

COMPREHENSIVE MULTI-AGENCY JUVENILE JUSTICE ACTION PLAN UPDATE

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA



Prepared by Community Crime Prevention Associates

April 2007

SANTA CLARA COUNTY LEADERSHIP

Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors

Donald F. Gage, District One
Blanca Alvarado, District Two
Peter McHugh, District Three
Ken Yeager, District Four
Liz Kniss, District Five

Peter Kutas, Jr., County Executive

Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

Blanca Alvarado, District Two, Board of Supervisors
Dolores Carr, District Attorney
Rob Davis, Chief, San Jose Police Department
Mary Greenwood, Public Defender
Don Johnson, Chief, Los Altos Police Department
Judge Richard J. Loftus, Presiding Judge, Juvenile Court
Olivia Mendiola, Executive Director, MACSA
Sheila Mitchell, Chief, Probation Department
Erin O'Brien, Executive Director, Community Solutions
Nancy Pena, Director, Mental Health Department
John Porter Jr., Superintendent, Franklin-McKinley School District
Bill Scilacci, Chairperson, Juvenile Justice Commission
Laurie Smith, Sheriff
Norma Sparks, Director, Dept. Family and Children's Services
Ken Yeager, District Four, Board of Supervisors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	4
II.	Immediate Interventions and Appropriate Sanctions	8
III.	Strengthen and Mobilize Communities and Families	11
IV.	Maximize Partnerships with Schools	18
V.	Maximize Opportunities for Children and Youth	22

INTRODUCTION

Background

In September 2000, the County of Santa Clara received \$6,135,582 as part of its share of the Schiff–Cardenas Crime Prevention Act of 2000. The funds represent the State’s support of local jurisdictions to implement their juvenile justice action plans, called Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Action Plans (CMJJP). This funding stream was continued by the passage of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) in Fiscal Year 2003 and is still in existence. In fact, the County’s allocation in FY 2007 was \$5,482,223. Allocations are made only to those counties with a State Corrections Standards Authority (CSA)-approved CMJJP.

The Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council approved the County’s CMJJP in 1997. The CMJJP was updated in 1999 and in 2004. This report is the third update. Community Crime Prevention Associates (CCPA) was retained by the Probation Department in March 2007 to update the County’s CMJJP.

Purpose of Update

The purpose of this update to the CMJJP is to provide program information on the existing five JJCPA-funded programs, the newly added sixth JJCPA program, and relevant information from the Continuum of Services Report completed in December 2005.

The existing five JJCPA funded programs are: Community-Based Aftercare Services, Mexican American Community Services Agency (MACSA) Personal Enhancement Program, Multi-Agency Assessment Center (MAAC), Restorative Justice Program (RJP), and Truancy Reduction Services.

Context for CMJJP Update

In 1997, when the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council was formed, it adopted the following mission statement:

“The Santa Clara County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council's mission is to develop a balanced restorative justice system in Santa Clara County with three components: (1) to provide for the protection and safety of the community; (2) to hold youth personally responsible and accountable for delinquent acts; and (3) to build competencies in youth that encourage them to become contributing, responsible members of the community.”

The mission statement was developed in response to a call to action issued by the United States Department of Justice and then State of California Board of Correction -- to reduce juvenile crime and violence.

The revision to the CMJJP provided in 1999 focused primarily on updating the continuum of services and indicators of juvenile delinquency. In 2004, CCPA was asked to focus on recent research related to youth developmental asset and resiliency theory, local indicators of juvenile delinquency, and effective practices in addressing juvenile offenders.

The County’s CMJJP focused on engaging the community in the juvenile justice process, in order to increase protective factors and prevent juvenile crime and violence. In particular, the plan focused on:

(A) Community Protection – community members work with justice system partners and community-based service providers to identify and address neighborhood problems and improving the quality of life in their neighborhood. The community becomes active participants in ensuring public safety and community protection.

(B) Accountability – Delinquent youth are required to make amends for the harm they inflicted on victims and the community. Community volunteers are engaged in this process and assist youth to understand the impact of their crime.

(C) Competency Development – Community-based programs are made available to youth to build competencies and pro-social thinking.

The previous CMJJPs articulated the five guiding principles adopted by the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), Santa Clara County’s local oversight committee required by the legislation. The purpose of these principles is to guide budget and policy recommendations, assist law and justice practitioners understand their role in the larger system of services for children and youth. These five guiding principles are:

1. Strengthen the family to instill moral values and provide guidance and support to children. Where there is no functioning family unit, we must establish a family surrogate to assist the child to develop pro-social behavior;

2. Support core social institutions, such as schools, religious institutions, community-based organizations, and public youth service organizations, in order to develop pro-social behavior in our youth;
3. Promote delinquency prevention programs as a cost effective approach to reducing juvenile delinquency. Levels of prevention programs are an appropriate sanction for problem delinquent behavior;
4. Intervene immediately and effectively when at-risk and delinquent behavior occurs to successfully prevent delinquent offenders from becoming chronic offenders or committing more progressively serious and violent crimes; and
5. Identify and control the small group of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders who have failed to respond to intervention efforts and graduated sanctions. Incarcerating these youths will protect the community.

In addition to these guiding principles, the JJCC adopted the nine specific objectives listed below.

- Objective 1:** Provide immediate interventions and appropriate sanctions for delinquent youth.
- Objective 2:** Strengthen and mobilize communities and families through a balanced and restorative approach to combat juvenile violence and anti-social behavior.
- Objective 3:** Prosecute certain serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders.
- Objective 4:** Maximize the effectiveness of schools to build pro-social competencies and to reduce truancy in troubled youth.
- Objective 5:** Maximize opportunities for children and youth by making juvenile delinquency prevention a priority.
- Objective 6:** Reduce youth involvement with guns, drugs and gangs.
- Objective 7:** Break the cycle of violence by addressing youth victimization from abuse, neglect, and domestic violence.
- Objective 8:** Reduce the disproportionate minority confinement of juveniles in the Ranch, Juvenile Hall, and Referred to California Youth Authority, and increase gender-specific programming.
- Objective 9:** Support improved data collection, youth case management, research, and evaluation.

These principles and objectives were originally developed with the input of representatives from over 40 public agencies, community-based youth service providers, and other community stakeholders.

The mission, guiding principles, and objectives were developed with the expectation that Santa Clara County would have:

- Safer communities;
- More competent youth;

- Increased juvenile justice system responsiveness, such as more dispositional options;
- Engaged communities to mobilize resources for youth programs;
- Increased ability in the juvenile justice system to identify, process, evaluate, refer, and track juvenile offenders;
- Increased juvenile accountability;
- Decreased number of youth and related cost to incarcerate youth;
- Decreased number of incarcerated youth of color;
- Increased program effectiveness; and
- Long-term reduction in crime.

Limitations to Report

This report was not crafted as a youth services master plan. Rather, it is a limited-scope report that seeks to build on past plans, focusing on the JJCPA-funded programs in the context of the JJCC objectives and Continuum of Services report. This update is also limited by the amount of time available to complete the work.

Additional Information

Shirly Lee, CCPA Partner, served as the Principal. For additional information contact:

Community Crime Prevention Associates
P.O. Box 730
San José, CA 95108
(408) 271-7049

IMMEDIATE INTERVENTIONS AND APPROPRIATE SANCTIONS

The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council and other community stakeholders have long known the importance of providing immediate interventions and appropriate sanctions for juvenile delinquents. The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan emphasizes the importance of having a juvenile justice system that is equipped to address the breadth of juvenile problem behaviors. In addition to the County's focus on providing a full continuum of services, the County also strives to provide services that target criminogenic factors in the context of youth need and risk.

Criminogenic Factors

In order to better fulfill this and other objectives, the County commissioned the Continuum of Services study, prepared in December 2005. One of the Key Findings in the Continuum of Services report is the need to target criminogenic factors that contribute to delinquent behavior. The report also includes recommendations to adopt an objective risk and needs assessment instrument in order to more accurately target criminogenic factors, as well as to use assessment results to target the highest risk youth for the highest levels of supervision and services.¹ Understanding the criminogenic factors of delinquent youth will assist service providers and juvenile justice system practitioners provide sanctions and services that reflect youth risk and need.

Risk, Need, and Treatment

The County has also shaped its services, in part, on the research Dr. Edward Latessa, head of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati. Dr. Latessa's work is partly based on a large-scale meta-analysis of research about what works with juvenile offenders. Dr. Latessa identified three core principles of effective interventions with juvenile offenders: Risk Principle, Need Principle, and Treatment Principle.

The Risk Principle states that treatment intervention should be used primarily with higher risk offenders. By matching levels of treatment services to the risk level of the offender, programs have increased their success as measured by program completion and reduced recidivism. Service providers must identify which of the population has the highest probability of recidivism and provide the most intensive intervention to these youth.

The Need Principle states that criminogenic predictors of crime and recidivism should be targeted. Criminogenic predictors include anti-social/pro-criminal attitudes, values,

¹ Huskey, B. and Associates. 2005. Continuum of Services Report.

beliefs, and peers. These predictors manifest as poor self-control, poor problem solving skills, and lack of empathy.

The Treatment Principle states that treatment and services should be behavioral in nature. Programs seeking to reduce recidivism in juvenile offenders should use empirically valid behavior/social learning and cognitive behavioral services specific to risk level.

Enhanced Services Initiative

In January 2007, the Santa Clara County Probation Department received approval from the State Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) to expend JJCPA funds for enhanced services in the form of a Sixth JJCPA-funded Program. The program was designed to: (1) enhance services in order to reduce the number youth failing the Community Release and Electronic Monitoring Programs through mental health and/or substance abuse treatment services, as well as family intervention counseling and child development and parenting skills training; and (2) enhance services for high-risk probationers in order to reduce the number of youth that return to Juvenile Hall on a bench or arrest warrants -- through family intervention and counseling. Program components were based on the criminogenic factors, including alcohol and drug, co-morbidity, and trauma issues, as identified in recent studies.

The design of this sixth program is consistent with the County's focus on providing a full continuum of services, targeting criminogenic factors, and providing appropriate sanctions based on an assessment of the youths risk and need. The use of an objective risk and needs assessment will allow Probation to determine which youth should participate, eliminating low-risk cases who do not need the level of supervision provided by these programs. The enhanced services will address the existing gap in services to address anti-social behavior and to build competencies for youth who are high-risk and out-of-custody.

The Sixth JJCPA Program, Part One - Enhanced Services for Community Release and Electronic Monitoring Programs

The County Mental Health Department and the County's Department of Alcohol and Drug Services will each conduct a RFP process, contract with community-based providers, and oversee their respective components. The goals of the mental health component include: (1) reducing the return of youth to detention and ranch programs through stabilizing the family and community systems and reducing the high-risk and criminal behaviors that result in re-incarceration; (2) assisting youth and their families in developing life skills that will improve their ability to live and thrive in the community; and (3) assisting the youth to return to the public school setting.

The Probation and Mental Health Departments have partnered to leverage funding opportunities through Medical and provide a higher level of expertise in mental health delivery. The partnership will allow for the County to contract with trained community-based family treatment providers in family counseling services of Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT). BSFT is an evidence-based program and recommended in the Continuum of Services report. Three-quarters of participating families are expected to

participate in this program. BSFT is a best practice model of family-centered counseling services that have been validated to work effectively with juvenile justice populations.

The Sixth JJCPA Program, Part Two - Enhanced Services for High-Risk Probationers

The second component to the Enhanced Services Initiative targets those youth who are high-risk wards of the court and who are residing with their parent, guardian, or relative. These youth are targeted in order to: (1) reduce the number of youth who are returned to the Juvenile Hall on a bench or arrest warrant; (2) the number of youth who are sent to out-of-home placements. Participating youth would otherwise be detained in Juvenile Hall for a violation of probation or for committing a new law violation. Through an objective risk and needs assessment, these youth would also have demonstrated a need for family counseling.

Program eligibility criteria are:

1. Male and female wards of the court between the ages of 14-17 years and 10 months; and
2. Is in violation of probation and for whom the probation officer is preparing to calendar a violation hearing; or
3. Has been arrested for a new law violation; or
4. Is not in compliance with the Community Release Program (CRP) and Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP); or
5. Has been identified and/or assessed and found appropriate based on the YLSI-R.

The program is consistent with the recommendation contained in the Continuum of Services report to provide “interventions and sanctions that are progressive, beginning with the least restrictive used first followed by increasingly restrictive measures in non-compliance continues.”² For example, only youth who are at risk of violation and returning to secure detention will be recommended to the program – prior to violation. Also, in order to ensure that only high-risk youth participate, Probation Officers will use the YLSI-R assessment instrument. A Family Contract will be developed with the youth and family, after a family is assessed to determine their ability and commitment to provide supervision and support.

The program’s community-based partners will provide Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT). BSFT has been proven to an effective model of family counseling that works particularly well with Latino and African American families. BSFT has been identified as a best practice and a model of family counseling that focuses on the development of strong family relationships and addresses unresolved family system issues. This model targets youth conduct problems, associations with anti-social peers, substance abuse and problematic family relationships.

² Huskey, B. and Associates. 2005. Continuum of Services Report.

STRENGTHEN AND MOBILIZE COMMUNITIES AND FAMILIES

Communities can generate solutions on how individuals and groups can prevent or reduce violence in their own block, or neighborhood. Cooperative partnerships among justice, health, child welfare, education, and social service systems can lay the foundation to assist communities to control their neighborhoods. Working together, individuals, groups, and communities can make real and sustained changes.

Former U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno stated that, “To combat juvenile violence, all citizens must recognize that they can make a difference in their communities, both through individual action and by joining with others in comprehensive, collaborative initiatives. All individuals can play crucial roles in protecting and nurturing children in their communities. Efforts to reduce juvenile violence can be as basic as parents setting clear expectations and standards for children's behavior or as far-reaching as a local government forming an anti-violence task force or implementing community oriented policing.” Santa Clara County is home to numerous community-based partnerships and its leaders recognize that these partnerships are critical to solving tough problems – including that of juvenile crime and violence.

When it comes to addressing juvenile delinquency, policy makers and other community leaders are reminded about the importance of building family and community capacity to work with anti-social and other troubled youth. The 2004 CMJJP cited a report entitled, *Preventing Problems, Promoting Development, Encouraging Engagement* (Pittman, 2001). This research emphasized the importance of supporting and strengthening the position of the “natural actors” in the lives of youths: family, peers, neighbors, and community institutions. Researchers explain that intervention programs and services need to be community based and prepare juvenile delinquents for the transition back home, back in their schools, and back in their communities.

JJCPA funds currently fund Aftercare Services and the Restorative Justice Program, which are summarized below. These services are designed, currently, to work with youth in groups when appropriate and work in partnership with community-based organizations, as recommended in the Continuum of Services report.

Community-Based Aftercare Services Summary³

The Community-Based Aftercare Services is a highly structured, inter-agency, community-based program designed to assist youth prepare for a smooth transition back into their families and communities. The three primary program goals are:

- Reintegrate students into pro-social community life through independent living, foster homes, or home family reunification;
- Eliminate delinquency and self-defeating behaviors; and
- Promote pro-social self-sufficiency through healthy behaviors in employment, school, social activities, etc.

Prior to the implementation of this program, comprehensive and community-based aftercare services were not available for youth exiting from Juvenile Hall and Ranch. As a result, youth had limited support while navigating the variety of challenges, decisions, and temptations when returning to their oftentimes chaotic families, schools and communities. Research indicates that youth who return to the very same negative family dynamics, peer pressures, and community influences which contributed to their initial incarceration are at high risk of re-offending. Without support and a high level of structure, these youth frequently fall back into their harmful behavior patterns with past peers groups. Aftercare Services provides youth and families the support they need for the youth's healthy re-integration.

Partners include:

- Community-Based Service Providers
 - California Youth Outreach (CYO)
 - Gardner Family Care Corporation
 - Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)
- Probation Department
- Department of Alcohol and Drug Services
- Mental Health Department
- Pathway Society

Program partners set out to reduce the recidivism rate for participating youth and prevent the further penetration of these youth in the criminal justice system. The program approach is rooted in helping youth to: (1) envision a positive future for themselves; (2) create new pro-social values and become involved in community life; (3) discover and develop new life skills and behaviors that will further their goals; (4) disassociate from a delinquent and/or criminal lifestyle; and (5) complete their probationary status without re-offending. The following section describes the four core steps of the Aftercare Services process.

Step 1: Intake/Assessment/ Individual Transition Service Plan (ITSP)

³ Program summaries contained in this update reflect the current program in place and do not describe changes that are currently under discussion.

The youth assessment and Individual Transition Service Plan (ITSP) are developed three weeks before a youth's release by the Aftercare Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT). The MDTs for youth from the Ranch and Juvenile Hall differ depending on the providers but are generally comprised of representatives from California Youth Outreach (CYO), Mental Health Department (MH), Drug and Alcohol Services Department, Pathways, Gardner, Probation Education Counselor, and staff from the facility. The Aftercare Probation Officer schedules the MDT, writes the ITSP, and works closely with CYO to ensure that the plan is implemented during the aftercare period. The Probation Officer also contacts the parents to inform them about the MDT process and to ask for input about what services they believe their child will need when released.

Prior to the MDT meeting, each member gathers pertinent information (including any existing assessments) on the youth and his family; conducts any necessary assessments; and meets with the youth and his family as needed. For example, the Probation Education Counselor inquires about the youth's school status; the CYO Community Aftercare Worker begins to build a relationship with youth; and the MH staff person determines mental health needs in preparation for youth's release and the aftercare period, including identifying referral sources and making System of Care referrals as needed. At this time, it is determined whether a referral to Gardner Family Care Corporation is appropriate for dual-diagnosis treatment and/or to FLY for additional programming

The intake and assessment process is also conducted in order to determine classification of the youth. The practice was developed by the Steering Committee in order to ensure that youth receive the appropriate level of service. For instance, youth needing more intense services have more frequent contact with his/her Aftercare Worker.

The ITSP is developed with clear guidelines and expectations for the youth. It addresses the youth's:

- living arrangement
- education plan
- employment training/placement
- social & extra-curricular activities
- guidelines and rules for the home
- individual behavioral goals
- mental health and/or substance abuse counseling, as needed.
- restitution and community service requirements

The MDT draws on the youth and family's strengths and places emphasis on family reunification that includes preserving, strengthening and/or re-establishing family acceptance of the youth.

Step 2: Service Delivery

Upon release from the facility, the youth enters the Initial Aftercare Period also known as, 'Pre-Release', when the youth is still under the authority of the Ranch. (Youth released from Juvenile Hall do not have a 'Pre-Release' period.) The youth is most vulnerable and at-risk of regressing to past destructive behaviors during this period, which is the first ten weeks of the program. The Ranch Aftercare Counselor begins primary supervision and meets with the youth once per week in order to ensure contract compliance and implementation of the transition plan. The Aftercare Probation Officer coordinates across MDT partners as it relates to the implementation of transition plan, and maintains primary oversight of the case. While supervision and services from all partners is critical, the Community Aftercare Worker plays an especially important role in continuing to build a caring and trusting relationship with the youth. The core of the youth's change in mindset and behavior begins with this relationship.

Step 3: Ongoing Client Contract/Case Management:

The Aftercare Counselor, Probation Officer, and Community Aftercare Worker share case monitoring and service delivery responsibilities. Together, they work to ensure that services and activities are consistent with the findings articulated in the ITSP. The service plan is updated as needed; the youth classification is modified if the youth is re-arrested. ITSP activities for the first 30 days are especially engaging, intensive and meaningful for the youth. Updates to the ITSP incorporate the youth's own articulated goals and concerns, in order to obtain his buy-in. The Community Aftercare Worker is also available for on-call support services for urgent matters. The Community Aftercare Worker works closely with the Aftercare Probation Officer to share information about the youth and his/her progress. The youth and his family continue to participate in the Aftercare program for the remaining ten and one-half weeks, the Extended Aftercare period. During this time, supervision provided by the Aftercare Counselor's (also know as the Ranch Pre-Release Counselor) is reduced as the youth's Ranch commitment is vacated. Supervision by the Probation Officer increases, as does supervision provided by the CYO Community Aftercare Worker.

Step 4: Exit:

When the youth has successfully met the goals of the ITSP at the end of the six-month period, the Probation Officer meets with the youth and his/her family. The Probation Officers closes out the ITPS and returns the youth's case to a general supervision unit, if Probation dismissal is not possible.

The following table provides a one-page overview of the Aftercare Program's evaluation results for Fiscal Year 2005-06.

JJCPA Performance – Logic Model Evaluation System Aftercare Program, FY 2005-06																														
Performance-Logic Model Term		Evaluation Questions	Answer to Evaluation Questions																											
E F F O R T	Inputs	What was spent on services?	The Aftercare Program expended \$602,520 in JJCPA grant funds to deliver services.																											
	Customers	Who were the customers?	Served 172 customers. See appendix.																											
	Strategies	What service strategies were used?	Middle column shows percent of all units of service delivered in FY 2005-06. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #ffffcc;">Activity</th> <th style="background-color: #ffffcc;">FY 05-06</th> <th style="background-color: #ffffcc;">FY 04-05</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outreach & Recruitment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intake, Assess. & ISP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.9%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Home/School Visit/Parents</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25.8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">23.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ind./Family Counsel</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17.0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transportation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.9%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Field Trips & Cmty. Service</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Group Workshops</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	Outreach & Recruitment	1.0%	0.0%	Intake, Assess. & ISP	1.9%	1.8%	Home/School Visit/Parents	14.3%	17.1%	Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	25.8%	23.8%	Ind./Family Counsel	17.0%	8.9%	Transportation	4.9%	3.8%	Field Trips & Cmty. Service	1.5%	9.2%	Group Workshops	33.7%	35.3%
	Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05																											
	Outreach & Recruitment	1.0%	0.0%																											
	Intake, Assess. & ISP	1.9%	1.8%																											
Home/School Visit/Parents	14.3%	17.1%																												
Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	25.8%	23.8%																												
Ind./Family Counsel	17.0%	8.9%																												
Transportation	4.9%	3.8%																												
Field Trips & Cmty. Service	1.5%	9.2%																												
Group Workshops	33.7%	35.3%																												
Output: Units of Service	How much service was provided?	Community-based providers of the Aftercare Program delivered 28,542 units of service. One unit of service equals one hour of direct service per customer.																												
Output: Cost per Unit of Service	What was the cost to provide services?	The cost per unit of service for the services delivered by the community-based providers was \$21.11.																												
E F F E C T	Performance Measure: Customer Satisfaction	Were customers satisfied with services?	The average customer satisfaction rating (out of 100 possible points) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● youth-reported = 79.3 ● parent-reported = 87.6 																											
	Performance Measure: Productivity Outcomes	Were services effective in producing the desired change?	Productivity scores (range from -100% to +100%) reflect the percent of targeted changes achieved minus the percent of targeted changes missed. Scores are listed by respondent. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Service Productivity</th> <th colspan="2">Youth-Reported</th> <th colspan="2">Parent-Reported</th> <th colspan="2">Staff-Reported</th> </tr> <tr> <th>FY 05-06</th> <th>FY 04-05</th> <th>FY 05-06</th> <th>FY 04-05</th> <th>FY 05-06</th> <th>FY 04-05</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dev. Asset</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">70.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">72.9%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">84.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">82.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program-Specific</td> <td style="text-align: center;">67.8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">69.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">79.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">84.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">83.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">75.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported		FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	Dev. Asset	60.6%	70.6%	72.9%	84.3%	82.5%	80.4%	Program-Specific	67.8%	69.3%	79.6%	84.5%	83.6%	75.0%
Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported																									
	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05																								
Dev. Asset	60.6%	70.6%	72.9%	84.3%	82.5%	80.4%																								
Program-Specific	67.8%	69.3%	79.6%	84.5%	83.6%	75.0%																								

Restorative Justice Program Overview

The JJCPA funds allowed for the continuation of the Restorative Justice Program (RJP) in all areas of the county. The program uses balanced and restorative justice principals to prevent youth from further penetrating the juvenile justice system. The Probation Department directly contacts victims of juvenile crime to request impact statements and restitution information. The program utilizes strength-based and family-focused rehabilitation services mindful of the ethnic and cultural diversity of its communities. In addition, the program is also a vehicle for increased victim participation in shaping youth

accountability by incorporating victim offender meetings and victim awareness workshops.

The program promotes community safety and youth accountability by supporting youth to repair the harm that they inflicted on the victim and community. Community Service Work provides youth the opportunity to develop empathy skills, gain assets and regain respect, as well as identifying and utilizing community resources to develop youth and family competencies.

Program partners include:

- Bill Wilson Center
- California Youth Outreach
- Community Health Awareness Council
- Community Solutions
- Probation Department

RJP was established to:

- To provide for the protection and safety of the community;
- To hold youth personally responsible and accountable for delinquent acts; and
- To foster youth who are contributing and responsible members of the community by focusing on youth developmental assets and youth resiliency.

RJP tests the theory that the best method of reducing juvenile crime and violence is to build the capacity of victims of crime, the community, and its youth. There are three core components to RJP: community protection, accountability, and youth competency development.

During Fiscal Year 04-05, a mentoring component was made available for youth in the East and West regional areas of the Restorative Justice Program who were identified as needing additional services and could benefit by being connected with a caring, adult role model from the community. The goal of Mentoring is to engage and support the youth in developing positive alternatives to delinquent behavior through the establishment of a relationship with an older, wiser, more experienced adult who can assist the youth by providing consistent support, guidance and concrete help to a minor whose at-risk environment increases his or her chances of exposure to at-risk behaviors.

The mentoring program ensures that those elements of culture, language, values, beliefs, worldview traditions and historical experiences are incorporated into the services provided to youth and their families. These services also ensure accessibility and maximize the strengths of different cultural groups in Santa Clara County.

The FY 2005-06 evaluation results for the Restorative Justice Program are described in the table below.

JJCPA Performance – Logic Model Evaluation System Restorative Justice Program, FY 2005-06							
Performance-Logic Model Term		Evaluation Questions	Answer to Evaluation Questions				
E F F O R T	Inputs	What was spent on services?	The Restorative Justice Program expended \$1,039,137 in JJCPA grant funds to deliver services.				
	Customers	Who were the customers?	Served 5,682 customers. See appendix.				
	Strategies	What service strategies were used?	Middle column shows percent of all units of service delivered in FY 2005-06.				
			Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05		
			Outreach & Recruitment	1.0%	0.5%		
			Intake, Assess. & ISP	8.0%	8.6%		
		Home/School Visit/Parents	0.0%	1.1%			
		Ind./Group/Family Counsel	9.8%	6.4%			
		Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	2.3%	3.3%			
		Transportation	0.0%	0.0%			
		Field Trips & Cmty. Service	42.7%	35.0%			
		Group Workshops	36.2%	45.1%			
Output: Units of Service	How much service was provided?	Community-based providers of the Restorative Justice Program delivered 51,036 units of service. One unit of service equals one hour of direct service per customer.					
Output: Cost per Unit of Service	What was the cost to provide services?	The cost per unit of service for services delivered by the community-based providers was \$20.36.					
E F F E C T	Performance Measure: Customer Satisfaction	Were customers satisfied with services?	The average customer satisfaction rating (out of 100 possible points) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● youth-reported = 78.9 ● parent-reported = 84.1 				
	Performance Measure: Productivity Outcomes	Were services effective in producing the desired change?	Productivity scores (scale from -100% to +100%) reflect the percent of targeted changes achieved minus the percent of targeted changes missed. Scores are listed by respondent.				
		Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported
			FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06
		Dev. Asset	54.0%	51.7%	62.5%	60.3%	76.5%
		Program-Specific	64.9%	60.0%	75.7%	71.2%	83.5%

MAXIMIZE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AND PARTNERSHIPS WITH SCHOOLS

Santa Clara County's community stakeholders, including justice system partners, have been concerned with how to maximize the effectiveness of schools and improve partnerships with schools. After all, schools are an ongoing and significant public investment made to socialize young people. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), high school graduation rates for San José's schools have slowed since 1996 and even dipped from 90% to 85% in the last two years. Also, according to the California State Department of Education, the four-year dropout rate for San José high schools increased by 71% since 1997. In 2005, 2,430 youth dropped out of San José high schools. Addressing truancy and school dropout is critical to maximizing the public's investment in socializing youth.

Currently, JJCPA funds provide support for truancy reduction services, as described below.

Truancy Reduction Services Program Summary

The Truancy Reduction Services (TRS) is comprised of four community-based organizations (CBO) and ten school districts. The four youth service organizations serve school-age youth between the ages of six and 17 years who are identified as "habitual" truants – those with six or more absences. The collaborative was formed based on an *Action Plan* developed by the Status Offender Services (SOS) Task Force. The *Action Plan* called for an expansion of services to status offenders, including truants of all ages.

The collaborative between the four community-based organizations was expanded from nine to ten participating school districts. The relationship is delineated in memorandums of understanding between the service agencies and school districts.

Partners and participating school districts are as follows:

- Alum Rock Counseling Center (lead agency)
- Community Solutions
- Emergency Housing Consortium
- California Youth Outreach
- School Districts and Student Attendance Review Boards (SARB)
 1. East Side Union High School District
 2. San José Unified School District
 3. Santa Clara Unified School District
 4. Cupertino School District
 5. Sunnyvale School District
 6. Gilroy Unified School District

7. Morgan Hill Unified School District
8. Alum Rock Union Elementary School District
9. Berryessa Union School District
10. Franklin-McKinley School District

Depending on the school district, youth clients are referred to the program by the youth's attendance office, school Counselor or Administrator, and/or SARB. In some cases, school districts have opted to place the TRS counselor at a school(s) with a demonstrated incidence of truancy. If any TRS service provider receives a referral from a CBO, and if the child/youth is in the corresponding school district, the referring source is directed to the child's school to make the referral to TRS. All TRS cases are certified by a school official and/or administrator. This ensures that the school and/school district are identifying the youths and for monitoring and tracking purposes. Referring sources receive a report back on the case disposition within one week of referral or one month, as established with the school district. The Case Managers with input from the collaborating school district have an established referral and report-back process.

Intensive case management services are provided to youth who are referred to the program. Intensive case management includes comprehensive youth and family assessment; development and implementation of an individual case plan with focus on increasing school attendance, participation, achievement, and diversion of youth from involvement with the criminal justice system; individual one-on-one support, and monitoring of progress through individual and family case management, school visits, home visits, and referral to other services as needed.

Each Case Manager carries a caseload of 15-20 clients and generally carries the cases for an average of 90 days. In addition to working with the referred youth, Case Managers work closely with parents and siblings of the identified youth. In some instances, Case Managers discover early truancy behaviors in younger siblings. Working with parents is also an integral part of the Case Manager's effort to improve the youth's school attendance. Case Managers refer parents to counseling, job training, and substance abuse services as part of the overall goal to reduce the youth's truant behavior. The TRS intervention model integrates culturally sensitive and language proficient services that are relevant and appropriate to the needs of participating youths and their families. Service providers work to ensure that clients have access to educational services as well as linked to community resources, including monitoring and follow-up.

The program evaluation results from FY 2005-06 are described in the table below.

JJCPA Performance – Logic Model Evaluation System Truancy Reduction Services, FY 2005-06																														
Performance-Logic Model Term		Evaluation Questions	Answer to Evaluation Questions																											
E F F O R T	Inputs	What was spent on services?	Truancy Reduction Services expended \$268,076 in JJCPA grant funds to deliver services.																											
	Customers	Who were the customers?	Served 329 customers. See appendix.																											
	Strategies	What service strategies were used?	Right-hand column shows percent of all units of service delivered. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Activity</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 05-06</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 04-05</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outreach & Recruitment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intake, Assess. & ISP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10.2%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Home/School Visit/Parents</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48.4%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ind./Family Counsel</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transportation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Field Trips & Cmty. Service</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.9%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Group Workshops</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	Outreach & Recruitment	15.6%	9.6%	Intake, Assess. & ISP	10.2%	8.5%	Home/School Visit/Parents	48.4%	22.7%	Ind./Family Counsel	14.7%	13.8%	Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	8.6%	40.4%	Transportation	0.0%	0.0%	Field Trips & Cmty. Service	0.9%	1.5%	Group Workshops	1.7%	3.5%
	Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05																											
	Outreach & Recruitment	15.6%	9.6%																											
	Intake, Assess. & ISP	10.2%	8.5%																											
Home/School Visit/Parents	48.4%	22.7%																												
Ind./Family Counsel	14.7%	13.8%																												
Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	8.6%	40.4%																												
Transportation	0.0%	0.0%																												
Field Trips & Cmty. Service	0.9%	1.5%																												
Group Workshops	1.7%	3.5%																												
Output: Units of Service	How much service was provided?	Community-based providers of Truancy Reduction Services delivered 12,442 units of service. One unit of service equals one hour of direct service per customer.																												
Output: Cost per Unit of Service	What was the cost to provide services?	The cost per unit of service for services delivered by the community-based providers was \$21.55.																												
E F F E C T	Performance Measure: Customer Satisfaction	Were customers satisfied with services?	The average customer satisfaction rating (out of 100 possible points) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● youth-reported = 81.2 ● parent-reported = 85.4 																											
	Performance Measure: Productivity Outcomes	Were services effective in producing the desired change?	Productivity scores (scale from -100% to +100%) reflect the percent of targeted changes achieved minus the percent of targeted changes missed. Scores are listed by respondent. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Service Productivity</th> <th colspan="2">Youth-Reported</th> <th colspan="2">Parent-Reported</th> <th colspan="2">Staff-Reported</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 05-06</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 04-05</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 05-06</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 04-05</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 05-06</th> <th style="text-align: center;">FY 04-05</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dev. Asset</td> <td style="text-align: center;">68.4%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">63.0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">68.4%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">64.8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">61.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">64.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program-Specific</td> <td style="text-align: center;">70.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">67.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">76.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">75.8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59.4%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">71.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported		FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	Dev. Asset	68.4%	63.0%	68.4%	64.8%	61.5%	64.5%	Program-Specific	70.3%	67.7%	76.5%	75.8%	59.4%	71.4%
Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported																									
	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05																								
Dev. Asset	68.4%	63.0%	68.4%	64.8%	61.5%	64.5%																								
Program-Specific	70.3%	67.7%	76.5%	75.8%	59.4%	71.4%																								

Decentralize Probation Services to Highest Risk Schools

The Continuum of Services report describes the importance of decentralizing probation services to the highest risk neighborhoods and to develop Family Resource Centers in the neighborhoods. While developing Family Resource Centers may be cost prohibitive, given the unprecedented budget cuts faced by the Probation Department, partnering with schools may not. Schools are natural community institutions, easily accessible and ripe for probation presence and leadership. Decentralizing probation services to

neighborhoods via schools is also a seamless way for the juvenile justice system to help maximize the effectiveness of schools to socialize youth.

As explained on page 75 of the Continuum of Services report, “National trend in probation is to decentralize services to neighborhoods, increase visibility of probation in underserved neighborhoods, enhance access of services to offenders, victims and enhance quality of life in neighborhoods.”⁴ The report suggests that probation explore increasing probation visibility in housing projects that have the highest referral rates, but schools are, perhaps, a more compelling place to begin this process.

⁴ Huskey, B. and Associates. 2005. Continuum of Services Report.

MAXIMIZE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Two effective practices in working with juvenile delinquents are also recommended in the Continuum of Services report: (1) working with youth in groups; and (2) implementing cognitive behavioral and social learning models.

Working with Youth in Groups

As explained in on page 69 of the Continuum of Services report, “There is an emerging trend within probation departments across the country to deliver some probation services in groups and to collaborate with community-based organizations to conduct this intervention.” The report describes the benefits of working with youth in groups, including reaching more offenders at one time.

Research indicates that working with youth in groups is also effective since service providers have an opportunity to use the biggest influence on youth – other youth.⁵ Research on youth dynamics and pro-social behaviors indicate that working with youth in groups is also beneficial because:

- youth do not need to feel alone in their experience;
- youth develop a sense of belonging to a pro-social entity;
- the group setting is a practice field and increases pro-social experiences; and
- youth can identify and build on strengths.

Cognitive Behavioral Interventions

Programs designed to address juvenile delinquency in Santa Clara County have gradually been moving towards incorporating cognitive behavioral change features. The Continuum of Services report explains on page 70: “Cognitive behavioral interventions assist offenders to change the way they think by providing facts to alter distorted values and thinking patterns and by teaching them skills that result in positive behavioral change.”

Latessa’s research, also mentioned earlier, indicates that treatment and services should be behavioral in nature. Programs seeking to reduce recidivism in juvenile offenders should use empirically valid behavior/social learning and cognitive behavioral services specific to risk level. Interventions for offenders need to provide “...structured social learning programs where new skills are taught, and behavior and attitudes are reinforced. Cognitive behavioral programs target attitudes, values, peers, etc. Family-based interventions should train families on appropriate behavioral techniques.”

⁵ Carrell, Susan. *Group Exercises for Adolescents*, second edition, 2000.

The County funds two additional programs that seek to maximize opportunities for youth through assessment, case management, and skill-specific group workshops. The two programs are Multi-Agency Assessment Center and MACSA's Personal Enhancement Programs, summarized below. Both programs have some group work and cognitive/behavioral change features.

Multi-Agency Assessment Center Program Summary

The Multi-Agency Assessment Center provides comprehensive assessments for youth admitted and detained in Juvenile Hall for longer than 72 hours. Youth receive mental health, educational, and medical screening assessments.

The assessment information is used to develop an individual case plans for each youth. The assessment results help to inform the integrated case management process and assist staff in identifying the appropriate support services for youth while in custody. The assessment center process also helps to prevent 'over-programming' of youth.

In addition to using assessment results to inform in-custody needs for youth, the results are used to link the youth and his family to appropriate community-based services upon release from Juvenile Hall. Contracted community-based organizations provide these services when the youth returns to his family and community. Lastly, the assessment-based individual case plans provide valuable information for those youth who transition to the Aftercare Services program.

Program partners include:

- Probation Department
- Asian American Recovery Services
- Asians for Community Involvement
- California Youth Outreach
- Fresh Lifelines for Youth
- Friends Outside
- Gardner Family Care
- Mexican American Community Services Agency
- County Office of Education
- Mental Health Department

Youth who are to be detained for longer than 72 hours are referred to the Assessment Center for a mental health assessment and risk/classification assessment that occur during the intake procedure. Educational testing takes place within the first 72 hours of a youth's admission, as is the Valley Medical Center (VMC) medical clinic screening. Drug and alcohol-related testing takes places within the first week.

Based on the results of the various assessments, an individual case plan is developed for each youth. While the Probation Department oversees the development of the case plan, each agency gives input based on the testing results.

Following the battery of assessments and the development of the individual case plan, the youth receives in-custody services. Each community-based provider is assigned a unit except for Friends Outside, which only provides one-on-one counseling due to the closure of a living unit. All other agencies are contracted to perform group workshops and one-on-one counseling. Group workshop services include substance abuse/relapse prevention, life skills development, conflict resolution, anti-criminal thinking patterns, gang intervention, parenting/family skills, and family/domestic violence education, and character building. Assessment Center staff monitor the youth's progress and make adjustments to the case plan as needed.

The following table shows the program's evaluation results for FY 2005-06.

JJCPA Performance – Logic Model Evaluation System Multi-Agency Assessment Center, FY 2005-06							
Performance-Logic Model Term		Evaluation Questions	Answer to Evaluation Questions				
E F F O R T	Inputs	What was spent on services?	The Multi-Agency Assessment Center expended \$181,091 in JJCPA grant funds to deliver services.				
	Customers	Who were the customers?	Served 1,007 customers. See appendix.				
	Strategies	What service strategies were used?	Middle column shows percent of all units of service delivered in FY 2005-06.				
			Activity	FY 05-06	FY 04-05		
			Outreach & Recruitment	0.0%	0.0%		
			Intake, Assess. & ISP	0.0%	0.0%		
		Home/School Visit/Parents	0.0%	0.2%			
		Case Mgmt., Support, Refer.	0.0%	1.7%			
		Ind./Family Counsel	7.3%	5.0%			
		Transportation	0.0%	0.0%			
		Field Trips & Cmty. Service	0.0%	0.0%			
		Group Workshops	92.7%	93.2%			
	Output: Units of Service	How much service was provided?	Community-based providers of the Multi-Agency Assessment Center delivered 16,735 units of service. One unit of service equals one hour of direct service per customer.				
	Output: Cost per Unit of Service	What was the cost to provide services?	The cost per unit of service for services delivered by the community-based providers was \$10.82.				
E F F E C T	Performance Measure: Customer Satisfaction	Were customers satisfied with services?	The average customer satisfaction rating (out of 100 possible points) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● youth-reported = 79.1 ● parent-reported = NA 				
	Performance Measure: Productivity Outcomes	Were services effective in producing the desired change?	Productivity scores (scale from -100% to +100%) reflect the percent of targeted changes achieved minus the percent of targeted changes missed. Scores are listed by respondent.				
		Service Productivity	Youth-Reported		Parent-Reported		Staff-Reported
			FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 04-05	FY 05-06
		Dev. Asset	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Program-Specific	57.0%	63.8%	NA	NA	70.4%

Mexican American Community Services Agency (MACSA) Personal Enhancement Program (PEP) Summary

JJCPA funds have enabled MACSA to expand, strengthen and continue existing programs. The PEP consists of several components, including the Male Involvement Program (MIP) and Ollin Project, described below.

The Male Involvement Program (MIP) is a teen pregnancy prevention program, focused on male responsibility, providing traditional rites of passage for adolescent males, youth leadership, and promoting fatherhood involvement. The MIP provides presentations; support groups (Circulos), multi-session workshops and staff trainings on how to work with at-risk Latino males and Fathers.

The Ollin Project provides gang intervention services to youth, ages 10 to 21 years old. The program's primary objectives are to provide a highly mobile outreach and Crisis Response Team with the expertise in gang intervention and mediation. The Ollin Project recruits and involves youth congregating (hanging out) on streets, parks, community centers, and schools and enrolls them into the comprehensive transitional program that begins with assessment, case management and mentoring services.

MACSA's JJCPA-funded strategy has been able to improve services at the Interventions Center in San José and the South County Youth Center, as well as at MACSA's two charter schools (Academica Calmecac and El Portal) by adding an intensive case management approach that is built upon a personalized development plan.

MACSA also operates a family advocate and parent education component. The family advocate provides support to parents who are trying to navigate the school and justice systems.

Primary partners include:

- Alum Rock Counseling Center
- Chamberlains Counseling Center
- Eastside Union High School District
- Gilroy Unified School District
- Morgan Hill Unified School District
- Probation Department
- School-Linked Services
- Workforce Investment Act – Youth Employment Services

There are four core program components to the JJCPA-funded program enhancements: assessment, intensive case management, family advocacy, and parent education.

Assessment: A Case Manager conducts a comprehensive intake and assessment of each youth. MACSA uses an asset-based assessment model and incorporates the 40 assets identified by the *Search Institute*. The case manager also meets with the youth's parents and siblings as needed in order to determine family and community assets. The information is used to develop a personalized development plan for each youth.

Intensive Case Management: The Case Manager works to ensure that all components of the personalized development plan are implemented. Instead of simply identifying and referring a youth and his family to a program or service, the intensive case management system ensures that the youth understands the service, knows how to get there, attends regularly, and is engaged. In addition to working with the youth and his parents to select the programs and services, the Case Manager monitors the youth's progress through individual and family meetings, site visits, and home visits. Quarterly assessments are conducted to document the success as well as to update the personalized development plan as needed.

Youth and Family Advocacy: The Case Manager refers a youth and his family to the Family Advocate when a family needs additional support. Services include translation for school and County services, support at court hearings, understanding procedures and completing documents, and enrolling in and accessing other services such as low-income health insurance programs. The Family Advocate works closely with the Case Manager to ensure that all progress is included in the case management system.

Parent Education: Parent education services are available to parents whose youth are at risk of entering the juvenile justice system or are recently released from custody. Parent education services are conducted in one-time workshops and ongoing parent support groups. Parent workshop and support group topics include: communicating with youth teenager, domestic violence, depression, and anger management.

