



LINDA M. PENNER
Chair

KATHLEEN T. HOWARD
Executive Director

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

600 BERCUT DRIVE ♦ SACRAMENTO CA 95811 ♦ 916.445.5073 ♦ BSCC.CA.GOV



EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.
Governor

**Juvenile Justice Data Working Group
(JJDWG)
Thursday, October 9, 2014
BSCC • 660 Bercut Drive • Sacramento, CA • 95811**

Meeting Minutes

1. **Meeting Convened.** The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. by Chair David Steinhart.
2. **Members Present.** David Steinhart (Commonweal Juvenile Justice Program), Jill Silva (Stanislaus County Probation Department), Jim Salio (San Luis Obispo County Probation Department), Mike Ertola (Nevada County Probation Department), Julie Basco (California Department of Justice), Denise Herz (CSU, Los Angeles), Dorothy Thrush (County of San Diego), Mike Roddy (San Diego County Superior Court), Wayne Babby (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation), Sue Burrell (Youth Law Center), Hon. Donna Groman (Los Angeles County Superior Court).
3. **Members Absent.** Sandra McBrayer (The Children's Initiative) and Laura Ridolfi (W. Haywood Burns Institute)
4. **BSCC Staff Present.** Katie Howard, Executive Director; Bill Crout, Deputy Director, Corrections Planning and Programs Division; Bob Takeshta, Deputy Director, Administration and Research; David Lovell, Research Division; Colleen Curtin, Field Representative; Corey Kai, Research Program Specialist; Juanita Flores, CPP Division Secretary.
5. **Welcome and Introductions.** Katie Howard, Executive Director of the Board of State and Community Corrections, introduced herself, welcomed the group, and thanked them for agreeing to be part of this important, legislatively-mandated effort. Ms. Howard then asked the group to introduce themselves one at a time, describing their current work assignment as well as something unique they bring to the group. Each member spent a few minutes introducing them to the group, discussing their backgrounds and interest in this group.
6. **Overview of the JJDWG.** Chair Steinhart showed a PowerPoint presentation to provide an overview of the background and history, enabling legislation and tasks and deliverables. The following are highlights from the presentation:
 - Background and need: What prompted the creation of this group?
 - Rising concern about quality, sufficiency and reliability of juvenile justice data in California;
 - Recognition that adequate data are needed to support evidence-based practices, evaluation of programs, and overall quality assurance.
 - County agency concerns about data collection cost and workload

- Deficiencies noted to date:
 - Juvenile justice caseload data – limitations and missing information;
 - Facility data – information gaps and reliability issues;
 - Fractured responsibilities among agencies tasked with collection and reporting responsibilities (BSCC, DOJ, DJJ)
 - Antiquated software and data networks.
- Performance and outcome measures: What’s missing and what should be done?
 - Recidivism data – need to define “recidivism” for the juvenile justice system;
 - Other youth outcomes – what other data can we collect in “wellness” areas (e.g., education, employment, etc.)
 - Grant programs – what are the right outcome measures for state-funded programs
- Mandates for the JJDWG:
 - Analyze capacities and limitations of existing data systems and networks in order to identify changes and upgrades “to improve the capacity and utility of juvenile justice caseload and outcome data.”
 - Report to the Legislature due on 1/1/16 on options for improving interagency coordination, modernization and upgrading of state and local juvenile justice data systems.
 - Report to the BSCC due on 4/30/15 with recommendations on how to improve reporting requirements for the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) and Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs.

7. Background on California’s Juvenile Justice Data System. The group heard three brief presentations on juvenile justice data collection in California:

- **Julie Basco, Deputy Director - Division of CA Justice Information Systems, DOJ.**
 Provided an overview of the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS)
 - JPCSS established in 1995 and converted to a web-based system in 2002. The system has not been updated since the web conversion in 2002.
 - Limitations to the current system:
 - Static information
 - Depository only.
 - Aggregate data is all we have; no access to individual data.
 - The system cannot withstand major revisions to account for current data collection needs. Minor enhancements might be possible, but major enhancements would be difficult and unreliable.
 - Fed by local court and probation data systems:
 - JPCSS data reported on a monthly basis. Reporting is not a mandated requirement (there are currently two counties who do not report data to DOJ).
 - What kind of data is collected? – Juvenile actions referred to probation department (i.e. referral actions, count actions, termination actions, subsequent actions).

- Discussion:
 - Could JCPSS track recidivism outcomes? JCPSS would have to talk to other criminal history databases; not feasible.
 - Can we cross-check reliability of the data across counties to ensure consistency? This is not currently done due to limited resources.
 - Could update the system, rather than add to it. Use current system as a foundation and do upgrades.
 - JCPSS could be more useful if it had more variables. In its current state, it doesn't fulfill all local needs; seen as a mandate.

- **Toni Gardner, Field Representative - BSCC, Facility Standards and Operations.**
 Provided an overview of the state's Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS).
 - Required by Executive Order, not by statute.
 - Original intent of the JDPS – to collect information to help decision makers make the best choices regarding capital outlay, construction, programs and maintenance, how to operate, build, design facilities, where and how to spend money to provide adequate services.
 - Many concerns over why ethnicity is not captured.
 - ✓ Ans. The original intent was to address funding needs only.
 - Limitations to current survey:
 - County staff reporting may have limited program knowledge and/or high staff turnover which leads to reporting errors.
 - Data is not entirely reliable, some definitions may be unclear and lead to inconsistent interpretations. For example, "open Mental Health cases" to some counties means those juveniles with a formal Mental Health case and to some it means those juveniles with an identified need.
 - Some data elements are no longer relevant (i.e., questions regarding overcrowding).
 - Recommendations to change the survey were considered in 2009, but never adopted.

- **Denise Herz, Director – CSULA School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics.**
 Provided an overview of a pilot outcome study in Los Angeles where the Probation Department, Department of Child and Family Services, the Department of Mental Health and the Courts are partnering to study outcomes across and between systems.
 - It is important to look at what the IDEAL system would look like. Need a seamless data system that is easy to use and data that is collected/reported is meaningful.
 - Should track youth from the point of entry through termination from the system.
 - Data sharing with other systems is critical.

- The ideal would be ONE system, but if separate systems are necessary, then they MUST be able to interface.
- Systems that must interface in order to gather a complete picture:
 - ✓ Courts
 - ✓ Probation
 - ✓ Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS)
 - ✓ Mental Health
 - ✓ Schools
 - ✓ Public Health
 - ✓ Social Services
- Two thoughts of what an ideal system could look like:
 1. An interface that is able to pull from current silo systems. However, it was noted that this may not be a possibility. Why?
 - Would require a lot of work to make these individual systems “talk” with each other and if “talking” was a possibility, may require a lot of work from each department.
 2. If interfacing doesn’t work, then maybe require other agencies to enter in data into existing probation system. However, this would mean that agencies are double entering the same information into multiple systems.
 - This not any different than what probation does now for certain data (i.e., probation enters in data into their own system and the Child Welfare Case Management System for the California Department of Social Services).
- “Dashboard” system would be ideal.
- Ultimate end goal – *help Probation case manage their cases.*
- Challenges:
 - ✓ No standard definitions
 - ✓ No interagency agreements
 - ✓ No ability to interface
 - ✓ No statewide system
- Child welfare system in California is a good example of a consistent statewide data system – consistent across counties.
- Our current system is compliance-driven rather than outcome-driven.
- Recent study in Los Angeles found that most children are in trouble long before they enter the juvenile delinquency system, through one of the other systems:
 - ✓ DCFS
 - ✓ Mental Health
 - ✓ Dependency Court

Key Concept: *Data collection and evaluation is often seen as a “side job,” or done only for compliance-- something that takes staff away from providing direct services. This perception needs to change; California will never be successful with this mindset. Data collection and evaluation must be an integral part of any service model.*

8. Review and Discussion of Working Group Tasks and Deliverables. Based on the three presentations, members of the group began a discussion around what an ideal data system might look like.

Key Question: *Do we recommend the creation of a NEW system, or work toward interfacing between EXISTING systems?*

- **Preliminary concerns and issues arising in discussion:**
 - Consensus-that interfacing between all systems would be difficult.
 - Do not need one integrated system, rather have different departments enter data:
 - ✓ Data goes to a central repository
 - ✓ Can be accessed by all users
 - ✓ Must agree on definitions of terms
 - Strong interest expressed in development of outcomes, over and above recidivism, in order to track “wellness” outcomes for juvenile justice system youth in key areas such as education, employment, mental health.
 - “Collective ownership” of data and outcomes.
- **Subcommittee formation:** In order to best accomplish goals within specified timeframe, Working Group will establish a Grant Reports subcommittee to identify issues and recommendations for the report due April 2015 to the BSCC Board on reporting revisions.
 - The following Working Group members volunteered to serve on this subcommittee: David Steinhart, Jill Silva, Sue Burrell, Denise Herz, Dorothy Thrush and Jim Salio.
 - 1st meeting: Wednesday, December 17, 2014
 - Goal: Develop recommendations to present to the full Working Group at January meeting.
- The full working group will hear the subcommittee report in January and will work as a whole on the broader data reform review and recommendations for the Legislative report due January 2016.
- Group needs to understand current requirements and data collection limitations. Some priority items for review at the January meeting include:
 - Review YOBG Annual Report, Review JJCPA Annual Report

- Review State Auditor findings around YOBG program administration
- Cost should be factored into the work of this group. Consider how to factor in cost?
 - ✓ Cost/benefit
 - ✓ Cost effectiveness
- Review data already captured through the JCPSS and JDPS systems
 - ✓ Can we find useful data in these existing systems?

9. Next Meeting Dates:

- **Wednesday, December 17th – Grant Reports Subcommittee**
 - Sacramento, BSCC Room 660
- **Thursday, January 15th – full Juvenile Justice Data Working Group**
 - Sacramento, BSCC Room 660
 - Anticipated agenda Items for January meeting:
 - ✓ Report out from Grant Reports Subcommittee
 - ✓ Presentation from Los Angeles Probation Pilot Outcome Study
 - ✓ Review 2009 Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan, other California JJ data reform studies as relevant
 - ✓ Additional background on data system capacities, gaps, etc. and technological and cost challenges to modernization
 - ✓ Review of Other States' Work in this Area, Focusing on Cost and Requirements. Spotlight: Georgia, Florida—perhaps with live web-views of those on-line data clearinghouses
 - ✓ Identify research and information needs for follow up meeting(s)
 - ✓ Adopt JJDWG workplan with specific timelines linked to research activity, meetings, when recommendations will be adopted, reports will be drafted-reviewed-approved, etc.

10.Meeting Adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. by Chair David Steinhart.