



YOUTHFUL OFFENDER BLOCK GRANT

MARCH 2015
Annual Report



Youthful Offender

Block Grant

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2015

**Board of State and Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833
<http://www.bscc.ca.gov>**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., GOVERNOR
BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Board Members

Linda M. Penner, Chair

Board of State and Community Corrections

Jeffrey A. Beard

Secretary

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Michael Ertola

Chief Probation Officer (county under 200,000 pop.)

County of Nevada

Daniel P. Stone

Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

William R. Pounders

Judge

Retired – County of Los Angeles

Dean Growdon

Sheriff (jail with RC of 200 inmates or less)

County of Lassen

David L. Maggard, Jr.

Chief of Police

Irvine Police Department

Geoff Dean

Sheriff (jail with RC over 200 inmates)

County of Ventura

Scott Budnick

Community provider or rehabilitative treatment

or services for adult offenders

Anti-Recidivism Coalition

Susan Mauriello

County Supervisor or

County Administrative Officer

County of Santa Cruz

David Steinhart

*Community Provider or advocate with expertise in
effective programs, polices, and treatment of at-risk youth
and juvenile offenders*

Commonweal

Michelle Brown

Chief Probation Officer (county over 200,000 pop.)

County of San Bernardino

Mimi H. Silbert

Public Member

Delancey Street Foundation

Staff

Kathleen T. Howard, Executive Director

Tracie Cone, Communications Director

Patricia M. Pechtel, General Counsel

Robert J. Takeshta, Deputy Director

Administration & Research Division

Mary Jolls, Deputy Director

Corrections Planning & Programs Division

Allison Ganter, Deputy Director

Facilities Standards & Operations Division

Evonne Garner, Deputy Director

Standards & Training for Corrections Division

Kimberly D. Bushard, Field Representative

Corrections Planning & Programs Division

Nicole M. Woodman, Field Representative

Corrections Planning & Programs Division

Corey Kai, Research Program Specialist I

Administration & Research Division

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Background	3
History of the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program	3
YOBG Reporting Requirements	4
Key Provisions of YOBG	4
California State Auditor Review	5
Juvenile Justice Data Working Group	5
3. Expenditures Reported for FY 2013-14	7
Summary of Actual Expenditure Data	7
YOBG Expenditures by Fiscal Year Allocation	13
Leveraging of YOBG Funds	13
Planned Versus Actual YOBG Expenditures	15
4. Performance Outcome Process and Results	17
Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample	17
Assembling the Final Sample	17
Characteristics of Final Sample	18
Data Collection Instrument	19
Data Verification	19
Results	19
Comparison of Current Year Findings with Prior Year Findings	28
Summary	33

Tables

- Table 1 – YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- Table 2 – Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- Table 3 – YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type
- Table 4 – Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Category Type
- Table 5 – Summary of YOBG Expenditures
- Table 6 – Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category and Fiscal Year
- Table 7 – YOBG Expenditures by Allocation Year
- Table 8 – Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and Other Funding Sources
- Table 9 – Fiscal Year Comparisons of All Funding Sources
- Table 10 – Planned Versus Actual YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- Table 11 – Planned Versus Actual YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type
- Table 12 – Cases Excluded from Initial Study Sample
- Table 13 – Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample
- Table 14 – Mean Number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services
- Table 15 – Assessments, Placements and Direct Services Rates
- Table 16 – Frequency of YOBG Funding of Provided Assessments, Placements and Direct Services
- Table 17 – Baseline Characteristics of Study Sample
- Table 18 – Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period
- Table 19 – Performance Outcomes Relationships with Baseline Characteristics
- Table 20 – Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services
- Table 21 – Mean Number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services in the Three Most Recent Reporting Years
- Table 22 – Percentage of YOBG Youth and Other Youth Receiving Assessments, Placements and Services in Each of the Last Five Reporting Years
- Table 23 – Baseline Characteristics of YOBG Youth and Other Youth by Reporting Year
- Table 24 – Outcomes for YOBG Youth and Other Youth by Reporting Year

Appendices

- A – Expenditures and Per Capita Costs by Expenditure Category (All Funding Sources)
- B – Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item
- C – Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Category Type
- D – Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category and Fiscal Year
- E – Allocation Year Source of FY 2013-14 YOBG Expenditures
- F – Summary of Per Capita Costs
- G – Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by County
- H – Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by Program Type
- I – County YOBG Allocation Amounts and County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group

1 Executive Summary

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG), sometimes known as “juvenile realignment,” was enacted in 2007 by legislation that reassigned from state to local control the non-violent, non-serious, non-sexual offenders within California’s juvenile justice system.

The program had three primary goals: to reduce the number of offenders in Division of Juvenile Justice facilities, to reduce state costs for incarcerating lower level offenders, and to keep lower level offenders closer to home and to local support systems. In those ways, YOBG has been successful. From 2007-08 to 2013-14, the number of offenders in DJJ facilities declined from 2,439 to 523. Consistent with the population reductions, DJJ’s Institutions budget decreased from \$477 million to \$165 million. The DJJ parole population dropped to 0 (from 2,742) by the end of 2012-13, and the parole budget was eliminated.

In recognition of the increased county responsibilities for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through the YOBG program. The amount 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.

In FY 2013-14 statewide YOBG funding was \$104.3 million to serve 42,376 young offenders. To receive YOBG funding, counties submit annual funding applications and annual reports of expenditures and performance outcomes to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). In this report the BSCC has synthesized the data collected from county-submitted expenditure and performance outcome reports.

Given that 58 counties have approached juvenile realignment in 58 different ways it is not possible to draw inferences about cause and effect relationships between services and outcomes. That presents a problem in reporting outcomes. Funding legislation allows counties to spend their allocations as needed. It is possible for counties to make an argument for funding nearly anything that is part of their juvenile justice programs, a notion supported by anti-supplantation language in the statute. Some counties have used YOBG funds to offset cuts elsewhere in their budgets. Some use it for infrastructure or to infill staffing needs, while others apply it to programs. Because counties can decide how best to spend YOBG funding, not all provide services.

While juvenile crime rates continue to decline, the data do not paint a clear picture of the relationship between YOBG funding and outcomes for youth – especially their continued involvement in the criminal justice system. In three of the last five years, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth had new felony adjudications in juvenile court compared to Other Youth in the data sample used for this report. Also during

three of the last five years, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth had DJJ commitments. One factor might be that higher-risk youth are singled out for services. Another factor limiting usefulness of the reporting data is that only 5 percent of youthful offender cases statewide are analyzed by counties for this report.

Recognizing that previous reports have not given policymakers sufficient data regarding the juvenile offender population, the BSCC has been actively working with stakeholders to reconsider the data collection, analysis and reporting processes for YOBG. In April 2013 the Juvenile Justice Standing Committee (JJSC) reviewed reporting requirements specific to YOBG and began assessing data collection and reporting requirements for California's juvenile justice system as a whole. That work has continued in a more focused way with the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group (JJDWG) established by Assembly Bill 1468 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2014). The JJDWG is mandated to recommend a plan for improving the reporting requirements for both YOBG and the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) by streamlining and consolidating the current requirements without sacrificing meaningful data collection. The JJDWG is required to present that plan to the BSCC Board by April 30, 2015.

2 Background

History of the Youthful Offender Block Grant Program

The Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) Program was established in 2007 with the enactment of SB 81, and amended in 2009 by SBX4 13. The YOBG program realigned a segment of California’s juvenile justice population from state to county control. Under this legislation, counties are no longer permitted to send certain lower level offenders to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Youth who are no longer eligible for DJJ commitment are those who commit an offense that is not listed in Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 707(b) and is not a sex offense as set forth in Penal Code Section 290.008(c). YOBG supports the concept that public safety is enhanced by keeping juvenile offenders close to their families and communities.

In recognition of the increased county responsibility for supervising and rehabilitating youthful offenders subject to SB 81, the State provides annual funding through the YOBG program. 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. In FY 2013-14, statewide YOBG funding was \$104.3 million¹.

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. The proposed uses of YOBG funds vary significantly, reflecting the broad differences in California’s counties and highlighting local priorities. To guide counties in appropriate use of YOBG funds, the Legislature identified several key components counties could employ to positively and effectively impact the lives of juveniles who remain under their supervision per SB 81. Those key components include:

- Adequate risk and needs assessments;
- The ability to utilize a multitude of graduated sanctions from treatment to intensive supervision and detention;
- Re-entry and aftercare programs;
- Agency capacity building; and
- The formation or expansion of regional networks.

¹ \$104.3 million is the amount that was allocated for the 2013-14 fiscal year less growth funding. On November 25, 2014, counties received an additional \$9.2 million from the Juvenile Justice Growth Special Account that augmented the 2013-14 allocations. County expenditure of these funds will be included in next year’s annual report.

YOBG Reporting Requirements

In 2009, the enactment of SBX4 13 established the following annual reporting cycle:

By May 1 of each year counties must submit annual Funding Applications to the BSCC containing their proposed expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. These Funding Applications are also referred to as Juvenile Justice Development Plans.

By October 1 of each year counties must submit to the BSCC a report of actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year. Also by October 1 of each year, counties must report on performance outcomes for the previous fiscal year.

By March 15th of each year based on the October reports received from counties, the BSCC must prepare and submit to the Legislature a report summarizing county utilization of block grant funds in the preceding fiscal year, including a summary of performance outcomes. The BSCC must also post an annual summary of county reports on its website; however, the due date for this posting is not specified in law.

Key Provisions of YOBG

YOBG is formula-driven, not competitive: Every county is included in the YOBG program and receives an annual allocation. There is no competitive aspect to YOBG; each county's allocation is simply based on the formula prescribed in statute that gives equal weight to a county's juvenile population and its juvenile felony dispositions. The Department of Finance (DOF) calculates each county's allocation amount annually using its own demographic information for the juvenile population, and DOJ data for juvenile felony dispositions. Each county receives a minimum annual allocation of \$117,000, regardless of what the formula yields.

Broad flexibility: As provided by 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]." There is no other provision that addresses eligible uses of YOBG funds. Consequently, counties have tremendous flexibility in how they use YOBG funds and counties have used this flexibility to tailor YOBG-funded programs to fit local needs and priorities.

No Anti-Supplantation Clause: Consistent with the intent to give counties broad flexibility to manage the realigned population, the YOBG statute does not prohibit supplantation of funds. Consequently, some counties have chosen to use YOBG funds to offset cuts elsewhere in their budgets.

DOF and State Controller's Office roles: As specified in statute, the DOF is responsible for calculating the annual amount of YOBG funding to be allocated to each county. The DOF performs this calculation each year following enactment of the State budget. In turn, the State Controller's Office (SCO) is responsible for remitting the quarterly

allocation amounts to each county according to the calculation provided by the DOF. Consequently the BSCC, which is responsible for program administration and oversight for this program, is not the fiduciary agent.

BSCC Oversight/Monitoring: Although the BSCC has never received funding for administration of the YOBG program, the BSCC staff reviews each annual application, as well as expenditure and outcome reports, submitted by counties. If the BSCC staff identifies an issue or receives an inquiry regarding a county's use of YOBG funds that cannot be answered through a desk review, on-site monitoring is conducted in response.

WIC Section 1962(b) provides that "The [Board of State and Community Corrections] may monitor and inspect any programs or facilities supported by block grant funds ... and may enforce violations of grant requirements with suspensions or cancellations of grant funds." While this provision seems to provide a degree of accountability, the "grant requirements" for YOBG are so broad it is possible for counties to make an argument for funding almost anything that is part of their juvenile justice programs. The lack of anti-supplantation language in the statute further supports this county flexibility.

No Requirement for Evidence-Based Principles (EBP): Despite the current emphasis on evidence-based principles, there is no requirement that YOBG funds be used to support EBP. Nevertheless, some counties have opted to utilize YOBG funds in support of various evidence based practices.

California State Auditor Review

Commencing in February 2012, the California State Auditor (CSA) (formerly the Bureau of State Audits) conducted an audit of the YOBG program. As directed by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, the CSA looked at a number of issues related to YOBG specifically, and juvenile realignment in general. CSA issued its report in September 2012² and the BSCC has taken steps to implement some of the recommendations, including providing county-specific expenditure data and clarifying terminology related to county reporting of services.

Juvenile Justice Data Working Group

As required by AB 1468, the Juvenile Justice Data Working Group is a multidisciplinary group comprised of stakeholders who represent numerous geographic regions of the State. The JJDWG is mandated to recommend a plan for improving the reporting requirements for YOBG and JJCPA by streamlining and consolidating current requirements without sacrificing meaningful data collection. The JJDWG began meeting in October of 2014 and is actively working toward developing a plan for presentation to the BSCC Board by its April 30, 2015 statutory due date.

² BSCC's response to the report noted disagreement with some of the recommendations, however others are still under review for implementation. For additional information, the final audit report and the BSCC's response can be found on the CSA's website, <http://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2011-129.pdf>.

Given the data collection and reporting limitations that have been inherent in the YOBG program, the JJDWG represents an exciting opportunity for improvement. While the current methodology used to report YOBG performance outcomes is of limited utility to decision makers at either the State or local levels – and has brought scrutiny from a variety of stakeholders – the broad mandate of the JJDWG creates an opening for significant advancements in statewide juvenile justice data-collection efforts. By re-creating reporting requirements, the JJDWG is working toward a system that can be relied upon to inform policy making at the State level while significantly enhancing the ability of local governments to employ data-driven decision making. In addition to bringing increased efficiency and improved operations to both State and local components of the program, the work of the JJDWG also presents an opportunity to address some of the concerns identified by the State Auditor in its 2012 report.

3 Expenditures Reported for FY 2013-14

Summary of Actual Expenditure Data

On October 1, 2014 the fifth annual YOBG Actual Expenditure Reports were due from counties to the BSCC. All 58 counties complied with this reporting requirement. The expenditure information that follows was extracted from the county reports. While the expenditure information reported below is focused on YOBG expenditures, it should be noted that counties reported total expenditures for those YOBG Expenditure Categories that had multiple funding sources. For example, if a county had an electronic monitoring program funded 70 percent by YOBG, 20 percent by the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and 10 percent by the county general fund, the county reported all of those funding sources to the BSCC in its Actual Expenditure Report. For additional information regarding total funding for all YOBG Expenditure Categories, refer to Appendix A.

Counties reported total YOBG expenditures of \$100,158,880 in FY 2013-14. Total YOBG expenditures by budget line item are shown in Table 1. As in past years, the bulk of the funds were spent on staff Salaries and Benefits, accounting for more than 78 percent of total YOBG expenditures.

Table 1: YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

Line Item	Expenditures	Percent Total
Salaries & Benefits	\$78,401,472	78.28%
Services & Supplies	\$9,155,040	9.14%
Professional Services	\$7,286,047	7.28%
CBOs	\$4,376,689	4.37%
Fixed Assets & Equipment	\$54,325	0.05%
Administrative Overhead	\$853,297	0.85%
Other Expenditures	\$32,010	0.03%
Total	\$100,158,880	100.00%

YOBG budget line item expenditures for each of the past three fiscal years are reported in Table 2, while budget line item expenditures for the past five fiscal years are reported in Appendix B. Both Table 2 and Appendix B show notable consistency in the manner in which YOBG funds have been spent.

Table 2: Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

Line Item	FY 2013-14		FY 2012-13		FY 2011-12	
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total
Salaries & Benefits	\$78,401,472	78.28%	\$67,997,513	76.8%	\$69,501,485	76.5%
Services & Supplies	\$9,155,040	9.14%	\$8,124,244	9.2%	\$7,411,467	8.2%
Professional Services	\$7,286,047	7.28%	\$5,724,583	6.5%	\$7,268,432	8.0%
CBOs	\$4,376,689	4.37%	\$5,314,540	6.0%	\$3,764,557	4.1%
Fixed Assets	\$54,325	0.05%	\$232,369	0.3%	\$143,632	0.2%
Admin. Overhead	\$853,297	0.85%	\$701,427	0.8%	\$2,140,280	2.4%
Other Costs	\$32,010	0.03%	\$388,941	0.4%	\$565,433	0.6%
Total	\$100,158,880		\$88,483,617		\$90,795,286	

Table 3 shows FY 2013-14 YOBG expenditures by each of three major Expenditure Category Types – Placements, Direct Services, and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities. As shown in Table 3, over two-thirds of YOBG funds were spent on Placements (67.6 percent), with Direct Services accounting for nearly 30 percent of total YOBG expenditures. While this pattern of YOBG expenditures is generally consistent with prior years, the trend shows a slow increase in Direct Services expenditures. That trend is seen in Table 4, which shows YOBG expenditures by major Expenditure Category for each of the past three fiscal years, and in Appendix C, which shows the same data for the past five fiscal years.

Table 3: YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type

Expenditure Category Type	Amount	% Total
Placements	\$67,695,958	67.6%
Direct Services	\$29,839,086	29.8%
Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities	\$2,623,836	2.6%
Total	\$100,158,880	100.00%

Table 4: Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Category Type

Expenditure Category Type	Fiscal Year 2013-14		Fiscal Year 2012-13		Fiscal Year 2011-12	
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total
Placements	\$67,695,958	67.6%	\$59,806,502	67.6%	\$63,039,975	69.4%
Direct Services	\$29,839,086	29.8%	\$26,486,759	29.9%	\$25,632,549	28.2%
Capacity Bld/Maint	\$2,623,836	2.6%	\$2,190,356	2.5%	\$2,122,762	2.3%
Total	\$100,158,880	100.0%	\$88,483,617	100.0%	\$90,795,286	100.0%

Table 5 provides a more detailed breakdown of YOBG expenditures within each of the three major Expenditure Types. Specifically, results are reported for each of six types of Placements, 33 types of Direct Services, and six types of Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities. Total YOBG expenditures and the number of counties spending in the category are shown for each. In addition, the total number of youth served and the YOBG per capita cost are reported for each type of Placement and Direct Service.

Among Placements, Camps accounted for the largest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$37,014,095), with the second highest YOBG per capita cost (\$10,524). While Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facilities accounted for only \$7,435,133 of YOBG costs, this type of Placement had the highest per capita cost (\$11,439). The Placement most frequently funded by YOBG was Juvenile Hall (19 counties).

Mirroring last year's data, within Direct Services, Intensive Probation Supervision accounted for the greatest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$10,228,943), followed by Re-Entry or Aftercare Services (\$4,223,258), Other Direct Service - which includes various other services that are not captured by the other Direct Service categories (\$3,482,374), and Day/Evening Treatment Programs (\$2,643,989). The Direct Service most frequently funded by YOBG was Risk/Needs Assessment (19 counties). The two Direct Service categories with the highest per capita costs were Functional Family Therapy (\$5,854) and Family Counseling (\$4,472).

Among Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities, Staff Salaries/Benefits accounted for by far the greatest expenditure of YOBG funds (\$1,281,002), while Staff Training/Professional Development was the activity most frequently funded by YOBG (10 counties).

Table 5: Summary of YOBG Expenditures

Expenditure Category	Expenditures	Number of Counties	Youth Served	Per Capita Costs
Camp	\$37,014,095	13	3,517	\$10,524
Home on Probation	\$8,427,844	10	6,774	\$1,244
Juvenile Hall	\$7,416,618	19	3,622	\$2,048
Other Placement	\$7,251,151	3	768	\$9,442
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility Ranch	\$7,435,133	5	650	\$11,439
	\$151,117	3	31	\$4,875
All Placements	\$67,695,958	53	15,362	\$4,407
After School Services	\$27,003	2	311	\$87
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$123,216	3	208	\$592
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$648,721	8	671	\$967
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$485	1	8	\$61
Community Service	\$113,312	4	209	\$542
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$2,643,989	7	844	\$3,133
Detention Assessment(s)	\$165,608	2	678	\$244
Development of Case Plan	\$456,176	3	380	\$1,200
Electronic Monitoring	\$453,644	8	900	\$504
Family Counseling	\$979,299	1	219	\$4,472
Functional Family Therapy	\$152,204	1	26	\$5,854
Gang Intervention	\$234,436	1	90	\$2,605
Group Counseling	\$37,000	1	10	\$3,700
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$10,228,943	15	2,554	\$4,005
Job Readiness Training	\$88,630	1	149	\$595
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	\$47,303	2	754	\$63
Mental Health Counseling	\$1,359,696	9	1,155	\$1,177
Mental Health Screening	\$294,771	2	642	\$459
Mentoring	\$353,490	4	208	\$1,699
Other Direct Service	\$3,482,374	17	3,894	\$894
Parenting Education	\$2,609	1	71	\$37
Programming for Boys	\$58,741	1	79	\$744
Programming for Girls	\$245,110	4	583	\$420
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$1,369,504	9	802	\$1,708
Recreational Activities	\$127,471	5	880	\$145
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$4,223,258	8	1,267	\$3,333
Restorative Justice	\$8,506	2	17	\$500
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,514,072	19	8,555	\$177
Special Education Services	\$13,250	1	360	\$37
Substance Abuse Screening	\$4,409	1	250	\$18
Transitional Living Services/Placement	\$36,285	1	31	\$1,170
Tutoring	\$7,229	1	37	\$195
Vocational Training	\$338,342	2	172	\$1,967
All Direct Services	\$29,839,086	147	27,014	\$1,105
Capital Improvements	\$565,810	4	N/A	N/A
Contract Services	\$184,201	6	N/A	N/A
Equipment	\$23,516	2	N/A	N/A
Other	\$348,110	6	N/A	N/A
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,281,002	8	N/A	N/A
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$221,197	10	N/A	N/A
All Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities	\$2,623,836	36	N/A	N/A

Table 6 shows YOBG expenditures within each of the three major Expenditure Category Types for each of the past three fiscal years. To provide additional detail, Appendix D shows the same data for the past four fiscal years. Both data sets show a relatively consistent pattern in the manner in which YOBG funds have been spent.

Notable variations are seen with respect to the different types of Placements. As compared to FY 2012-13, expenditures for Camps and Home on Probation increased sharply, while expenditures for Juvenile Hall and Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility decreased slightly. Since FY 2011-12, the trend shows a steady decrease in expenditures for Juvenile Hall and Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility, while expenditures for Other Placements and Ranches have continued to increase.

The total number of youth receiving YOBG-funded Placements during FY 2013-14 (15,362) increased 5.5 percent from FY 2012-13 (14,559). More significantly, the number of youth receiving YOBG-funded Placements during FY 2013-14 has increased 79 percent since reporting began in FY 2009-10 (from 8,563 to 15,362). During that same time period, total YOBG expenditures for Placements increased by 7.5 percent (from \$62,944,571 in FY 2009-10 to \$67,695,958 in FY 2013-14).

Table 6 shows that within the major Expenditure Category Type of Direct Services, there were a number of significant changes from FY 2012-13 to 2013-14. YOBG funds were spent on Substance Abuse Screening for the first time. Sharp increases were seen in YOBG expenditures for Restorative Justice, Pro-Social Skills Training, and Intensive Probation Supervision. Sharp decreases were seen in expenditures for Programming for Boys, Parenting Education, Vocational Training, and Family Counseling. After downward spikes in FY 2012-13, the following Expenditure Categories returned to and/or exceeded FY 2011-12 levels: Development of Case Plan, Mental Health Screening, Programming for Girls, and Group Counseling. Although the number of youth receiving YOBG-funded Direct Services increased by less than one percent compared to FY 2009-10, total YOBG expenditures for Direct Services increased by 43 percent (from \$20,918,716 in FY 2009-10 to \$29,839,086 in FY 2013-14).

YOBG spending for Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities increased slightly over last year and has varied only minimally since FY 2009-10.

Overall, compared with last year, total YOBG expenditures increased by 13 percent in FY 2013-14, while the total number of youth served only increased by 2.3 percent. Since reporting began in FY 2009-10, total YOBG expenditures have increased by 15.7 percent (from \$86,570,073 in FY 2009-10 to \$100,158,880 in FY 2013-14) and the total number of youth served has increased by 19.2 percent (from 35,540 in FY 2009-10 to 42,376 in FY 2013-14).

Table 6: Three-Year Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category and Fiscal Year

Expenditure Category	YOBG Expenditures			Total Youth Served		
	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12
Camp	\$37,014,095	\$31,539,106	\$32,721,278	3,517	2,292	1,969
Home on Probation	\$8,427,844	\$5,742,128	\$9,062,040	6,774	4,898	4,940
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility	\$7,435,133	\$7,760,575	\$8,312,863	650	1,093	1,365
Juvenile Hall	\$7,416,618	\$8,552,368	\$8,719,676	3,622	5,422	4,108
Other Placement	\$7,251,151	\$6,094,416	\$4,149,027	768	816	837
Ranch	\$151,117	\$117,909	\$75,091	31	38	50
All Placements	\$67,695,958	\$59,806,502	\$63,039,975	15,362	14,559	13,269
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$10,228,943	\$6,633,044	\$5,574,312	2,554	2,745	2,461
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$4,223,258	\$3,665,753	\$2,733,452	1,267	1,789	2,162
Other Direct Service	\$3,482,374	\$4,969,585	\$5,352,780	3,894	4,702	4,086
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$2,643,989	\$2,529,646	\$2,193,519	844	1,013	879
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,514,072	\$1,574,655	\$1,525,376	8,555	7,376	4,908
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$1,369,504	\$829,230	\$799,880	802	691	889
Mental Health Counseling	\$1,359,696	\$1,298,880	\$1,503,618	1,155	1,419	1,343
Family Counseling	\$979,299	\$1,336,173	\$1,202,578	219	378	138
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$648,721	\$496,650	\$473,464	671	1,177	512
Development of Case Plan	\$456,176	\$11,342	\$412,299	380	295	642
Electronic Monitoring	\$453,644	\$579,166	\$714,481	900	693	1,679
Mentoring	\$353,490	\$216,765	\$214,067	208	93	108
Vocational Training	\$338,342	\$670,301	\$739,844	172	259	261
Mental Health Screening	\$294,771	\$55,193	\$212,012	642	255	588
Programming for Girls	\$245,110	\$170,363	\$234,865	583	222	217
Gang Intervention	\$234,436	\$244,309	\$200,666	90	100	96
Detention Assessment(s)	\$165,608	\$154,713	\$219,070	678	734	1,788
Functional Family Therapy	\$152,204	\$158,287	\$171,002	26	74	65
Recreational Activities	\$127,471	\$148,147	\$337,547	880	348	422
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$123,216	\$173,938	\$191,031	208	189	247
Community Service	\$113,312	\$103,518	\$50,451	209	173	140
Job Readiness Training	\$88,630	\$103,507	\$140,458	149	205	237
Programming for Boys	\$58,741	\$163,966	\$136,745	79	360	265
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	\$47,303	\$54,205	\$55,345	754	671	491
Group Counseling	\$37,000	\$19,158	\$58,197	10	85	7
Transitional Living services./Placement	\$36,285	\$60,476	\$78,055	31	55	115
After School Services	\$27,003	\$32,221	\$28,721	311	295	413
Special Education Services	\$13,250	\$13,250	\$27,014	360	395	417
Restorative Justice	\$8,506	\$4,950	\$0	17	22	0
Tutoring	\$7,229	\$8,950	\$5,100	37	20	15
Substance Abuse Screening	\$4,409	\$0	\$0	250	0	0
Parenting Education	\$2,609	\$6,417	\$0	71	0	0
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$485	\$0	\$46,600	8	0	134
All Direct Services	\$29,839,086	\$26,486,758	\$25,632,549	27,014	26,833	25,725
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,281,002	\$1,188,927	\$1,198,314			
Capital Improvements	\$565,810	\$132,101	\$0			
Other Capacity Building/Maintenance	\$348,110	\$315,923	\$242,653			
Staff Training/Development	\$221,197	\$367,542	\$299,056			
Contract Services	\$184,201	\$62,438	\$37,101			
Equipment	\$23,516	\$109,343	\$114,923			
Other Procurements	\$0	\$14,082	\$230,715			
All Capacity Building Activities	\$2,623,836	\$2,190,356	\$2,122,762			
Total	\$100,158,880	\$88,483,616	\$90,795,286	42,376	41,392	38,994

YOBG Expenditures by Fiscal Year Allocation

Counties are not required to spend YOBG funds in the year they are allocated. Table 7 shows the YOBG funding sources (fiscal year allocations) that were used by counties during FY 2013-14. As shown in the table, almost 83 percent of all YOBG funds spent in FY 2013-14 were taken from the FY 2013-14 allocation. Another 10.5 percent of the YOBG expenditures were from the FY 2012-13 allocation, followed by much smaller amounts from the allocations for FY's 2011-12, 2010-11, 2009-10, 2008-09 and 2007-08. The \$82,816,232 spent from the FY 2013-14 allocation constitutes 79 percent of the total allocation of \$104,280,195 received by the counties in FY 2013-14.³ Allocation year sources of FY 2013-14 YOBG expenditures for each county are presented in Appendix E.

Table 7: YOBG Expenditures by Allocation Year

Allocation Year	Expenditure Amount	Percent Total
FY 2013-14	\$82,816,232	82.68%
FY 2012-13	\$10,522,716	10.51%
FY 2011-12	\$5,540,779	5.53%
FY 2010-11	\$1,087,491	1.09%
FY 2009-10	\$164,041	0.16%
FY 2008-09	\$27,621	0.03%
FY 2007-08	\$0	0.00%
All Allocations	\$100,158,880	100.00%

Leveraging of YOBG Funds

As mentioned previously, for each Expenditure Category funded by YOBG, counties are required to report expenditures from funds received under the JJCPA program, as well as other funding sources. Table 8 summarizes this information and shows that for all Placements, Direct Services, and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities that received YOBG funding, this funding accounted for 63.2 percent of all spending reported by the counties for these items, with one percent of total expenditures coming from JJCPA funds (\$1,657,708), and the remaining 35.8 percent of total expenditures coming from other funding sources (\$56,833,480). Again this year, as a percentage of total reported expenditures, the contribution of YOBG funds was greatest for Direct Services (86.7 percent) and smallest for Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities (45.3 percent). Overall, these results indicate that for every \$1 in YOBG funds spent by counties, an

³ By comparison, 77% of FY 2012-13 expenditures were made from the FY 2012-13 allocation, 78.0% of FY 2011-12 expenditures were made from the FY 2011-12 allocation, and 80.2% of FY 2010-11 YOBG expenditures were made from the FY 2010-11 allocation.

additional \$0.59 was spent from other funding sources (\$0.02 from JJCPA; \$0.57 from other sources).^{4, 5}

Table 8: Expenditures from YOBG, JJCPA and Other Funding Sources

	YOBG Expenditures		JJCPA Expenditures		Other Expenditures		All Expenditures
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount
Placements	\$67,695,958	57.2%	\$1,105,174	0.9%	\$49,642,069	41.9%	\$118,443,201
Direct Services	\$29,839,086	86.7%	\$527,486	1.5%	\$4,052,739	11.8%	\$34,419,311
Cap Bldg./Maint.	\$2,623,836	45.3%	\$25,048	0.5%	\$3,138,672	54.2%	\$5,787,556
Total	\$100,158,880	63.2%	\$1,657,708	1.0%	\$56,833,480	35.8%	\$158,650,068

Table 9 shows expenditures from all sources (YOBG, JJCPA and Other Funds) in each of the past five fiscal years. Whereas YOBG expenditures accounted for a larger percentage of total expenditures in FY 2009-10 (71.6 percent), YOBG expenditures as a percentage of total expenditures were very similar for the past four fiscal years (63.2 percent in FY 2013-14, 61.9 percent in FY 2012-13; 63.9 percent in FY 2011-12; 62.0 percent in FY 2010-11). Over the five years that counties have been reporting expenditure data, both JJCPA and Other Funds expenditures have fluctuated minimally from year to year. Comparing FY 2013-14 to FY 2012-13, JJCPA and Other Funds expenditures as a percentage of total expenditures decreased to 1.0 percent and 35.8 percent, respectively.

Table 9: Fiscal Year Comparisons of All Funding Sources

Fiscal Year	YOBG Funds		JJCPA Funds		Other Funds		All Funds
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount
2009-10	\$86,570,073	71.6%	\$2,946,940	2.4%	\$31,409,664	26.0%	\$120,926,677
2010-11	\$97,103,010	62.0%	\$2,053,926	1.3%	\$57,526,537	36.7%	\$156,683,473
2011-12	\$90,795,286	63.9%	\$2,884,901	2.0%	\$48,437,748	34.1%	\$142,117,935
2012-13	\$88,483,617	61.9%	\$1,990,221	1.4%	\$52,542,355	36.7%	\$143,016,193
2013-14	\$100,158,880	63.2%	\$1,657,708	1.0%	\$56,833,480	35.8%	\$158,650,068

⁴ This compares to 62 cents in other funds spent for every YOBG dollar in FY 2012-13, 56 cents in other funds spent for every YOBG dollar spent in FY 2011-12, and 61 cents in other funds spent for every YOBG dollar spent in FY 2009-10.

⁵ See Appendix F for breakdowns of per capita costs for each Expenditure Category for all funding sources and for YOBG expenditures only.

Planned Versus Actual YOBG Expenditures

In addition to reporting annually to the BSCC on actual YOBG expenditures, in the spring of each year counties are required to submit a report of planned YOBG expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year. Table 10 provides comparative information on planned and actual YOBG activities and expenditures for FY 2013-14. As indicated, 16 fewer “Programs” (types of Placements or Direct Services, and Types of Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities) than planned were funded by YOBG, and more than 5,000 fewer youth were served. Total YOBG expenditures were about \$1 million less than anticipated due to fewer-than-expected YOBG dollars being spent on Professional Services, Administrative Overhead, Other Expenditures, Salaries & Benefits, Community Based Organizations and Fixed Assets & Equipment. Conversely, spending on Services and Supplies was higher than anticipated.

Table 10: Planned Versus Actual YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

	Planned	Actual	Difference
Programs	252	236	-16
Youth Served	47,657	42,376	-5,281
Salaries & Benefits	\$79,022,012	\$78,401,472	-\$620,540
Services & Supplies	\$5,745,439	\$9,155,040	\$3,409,601
Professional Services	\$8,464,953	\$7,286,047	-\$1,178,906
CBOs	\$4,927,073	\$4,376,689	-\$550,384
Fixed Assets & Equipment	\$403,898	\$54,325	-\$349,573
Administrative Overhead	\$1,860,297	\$853,297	-\$1,007,000
Other Expenditures	\$875,000	\$32,010	-\$842,990
Total Expenditures	\$101,298,672	\$100,158,880	-\$1,139,792

Table 11 provides a further breakdown of planned versus actual activities and expenditures within each of the three major Expenditure Category Types. As indicated in this table, actual expenditures were far less than planned in the Direct Services Expenditure Category Type. There were 19 fewer Direct Services programs and 3 more Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities actually delivered in comparison to what was planned. Alternatively, there was no difference at all in the planned versus actual number of programs delivered under the Placements Category. Turning back to expenditures, actual YOBG expenditures exceeded planned expenditures for both Placements and Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities Category Types.

As shown in Appendix G, the variance between planned and actual expenditures is primarily attributable to just a small number of counties. During 2013-14, Los Angeles County spent more than originally planned, while Orange and San Bernardino counties spent less.

Table 11: Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category Type

Program Expenditure Category Type		Programs	Total Expenditures
Placements	Planned	53	\$66,370,094
	Actual	53	\$67,695,958
	Difference	0	\$1,325,864
Direct Services	Planned	166	\$33,028,414
	Actual	147	\$29,839,086
	Difference	-19	-\$3,189,328
Capacity	Planned	33	\$1,900,164
Bldg./Maint.	Actual	36	\$2,623,836
Activities	Difference	3	\$723,672

While planned versus actual YOBG expenditures are presented by “County” in Appendix G, Appendix H provides information on planned versus actual YOBG expenditures by “Program Type” (i.e., individual Expenditure Category within each of the three major Expenditure Category Types). The largest variances were the result of more spending than planned for Camps and less than planned for Tutoring, Other Placement and Home on Probation.

4 Performance Outcome Process and Results

Choosing and Selecting the Target Sample

BSCC staff, based on established direction from the Executive Steering Committee, worked with the Department of Justice (DOJ) to extract a random sample of 1,200 juveniles with sustained felony offenses between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013 from its Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS). In addition, DOJ provided a random sample of alternate cases for each county based on the number of sampled cases from each county that were subsequently excluded last year. For both the main sample and the alternate sample, juveniles with sustained felonies were selected based on the presumption that these youth reasonably approximate the types of juveniles who would have been likely candidates for DJJ commitment prior to SB 81. The specific time period was selected so that services and outcomes data could be collected for the one-year period following the disposition date for the sustained felony for each juvenile. The same general methodology has been used each of the past three years.

The number of cases sampled from each county was based on the percent of total YOBG funds received by each county, with a minimum of one case selected from each county. Within counties, sampling was done randomly within each gender group. Alpine, Amador, Del Norte, Mono, San Benito, Sierra, and Trinity counties did not have any felony adjudicated youth during FY 2012-13 and therefore did not report any youth for this reporting cycle.

Using these procedures the total number of cases for which data was sought was 1,260.

Assembling the Final Sample

A total of 104 cases were excluded to arrive at the final sample of 1,156 cases. The reasons for exclusion are shown in Table 12. As reported in the table, reasons for exclusion, in order of frequency, were early termination of jurisdiction (judiciary termination of juvenile probation either upon or shortly after disposition of the adjudicated offense), a non-felony adjudicated offense (an offense ultimately adjudicated as a misdemeanor), a sealed record (precluding collection of the desired data), transfer out of the county, an invalid case number (case not located in county records), transfer out of state, and an invalid disposition (case does not match county records). For the first time since FY 2010-11 no county reported a transfer to DJJ upon initial disposition for the adjudicated offense as a reason for exclusion. A listing by county showing the estimated YOBG allocation amount used to determine the target sample as well as the number of cases in the target sample and final sample is provided in Appendix I.

Table 12: Cases Excluded from Initial Study Sample

Reason for Exclusion	Number	Percent
Early Termination of Jurisdiction	39	37.5%
Non-Felony Adjudicated Offense	35	33.7%
Sealed Record	12	11.5%
Transferred Out of County	12	11.5%
Invalid ID (Could Not Locate in County Records)	3	2.9%
Transferred Out of State	2	1.9%
Invalid Disposition (Does Not Match County Records)	1	1.0%
Total	104	100.0%

Characteristics of Final Sample

Table 13 compares the age and other demographic characteristics of the final sample with those of the study population, i.e., all juveniles in the JCPSS database with felony adjudications between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. Inspection of the table shows that the final sample is highly similar to the study population.

Table 13: Demographic Characteristics of Study Population and Final Sample

Characteristic		Study Population (N=11,457)	Study Sample (N=1,156)
Mean Age (on Date of Adjudication)		16.04	16.59
Gender	Female	12.68%	11.33%
	Male	87.32%	88.67%
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian	0.42%	0.61%
	Asian Indian	0.09%	0.17%
	Black	26.46%	23.96%
	Cambodian	0.08%	0.09%
	Chinese	0.12%	0.00%
	Filipino	0.38%	0.35%
	Guamanian	0.01%	0.00%
	Hawaiian	0.01%	0.00%
	Hispanic	54.96%	53.80%
	Japanese	0.03%	0.00%
	Korean	0.03%	0.00%
	Laotian	0.05%	0.00%
	Other	1.41%	2.34%
	Other Asian	0.53%	0.17%
	Pacific Islander	0.31%	0.26%
	Samoan	0.20%	0.35%
Unknown	0.57%	0.00%	
Vietnamese	0.17%	0.17%	
White	14.17%	17.73%	

Data Collection Instrument

Performance Outcome data were collected via electronic files formatted in Excel. In addition to collecting information on selected outcomes, data were also collected for five types of Assessments, seven types of Placements, and 31 types of Direct Services. For each such applicable item, information was collected on all source(s) of funding, (YOBG, JJCPA, and Other funds). Baseline data were also collected on each juvenile as of the date of disposition (enrolled in school, case plan in place, employed, etc.). As mentioned previously, all service and outcome data were collected with reference to the one-year period following each juvenile's adjudicated felony disposition date.

Data Verification

All data received from the counties were subjected to a series of data-checking procedures to identify missing or conflicting responses. Counties were alerted to all such items and worked with BSCC staff to resolve any discrepancies. All but a small number were resolved.

Results

YOBG-Funded Services

Counties reported providing one or more YOBG-funded Assessment, Placement or Direct Service to 517 of the 1,156 youth sampled (44.7 percent). Alternatively, counties reported that 639 of the sample youth (55.3 percent) did not receive any YOBG-funded Assessments, Placements or other Direct Services. Within this report these youth are referred to as YOBG Youth and Other Youth respectively.

As shown in Table 14, the average number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services received by YOBG Youth was significantly greater than for Other Youth. Specifically, YOBG Youth received an average of 3.3 Assessments, 2.3 Placements, and 9.4 Direct Services; this compares to an average of 2.6 Assessments, 1.9 Placements, and 8.2 Direct Services for Other Youth. For each category, as well as for all categories combined, the difference in the averages is statistically significant. As in all subsequent tables, statistically significant findings are presented in bold to distinguish them from findings which are not statistically significant.⁶

Table 14: Mean Number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services

	YOBG Youth	Other Youth
Assessments	3.3	2.6
Placements	2.3	1.9
Direct Services	9.4	8.2
Combined	15.0	12.7

⁶ As is standard practice, a probability value of .05 or less ($p \leq .05$) was used as the criterion for statistical significance. Chi-Square was the predominant test statistic used to evaluate statistical significance.

The percentage of YOBG Youth and Other Youth who received each type of Assessment, Placement and Direct Service are shown in Table 15. Within each category, the specific types are ordered from highest to lowest based on the percentage rate for YOBG Youth.

As reported in Table 15, YOBG Youth received more Assessments than Other Youth, with four out of five types of Assessments being significantly greater. The most frequent Assessment for each group was Risk and/or Needs Assessment, while the least frequent was Mental Health Screening, which showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups.

With respect to Placements, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth were placed in a Juvenile Hall or Camp, whereas significantly more Other Youth spent time Home on Probation. Juvenile Hall and Home on Probation were by far the most prevalent Placements experienced by both YOBG Youth and Other Youth. The results also reflect the fluid nature of the youth during the one-year period from the date of disposition, with many youth in both groups spending time in more than one type of Placement during this time period.

The results for Direct Services show that a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth received 16 of the 31 Direct Services listed, and a higher percentage of Other Youth received the Direct Services of Restitution, Community Service, Restorative Justice, and Parent Education.

Table 15: Assessments, Placements and Direct Services Rates

Assessment, Placement or Direct Service	YOBG Youth (517)	Other Youth (639)
<u>Assessments</u>		
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	81.6%	68.4%
Substance Abuse Screening	69.4%	52.6%
Detention Assessment	62.9%	43.0%
Educational Assessment	61.3%	46.2%
Mental Health Screening	50.5%	45.1%
<u>Placements</u>		
Juvenile Hall	85.9%	61.7%
Home on Probation	78.1%	83.6%
Camp	30.8%	13.9%
Other Placement	17.0%	19.4%
Private Residential Care Facility	7.5%	6.7%
Ranch	4.3%	6.9%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility	3.7%	2.8%
<u>Direct Services</u>		
Case Plan	83.9%	73.4%
Intensive Probation Supervision	62.7%	30.7%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	60.2%	59.5%
Gender Specific Programming for Females	49.0%	16.3%
Group Counseling	46.4%	43.0%
Restitution	46.2%	56.5%
Pro-Social Skills Training	43.7%	37.9%
Recreational Activities	43.5%	33.5%
Community Service	43.5%	52.1%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	43.1%	47.7%
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	40.4%	45.9%
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	32.7%	35.7%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	31.7%	18.2%
Electronic Monitoring	31.1%	21.3%
Family Counseling	27.5%	32.7%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	26.3%	16.7%
Gang Intervention Program	26.3%	17.8%
Gender Specific Programming for Males	26.0%	12.0%
Mentoring	22.6%	16.6%
After School Services	21.1%	14.7%
Transitional Living Services	20.5%	16.1%
Job Readiness Training	20.5%	10.5%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	19.5%	11.7%
Special Education Services	19.1%	15.8%
Restorative Justice	17.0%	37.7%
Tutoring	13.7%	15.3%
Parent Education	13.5%	21.1%
Vocational Training	12.4%	5.8%
Job Placement	11.0%	7.7%
Functional Family Therapy	9.9%	7.8%
Monetary Incentives	7.5%	5.5%

YOBG Funding Priorities

The results reported in Tables 14 and 15 clearly indicate that youth who benefited from some YOBG funding were the recipients of greater numbers of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services. However, an important but different question not addressed by these results is that of priorities for YOBG funding. In other words, when a specific type of Assessment, Placement or Direct Service is provided to a youth, how often is it funded in whole or in part by YOBG? Results pertaining to this question are reported in Table 16. Specifically, two values are reported for each type of Assessment, Placement and Direct Service – the number of youth who were the recipients of the Assessment, Placement or Direct Service (irrespective of funding source); and for these youth, the percentage of cases where YOBG funds were used in whole or in part to fund the Assessment, Placement or Direct Service. Within each general category of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services, items are listed from highest to lowest in terms of the percentage of cases that received the intervention pursuant to the expenditure of YOBG funds. For example, as shown in the table, a total of 695 of the 1,156 cases in the Final Study Sample received Substance Abuse Screening during the one-year period from the date of disposition for their felony adjudicated offense. And for 19.1 percent of these cases, YOBG funds paid for some or all expenses associated with the Substance Abuse Screening Assessment.

The results in Table 16 show little variation in the priorities given to YOBG funding, with YOBG funds being spent on 20.6 percent of all Assessments, 23.6 percent of all Placements and 23.5 percent of all Direct Services. Among the different types of Assessments, YOBG funds were most often spent on Risk and/or Needs Assessments (26.3 percent of cases) and least often on Detention Assessments (15.5 percent of cases). By a large margin YOBG funding for Placements most frequently occurred for Camp (49.6 percent of cases), whereas for the most frequently occurring Placement of Home on Probation YOBG funds were spent in only 15.7 percent of cases. YOBG funding for Other Secure Placement Facility (27.0 percent of cases) was most comparable to the funding for Juvenile Hall (31.0 percent of cases) and fairly comparable to the frequency with which YOBG funds were spent on all Placements (23.6 percent of cases).

Among Direct Services, YOBG funds were most often spent on Vocational Training (41.6 percent of cases) and Gender Specific Programming for Males (41.5 percent of cases), but served a relatively small number of youth (101 and 188, respectively). By contrast, the Direct Service that was provided to the most youth received less YOBG funding. The services received by the largest numbers of youth included Case Plan Development (903 youth, 23.1 percent funded by YOBG), Alcohol/Drug Treatment (691 youth, 29.1 percent funded by YOBG), and Restitution (600 youth, 8.8 percent YOBG funds). On the whole YOBG funded 23.5% of the Direct Services provided to a total of 10,037 youth.

As noted above, the most striking feature of the overall pattern of results is the similarity in the percentage of cases funded across and within all Assessments, Placements and Direct Services.

Table 16: Frequency of YOBG Funding of Provided Assessments, Placements and Direct Services

Assessment, Placement or Direct Service	Youth Served	Percent Funded by YOBG
<u>Assessments</u>		
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	859	26.3%
Mental Health Screening	549	22.8%
Substance Abuse Screening	695	19.1%
Educational Assessment	612	17.3%
Detention Assessment	600	15.5%
All Assessments	3,315	20.6%
<u>Placements</u>		
Camp	248	49.6%
Juvenile Hall	838	31.0%
Other Secure Placement Facility	37	27.0%
Home on Probation	938	15.7%
Other Placement	212	11.8%
Ranch	66	7.6%
Private Residential Care	82	2.4%
All Placements	2,421	23.6%
<u>Direct Services</u>		
Vocational Training	101	41.6%
Gender Specific Programming for Males	188	41.5%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	280	38.6%
Intensive Probation Supervision	520	37.5%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	243	32.5%
Job Readiness Training	173	30.1%
Pro-Social Skill Training	468	29.7%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	691	29.1%
Gender Specific Programming for Females	38	28.9%
Group Counseling	515	28.2%
Electronic Monitoring	297	27.6%
After School Services	203	27.1%
Gang Intervention	250	26.8%
Recreational Activities	439	26.4%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	176	25.0%
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	502	24.5%
Monetary Incentives	74	24.3%
Case Plan	903	21.3%
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	397	20.9%
Job Placement	106	19.8%
Special Education Services	200	19.5%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	528	18.4%
Transitional Living Services and/or Placement	209	18.2%
Functional Family Therapy	101	17.8%
Tutoring Funding	169	17.2%
Mentoring	223	17.0%
Parent Education	205	16.6%
Restorative Justice	329	15.2%
Community Service	558	12.4%
Family Counseling	351	11.7%
Restitution	600	8.8%
All Direct Services	10,037	23.5%

Baseline Characteristics

Certain baseline information was collected for each youth in the final sample with reference to their status on the date of disposition. Results for these status indicators are presented in Table 17, with YOBG Youth compared to Other Youth, and show some significant differences between the two groups. Although both groups had a high percentage of youth with a case plan in place and substance abuse indicated in case file, for YOBG youth the percentage for substance abuse in case file was significantly higher at 87.8 percent. A significantly greater percentage of Other Youth had a mental health diagnosis indicated in their file, although there was virtually no significant group difference with respect to the taking of psychotropic medications. There was a significantly higher percentage of Other Youth employed on the date of disposition than YOBG Youth and no significant group difference between groups with respect to educational achievement. Unlike previous years, there was a significantly greater percentage of Other Youth enrolled in school than YOBG youth. While a higher percentage of Other Youth had a WIC 300 indicated in their case file, a lower percentage received a WIC 241.1 Evaluation, and the group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 17: Baseline Characteristics of Study Sample

Baseline Characteristic	YOBG Youth	Other Youth
Enrolled in School	87.7%	92.3%
Employed	7.3%	12.0%
High School Grad or GED Indicated in File	8.8%	10.2%
Case Plan in Place	84.9%	80.9%
Substance Abuse Indicated in File	87.8%	79.8%
Mental Health Diagnosis Indicated in File	33.7%	45.2%
Taking Psychotropic Medications	20.6%	20.3%
Ever WIC 300 Indicated in Case File	11.4%	14.7%
Ever Received a WIC 241.1 Evaluation	8.7%	7.6%

Performance Outcomes

Information was collected on seven different outcomes related to education and further involvement in the criminal justice system. All outcomes pertain to the one-year period from the date of disposition of the adjudicated felony. Results are reported in Table 18, and show no significant differences between YOBG Youth and Other Youth with respect to enrollment in school during the year, end-of-year school enrollment, or school graduation/receipt of GED or equivalent during the year. A significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth were found for all four criminal justice outcomes: New Felony Adjudication in Juvenile Court, New Felony Conviction in Adult Court, On Probation at end of year, and Committed to DJJ during the year. It should be noted, however, that the percent of youth committed to DJJ remained very low for both groups (1.0% YOBG Youth vs. 0.5% Other Youth).

Table 18: Performance Outcomes During One-Year Follow-Up Period

Performance Outcome	YOBG Youth	Other Youth
Enrolled in School At Any Time During Year	96.7%	95.1%
Enrolled in School At End of Year	75.2%	76.4%
Graduated from High School or Achieved GED or Equivalent	11.0%	9.7%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	20.5%	14.4%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	5.6%	2.5%
On Probation At End of Year	84.1%	68.7%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.0%	0.5%

Additional analyses were conducted to examine whether performance outcome differences for the outcomes of enrollment in school during the year, probation status at the end of the year, and commitment to DJJ during the year were associated with any of the significant baseline differences as reported in Table 17. Results of these analyses are shown in Table 19. Table entries are the percentages of cases among both YOBG Youth and Other Youth who achieved each outcome within each baseline characteristic subgroup. For example, as reported in the table, among those who had substance abuse indicated in their file on the date of disposition, 77.2 percent were on probation at the end of the year; whereas for those who did not have substance abuse indicated in their file, 67.7 percent were on probation at the end of the year.

As shown in Table 19, being employed was found to be significantly related to lower rates of school enrollment during the year, and much lower rates of being on probation at the end of the year. Having substance abuse indicated in their file was found to be related to a higher rate of being enrolled in school at any time during the year and a significantly higher rate of being on probation at the end of the year. Youth with a mental health diagnosis in their file showed a higher percentage on probation at the end of the year and a significantly greater percentage enrolled in school at any time during the year.

Table 19: Performance Outcome Relationships with Baseline Characteristics

Performance Outcome (One Year Follow-Up)	Baseline Characteristic	
	Yes	No
	Employed	
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	90.0%	96.6%
On Probation at End of Year	58.2%	77.0%
Committed to DJJ During Year	0.9%	1.4%
	Substance Abuse Indicated in Case File	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	96.1%	94.8%
On Probation at End of Year	77.2%	67.7%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.5%	2.1%
	Mental Health Diagnosis Indicated in Case File	
	Yes	No
Enrolled in School at Any Time During Year	98.1%	94.4%
On Probation at End of Year	77.3%	74.5%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.5%	1.6%

Analyses were also conducted to examine whether outcomes were associated with “dosage effects” with respect to the number of Direct Services received during the year. Results of these analyses, which include all youth irrespective of whether they received YOBG funding, are presented in Table 20. The results show that being on probation at the end of the year, being enrolled in school during the year, and having a new felony adjudication were all significantly related to the number of Direct Services received, with the overall trend showing that the more direct services a youth received, the more likely youth maintained involvement in school and in the juvenile justice system. Statistically significant results were also found for the outcomes of being committed to DJJ during the year and being enrolled in school at the end of the year, however the pattern of results is less clear with respect to an increase in direct services being related to higher occurrences of these outcomes.

Table 20: Performance Outcomes and Number of Direct Services

Performance Outcome (One Year Follow-Up)	Number of Direct Services			
	1-5	6-10	11-15	>15
Enrolled in School At Any Time During Year	94.0%	96.1%	98.7%	99.4%
Enrolled in School At End of Year	74.9%	72.7%	80.9%	83.2%
Graduated from High School or Achieved GED or Equivalent	8.9%	12.6%	11.1%	8.4%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	12.4%	14.7%	20.0%	25.2%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	3.8%	4.1%	3.8%	3.2%
On Probation At End of Year	66.3%	74.2%	83.8%	91.0%
Committed to Division DJJ During Year	1.9%	2.4%	.4%	0.6%

Comparison of Current Year Findings with Prior Year Findings

Highlighted below are the similarities and differences in the findings for the current reporting year and prior reporting years.⁷

Age at Disposition for Felony Offense

The mean age at the time of disposition for the felony offense upon which the juveniles were randomly selected (i.e., mean age at time of disposition for the offense that occurred during the applicable fiscal year) was 16.6, compared to 16.5 in FY 2012-13 report, 16.6 in each of the prior two years, and 16.5 the first year.⁸

Percentage of YOBG Youth

The percentage of youth receiving one or more YOBG-funded Assessment, Placement or Direct Service increased slightly from 42.1 percent in the previous year to 44.7 percent in the current year. Two years prior, 38.3 percent of youth received one or more YOBG-funded Assessment, Placement or Direct Service. Three years prior, the rate was 43.3 percent and four years prior the rate was 33 percent.

Frequency of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services

In all five years YOBG Youth received, on average, a significantly greater number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services during the one year from the date of disposition of their felony offense. As shown in Table 21, the difference in the mean number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services decreased from FY 2011-12 to FY 2012-13, due entirely to the reduced mean number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services for YOBG Youth from the prior reporting year. This pattern of results for each type of service is not seen between FY 2013-14 and FY 2012-13. However, as compared to the prior year, YOBG Youth are receiving more combined services than Other Youth.

⁷ Current reporting year (FY 2013-14) findings refer to findings for youth who were randomly sampled based on an adjudicated felony that occurred in FY 2012-13; findings for prior years are those for youth who were randomly sampled based on an adjudicated felony that occurred in FY 2011-12, FY 2010-11, FY 2009-10, or FY 2008-09.

⁸ Similarly, the mean ages for the populations of juveniles from which the samples were randomly selected were 16.6 in the current year, 16.5 in FY 2012-13, 16.6 in FY 2011-12 and FY 2010-11, and 16.5, 16.5 in the first reporting year.

Table 21: Mean Number of Assessments, Placements and Direct Services in the Three Most Recent Reporting Years

	FY 2013-14			FY 2012-13			FY 2011-12		
	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	Mean Difference	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	Mean Difference	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	Mean Difference
Assessments	3.3	2.6	0.7	3.2	2.8	0.4	3.6	2.8	0.8
Placements	2.3	1.9	0.4	2.1	1.9	0.2	2.2	1.9	0.3
Direct Services	9.4	8.2	1.2	8.4	7.1	1.3	10.0	7.5	2.5
Combined	15.0	12.7	2.3	13.6	11.8	1.8	15.8	12.2	3.6

The percentage of YOBG Youth and Other Youth who received each type of Assessment, Placement and Direct Service in each of the five reporting years is presented in Table 22

Inspection of Table 22 shows a significantly greater percentage of YOBG Youth received each of the five types of Assessments in FY 2011-12, FY 2010-11 and FY 2009-10. In FY 2012-13 this was true for all but Risk/Needs Assessment, and in the current reporting year this was true for all but Mental Health Screening. In every year the Assessment most frequently conducted for the youth in both groups was a Risk/Needs Assessment.

Results reported for Placements show that by far the most frequently occurring placements experienced by youth in both groups are Juvenile Hall and Home on Probation. In every year a significantly greater percentage of YOBG Youth spent some time in Juvenile Hall; whereas over the course of five years, there has either been no significant difference in the percentage of youth who were Home on Probation, or the percentage has been significantly higher for Other Youth. Among the less frequently occurring types of placements, in each of the past four years significantly more YOBG Youth were placed in a Camp. There are no discernible trends in the results for the other less frequently occurring Placements.

Results for Direct Services show that YOBG Youth received consistently greater levels of such services. However, in the current reporting year a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth received each of 16 specific services, compared to 17 specific services the previous reporting year and 24 specific services two years prior. Although not a significant reduction from the previous year, it reflects a change in the previous trend of a significantly higher percentage of YOBG youth receiving each of a greater number of specific services from year to year.

Case Plan Development has been the most frequently provided Direct Service to youth in both groups all five years. Intensive Probation Supervision and Alcohol/Drug Treatment have also been among the most highly occurring Direct Services for both groups. For all of these Direct Services, the frequency of occurrence has been significantly higher for YOBG youth in every reporting year for Intensive Probation Supervision. Alcohol/Drug Treatment had no significant group difference in the current

reporting year. Case Plan Development showed no significant group difference in the prior reporting year.

The current reporting year also marks the third consecutive year in which Other Youth received Restorative Justice at significantly higher rates than YOBG Youth, and the first time a significantly higher percentage of Other Youth participated in a Parenting Education Program.

Baseline Characteristics and Performance Outcomes

Table 23 shows the baseline characteristics of YOBG Youth and Other Youth in each of the five reporting years. As indicated in the table:

- In all five years a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth had substance abuse indicated in their file at the time of disposition for their felony offense.
- Except for FY 2011-12, a significantly higher percentage of Other Youth had a mental health diagnosis on file.
- Except for FY 2012-13, the percentage of cases with a Case Plan in place has been greater for YOBG Youth; however, it was not significantly greater in FY 2013-14.
- There has been a two-year trend where the percentage of cases with a WIC 300 declaration indicated in their file was higher, but not significantly higher for Other Youth in the current reporting year.
- In the current year, there are no group differences with respect to those that had a record in their file of taking psychotropic medications.
- No significant group differences have been found with respect to having graduated or receiving a GED or having a WIC 241.1 evaluation indicated in case files.
- In FY 2013-14, for the first time, a significantly higher percentage of Other Youth were enrolled in school at some time during the one year following disposition of their felony offense.

Table 22: Percentage of YOBG Youth and Other Youth Receiving Assessments, Placements and Direct Services in Each of the Last Five Reporting Years⁹

Assessment/ Placement/Direct Service	2013-14		2012-13		2011-12		2010-11		2009-10	
	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth
Assessments										
Risk/Needs Assessment	81.6%	68.4%	82.6%	80.4%	87.1%	74.6%	92.4%	74.4%	91.9%	80.4%
Detention Assessment	62.9%	43.0%	61.5%	51.8%	74.3%	53.5%	71.1%	48.6%	78.4%	58.1%
Substance Abuse Screening	69.4%	52.6%	67.4%	60.4%	71.0%	58.1%	81.9%	65.0%	76.3%	62.0%
Educational Assessment	61.3%	46.2%	53.7%	37.9%	63.8%	50.4%	74.8%	46.8%	72.2%	59.5%
Mental Health Screening	50.5%	45.1%	57.0%	51.3%	63.4%	44.1%	65.9%	51.9%	67.4%	48.3%
Placements										
Juvenile Hall	85.9%	61.7%	76.2%	59.1%	80.8%	60.8%	77.7%	57.7%	74.3%	65.7%
Home on Probation	78.1%	83.6%	84.8%	82.0%	75.6%	83.6%	78.3%	83.0%	75.4%	77.7%
Camp	30.8%	13.9%	25.2%	13.5%	32.2%	16.5%	28.9%	11.6%	20.4%	24.1%
Other Placement	17.0%	19.4%	9.4%	16.4%	10.7%	14.3%	12.9%	12.0%	15.0%	7.2%
Private Residential Care Facility	7.5%	6.7%	4.1%	4.5%	8.5%	6.8%	4.8%	7.5%	4.2%	11.5%
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab. Facility	3.7%	2.8%	2.7%	3.7%	7.8%	1.6%	4.0%	6.4%	5.7%	4.4%
Ranch	4.3%	6.9%	3.9%	7.1%	7.4%	7.7%	7.2%	4.1%	12.3%	3.4%
Direct Services										
Case Plan	83.9%	73.4%	82.2%	85.0%	85.4%	77.8%	85.9%	77.3%	88.3%	73.6%
Intensive Probation Supervision	62.7%	30.7%	62.1%	46.4%	66.9%	40.7%	64.9%	46.3%	60.5%	31.8%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	60.2%	59.5%	60.7%	50.9%	64.7%	51.6%	61.0%	48.1%	56.9%	36.0%
Restitution	46.2%	56.5%	49.0%	49.0%	56.2%	61.9%	49.6%	43.5%	47.0%	34.4%
Individual Mental Health Counseling	43.1%	47.7%	43.0%	34.5%	52.3%	36.5%	42.4%	32.9%	41.6%	41.4%
Group Counseling	46.4%	43.0%	39.3%	33.8%	49.2%	37.0%	46.4%	43.4%	46.4%	35.0%
Recreational Activities	43.5%	33.5%	35.7%	27.7%	48.1%	42.4%	44.4%	33.0%	39.5%	43.3%
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	40.4%	45.9%	42.6%	36.0%	45.1%	33.9%	46.8%	32.6%	44.9%	27.9%
Pro-Social Skills Training	43.7%	37.9%	36.3%	22.5%	44.2%	29.7%	35.1%	24.5%	37.7%	36.0%
Community Service	43.5%	52.1%	40.4%	39.9%	42.5%	45.3%	45.6%	44.9%	45.8%	34.0%
Family Counseling	27.5%	32.7%	24.4%	22.2%	41.6%	29.2%	38.4%	32.6%	32.0%	23.3%
Aggression Replacement Therapy	31.7%	18.2%	29.1%	15.6%	36.4%	14.5%	28.1%	12.6%	24.9%	7.1%
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	26.3%	16.7%	24.2%	14.7%	35.9%	23.2%	39.8%	25.9%	25.1%	22.6%
Gender Specific Programming for Males	26.0%	12.0%	19.7%	15.3%	30.3%	7.9%	19.8%	10.8%	23.2%	17.2%
Electronic Monitoring	31.1%	21.3%	33.8%	21.0%	30.1%	19.2%	24.5%	17.0%	26.9%	20.1%
Gang Intervention Program	26.3%	17.8%	18.0%	13.2%	29.0%	13.2%	26.3%	14.0%	28.4%	20.8%
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	32.7%	35.7%	25.4%	23.4%	25.9%	20.4%	18.9%	13.4%	28.7%	33.7%
After School Services	21.1%	14.7%	14.8%	10.9%	22.4%	16.9%	24.1%	19.0%	15.9%	14.9%
Mentoring	22.6%	16.6%	17.2%	11.3%	22.0%	10.1%	17.9%	21.3%	21.3%	20.4%
Day or Evening Treatment Program	19.5%	11.7%	15.8%	25.3%	19.6%	17.6%	28.1%	21.0%	25.7%	14.9%
Special Education Services	19.1%	15.8%	13.5%	11.3%	19.0%	13.1%	12.5%	11.0%	17.7%	11.7%
Parenting Education	13.5%	21.1%	13.5%	13.1%	18.5%	11.5%	14.9%	12.2%	17.7%	7.4%
Job Readiness Training	20.5%	10.5%	16.6%	8.5%	17.9%	9.6%	17.5%	8.4%	21.9%	12.6%
Gender Specific Programming for Females	49.0%	16.3%	33.3%	25.8%	17.5%	15.4%	39.6%	30.5%	47.2%	24.1%
Functional Family Therapy	9.9%	7.8%	9.2%	6.5%	15.9%	10.7%	9.0%	5.8%	7.8%	9.0%
Tutoring	13.7%	15.3%	14.5%	12.5%	13.9%	10.3%	14.7%	10.4%	12.3%	8.9%
Restorative Justice	17.0%	37.7%	13.3%	28.9%	12.9%	28.5%	6.8%	9.6%	9.0%	7.5%
Vocational Training	12.4%	5.8%	12.5%	7.4%	11.3%	6.2%	12.2%	8.1%	17.4%	9.3%
Transitional Living Services	20.5%	16.1%	9.4%	13.2%	10.0%	14.1%	9.4%	12.0%	15.0%	13.7%
Job Placement	11.0%	7.7%	8.0%	5.8%	10.0%	4.5%	7.6%	4.6%	8.7%	8.3%
Monetary Incentives	7.5%	5.5%	1.8%	1.3%	8.7%	8.1%	5.6%	6.4%	3.3%	5.0%

⁹ Percentages in bold indicate statistically significant differences in the given reporting year.

**Table 23: Baseline Characteristics of YOYG Youth and Other Youth
By Reporting Year**

Baseline Characteristic	2013-2014		2012-13		2011-12		2010-11		2009-10	
	YOYG Youth	Other Youth	YOYG Youth	Other Youth	YOYG Youth	Other Youth	YOYG Youth	Other Youth	YOYG Youth	Other Youth
Enrolled in School	87.7%	92.3%	90.9%	89.0%	89.8%	86.4%	88.3%	87.3%	89.5%	82.6%
High School Grad or GED Indicated in File	8.8%	10.2%	7.5%	7.5%	5.8%	7.1%	5.9%	6.1%	6.0%	4.7%
Employed	7.3%	12.0%	11.1%	6.2%	7.1%	7.3%	6.6%	8.4%	10.2%	10.6%
Case Plan in Place	84.9%	80.9%	85.4%	87.9%	85.3%	77.2%	89.7%	80.0%	82.0%	69.9%
Substance Abuse Indicated in Case File	87.8%	79.8%	80.3%	72.9%	82.5%	76.1%	80.0%	70.5%	83.2%	73.9%
Mental Health Diagnosis in Case File	33.7%	45.2%	32.6%	42.6%	36.2%	35.9%	38.5%	44.3%	32.9%	42.4%
Taking Psychotropic Medications	20.6%	20.3%	18.8%	15.0%	19.5%	14.2%	14.8%	15.5%	16.5%	10.5%
Ever WIC 300 Indicated in File	11.4%	14.7%	7.4%	15.2%	10.7%	17.0%	18.4%	24.3%	9.6%	6.2%
Ever Received a 241.1 Evaluation	8.7%	7.6%	4.3%	7.1%	4.8%	5.8%	4.6%	5.3%	6.9%	4.9%

Performance outcomes for the two groups in each of the five reporting years are presented in Table 24. Results for outcomes pertaining to educational status and achievement indicate the following:

- The percentage of YOYG Youth enrolled in school at some time during the one year historically has been significantly greater than the percentage of Other Youth; however, FY 2013-14 marked the first time in which the percentage enrolled was not significantly greater than Other Youth
- In all five years there was no significant difference in the percentage of youth in the two groups who were enrolled in school at the end of this one-year period.
- While YOYG Youth have consistently graduated or received their GED or equivalent at higher rates than Other Youth, the difference was statistically significant in just the first reporting year.

With respect to criminal justice outcomes:

- In all five years the percentage of youth on probation at the end of the one-year period from the date of disposition was higher for YOYG Youth, and the percentage was significantly higher in each of the last three reporting years.
- The percentage of youth receiving a new felony adjudication has also been consistently higher for YOYG Youth. The current reporting year marks the first year since FY 2010-11 in which the percentage of new felony adjudications were significantly higher for YOYG Youth than for Other Youth.
- For the first time in the current reporting year, the rate of new felony convictions was significantly higher for YOYG Youth.
- For the third time in five years, the rate of DJJ commitments was significantly higher for YOYG Youth; however, the rate for YOYG youth did decrease from FY 2012-13 levels.

Table 24: Outcomes for YOBG Youth and Other Youth by Reporting Year

Performance Outcome	2013-14		2012-13		2011-12		2010-11		2009-10	
	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth	YOBG Youth	Other Youth
Enrolled in School During Year	96.7%	95.1%	96.9%	94.0%	97.6%	92.4%	95.8%	91.8%	95.2%	89.8%
Enrolled in School at End of Year	75.2%	76.4%	72.5%	75.0%	73.5%	70.7%	70.6%	73.7%	72.8%	67.1%
Graduated from High School/Received GED	11.0%	9.7%	9.8%	7.3%	8.5%	7.6%	7.6%	6.6%	12.0%	8.1%
New Felony Adjudication (Juvenile Court)	20.5%	14.4%	18.6%	16.1%	15.7%	11.9%	17.1%	10.0%	19.8%	12.4%
New Felony Conviction (Adult Court)	5.6%	2.5%	4.3%	3.0%	3.9%	4.5%	4.8%	3.7%	1.8%	6.4%
On Probation at End of Year	84.1%	68.7%	81.6%	76.2%	84.5%	70.5%	76.5%	71.5%	73.1%	72.1%
Committed to DJJ During Year	1.0%	0.5%	2.5%	0.3%	5.0%	4.3%	3.2%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%

Outcome Relationships with Number of Direct Services

In all five years the number of Direct Services was found to be significantly related to the outcomes of Enrolled in School at any time During Year, Enrolled in School at End of Year, and On Probation at The End of the Year. That is those who received more Direct Services were more likely to be enrolled in school during the year and at the end of the year, and were also more likely to be on probation at the end of the year.

Also in all five years no significant relationships were found between the number of Direct Services and the outcomes of Graduated from High School/GED and New Felony Conviction in Adult Court.

No consistent pattern of results has been found to exist between the number of Direct Services and the occurrence of the outcomes of New Felony Adjudication in Juvenile Court and Commitment to DJJ.

Summary

Counties provided detailed information for a representative sample of 1,156 youth with felony adjudications during FY 2012-13. Among this group approximately 42.1 percent were the beneficiary of YOBG funding during the one-year period following the date of disposition of their adjudicated offense. This compares to YOBG funding rates of 42.1 percent, 38.3 percent, 43.3 percent and 33 percent in the four prior years.

As in the past three years, YOBG Youth received significantly more Assessments, Placements, and other Direct Services than Other Youth. However, in the current year the total number of individual Assessments/Placements/Direct Services for which significantly more YOBG Youth benefited was 16, and marked the end of a steady increase in the number of such occurrences two years in a row. The number of YOBG Youth receiving Assessments, Placements, and other Direct Services over the previous

four years has been 18 in the first reporting year, 22 in the second reporting year, 24 in the third reporting year, and 17 in the fourth reporting year.

For both YOBG Youth and Other Youth in all five years the most frequently administered type of Assessment was a Risk/Needs Assessment, and the most frequently occurring Direct Service was Development of Case Plan. The most frequently occurring Placements were Juvenile Hall and Home on Probation, and in every reporting year, a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth received a Placement in Juvenile Hall. For the fourth consecutive year, the percentage of YOBG Youth receiving a Placement in Camp was also significantly higher.

For the 1,156 youth in the Study Sample, YOBG funds were spent on 20.6 percent of all provided Assessments; 23.6 percent of all provided Placements; and 23.5 percent of all provided Direct Services. Thus little differentiation was found in the frequency with which some YOBG funds were used in support of these three major types of interventions.

The current year marks the first time in five years in which the percentage of YOBG Youth enrolled in school at some time during the one year following disposition of their felony offense was not significantly higher than Other Youth. The current reporting year also marks the first year since FY 2010-11 in which the percentage of new felony adjudications in Juvenile Court was significantly higher for YOBG Youth than for Other Youth. While DJJ commitment rates were lower for both groups in the current reporting year, the rate was significantly higher for YOBG Youth. For the third consecutive year a significantly higher percentage of YOBG Youth were on probation at the end of the one-year reporting period. For the first time in the current reporting year, the rate of new felony convictions was significantly higher for YOBG Youth.

In all years, for all youth, the number of Direct Services was found to be associated with involvement in school, and with continued status as a probationer, but not with educational achievement or a new felony conviction.

Appendix A

FY 2013-14 Expenditures and Per Capita Costs by Expenditure Category
(All Funding Sources)

Expenditure Category	Total Expenditures (All Funds)	Per Capita Costs
Camp	\$59,810,550	\$17,006
Home on Probation	\$11,882,698	\$1,754
Juvenile Hall	\$25,377,082	\$7,006
Other Placement	\$11,545,311	\$15,033
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility Ranch	\$9,336,048 \$491,512	\$14,363 \$15,855
All Placements	\$118,443,201	\$7,710
After School Services	\$37,003	\$119
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$139,778	\$672
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$738,179	\$1,100
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$485	\$61
Community Service	\$113,312	\$542
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$2,940,121	\$3,484
Detention Assessment(s)	\$299,452	\$442
Development of Case Plan	\$469,476	\$1,235
Electronic Monitoring	\$1,300,724	\$1,445
Family Counseling	\$979,299	\$4,472
Functional Family Therapy	\$691,096	\$26,581
Gang Intervention	\$234,436	\$2,605
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	\$58,741	\$744
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	\$324,308	\$556
Group Counseling	\$37,000	\$3,700
Individual Mental Health Counseling	\$1,393,786	\$1,207
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$10,818,512	\$4,236
Job Readiness Training	\$199,167	\$1,337
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	\$47,303	\$63
Mental Health Screening	\$294,771	\$459
Mentoring	\$353,490	\$1,699
Other Direct Service	\$4,259,798	\$1,094
Parenting Education	\$2,899	\$41
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$1,375,228	\$1,715
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$4,567,281	\$3,605
Recreational Activities	\$157,376	\$179
Restorative Justice	\$8,506	\$500
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$2,178,269	\$255
Special Education Services	\$13,250	\$37
Substance Abuse Screening	\$4,409	\$18
Transitional Living Services/Placement	\$36,285	\$1,170
Tutoring	\$7,229	\$195
Vocational Training	\$338,342	\$1,967
All Direct Services	\$34,419,311	\$1,274
Capital Improvements	\$831,467	
Contract Services	\$191,341	
Equipment	\$23,516	
Other	\$468,571	
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$4,051,362	
Staff Training/Professional Development	\$221,299	
All Capacity Building/Maintenance Activities	\$5,787,556	

Appendix B

Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Budget Line Item

Line Item	FY 2013-14		FY 2012-13		FY2011-12		FY 2010-11		FY 2010-11	
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total
Salaries & Benefits	\$78,401,472	78.28%	\$67,997,513	76.8%	\$69,501,485	76.5%	\$76,547,445	78.8%	\$64,946,279	75.0%
Services & Supplies	\$9,155,040	9.14%	\$8,124,244	9.2%	\$7,411,467	8.2%	\$7,053,129	7.3%	\$7,412,578	8.6%
Professional Services	\$7,286,047	7.28%	\$5,724,583	6.5%	\$7,268,432	8.0%	\$7,532,683	7.8%	\$6,685,656	7.7%
CBOs	\$4,376,689	4.37%	\$5,314,540	6.0%	\$3,764,557	4.1%	\$3,051,254	3.1%	\$2,951,852	3.4%
Fixed Assets	\$54,325	0.05%	\$232,369	0.3%	\$143,632	0.2%	\$74,125	0.1%	\$711,554	0.8%
Admin. Overhead	\$853,297	0.85%	\$701,427	0.8%	\$2,140,280	2.4%	\$851,678	0.9%	\$1,322,726	1.5%
Other Costs	\$32,010	0.03%	\$388,941	0.4%	\$565,433	0.6%	\$1,992,696	2.1%	\$2,539,428	2.9%
Total	\$100,158,880		\$88,483,617		\$90,795,286		\$97,103,010		\$86,570,073	

Appendix C

Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Category Type

Expenditure Category Type	Fiscal Year 2013-14		Fiscal Year 2012-13		Fiscal Year 2011-12		Fiscal Year 2010-11		Fiscal Year 2009-10	
	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total	Amount	% Total
Placements	\$67,695,958	67.6%	\$59,806,502	67.6%	\$63,039,975	69.4%	\$69,104,839	71.2%	\$62,944,571	72.7%
Direct Services	\$29,839,086	29.8%	\$26,486,759	29.9%	\$25,632,549	28.2%	\$25,537,590	26.3%	\$20,918,716	24.2%
Capacity Bldg./Maint.	\$2,623,836	2.6%	\$2,190,356	2.5%	\$2,122,762	2.3%	\$2,460,581	2.5%	\$2,706,781	3.1%
Total	\$100,158,880	100.0%	\$88,483,617	100.0%	\$90,795,286	100.0%	\$97,103,010	100.0%	\$86,570,073	100.0%

Comparison of YOBG Expenditures by Expenditure Category and Fiscal Year

Expenditure Category	YOBG Expenditures				Total Youth Served			
	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
Camp	\$37,014,095	\$31,539,106	\$32,721,278	\$41,622,302	3,517	2,292	1,969	2,599
Home on Probation	\$8,427,844	\$5,742,128	\$9,062,040	\$7,686,682	6,774	4,898	4,940	5,975
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Facility	\$7,435,133	\$7,760,575	\$8,312,863	\$7,307,863	650	1,093	1,365	712
Juvenile Hall	\$7,416,618	\$8,552,368	\$8,719,676	\$6,772,688	3,622	5,422	4,108	2,094
Other Placement	\$7,251,151	\$6,094,416	\$4,149,027	\$5,652,315	768	816	837	2,290
Ranch	\$151,117	\$117,909	\$75,091	\$62,989	31	38	50	52
All Placements	\$67,695,958	\$59,806,502	\$63,039,975	\$69,104,839	15,362	14,559	13,269	13,722
Intensive Probation Supervision	\$10,228,943	\$6,633,044	\$5,574,312	\$6,568,079	2,554	2,745	2,461	2,128
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	\$4,223,258	\$3,665,753	\$2,733,452	\$2,590,080	1,267	1,789	2,162	1,658
Other Direct Service	\$3,482,374	\$4,969,585	\$5,352,780	\$2,674,060	3,894	4,702	4,086	7,211
Day or Evening Treatment Program	\$2,643,989	\$2,529,646	\$2,193,519	\$3,331,564	844	1,013	879	982
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	\$1,514,072	\$1,574,655	\$1,525,376	\$1,412,358	8,555	7,376	4,908	5,614
Pro-Social Skills Training	\$1,369,504	\$829,230	\$799,880	\$122,367	802	691	889	514
Mental Health Counseling	\$1,359,696	\$1,298,880	\$1,503,618	\$1,447,942	1,155	1,419	1,343	1,010
Family Counseling	\$979,299	\$1,336,173	\$1,202,578	\$1,005,196	219	378	138	326
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	\$648,721	\$496,650	\$473,464	\$823,008	671	1,177	512	1,124
Development of Case Plan	\$456,176	\$11,342	\$412,299	\$551,762	380	295	642	618
Electronic Monitoring	\$453,644	\$579,166	\$714,481	\$141,927	900	693	1,679	672
Mentoring	\$353,490	\$216,765	\$214,067	\$683,347	208	93	108	362
Vocational Training	\$338,342	\$670,301	\$739,844	\$917,161	172	259	261	285
Mental Health Screening	\$294,771	\$55,193	\$212,012	\$6,156	642	255	588	128
Programming for Girls	\$245,110	\$170,363	\$234,865	\$621,128	583	222	217	516
Gang Intervention	\$234,436	\$244,309	\$200,666	\$134,364	90	100	96	58
Detention Assessment(s)	\$165,608	\$154,713	\$219,070	\$427,724	678	734	1,788	2,183
Functional Family Therapy	\$152,204	\$158,287	\$171,002	\$144,884	26	74	65	135
Recreational Activities	\$127,471	\$148,147	\$337,547	\$193,427	880	348	422	725
Aggression Replacement Therapy	\$123,216	\$173,938	\$191,031	\$482,280	208	189	247	430
Community Service	\$113,312	\$103,518	\$50,451	\$75,276	209	173	140	40
Job Readiness Training	\$88,630	\$103,507	\$140,458	\$830,624	149	205	237	197
Programming for Boys	\$58,741	\$163,966	\$136,745	\$56,411	79	360	265	176
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	\$47,303	\$54,205	\$55,345	\$93,208	754	671	491	291
Group Counseling	\$37,000	\$19,158	\$58,197	\$85,062	10	85	7	257
Transitional Living Serves./Placement	\$36,285	\$60,476	\$78,055	\$0	31	55	115	0
After School Services	\$27,003	\$32,221	\$28,721	\$29,128	311	295	413	470
Special Education Services	\$13,250	\$13,250	\$27,014	\$26,987	360	395	417	484
Restorative Justice	\$8,506	\$4,950	\$0	\$0	17	22	0	0
Tutoring	\$7,229	\$8,950	\$5,100	\$4,725	37	20	15	20
Substance Abuse Screening	\$4,409	\$0	\$0	\$0	250	0	0	0
Parenting Education	\$2,609	\$6,417	\$0	\$245	71	0	0	N/A
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	\$485	\$0	\$46,600	\$57,110	8	0	134	230
All Direct Services	\$29,839,086	\$26,486,758	\$25,632,549	\$25,537,590	27,014	26,833	25,725	28,844
Staff Salaries/Benefits	\$1,281,002	\$1,188,927	\$1,198,314	\$1,167,266				
Capital Improvements	\$565,810	\$132,101	\$0	\$27,700				
Other Capacity Building/Maintenance	\$348,110	\$315,923	\$242,653	\$515,637				
Staff Training/ Development	\$221,197	\$367,542	\$299,056	\$491,849				
Contract Services	\$184,201	\$62,438	\$37,101	\$5,000				
Equipment	\$23,516	\$109,343	\$114,923	\$188,089				
Other Procurements	\$0	\$14,082	\$230,715	\$65,040				
All Capacity Building Activities	\$2,623,836	\$2,190,356	\$2,122,762	\$2,460,581				
Total	\$100,158,880	\$88,483,616	\$90,795,286	\$97,103,010	42,376	41,392	38,994	42,566

Appendix F

Summary of Per Capita Costs

Expenditure Category	Counties	All Funds			YOBG Funds		
		Statewide	Min	Max	Statewide	Min	Max
Camp	13	\$17,006	\$76	\$62,662	\$10,524	\$76	\$39,200
Home on Probation	10	\$1,754	\$18	\$15,728	\$1,244	\$18	\$11,226
Juvenile Hall	19	\$7,006	\$178	\$37,799	\$2,048	\$122	\$24,385
Other Placement	3	\$15,033	\$9,892	\$35,000	\$9,442	\$2,645	\$35,000
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility	5	\$14,363	\$2,490	\$129,533	\$11,439	\$2,490	\$109,829
Ranch	3	\$15,855	\$15,228	\$25,523	\$4,875	\$3,071	\$25,523
All Placements	53	\$7,710	\$18	\$129,533	\$4,407	\$18	\$109,829
After School Services	2	\$119	\$91.47	\$244.25	\$87	\$66	\$91
Aggression Replacement Therapy	3	\$672	\$306	\$832	\$592	\$306	\$714
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	8	\$1,100	\$72	\$3,289	\$967	\$12	\$3,289
Anger Management Counseling/Treatment	1	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$61	\$61
Community Service	4	\$542	\$150	\$655	\$542	\$150	\$655
Day or Evening Treatment Program	7	\$3,484	\$589	\$16,963	\$3,133	\$586	\$16,963
Detention Assessment(s)	2	\$442	\$35	\$687	\$244	\$35	\$371
Development of Case Plan	3	\$1,235	\$115	\$6,252	\$1,200	\$18	\$6,172
Electronic Monitoring	8	\$1,445	\$54	\$4,085	\$504	\$54	\$4,085
Family Counseling	1	\$4,472	\$4,472	\$4,472	\$4,472	\$4,472	\$4,472
Functional Family Therapy	1	\$26,581	\$26,581	\$26,581	\$5,854	\$5,854	\$5,854
Gang Intervention	1	\$2,605	\$2,605	\$2,605	\$2,605	\$2,605	\$2,605
Programming for Boys	1	\$744	\$744	\$744	\$744	\$744	\$744
Programming for Girls	4	\$556	\$246	\$2,136	\$420	\$49	\$2,136
Group Counseling	1	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700
Individual Mental Health Counseling	9	\$1,207	\$151	\$17,400	\$1,177	\$151	\$17,400
Intensive Probation Supervision	15	\$4,236	\$298	\$15,955	\$4,005	\$298	\$15,955
Job Readiness Training	1	\$1,337	\$1,337	\$1,337	\$595	\$595	\$595
Life/Independent Living Skills Training	2	\$63	\$26	\$82	\$63	\$26	\$82
Mental Health Screening	2	\$459	\$43	\$734	\$459	\$43	\$734
Mentoring	4	\$1,699	\$158	\$3,333	\$1,699	\$158	\$3,333
Other Direct Service	17	\$1,094	\$33	\$72,551	\$894	\$33	\$72,058
Parenting Education	1	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$37	\$37	\$37
Pro-Social Skills Training	9	\$1,715	\$151	\$7,458	\$1,708	\$151	\$7,458
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	8	\$3,605	\$383	\$22,886	\$3,333	\$383	\$22,886
Recreational Activities	5	\$179	\$69	\$1,610	\$145	\$69	\$1,224
Restorative Justice	2	\$500	\$409	\$1,956	\$500	\$409	\$1,956
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	19	\$255	\$4	\$3,375	\$177	\$4	\$3,375
Special Education Services	1	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37	\$37
Substance Abuse Screening	1	\$18	\$18	\$18	\$18	\$18	\$18
Transitional Living Services/Placement	1	\$1,170	\$1,170	\$1,170	\$1,170	\$1,170	\$1,170
Tutoring	1	\$195	\$195	\$195	\$195	\$195	\$195
Vocational Training	2	\$1,967	\$311	\$2,223	\$1,967	\$311	\$2,223
All Direct Services	147	\$1,274	\$4	\$72,551	\$1,105	\$4	\$72,058

Note: Costs shown are those based on total funds (all sources) and YOBG funds only. Statewide Per Capita Costs are based on total costs divided by total youth served. Also shown are Minimum and Maximum Per Capita Costs at the County level.

Appendix G (continued)

Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by County

County		Programs	Youth Served	Salaries & Benefits	Services & Supplies	Professional Services	CBOs	Fixed Assets & Equipment	Administrative Overhead	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Sutter	Planned	4	215	\$339,785	\$3,700	\$11,059	\$0	\$0	\$1,781	\$0	\$356,325
	Actual	4	196	\$207,531	\$2,596	\$6,059	\$0	\$0	\$1,066	\$0	\$217,252
	Difference	0	-19	-\$132,254	-\$1,104	-\$5,000	\$0	\$0	-\$715	\$0	-\$139,073
Tehama	Planned	1	0	\$155,160	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$155,160
	Actual	2	0	\$156,792	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$156,792
	Difference	1	0	\$1,632	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,632
Trinity	Planned	2	80	\$90,478	\$16,522	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,000
	Actual	2	93	\$90,478	\$16,522	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,000
	Difference	0	13	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Tulare	Planned	4	424	\$1,670,250	\$42,219	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,772,469
	Actual	3	148	\$1,542,235	\$151,767	\$13,455	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,707,457
	Difference	-1	-276	-\$128,015	\$109,548	-\$46,545	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$65,012
Tuolumne	Planned	1	50	\$0	\$0	\$117,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,500
	Actual	1	38	\$0	\$0	\$117,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,500
	Difference	0	-12	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ventura	Planned	6	791	\$1,958,037	\$316,143	\$77,000	\$33,000	\$0	\$238,419	\$0	\$2,622,599
	Actual	5	1,020	\$1,555,815	\$351,464	\$94,926	\$638	\$0	\$198,833	\$0	\$2,201,676
	Difference	-1	229	-\$402,222	\$35,321	\$17,926	-\$32,362	\$0	-\$39,586	\$0	-\$420,923
Yolo	Planned	5	420	\$478,979	\$9,005	\$7,292	\$0	\$12,248	\$0	\$0	\$507,524
	Actual	4	184	\$392,817	\$6,502	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$399,319
	Difference	-1	-236	-\$86,162	-\$2,503	-\$7,292	\$0	-\$12,248	\$0	\$0	-\$108,205
Yuba	Planned	4	843	\$221,446	\$11,460	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$239,106
	Actual	4	908	\$208,737	\$8,819	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$218,756
	Difference	0	65	-\$12,709	-\$2,641	-\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$20,350
All Counties	Planned	252	47,657	\$79,022,012	\$5,745,439	\$8,464,953	\$4,927,073	\$403,898	\$1,860,297	\$875,000	\$101,298,672
	Actual	236	42,376	\$78,401,472	\$9,155,040	\$7,286,047	\$4,376,689	\$54,325	\$853,297	\$32,010	\$100,158,880
	Difference	-16	-5281	-\$620,540	\$3,409,601	-\$1,178,906	-\$550,384	-\$349,573	-\$1,007,000	-\$842,990	-\$1,139,792

Appendix H

Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by Program Type

Program Type		Programs	Salaries & Benefits	Services & Supplies	Professional Services	CBOs	Fixed Assets & Equipment	Administrative Overhead	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures
After School Services	Planned	4	\$0	\$17,300	\$8,000	\$105,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,300
	Actual	2	\$20,125	\$3,678	\$3,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,003
	Difference	-2	\$20,125	-\$13,622	-\$4,800	-\$105,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$103,297
Aggression Replacement Therapy	Planned	4	\$76,567	\$22,630	\$30,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$7,920	\$0	\$165,117
	Actual	3	\$71,257	\$25,421	\$0	\$17,450	\$0	\$9,088	\$0	\$123,216
	Difference	-1	-\$5,310	\$2,791	-\$30,000	-\$10,550	\$0	\$1,168	\$0	-\$41,901
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	Planned	11	\$65,622	\$10,375	\$248,000	\$546,300	\$0	\$1,167	\$0	\$871,464
	Actual	8	\$34,392	\$3,883	\$82,724	\$526,990	\$0	\$732	\$0	\$648,721
	Difference	-3	-\$31,230	-\$6,492	-\$165,276	-\$19,310	\$0	-\$435	\$0	-\$222,743
Anger Management Counseling	Planned	1	\$400	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700
	Actual	1	\$435	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$485
	Difference	0	\$35	-\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$215
Camp	Planned	12	\$25,951,433	\$1,818,718	\$2,735,712	\$350,000	\$0	\$64,200	\$0	\$30,920,063
	Actual	13	\$30,743,056	\$3,871,334	\$2,142,496	\$256,994	\$0	\$215	\$0	\$37,014,095
	Difference	1	\$4,791,623	\$2,052,616	-\$593,216	-\$93,006	\$0	-\$63,985	\$0	\$6,094,032
Capital Improvements	Planned	3	\$87,000	\$1,500	\$100,000	\$0	\$17,000	\$0	\$0	\$205,500
	Actual	4	\$24,428	\$501,973	\$18,913	\$0	\$20,496	\$0	\$0	\$565,810
	Difference	1	-\$62,572	\$500,473	-\$81,087	\$0	\$3,496	\$0	\$0	\$360,310
Community Service	Planned	4	\$122,210	\$15,197	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,907
	Actual	4	\$99,532	\$9,880	\$0	\$3,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$113,312
	Difference	0	-\$22,678	-\$5,317	-\$500	\$3,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$24,595
Contract Services	Planned	3	\$0	\$0	\$65,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$65,800
	Actual	6	\$26,000	\$38,300	\$104,901	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$184,201
	Difference	3	\$26,000	\$38,300	\$39,101	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$118,401
Day or Evening Treatment Program	Planned	7	\$1,429,926	\$242,388	\$652,264	\$574,000	\$0	\$720	\$0	\$2,899,298
	Actual	7	\$1,251,776	\$218,424	\$203,212	\$968,992	\$465	\$1,120	\$0	\$2,643,989
	Difference	0	-\$178,150	-\$23,964	-\$449,052	\$394,992	\$465	\$400	\$0	-\$255,309
Detention Assessment(s)	Planned	1	\$137,559	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$147,559
	Actual	2	\$161,369	\$0	\$4,239	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$165,608
	Difference	1	\$23,810	\$0	-\$5,761	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,049
Development of Case Plan	Planned	3	\$396,926	\$15,689	\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$425,115
	Actual	3	\$383,364	\$72,812	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$456,176
	Difference	0	-\$13,562	\$57,123	-\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,061
Electronic Monitoring	Planned	8	\$676,485	\$137,638	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$834,123
	Actual	8	\$310,282	\$37,346	\$104,666	\$0	\$1,350	\$0	\$0	\$453,644
	Difference	0	-\$366,203	-\$100,292	\$84,666	\$0	\$1,350	\$0	\$0	-\$380,479
Equipment	Planned	3	\$0	\$9,005	\$0	\$0	\$69,248	\$0	\$0	\$78,253
	Actual	2	\$0	\$6,502	\$0	\$0	\$17,014	\$0	\$0	\$23,516
	Difference	-1	\$0	-\$2,503	\$0	\$0	-\$52,234	\$0	\$0	-\$54,737
Family Counseling	Planned	2	\$640,013	\$42,259	\$107,179	\$565,164	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,354,615
	Actual	1	\$621,182	\$20,287	\$6,987	\$330,843	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$979,299
	Difference	-1	-\$18,831	-\$21,972	-\$100,192	-\$234,321	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$375,316
Functional Family Therapy	Planned	1	\$115,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$115,000
	Actual	1	\$142,204	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$152,204
	Difference	0	\$27,204	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,204
Gang Intervention	Planned	1	\$284,229	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$284,229
	Actual	1	\$232,610	\$1,826	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$234,436
	Difference	0	-\$51,619	\$1,826	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$49,793
Gender Specific Programming for Boys	Planned	3	\$66,300	\$29,733	\$0	\$0	\$1,325	\$1,662	\$0	\$99,020
	Actual	1	\$48,380	\$10,361	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$58,741
	Difference	-2	-\$17,920	-\$19,372	\$0	\$0	-\$1,325	-\$1,662	\$0	-\$40,279
Gender Specific Programming for Girls	Planned	4	\$159,767	\$16,990	\$0	\$48,000	\$1,325	\$0	\$0	\$226,082
	Actual	4	\$159,873	\$44,818	\$0	\$38,640	\$0	\$1,779	\$0	\$245,110
	Difference	0	\$106	\$27,828	\$0	-\$9,360	-\$1,325	\$1,779	\$0	\$19,028
Group Counseling	Planned	4	\$0	\$0	\$73,500	\$34,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$108,279
	Actual	1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,000
	Difference	-3	\$0	\$0	-\$73,500	\$2,221	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$71,279
Home on Probation	Planned	9	\$9,102,494	\$447,901	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$362,525	\$0	\$9,917,920
	Actual	10	\$8,175,499	\$242,433	\$9,912	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,427,844
	Difference	1	-\$926,995	-\$205,468	\$4,912	\$0	\$0	-\$362,525	\$0	-\$1,490,076
Individual Mental Health Counseling	Planned	11	\$285,515	\$60,000	\$647,872	\$378,107	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,371,494
	Actual	9	\$319,401	\$129,001	\$691,302	\$219,992	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,359,696
	Difference	-2	\$33,886	\$69,001	\$43,430	-\$158,115	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$11,798

Appendix H (continued)

Planned and Actual YOYG Expenditures by Program Type

Program Type	Programs	Salaries & Benefits	Services & Supplies	Professional Services	CBOs	Fixed Assets & Equipment	Administrative Overhead	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures	
Intensive Probation Supervision	Planned	17	\$9,218,857	\$336,879	\$127,400	\$175,380	\$0	\$469,140	\$25,000	\$10,352,656
	Actual	15	\$9,077,120	\$265,481	\$233,008	\$175,380	\$0	\$469,194	\$8,760	\$10,228,943
	Difference	-2	-\$141,737	-\$71,398	\$105,608	\$0	\$0	\$54	-\$16,240	-\$123,713
Job Readiness Training	Planned	1	\$0	\$0	\$114,870	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$114,870
	Actual	1	\$0	\$0	\$88,630	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$88,630
	Difference	0	\$0	\$0	-\$26,240	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$26,240
Juvenile Hall	Planned	20	\$5,773,009	\$858,361	\$367,025	\$10,000	\$300,000	\$194,496	\$0	\$7,502,891
	Actual	19	\$5,177,572	\$1,742,127	\$289,065	\$31,753	\$0	\$176,101	\$0	\$7,416,618
	Difference	-1	-\$595,437	\$883,766	-\$77,960	\$21,753	-\$300,000	-\$18,395	\$0	-\$86,273
Life/Independent Living Skills Training/Education	Planned	3	\$7,101	\$3,049	\$52,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,650
	Actual	2	\$5,023	\$1,501	\$40,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,303
	Difference	-1	-\$2,078	-\$1,548	-\$11,721	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$15,347
Mental Health Screening	Planned	2	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$287,515	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$292,515
	Actual	2	\$10,846	\$0	\$0	\$283,925	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$294,771
	Difference	0	\$10,846	\$0	-\$5,000	-\$3,590	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,256
Mentoring	Planned	3	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$230,625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$262,625
	Actual	4	\$0	\$0	\$162,651	\$190,839	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$353,490
	Difference	1	\$0	\$0	\$130,651	-\$39,786	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$90,865
Monetary Incentives	Planned	1	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
	Actual	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Difference	-1	\$0	-\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$5,000
Other	Planned	7	\$475,192	\$2,500	\$12,905	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$490,597
	Actual	6	\$330,141	\$28	\$9,941	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000	\$348,110
	Difference	-1	-\$145,051	-\$2,472	-\$2,964	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000	-\$142,487
Other Direct Service	Planned	19	\$2,738,003	\$298,941	\$431,228	\$113,346	\$15,000	\$228,150	\$0	\$3,824,668
	Actual	17	\$2,444,701	\$334,590	\$202,956	\$312,413	\$0	\$187,714	\$0	\$3,482,374
	Difference	-2	-\$293,302	\$35,649	-\$228,272	\$199,067	-\$15,000	-\$40,436	\$0	-\$342,294
Other Placement	Planned	4	\$6,855,930	\$576,580	\$763,646	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$8,896,156
	Actual	3	\$5,328,539	\$925,493	\$997,119	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,251,151
	Difference	-1	-\$1,527,391	\$348,913	\$233,473	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$700,000	-\$1,645,005
Other Secure/Semi-Secure Rehab Facility	Planned	4	\$6,777,309	\$416,279	\$459,195	\$40,000	\$0	\$520,149	\$0	\$8,212,932
	Actual	5	\$6,546,918	\$480,251	\$390,881	\$17,083	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,435,133
	Difference	1	-\$230,391	\$63,972	-\$68,314	-\$22,917	\$0	-\$520,149	\$0	-\$777,799
Parenting Education	Planned	2	\$4,800	\$4,100	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,900
	Actual	1	\$0	\$2,596	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$0	\$2,609
	Difference	-1	-\$4,800	-\$1,504	-\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$0	-\$7,291
Pro-Social Skills Training	Planned	8	\$175,433	\$37,520	\$267,000	\$929,500	\$0	\$6,911	\$0	\$1,416,364
	Actual	9	\$179,267	\$2,711	\$279,081	\$898,363	\$0	\$7,059	\$3,023	\$1,369,504
	Difference	1	\$3,834	-\$34,809	\$12,081	-\$31,137	\$0	\$148	\$3,023	-\$46,860
Ranch	Planned	4	\$817,693	\$30,439	\$72,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$920,132
	Actual	3	\$75,837	\$10,157	\$65,123	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$151,117
	Difference	-1	-\$741,856	-\$20,282	-\$6,877	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$769,015
Re-Entry or Aftercare Services	Planned	8	\$3,864,315	\$75,531	\$47,900	\$37,000	\$0	\$891	\$150,000	\$4,175,637
	Actual	8	\$3,613,006	\$37,577	\$572,423	\$0	\$0	\$252	\$0	\$4,223,258
	Difference	0	-\$251,309	-\$37,954	\$524,523	-\$37,000	\$0	-\$639	-\$150,000	\$47,621
Recreational Activities	Planned	5	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$455,857	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$530,857
	Actual	5	\$13,231	\$14,163	\$33,945	\$66,132	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$127,471
	Difference	0	\$13,231	\$14,163	-\$41,055	-\$389,725	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$403,386
Restorative Justice	Planned	1	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
	Actual	2	\$0	\$0	\$8,506	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,506
	Difference	1	\$0	\$0	-\$1,494	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$1,494
Risk and/or Needs Assessment	Planned	22	\$1,754,340	\$165,399	\$265,407	\$0	\$0	\$2,366	\$0	\$2,187,512
	Actual	19	\$1,317,752	\$46,987	\$137,076	\$0	\$0	\$30	\$12,227	\$1,514,072
	Difference	-3	-\$436,588	-\$118,412	-\$128,331	\$0	\$0	-\$2,336	\$12,227	-\$673,440
Special Education Services	Planned	1	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
	Actual	1	\$0	\$0	\$13,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,250
	Difference	0	\$0	\$0	-\$1,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$1,750
Staff Salaries/Benefits	Planned	7	\$650,132	\$6,050	\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$658,582
	Actual	8	\$1,275,156	\$5,846	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,281,002
	Difference	1	\$625,024	-\$204	-\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$622,420
Staff Training/Professional Development	Planned	10	\$312,452	\$41,188	\$47,792	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$401,432
	Actual	10	\$181,198	\$35,210	\$4,789	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$221,197
	Difference	0	-\$131,254	-\$5,978	-\$43,003	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$180,235

Appendix H (continued)

Planned and Actual YOBG Expenditures by Program Type

Program Type		Programs	Salaries & Benefits	Services & Supplies	Professional Services	CBOs	Fixed Assets & Equipment	Administrative Overhead	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Substance Abuse Screening	Planned	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Actual	1	\$0	\$4,409	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,409
	Difference	1	\$0	\$4,409	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,409
Transitional Living Services/Placement	Planned	1	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
	Actual	1	\$0	\$0	\$36,285	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,285
	Difference	0	\$0	\$0	-\$63,715	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$63,715
Tutoring	Planned	1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,500
	Actual	1	\$0	\$7,229	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,229
	Difference	0	\$0	\$7,229	\$0	-\$18,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$11,271
Vocational Training	Planned	2	\$0	\$0	\$479,358	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$479,358
	Actual	2	\$0	\$355	\$337,987	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$338,342
	Difference	0	\$0	\$355	-\$141,371	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$141,016
All Program Types	Planned	252	\$79,022,012	\$5,745,439	\$8,464,953	\$4,927,073	\$403,898	\$1,860,297	\$875,000	\$101,298,672
	Actual	236	\$78,401,472	\$9,155,040	\$7,286,047	\$4,376,689	\$54,325	\$853,297	\$32,010	\$100,158,880
	Difference	-16	-\$620,540	\$3,409,601	-\$1,178,906	-\$550,384	-\$349,573	-\$1,007,000	-\$842,990	-\$1,139,792

Appendix I

County YOBG Allocation Amounts and County Representation in Performance Outcome Study Group

County	YOBG Allocation		Performance Outcome Study Group			
	Amount	% Total	Initial	Exclusions	Final	% Total
Alameda	\$3,651,676	3.5%	42		42	3.5%
Alpine	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Amador	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Butte	\$544,102	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Calaveras	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Colusa	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Contra Costa	\$2,463,315	2.4%	29	1	28	2.4%
Del Norte	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
El Dorado	\$396,860	0.4%	5		5	0.4%
Fresno	\$3,779,748	3.6%	43		43	3.6%
Glenn	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Humboldt	\$268,990	0.3%	3		3	0.3%
Imperial	\$492,925	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Inyo	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Kern	\$3,991,075	3.8%	46		46	3.9%
Kings	\$574,545	0.6%	7		7	0.6%
Lake	\$132,832	0.1%	4	2	2	0.2%
Lassen	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Los Angeles	\$26,904,734	25.8%	365	81	284	24.6%
Madera	\$556,980	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Marin	\$685,145	0.7%	5		5	0.4%
Mariposa	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Mendocino	\$151,416	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Merced	\$963,153	0.9%	11	2	9	0.8%
Modoc	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Mono	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Monterey	\$1,272,137	1.2%	15		15	1.3%
Napa	\$462,890	0.4%	5		5	0.4%
Nevada	\$166,331	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Orange	\$8,891,169	8.5%	102		102	8.8%
Placer	\$664,201	0.6%	8		8	0.7%
Plumas	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Riverside	\$6,620,965	6.3%	76		76	6.6%
Sacramento	\$4,523,765	4.3%	52		52	4.5%
San Benito	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
San Bernardino	\$8,087,727	7.8%	98	13	85	7.4%
San Diego	\$5,381,804	5.2%	62		62	5.4%
San Francisco	\$1,360,143	1.3%	16	1	15	1.3%
San Joaquin	\$2,193,033	2.1%	25		25	2.2%
San Luis Obispo	\$580,134	0.6%	7		7	0.6%
San Mateo	\$1,578,299	1.5%	18		18	1.6%
Santa Barbara	\$1,102,738	1.1%	13		13	1.1%
Santa Clara	\$3,520,350	3.4%	41		41	3.5%
Santa Cruz	\$575,506	0.6%	7		7	0.6%
Shasta	\$427,569	0.4%	6	2	4	0.3%
Sierra	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Siskiyou	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Solano	\$1,290,984	1.2%	15		15	1.3%
Sonoma	\$955,130	0.9%	11	1	10	0.9%
Stanislaus	\$1,368,875	1.3%	16		16	1.4%
Sutter	\$304,938	0.3%	4		4	0.3%
Tehama	\$164,580	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Trinity	\$123,155	0.1%	0		0	0.0%
Tulare	\$1,970,911	1.9%	23	1	22	1.9%
Tuolumne	\$123,155	0.1%	2		2	0.2%
Ventura	\$2,412,787	2.3%	28		28	2.4%
Yolo	\$537,937	0.5%	6		6	0.5%
Yuba	\$214,159	0.2%	2		2	0.2%
Total	104,280,193	100%	1,260	104	1,156	100.0%