp; Rate</li> <li>○ Incarcerations: Number &amp; Rate                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Juvenile Hall</li> <li>▪ Camp/Ranch</li> <li>▪ Division of Juvenile Justice</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Subsequent Petition**: Number &amp; Rate                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Law Violation</li> <li>▪ Probation Violation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>*F/M: Felony/Misdemeanor</i>  <i>**To be considered as an indicator of "recidivism" for purposes of this report.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific evaluation plans are required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to the system-level data, the consolidated reports must contain:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A description of how the programs funded through YOBG and JJCPA have contributed to or influenced the system wide trends reported above.</li> <li>○ A description of evaluation outcomes, tied to the programs and system enhancements outlined in the plans, as developed by the counties.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC must review and approve up to <b>114</b> annual reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC will continue to review and approve the <b>58</b> consolidated reports.</li> </ul>



Comments on annual, consolidated county reports to BSCC:

1. The most notable change here, other than the consolidation of reports itself, is the elimination of the program-specific outcome data in favor of data that will now be reported on system-wide county juvenile justice trends and outcomes. The inadequacies and limitations of the program-specific outcome measures now contained in legislation and BSCC reporting mandates are explained at multiple points in this report.

The JJDWG is persuaded that more reliable and meaningful information on overall juvenile justice system performance, including the impact of grant-funded programs, can be provided by reports on the system-level data points listed in the table above. These data are readily available to counties using data submitted and compiled on California Department of Justice (DOJ) data banks (see point number 4 below). The new “trend line” approach to tracking county juvenile justice system outcomes will allow for consistent analysis and review of county-level results. BSCC will provide further instructions to counties on the trend data to be included in annual reports and how it may best be accessed or obtained from local or state sources.

2. The general trend data now to be reported by all counties is slated to be disaggregated by race/ethnicity, age and gender. BSCC will provide guidance to counties on exactly how disaggregation of these specific data elements is to be reported based on available data.
3. Program level outcomes must also be reported, but in the revised scheme program-specific outcomes will be reported by counties based on an evaluation plan the county devises for each YOBG- or JJCPA-funded program. This will open the door to more accurate, reliable and useful program-specific data that can be used to assess program performance and outcomes and to inform program-level modifications over time. BSCC will assist counties in the design and submission of program-specific evaluation reports that are to be submitted in compliance with this change.
4. The proposed changes assume the elimination of the online reporting system used for JJCPA. Counties will submit the consolidated, system-level data points in Excel spreadsheets. It is important to note that, with the exception of arrest data, counties will use data they already submit to the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) administered by the DOJ. There will be no duplicate reporting. Once counties receive their summary JCPSS data back from the DOJ each year they will verify the data, disaggregate it by race/ethnicity, age and gender, and then submit it to the BSCC. Arrest data is captured in the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) also administered by DOJ. MACR contains data submitted by all arresting agencies in the state. BSCC will establish an agreement with DOJ to facilitate the annual exchange of this data.
5. The JJDWG has adopted a goal of collecting relevant recidivism data on juvenile justice programs and clients, but given the limitations of current data system

technology the JJDWG has elected to defer recommending or imposing any standard requirement that counties must collect and report juvenile recidivism data in YOBG and JJCPA reports.

Adding data-collection capacity at the state and local level capable of supporting standardized recidivism reports is a challenge currently being considered by the JJDWG in the wider context of juvenile justice data system reforms that will be addressed in its 2016 report to the Legislature. For the present county JJCPA and YOBG outcome reports will include the available JCPSS data on subsequent petitions as a surrogate measure of recidivism. Further comments on recidivism data collection and reporting are found in a separate section below.

6. Detailed expenditure reports will continue to be required using report formats to be provided by BSCC.
7. BSCC will continue in an oversight and reporting role, to include:
  - Review and feedback on both Annual Plans and Annual Reports of Expenditures and Outcomes, as submitted by the counties.
  - Site visits, periodic desk audits and technical assistance to the counties as needed.
  - The submission of one consolidated Annual Report to the Legislature.

**Table C.**

**BSCC Annual Reports to the Legislature:** *In the future these annual reports will be combined into a single and consolidated report to the Legislature.*

Current Requirement	Change Proposed by JJDWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC must submit <b>two annual reports</b> to the Legislature: one for JJCPA and one for YOBG.</li> <li>• For YOBG, BSCC draws conclusions based on data that represents <b>only 5 percent of juveniles statewide</b>, using a methodology that attempts to separate the funding streams and tie juveniles to specific programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BSCC will submit <b>one consolidated annual report</b> to the Legislature assessing both programs.</li> <li>• The report will summarize program-specific and system-level outcomes from each county. For YOBG, system-wide outcomes will incorporate data for the entire juvenile justice population rather than a sample.</li> </ul>

Comments on the consolidated annual report:

The annual reports will seek to provide a statewide summary on the annual trend data now being reported by each county. To the extent possible the annual reports will also summarize the programs and program-specific outcome data that are reported by counties in accordance with the county-level evaluation designs and plans for each grant-funded program. Annual reports will continue to document expenditures of YOBG and JJCPA grant funds.

## Rationale behind Proposed Changes

---

Underlying the discussion around revised reporting requirements is the recognition that current outcome measures for both grant programs do not accurately reflect different county programs or needs and are of limited utility in evaluating program performance. The substitution of general and system-wide juvenile justice trend data for program-specific outcome data is expected to generate discussion and reaction from county and other stakeholder groups that are interested or involved in YOBG and JJCPA grant programs. The changes recommended in this report, including the modifications to outcome measures, were carefully considered and weighed against alternative proposals and options by the JJDWG. Some of the considerations taken into account by the JJDWG as it moved toward the recommendations of this report are cited below:

- **Existing data elements and performance outcomes required for both JJCPA and YOBG lack value or utility as meaningful measures of youth or system performance or success.** Members of the JJDWG carefully reviewed the performance outcomes reports required under the current system. There was unanimous agreement that the outcomes tracked under current requirements—aside from collection reliability concerns—are of limited value as measures of juvenile justice program performance. For example, JJCPA reports counting completion of community service or violations of probation were viewed as revealing little about whether youth in grant-funded programs are doing better, or about the quality or crime reduction impact of those programs. All in all, using currently supplied grant report data, no coherent picture of progress or juvenile justice system performance could be constructed, leaving program planners and policymakers without the information needed to assess the impact of grant funding on system-wide results.

In addition the program-level data being reported under current grant requirements has been notoriously inconsistent and unreliable. Thus the decision was reached by the JJDWG to have counties report more meaningful county juvenile justice trend data tied to more consistent and reliable data sources. Admittedly this approach does not put in place a statistically reliable methodology of being able to attribute county juvenile justice trends to the individual programs and investments made via the grants. To establish such an approach is beyond the technological reach of the data systems now in place. Meanwhile, program-specific outcomes are retained in the new reporting scheme based on individual

evaluation designs and outcome reports that will be required for each program funded by YOBG or JJCPA.

- **Existing program-specific outcome measures for both grant programs are flawed in multiple respects.** As repeatedly emphasized in this report, currently collected performance outcome data for both grant programs are flawed. No standard definitions for the data points under JJCPA apply to counties collecting and submitting the data, thus counties are submitting inconsistent data that defy useful comparison and evaluation. On the YOBG side program recidivism reports are troubling for several reasons. First, not all YOBG funds are expended on service programs, with a significant share going to support staffing and administrative costs, thus it is not always possible to link a YOBG expenditure with a program and service group of youth whose YOBG outcomes can be assessed. Secondly, YOBG relies on small statewide sample of 1,000 cases per year (pre-identified by the Department of Justice) to compile and report recidivism outcome data appearing in YOBG annual reports. This approach is indirect and unreliable as a measure of system-wide or county-level grant performance. Many of these deficiencies were highlighted in the California State Auditor's report (2012) that was critical of the current YOBG data collection methodology.
- **Difficulty tying individual juveniles to individual funding streams.** Because most county programs are split-funded with multiple funding sources, including some with both YOBG and JJCPA funding, it is difficult to make a connection with any certainty or validity between one particular funding stream and a particular program, outcome, or single set of youth clients.
- **The difficult, time-consuming process of double reporting.** Current requirements force counties to submit two plans and reports and to duplicate efforts where one consolidated plan and report may well suffice.
- **Local control issues.** With the implementation of both juvenile and adult realignment reforms, the trend in California is toward increased local control of justice system sanctions, interventions, supervision and programs. The proposed reporting changes will allow counties to devise their own program-specific evaluation plans without having to report on state-mandated and perhaps unsuitable or irrelevant outcome measures. The changes also acknowledge inherent differences in local and county demographics and crime control strategies. The inclusion of common and standard measures for broader juvenile justice trends adds a uniform data set that can provide useful information about progress toward juvenile justice realignment and crime reduction goals on a uniform, statewide basis.
- **Reduced administrative burden for counties and BSCC.** With the changes counties will no longer have the burden of developing two plans and completing two reports. In addition the reporting and consolidation changes will reduce the BSCC staff burden now involved in reviewing up to 114 plans, 114 outcome reports and 114 expenditure reports each year, while freeing staff time for troubleshooting and

technical assistance to counties in relation to the revised outcomes and for completion of the annual state reports.

- **Continued state guidance and oversight is necessary.** BSCC will retain a review and oversight role in order to ensure consistency with program intent. The changes will also free up staff time, allowing BSCC to spend more time in the field conducting program monitoring visits.

## **Collateral Issues and Challenges Addressed by the JJDWG**

---

The JJDWG discussed barriers that prevent consistent and meaningful data collection at either a local or state level. Inherent limitations in the capacity of the current data systems and networks make it difficult or impossible to support several desired juvenile justice system outcome measures. These larger system-wide challenges are being addressed by the JJDWG in the context of statewide data system recommendations due in its January 2016 report to the Legislature. Briefly, some of the challenges in three key areas are referenced below:

**Defining and measuring recidivism.** Recidivism is acknowledged to be a highly sought after and commonly accepted state and national standard for justice system (and realignment) performance. In California common statewide definitions and measures for recidivism in a juvenile justice context have yet to be devised. Currently available data technology does not support tracking juvenile offender outcomes. While recidivism measures are included in current JJCPA and YOBG grant reporting requirements, the lack of a standard definition of recidivism and inconsistent terms result in data that are of limited value. For these and other reasons the JJDWG is not presently able to recommend new recidivism outcome measures for grant funded programs. We have included a measure of “subsequent petitions filed” as a partial recidivism indicator that can be supported by currently available data. However, more meaningful recidivism data collection will have to wait until California state and local data systems are able to support this advance. The JJDWG is tackling this issue as a challenge that needs to be addressed in the wider context of juvenile justice data reform in California. Some of the specific recidivism development needs acknowledged by the JJDWG to date include:

- **Need to adopt standard definitions of recidivism.** While BSCC has adopted a standard definition of recidivism for the adult criminal justice system per statutory requirement (AB 1050), no such standard definition has been adopted on the juvenile justice side. Definition tasks include defining what constitutes a repeat recidivism event in the context of the juvenile justice system, and what the time periods for tracking recidivism should be.
- **Benchmarks and comparisons.** An overarching concern is: how will recidivism data, if collected, be used to assess or evaluate county or statewide grant and program performance? Benchmarks for comparison of recidivism outcomes are hard to come by and often involve comparing “apples to oranges” results using different recidivism criteria. There is the additional concern, expressed by some JJDWG members, that recidivism results posted by counties will vary widely

depending on different demographics, crime trends, law enforcement practices and other factors, illuminating the need for informed interpretation of reported results.

- **Technological support.** Data systems need to have the capacity to track offender outcomes over time and, in some cases, across different data systems. Currently the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) maintained by the Department of Justice is not capable of tracking and reporting juvenile offender recidivism, and system upgrades or replacement may be needed to meet changing data collection needs. Offender identifiers are a related issue in that different data systems have different methods of labeling and accessing case records for individual juveniles. The cost of supplanting old technology with new is an additional concern.

**Wellness measures.** The JJDWG has considered the need and value of tracking youth outcome measures that go beyond recidivism to include measures related to youth “wellness”—such as education status, health and mental health status, employment outcomes and other measures of youth and community well-being. YOBG reports currently include limited information on the school status of selected youth, but these measures have very limited reliability and utility. One goal of the JJDWG is to recommend approaches and options for addressing wellness outcomes for youth offenders in key areas. The concept is that we should be able to provide insight into how justice system control affects the re-entry and rehabilitation prospects and outcomes of justice-involved youth. The JJDWG is continuing to investigate options in this area.

**Broader technology challenges.** The data that counties can report is limited in light of currently available technology. The JJDWG is conducting a thorough investigation into the capacities and limits of current data technology. The main probation-court data system in California that supports reporting elements required for JJCPA and YOBG is the JCPSS. This system, maintained by DOJ, collects individual-level data submitted by county agencies. The system is antiquated by current standards and has only a limited capacity to add new data elements or to gather recidivism information. These limitations are barriers that prevent BSCC from imposing grant report requirements that may be desired but cannot be sustained by the available technology.

## **Future Efforts and Next Steps**

---

**Continued JJDWG discussions.** The JJDWG recognizes that the proposed changes to the reporting requirements for JJCPA and YOBG represent short-term fixes to a problem that needs a long-term solution. The challenges listed above will need to be addressed as a part of the JJDWG’s continued work. It is possible that future changes to the state’s data collection framework could further impact reporting requirements for the JJCPA and YOBG programs.

**Administrative cost set-aside in the grant programs.** Committee members discussed the fact that neither JJCPA nor YOBG program has a statutory earmark or set-aside of

administrative funds to support the administrative workload imposed on BSCC by the grant programs. This concern may be outside the scope of the statutory instructions for the JJDWG, but it is nevertheless a concern and issue that is related to the proposed overhaul of the plan and report requirements and may deserve further discussion.

**Next steps.** The proposed changes assume a continuing and enhanced administrative and oversight role for the BSCC. Initially, these responsibilities will include:

- *Working with the Administration and Legislature to implement any necessary changes to authorizing statutory language for JJCPA and YOBG.*
- *Developing template formats for both the consolidated County Annual Plans and County Annual Expenditure and Outcome Reports, to ensure some level of consistency in reporting of system-level as well as program-specific outcomes.*
- *Developing guidelines for evaluation plans, outcome measures and other criteria for ongoing compliance.*
- *Possibly holding regional technical assistance and outreach workshops to message the revised reporting requirements.*

**Appendix A**  
**SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF CURRENT YOUTHFUL OFFENDER BLOCK GRANT (YOBG)**  
**AND JUVENILE JUSTICE CRIME PREVENTION ACT (JJCPA) REQUIREMENTS**

Item	YOBG	JJCPA
A. Full name of grant program and year commenced	Youthful Offender Block Grant Program (2007)	Schiff-Cardenas Juv. Justice Crime Prevention Act (2000)
B. Purpose and program spending focus or limits	Funding to support local & community alternatives to state youthful offender custody (DJJ) including but not limited to seven types of programs listed at WIC Sec. 1960.	Funding to support a continuum of responses to juvenile crime using a collaborative approach to implement swift, certain & graduated responses for at-risk and offender youth.
C. Target Population	Juvenile offenders realigned from state custody (DJJ) to counties under SB 81.	Broadly defined at-risk juvenile justice population.
D. Current annual funding (FY 14/15)	\$ 113.8 million statewide	\$ 107 million statewide
E. In local public safety/ juvenile justice realignment account?	YES	YES
F. Allocating state agency	State Controller	State Controller
G. Allocation formula	County share based half on its share of the state juvenile population (10-17) and half on its juvenile felony adjudication rate as annually fixed by the Department of Finance; determined in 2007 to be the best available approximation of juveniles formerly eligible for DJJ.	County share is its share of the state general population; note this is not adjusted by statute to a share of the juvenile-only population. Note also: JJCPA funds are linked by formula (1:1) to annual COPS program funding within the combined total Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund.
H. Supplantation allowed?	YES	NO
I. Evidence based practice (EBP) requirement?	NO specific EBP requirements but annual reports must report outcome measures listed in statute (WIC 1961) as later modified by BSCC.	YES, programs must be based on those programs and approaches that have been demonstrated to be effective.
J. Data/ info system requirement?	NO, however the YOBG legislation does mandate a JJ Operational Master Plan that was issued in Jan. 2009 including a statewide data reform plan.	YES, programs must have info sharing systems to ensure coordination and success measurement.



**Appendix A**  
**SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF CURRENT YOUTHFUL OFFENDER BLOCK GRANT (YOBG)**  
**AND JUVENILE JUSTICE CRIME PREVENTION ACT (JJCPA) REQUIREMENTS**

Item	YOBG	JJCPA
K. Local fund recipient and funding body	County receives funds, allocation is by the Probation Department; though not required by statute some counties may require local Board of Supervisor approval for YOBG spending plans and programs.	County receives funds which are allocated by a County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council having diverse agency representation. Supervisors must approve the JJSC spending plan; see WIC Sec 749.22 for JJSC membership.
L. Plan submission requirement	Annual plan to BSCC with programs, services and strategies identified including program spending amounts; plan must state how it supports DJJ realignment and how it coordinates with JJCPA.	Annual plan with spending and programs Identified by the JJSC, approved by the Board of Supervisors and submitted to BSCC.
M. BSCC plan approval?	YES. Plan format to be set by BSCC which may provide for a dual format for counties for both YOBG and JJCPA funds.	YES, within 30 days of submission.
N. Plan due date	May 1 <sup>st</sup> of each year	May 1 <sup>st</sup> of each year
O. County evaluation and reporting requirements	Each county to submit an annual report to BSCC on utilization of funds including programs, strategies and facilities supported by grants, an accounting of county expenditures and outcomes on performance measures listed in statute at WIC Sec. 1961 (c). Due to data limitations, the statutory performance measures were significantly revised by a BSCC-ESC in 2009 to track recidivism rates (felony adjudications) and school and probation status for a statewide sample of about 1000 YOBG served/YOBG not served youth each year.	Each county to report annually to the Board of Supervisors and to BSCC on funded programs and outcomes. Report to include accounting of all program participants including those who do not complete the programs. Outcome measures shall include but not be limited to all of the following: rate of juvenile arrest per 100,000; rates of successful completion of probation, restitution and court-ordered community service; arrest, incarceration and probation violation rates of program participants; and annual per capita program costs.
P. County report submission date(s)	October 1st each year	October 15th each year
Q. BSCC annual report requirement	BSCC to submit a report to the Legislature by March 15 <sup>th</sup> of the following year summarizing how counties used grant funds and summarizing performance outcomes for the previous year. BSCC must post summaries of annual county reports on its website.	BSCC to compile local reports into an annual report to the Legislature by March 15 <sup>th</sup> of the following year on expenditures and statutory listed outcomes for the previous year.